COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY STUDIES IN ENGLISH

THE STAGE HISTORY OF KING RICHARD THE THIRD

THE STAGE HISTORY OF SHAKESPEARE'S KING RICHARD THE THIRD

BY

ALICE I. PERRY WOOD, PH.D.

New York
THE COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
1909

Printed from type May, 1909

Press of
The New Era Printing Company
Lancaster, Pa.

This Monograph has been approved by the Department of English in Columbia University as a contribution to knowledge worthy of publication.

A. H. THORNDIKE,

Secretary.

TO

My Mother

Sarah S. Wood

AND

My Sister

Caroline C. Wood

WITH GRATITUDE AND AFFECTION

PREFACE

In the following pages it is my purpose to trace the fortune upon the stage of one of the most popular of Shakespeare's plays, "The Tragedy of King Richard the Third." In such a history, the consideration of the play as literature must be entirely subordinated to the exhibition of its capacity for stage effectiveness, and its success, deserved or not, with the public. For this reason, discussions of text, date and authorship, are deemed out of the province of this enquiry. While the materials for such a study, especially in the earlier history of the play, are scant, it has been my aim to give such records of performances as are extant, with the conditions of staging, the use of scenery, properties, and costume, the methods of actors, especially of those who have taken the principal part, and the attitude of the audience in successive periods and under varying conditions. Since there is little direct information concerning the play during the Elizabethan period, I have attempted to supply this lack in some measure, by an examination of the typical plays of the time, with a view to discovering the stage conditions which affected the original presentation. Having established the prevailing methods of staging by careful reference to the directions in contemporary plays, and by noting the favorite devices, and the management of situations similar to those occurring in this play, I have thought it possible, by a comparative method, to reconstruct the presentation of "Richard the Third" in Shakespeare's time.

The work naturally falls into well-marked divisions. First, the history of the play from its earliest performance to the closing of the theatres. The next period extends from the opening of the theatres to 1700, a time of general rather than particular importance to our subject. With the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Cibber version of "Richard the Third," the best known of all the adaptations of Shakespeare, appeared, and this constitutes the main feature of the history of the play during the century. Garrick initiates a new era in the history of acting in the mid-eighteenth century and I have therefore made his age the beginning of a fourth period. This extends through the career of Sir Henry Irving. The

fortune of "Richard the Third" in America deserves a place in the history of this play, both because of its intrinsic interest and because of its importance in American theatrical development, and the last chapter therefore gives the main facts of its history in this country, from its first performance in 1750, through the life-time of Edwin Booth. The study ends with such indications of general tendencies in the presentation of the play as I have gathered in the course of this investigation.

While the general purpose is expressed in the opening sentence of these introductory remarks, it is hoped that a farther aim has not been entirely lost sight of, and that this work has served to add some slight evidence for the worthier estimation of Shakespeare's genius as one that but turned to most significant use the common materials lying close to the hands of all.

I take this opportunity to express my gratitude for many courtesies received at the Astor, Lenox and Columbia libraries, and my indebtedness to the various members of the English department at Columbia University. Especially do I wish to thank Professor G. R. Carpenter, whose advice and encouragement have been invaluable; Professor W. P. Trent, for helpful counsel; Professor W. W. Lawrence, for reading the manuscript; Professor Brander Matthews, for reading the manuscript and furnishing some data; Professor W. A. Neilson, now of Harvard University, at whose suggestion this subject was undertaken; and Professor A. H. Thorndike, whose method of procedure I have adopted and who, throughout the work, has aided generously with suggestion and criticism.

A. I. P. W.

Vassar College,
December 13, 1908.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

L'opinion généralement etablie sur Richard a pu contribuer au succès de la pièce qui porte son nom : aucun peut-être des ouvrages de Shakspeare n'est demeuré aussi populaire en Angleterre. Les critique ne l'ont pas en général traité aussi favorablement que le public ; quelques-uns, entre autres Johnson, se sont étonnés de son prodigieux succès ; on pourrait s'étonner de leur suprise si l'on ne savait, par expérience, que le critique, chargé de mettre de l'ordre dans les richesses dont la public a joui d'abord confusement, s'affectionne quelquefois tellement à cet ordre et surtout à la manière dont il l'a conçu, qu'il se laisse facilement induire à condamner les beautés auxquelles, dans son système, il ne sait pas trouver une place convenable.

GUIZOT : Notice sur La Vie et La Mort de Richard III.

I

Richard the Third in its Relation to Contemporary Plays

Documentary facts of presentation and stage history—Earlier and contemporary plays—"Richardus Tertius"—"The True Tragedy"—References to other plays on the subject—Theatrical conditions in 1593–4—The close relations between dramatic authors tending to produce well-marked types—Plays based on the chronicles—Typical situations and general characteristics—Influence of Marlowe—"The Spanish Tragedy"—"Richard the Third" in reference to these types.

It is one of the surprises of Shakespearian criticism that some of the plays known to have been on the stage for three hundred years seem to have left so little trace in the annals of stage history or in contemporary literature. The play of "Richard the Third" offers slight reward to the student searching for documentary facts, merely a few references, sometimes vague, sometimes ambiguous, to what is conceded to have been one of the most popular of Shakespeare's plays. What is surely known may be given very briefly.

While no definite evidence exists, authorities generally agree in fixing the date of "Richard the Third" at 1593–4.[1] We learn from the title page of the first Quarto, 1597, that it was performed by the Lord Chamberlain's Men, one of the leading

[1] Such as Ward, Fleay, *The Irving Shakespeare*, The *Temple* and *Cambridge* editions, etc. The reasons, so far as based upon the publication of *The True Tragedy*, are of little weight, as many plays were printed in 1594–5 owing to the breaking up of the companies. Surer indications are the workmanship and the traces of Marlowe. Halliwell-Phillipps puts the date at 1597, because of the phrase "lately acted" on the Quarto as referring to the Lord Chamberlain's Company. The company would obviously be designated by its name at the time, no matter what it may have been called when the play first appeared. The opinions of the leading authorities on the question of the date may be found on pages 451–6 of the *New Variorum* edition of *Richard the Third*, which has appeared since this was written.

companies of the day. That it was popular and fell in with the taste of the day, we gather from the constant demands for republication,[2] as well from frequent allusions. It is first mentioned in John Weever's "Epigram Ad Gulielmum Shakespeare,"[3] 1595, where, among other characters of "honie-tong'd Shakespeare," he names Richard, probably, though not surely, Richard the Third. In "Epigrams and Elegies" by J. B. and C. M., supposed to belong to 1596, a part of Richard's speech is imitated.[4] "Richard the Third" is among the tragedies commended by Meres in "Palladis Tamia," 1598. Richard's line,

A horse! a horse! my kingdom for a horse!

found many imitators.[5] In "England's Parnassus," 1600,

[2] Wise published the Quartos of 1597, 1598 and 1602. The copyright was then sold to Matthew Law who republished the play in 1605, 1612, 1622, 1629 and 1634. In 1623 it appeared in the Folio. There were a larger number of editions of *Richard the Third* before 1640 than of any other of Shakespeare's plays.

[3] 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 love her,
Chaste Lucretia virgine-like her dresses,
Prowd lust-stung Tarquine seeking still to prove her;
Romea Richard; more, whose names I know not,
Their sugred tongues, and power attractive beuty
Say they are Saints, althogh that Sts they show not,
For thousands vowes to them subjective dutie.

[4] I am not fashioned for these amorous times,
To court thy beauty with lascivious rhymes;
I cannot dally, caper, dance and sing,
Oiling my saint with supple something.

Compare *Richard the Third,* Act I, Scene 1, lines 14–17.

[5] Marston: *Scourge of Villainie,* 1598.
A man, a man, a kingdom for a man!
Chapman: *Eastward Hoe,* 1605.
A boate, a boate, a boate, a full hundred marks for a boate.
Marston: *Parasitaster, or the Fawne,* 1606.
A foole, a foole, a foole, my coxcombe for a foole!
Marston: *What you Will,* 1607.
A horse, a horse, my kingdom for a horse!

there are five quotations from "Richard the Third." Sir William Cornwallis, in 1600, remonstrated against the popular conception of Richard as gained from the plays. In 1601, in "The Return from Parnassus," Part I, Act IV, Scene 3, Burbage and Kempe are represented as teaching students to act and as using this play for their text.[6] Manningham, in his "Diary" under date of March 13, 1601, tells an anecdote of Burbage and Shakespeare at a performance of "Richard the Third." Barnabe Barnes, in "Four Bookes of Office," 1606, and Nicholas Breton in "Good and Badde," 1616, both refer to the popularity of "Richard the Third" with vulgar audiences. The allusion most frequently quoted occurs somewhat later in Bishop Corbet's "Iter Boreale" of about 1618, where Burbage is inseparably identified with the part of Richard the Third.[7] In the same year, in "Funeral Elegy" on Burbage, it is said,

> And Crookback, as befits, shall cease to live.

Brathwaite: *Strappado for the Divell,* 1615.

> A horse, a kingdom for a horse.

Heywood: *Iron Age,* 1611.

> Syn. A horse, a horse.
> Pyn. Ten kingdoms for a horse to enter Troy.

Beaumont and Fletcher: *Little French Lawyer,* c. 1620.

> My kingdom for a sword.

Heywood: *Edward the Fourth,* 1600 pub.

> A staff, a staff,
> A thousand crowns for a staff!

Peele: *The Battle of Alcazar,* 1594.

> A horse, a horse, villain, a horse.

This last may antedate *Richard the Third* and therefore be the original line. Compare with these Shakespeare's own imitation in the Prologue of *Henry the Fifth.*

> A kingdom for stage.

[6] Burbage. I like your face, and the proportion of your body for Richard III; I pray, Master Philomusus let me see you act a little of it.

Phil. "Now is the winter of our discontent
Made glorious summer by the sun of York."

Bur. Very well, I assure you.

[7] For when he would have sayed "King Richard dyed,"
And called—"a horse, a horse!"—he Burbage cryed.

We find later references in Nahum Tate's "Loyal General," 1680,[8] and in Milton's "Eikonoclastes," 1690,[9] and reminiscences of lines from "Richard the Third" appeared in various poems for fifty years after the play.

These allusions,[10] while scanty, show that the figure of Richard the Third was a familiar one,[11] that it appealed to the imagination in its portrayal of an arch-villain, and that the greatest actor of the time, Burbage, was identified with it. With the one record of a performance, given in Sir Henry Herbert's Office Book under date of 1633,[12] these references comprise all the direct information we possess prior to the Restoration, of "Richard the Third" as a stage play. What further light we may throw upon its presentation must come from a consideration of the theatrical and dramatic situation of the time.

Before considering this, however, it is necessary to turn for a moment to the earlier plays on the subject.[13] "Richard the

[8] In the dedication to Edward Tayler, he speaks of Shakespeare's power in delineating Richard the Third's "Person, and Cruel Practices" and gives quotations to illustrate.

[9] Shakespeare "introduces the Person of Richard the Third, speaking in as high a strain of Piety, and mortification, as is uttered in any passage of this Book (*Eikon Basilike*); and sometimes to the same seise and purpose with some words in this Place, etc." There is a reference to Richard the Third in Gayton's *Festivous Notes on Don Quixote*, 1654, in addition to these given.

[10] See for many of these *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse*, edited by C. M. Ingleby, revised by L. T. Smith, published by *The New Shakespeare Society*, Series IV, number 2, 1879.

[11] C. B., the author of a poem, *The Ghost of Richard III*, explains that he does not enlarge on the story of Richard because it is "made so common in plays and so notorious among all men."

[12] "On Saterday the 17th of Novemb being the Queene's birthday, Richarde the Thirde was acted by the K. players at St. James, wher the king and queene were present."

[13] This subject as it has appeared in chronicle, poem and play, has been fully treated by Mr. G. B. Churchill in *Richard the Third up to Shakespeare*, and to that I am greatly indebted. He shows that before, and contemporary with its appearance on the stage, the subject was popular in several forms. In ballads there are extant *The Song of Lady Bessie*, dating from about 1500, *The Tragical Report of King Richard the Third*,

Third " on the stage dates from the appearance in 1579, of the Latin play, " Richardus Tertius," by Dr. Thomas Legge, Vice Chancellor of Cambridge and Master of Caius College. This is said to have been elaborately staged, and was very popular with academic audiences. There are some, though rather doubtful, evidences that it was repeated in 1582 and in 1592, on the former date before the Earl of Essex, on the latter before the Queen,[14] and Henry Lacey, in 1586, made a transcript of it for presentation at Trinity College, Cambridge. An indication of its popularity lies in the large number of manuscripts in existence, of which there are no fewer than ten; three at Cambridge, two in the British Museum, one in Bodleian, and one in private hands.[15] It is to this play that

1586, Deloney's *Lamentation of Jane Shore* in *The Garland of Good-Will* of the same time. In *The Mirour for Magistrates,* compiled as early as 1554, but first published in 1559, there were nine poems concerned with the story of Richard the Third in the first four editions. These were the poems on Henry the Sixth, on the Duke of Clarence and on Edward the Fourth, in the 1559 edition; in the edition of 1563 were added *Sir Anthony Woodville, Lord Rivers, Lord Hastings, The Complaint of Henrie, Duke of Buckingham* by Thomas Sackville, *Collingborne* by Baldwin, *Richard Plantagenet, Duke of Gloucester* by Segar, and *Shore's Wife* by Thomas Churchyard. In 1593, contemporary with *Richard the Third,* two poems on the subject, *Beawtie dishonoared written under the title of Shore's wife* by Anthony Chute, and *Licia* or *Poems of Love, in Honour 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 Crowne of Richard the third,* by Giles Fletcher. Michael Drayton's *Heroicall Epistles* were published in 1599, but were probably written earlier. Those related to this subject are, *Queene Margaret to William de-la-Poole, Duke of Suffolk, Edward IV to Shore's Wife,* and *The Epistle of Shore's Wife to King Edward the fourth.* Less popular versions of the story were to be found in Sir Thomas More's *History of King Richard III,* which appeared in English about 1513 with an earlier Latin version, in Polydore Vergil's *Historia Angliæ,* 1534, in John Rastell's *Pastime of People or the Chronicles of Divers Realms,* 1529, and in such accounts as Hall's, 1548, Grafton's, 1562, and Holinshed's, 1578, and in the work of the contemporary popular chronicler Stowe, whose accounts date 1561 and 1580.

[14] Churchill, *op. cit.,* page 267. See also Fuller's *Worthies, Norwich,* edition of 1840, Vol. II, page 491.

[15] *Ditto,* page 269.

Sir John Harrington refers in his "Apologie of Poetrie," 1591, where he says:

"For tragedies, to omit other famous tragedies, that which was played at St. John's in Cambridge, of Richard the Third, would move, I thinke, Phalaris the tyrant, and terrifie all tyrannous minded men from following their foolish ambitious humours, seeing how his ambition made him kill his brother, his nephews, his wife, beside infinit others, and last of all, after a short and troublesome raigne, to end his miserable life, and to have his body harried after his death."

This opinion of the "convicting" power of the play is quoted by Thomas Heywood in his "Apology for Actors," 1612, and Meres in "Palladis Tamia," 1598, includes Dr. Legge, of Cambridge, among "our best for Tragedy," mentioning his "two famous tragedies" of "Richard the Third" and "The Destruction of Jerusalem."[16] The play follows the story as found in Polydore Vergil and More with slight variations for the sake of bringing it into the Senecan mould, as the personal wooing of Anne by Richard and the extension of the scenes with the counsellors.

Mr. Churchill has pointed out that, while the choice of the subject of Richard the Third was probably the result of its adaptability to the Senecan idea of tragedy, this play nevertheless, in treating English material, was the precursor, if not the "direct incitement to that dramatizing from the chronicles of the careers of English monarchs which established a national historical drama in popular form upon the popular stage."[17] Since this was a university play and in Latin, it was known to a limited, but nevertheless an important audience, for Marlowe, Lodge, Peele, and Greene were Cambridge men and must have been familiar with it. This first chronicle play must, therefore, have undoubtedly helped to establish a tradition for later forms.[18]

[16] Allusion to this play is made by Thomas Nash in *Have with you to Saffron Walden,* 1596, where he tells of the mistake of an actor, who, "in the Latine tragedie of King Richard cries Ad urbs, ad urbs, ad urbs when his whole part was no more than Urbs, urbs, ad arma, ad arma." Churchill, *op. cit.,* page 265.

[17] *Ditto,* page 272.

[18] A detailed analysis of the play is given by Mr. Churchill, *op. cit.,* pages 280–375.

"Richard the Third" soon became a favorite on the public stage. On June 19, 1594, Thomas Creede entered on the Stationers' Register "an enterlude" which was published the same year under the title of "The True Tragedy of Richard the Third: Wherein is showne the death of Edward the Fourth, with the smothering of the twoo yoong Princes in the Tower: With a lamentable ende of Shore's wife, an example for all wicked women. And lastly the conjunction and joining of the two noble Houses, Lancaster and Yorke. As it was playd by the Queenes Maiesties Players." This play seems to have been the outcome of the rivalry between the Queen's Company at The Theatre and Pembroke's Men at The Curtain, in an attempt to supply the popular demand for a continuation of the subject of the Lancastrian and Yorkist conflict already set forth in the play given by the Queen's Company, and called "The First Part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster, with the death of the good Duke Humphrey: And the banishment and death of the Duke of Suffolk, and the Tragicall end of the proud Cardinall of Winchester, with the notable Rebellion of Jacke Cade: And the Duke of Yorkes first claime unto the Crowne."[19] A continuation of this play, the second part of "The Contention," also called "The True Tragedy of the Duke of Yorke," was given a little later by the Earle of Pembroke's Men, a rival company, which still later probably acted the third part of "Henry the Sixth," evidently based on this play. While these are not preëminently dealing with Richard the Third, his character is prominent and suggests the possibilities which were later carried out in making him protagonist in the play given by the Queen's Men. This was in competition, apparently, with "The Second Contention," and in it we find the typical situations that have distinguished the plays on Richard the Third throughout.

It is not to be supposed that The Rose was without a play upon a subject that, according to Thomas Nash, filled both

[19] F. G. Fleay, *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, Vol. II, page 315. Also Churchill, *op. cit.*, page 485. Fleay dates this play about 1589.

houses as did those on the life of King Henry the Sixth.[20] In Henslowe's Diary, in the account of the Earl of Sussex' Men, we find:

"Rd at buckingam, the 30 of desembr 1593 ..... lix^{s}.
" " " " 1 " Jenewary 1593 ..... lviii^{s}
" " " " 10 " " " ..... xxii^{s}
" " " " 27 " " " ..... xviii^{s} "[21]

This play of "Buckingham" may have been a version of the story of Richard the Third with the emphasis upon this character, his "rising" and overthrow offering a tragic theme almost as notable as that of Richard himself. There is a possibility also[22] that the entries for December 31, and January 16, 1593, in regard to a play of "Richard the confeser" may be on the same subject, or at least connected with it.

It is seen, therefore, that when the play of "Richard the Third," which we attribute to Shakespeare,[23] appeared, probably at The Theatre,[24] and probably in the season of 1593–4, there were several plays in the possession of companies on the same subject, and perhaps more than one actually on the boards at the same time.

The theatrical situation in London in 1593–4 should be noticed. The old Queen's Company had been broken up, the children's companies, for one reason or another, had been

[20] "How would it have joyed brave Talbot, the terror of the French, to think that after he had been two hundred years in his tomb he should triumph again on the stage, and have his bones embalmed with the tears of ten thousand spectators (at least at several times) who, in the tragedian that represents his person, behold him fresh bleeding." *Pierce Penniless,* 1592.

[21] *Shakespeare Society Publications,* 1845, pages 31–3.

[22] According to J. P. Collier's edition of *Henslowe's Diary, Shakespeare Society Publications,* 1845, page 31.

[23] F. G. Fleay (*Life of Shakespeare,* pages 118 and 276–7) believes that Marlowe left this play incomplete at his death, and that it was finished by Shakespeare. Halliwell-Phillips (*Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare,* page 94) thinks it is essentially Shakespeare's, but contains remnants of an older play. J. R. Lowell, on æsthetic grounds, denies that Shakespeare did more than to remodel an old play. See *Latest Literary Essays and Addresses.*

[24] Fleay, *History of the London Stage,* page 154.

inhibited, not to appear in public again until 1596, and from the large number of players' companies of the earlier time, three had come to be recognized as the only ones authorized within the liberties of the city, namely, Lord Strange's, later the Lord Chamberlain's, the Earl of Pembroke's, and the Lord Admiral's. By this time also, from the six public playing places open two years before, only three were now maintained, The Theatre, The Curtain, and The Rose. To these, however, must be added the place, theatre or not, at Newington Butts,[25] which was used in 1594 by the Chamberlain's and Admiral's men. The occupation of these theatres by the different companies is hard to follow, for a company shifted frequently from one to another. Thus, according to Mr. Fleay's researches, Pembroke's Company was at The Curtain from 1589 to 1597, and at intervals from 1597 to 1600, when they disappear, they joined with the Admiral's Men at The Rose. The Chamberlain's Company, of most interest to us, also had changing fortunes about this time. Their home was The Theatre, but in June of 1594 we find them playing in alternation with the Admiral's Men at Newington Butts, and under the management of Henslowe, of The Rose. In October they were back at The Theatre, and it is here that "Richard the Third" was probably produced. Plays as well as companies were shifted about. Thus, the London theatrical season of 1593 had been abruptly ended in April by the plague, and the houses remained closed until Christmas. In this time Pembroke's Men were unsuccessful in their tour in the country, and soon after sold several of their plays to the Chamberlain's Men.[26] Some of these plays the Chamberlain's Company acted during the next season.[27]

From these few facts, it may be seen that the relations of the various companies to each other were very close. Several

[25] See T. F. Ordish, *Early London Theatres,* Chapters IV and VI.

[26] Among these were *Edward the Third* and *The Contention.*

[27] The foregoing statements based on F. G. Fleay's *History of the English Stage,* serve to illustrate the probable general conditions, although some of the facts in detail may be open to question. For a discussion of these matters, see W. W. Greg's edition of *Henslowe's Diary,* Vol. II, which has appeared since this was written.

were at times under one management, as the Sussex, Admiral's and Chamberlain's are shown to have been in Henslowe's accounts;[28] plays were sold from one company to another; actors and writers changed about, and the companies played in different theatres. In such a state of affairs not only were successful themes worked up into rival plays by several companies, but telling theatrical effects and situations were borrowed and imitated. An example of the theatrical policy of the day is seen in the list of the York and Lancaster plays in the possession of the companies at this time, more than one of which were being acted at the same time. Pembroke's Men were playing "The Contention," Part II, at The Curtain, 1589 to 1591; the Queen's Men Marlowe's (?) early version of "Henry the Sixth," Part I, at The Theatre in 1588–9, and "The True Tragedy" in 1591; Strange's Men gave "Henry the Sixth," Part I, with the Talbot scenes, at The Rose seventeen times from March 3, 1592, to January 31, 1593. Henslowe's "Richard the Confessor," a possible Richard the Third play, ran from December 31, 1583, to January 16, 1594, at The Rose, and "Buckingham" from December 30 to January 27.[29] The Chamberlain's Men at the same time were probably playing "Richard the Third" at The Theatre.[30] A "hit" in material or staging was eagerly sought in this theatre-going age, and imitation of a success became inevitable."[31]

[28] *Henslowe's Diary.* Edited by W. W. Greg.

[29] See Fleay, *History of the English Stage.* See also *Revels Accounts.*

[30] Fleay's conjecture of a performance of *Richardus Tertius* before the Queen, September, 1592, is interesting in the light of the vogue of the subject at this time.

[31] The popularity of the subject continued long after the height of the vogue of the chronicle play. In 1610, Robert Niccol's new edition of *The Mirror for Magistrates* appeared, in which there were two poems on Richard the Third, *The Two Princes,* and *Richard III,* the last to replace Segar's poem, *Richard Plantagenet, Duke of Gloucester,* in the 1563 edition. In 1614 a poem appeared called *The Ghost of Richard the Third, Expressing himselfe in these three Parts. 1. His Character. 2. His Legend. 3. His Tragedie, containing more of him than hath been heretofore shewed: either in Chronicles, Playes or Poems.* The author signed himself C. B., and is supposed to be Christopher Brooke. Sir John Beaumont wrote a poem on Bosworth Field in 1629. In ballad literature Richard the Third figures

Turning now to the drama of the time, we find a similar state of affairs, *i. e.*, a close relation between authors, which furthered imitation and tended toward the establishment of

in R. Johnson's *Buckingham,* in his collection called *The Crowne-Gardland of Goulden Roses,* published in 1612, and going through many subsequent editions. (See *Publications of the Percy Society,* Vol. 6.) This was to be sung to the tune of *Jane Shore,* an air frequently referred to, but which has never been recovered. (J. P. Collier's *Extracts from the Register of the Stationers Company.*) About this time too, must have appeared the collection called *The Golden Garland of Princely Delight,* in which there was a song on *The most cruel Murther of Edward V.* The thirteenth edition of this came out in 1690. There were innumerable chap-books also during this period. Plays on Richard the Third continued to appear. In Henslowe's accounts for the year 1599, we find this entry:

> "Receaved of M^r^ Ph. Hinchlow, by a note under the hand of M^r^ Rob. Shaw, in full payment, for the second pt of Henrye Richmond, sold to him and his Companye, the some of eight powndes current money, the viii^th^ daye of november 1599. . . . viii^li^

This may refer to a play on Richard the Third with the emphasis upon the character of Henry Richmond. This is further borne out by the discovery among the papers of Edward Alleyn at Dulwich College, on the back of a note from one Robert Shaa to Henslowe, of the following memorandum:

> "1 sce. Wm. Wor. and Ansill, and to them the plowghmen.
> 2 sce. Richard and Q. Eliza. Catesbie, Lovell, Rice ap. Tho., Blunt, Banester.
> 3 sce. Ansell. Daug^r^: Denys, Hen, Oxf. Courtney, Bouchier and Grace. To them Rice ap. Tho. and his Souldiers.
> 4 sce. Milton, Ban. his wyfe and Children.
> 5 sce. K. Rich. Cates, Lovell, Norf. Northumb. Percye."

Collier refers this to Jonson's *Richard Crookback* of 1602, but Mr. Fleay (*Chronicle History of the London Stage,* Vol. II, page 284), thinks it belongs to the second part of *Richmond,* while Mr. Churchill (*Richard the Third up to Shakespeare,* page 531), believes it "is a bit from a play used during this period (*i. e.,* the nineties), and replaced by Jonson's *Richard Crookback* in 1602. This play of Jonson's we know only by name, from the entry in Henslowe's Diary:

> "Lent unto bengemy Johnsone at the apoyntment of E. Alleyn and W^m^ Birde, the 24 of June 1602, in earneste of a Boocke called Richard crookbacke, and for new adicijons for Jeronymo, the some of . . . x^li^

types. This is seen in an examination of the plays which were produced at this period. Leaving out of consideration the comedies as having little to do with our question, we find nine extant histories and tragedies appearing in the twenty years between 1560 and 1580, or roughly, between "Gorboduc" and "The Famous Victories." I give the list below.[32] These plays, with the exception of "Apius and Virginia," are either Senecan in general character, as "Gorboduc" "Jocasta," "Tancred and Gismunda," and "The Misfortunes of Arthur,"[33] or they illustrate some of the many modifications of the morality, as in the revenge play of "Horestes," or the biography of "Cambyses."[34] Both classes have contributed to the history of the drama. The indebtedness to the classical influence has been noted from the time of Nash's Preface to Greene's "Menaphon," was discussed by Warton in his "History of Poetry," and has received attention from such writers as Collier, Ward, Symonds, Klein, R. Fischer, J. W. Cunliffe and others.[35] The contributions especially to

There are several allied plays in this period. In 1600, Heywood's *Edward the Fourth,* in two parts, was published, after having been acted by Derby's Men at The Curtain. The second part gives the story of Jane Shore with scenes in which Richard the Third figures, though not prominently. About the same time Day and Chettle wrote a *Shores Wife,* of which we know nothing more than the name. We have no information either of *A Tragedy of Richard the Third or the English Prophet,* by Samuel Rowley, licensed in 1623. Fleay says that it was played at The Fortune by Palsgrave's Men in 1623. (*History of the London Stage,* page 307.) These are the only plays of which we have any information up to the closing of the theatres.

[32] *Cambyses,* 1561. *Gorboduc,* 1562. *Jocasta,* 1566. *Albyon Knight,* 1566. *Horestes,* 1567. *Apius and Virginia,* 1567–8. *King Johan,* 1538, and *The Misfortunes of Arthur,* 1588, belong here, although they do not come within these limits. In addition to these, a number of Latin plays on chronicle subjects were produced. We are directly concerned with *Richardus Tertius,* 1579. Descriptions and discussions of these may be found in Schelling, *The English Chronicle Play,* and in Fleay, *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama.*

[33] For an analysis of the Senecan characteristics of *The Misfortunes of Arthur,* see J. W. Cunliffe, *The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy,* Appendix II.

[34] And in the earlier social-polemical play of *King Johan.*

[35] See J. W. Cunliffe, *op. cit.,* for a brief history of its treatment.

be noted are the " high " style in the treatment of lofty themes, the better ordering and limitation of act and scene, and the facility in furthering the narrative gained by the character of the messenger.[36] In the moralities, the methods of presentation are borrowed largely from the older religious drama, and thus, especially in regard to staging, these plays are highly interesting. While the figures of Johan, Horestes, and Cambyses are little more than abstractions, yet they show the popular and traditional ideas of stage propriety in dealing with kingly and national subjects.

Of the plays immediately succeeding these early ones up to 1594, about forty are histories[37] and tragedies;[38] in which

[36] An important influence came indirectly from the Senecan play through Kyd's adaptations of Senecan devices in *The Spanish Tragedy*, 1585. See Schelling, *op. cit.*, page 25.

[37] These may be tragedies, comedies, or tragi-comedies.

[38] The following are the extant tragedies and history plays produced between 1580 and 1594.

Play.	*Date.*	*Place.*	*Company.*	*S. R.*
Solyman and Perseda	1583	Theatre	Queen's	Nov. 20, 1592
First Part of Jeronimo	c. 1584	"	"	1605.
Arden of Feversham	1585	" (?)	"	Apr. 3, 1592.
Locrine	1586	?	?	Jul. 20, 1594.
Jack Straw	1587	Theatre	Queen's	Oct. 23, 1593.
1 and 2 Tamburlaine	1587	In City	Adm'l's	Aug. 14, 1590.
Wounds of Civil War	"	"	"	May 24, 1594.
Famous Victories	c. 1588	Theatre	Queen's	May 14, 1594.
Selimus	1588	"	"	1594.
Troublesome Raigne	"	"	"	1591.
Alphonsus of Arragon	c. 1588	"	"	
Dr. Faustus	1588	In City	Adm'l's	Jan. 7, 1601.
Spanish Tragedy	c. 1588	"	"	Oct. 6, 1592.
David and Bathseba	"	"	"	May 14, 1594.
Leir	1588–9	Theatre	Queen's	"
George a Green	"	"	"	Apr. 1, 1595.
1 Henry VI (Marlowe's)	"	"	"	
Battle of Alcazar	"	In City	Adm'l's	1594.
1 Contention	1589	Theatre	Queen's	Mar. 12, 1594.
Jew of Malta		"	"	May 17, 1594.
Friar Bacon	1589	"	"	May 14, 1594.
Fair Em	1590	Cross Keys	Strange's	1631.
Edward I	"	"	"	Oct. 8, 1593.

three well-marked types may be distinguished; the chronicle history, the Marlowean play, and the neo-Senecan tragedy of Kyd. These three classes may be differentiated according to the material of the plot, the structure, characterization, and stage effects, but they are not mutually exclusive. There is hardly a serious play after the appearance of "Tamburlaine" in 1586, which is not influenced by Marlowe's heroic ideals, often, at the same time, showing the influence of Kyd. Many of these plays deal with subjects from the national chronicles and show in combination with the traits of the work of Marlowe and Kyd, what came to be considered the essential marks of the chronicle play. In addition, as a result of the great vogue of this latter type at this time, there are a number of plays which, while the material is not drawn from the English chronicles, in structure, spirit, and general character, are chronicle plays.[39]

Such being the theatrical and dramatic situation of the time, it is possible to learn much of the character of "Richard the Third" as a stage play through a study of this preceding drama, especially of the plays produced during the ten years immediately before its appearance. Disregarding for the nonce the special marks of Marlowe and Kyd in these plays,

Edward III	1590	Curtain	Pemb'k's	Dec. 1, 1595.
2 Contention	"	"	"	1595.
Edward II	1590–1	"	"	Jul. 6, 1591.
James IV	1590	Theatre	Queen's	May 14, 1594.
Nobody and Somebody	"	?	?	Mar. 12, 1606.
True Tragedy	1591	Theatre	Queen's	Jun. 19, 1594.
Woodstock	c. "	"	" (Fleay. ?)	
Romeo and Juliet	"	In City	Adm'l's	
Dido	"	Children of	Chapel.	
Knack to Know a Knave	1592	Rose	Strange's	Jan. 7, 1594.
1 Henry VI (Shakespeare's)	1592	"	"	Feb. 25, 1597–8.
Massacre at Paris	1593	"	"	
Titus Andronicus	1594	"	Sussex,	Feb. 6, 1593–4.
Richard III	"	Theatre	Chamb.	Oct. 29, 1597.
Sir Thomas More	1595–6 (Dyce 1590)	"	"	

[39] For a fuller treatment of this subject, see A. H. Thorndike's *Tragedy*, especially Chapter IV. To Professor Thorndike the writer is personally indebted for many suggestions in this chapter.

and considering the body of plays based upon chronicles, either really or nominally, we find a sufficiently constant recurrence of situations and characteristics to constitute a well-marked type. This type may be characterized generally as dealing with large national questions, the course of events often extending through a long period of years, and concerned with some national crisis, as the fate of a king, or the opposition of a foe. The interest centers in the story, which is generally one of a popular nature, and often well-known to the audience in ballad and legend. As in other popular forms of the drama, the number of characters is large, and the scenes are of wide variety of appeal, and usually rapid in succession. Favorite situations, which are found constantly recurring, may be classed as follows:

I. *Martial Scenes.*—There is an invariable group of situations having to do with the preparation for war or with the progress of the battle. Such are the embassy, the defiance, boast, threat, denunciation, parley and quarrel, the battle, whether on the stage or behind the scenes, the storming of a city wall, the single encounter, and the flight from the field. All these occur so frequently that particular examples are unnecessary. Other scenes of this sort, not so frequent, but effective when they are introduced, are the refusal to surrender, the supplication to a conqueror, and the reception of a deliverer.

II. *Scenes of Wonder.*—The interest in the story is whetted by the introduction of scenes dealing with the wonderful. This element may be introduced by means of prophecies and their fulfillment,[40] or by supernatural events, such as Queen Elinor's "sinking" in "Edward the First,"[41] or the appearance of the five moons in "The Troublesome Raigne," or of the three suns in "The Contention," Part II, and "Henry the Sixth," Part III.

III. *Comic Scenes.*—There is invariably a comic element. This often centers about the life of the common soldier. He

[40] *Troublesome Raigne, Edward the First, Edward the Third,* etc.

[41] Or Lady Elinor and the wizard in *Henry the Sixth,* Part II.

is levied unwillingly,[42] or he is thievish and ridiculously boastful.[43] The comic scenes as a whole are not distinctive, but deal with the material found commonly successful on the stage.

IV. *Political Wooing Scenes.*—In these plays the political marriage is presented as a motive, as in "The Famous Victories," and "The Troublesome Raigne."[44]

V. *Terminal Scenes.*—Stages in the story are marked by eloquent scenes of self-congratulation after a battle,[45] or reconciliations of opponents.[46] The funeral or the preparation for it is common here as in other Elizabethan tragedy.

VI. *Typical Characters.*—Consonant with these typical scenes, the characters fall into well-defined types, as the warrior, whether king or subject, the popular hero, like Falconbridge in "The Troublesome Raigne," the Black Prince in "Edward the Third," or Richmond in "The True Tragedy," the loyal statesman, like Humphrey and Cromwell, the queen bewailing misfortune, like Constance, Margaret, and Anne of Bohemia, and the conquered king, often in great distress, as in "Locrine," "Selimus," "Wounds of Civil War," and "Alphonsus of Arragon."

VII. *Stage Effects.*—The plays are characterized by elaborate devices for stage effects. In this they were undoubtedly influenced by the processions and royal progresses of the time, and probably owe something to the pageants of the medieval drama.[47] We find the predominance of such scenes as crown-

[42] *The Famous Victories.* Also in *Locrine.*

[43] *Jack Straw, The Famous Victories, Locrine.*

[44] Also in *Henry the Sixth,* Part I, Margaret and Suffolk. In slightly different form also in *Tamburlaine, Locrine, Alphonsus of Arragon.* Mr. Churchill (*op. cit.,* page 349) points out a similar case in *Mad Hercules,* Act II, Scene 2, and in *Richardus Tertius,* Actio III, Scene 4. Theodor Vatke suggests the same comparison, in *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Gesellschaft,* Vol. IV, page 64.

[45] *Henry the Sixth,* Part III, *Contention,* Part II, *Jack Straw.* Also in *Tamburlaine, Locrine, Alphonsus of Arragon,* and *Battle of Alcazar.*

[46] *Henry the Fifth, Troublesome Raigne, James the Fourth,* etc.

[47] Found frequently in Greek drama. The "shows" in *Richardus Tertius* take the form of processions.

ings,[48] marriages, betrothals,[49] ceremonies connected with arming or "dubbing,"[50] the issuing of proclamations,[51] pennances,[52] "shows," or tableaux.[53] In the martial scenes much is made of the march to battle, or the rush of soldiers across the stage,[54] or the effectiveness is heightened by frequent "alarums," by the sennet at the entrance and exit of the king, by the flourish of trumpets accompanying the army, by the firing of cannon, or "noise without."[55] Thunder and lightning, darkness, or other devices heighten the effect of the scenes of wonder.

VIII. *Structure and Style.*—The chronicle play is essentially epic in form. While there is some selection of material, imposed by the central interest in the life of the king, or in the particular national struggle, the tendency is to present everything upon the stage. In this the chronicle play has much in common with the dramatization of the Bible narrative, the aim in both cases being the same, namely the presentation of a story. In style, these plays are characterized generally by oratorical effects, which display themselves in such passages as the reports of heroic deeds,[56] descriptions of England and references to her past,[57] patriotic harangues before an army,[58] and high-resolved defiances.

Such being the characteristics of the chronicle as such, we may now turn to the influence upon it of the epoch-making plays of Marlowe. But before noticing the important innovations effected by them, it is necessary to consider the general characteristics of his work. The peculiar Marlowean feature

[48] Passim.

[49] *Edward the First, James the Fourth.*

[50] *Edward the Third, Contention Part II, Sir Thomas More.*

[51] *Jack Straw, Contention Part I, Edward the First.* Also *Promos and Cassandra.*

[52] *Henry the Sixth Part I, The True Tragedy.*

[53] *Contention Part II, Edward the First, James the Fourth, Locrine.*

[54] Passim.

[55] Passim.

[56] *Famous Victories, Edward the Third.*

[57] *Henry the Sixth Part II, Contention Part I, Locrine, Edward the First.*

[58] *Edward the Third.*

to be noted is the entirely new element in his conception of heroic figures, and in his lofty ideas of the possibilities of human achievement. The modifications growing out of this new conception are the intense centering of attention upon the person of the hero, and the suppression of all scenes not closely connected with this central figure. This results in a unity quite at variance with the general epic quality of the early histories which we have been considering. In this intenser focusing, where some overruling passion is made the motive, we have a new and remarkable development of the villain-hero, as in "Tamburlaine," "The Jew of Malta," and "Faustus," and the chronicle is transformed into a play of tragic rather than of epic interest. An illustration of Marlowe's method of suppressing all extraneous matter is found in his peculiar modification of the comic element. When the comic appears in his plays, it grows out of the situation and is never so distinctly a by-play as in the epic type of chronicle play.[59] For this reason it is often grotesque rather than broadly comic. This seems to have led to the frequent statement that this element is lacking. In "Tamburlaine,"[60] the scenes dealing with the foolish king Mycetes,[61] the war of words between Zenocrate and Zabina,[62] the inert son of Tamburlaine,[63] and the artless captain,[64] were undoubtedly grotesquely comic. It may be also that the Bajazet scenes[65] had a similar effect to an Elizabethan audience. The same elements of the grotesque are seen in the trick put upon Jacomo,[66] in the ironical justice

[59] The comic scenes in *Dr. Faustus*, which may seem to be an exception to this, clearly bear the marks of other hands than Marlowe's. For a discussion of this, see A. W. Ward's edition of *Faustus, Appendix A*, by F. G. Fleay.

[60] The first editor of *Tamburlaine* says that he omitted "many fond and frivolous gestures" from the play as given on the stage. These were probably added by the actors and were undoubtedly of a broadly comic character.

[61] *Tamburlaine*, Part I, Act I, Scene 1, and Act II, Scene 3.

[62] *Ditto*, Act III, Scene 3.

[63] *Tamburlaine*, Part II, Act IV, Scene 1.

[64] *Ditto*, Act V, Scene 1.

[65] Part I, Act IV, Scenes 2 and 4.

[66] *Jew of Malta*, Act IV, Scene 3.

of Barabas being caught in his own trap,[67] in the folly of the scheming Ithomar,[68] and in the ridiculous figure of the Jew.[69] When we turn to "Faustus," the character of the comic element here, more distinctly a by-play than in any of the others, may be accounted for by the close adherence to the source, from which the comic passages are copied with great fidelity. They are, however, with characteristic Marlowean intensity, kept, like the rest of the play, within the realm of the magical. In "Edward the Second," while there seems to be no comic relief to the tragedy, there certainly might have been opportunity in the "business" here and there for comic touches, after the manner of Marlowe, especially in the characters of Gaveston and Spenser.

As a result of this intenser centering of interest, Marlowe developed into greater effectiveness situations that had been of little more than narrative value in the chronicle plays. This can be seen by comparing the wooing of Katherine in "The Famous Victories" with the similar scene of Tamburlaine's wooing of Zenocrate,[70] or by noting the importance and effectiveness of murder scenes after the model was set in "Edward the Second."[71] The splendor and impressiveness of Zenocrate's funeral outdoes all the earlier attempts at making this favorite scene an effective one. So it is with many of his other elaborations of novel and striking scenes, as Tamburlaine's entrance when drawn by the "pampered jades,"[72] the panoply of Scythian chieftains, the gorgeousness of oriental accoutrements, or the Jew tortured in his cauldron,[73] the apparitions of Mephistopheles and his band of devils,[74] and the writing of Faustus' fearful compact in his own blood.[75]

[67] *Ditto,* Act V, Scene 6.

[68] *Ditto,* Act IV, Scenes 4 and 6.

[69] Barabas was represented with a large false nose. In Rowley's *Search for Money,* 1609, allusion is made to the "artificall Jewe of Maltaes nose." *Mermaid Series* edition of Marlowe, page 264.

[70] *Tamburlaine,* Part I, Act I, Scene 2.

[71] Act V, Scene 5.

[72] *Tamburlaine,* Part II, Act IV, Scene 4.

[73] *Jew of Malta,* Act V, Scene 6.

[74] *Faustus,* Scenes 5 and 6.

[75] *Ditto,* Scene 5.

The popularity of these plays was enormous and their influence far-reaching.[76] "Tamburlaine" was the one most immediately influential. Of direct imitations, the earliest are "Selimus"[77] and Greene's "Alphonsus of Arragon."[78] Peele's "Battle of Alcazar," acted in 1592, with the hero of overweening assurance, Stukeley, showed the lasting popularity of the type. Of these, "Selimus" alone retains the broadly comic element; in "Alphonsus of Arragon," such comic touches as appear are in the manner of Marlowe. "The Battle of Alcazar," in its unrelieved gloom, as well as in other characteristics, illustrates as well the third great dramatic influence of the time.

Kyd's "Spanish Tragedy" appeared in 1585–7, and was very popular, as seen from Henslowe's entries and the constant references to the play. Professor A. H. Thorndike has shown[79] that it was this play that brought into prominence in the Elizabethan drama the motive of revenge, with its attendant motives of intrigue and bloodshed, and further characterized by the presence of ghostly monition, and of the reflective element in the soliloquies. In the plays we have just considered, we find these elements present in addition to the modifications imitated from Marlowe.[80] "Locrine," "Alphonsus of Arragon," and "The Battle of Alcazar" are all revenge plays. "Locrine" and "The Battle of Alcazar" develop this motive throughout; "Alphonsus of Arragon" is a revenge

[76] Plays of this type were satirized by Hall in his *Virgidenarium*, Book I, Satire 3.

[77] Anonymous. Acted about 1588.

[78] Acted about 1588.

[79] *The Relation of Hamlet to Contemporary Revenge Plays. Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 1902.

[80] Mr. Churchill has pointed out that *The True Tragedy*, while a chronicle play in important features, was influenced by Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* and the revenge plays, and that owing to these influences, "as a History play The True Tragedy is undoubtedly the first in which the interest is fixed upon one central and dominating figure," and adds, "The Richard of the True Tragedy is not only central but dominating, not merely attracts the chief interest but absorbs practically all of it." *Op. cit.*, pages 398–9. An analysis of the influences upon it and its relation to *Richard the Third* is given on pages 396 to 528.

play in the first two acts, it then changes to a play of the conquest type of "Tamburlaine." In "Locrine," "The Battle of Alcazar," and "The True Tragedy," we have the ghost appearing and crying "Vindicta!"; in "Alphonsus of Arragon," this ghostly element is furnished in a measure, by the enchantments of Medea, and by the misleading incitement of Mahomet of the Brazen Head. The soliloquy is present in "Selimus," "Locrine," "Alphonsus of Arragon," and "The Battle of Alcazar." This element is almost lacking in the epical chronicles, where the solitary speaker is not common, and long speeches are, for the most part, addresses to followers.

We have now examined the histories and tragedies preceding and contemporary with "Richard the Third," the subject of our investigation. It remains to show in how far "Richard the Third" is a typical play of the chronicle type and in how far it has been modified by the influence of Marlowe and Kyd. The situations and characteristics that mark it as a chronicle play are such as the following: (1) The battle at the end with the inevitable single encounter.[81] (2) The prominence given to the fulfilment of prophecies, as in the case of Clarence and the letter G,[82] of Richmond's foretold succession,[83] of the Irish bard's warning of Richard against Richmond,[84] or of Margaret's maledictions[85] and Buckingham's ill-kept oaths,[86] or Richard's grotesque trickery of Hastings[87] and Clarence.[88] (3) The wooing of an enemy, introduced twice, in the brilliant Anne[89] and Elizabeth[90] scenes. (4) The typical character of the wailing queen in its highest perfection in Elizabeth, Anne, and Margaret, of the popular

[81] Act V, Scenes 4 and 5.
[82] Act I, Scene 1. Cf. page 15, note 40.
[83] Act IV, Scene 2.
[84] Ditto.
[85] Act I, Scene 3.
[86] Act II, Scene 1 and Act V, Scene 1.
[87] Act III, Scene 4.
[88] Act I, Scenes 1 and 4.
[89] Act I, Scene 2. Cf. page 16, note 44.
[90] Act IV, Scene 4.

hero in Richmond, and of the loyal statesman in Hastings.[91] (5) The repetition of favorite "effects," such as the funeral procession of Henry the Sixth,[92] the "large" scenes in the council,[93] with the mayor and citizens in Baynard Castle,[94] or the leaders haranguing their troops,[95] the throne scene with Richard in state, crowned,[96] the company of wailing women,[97] the marching of soldiers across the stage,[98] the excursion, the frantic entrance of Richard calling for a horse, the encounter and death of Richard, and the crowning of Richmond on the battle-field.[99] (6) The epic qualities of structure, exemplified in the general aim of presenting the life and death of the hero, and in the retention of such episodes from the source as the resolve by the queen to take sanctuary,[100] Rivers, Grey and Vaughan on the way to death,[101] the scrivener with the indictment of Hastings,[102] and Buckingham led to execution.[103]

As has been said, this play shows the dominating influence of Marlowe. As in the plays of that author, so in "Richard the Third," the hero is of constant and over-weening importance. The interest is held and the action centers about his figure as it did not in such plays as "The Famous Victories," "The Troublesome Raigne," or "Edward the First." In variance from the epic type, the whole play tends to become a series of episodes connected by the shortest possible narrative scenes. As in Marlowe again, the scenes of humorous nature are of the warp and woof of the play, and are of

[91] Cf. page 21, VI.
[92] Act I, Scene 2. Cf. page 16, VII, and note 47.
[93] Act III, Scene 4. Cf. page 17, note 53.
[94] Act III, Scene 7.
[95] Act V, Scene 3. Cf. page 15, I.
[96] Act IV, Scene 2. Cf. page 17, note 48.
[97] Act IV, Scenes 1 and 4. Cf. page 16, VI.
[98] Act IV, Scene 4. Cf. page 17, note 54.
[99] Act V, Scenes 4 and 5. Cf. page 17, notes 48 and 54.
[100] Act II, Scene 4.
[101] Act III, Scene 3.
[102] Act III, Scene 6.
[103] Act V, Scene 1. Cf. pages 15 and 17, VIII.

the same ironical and grotesque character. The quarrel of Richard and Margaret,[104] the wooing of Anne,[105] the scene with Elizabeth,[106] and the satirical over-reaching of the Mayor and Citizens,[107] are treated with Marlowean "coarseness of stroke," and Richard's mis-shapen body probably gave opportunity for comic touches of the same nature. Extravagance and elaboration of effective situations, as in Marlowe's work, are also seen in the two wooing scenes, in the murder of Clarence, with its repetition in Tyrrel's account of the death of the two princes, and in the last scene on the battle-field. Again this play represents the culmination of the development of the villain-hero accomplishing his ends by intrigue and murder, characteristic of the "Jew of Malta."

This last characteristic is, at the same time, one of the marks of the influence of Kyd upon the play, exerted directly, or it may be indirectly, through Marlowe. The particular influence of Kyd, however, is seen in the emphasis upon the revenge motive, in this case of a double nature, with Richard at first the principal agent and later its object,[108] and in the introduction of the ghosts to appal the wrong-doer and to urge on the avenger. The soliloquy, characteristic of both Kyd and Marlowe, is frequent; the play opens with a long one, and, from time to time, Richard gives account of himself in passages of varying length.[109] These seem to mark the steps in the progress of the play in much the same manner as the congratulatory scenes of the epical plays.

"Richard the Third" then, when examined in its situations and motives, is found to display within itself the marks of the three most potent influences upon the early Elizabethan drama, the chronicle, the play of Marlowe, and the Kydian tragedy. There are discoverable medieval elements also, still to be noted

[104] Act I, Scene 3.
[105] Act I, Scene 2.
[106] Act IV, Scene 4.
[107] Act III, Scene 7.
[108] This double revenge is found also in *Locrine*.
[109] Act I, Scene 1, Act III, Scene 5, Act IV, Scenes 2 and 3, Act V, Scene 3.

when the play is considered in greater detail. The most important characteristic in fixing its type is the prominence given to the protagonist, which results in the transference of the interest to character, rather than centering in the story, a fact which may explain its persistence on the stage over all the other chronicle plays of this period. Its greater interest histrionically by virtue of this we shall attempt to make plain in the next chapter.

II

Richard the Third on the Elizabethan Stage

Theories of Elizabethan staging—Documentary evidence—Method here pursued—Examination of the play from the point of view of its presentation—The prologue—Stage oratory—The funeral procession—The wooing—Comic touches—The murder scene—The use of the lament—Scene of the two camps—The ghost on the stage—The battle scene, its history and importance—Conclusion.

Although "Richard the Third" was indisputably one of the most popular of Shakespeare's plays, we have no record of its performance during the time of Elizabeth or James. There is no entry in Henslowe's diary, or in the Revels Accounts pertaining, so far as we know, to this play, although Fleay conjectures a performance at Court during the Christmas festivities of 1594.[1] The only known, definite account of a performance before the closing of the theaters is found in the Office Book of Sir Henry Herbert, under date of November 16, 1633, and already alluded to in Chapter I. Any further information must come indirectly from such references as the entry in Manningham's Diary, which refers to a performance on March 31, 1601,[2] or from such interpretation as may be given to the phrase "lately acted," on the successive quartos.

It has been pointed out in Chapter I that this play was probably first given at The Theatre by the Lord Chamberlain's Company, and it has been further seen, in the allusions given, that Burbage was the Elizabethan Richard. But under what conditions Burbage played Richard the Third at The Theatre

[1] *Life of Shakespeare*, page 14. Also *History of the London Stage*, page 121.

[2] See Chapter I, page 3. A hint of a Richard in the mid-seventeenth century is given by the Prologue to Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois*. One of the actors, supposed to be Tom Bond, is recommended because

As Richard he was liked.

This prologue was prefixed to the edition of 1641.

in the season of 1593–4 must, except in their general character, be a matter of conjecture, and even the general conditions, it has been found, are difficult to establish.

The question of Elizabethan staging is a large one, and the various theories advanced need not be reproduced here. The writers upon the subject, however, whether following Kilian,[3] Brandl,[4] and Brodmeier[5] in their theory of "alternation," or upholding the idea of the "plastic," "symbolic," or "incongruous" stage as set forth by Mantzius,[6] Reynolds,[7] or Corbin,[8] or insisting upon the bare stage as conceived by Mr. Greet and his co-workers, agree upon certain leading points.[9] It is generally accepted that the stage was a large, open platform, with a tiring-room at the back, and a balcony above. The division of the stage into an outer and inner part is a moot point, as is also the question of the presence of curtains. Or, conceding that the stage was curtained, the position of these hangings is debated. Whether there were two or three doors to the stage, and the position of these, it is from our present data impossible to determine.[10] It must be remembered, moreover, that the establishment of the use and position of these in one theatre would by no means show their existence in others.

[3] *Jahrbuch der Shakespeare Gesellschaft,* Vols. XXVIII and XXXVI.

[4] Introduction to the *Schlegel-Tieck Shakespeare.*

[5] *Die Shakespeare Bühne nach den alten Bühnenanweisungen.* Weimer, 1904.

[6] *History of Theatric Art,* Vol. II, page 338.

[7] *Some Principles of Elizabethan Staging. Modern Philology,* April and June, 1905.

[8] *Shakespeare and the Plastic Stage. Atlantic Monthly,* March, 1906.

[9] A review of several recent theories of the Elizabethan stage is given by Mr. William Archer in *The Quarterly Review* for April, 1908.

[10] For a discussion of these points, see W. J. Lawrence, *Some Characteristics of the Elizabethan Stuart Stage. Englische Studien,* Vol. 32 (1902). See also G. P. Baker, *The Development of Shakespeare as a Dramatist,* New York, 1907. Chapter II is on *The Stage of Shakespeare.* The most recent and a very valuable treatment of the question may be found in a pamphlet by Mr. V. E. Albright, *A Typical Shakesperian Stage: The Outer-Inner Stage,* New York, 1908. Mr. Albright's complete discussion is about to appear in *Columbia University Studies in English.*

An idea of some of the properties used may be gathered from Henslowe's Diary, The Revels Accounts, and from stage directions, but it is quite impossible to determine definitely how "a mose bancke," "a rocke," the "baye tree," or the "tree of gowlden apelles" was used, or what became of "the sittie of Rome," or the "tome of Dido," or "Hell mought" after their part in the play was over. Henslowe's inventories of the wardrobes of the companies under his management give only a general notion of the kind of costume used. Thus we know that the Admiral's Men had for Tamburlaine a "cote with coper lace," "breches of crymson vellvet," and a "brydell," that Henry the Fifth had a "satten dublet, layd with gowld lace," and a "velvet gowne," but little can be gathered as to their style, whether attempting any great historical or national distinction. From their description and the price paid for them, they appear to have been elaborate and rich in effect. We read of a "read clocke with read coper lace," a "scarlet clocke with silver buttons," "Dobes cotte of cloth of silver" and of a "womanes gowne of cloth of gowld." The plays of the period supplement this information somewhat by chance references to dress here and there. "Hieronimo's old cloak, ruff, and hat" are mentioned when the actors want a Spanish suit in "The Alchemist";[11] an elaborate description of the dress of Richard the Second's courtiers is given in "Woodstock,"[12] emphasizing the contrast to Gloucester's clothes of frieze; Edward the First appears in a "glass suit";[13] Tamburlaine's dress is loaded with the treasure of the Persians, and Edward the Second's favorite, Gaveston,

[11] Act IV, Scene 4.

[12] They sit in counsell to devise strange fashions
And suite themselves in wyld and anticke habitts,
Such as this kingdome never yett beheld:
Frenche hose, Italian cloakes, and spanish hatts,
Polonian shoes, with pickes a hand full longe,
Tyde to ther knees with chaynes of pearle and gould;
Ther plumed topps fly waveing in the ayre,
A cubit hye above ther wanton heads. Act I, Scene 3.

[13] *The famous Chronicle of King Edward the first,* Dyce edition of *Works of Greene and Peele,* page 385.

wears a short Italian hooded cloak,
Larded with pearl, and in his Tuscan cap,
A jewel of more value than the crown.

These references might be multiplied indefinitely. Whether all of these suggestions in the text were carried out is doubtful, but the general conclusion, so far as such data lead to one, is that there was an attempt to distinguish nationalities in dress, but evidently little feeling for anachronism or incongruity in the costume any more than in the properties.

The bearing of such items as the foregoing has received much attention, and attempts have been made to reconstruct an Elizabethan performance from the data so gathered, supplemented by the descriptions of social conditions, such as are found in "The Gull's Handbook," in "Coryat's Crudities,"[14] or Hentzer's "Travels."[15] The most notable of these attempts are found in Mantzius' "History of Theatric Art,"[16] and in Regel's "Uber Englisches Theaterwesen zu Shakespeare's Zeit." In the investigation here attempted, however, I shall try to throw what light I may upon the presentation of "Richard the Third" by considering the stage directions, and other internal evidences of staging in this play and in similar plays of the period. In other words, relying upon the close relations of the authors and of the theatres of the time, I shall continue the comparative method used in Chapter I. The result of such an investigation will not, perhaps, be any such rehabilitation as those mentioned above, but will serve to fix "Richard the Third" in its place among the plays on the London stage during the season of its popularity.

In a consideration of this play from the point of view of presentation, however, it must be reiterated, in trying to conceive the impression made by "Richard the Third" on the Elizabethan stage, that it was not a new subject, but one as well known to the audience as were the fortunes of the house of Pelops to the Greeks. As has been pointed out in Chapter I,

[14] By Thomas Coryat. 1611. London, 1776. 3 Vols.

[15] *A Journey into England In the year MDXCVIII.* Edited by Horace Walpole, 1757.

[16] Vol. III, pages 157–166.

there had been several plays dealing with the same personages, and presenting many of the same situations, such as " The true Tragedy of Richard the Third," which was on the stage in 1591 and continued on the stage until the time of Charles the First.[17] In view of the close relations of authors, actors, and theatres at this time, it is impossible to believe that Shakespeare did not know this play,[18] whether " Richard the Third " was a conscious reworking of the materials there used or not. Any knowledge of the university play, " Richardus Tertius," is much more doubtful, but by no means impossible. From this point of view, therefore, " Richard the Third " was a revision in somewhat the same sense as was " Lear " and a study of its presentation must take these older plays into account.

Act I, Scene 1.[19]—The play opens with a scene which performs the function of a prologue, Clarence and Hastings serving to illustrate the situation described by Richard in his soliloquy, in much the same manner as, in " The Battle of Alcazar," the Presenter's speech is interrupted by the dumb shows.[20] The opening soliloquy, while thoroughly orthodox Senecan usage, and an almost inevitable dramatic device, had not characterized the chronicle plays generally before " Richard the Third." In plays of the type of " The Contention," " The Famous Victories," and " Edward the First," the reflective element is almost wholly lacking. In Marlowe's plays however, except " Tamburlaine," we find the opening soliloquy, and it is used frequently throughout the play, a natural result of the absorbing interest in the machinations of a villain, such as the

[17] According to Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare,* pages 94–5.

[18] See Churchill, *Richard III up to Shakespeare,* pages 396–8, and 497. Present opinion considers it uncertain whether Shakespeare knew the play, but agrees that whether he knew it or not, he was very slightly dependent upon it. The same is true of *Richardus Tertius.*

[19] The division into acts and scenes follows the *Cambridge* edition. The Quartos are not divided and in the Folio the division is incomplete.

[20] The opening soliloquy is closely related to the expository matter at the beginning of the morality plays, and in the folk drama, like the St. George plays.
See Manly, *Specimens of the Pre-Shakesperean Drama,* Vol. I, page 289.

Jew, or the fluctuations of a tumultuous mind, as in "Faustus." It is probably due to this influence, reinforced by the example of the tragedy of Kyd, that Richard the Third indulges in his self-reporting and self-analytic soliloquies at every turn. How these were spoken we can gather only from chance references in the plays, the *locus classicus* being the advice to the players in "Hamlet."[21] Shakespeare has there furnished us with a document which gives us the popular stage oratory, and the reforms for which he worked. This speech, written about 1602, describes the methods which probably prevailed during the earlier performances of "Richard the Third." The popular style of oratory Shakespeare had ridiculed in "Midsummer Night's Dream" in Bottom's histrionic aspirations to reproduce "Ercles' vein" or "a part to tear a cat in, to make all split."[22] This expression, showing the popular ideal of tragic utterance, is found also in "Histriomastix," where an actor is referred to as liking to "rend and tear the cat upon a stage."[23] In Greene's "Groatsworth of Wit" (1592), a player says: "The twelve labors of Hercules. . . . I terribly thundered upon the stage," referring to a stock character much like the old part of Herod,[24] giving full scope for rant and always associated with it. In addition to these direct references, it may be seen that the Tamburlaine type of hero encouraged, with his "high astounding terms," the indulgence in this bombastic style of speaking. Shakespeare's fling at the "deep tragedian"[25] in "Richard the Third" suggests a lack of sympathy thus early with their extravagance, and the ideal of a more intelligent and thoughtful manner which foreshadowed his later explicit defini-

[21] Act III, Scene 2.

[22] Act I, Scene 2. See also, Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair,* Act V, Scene 5. "I like 'em (*i. e.,* the puppets) for that; they offer not to fleer, nor jeer, nor break jests, as the great players do."

[23] Act V, line 241.

[24] The stage directions in the *Pageant of the Shearmen and Taylors* reads, "Here Erode ragis in the pagond and in the strete also."

Erode. I stampe! I stare! I loke all abowtt!
Might I them take, I schuld them bren at a glede!
I rent! I rawe! and now run I wode!

[25] Act III, Scene 5.

tion in "Hamlet." These soliloquies, therefore, we must believe, in the Richard of Burbage, were given, under the supervision of Shakespeare's own tutelage, with greater temperance and more "gently." In this more than in any chronicle play which preceded, the emphasis was placed upon the individual speeches rather than upon the action or upon such oratorical displays as were necessitated by the character of Edward the First, Edward the Third, or Tamburlaine, and the manner of giving these lines had, for that reason, a real significance in the development of the play.

Scene 2.—The second scene opens with a funeral procession which strangely serves as the setting for the wooing. The funeral scene was a favorite one on the Elizabethan stage, as were all processional scenes, which gave opportunity for display, of which the audience was fond, and which gratified in some measure the popular delight in realistic staging. There are usually few directions for the funeral processions, probably because they had become highly conventionalized. In some cases a few suggestions are given in addition to the "Enter funeral," as in "The First Part of Hieronimo," Act III, Scene 3, "Enter two, draging of ensigns; then funerall of Andrea," and in "The Massacre at Paris," "They march out, with the body of the King lying on four men's shoulders, with a dead march, dragging weapons on the ground."[26] In "Hamlet" the directions call for a "dead march" and a "peal of ordinance";[27] in "Edward the Second" they bring in the hearse and the "funeral robes."[28] The funeral of Zenocrate moves along in the light of a town burning in her honor, and a pillar, a "streamer," a tablet, and a picture of her are carried in the procession.[29] Yet, with the possibility of making much of a popular subject, the stage directions in this scene[30] and the later lines suggest that the

[26] Act III.

[27] Act V, Scene 2.

[28] Act V, Scene 6.

[29] *Tamburlaine,* Part II, Act III, Scene 2.

[30] "Enter the corps of King Henry the Sixth, Gentlemen with halberds to guard it. Lady Anne being the mourner."

sources were closely followed by Shakespeare, and that the train here numbered only a few. This is interesting, not so much because it would seem to illustrate his fidelity to the source, for he flagrantly disregards this in introducing the wooing of Anne, but because we find the figure of Richard made the dominant interest in a scene usually given over to purely decorative purposes.

With such a setting, and immediately succeeding a scene of wailing, the wooing of Anne with its possibility of comic "business," and in the presence of the murdered Henry whose wounds, at the approach of Richard,

> Open their congealed mouths and bleed afresh,

shows a grotesqueness typical of the Elizabethan drama. How much "business" was introduced cannot be determined, but on a stage where improvisation was the rule, it can hardly be thought that such an opportunity would be overlooked or lost.[31] Besides, Shakespeare intensifies this situation by representing the wrongs of Anne as coming more directly and personally to her from her wooer than had been the case in the similar scenes in "Tamburlaine"[32] and "The Famous Victories," and at the same time in making Richard, the wooer, almost revolting in his appearance.[33] The hideousness of Richard is constantly flung in his teeth in an entirely brutal manner, and spoken of in his soliloquies in the frank, self-reporting style of the tragedy villain. In picturing Richard thus, Shakespeare has only followed the chronicles from More down, who represent Richard as "croke backed," "hard favored," and with "ill-featured limbs," and an arm

[31] Comic touches are suggested not only in the situation of a skilful dissembler, but also in the "keen encounter of our wits," as Richard himself describes it. This would delight an audience that enjoyed word-juggling. In addition, to overreach a woman has ever been considered comic, giving delight of the same kind as that felt in making game of anything weaker.

[32] Part I, Act I, Scene 2.

[33] Richard as "a jolly thriving wooer" presented a ludicrous anomaly. He appreciates this when he says sardonically:

> I do mistake my person all this while:
> Upon my life, she finds, although I cannot,
> Myself to be a marvellous proper man.

" werish, withered, and small." In " The True Tragedy " he is described as

> A man ill shaped, crooked backed, lame armed, withall.[34]

From the allusions to his deformity, it is seen that Shakespeare utilized these traditions to the utmost. Thus Richard speaks of himself as

> Deformed, unfinished, . . .
> . . . scarce half made up,
> And that so lamely and unfashionable
> That dogs bark at me as I halt by them.[35]

Anne calls him a " lump of foul deformity," " hedgehog " and " toad " while Margaret adds the epithets of " elvish mark'd," " bunch-back'd toad," and " bottled spider."[36] Such words as these suggest an emphasis on physical unsightliness of an extreme type. But this, far from being revolting, was, we must believe, to an audience that delighted in the antics of dwarfs and idiots and had not outgrown the love for harlequinade, highly ludicrous.

Scene 3.—The figure of Margaret dominates this scene, in her curses and exultation combining the ferocity of a Fury and the malignant forebodings of a witch.[37] The impressiveness of the scene depended less upon the dramatic situation than upon the current belief in the efficacy of such curses, and in this respect is wholly of its time. Its effect upon the audience was undoubtedly expressed in Hasting's words after Margaret's parting execration,

> My hair doth stand on end to hear her curses.

The scene closes with Richard's compact with the murderers in preparation for the next scene.

Scene 4.—The act closes with Clarence's murder, which carries on and intensifies the somberness of the preceding

[34] *Shakespeare Society Publications,* Vol. 21, page 3.

[35] Act I, Scene 1.

[36] Act I, Scene 3.

[37] Professor A. H. Thorndike in *Tragedy,* page 119, shows that Shakespeare " personified Nemesis in Margaret, and gave her the various functions of a supervising ghost and of a chorus—curses, laments, and exultations."

scenes. The presentation of the murder scene in the drama shows signs of development as do other situations constantly used. In the English Senecan plays, following the Greek usage, the murder is usually behind the scenes, and in the Senecan imitations, "Tancred and Gismunda," and "Gorboduc," this is the case. In the medieval English drama, where traditional decencies had no sway, murders are frequently on the stage, and seem to have elicited considerable care to heighten their effectiveness. This is seen in the morality plays, and in such a late development of the morality as "Cambyses." In the vogue of the "Spanish Tragedy" and the drama of blood, no scene of this sort was too revolting to be represented on the stage. This reached its height in such a play as "Titus Andronicus." In all of these the murderer is ruthless to the last extreme, the murder takes place quickly, with great bloodiness, and the situation, with utter indifference to the consideration of dramatic force, is repeated again and again. On the other hand, after Marlowe's "Edward the Second,"[38] the murder scene was made more of and used with great effectiveness. The scene in Marlowe's play is one of the greatest in English drama, and it is small wonder that it found instant imitation in the succeeding plays of "Henry the Sixth" Part II,[39] "Woodstock," and "Richard the Third," all three being probably written within three years after the appearance of "Edward the Second." In these scenes the preliminary arrangements for the murder, the forebodings and apprehensions of the one about to die, the discussion between the murderers and their victim, his attempt to move the hard-visaged men, and the repentance of the murderers after the deed, contributed elements of suspense, pity, and humanity which made of them something entirely new. For the presentation of the scenes, the stage directions are, as a rule, explicit. Thus in "Cambyses" we have an interesting indication of how these things were managed in the early dramas, in the scene where Lord

[38] Act V, Scene 5. The death of Guise in *The Massacre at Paris*, Act III, Scene 2, is similar.

[39] The murder of Gloucester, Act III, Scene 2.

Smirdis is killed. Cruelty and Murder enter " with bloody hands," they seize him, " strike him in divers places," and then " a little bladder of vinegar " is " prickt." In the later plays no mention is made of such devices, but in the conferences of the murderers over the methods to be employed, quite as realistic effects are suggested. So we have the gruesome preparation of the table and the featherbed for Edward the Second, the towell for Woodstock, and the direction to the Second Murderer at the death of Clarence to " Take him over the costard with the hilts of thy sword." The disposition of the body after the murder is prepared for, probably more for the purpose of getting it off the stage than from any regard for historical accuracy.

In " Richard the Third," therefore, we have a scene closely resembling others on the stage at the time. It is the longest of these imitations of " Edward the Second," this being due in large part to the strange introduction of the grotesquely humorous conversation of the murderers before the deed, a touch entirely lacking in any of the similar scenes in other plays. It is hard for us to realize the effect of this humor, but we find from their popularity that such violent contrasts were in complete harmony with the temper of the sixteenth century audience.

Looking at these scenes as they are grouped in Act I, we find that they exhibit in succession those typical of Elizabethan taste. Considered from the aspect of stage effect, they presented to the audience a series of situations already familiar in other plays of the period, but here elaborated beyond anything they had yet seen. The effect of the whole act is extravagant, these typical scenes being heightened, and going beyond their predecessors. In contrast to this extravagance in the conception, the setting of the act seems to have been very simple. I see no suggestion of any furniture other than a couch for the sleeping Clarence, and no sure indication of an inner stage, even in a case which would call it into use if one were available. Thus in the murder scene, where the conversation which takes place between Brakenbury and the murderers would presum-

ably be in another room, there is nothing in the text to indicate that they are not in the room with Clarence.[40]

Act II, Scene 1.—The effect of the opening lines with King Edward attempting to reconcile his nobles, is to relieve a little the tension of the preceding, but with the entrance of Richard, the irony of it all becomes apparent, and the scene ends in mourning. In regard to the staging, this would seem to indicate the lack, at least in The Theatre, of any arrangement for "discovered" scenes, for the sick king was probably brought in "carried in a chair" like Brutus in "Locrine,"[41] or Abdilmelec in "The Battle of Alcazar,"[42] and is taken off at the end of the scene.

Scene 2.—This is a thoroughly typical scene of lamentation, of which the drama offers many examples. The dramatic effectiveness of the lament had always been recognized, but it had never received such abundant illustration as in "Richard the Third." In this play there are no less than four scenes in which the lament is the principal motive; namely, Act III, Scene 2, the Queen and the Duchess of York mourning for Edward and Clarence, Act II, Scene 4, the Queen mourning for Grey and Rivers, Act IV, Scene 1, the Queen, the Duchess of York and Anne before the Tower, and Act IV, Scene 4, the Duchess of York, Margaret, and the Queen lamenting together. There are also seven scenes in which the lament plays a fairly important part.[43]

Such lyric passages have figured largely from the earliest attempts to represent a story dramatically. In the liturgy of the medieval Church one of the most impressive interpolations for special celebrations was the Easter Officium Sepulchri, which represented the three Marys on their way to the Tomb and exclaiming in turn:

[40] Brackenbury's speech,

Here are the keys, there sits the duke asleep,

does not seem to indicate that Clarence is in another room when this is taken in connection with the duke's last speech.

[41] Act I, Scene 1.

[42] Act V.

[43] Anne, I, 2. Margaret, I, 3. King Edward, II, 1. Rivers and Grey, III, 3. Hastings, III, 4. Tyrrel, IV, 3. Buckingham, V, 1.

Heu! pius pastor occiditur,
Quem nulla culpa infecit:
O mors lugenda!
Heu! nequam gens Iudaica,
Quam dira frendet uesania,
Plebs execranda!
Heu! uerus doctor obijt,
Qui uitam functis contulit:
O res plangenda!

Again in the religious cycles the mourning women have an important part, as in the Chester play of the Crucifixion,[44] or the York play of the Resurrection, where the Marys lament thus:

Allas! to dede I wolde be dight,
So woo in worlde was never wight;
Mi sorowe is all for that sight
That I gune see,
Howe Criste, my maister, moste of myght,
Is dede fro me.

Later in the morality of "King Johan," one of the characters is Ynglond, a widow, who bemoans the evils of the day. In "Cambyses," the Mother mourns thus for her child:

Alas, alas! I doo heare tell the king hath kild my sonne!
If it be so, wo worth the deed that ever it was doone!
. . . O wel-away, that I should see this houre!
Thy mother yet wil kisse thy lips, silk-soft and pleasant white,
With wringing hands lamenting for to see thee in this plight!

The introduction of such a scene is especially interesting, because of its entirely ornamental character, playing no part in the development of the story.

With the imitation of Senecan plays, a new motive characterizes such scenes, and the elegiac note is combined with the reflective or imprecatory lament. Taking one of the earliest extant Senecan imitations, "Gorboduc," we find this illustrated in the mourning of the Queen, where she says:

O my beloued sonne, O my swete childe,
My deare Ferrex, my ioye, my lyues delyght!
Is my beloued sonne, is my sweete childe,
My deare Ferrex, my ioye, my lyues delyght,

[44] *Shakespeare Society Publications*, Vol. 17, pages 61, 204 and 206.

Murdered with cruell death?
. . . . . .
Thou, Porrex, thou shalt dearely bye the same!
Traitour to kinne and kinde, to sire and me,
To thine owne fleshe, and traitour to thy-selfe,
The gods on thee in hell shall wreke their wrath,
And here in earth this hand shall take revenge
On thee, Porrex, thou false and caitife wight!
. . . . . .
Doest thou not know that Ferrex mother liues,
That loued him more dearly than her-selfe?
And doth she liue, and is not venged on thee?[45]

This, compared with the mother's lament in "Cambyses," gives all the difference between the medieval and Senecan idea of such a scene. The violence of such laments as that of Œdipus[46] or of Cassandra[47] finds no place in the medieval plays. "Richardus Tertius" is filled with lamenting scenes, partly reflective, partly vengeful. The play opens with Elizabeth's sad reflections on the cares of state. Later, in sanctuary, she gives expression to her apprehensions and presentiments, and when told of the murder of the princes, she reproaches herself for giving them up to Richard, and then breaks out:

Te, te, precor supplex mater genibus minor,
qui vindicans flammas vibras tonans pater,
et hunc vibrentur tela perjurum tua,
spolies Olimpum irate fulminibus tuis,
et impium coeli ruina vindicet.[48]

Richard, in Actio III, after the death of his son, bewails the ups and downs of "Fortuna fallax," in terms that, as Mr. Churchill has pointed out, resemble the lament of Andromache in "The Troas."[49] These vengeful laments are found also in "The Spanish Tragedy,"[50] in "Locrine,"[51] in "Selimus,"[52]

[45] Act IV, Scene 1.
[46] *Œdipus,* Act V, Scene 3.
[47] *Agamemnon,* Act III, Scene 2.
[48] Actio III, Scene 1.
[49] *Op. cit.,* page 337.
[50] Act I, Scene 3.
[51] Act III, Scene 4.
[52] Grosart edition, pages 242 and 249.

and frequently elsewhere. In "The True Tragedy," the lament is almost entirely lacking, except in the scenes concerned with Jane Shore, the first of these being in familiar Senecan form,

O Fortune, wherefore wert thou called Fortune, etc.[53]

The frequency of such scenes in "Richard the Third" has been pointed out. These are of both the elegiac and the vengeful type. In the "lamentations of poor Anne" there is a combination of the two, Elizabeth is purely elegiac in her mourning, Margaret is the embodiment of the spirit of vengeance.

The outward signs of woe seem to have consisted conventionally in weeping, tearing the hair, and throwing oneself on the ground. Thus Tamburlaine speaks of Zenocrate's "dishevelled hair" and "watery cheeks," when she mourns for her people.[54] Henry the Sixth sits on the mound and mourns while the battle rages without,[55] Constance seats herself on the ground and says:

Here I and sorrow sit;
Here is my throne, bid kings come bow to it.[56]

In Peele's "David and Bethsabe," the Queen lies "prostrate" when she mourns Absalon's death;[57] Gismunda, in her grief, loosens her hair and casts herself on the ground,[58] and in the sanctuary scene in "Richardus Tertius," a curtain is drawn, and we see "the queen sitting on ye ground wth fardells about her."[59]

The lamentations often took an antiphonic form, as in "Locrine," where they mourn for Albanact thus:

Locrine. Not aged Priam, king of stately Troy,
Grand emperor of barbarous Asia,
When he beheld his noble-minded sons
Slain traitorously by all the Myrmidons,
Lamented more than I for Albanact.

[53] *Shakespeare Society Publications*, Vol. 21, page 9.
[54] Part I, Act V. Scene 1.
[55] *Henry the Sixth*, Part III, Act II, Scene 5, lines 14 and 124.
[56] *King John*, Act III, Scene 1.
[57] Act III, Scene 2, line 203.
[58] *Tancred and Gismunda*, Act V, Scene 2.
[59] Actio I, Actus III.

Guendolen. Not Hecuba the queen of Ilion,
When she beheld the town of Pergamus,
Her palace, burnt with all-devouring flames,
Her fifty sons and daughters, fresh of hue,
Murder'd by wicked Pyrrhus' bloody sword,
Shed such sad tears as I for Albanact.
Camber. The grief of Niobe, fair Amphion's queen,
For her seven sons magnanimous in field,
For here seven daughters, fairer than the fairest,
Is not to be compar'd with my laments.[60]

Similar passages are found in "Henry the Sixth," Part I,[61] in the funeral scene that opens the play, in "David and Bethsabe,"[62] and in "Selimus."[63] In "Richard the Third," this chanting quality comes out in such passages as the following.

Queen Elizabeth. Oh for my husband, for my dear lord Edward!
Children. Oh for our father, for our dear lord Clarence!
Duchess. Alas for both, both mine, Edward and Clarence!
Q. Eliz. What stay had I but Edward? and he's gone.
Chil. What stay had we but Clarence? and he's gone.
Duch. What stay had I but they? and they are gone.
Q. Eliz. Was never widow had so dear a loss.
Chil. Were never orphans had so dear a loss.
Duch. Was never mother had so dear a loss.[64]

And again,

Q. Margaret. I had an Edward, till a Richard kill'd him;
I had a Harry, till a Richard kill'd him;
Thou hadst an Edward, till a Richard kill'd him;
Thou hadst a Richard, till a Richard kill'd him.
Duch. I had a Richard too, and thou didst kill him;
I had a Rutland too, thou holp'st to kill him.
Q. Marg. Thou hadst a Clarence too, and Richard kill'd him.[65]

In "Richard the Third," therefore, we find frequent lamenting scenes, representing a familiar device in the drama. They also exhibit the conventional modes of expression, as where

[60] Act III, Scene 2.
[61] Act I, Scene 1.
[62] Act III, Scene 1.
[63] Scene in which Bajazet and Aga bewail fortune. The play is not divided into acts in the reprint.
[64] Act II, Scene 2.
[65] Act IV, Scene 4.

Queen Elizabeth enters " with her hair about her ears,"[66] and where the women sit on the ground, and weep and curse and wail in turn.[67]

Scenes 3 and 4.—These are examples of the narrative scenes common in the histories, and illustrate the close adherence to sources and the epic structure of the chronicle play. There are similar scenes throughout this play, as Act III, Scenes 2, 3, and 6, Act IV, Scene 5, and Act V, Scenes 1 and 2. In this act, Scene 3, the stage directions of the Folio, " Enter one citizen at one doore, and another at the other," shows the usual method of managing such a meeting in the street.

Act III, Scene 1.—This act opens with the processional scene of the young king's entrance into London, attended by his nobles. As in the funeral scene, so here, the opportunity for display seems again to have yielded to close adherence to the source. In Act II, Scene 3, Buckingham suggests " some little train " for the king on his way to London, part of this train is arrested on the road, and the royal entry is, therefore, curtailed of much of its ostentation. Another opportunity, as we see later, for an elaborate procession-scene is neglected in the omission of the coronation scene in Act IV, and the introduction merely of Richard's entrance " in pomp, crowned " to a small number of his followers. That the play offered opportunities for large and showy scenes is shown in the processions in " Richardus Tertius " at the end of each actio. In " Richard the Third," and in a smaller degree in " The True Tragedy," the authority of the chronicles, and the concentration of the attention upon the figure of Richard resulted in such distractions being introduced but rarely.

Scene 2.—The testing of Hastings I have included with the narrative scenes under Act II, Scene 3.

Scene 3.—In " The True Tragedy," the scene of the imprisonment of Rivers, Grey, and Vaughan is given, while in this play it is merely reported by the messenger in Act II, Scene 4. Shakespeare chooses the less dramatic culmination of the situation, as he does also in the case of Buckingham's

[66] Act II, Scene 2.
[67] Act IV, Scene 4.

arrest and death. This may have been done with the idea of displaying the popular theme of the fulfilment of prophecy which is brought out in these scenes, or it may be, with the idea of differing from the scenes used in other plays on the same subject.

Scene 4.—The dramatic irony of this council scene is developed in the rapid manner that reminds one of Marlowe's work. Here would have been another opportunity for the use of a curtained inner stage had one been available. In a similar scene in "Sir Thomas More," the stage direction reads, "An arras is drawne, and behinde it (as in sessions) sit the Lord Mayor, Justice Suresbie, etc."[68] In "Richard the Third" there is no suggestion of such an arrangement, for Buckingham, Hastings and others enter and take their places at a table.

Scenes 5, 6 and 7.—Scenes 5 and 7, with the gullible mayor and citizens, are distinctly comic,[69] giving constant suggestion of "business," and offering a relief to the somber scenes before and after. Both take place in the balcony, representing first the Tower walls, and later the upper gallery of Baynard Castle. The dress of Richard and Buckingham is given in some detail, as "rotten armour, marvellous ill-favoured." The scene of the Scrivener, a close following of the source, suggests the lapse of time before the meeting at the Guildhall is over.

Act III is constructed on the plan of three "large" scenes, with short narrative or preparatory scenes intervening. It is less somber than the acts preceding or following, and seems to offer, midway in the play, a series of "relief" scenes. In its staging several properties are mentioned, such as the "dusty armour," a "head," a table, chairs, halberds for those accompanying the prisoners, but no elaborate setting is indicated. The use of the balcony is typical. First, the elevated platform with the wall, arras or curtain beneath, is a part of the Tower fortifications, later the same setting suggests, evidently without

[68] *Shakespeare Society Publications*, Vol. 23, page 6.

[69] They were so regarded in the days of Kean. See Genest, *op. cit.*, Vol. VIII, page 692.

any inconvenience, a balcony overlooking the castle court. Such a change of association without change of scene is eminently Elizabethan.

Act IV, Scene 1.—The lamenting scene of the women has been already treated in connection with Act II, Scene 2.

Scene 2.—The stage directions read, "Sennet. Enter Richard, in pomp, crowned; Buckingham, Catesby, a Page, and others." The effect of this may be gathered from the fact that here, where, after this entrance, a "large," eloquent scene, common in the chronicle plays, is expected, there is none such, but all is keyed to the note of intrigue and apprehension. Richard makes no address to his nobles to suit the stately setting, but they are told to stand apart while he deals individually with those upon whom his machinations depend. The repeated importunities of Buckingham[70] are not in the Folio, but whether put into the acting version or not by the players, are characteristic, and introduce another of those prophetic sayings which were so popular a theme in the chronicle plays. Since Richard is so preëminently the leading figure here, the "pomp" of the scene probably consisted in the gorgeousness of his dress[71] and the appointments of the throne, rather than in any splendor in the setting or in the grouping of the other characters.

Scene 3.—The Senecan device of reporting the murder of the princes is used at this point to keep the interest bent upon Richard. This, rather than any effort to avoid repetition, would explain its employment, for, as has been seen, situations are constantly repeated. In "Richardus Tertius" the murder goes on within, while Brakenbury muses upon the horror of it;[72] in "The True Tragedy," the lines are not quite clear, but suggest that it might have taken place in the balcony, before the audience.[73] This scene may therefore show another studied

[70] Lines 103 to 120.

[71] That Richard dressed gorgeously is shown by the chronicles, and by the Wardrobe Accounts which have been preserved. Henslowe's entries suggest richness of dress as common on the stage.

[72] Actio III.

[73] *Shakespeare Society Publications,* Vol. 21, page 44.

variation from the play that had preceded "Richard the Third" on the stage.

Scene 4.—The remarkable company of wailing women in this scene has been discussed. We have here a repetition of the wooing in Act I, but, if possible, under even more preposterous circumstances. It is hard to conceive how this stichomythic reasoning could have been other than tedious except to an audience that delighted in all sorts of playing with words.[74] This part of the scene, which is very long in the Folio, was shorter by nearly two hundred lines in the Quarto. The scene passes into the preparations for the conflict with Richmond, in which Richard in frenzied haste gives and repeals his commands.

Scene 5.—The function of this scene before Lord Derby's house is to give Elizabeth's decision concerning her daughter, and to show the feeling of Richard's army. It illustrates at the same time the very loose, epic structure of the play.

Act V, Scenes 1 and 2.—As has been already shown, these two scenes are epic in nature, and detract from the dramatic situation in their close adherence to the source.

Scene 3.—On the one side Richard enters with his troops and orders his tent up; on the other side of the stage, immediately after, Richmond and his men come in, his tent is pitched, and they withdraw into it. A similar scene of stage carpentry is found in "The Warning for Fair Women," where the direction is, "Enter some to prepare the judgement seat to the Lord Mayor, etc. . . . who being set command Browne to be brought forth."[75] Again, in "Sir Thomas More," one scene is partly taken up with the preparations for a mask, the placing of seats, etc.,[76] and in "The Spanish Tragedy," Hieronimo

[74] K. Rich. Say that the king, which may command, entreats.
Q. Eliz. That at her hands which the king's King forbids.
K. Rich. Say, she shall be a high and mighty queen.
Q. Eliz. To wail the title, as her mother doth.
K. Rich. Say, I will love her everlastingly.
Q. Eliz. But how long shall that title "ever" last?
K. Rich. Sweetly in force unto her fair life's end.
Q. Eliz. But how long fairly shall her sweet life last? etc.

[75] Act II.

[76] *Shakespeare Society Publications*, Vol. 23, page 53.

" Knocks up the curtaine," and hangs up the " title," in getting ready for the play.[77]

The incidents that follow take place successively in the two tents, care being taken to keep those on one side off the stage or shut within the tent, while the others are the center of interest. An exact counterpart of this arrangement is found in the fifth act of " Histriomastix," where the action even takes place on both sides at the same time. " Enter Lyon-Rash to Fourchier sitting in his study at one end of the stage; at the other end enter Vourcher to Velure in his shop"; after a short conversation between the first two, " Lyon-Rash and Fourchier sit and whisper whilst the other two speak." The scene of the camps on Bosworth Field is, from the standpoint of staging, the most interesting in the play, for it is a direct survival of the medieval " stations " or " mansions," and of the method by which places remote from each other were, without any inconvenience to the audience, represented simultaneously.[78] The evidences of this " incongruous," or " symbolic," or " plastic " stage, as it is variously called, in Elizabethan plays have been fully discussed by Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Corbin,[79] and need not be treated here. It is interesting to note, however, that of all of Shakespeare's plays, this scene offers the most striking survival of such archaic arrangement.[80] That it was conscious medievalism we are led to believe from the Prologue of " Henry the Fifth."

This scene also furnishes an instance of how Shakespeare used his sources in this play, in his representation of the ghosts.[81] The ghost in Elizabethan plays is one of the inherit-

[77] Act IV, Scene 3.

[78] For a fuller discussion, see Brander Matthews, *The Development of the Drama*, Chapter IV.

[79] Cited above.

[80] " Whatever share he (Shakespeare) may have had, moreover, in the actual phrasing of Titus Andronicus and Richard III, there can be little doubt that the primary structure of the scenes, so reminiscent of the archaic stage, was the work of an earlier hand." Corbin, *Shakespeare and the Plastic Stage*, page 377.

[81] See on this general subject, *The Pre-Shakespearian Ghost* and *Shakespeare's Ghosts*, by F. W. Moorman. *Modern Language Review*, 1906.

ances from the Senecan drama, principally through the work of Kyd. In "The Spanish Tragedy" the ghost acts as the impulse to revenge, and also as a Chorus, first to introduce the action, later, at the end of each act, to sum up what had been accomplished and to plan further incitement to revenge. Although the vogue of plays in which the ghost figures prominently did not culminate until somewhat later, such are found from the beginning of the Senecan influence on the English drama. One of the earliest of these plays is "The Misfortunes of Arthur" (1589), where Gorlois' ghost speaks the Prologue. In "Alphonsus of Arragon" (1589), the figure of Calchas is called up,[82] and in "The Wounds of Civil War" (1590), a Genius appears to Scilla,[83] both of which serve this same purpose in stage effect. In "The True Tragedy" the ghost appears at the opening of the play, a Prologue ghost as in strict Senecan use. In "Locrine" the function of the ghost is extended so that it participates in the action.[84] A further development is found in "Woodstock" and in "Richard the Third," where several ghosts appear, but, more convincingly, in a dream. The scene in "Richard the Third" bears such a close resemblance to the one in "Woodstock," and differs so much in this from any other extant play of this date, that it might suggest indebtedness to the earlier drama.[85] There is, however, ample suggestion in the source for such a scene without recourse to any model. In More's "History of King Richard III," it is said, "He took ill rest a nightes, lay long wakyng and musing, sore weried with care and watch, rather slumbered than slept, troubled wyth feareful dreams,"[86] and all of the other chronicles tell of these visions. The evil dreams are thus described in "Richardus Tertius,"

> Horrenda noctis visa terrent proximae.
> Postquam sepulta nox quietem suaserat,
> altusque teneris somnus obrepsit genis:

[82] Act III, Scene 2.
[83] Act IV, Scene 2.
[84] Act IV, Scene 2.
[85] Fleay conjectures 1591 for the date of *Woodstock*.
[86] Quoted by Churchill, in *Richard Third up to Shakespeare*, page 458.

subito premebant dira furiarum cohors,
saevoque laceravit impetu corpus tremens,
et foeda rabidis praeda sum daemonibus:
somnosque tandem magnus excussit tremor,
et pulsa artus horridus nostros metus.
Heu! quid truces minantur umbrae Tartari?[87]

In "The True Tragedy" a more explicit description is given,

Sleep I, wake I, or whatsoever I do,
Me thinkes their ghoasts come gaping for revenge,
Whom I have slain in reaching for a crown,
Clarence complaines, and crieth for reuenge,
My nepheues bloods, Reuenge, reuenge doth crie.
And euery one cries, let the tyrant die.[88]

This scene in Richard the Third," therefore, was merely a dramatization, in line with a popular device of the day, of a part of the legend which had been treated in narrative in the preceding plays.

The representation of ghosts may be gathered in some detail from the stage directions and references in the text of the dozen or so plays of this period in which the ghost appears. Their entrance upon the stage was sometimes accompanied by thunder and lightning,[89] at times by smoke, as described in "The Warning for Fair Women,"[90] but oftener they seem to have appeared suddenly and quietly. There is some indication that they arose from a trap door, especially where the visitant is to perform no action, as in "The Spanish Tragedy," "The Wounds of Civil War," "The True Tragedy," "The Misfortunes of Arthur," and "Alphonsus of Arragon." In one case, at least, there are stage directions indicating an exit by the trap door, in "The Old Wives' Tale," where Jack, the ghost, "leaps down in the ground"[91] after his beneficent labors are at an end. The spirit was sometimes represented as speaking Latin, as in "The True Tragedy," "Locrine," and "The Wounds of Civil War," probably because of the mysterious-

[87] Actio III, Actus V.
[88] *Shakespeare Society Publications,* Vol. 21, page 61.
[89] *Locrine,* Act V, Scene 4. *Woodstock,* Act V, Scene 1.
[90] Induction, lines 51–2.
[91] Bullen edition, page 346.

ness added by the use of another tongue. The ghost came to be caricatured as shrieking "Vindicta!", as we see in "The Warning for Fair Women,"[92] in Jonson's "Poetaster"[93] and Heywood's "Captives."[94] The ghosts in "Richard the Third" do none of these things; they enter at one door evidently, and go out at the opposite side; they speak English; the light "burns blue" it seems, but their coming and going is quiet, with a certain solemnity that must have been particularly impressive to an audience where belief in such visitations was unquestioned.

From "The Warning for Fair Women" we know that it had been customary for the ghosts to appear wrapped in a sheet, or in a leather pilch,[95] and Henslowe's entries of "j gostes sewte, and j gostes bodeyes," and "j gostes crowne," suggest some kind of distinctive dress. In "Alphonsus of Arragon" the ghost appeared in a Cardinal's robes;[96] in "Old Wives' Tale," Jack must have been in his usual dress, as his ghostly character is unknown until he divulges it at the end. The most interesting feature of their presentation is the attempt to represent their invisibility. Henslowe's entry of "a robe for to goo invisibell" awakens one's imagination, but the nature of it is unascertainable. In "Old Wives' Tale" we find "Enter (the ghost of) Jack invisible and take Sacropant's wreath from his head, etc."[97] As for their "make up," it is evident that the face was whitened and that the hands, and perhaps the face, were sometimes smeared with blood. Thus in "Locrine" Humber says,

> But why comes Albanact's bloody ghost?[98]

In Lodge's "Wit's Miserie" one of the devils is said to be

[92] Induction, line 50.
[93] Act III, Scene 1.
[94] Act IV.
[95] Induction, lines 47–8.

> A filthy whining ghost,
> Lapt in some foul sheet, or in a leather pilch, etc.

[96] Act III, Scene 2. "Rise Calchas up, in a white surplice and a Cardinal's Myter."
[97] Bullen edition, page 342.
[98] Act III, Scene 5.

"a foule lubber, and looks as pale as the visard of the ghost."[99] Horatio addresses Andrea's ghost in "The First Part of Hieronimo" as "my pale friend."[100] In trying to realize the effect of these scenes, it must be remembered that the Elizabethan stage did not have the advantages, especially necessary for such subjects, of artificial lighting. The stage in this scene might have been darkened in some way, with only the light which "burned blue" when the ghosts approached, an effect not so easily obtained on a stage open to the sky except where it was shaded by the "heavens," and where any illusory effects to be attained by strong lighting from a particular quarter were out of the question. What conditions prevailed in this play is uncertain, in how far they were conventional, and in how far they show the more significant presentation of the ghost found in "Hamlet" and "Macbeth."

Scenes 4 and 5.—The play closes with two short but exciting scenes on the battle field. In these chronicle plays the battles seem to have made the greatest impression on the audience, and they became the special mark of plays of this kind, as is seen in "The Warning for Fair Women," where Hystorie enters with drum and ensign.[101] Richard's line,

A horse! a horse! my kingdom for a horse!

from the battle scene in this play seems to have been the one that most impressed the audience, so far as can be judged from its recurrence, while the stir and bustle, the noise and occasion for hand to hand contests supplied a realistic element very attractive to the "groundlings."

The frequent occurrence of such scenes makes it possible to follow the changing nature of their presentation from the earliest plays to "Richard the Third." The two earliest examples exhibit typically Senecan and medieval handling respectively. In "Gorboduc" (1562), the battle is relegated to the dumb show, and is described thus,

[99] *Wit's Miserie or the World's Madness,* 1569.
[100] Act III, Scene 3.
[101] Induction.

"First the drommes and fluites began to sound, during which there came forth upon the stage a company of hargabusiers and of armed men all in order of battaile. These, after their peeces discharged, and that the armed men had three times marched about the stage, departed, and then the drommes and fluits did cease." [102]

In "Horestes" (1567), on the other hand, the army and the battle play an important part in the action. It may not be uninteresting to give in detail the martial scenes in this, as they show the method of presentation at this early date. When the army first comes on the stage the directions are, "Let ye drum play and enter Horestes with his band; and march about the stage." After a few words, they "march about and go out." When it comes to the battle after the parley, and the storming of the city, it reads, "Let Egistus enter and set hys men in a rayl, and let the drom playe tyll Horestes speaketh." Horestes and Egistus defy each other, and then, "stryke up your drum and fyght a good whil, and then let sum of Egistus men flye, and then take hym and let Horestes drav him vyolently, and let ye drums sease." In "Richardus Tertius" (1579), although a Senecan play, a popular element is introduced in bringing the battle on the stage. It is described in some detail thus,

"Lett gunns goe of, and trumpetts sound, with all stir of Soldiers without ye hall, untill such time as ye lord Stanley be on ye stage ready to speake."

Stanley addresses the soldiers, urges them to fight bravely, and then the battle is heard behind the scenes as before.

"After the like noise againe, let souldiers run from ye feild, over the stage one after another, flinginge of their harnesse, and att length let some come haltinge and wounded. After this let Henerye, Earle of Richmond come tryumphing, haveinge ye body of K. Richard dead on a horse, Catesby, and Ratliffe and others bound." [103]

We find that the later development followed closely the method marked out in these two plays. In the York and Lancaster plays, where we have a succession of battles, great importance is given to the marshalling of troops, the marching in of the

[102] "The Order and Signification of the Domme Show" before the Fifth Act.

[103] Actio III.

forces, the passing of the companies across the stage; and the conflict is represented by a succession of single encounters between the leading figures, accompanied by the running in and out of the soldiers. In Marlowe's plays, the noise of battle rather than the actual fighting is used for scenic effect, as in "Tamburlaine," Part I, Act III, Scene 3, where the battle rages without while Zenocrate and Zabina carry on a woman's war of words; or in Part II, Act IV, Scenes 1 and 2, where the dullard son of Tamburlaine plays cards while the noise of the battle is heard in the distance; or in the last scene where the dying Tamburlaine is borne out to the conflict.[104] In the imitators of Marlowe, we find the general method of the chronicle plays. In "The Battle of Alcazar," for instance, these scenes are represented at great length and in great detail,[105] and so in the other plays of the time.

There seems to be a typical development of the steps in these situations, thus; (1) the news of the coming of the enemy; (2) the preparations immediately before the battle, as the entrance of the troops,[106] the defiance, etc.; (3) the fight, in which the alarm, the continuous sound of fighting without, the excursions, the single encounters, the death of one or more wounded leaders, and the sounding of the retreat are found in nearly every scene of this sort; and (4) the triumphant entry of the victor, bringing the trophies with him. The hero is rewarded or crowned and preparations are made for the burial of the slain.[107] All these stages appear in "Richard the Third," the announcement of Richmond's coming, the march of both armies to Bosworth, the preparation the night before the battle, with the feeling of foreboding increased by the appearance of the ghosts, the warning message to Richard, the orations to the armies, with the call to arms. Two scenes are given to the battle,

[104] There is only one encounter on the stage, in *Tamburlaine*, Part I, Act III, Scene 3.

[105] Act V.

[106] The most elaborate scenes of this sort are found in *The Contentions.*

[107] Examples of these are found in *Henry the Sixth, The Contentions, Locrine, The Wounds of Civil War, Alphonsus of Arragon,* etc.

the last showing the field after Richard has fallen,[109] when Richmond enters in triumph, congratulations are exchanged, Richmond is crowned, and the play ends with orders for the burial of those who have fallen, and the announcement of the marriage of Richmond and Elizabeth.[109]

The opportunity for effective scenes is apparent. The leader with his followers, the oration, the encounter, all place the principal actor in heroic situations, and the triumph and crowning give further occasion for brilliant effects. What the setting actually was may be gathered in some detail. It is probable that the equipment for martial scenes was more elaborate than for any other. The parts of the armor are referred to very frequently, and the description of the "solemnity" of arming the prince in "Edward the Third"[110] shows with what care for detail such scenes were reproduced. In "Richard the Third" the King gives directions to Catesby,

> Look that my staves be sound, and not too heavy,[111]

showing that he carried a lance. Later, reference is made to his sword,[112] and archers are spoken of as the main part of the army.[113] That a distinguishing dress was used for soldiers of different nationalities would seem apparent from

[108] "According to the old stage direction Richard dies on the stage, and it is remarkable that Shakespeare has given him no dying words, and doubtless the omission is designed as it is characteristic. It is left to the actor to give the last expression to the state of mind which is the true retribution of Richard, in the spirit and character of his combat and fall. Burbage, the first and celebrated representative of Richard, had no doubt the poet's own instructions for this great conclusion, and certain glimmerings and true stage tradition may easily have reached and we may hope did not die out with Kean. The reader of the play, who has but the general stage-directions in compensation, may pause to bring back in thought the impression of the interval before the closing speeches." W. W. Lloyd, *Critical Essays. Richard III.*

[109] The barbarous treatment of Richard's body, found in the chronicles and in *The True Tragedy*, is omitted in Shakespeare's play.

[110] Act III, Scene 3. "Enter four Heralds, bringing a coat-armour, a helmet, a lance, and a shield." Then follows the arming.

[111] Act V, Scene 3, line 65.

[112] Ditto, line 163.

[113] Ditto, lines 285 and 339.

a stage direction in "Edward the Third," "Enter Bohemia, and Forces; and Aid of Danes, Poles and Muscovites."[114] Distinction of weapons is suggested in "Locrine," as Corineus carries a club, and Locrine a curtle-axe and sword, while the Scythian Humber has a helm, targe and dart. The Scythians are armed in "azure blew" and their banners are "crost with argeant streams."[115] Distinctions were made in the martial airs also. In "Henry the Sixth," Part I, Act III, Scene 3, the stage directions read, "Here sound an English march. Enter and pass over at a distance, Talbot and his forces." After a few lines it says, "French march. Enter the Duke of Burgundy and forces." The drums, trumpets and colors of different forces are constantly referred to. The King seems to have worn his crown in battle. This is mentioned in "Henry the Sixth," Part III, Act IV, Scene 4, in "Tamburlaine," Part I, Act II, Scene 4, in "The True Tragedy" and "Richardus Tertius." In "Richard the Third" Derby enters bearing the crown and says:

> Lo, here, this long usurped royalty
> From the dead temples of this bloody wretch
> Have I pluck'd off, to grace thy brow withal.[116]

The presentation of the battle, therefore, is seen to have furnished the most serious attempts at realistic staging that we find in these early plays. That these attempts were not without their detractors is seen in the Prologue to Jonson's "Every Man in His Humour," where he tells how in the theatres they,

> with three rusty swords,
> And help of some few foot and half-foot words,
> Fight over York and Lancaster's long jars.

The realization of the inadequacy of these representations

[114] Act III, Scene 1.

[115] Act II, Scene 3.

[116] Women figure prominently in battle scenes and are sometimes represented as taking part in the fighting, as in *Alphonsus of Arragon* and *The Contention*. In *Sir Thomas More* Doll enters "in a shirt of maile, a headpiece, sword and buckler."

led Shakespeare to prefix to "Henry the Fifth" his often quoted apology.[117]

Such are the scenes in their sequence. It is apparent that their arrangement is governed very slightly by an effort to obtain contrast, or to reach any dramatic climax.[118] The structure, so far as scene arrangement is concerned, is entirely epic. Dramatic structure, so far as it is present, comes from the exposition of Richard's character. The scenes and situations which would make the play something new to an audience familiar with "The True Tragedy" and the York and Lancaster plays,[119] were characterized by going beyond and making better the suggestions of earlier writers, rather than by actually introducing novel effects. Thus, the wooing of Anne is a development of similar scenes found in other plays, and the murder of Clarence is a direct imitation of "Edward the Second." There seems to be a constant effort to carry the audience off its feet, to go farther in the elaboration of these situations than any one before. This may account in some degree for the constant repetition. Thus the wooing of Anne finds a counterpart in the solicitation of Elizabeth, the preparation for the murder of Clarence is re-

[117] Can this cockpit hold
The vasty fields of France? or may we cram
Within this wooden O the very casques
That did affright the air at Agincourt?
. . . . . .
Piece out our imperfections with your thoughts;
Into a thousand parts divide one man,
And make imaginary puissance:
Think when we talk of horses, that you see them
Printing their proud hoofs i' the receiving earth;
For 'tis your thoughts that now must deck our kings.

[118] Pofessor R. G. Moulton in *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist*, finds in *Richard the Third* other than epic unity by tracing in it the network and the "unvarying reiteration of Nemesis" which "has the effect of *giving rhythm to fate*,"—a point of view which has given occasion for an interesting exposition of the plot, but which seems to be pushed to the verge of absurdity.

[119] *Richardus Tertius* would not affect the popular conception, as its performance was restricted to the university.

peated in part in the conference with Tyrrel, the weeping women are the center of no less than four scenes, and ghosts appear to the number of eleven. Sheer effect is sought, rather than the economical and orderly development of the story.

Yet from this examination of the scenes in "Richard the Third" and of their relation to similar scenes in other plays of the time, it is seen that, whatever may have been its effect upon the audience, this effect was little furthered by elaborate staging. There is no requirement for such devices as were common at the time, as in the banquet scene in "The Jew of Malta" where Barabas is dropped into the cauldron,[120] or in "Alphonsus of Arragon" where Venus is let down from the top of the stage and at the end of the play is drawn up again, or in "Tancred and Gismunda" where Cupid "cometh out of the heavens in a cradle of flowers";[121] nor are there as in other plays, any appearances of blazing stars,[122] or suns[123] or moons.[124] It has been shown that there is a marked absence apparently, of brilliant scenes, such as processions, large court scenes, etc. Hardly any contemporary play requires less in scenery and properties. In the most elaborate scenes, where Richard enters "in pomp" with the setting of the throne-room,[125] and where the two tents are on the stage,[126] the furnishings were in no way extraordinary and made no unusual demands. Even the ghost scene was a simple matter for an audience which probably demanded no greater illusory effects here than in the rest of the play. The greatest elaboration evidently showed itself in the gorgeousness of Richard's dress, which centered attention on the notable feature of the play.

This play, so far as I can see, contributes no certain evidences

[120] Act V, Scene 4.
[121] Act I, Scene 1.
[122] *Battle of Alcazar.*
[123] *The Contention,* Part II.
[124] *The Troublesome Raigne.*
[125] Act IV, Scene 2.
[126] Act V, Scene 3.

of the use of an inner stage. Indeed, as has been pointed out, in more than one instance where the use of it would suggest itself as the most natural arrangement, the text seems to show that it was not used. The directions call for a balcony and two doors, but give no other indications of the divisions of the stage.

Place is indicated in the text, or, in two instances, by the setting of the throne and of the council table. There was here, then, no necessity to resort to the device of placards, although there is no proof that it was not done. The change of scene is not frequent and about half of the scenes are unlocated.

That intermissions between the acts were common seems to be shown, in many plays of the time, by the presence of the dumb shows,[127] by the part of the Presenter, or of a Chorus at the end of each stage of the action, as in "Soliman and Perseda," and by references to musical interludes.[128] There are however, no indications in "Richard the Third" of any such breaks in the performance.

On the question of the text used, the position of the Cambridge editors seems to be the most tenable, namely, that the Quarto represents the original manuscript of the author with some few changes.[129] This therefore, would represent the acting version, as nearly as it is obtainable.[130] The main differences between this acting version and the text of the Folio, is that it is shorter by about two hundred lines, an obvious advantage in a play numbering 3620 lines.[131] How

[127] *Locrine, The Battle of Alcazar, Alphonsus of Arragon, James the Fourth, The Misfortunes of Arthur, Tancred and Gismunda.*

[128] See W. T. Lawrence, *Music in the Elizabethan Theatre. Shakespeare Jahrbuch,* Vol. 44.

[129] See Cambridge Shakespeare, preface to *Richard the Third.* A detailed discussion of the relation of the Folio to the first Quarto, with conclusions opposed to those of the Cambridge editors, by J. Spedding and E. H. Pickersgill, may be found in *The New Shakespeare Society's Transactions,* 1875.

[130] *The Bankside Shakespeare,* edited by Appleton Morgan, Shakespeare Society of New York, 1891, gives on opposite pages the text of the 1597 Quarto and the first Folio.

[131] *Richard the Third* is the longest of Shakespeare's plays, except *Hamlet.*

this number could be given in a two hours performance,[132] when to-day two thousand lines are considered the limit, may be accounted for, in part at least, by the greater rapidity possible where no time was lost in the shifting of scenery, and by the fact that in "Richard the Third" very few properties had to be moved about during the play. The absence of distinctly comic scenes would also further this rapidity of performance, for it is in the comic scenes that most time for "business" must be allowed.

The prominence of the hero is one of the noteworthy characteristics of this play. As a practical result of this Richard is upon the stage more constantly than the hero in the typical chronicle. In "Edward the First" about as much is spoken when the king is off the stage as when he is on, *i. e.*, he is on the stage just half the time. In "Henry the Fifth" and "The Troublesome Raigne," the hero is on rather more than half the time. Richard is on the stage about two-thirds of the time. This however, is not so good a test as the importance of the scenes in which the hero does not figure. In "Edward the First," the Lluellen scenes run parallel with the main plot and claim a large part of the interest as well as of the time. In "Henry the Fifth," the scenes in which Henry does not appear are either comic or more important by the figure of Henry the Fourth. In "The Troublesome Raigne," John is no more interesting than Arthur or Falconbridge. Richard figures in fifteen out of the twenty-five scenes; five of the ten scenes in which he does not appear are very short, as where Buckingham is led to execution, or two citizens are discussing Richard's protectorate, or a scrivener appears with the indictment of Hastings. Richard is absent from only two scenes where there is any action, the murder of Clarence and the testing of Hast-

[132] The two hours' traffic of out stage.

Romeo and Juliet, Prologue.

May see away their shilling
Richly in two short hours.

Henry the Eighth, Prologue.

But in the Induction to *Bartholomew Fair*, the length of the performance is given as "two and a half hours and somewhat more."

ings.[133] In other words, there is here opportunity for the development of the "star." Besides, in no play up to that time had such opportunity been given for the display of a variety of emotions and capabilities in the actor. The part of Richard the Third is an especially many sided one; he is the scheming villain, the injured patriot, the king *par excellence*, the lover, a consummate actor. He is seen in playful banter with the little princes, in the heroic encounter, as leader of an army, and in the last moments of a tragic death. This would explain the popularity of "Richard the Third" with actors as well as audiences from the days of Burbage to the present time.

It is easy to imagine the attractiveness of this play to audiences of Shakespeare's time. The great figure of Richard, grotesque, imminent in every action, varying at every turn, is surrounded by a multitude of characters helplessly involved in the net-work of his machinations—the demonic Margaret, half Fury, half prophetess, her awful presence giving the note of fatefulness to these scenes in the fortunes of the houses of York and Lancaster, the weeping women, suggestive of the ancient Chorus, the enthusiastic, wrong-headed Buckingham, the obtusely loyal Hastings, the precocious princes, and the simple, wondering children of Clarence. These in their succession and combination give scenes of constantly shifting "values." How much Shakespeare has done in the creation of this world of interacting natures surrounding this central figure could be readily appreciated by an audience which had seen the old play of "The True Tragedy," where Richard's schemes are planned with a certain commonness and vulgarity far removed from the sardonic, yet always kingly character of Shakespeare's protagonist; Margaret's awful curses are in no measure suggested by the mournful complainings of Anne and Elizabeth; and the children, so effectively introduced in this play, are mere little puppets with large speeches. For Shakespeare's transformations in these respects, I believe, are what would most impress the audience who went to see "Richard the Third" at The Theatre in 1594 and 1595.

[133] Richard speaks 1161 lines, a greater number than any other character in Shakespeare's plays, except Hamlet.

Above all, the play is typically Elizabethan. As has been seen, it shows in its construction and presentation a mingling of the classical and medieval together with a regard for the current theatrical fashions, which mark it as typical of the plays on the stage during the last years of the sixteenth century. At the same time, in its emphasis upon the development of character rather than upon action, it looks forward to the great tragedies of the next decade.

III

Richard the Third and the Drama of the Restoration

The chronicle play during the Restoration—Characteristics of the heroic play—"The English Princess"—The character of Richard the Third in this play—Betterton as Richard—Popularity of "The English Princess"—Changes in stage conditions during this period—Women on the stage—Scenery—Music—Costume—Importance of the period.

Although with the opening of the theatres after the Restoration numerous plays of Shakespeare were revived,[1] either in their original or in an altered form, no record has been discovered of a performance of Shakespeare's "Richard the Third" until the beginning of the next century,[2] and then in a revised form, and no performance of the Shakespearian form occurs for more than one hundred and fifty years.[3] During this period, however, between 1660 and 1700, the character of Richard the Third figured on the stage in other plays, namely, "Henry the Sixth, The Second Part, or The Misery of Civil War," by John Crowne (1681), and "The English Princess, or The Death of Richard the Third," by John Caryl[4] (1667), the latter of which presents a treatment of the subject which influenced the later history of the Shakespearian play. Before examining these plays, some brief account should be given of the chronicle play after 1594 in order to exhibit the influences which resulted in the form which we meet at this time.

[1] For a list of these alterations and revisions for the fifty years following the Restoration, see Lounsbury, *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist*, page 302 note.

[2] "I do not find that this play which was so popular in Shakespeare's time, was performed from the time of the Restoration to the end of the last century." Malone, *Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the English Stage* (1790). London, 1803, pages 347–8.

[3] In 1821, Macready's attempt to revive the original form.

[4] Written variously as Caryll and Carroll.

During the early years of the seventeenth century the popularity of the chronicle play persisted, but after the succession of Charles the First, plays founded on the English chronicles became more and more rare, and the history of this dramatic form may be said to close with Ford's "Perkin Warbeck," acted at The Phœnix in 1633. This play is of some special interest here as dealing remotely with the subject of Richard the Third, and as being of a quality to rank it among the few great plays of the class of Shakespeare's epic histories.[5] This, with Samuel Rowley's "Richard the Third or the English Prophet" (1623),[6] of which we know nothing, exhibits the subject of Richard the Third among the very last representatives in this period of the English chronicle play.

The period succeeding the restoration of the Stuarts upon the throne was not a time in which this form of the drama would be likely to attain popularity. Aside from the unacceptableness of plays dealing with the fall of English monarchs, the absence of national enthusiasm, the total separation of the ideals and practices of the Court from those of the great mass of the people, the lack of connection or sympathy between the stage and the general public, would account for the failure of interest in national themes. It has been pointed out that "the literature of the stage was not only out of sympathy with the opinions and sentiments of the people at large, but was in part both intended and received as an insult to them." The drama of the time appealed to and was fostered entirely by a small and non-representative class, the Court, and, in addition, its models, form and themes were highly "Frenchified."[7]

Plays based really or nominally on the English chronicles number about a dozen during the years between the Restoration and the beginning of the next century. To these must be added, however, the revivals and alterations of history plays from the older drama, that now began to appear.[8] The first

[5] F. E. Schelling: *The English Chronicle Play,* page 265.

[6] Fleay, *History of the London Stage,* page 30, says it was played at The Fortune by the Palsgrave Men.

[7] See Chase, *The English Heroic Play,* page 193.

[8] *Macbeth,* according to Downes' *Roscius Anglicanus,* was given "as

original history plays of the period seem to have been the Earl of Orrery's "Henry the Fifth" in 1664, "The Black Prince" by the same author in 1667, and Caryl's "The English Princess" in the same year. Two plays based on the popular story of King Edgar, one by Edward Ravenscroft in 1677, and the other by Thomas Rymer in 1678,[9] and a group of plays by John Banks dealing with the events of the reign of Elizabeth,[10] complete the list until the appearance, late in the nineties, of Charles Hopkins' "Boadicea" and Mrs. Pix' "Queen Catherine, or The Ruins of Love," unless Dryden's opera, "Arthur," may be included here. All of the histories of this period, except those by Banks,[11] are of the prevalent type of serious drama, *i. e.*, heroic plays. It remains, therefore, to show the general character of this type as related to the histories of the former age.

The heroic play[12] has certain affiliations with the "virtù" play so called, such as Marlowe's "Tamburlaine," or "Faus-

Shakespeare wrote it" in 1663 at the Duke's Theatre, and according to the same authority *Lear* was played at Lincoln's Inn Fields between 1662 and 1665. In 1667, *Henry the Fourth* was revived. *Macbeth* appeared as an opera, altered by D'Avenant, in 1692, and Nahum Tate produced his revisions of *Richard the Second* and *Lear* in 1681. In this same year also, *Henry the Sixth,* very much altered by Crowne, appeared, and in 1682 D'Urfey's revision of *Cymbeline* as *The Fatal Wager.*

[9] *King Edgar and Alfrida* and *Edgar or the English Monarch.*

[10] *Virtue Betrayed, or Anna Bullen,* 1682, at Dorset Garden, *The Unhappy Favorite, or The Earl of Essex,* 1682, at the Theatre Royal, and in 1684, *The Island Queens, or The Death of Mary Queen of Scotland,* not acted until 1704, at Drury Lane, with the title *Albion Queens,* and *The Innocent Usurper, or The Death of Lady Jane Grey,* which was not acted.

[11] Banks' plays have looser structure and use blank verse, but in the characters and sentiments differ little from the heroic plays. The alterations of Shakespeare's plays kept something like the outward form and the blank verse of the originals.

[12] For the relation of the heroic play to the preceding drama, see especially, J. W. Tupper, *The Relation of the Heroic Play to the Romances of Beaumont and Fletcher; Publications of Modern Language Association,* Sep., 1905; W. J. Courthope, *History of English Poetry,* Vol. IV, page 404; A. H. Thorndike, *The influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare,* Introduction to the edition of *The Maid's Tragedy and Philaster in the Belle Lettre Series,* and *Tragedy,* Chapter VIII.

tus," or Shakespeare's "Richard the Third." In both we have the desire to attain great things, scorn for the impossible, utter self-confidence, and the "high astounding" eloquence of the self-assertive hero. Furthermore, through the influence of the French romances and of the romantic plays of the preceding age, especially those of Beaumont and Fletcher, whose plays were popular on the Restoration stage, the "virtù" play became modified from martial and political themes, and from a play in which love played only a subordinate part, to one in which the sentiment of love was the predominating motive and interest. The hero, as in the chronicle play, was a person of royal or noble birth, but as Rymer says of the hero of his "Edgar,"

Unking'd, in Love, we represent him here.[13]

The heroic play, *sui generis,* is professedly a history play, but even in the time of its greatest vogue we find few themes taken from English history. The scenes, as in the romances, are remote in place, as well as in time. In contradistinction to the loose epic structure, with the large number of characters, and the introduction of comic matter, which characterized the chronicles generally, and in accordance with the stricter dramatic structure of the romantic plays, the heroic play developed a tolerably consistent observance of the unities, a suppression of all comic elements and a reduction of the number of characters. Yet, instead of presenting in this smaller compass the interaction and complexities of character, introspection and passion find no place here, but the "tendency is for each character to become the exponent and champion of a single phase, a single idea."[14] This impression is strengthened by the further rigidity brought about by the change from the more varied cadences of blank verse to the fixed rhythm of the couplet.

So far as the history of the chronicle play is concerned, the most significant characteristic of these heroic plays is their treatment of historical sources. The writer used the names

[13] Prologue.

[14] Chase, *op. cit.,* pages 54 and 103.

of historical personages and kept to historical events in the merest outline, but that is all. Love is the whole concern and history is "twisted" to make it so, patriotism plays no part in motive and little in expression, war is kept in the background as a point of reference for the lover, who engages in it chiefly to remove the obstacles which stand in the way of his obtaining the object of his desire. If in the course of this a number of persons are killed, the play is called a tragedy, irrespective of a happy ending.[15] It is seen, therefore, that the history play became in this period quite another thing in spirit and form, far removed from the plays contemporary with Shakespeare's "Richard the Third."

In the small number of these heroic histories between the years of 1660 and 1700, Richard the Third is the hero of one of the most successful, "The English Princess, or The Death of Richard the Third." The theme is developed from Richard's solicitation of the Queen for her daughter Elizabeth, the English Princess. Richmond is the rival suitor, secondarily the liberator of England. To illustrate the form which the subject took at this time, a short résumé of the play is given.

Act I.—The play opens just before the battle of Bosworth. Richard is on his way to meet Richmond. But the first concern of Richard, for political and personal reasons, is to win Elizabeth, the daughter of Edward the Fourth, for his wife. Elizabeth vows herself plighted, both by love and honor, to Richmond.

Act II.—Lord Stanley's treachery to Richard and his adherence to Richmond become apparent. Charlot, the page of Richmond, furthers the communication between the lovers.

Act III.—The King's further attempts to win Elizabeth are unsuccessful, and she is condemned to die unless she yields. The scene changes to the camp of Richmond. The Prior of Litchfield fortells his success.

Act IV.—On the night before the battle Richmond visits Elizabeth with Stanley and begs to die in her place, but she utterly refuses the sacrifice. Richard appears walking in his sleep, surrounded by the ghosts of those whom he has slain.

[15] Chase, *op cit.*, pages 20–1.

Act V.—The day of the battle. Elizabeth escapes to a cloister in the dress of the page, Charlot. Sir William Stanley, disguised as Richmond, meets Richard and is about to fight with him, when Richmond appears. They fight and Richard falls.[16] The play closes with the revelation of the identity of Charlot as the daughter of a French count, the appearance of Elizabeth and the crowning of Richmond.

The author gives his sources in the prologue as "plain Holinshead and down-right Stowe," but it is seen that great liberties have been taken with these sources to meet the requirements of the heroic plot. This offers all the conventional obstacles of the typical heroic play, the rivals both to hero and to heroine, and the strong opposing force of the tyrant king. The prime interest is heroic love, the characters present the well-known types, the lover of noble birth, splendid in valor, extravagant in love; the heroine strictly regardful of the conventionalities, prating always of love and honor; the generous rival in Sir William Stanley; the love-lorn maiden in Charlot. Richard, quite at variance with the complexity of Shakespeare's conception, is here a character of one idea, the typically ambitious king-villain. Some violence is done to the character of Queen Elizabeth to make her fill the part of the evil-minded woman lost to all sense of honor, bent only on ambition. The sentiments present the familiar themes of love and honor, the former expressed in the familiar terms of "poison in the blood," and "raging fire." The villain's theme is ambition. It is this preference of ambition to love that makes Richard the villain in distinction to Richmond, who prefers love to ambition; otherwise their characters are not sharply differentiated. Loyalty to the monarchical idea finds expression from time to time, the patriotic note is slight, although the Prologue and Epilogue point to a patriotic motive in the undertaking.[17] The tragic note is hardly perceptible. The villain

[16] Compare Rymer's canon in *Tragedies of the Last Age,* "If I mistake not, in Poetry no woman is to kill a man, . . . nor is a Servant to kill the Master, nor a Private Man, much less a Subject to kill a king, nor on the contrary."

[17] Greece, the first Mistress of the Tragic Muse,
To grace her Stage did her own Heroes chuse;

is punished, but his fate awakens no pity, nor does his overthrow seem of more significance than denoting his lack of success in love. The national concern is almost unfelt.

Richard's ugliness is touched upon, but only vaguely. He is called " this monster,"[18] and his " ill-shape "[19] is spoken of, but neither of these in terms that suggest any great physical deformity. He rather stands abstractly for the ugliness of the tyrant, but probably in his character as a king, in accord with orthodox heroic canons,[20] some measure of dignity above a common villain was given him. All elements of the comic in connection with his character, either in the suggestion of the grotesque or in the situation, are severely suppressed.

> Their pens adorn'd their Native Swords; and thus
> What was not Grecian past for Barbarous.
> On us our Country the same duty lays,
> And English Wit should English Valour raise.
> Why should our Land to any Land submit
> In choice of heroes or in height of wit?
> This made him write, who never writ till now,
> Only to show what better pens should do.
> And for his pains he hopes he shall be thought
> (Though a bad Poet) a good Patriot. Prologue.

> Richard is dead; and now begins your Reign:
> Let not the Tyrant live in you again,
> For though one Tyrant be a Nation's Curse,
> Yet Commonwealths of Tyrants are much worse,
> Their name is Legion: And a Rump (you know)
> In Cruelty all Richards does outgo. Epilogue.

Also compare the title motto in the Quarto of 1674.

> Nec minnimum meruere decus vestigia Graeca
> Aussi deserere, et laudare domestica facta.
> Horat. de Art. Poet.

[18] Act I, Scene 4.

[19] Act II, Scene 3.

[20] " Though it is not necessary that all heroes should be Kings, yet undoubtedly all crown'd heads, by Poetical right are Heroes. This Character is a flower, a prerogative, so certain, so indispensably annexed to the Crown, as by no Poet, or Parliament of poets, ever to be invaded." Rymer, *Tragedies of the Last Age,* page 61. Quoted by Chase, *op. cit.,* page 29.

Richard is sceptical, as the typical heroic villain. Thus he says:

'Tis fear makes Gods above, and Kings below.[21]

To reassure himself, he scoffs:

There are no ghosts, nor ever were
But in the tales of Priests, or Womens Fear.[22]

He dies exclaiming:

Since I must lose my Throne, I only crave,
That nothing may be found beyond the Grave.[23]

Genest says that in this play "nothing is taken from Shakespeare."[24] The end of the play seems generally modelled on the older one, especially the ghost scene, though here greatly simplified by representing the ghosts as appearing to Richard alone. Such imitation, however, is only barely possible, as the suggestion stands in the chronicles, and the representation of ghosts on the stage at this time was as common as in the time of Elizabeth. The battle or any portion of it seemed out of favor in the heroic play, so the battle of Bosworth Field is represented only by the duel between Richard and Richmond.

The actor of the heroic Richard was Betterton, the greatest actor of his age, a worthy successor of the first Richard, Burbage, and like him inclining to the quieter delivery, in a time when bombast and bombastic plays were in vogue. Colley Cibber, in his "Apology" gives as the main characteristic of Betterton's acting the power "to keep the attention more pleasingly awake by a temper'd Spirit than by meer Vehemence of Voice."[25] Again he says, "Betterton had a Voice of that kind which gave more Spirit to Terror than to

[21] Act III, Scene 1.

[22] Act IV, Scene 9.

[23] Act V, Scene 6.

[24] John Genest, *Some Account of the English Stage from 1660 to 1830*, Vol. I, page 73.

[25] *An Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber by Himself.* Edited by Robert W. Lowe. London, 1889. Vol. I, pages 101–2.

softer Passions; of more strength than Melody."[26] In figure he was "not exceeding middle stature, inclining to the corpulent; of a serious and penetrating Aspect; his Limbs nearer the Athletick than the delicate Proportion;" yet he had "a commanding Mien of Majesty."[27]

"The English Princess" seems to have been a successful play, although opinions differed as to its excellence. Downes, the prompter, writes of it:

"Richard the Third, or the English Princess, wrote by Mr. Carrol was excellently well acted in every Part; chiefly King Richard, by Mr. Betterton; Duke of Richmond, by Mr. Harris; Sir William Stanly, by Mr. Smith, gained them Additional Estimation, and the Applause from the Town, as well as profit to the whole Company."[28]

Pepys saw the play when it was given on March 7, 1667, and characterizes it as "a most sad, melancholy play, and pretty good; but nothing eminent in it, as some tragedys are."[29] Genest records but one performance, but it seems to have been on the stage later, according to the title-page of the second Quarto of 1674, which reads: "As it is now acted at His Highness the Duke of York's Theatre." It seems even to have enjoyed some popularity, for I find references in the plays of the season which seem to apply to this "Richard the Third." In the Epilogue to "The Tempest," which Pepys saw on November 7, 1667,[30] that year is represented as being unfortunate:[31]

> Gallants, by all good signs it does appear
> That sixty-seven's a very damning year,
> For knaves abroad, and for ill poets here.

[26] *Ditto,* page 116. Anthony Aston, in his *Lives of the late famous Actors and Actresses,* says of Betterton's voice, "His voice was low and grumbling; yet he could tune it by an artful climax, which enforced universal attention even from the Fops and Orange-girls."

[27] *Ditto,* page 117.

[28] *Roscius Anglicanus.* Facsimile Reprint of the Rare Original of 1708, by Joseph Knight. London, 1886. Page 27.

[29] *The Diary.* Edited by H. B. Wheatley. London, 1895. Vol. VI, pages 200 and 201.

[30] *Ditto,* Vol. VII, page 176.

[31] Referring, no doubt, to the two edicts of suspension of performances issued that year.

"The English Princess" had been given at the Theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields in March of the same year, and it is probable that the reference is to the play that had just scored a success. Again in Banks' "Unhappy Favorite," played at the Theatre Royal in 1682, Burleigh is called:

> Fourth Richard rather,
> Heir to the Third in Magnanimity,
> In Person, Courage, Wit, and Bravery all,
> But to his vices none, nor to his End
> I hope.[32]

But "The English Princess" is not the only play in which the figure of Richard was kept upon the stage, for among the alterations of Shakespeare's plays, which, we have noted, began to appear in considerable numbers at this time, John Crowne's "Henry the Sixth the Second Part, or the Misery of Civil War" (1681), presents the character of Richard the Third, and quite prominently. Although the writer says of himself in the Prologue:

> For by his feeble Skill 'tis built alone,
> The Divine Shakespeare did not lay one stone,

this play is a combination of the Jack Cade scenes of the second part of Shakespeare's "Henry the Sixth," with the leading scenes of the third part, together with certain interpolations, such as the scenes dealing with Lady Elinor Butler, an early sweetheart of Edward the Fourth, Warwick's wooing of Lady Elizabeth Grey before her meeting with the King and his subsequent jealousy, and the marriages of Edward, George and Prince Edward. The great Earl Warwick is the hero of the play,[33] but is here converted into a sighing lover,

> . . . . . .
> The ghosts of poets walk within this place,
> And haunt us actors whereso'er we pass,
> In visions bloodier than King Richard's was.

[32] This might refer to Crowne's *Henry the Sixth*. Or, since later in the play, we have the line,

> Was not brave Buckingham for less Condemned?

it may be that Banks was reading Shakespeare, as Buckingham does not figure in either of these plays.

[33] Acted by Betterton, as was also the part of the Duke of Gloucester. Genest, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, page 459.

hardly to be torn from his lady's side when the battle opens. The conception of Richard in this play is coarser, less brooding, more blatant, and he is even more a villain confessed than in Shakespeare. The soliloquies giving his intentions to clear the way to the throne by murder, seem clearly reminiscences of "Richard the Third;" and here, differing from "The English Princess," he is reproached with his ugliness within and without, with the greatest frequency and detail. Edward the Fourth's speech,

My Horse, my Horse, I must ride for a Kingdom![34]

suggests imitation of Richard's noted line. The appearance of the ghost of Richard the Second to Henry as he sleeps, foretelling his death, and of the spirit who sings to him,[35] is typical of the plays of the time. The scenes of carnage,[36] depicted with sickening detail, exhibit the increased possibilities of stage setting.

Aside from furnishing these interesting items to the literature of the subject, the staging of these plays, especially of "The English Princess," gives some, though slight, evidences of the changes in conditions at this time. These changes must be considered briefly. In this connection, the work of Sir William D'Avenant is of importance. In 1656 appeared "The Siege of Rhodes, Made a Representation by the art of Prospective in Scenes and the Story sung in recitative music." This musical play or opera, marked the reopening of the theatres and introduced several novelties on the stage. The two most important were the employment of movable scenery and the appearance of women as performers. From this time, scenery became an important feature in distinction to properties. This is felt strongly if one reads a play of the Elizabethan age where the properties are elaborate, such as "A Looking Glass for London," and compares it with a play of this time, such as "The Indian Queen." The employment of scenery was most extravagant in the operas which were now in vogue, and

[34] Act III.
[35] Act V, Scene 5.
[36] Act III, Scene 2.

which were marked from the very beginning by elaborate "machines" and "other Diverting Contrivances." The regular drama felt the influence of this in great measure, and Dryden's plays, to take a notable example, seem to have been elaborately staged. "The Indian Queen" evoked the admiration of both Pepys[37] and Evelyn[38] by the scenery and decorations,[39] and the latter also speaks of "The Conquest of Granada" as having "very glorious scenes and perspectives."[40]

The introduction of women on the stage of the public theatres was not an entirely new thing, for French and Italian women had played in English theatres,[41] but the first English women appeared at this time, and were officially recognized as members of the theatrical companies. It is stated in D'Avenant's patent thus: "Whereas the women's parts in plays have hitherto been acted by men, at which some have taken offence, we do give leave that for the time to come all women's parts be acted by women." This license from the King was the result of the French influence exerted during his residence abroad, where women were commonly employed on the stage. Pepys and Evelyn both speak of the novelty of seeing these actresses. Pepys, on January 3, 1661, saw "The Beggar's Bush," and notes that it was "here the first time that I ever saw women come upon the stage," and many references occur later to the actresses he saw. From one of these we learn that Mary Davis, one of the leading actresses of the time, took part in "The English Princess," and at the same time we get an interesting glimpse of a stage practice: "To the Duke's playhouse, . . . and saw 'The English Princesse or Richard the Third; a most sad, melancholy play, and pretty good; . . . little Mis. Davis did dance a jig after

[37] *Diary*, January 27, 1664, and February 10, 1664.

[38] *Diary*, February 5, 1664.

[39] The Epilogue refers to these in the line,

> The poet's scenes, nay, more, the painter's too.

[40] Quoted in Doran, *Annals of the English Stage*, page 177.

[41] See Prynne, *Histriomastix;* Downes, *Roscius Anglicanus*, ed. Joseph Knight, Preface; Fleay, *History of the London Stage*, page 22; Cibber, *Apology*, pages 90 and 110 note.

the end of the play, and there telling the next day's play; so that it come by force only to please the company to see her dance in boy's clothes."[42] From this it is seen that she probably played the part of Charlot. Who the other women in the play were does not appear in any of the notices of it, but it may be conjectured that Mrs. Betterton, then in the height of her powers and acting similar parts in other plays, probably took the part of Elizabeth to her husband's Richard.

In general stage arrangement this period was a time of transition from the older non-scenic "platform" stage to the present "picture" stage with scenery. Front curtains were first introduced into the public theatres at this time. The stage projecting into the auditorium was retained until the end of the century; and much of the action took place on the proscenium stage because of the necessity, with the poor facilities for lightning, of keeping in the "focus." But with the introduction of scenery, entrances were made by doors opening on the forward part of the proscenium,[43] or by the "wings," while the balcony disappeared, except the portions over the opposite proscenium doors.[44] With a stage that projected into the pit and had a curtain in front of the scenery, some of the scenes in "The English Princess" would naturally become changed in their treatment when compared with similar ones in the Elizabethan play. This comes out especially in the last act. Here the scenes in the two camps are given in succession rather than in coincidence, as now the front curtain could be dropped and a change of scene take place quickly. As a natural outcome of this, the ghosts appear only to Richard.

In "The English Princess" we have few indications of the elaborate staging which characterized the serious dramatic efforts of the day. There is here a simplicity which suggests the pseudo-classical French plays of the period. Many of the

[42] *Diary*, ed. Wheatley, Vol. VI, page 200–1.

[43] *English Princess*, Act IV, Scene 8, Catesby and Ratcliffe enter at one of the doors before the curtain, Lovell at the other door.

[44] On the history of the proscenium doors and the balconies, see W. J. Lawrence, *A Forgotten Stage Conventionality*. *Anglia*, Vol. 28 (1903). Also on the relation of the Restoration stage to the earlier form, see V. E. Albright, *A Typical Shaksperian Stage: The Outer-Inner Stage*.

scenes take place in an open space with a background of buildings to represent the royal "lodgings," such a scene as appears in many of the illustrations of the French stage.[45] Most of the other scenes are placed before the tent of either Richard or Richmond. The change of scene from one to the other is frequent.

It was at this time that music took a permanent and important place in the theatrical performance. The opera was a new and popular entertainment, and the song was an inevitable element even in serious plays. In "Historia Histrionica" (1699), it is said, "All this while play-house music improved yearly, and is arrived at greater perfection than ever I knew it."[46] Pepys speaks enthusiastically of the "wind music" which he heard at a performance of "The Virgin Martyr."[47] George Hogarth, in "Memoirs of the Opera" (1851), says:

"A regular band of musicians was placed in the orchestra, who between the acts, performed pieces of music composed for that purpose and called act-tunes; and also accompanied the vocal music sung on the stage, and played the music of the dances. . . . The most favorite music was that which was heard in the dramatic pieces of the day; and to sing and play the songs, dances, and act-tunes of the theatres became a general amusement in fashionable society."[48]

We find the "act-tune" introduced in "The English Princess"—here it seems most inappropriately—to meet the popular taste. From the stage directions of D'Avenant's alteration of "The Tempest,"[49] we learn that the orchestra is placed between the pit and the stage, instead of in a "box" as in the Elizabethan theatre. Pepys mentions this when he first visited Killigrew's theatre in Drury Lane, and found that "the musique being below, and most of it sounding under the very stage, there is no hearing of the basses at all, nor very well of the trebles."[50]

[45] See Mantzius, *History of Theatric Art.*

[46] By James Wright. Quoted in Chase, *The English Heroic Play,* page 12, note 1.

[47] *Diary,* ed. Wheatley, Vol. VII, page 324. Also Vol. VIII, page 320.

[48] Quoted by Chase, *op. cit.,* page 11.

[49] Act I, Scene 1.

[50] *Diary,* May 8, 1663. See also article cited above, *Music in the Elizabethan Theatre,* by W. J. Lawrence.

The Richard of this play probably appeared in the dress of the day, with periwig, and, as was the fashion for heroic characters, with a long plume on his head,[51] but anachronism of dress caused no greater offence than in the preceding age. It had become the fashion at this time, a consequence of the interest of the Court in the theatre, for the King and nobles to allow their coronation suits to be used for kingly parts. Downes gives several instances of this. Thus, in speaking of Orrery's "Henry the Fifth," he says, "This play was splendidly Cloath'd: The King in the Duke of York's Coronation Suit: Owen Tudor in King Charle's: Duke of Burgundy, in the Lord of Oxfords, and the rest all new."[52] Again, in regard to D'Avenant's "Love and Honor," "This play was Richly Cloath'd; The King giving Mr. Betterton his Coronation Suit, in which he acted the Part of Prince Alvaro; The Duke of York giving Mr. Harris his, who did Prince Prospero; And my Lord of Oxford gave Mr. Joseph his, who did Lionel the Duke of Parma's Son."[53] In regard to other plays, he speaks of the great expense of "cloathing" them,[54] and of the fine performances of revived plays with new costumes and scenes, as in the case of "Henry the Eighth."[55] The tradition of Richard's fondness for rich costumes was, therefore, at this time, consciously or unconsciously, preserved.

The changes, then, that had been effected in the handling of the subject of Richard the Third were hardly greater than those that had been developing in the presentation of it upon the stage. With a front curtain, movable scenery, music between the acts and accompanying the songs, the parts of Elizabeth and the Queen played by women, the play of "Richard the Third" was quite changed in its character from the Elizabethan performance. The predominating importance of

[51] Fitzgerald, *A New History of the English Stage,* Vol. I, page 170.

[52] *Roscius Anglicanus,* ed. Knight, pages 27–8.

[53] *Ditto,* page 21. In *The Unhappy Favorite,* acted 1685, Mrs. Barry is said to have played Queen Elizabeth in the coronation robes of the queen of James the Second. She had before been presented with the Queen's wedding suit. See Genest, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, page 448.

[54] *Ditto,* pages 22, 26, and 45.

[55] *Ditto,* page 24.

Richard in the scenes has shifted to the heroine, and the impressiveness of his figure has given place to the artificiality, though with a certain clear-cut simplicity of motive, of the protagonist of the heroic play.

This period is important in the stage history of "Richard the Third" because of its advance in stage-craft, because of the new form here given to the material, which modified the later conception and representation of "Richard the Third," and because at this time we have the beginning of the vogue for Shakespearian alterations, which prepared the way for the best known of all of the revisions of Shakespeare's plays, Colley Cibber's "Richard the Third."

IV

The Cibber Version of Richard the Third

Popularity of alterations of Shakespeare's plays during the period—Colley Cibber—Available material—Detailed examination of the Cibber version—General character of changes—Additions—Minor changes, the result of the effort to modernize—Cibber's conception of the character of Richard—Prevalent method of acting—Theatrical dress—Changes in general stage effects—History of the version for the first forty years—Cibber as Richard—Ryan—Quin—Popularity of the play after 1714.

When "Richard the Third," after its half century of eclipse, reappeared upon the stage, it had taken on a form as different from the original play as the eighteenth century theatre was from that of the Elizabethan age. By 1700, tampering with the plays of Shakespeare was no new thing, and had proved a facile and ready way to theatrical success. It is not strange therefore, that this play, which had always been popular and which offered exceptional opportunities to the actor, should have been subjected to the process. The motives which governed these alterations have been fully discussed by Professor Lounsbury in "Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist,"[1] and need not be taken up here, except to note that in the case of this play, contrary to the general practice, the tragic ending is kept, love is not made a leading motive, the "unities" are no more strictly regarded than in the original, and while the general "affects" of the play are heightened, no new spectacle is introduced. The success of this revision upon the stage may be a direct result of the fact that this play suffered less essential change from the original than any other revisions of the time. And this is the more remarkable, because this adaptation came at the height of the disregard for Shakespearian tradition, and at a time when alterations of his plays

[1] Chapter VIII.

were constantly appearing,[2] and when the heroic play with its iron-bound canons had just passed the height of its popularity and might be expected to leave more patent evidences of its influence.

The reviser of this play, Colley Cibber, was an actor excellent in comedy parts, entirely unfitted for tragedy, and one of the best-known and most efficient of the managers of Drury Lane. His ideas of stage management were practical, philistine. As we are to consider him mainly as an adaptor, it is fortunate for us that he has left a full account of his attitude and methods in his entertaining and much admired "Apology."[3] He says there: "Whenever I took upon me to make some dormant Play of an old Author to the best of my Judgment fitter for the Stage,[4] it was honestly not to be idle that set me to work; as a good Housewife will mend old Linnen when she has not better Employment,"[5] and again in speaking of his compilation of "the Double Gallant" from several plays, he says: "A Cobbler may be allow'd to be useful though he is not famous: And I hope a Man is not blameable for doing a little Good, tho' he cannot do as much as another."[6] His attitude, while perhaps ostentatiously

[2] Many of these appeared just at this time, as Lacey's *Sawney the Scott* (*The Taming of the Shrew*), 1698, Gildon's *Beauty the Best Advocate* (*Measure for Measure*), 1700, Lord Lansdowne's *The Jew of Malta* (*Merchant of Venice*), 1701, and *The Comical Gallant*, an adaptation of *Merry Wives of Windsor*, 1702. Ravenscroft's alteration of *Titus Andronicus*, which was first acted in 1686, became popular in 1702. In 1700, Betterton revived with great success the first and second parts of *Henry IV*. The second part was somewhat altered, scenes from *Henry V* being incorporated with it. It is in this play that Colley Cibber made one of the successes of the day in the character of Shallow. *Henry VIII* was revived by Betterton without alteration during this same season.

[3] *An apology for the Life of Colley Cibber by Himself*. Edited by Robert W. Lowe. London, 1889. Two volumes. Printed from the second edition, London, 1750.

[4] The same attitude is seen in the Preface to Tate's *Lear* and Dryden's *Troilus and Cressida*. See also, for others, Lounsbury, *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist*, page 301.

[5] *Apology*, Vol. I, page 265.

[6] *Ditto*, Vol. 33, page 4.

" honest," is quite free from any academic pose or enthusiasm for reform, and nearer to that of a conscientious mechanic.

The material available at the time that Cibber made " Richard the Third " " fitter for the stage " was abundant. The last Shakespeare Folio had appeared in 1685. Dr. Richard Dohse however, in his article on Cibber's " Richard the Third "[7] has shown by comparing Cibber's text with the Quartos and Folios, that he used chiefly the 1664 Folio, with the addition of some passages found only in the first Quarto. In 1681, the first and second parts of Shakespeare's " Henry the Sixth " were revised by John Crowne, and appeared at Dorset Garden,[8] the second part dealing, as we have seen, with the death of Henry the Sixth and the early career of Richard. " The English Princess," as we saw, appeared in 1667 and was played at Lincoln's Inn Fields with great success, Richard the Third being one of Betterton's best parts. This play seems to have disappeared from the boards by 1700, after the vogue for the rhyming tragedy was over, but it is not impossible that Cibber might have been familiar with it. About 1695–6 Cibber was at Lincoln's Inn Fields for a short time and there might have seen the play in the library of the theatre, or he may have been led through his interest in the subject and in Betterton, to have read either the Quarto of 1667 or of 1674. The pre-Restoration plays on Richard the Third were probably not easily accessible at this time. Heywood's " Edward the Fourth " had not appeared since 1626, and of Rowley's " Richard the Third " no trace is found except the Prologue written for it by Heywood in 1632. " The True Tragedy " was first reprinted from the Quarto of 1594 by the Shakespeare Society in 1844.

It is quite conceivable that Cibber, when preparing a revision of this play, should have consulted the chronicles. We find that Caryl went to these sources for his unhistorical treatment of Richard the Third, giving his authorities, as " plain Hollinshead and downright Stow."[9] The last edition of Holinshed's

[7] *Colley Cibber's Bühnenbearbeitung von Shakespear's Richard III. Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik,* Vol. II, Bohn, 1899.

[8] *Op. cit.,* Vol. I.

[9] Prologue to *The English Princess.*

Chronicle had appeared in 1586, of Hall's in 1550, of Stowe's "Annales" in 1631. Grafton's "Chronicle at large and meere Historye of Affayres of Englande," a compilation of the work of Hall and other chroniclers, had appeared in its last edition in 1569, followed by an abridgment edited as late as 1572. Much later, Speed's "History of Great Britaine" had reached a fourth edition in 1650, with an epitome in 1676.

As important as a possible source must be accounted "The Mirror for Magistrates." Issued originally by William Baldwin in 1559 with Sackville's famous "Induction," it had received frequent additions from time to time by other authors. In 1610, Richard Nicolls issued an edition in which, among other additions, he substituted a poem on Richard the Third by himself in place of Segar's in the edition of 1587. This was reissued, or revamped, in 1619 and again in 1628.[10]

In 1646, Sir George Buck's "Life and Reign of Richard III" vigorously defended him against his detractors.[11] Besides, such productions as "The Golden Garland of Princely Delight," containing a song on "The Most Cruel Murder of Edward V," which reached its thirteenth edition in 1690, and innumerable chap-books were constantly throwing into poetic form this familiar story.

Turning now to the play, let us examine this alteration in regard to situations and stage effects.[12]

Act I. Scene 1.—The first act is taken from "Henry the

[10] See W. F. Trench, *A Mirror for Magistrates, Its origin and influence.* Also Haslewood, *The Mirror for Magistrates.* In Five Parts. London, 1815.

[11] A course followed by Horace Walpole a century later in his *Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of King Richard III,* 1768, and by various later writers. The latest defense of Richard is by Sir Clements R. Markham, in his recently published volume on Richard the Third.

[12] The references apply to the *Works of Colley Cibber* in five volumes, London, 1777. Other editions appeared in 1700, 1710, 1721, 1760, etc. A note is added to the title in the 1779 edition which says: "This Tragedy being admirably altered from the original, by that excellent judge and ornament of the stage, Colley Cibber, we shall have the fewer observations to make upon it." To which Genest adds: "This note shows the editor a bigger fool than Cibber himself." Quoted by Lounsbury, *op. cit.,* page 424.

Sixth, Part III," in its general plot. In the first scene, the events of the battle of Tewkesbury are narrated by Tressel, thus giving the audience at once the setting, and introducing Richard as on his way from the battle-field to London. Richard appears, and in a soliloquy tells of his intention to murder Henry.

Scene 2.—The murder of Henry is given practically as it is in Shakespeare.

In this act King Henry's monologue is from " Richard the Second," Act V, Scene 1, lines 38 to 45. Richard's Soliloquy is from " Richard the Third," Act I, Scene 1, with three lines from " Henry the Sixth," Act III, Scene 2, lines 169 to 171, and the last two lines and concluding couplet by Cibber. In the murder scene two lines from the scene of the murder of Clarence (1, 4) are used. The monologue of Richard at the end is composed of lines from " Henry the Sixth," Part III, Act V, Scene 6, from " Richard the Third," Act I, Scene 1, together with additions by Cibber.[13] For this act Cibber seems to have used Shakespeare exclusively, unless the idea of showing Henry sleeping was suggested by Crowne's similar scene in " Henry the Sixth, the second Part, or The Misery of Civil War." Whether as the result of direct influence or not,[14] Cibber, in beginning the story of Richard the Third with the battle of Tewkesbury and the death of Henry the Sixth follows Nicolls' method in " The Mirror for Magistrates,"[15] and the last act throughout is surprisingly close to Nicoll's story. Thus, after Henry recites the story of Edward's death on the field at Tewkesbury and his own death

[13] For details such as these I am indebted largely to the article by Dr. Dohse, already cited. A table of the lines added by Cibber from other plays of Shakespeare may be found on page 604 of the *New Variorum* edition of *Richard the Third.*

[14] Dr. Dohse, *op. cit.,* explains the introduction of this act in the play by Cibber's desire to make *Richard the Third* independent of the plays dealing with Henry the Sixth.

[15] Th' induction to my storie shall begin
Where the sixth Henrie's Edward timeless fell.
Stanza 9.

in the Tower, Richard, in Nicoll's poem, dilates upon the peaceful times to follow:

> He dead, the battles fought in field before,
> Were turned to meetings of sweet amitie.
> The war-god's thundring cannons dreadful rore,
> And rattling drum-sounds warlike harmonie,
> To sweet tim'd noise of pleasing minstralsie,
> The haile-like shot, to tennis-balls were turn'd,
> And sweet perfumes in stead of smoakes were burn'd.[16]

This is using Shakespeare much as Cibber did.

Act II.—In the second act, Cibber draws nearer to the original. It is occupied with the wooing of Anne and the mourning for Edward the Fourth. The wooing is preceded by a scene by Cibber giving the conversation between Tressel and Stanley, in which they discuss the approaching death of Edward and the attempts of Richard to win the Lady Anne. Richard appears and bewails the misfortune of an ugly body as hindering his suit. The scene draws and discovers Anne, Stanley, Tressel, guards and bearers with the body of King Henry. What follows is practically Shakespeare's but cut down considerably. Cibber's only additions are the "asides" of Stanley and Tressel upon Anne's weakening opposition.[17] The only borrowing is in Anne's monologue, where the lines from "Henry the Sixth," Part I, Act I, Scene 1, referring to Henry the Fifth are here applied to the dead king. From this the scene goes directly to Act II, Scene 2 of Shakespeare, leaving out the murder of Clarence and the scene of reconciliation about the dying Edward. The scene closes with a soliloquy by Cibber.

The changes in the details in this act are noteworthy. The addition of the scene before the wooing of Anne in which the hostility of Buckingham and Stanley is marked so much earlier than in the original, seems a reflection of "The Eng-

[16] Stanza 17.

[17] Genest thinks that Cibber shows the influence of *The English Princess* in the line,

> But first I'll turn St. Harry to his grave,

where he substitutes St. Harry for Shakespeare's "yon fellow." *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, page 200.

lish Princess," in which Stanley, as a champion of the faction against Richard, is prominent from the first. The romantic nature of Richard's first soliloquy may also be attributed to the same source. In Shakespeare, from the very beginning, Richard's attempts to win Anne are the result of his ambition; in Cibber's play, Richard, like the typical heroic villain, seems for a time to vacillate between love and ambition. The omission by Cibber of Shakespeare's lines,

> not all so much for love,
> As for another secret close intent,
> By marrying her which I must reach unto,

has been attributed to blundering and misconception, but the effort to give a romantic vein to Richard's "reaching to the crown," at least in its earlier stages, was the natural course for a playwright of Cibber's time. In accordance with the taste of the day, Anne is made less a hoyden than in the scene in Shakespeare, but weaker, and so easily won over, that Tressel and Stanley exclaim satirically:

> Stanley. What think you now, Sir?
> Tressel. I'm struck! I scarce can credit what I see.
> Stanley. Why, you see—a woman.
> Tressel. When future chronicles shall speak of this,
> They will be thought romance, not history.[18]

The "asides" throughout the scene are effective, and give time for the "business" that made this scene one of the crucial tests for the actor. In the mourning scene Cibber has made his changes with a heavy hand, in order to leave no doubt as to Richard's duplicity. He enters with an "aside," Cibber's addition:

> Why, ay! these tears look well—Sorrow's the mode,
> And every one at Court must wear it now:
> With all my heart; I'll not be out of fashion.

[18] "Cibber, who altered King Richard III, for the stage, was so thoroughly convinced of the ridiculousness and improbability of this scene, that he thought himself obliged to make Tressel say:

> When future chronicles, etc."

Note by Steevens, in the Reed edition of Shakespeare, 1802. Vol. 14, page 295.

He stands in the center of the group, weeping and voluble. The difference of effect between this act and the opening acts of Shakespeare's play is readily explained when we note that instead of the numerous epic scenes behind which the chronicle is distinctly felt, Cibber has used only the most effective scenes in the action, and has introduced them by the shortest explanation. A further essential change in the tone results from the omission of the figure of Margaret with her magnificent curses and lamentations, which were so strongly reminiscent of the medieval drama.

Act III.—With this act the two plays come together, in the reception of the young king and his brother in London, but all the following scenes are omitted to the end, where the Mayor and citizens visit Richard and offer him the crown. In place of these, a scene between Richard and Anne is introduced. In the scenes taken from Shakespeare, the text is kept practically as in the original. The additions by Cibber are interesting. In the first scene, the episode of the precocious Duke of York taunting Richard with his deformity, is taken from a similar episode in Shakespeare's play, Act I, Scene 4, where the child is talking to his grandmother. This brutal touch was quite in keeping with the taste of the time, which we see not only delighted in violent scenes as much as did an Elizabethan audience, but enjoyed as well the added elements of cynicism and mockery.[19] More interesting as concerning the question of sources however, is Cibber's most striking addition to the play, the scene between Richard and Anne. This suggests that the reviser may have used the chronicles. The only hint of such a situation in Shakespeare is in Act IV, Scene 1, where Anne recounts the miseries of her life with Richard. Cibber has elaborated these allusions, and along the lines given in the chronicles. While Holinshed gives no more than Shakespeare has used, Hall adds in regard to Richard's dissatisfaction with Anne, that the King thought "he would enucleate and open to her all these thinges, trus-

[19] A similar addition is seen in Tate's revision of *Lear*, where, after the extrusion of Gloster's eyes, Goneril taunts him with his blindness.

tynge the sequell hereof to take this effecte, that she herynge this grudge of her husband, and takyng therefore an inward thought, would not long lyve in this world."[20] Grafton, who incorporated much of Hall's text into his Chronicle, after telling that Thomas Rotheram, Archbishop of York, was delegated to tell the Queen of the King's displeasure, recounts the scene between Richard and Anne thus:

"When the Queene heard tell that so horrible a rumour of her death was sprong amongst the commoniltie, she sore suspected and judged the worlde to be almost at an end with her, and in that sorrowfull agony, shee with lamentable countenance and sorrowfull chere, repayred to the presence of the King her husbande, demanding of hym, what it should meane that he had judged her worthy to die."[21]

In the Chronicle and in the Latin play, "Richardus Tertius,"[22] the King with "smiling and flattering leasings comforted her," but Cibber, to make Richard's villainy perfectly unmistakable to his audience, portrays him as entirely frank in regard to his motives.[23] This scene is preceded by Cibber's most notable addition to the lines of the play, the soliloquy on conscience, which appears to be original and has been greatly admired.[24] The act closes with another soliloquy, also Cibber's.

Act IV, Scene 1.—This scene of the parting of the Queen from her children is a characteristic elaboration of the original, Act IV, Scene 1. Were not this frank enjoyment of rather coarse-grained pathos so truly a mark of the eighteenth century

[20] Edition of 1809, page 407.

[21] Edition of 1809, Vol. II, page 144.

[22] Actio III, Actus III. The subject of Anne's death is treated in three scenes; first, the suggestion from Lovell as to the means; second, Anne's complaint to her husband; and third, the detailed announcement of her death by the messenger.

[23] In regard to Cibber's use of historical sources, Genest says: "Cibber did not look into History, for fear of damping his 'Muse of fire' by too great attention to dull matter of fact." *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, page 209.

"In den aus Shakespeare entlehnten abschnitten hält sich Cibber ebenfalls an Hall und Holinshed, während die zuge, die neu hinzukommen, freie erfindung des bearbeiters sind." Dohse, *op. cit.*, page 13.

[24] Genest says rather grudgingly, "This may be considered as the acme of Cibber's poetry."

audience, one might think that Cibber had taken his suggestion from the similar scene in Heywood's "Edward the Fourth,"[25] where, however, the overwhelming pathos of the scene is for our taste increased by the restraint lacking in Cibber's.[26]

Scene 2.—This corresponds to a similar scene in Shakespeare, though here shortened. Buckingham's soliloquy at the end, however, is lengthened.

Scene 3.—The murder of the Princes, in Shakespeare merely reported by Tyrrel, is by Cibber made as apparent as possible. The murderers, Digton and Forrest, appear and make their preparations. While they are performing the murder, Richard is present with a long soliloquy, while the audience evidently hears the screams from the adjoining room, a scene of sheer sensationalism.[27] The scene of the mourning women which follows, is much cut down, as is the scene between Richard and Elizabeth, which is otherwise practically the same as in Shakespeare. Cibber in this makes Elizabeth's attitude clear immediately,[28] as Shakespeare does not, by means of an "aside":

> What shall I say? Still to affront his love,
> I fear will but incense him to revenge:
> And to consent, I shou'd abhor myself:
> Yet I may seemingly comply, and thus

[25] Part II, Act III, Scene 5.

[26] A passage in *The Mirror for Magistrates* suggests this scene. In *The Lamentable Lives and Deaths of two yong Princes, Edward the Fifth, and his Brother Richard Duke of Yorke,* stanza 39, the parting of Elizabeth from her son Richard is thus described:

> "Farewell my little sonne, God be thy aid"
> With that she turned about, and wept for woe:
> Then being about to part, she turn'd and said,
> "Kisse me my sonne, Kisse me before thou go,
> When we shall kisse againe, our God doth know:"
> We kist, she sigh'd, I wept and did refuse
> So to depart from her; but could not chuse.

[27] How are we to reconcile Forrest's

> Smothering will make no noise, Sir,

with

> Hark! the murder's doing,

of Richard?

[28] Noted also by Dohse, *op. cit.*

> By sending Richmond word of his intent,
> Shall gain some time to let my child escape him.
> It shall be so.

The act closes with a monologue for Richard by Cibber.[29]

Act V, Scene 1.—The act opens with the arrival of Richmond, corresponding to Shakespeare's Act V, Scene 2.

Scene 2.—The events leading up to the battle are much as in Shakespeare, except that the meeting of Richmond and Stanley occurs earlier, to obviate a second appearance of Richmond, and consequent change of scene, which on the Elizabethan stage was not considered.

Scene 3.—The ghost scene is preceded by a long soliloquy by Richard, which is for the greater part from the Prologue to Act IV, in Shakespeare's "Henry the Fifth," lines 4 to 22. As Richard lies down, "a groan is heard," adding a premonitory horror to the scene. The ghosts here, as in "The English Princess," appear to Richard alone, and they number but four, Henry the Sixth, Anne, and the Princes, against eleven in Shakespeare.[30] Their speeches are longer and much changed. They seem to have risen together from below, remained on the stage until all had spoken, and to have sunken together after Henry the Sixth's lines, reminiscent of the ghost in "Hamlet:"

> The morning's dawn has summoned me away.

[29] In this last scene occurs Cibber's most-quoted line:

> Off with his head—so much for Buckingham.

The excellence of this line led Genest to say, "This line is not Shakespeare's, tho' quite worthy of him—is it possible that Cibber in some happy moment could produce it out of his own head?—if not, from whence did he get it?—perhaps from some obscure play with a slight alteration." *Op. cit.*, Volume II, page 208.

[30] The appearance of ghosts in the heroic play is frequent. Often much is made of these scenes by the introduction of impressive summons, such as the "great flashes of fire" in Orrery's *Herod the Great,* or by the working of elaborate "charms," as in Crowne's *Charles the Eighth.* Mr. Chase, in *The English Heroic Play,* pages 180–1, notes the sceptical attitude toward these visitants, giving as a typical expression of this, the scenes in *The English Princess* and the following lines from *Herod the Great,*

> The Dead ne'er to the Living durst appear,
> Ghosts are but shadows painted by our fear.

Richard's speech upon awaking, again as in "The English Princess," is much shortened, but includes a few lines by Cibber. The scene changes to Richmond's camp, and from this point keeps close to the original, though the orations to the armies, considered effective upon the older stage, are now omitted, their substance in a few lines being spoken in each case to a few friends. In the excursions that follow, Cibber introduces a scene from "Henry the Sixth," Part II, the war of words between Richard and Richmond before their encounter. Richard falls, and in Shakespeare dies silently; in Cibber, he speaks a long monologue,[31] of which the first four lines are Cibber's and the following six are from "Henry the Fourth," Part II, Act I, Scene 1, lines 155 to 160.[32] Richmond's speech over the dead body of the king:

> Farewel Richard, and from thy dreadful end
> May future kings from tyranny be warn'd:
> Had thy aspiring soul but stirr'd in virtue,
> With half the spirit it has dar'd in evil,
> How might thy fame have grac'd our English Annals!
> But as thou art, how fair a page thou'st blotted!

might have been suggested by the similar speech in "The English Princess," where he says:

> How great thy Fame had bin, hadst thou been good!

The play closes as in Shakespeare,[33] with the addition of the lines by Blunt telling Richmond that

> the queen and fair Elizabeth
> Her beauteous daughter, some few miles off,
> Are on their way to 'gratulate your victory,

[31] Likewise D'Avenant has given Macbeth a dying speech, and Garrick did the same, because he "excelled in this, and therefore could not give up the opportunity to show his skill." Davies: *Dramatic Miscellanies,* Vol. II, page 119.

[32] Genest says that Cibber has adapted this "with infinitely more judgment than any thing else that he has borrowed." *Op. cit.,* Vol. II, page 216.

[33] Genest points out the likness of the lines from Caryl's play,

> In this day's booty they the crown have found,
> Behold the noblest spoil of Bosworth Field!

and Cibber's

> Among the glorious spoils of Bosworth field
> We've found the Crown.

Op. cit., page 214.

and Richmond's reply,

Ay, there indeed, my toil's rewarded.

This introduction of a love motive at the end, which is entirely lacking in Shakespeare, and without historical basis, was in accord with the demands of the day, and seems a reminiscence of the absurd scene in "The English Princess," where Richmond and Elizabeth vie with each other in their protestations of obligation and esteem.[34]

In the examination of this play it is seen that the reviser has made no essential change in plot nor in the conception of character, but, following the instinct of the practical actor and stage-manager, has shortened the play, made it easier to follow, and added and heightened situations in accordance with the theatrical taste of the day. The play has been cut down from 3,603 to 2,380 lines, a change justifiable upon the modern stage, where time must be allowed for the shifting of scenery. It can hardly be denied that his changes have made for dramatic unity and coherence, as well as for theatrical adaptability. This can easily be seen from a list of the omissions,[35]

[34] Genest thinks the idea of Elizabeth's beauty is from the same source. "Caryl's play differs so widely from Shakespeare's that Cibber could make but very little use of it, from thence however he has borrowed that beauty which he repeatedly bestows on Elizabeth, and of which, history and Shakespeare know but little." *Op. cit.*, Vol. 33, page 213.

[35] A list of the omitted scenes includes the following:

Act I, Scene 1. Richard's conversations with Clarence and Hastings.
Act I, Scene 3. Richard and the Queen's relatives, etc.
Act I, Scene 4. The murder of Clarence.
Act II, Scene 1. Reconciliation of the nobles.
Act II, Scene 3. Scene with two citizens.
Act II, Scene 4. Elizabeth and the Duke of York.
Act III, Scene 2. Attempt to win Hastings to Richard's side.
Act III, Scene 3. Rivers, Gray and Vaughan on their way to death.
Act III, Scene 4. Hastings accused and condemned.
Act III, Scene 5. Scene on the Tower walls.
Act III, Scene 6. Scrivener with the indictment of Hastings.
Act IV, Scene 4. The wailing queens.
Act IV, Scene 5. Scene before Lord Derby's house.
Act V, Scene 1. Buckingham led to execution.

See also Dohse, *op. cit.*, page 37–9.

which have been largely the epic scenes,[36] or those whose substance could be given in short narratives. The result, while gained at the expense of some touches of great significance, especially in the character of Richard, is decidedly a concentration upon the important aspects of the theme, and a more direct exposition of the central figure. About half of Shakespeare's characters are omitted, and thus many parts of scenes. The sparing use of epic scenes and the smaller number of characters as compared with the Elizabethan plays, we have already found obtaining in the heroic play, and mark the tragedies of this period.

The second consideration seems to have been to make the play clearer and more easily followed by the audience. To do this, we have seen that "asides" are introduced, as in the wooing, or in the scene between Richard and Elizabeth. The scene before the wooing, where Tressel and Stanley give the situation, is also of this nature, and prepares the audience for what follows. In other places we have found that the attitude of Richard is made more patent, less equivocal, as in the scene with Anne in Act III, and in the scene of mourning in Act II.

Very significant are the additions. Perhaps the most puzzling in this bustling play are the soliloquies, which occur at every turn. These are frequent in the original form, but Cibber, in excess of Shakespeare, ends every act with them, besides introducing many within scenes. They tend to call attention to Richard, and to fix his character, for every stage of the action is closed with the hero on the stage revealing his motives and hopes. Other additions have been noted. It is seen that these are usually of a sensational nature, calculated to appeal to an audience that wanted, quite as distinctly as the Elizabethans, plenty of action, unambiguous situations, definite emotional values.[37] There is in these a lack of self-

[36] Such as Act III, scenes 3 and 6, and Act V, Scene 1.

[37] That Cibber appreciated this taste in the public comes out in his Epilogue to *Eugenia,* where he says:

> English stomachs love substantial food.
> Give us the lightning's blaze, the thunder's roll!

restraint which brings them close to the melodramatic, but it is to be questioned whether to an eighteenth century audience they were any more excessive in their effect than were the wailing scenes, or the murder of Clarence, with its painful details and grotesque humor, to the theatre-goers of two centuries earlier.

In addition, minor changes occur as the result of the new methods of staging already noted in Chapter III. The omission of half of the ghost scene was no more the result of a desire to shorten the play, than of the effort to adapt it to a modern stage, by eliminating the archaic element of representing two distant places on the stage at the same time.[38] The management of this whole act which we have cited as in Shakespeare typical of the Elizabethan stage, and which in Cibber's text is only slightly changed, brings out the advantages of a curtain to an audience which has largely lost the sense of "dramatic place."[39] It was probably arranged somewhat like this. The act opens with a short scene with Richmond and his forces, on the proscenium stage. The curtain is then drawn, showing Bosworth Field, and Richard's tent is pitched here. The curtain drops, and Richmond and Stanley meet on the proscenium stage. With the ghost scene we have Richard's tent again, to which we return for the final

> The pointed dagger, and the poisoning bowl!
> Let drums' and trumpets' clangor swell the scene,
> Till the gor'd battle bleed in every vein.

Quoted by Lounsbury, *op cit.*, page 197.

[38] A further justification of Cibber is advanced by Mr. Corbin, in his article, *Shakespeare and the Plastic Stage* (*Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 97, page 376, note), where he shows that Cibber's rearrangement of the scenes is necessitated by the non-adaptability of the original to the pictorial stage. At the same time he takes the opportunity to say a word of appreciation for the dramatic quality of the Cibber version, made by "the reputed master of clap-trap."

[39] By 1700, Drury Lane had been so altered by Christopher Rich, the manager, to increase the seating capacity of the building, that the "apron" had become much shortened, and the stage started on its way toward the "flat" stage of to-day. For a discussion of the development of the later form during this period, see *A Forgotten Stage Conventionality*, by W. J. Lawrence, in *Anglia*, Vol. 26 (1903).

preparations for battle, after a short outer scene with Richmond. The act closes with the entire stage exposed and the tent of Richard removed.[40] We have noted that the scene in Baynard Castle was adapted to a stage without a center balcony, and the funeral procession, with the presence of a front curtain, was changed into a tableau.[41] Again, there was economy of scene-change in Act V, in the scenes between Richmond and Stanley, such as would not have been considered on the Elizabethan stage.

The presence of Richard on the stage is here considerably more constant than in Shakespeare's play. There we found ten scenes in which Richard did not figure; in Cibber's form only three are without the protagonist. This difference is due in large measure, of course, to the omission of the epic scenes, but from the point of view of the general impression gained, this is an important difference.

From Cibber's "Apology" we may gain a pretty clear idea of his conception of Richard the Third, as he attempted to represent the part in his acting, for he played the title part in his revision for many years.[42] In his sketch of the life and work of the actor, Samuel Sandford, called by Charles the Second "the best villain in the world," he says:

"Had Sandford lived in Shakespear's Time, I am confident his judgment must have chose him above all other Actors to have play'd his Richard the Third: I leave his Person out of the Question, which tho' naturally made for it, yet that would have been the least Part of his Recommendation; Sandford had stronger Claims to it; he had sometimes an uncouth Stateliness in his Motion, a harsh and sullen Pride of Speech, a meditating Brow, a stern Aspect, occasionally changing into an almost ludicrous Triumph over all Goodness and Virtue: From thence falling into the most asswasive Gentleness and soothing Candour of a designing Heart. These, I say, must have preferr'd him to it."[43]

[40] It seems likely that at this time the tendency was toward a more frequent change of scene than in the later staging of this play.

[41] "Scene draws, and discovers Lady Anne in Mourning, Lord Stanley, Tressel, Guards and Bearers, with King Henry's Body." It must be remembered, however, that the illuminated stage was not possible until nearly a half century later.

[42] Until 1733, with occasional appearances thereafter.

[43] Volume I, page 138.

Anthony Aston rather maliciously describes the person of this ideal Richard as "Round-shoulder'd, Meagre-fac'd, Spindle-shank'd, Splay-footed, with a sour Countenance, and long, lean Arms."[44] According to this, the conception of Richard's extreme ugliness, which had been glossed over in the heroic play of "The English Princess," here seems to be revived.

The method of acting at this time and for the following forty years was influenced by the example of the French stage, and exemplified at its best in Betterton and the great actors of his time, while the less original performers easily fell into the vices which followed the adoption of this method. The elocution is referred to as a "demi-chant," and the action is described as stiff, ponderous, stilted, a result of the "heroic" manner. Thus, Aaron Hill, in the dedication of his "Fatal Vision," complains of the "affected, vicious, and unnatural tone of voice" common on the stage and exempts Booth alone among tragedians from a "horrible theatric way of speaking."[45] Cibber carried on this Betterton tradition, with more or less success, especially in the matter of elocution, and taught it to the younger actors about him.[46]

In dress, the old ideas of costume still prevailed. The men dressed as their contemporaries; the women, whose presence on the stage we have noted in connection with "The English Princess," appeared in all the furbelows of the latest London fashions, wore towering head-dresses, and had pages to carry about their enormous trains.[47] With the increased promi-

[44] *A Brief Supplement to Colley Cibber Esq. his lives of the late famous actors and actresses.* Reprinted in R. W. Lowe's edition of Cibber's *Apology*, Vol. II, page 306.

[45] Joseph Knight, *Life of Garrick*, page 26.

[46] Cibber's most noted pupil, Mrs. Theophilus Cibber, a really gifted actress, is spoken of as moving her audience, in spite of the high-pitched, chant-like delivery of her lines.

[47] "The Cibbers, and Bellamys, and Barrys, revelled in and extorted from reluctant managers, those rich, gorgeous, and elaborate robes, in which they looked like true 'tragedy queens.' They were 'inhabitants,' as Steele would say, of the most sumptuous structures, stiff, spreading, encrusted with trimmings and furbelows as stiff. Their heads towered with

nence of the "star" at this time, another incongruity made its appearance, in that the leading character dressed extravagantly, while the supporting actors were sometimes in rags, a common cause of complaint during the greater part of the century.

We noticed that "The English Princess" was given with a "jig" to close the performance. There is no record of such being used with "Richard the Third" in the early performances, but in other plays nearly contemporary, farces or scenes from other plays are mentioned in the play-bills, showing that some sort of after-piece was still the fashion, but that its form was changing.[48] The first notice of such a piece with "Richard the Third" is on October 14, 1732, at Drury Lane, when it was followed by "Devil to Pay." This same bill mentions "a new Prologue to the memory of Wilkes," suggesting that the play was furnished with this essential, though none of these has been discovered.[49]

strange and nodding edifices, built and entwined with rows of pearls and other jewels. . . . With such accessories and recollections of the majestic demi-chanting which even now obtains on the French stage, we might almost accept this rococo school as a type of something grand and elevating. These stage royal ladies were usually attended by pages, even in their most intimate and domestic scenes, who never let down the sumptuous trains of their mistresses. There could be none, therefore, of that 'crossing' and recrossing which make up the bustle and movement of modern drama. Nor was this style of decoration made subservient to the interests of the play. Mrs. Cibber played her Juliet in white satin, hoops and furbelows. . . . Clive or Woffington, when doing the 'pert' part of a waiting-maid, or the more *gauche* one of a farmer's rustic daughter, presented themselves in white satin shoes, and with their hair dressed according to the gorgeous cannons of London fashions." Fitzgerald, *Life of Garrick,* Vol. II, pages 24–5.

[48] On June 30, 1703, *Humour of the Age* was given with an *Interlude of City Customs* by "several Aldermen's Ladies"; the next spring *The School Boy* was performed with the last act of *Le Medecin Malgre Lui; Taming of the Shrew* was given in July with scenes from the same play; on June 30, 1705, *The Royal Merchant* was followed by Purcell's Frost Scene in *King Arthur.* Genest, *op. cit.,* Vol. II.

[49] Heywood's prologue for a "a young witty Lad playing the part of Richard the Third" at the Red Bull, is the only possible one discovered, and this was probably not for Shakespeare's play but for Rowley's. The

It is in general effect, however, that the greatest difference lies between this revision and the original Shakespearian form. "Richard the Third" is no longer a largely conceived epic play with throngs of characters, with archaic elements that take one back to the medieval drama, with the crude staging that recalls the earliest days of dramatic representation, but it has become essentially modern. It has been subjected to the demands of reason obtaining in the eighteenth century, and to the changes of a scenic stage. We no longer feel the chronicle story back of it, but the effects are purely dramatic, with theatrical sensationalism freely introduced. More than ever the interest centers about Richard, adding greatly to its appeal to the actors, because of the opportunity given for declamation and striking situation. It is significant that Cibber's revision appeared at the beginning of a century in which the distinguishing characteristic, so far as the stage is concerned, is the prominence given to the actor. It has been called "the century of the actor." It may not have been entirely without some foresight of this that Cibber was led to choose this one of Shakespeare's plays for revision, for by 1700, with Betterton, Barton Booth and Quin, the age of great actors had already begun.

The history of this revision for the first thirty or forty years of its existence is rather meager. We know that Cibber played the principal part until 1733, though with no great success. Mr. Lowe, in his edition of the "Apology,"[50] gives the following cast for the play in 1700:

> "King Henry the Sixth, designed for.....Mr. Wilks.
> Edward, Prince of Wales.....Mrs. Allison.

evidence against this being a Shakespearian *Richard the Third* is discussed by F. G. Fleay in his *History of the London Stage,* page 354. The play, according to Sir Henry Herbert's entry in the *Office Book,* belonged to the Palsgrave Company. This, in 1637, had the name of Prince Charles' Men and was playing at the Red Bull. J. P. Collier, in *Annals of the Stage,* page 18, notes that in 1627, Sir Henry Herbert, Master of Revels, was paid £5 by the King's Players, then at Blackfriars, to prevent the players at the Red Bull from performing Shakespeare's plays.

[50] Vol. II, page 288.

Richard Duke of York.....Miss Chock.
Richard Duke of Gloucester.....Mr. Cibber.
Buckingham .....Mr. Powel.
Stanley .....Mr. Mills
Norfolk .....Mr. Simpson.
Ratcliff .....Mr. Kent.
Catesby .....Mr. Thomas.
Henry, Earl of Richmond.....Mr. Evans.
Oxford .....Mr. Fairbank.
Queen Elizabeth .....Mrs. Knight.
Lady Anne .....Mrs. Rogers.
Cicely[51] .....Mrs. Powell."

Cibber, in his "Apology," says that he copied Sandford, his ideal for Richard, then playing at Lincoln's Inn Fields and therefore not available for Cibber's Company, in his interpretation of the part, and did it so well that Sir John Vanbrugh complimented him upon the imitation. Contemporary criticism, however, is not so enthusiastic. "The Laureate," a furious attack upon Cibber, says that "he screamed thro' four Acts without Dignity or Decency," and in the fifth, "degenerated all at once into Sir Novelty" (Cibber's favorite comedy character), and "when he was kill'd by Richmond, one might plainly perceive that the good People were not better pleas'd that so execrable Tyrant was destroy'd, than that so execrable an Actor was silent."[52] Davies says: "Cibber had two passions, which constantly exposed him to severe censure, and sometimes the highest ridicule: his writing tragedy and acting tragic characters. In both he persisted to the last; for, after he had left the stage for many years, he acted Richard III, and very late in life produced his Papal Tyranny. . . . The truth is, Cibber was endured in this and other tragic parts, on account of his general merit in comedy."[53] Later he says, "Cibber persisted so obstinately in acting parts in tragedy, that at last the public grew out of patience, and fairly hissed him off the stage."[54]

[51] *I. e.*, the Duchess of York whose name was Cicely Neville.

[52] *The Laureate: or the right side of Colley Cibber, Esq., etc.* London, 1740. Quoted by R. W. Lowe, in his edition of the *Apology*, Vol. I, page 140, note.

[53] Davies, *Dramatic Miscellanies*, Vol. III, page 471.

[54] *Ditto*, page 469.

Added to the disabilities of the chief actor of the part during the first decades of its history, an unlooked-for misfortune befel it. In 1698, Jeremy Taylor had lashed the immorality of the contemporary stage so effectively that not only were the playwrights put to shame, but the Licenser of Plays, Charles Killigrew, was stirred to unwonted zeal, which found a fitting object in this very play. Cibber gives this account of his ill-usage:

"When Richard the Third (as I alter'd it from Shakespear) came from his hands for the Stage, he expugn'd the whole first Act without sparing a line of it. This extraordinary Stroke of *Sic volo* occasioned my applying to him for the small Indulgence of a Speech or two, that the other four Acts might limp on with a little less absurdity! no! he had not leisure to consider what might be separately inoffensive. He had an objection to the whole Act, and the Reason he gave for it was, that the distresses of King Henry the Sixth, who is killed by Richard in the first Act, would put weak People too much in mind of King James, then living in France; . . . In a Word, we were forc'd, for some few Years, to let the Play take its Fate with only four Acts divided into five; by the Loss of so considerable Limb, may we not modestly suppose it was robbed of at least a fifth Part of that Favour it afterwards met with? For tho' this first Act was at last recovered, and made the Play whole again, yet Relief came too late to repay me for Pains I had taken with it."[55]

In this lopped condition the play evidently appeared, until George I, in the patent granted to Sir Richard Steele and his assignees, of which Cibber was one, made the managers the sole judges of what plays should be put on their stage. This was in 1715. These circumstances may account for the slowness with which the play apparently won its way to popular favor, for not until about this time does it seem to have appeared with any frequency on the boards.[56]

How many times "Richard the Third" was played in 1700, I have been unable to ascertain.[57] The next performance

[55] *Apology*, Vol. I, pages 275–6.

[56] In his address to the reader in *Ximena*, 1719, Cibber says, "Every Auditor, whose Memory will give him Leave, cannot but know, that Richard the third, which I alter'd from Shakespear, did not raise me Five Pounds on the Third Day, though for several years since, it has seldom, or never failed of a crowded Audience."

[57] Its first appearance was in Lent, 1700. Genest quotes an advertise-

recorded by Genest is in 1704, when it was played at Drury Lane on April 4th, for Cibber's benefit, after a lapse of three years. It next appeared at the Haymarket Theatre for a benefit for Mrs. Porter, on March 27, 1710, acted by the Drury Lane Company.[58] There was another lapse of three years before it was given again, at Drury Lane, on February 14, 1713, but from this time it appeared with greater frequency,[59] which, together with other evidence, suggests that the strictures of the Licenser were perhaps disregarded before they were formally removed, and that the first act was probably restored.[60]

For the first twenty years, the play seems to have been acted exclusively by the Drury Lane Company, with Cibber as the only Richard, and Wilks as Henry the Sixth.[61] In March,

ment at the end of Manning's *Generous Choise,* which came out in Lent of that year, in which it is said, "This day is published the last new Tragedy called Richard the 3rd, written by Mr. Cibber." *Op. cit.,* Vol. II, page 219.

[58] Malone says that *Richard the Third* "was once performed at Drury Lane in 1703, and lay dormant from that time to the 28th of Jan. 1710, when it was revived at the Opera House in Haymarket." *History of the Stage,* page 347. The discrepancy of dates is due to Malone's use of the old style in dating.

[59] Malone observes that after Rowe's edition of Shakespeare's *Works* in 1709, the exhibition of his plays became more frequent than before. *Op. cit.,* page 348.

[60] As early as 1710, Genest gives Henry the Sixth in the cast. This may mean that at that date the restriction was practically removed or disregarded. An early attempt had been made to use Act I, as seen from Genest's record: "In the Daily Courant for Oct. 12th [1702] Pinketham proposed to present the town on his night with a Medley which was to consist—1st of the death of King Henry 6th—2dly of scenes from Aesop—and 3dly of the School Boy—Richard the 3d, the Beau, and Major Rakish by Pinketham." This Medley was not given, but "by particular desire" the play was altered to *Love makes a Man. Op. cit.,* Vol. II, pages 254–5. The "particular desire" may have emanated from the Licenser's office.

[61] In 1721 the principal parts were taken as follows.

King Henry the Sixth	Mr. Wilks.
Edward, Prince of Wales	Mr. Norris, Jun.
Richard, Duke of York	Mr. Lindar.
Richard, Duke of Gloucester	Mr. Cibber.
Duke of Buckingham	Mr. Mills.
Henry, Earl of Richmond	Mr. Ryan.

1721, however, it was given at the theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields, with Ryan as Richard, Boheme as Henry the Sixth, Quin as Buckingham, the other characters being unimportant.[62] This was the beginning of that series of rival performances of " Richard the Third " which continued throughout the century, and in which the most noted actors of the time took part. For some reason " Richard the Third " does not appear in the playbills of Drury Lane between 1720 and 1726, but the play was frequently given at Lincoln's Inn Fields. There Ryan played the part of Richard until about 1740, when he shared it with Quin, both of these men having performed in it at Drury Lane years before, Ryan as Richmond, and Quin as Lieutenant of the Tower, the part in which he first attracted attention by his painstaking representation of an unimportant character. Ryan's Richard was a rugged conception, of more individuality than those preceding him, and one which Garrick confessed he took in its general features as the model for his own.[63] The company from Lincoln's Inn Fields moved to their new theatre in Covent Garden in December, 1732, where Ryan, with the help of Quin for several years, still held the part, until the middle of the century and the advent of a new generation of actors.

In the fall of 1726, Drury Lane took up the play again, with the former cast for the principal parts, Cibber continuing to play Richard until his retirement in 1733.[64] By this time,

Lieutenant of the Tower.....Mr. Quin.
Elizabeth .....Mrs. Porter.
Lady Anne .....Mrs. Horton.
Duchess of York.....Mrs. Baker.

[62] Lady Mary Montague in a letter from Paris, written in 1718, speaks thus of the English actors of the time: " I have seen the tragedy of Bajazet so well represented, I think our best actors can be only said to speak, but these to feel; and 'tis certainly infinitely more moving to see a man appear unhappy, than to hear him say that he is so, with a jolly face, and a stupid smirk in his countenance."

[63] Doran, *Their Majesties' Servants,* Vol. II, page 41. Garrick went to see Ryan for the purpose of laughing at his uncouth figure, and rasping pronunciation, but was surprised to find great excellence, and much to introduce into his own representation.

[64] Cibber appeared once more in the part in 1739. Mr. Lowe remarks

Quin had joined the Drury Lane Company, and Cibber's part fell to him. Quin carried on the Betterton tradition of the "heroic" manner in his solemn, ponderous, chant-like, monotonous pronunciation, which gave an effect of oppressive dignity.[65] Cumberland says of Quin's acting: "Unable to express emotions, whether violent or tender, he was forced or languid in action, and ponderous and sluggish in movement. In great characters of tragedy he was lost, and the most trustworthy of contemporary critics declares that people will remember with pleasure his Brutus and his Cato, and wish to forget his Richard and his Lear."[66]

Such was the situation up to the epoch-making performances of Garrick. From the time of the appearance of the play with the first act restored, about 1714, there had been hardly a season when it was not played; for most of this time it was appearing at both houses,[67] and had been undertaken by every

that during the dull period in the theater between 1730 and Garrick, when Quin was the great man, Cibber's reappearances after retirement must have had an importance and interest which they lacked after Garrick's advent.

[65] His eyes, in gloomy socket taught to roll,
Proclaim'd the sullen 'habit of his soul':
Heavy and phlegmatic he trod the stage,
Too proud for tenderness, too dull for rage.
Churchill: *The Rosciad,* lines 963–7.

[66] Quoted by Knight, *op. cit.,* pages 62–3.

[67] In addition to the performances at the London theatres, the play seems to have been given at the great fairs during the period of their greatest fame, 1714–1750. All the leading actors, with the exception of Garrick, acted in these booths the plays popular in London. We have a record of the appearance of Richard the Third at Bartholomew Fair in 1738. The notice read as follows: "At Turbutt's and Yates' (from Goodman's Fields) Great Theatrical Booth, formerly Hallam's, . . . will be presented a dramatic piece, call'd the True and Ancient History of the Loves of King Edward the 4th, and his famous Concubine, Jane Shore in Shoreditch, the acquisition of the crown by King Richard the 3d (commonly call'd crook-back'd Richard) and many other true historical passages—interspersed with the comical humours of Sir Anthony Lackbrains, his man Wezel, and Captain Blunderbuss." King Edward was played by Dighton, King Richard by Taswell, and Jane Shore by Mrs. Lamball. Genest, *op. cit.,* Vol. X, page 164. Genest also gives an advertisement of *King in the Country,* taken from the first part of Heywood's *Edward the Fourth.*

great actor, with the exception of Barton Booth, since Betterton.[68]

[68] During these years, an important play dealing with Richard the Third had appeared, Nicholas Rowe's *Jane Shore,* in 1713. This play, which was constantly upon the stage until far into the nineteenth century, presents but a subordinate side of Richard's character, and develops the Hastings scenes from Shakespeare's *Richard the Third,* which Cibber had omitted. It throws light upon Quin's idea of the character of Richard that he called Gloster in this play "one of his strut and whisker parts." Davies, *op. cit.,* page 213.

Some interest may be attached to a play noticed by Genest as acted but once at Drury Lane in 1723: *An Historical Tragedy of the Civil Wars between the Houses of York and Lancaster, etc.,* by Theophilus Cibber, son of the adaptor of *Richard the Third.* The principal additions were the love scenes between Price Edward and Lady Anne, and a few speeches by Cibber. The author played the Prince and the poet Savage the Duke of York.

V

From Garrick to Irving—1741–1897

Garrick as Richard the Third—Popularity—Revolution in staging at Drury Lane—Work of De Loutherbourg—John Philip Kemble—New Drury Lane—Capon—Elaborate revivals of old play—Archeological reforms at Covent Garden—Kemble's version of "Richard the Third"—Edmund Kean—Charles William Macready—His attempt to "restore" "Richard the Third"—Work of Samuel Phelps at Sadler's Wells—Revivals of Charles Kean at the Princess—Henry Irving—His restoration of the Shakespearian text—General summary.

For the first forty years of its history, Cibber's version had been the subject of no great or original interpretation, nor had it made any considerable stir in the theatrical world, but with Garrick, a new era in its history began. In Goodman's Fields a theater had been fitted up in 1729, that without a license, and under the guise of giving concerts and adding gratuitously an after-play, had been running with some success. It was here that Garrick appeared as Richard the Third on October 19th, 1741. The play-bill read as follows:

October 19th, 1741.

Goodman's Fields.

At the late Theatre, in Goodman's Fields, this day, will be performed a Concert of Vocal and Instrumental Music, divided into Two Parts.

Tickets at three, two and one shilling.

Places for the Boxes to be taken at the Fleece Tavern, next the Theatre.

N. B. Between the two parts of the Concert, will be presented, an Historical Play called,

The Life and Death of King Richard the Third.

Containing the distress of K. Henry VI.
The artful acquisition of the Crown by King Richard.
The murder of young King Edward V. and his brother in the Tower.

The landing of the Earl of Richmond; and the death of King Richard in the memorable battle of Bosworth-field, being the last that was fought between the houses of York and Lancaster.
With many other true Historical passages.
The part of King Richard by a Gentleman (who never appeared on any stage),
King Henry by Mr. Giffard; Richmond, Mr. Marshall; Prince Edward by Miss Hippisley; Duke of York, Miss Naylor; Duke of Buckingham, Mr. Patterson; Duke of Norfolk, Mr. Blakes; Lord Stanley, Mr. Pagett; Oxford, Mr. Vaughan; Tressel, Mr. W. Giffard; Catesby, Mr. Marr; Ratcliff, Mr. Crofts; Blunt, Mr. Naylor; Tyrrel, Mr. Puttenham; Lord Mayor, Mr. Dunstall; The Queen, Mrs. Steel; Duchess of York, Mrs. Yates;
And the part of Lady Anne
By Mrs. Giffard.
With Entertainments of Dancing,
By Mons. Froment, Madam Duvall,
and the two Masters and
Miss Granier.
To which will be added
A Ballad Opera of One Act, called,
The Virgin Unmask'd,
The part of Lucy by Miss Hippisley.
Both which will be performed gratis, by persons for their diversion.
The Concert will begin exactly at six o'clock.[1]

This and the following performances created an unprecedented sensation. The "Daily Post" spoke of its reception as "the most extraordinary and great that was ever known on such an occasion,"[2] Garrick's acting came to the public as a revelation, and as something so entirely different from what they were used to in Quin, Delane and others on the stage at the time, that it appeared to them that he had invented an art. Davies, a contemporary biographer, says:

"Mr. Garrick's easy and familiar, yet forcible style in speaking and acting, at first threw the critics into some hesitation concerning the novelty as well as propriety of his manner. They had been long accustomed to an elevation of the voice, with a sudden mechanical depression of its tones, calculated to excite admiration, and to entrap applause. To the just modulation of the words, and concurring expression of the features from the genuine workings of nature, they had been strangers, at least for some

[1] Given by Knight, in *David Garrick*, London, 1894, page 22–3.
[2] Quoted by Knight, *op. cit.*, page 28.

time. But after he had gone through a variety of scenes, in which he gave evident proof of consummate art, and perfect knowledge of character, their doubts were turned into surprise and astonishment, from which they relieved themselves by loud and reiterated applause. . . . When news was brought to Richard, that the duke of Buckingham was taken, Garrick's look and action, when he pronounced the words

Off with his head!
So much for Buckingham!

were so significant and important, from his visible enjoyment of the incident, that several loud shouts of approbation proclaimed the triumph of the actor and satisfaction of the audience. The death of Richard was accompanied with the loudest gratulations of applause."[3]

Another contemporary, Arthur Murphy, gives a more detailed but no less enthusiastic description of Garrick's Richard:

"The moment he entered the scene, the character he assumed was visible in his countenance; the power of his imagination was such, that he transformed himself into the very man; the passions rose in rapid succession, and, before he uttered a word, were legible in every feature of that various face. His look, his voice, his attitude, changed with every sentiment. . . . The rage and rapidity with which he spoke,

The North! what do they in the North,
When they should serve their Sovereign in the West?

made a most astonishing impression on the audience. His soliloquy in the tent scene discovered the inner man. . . . When he started from his dream, he was a spectacle of horror: He called out in a manly tone.

Give me another horse;

He paused, and with a countenance of dismay, advanced, crying out in a tone of distress,

Bind up my wounds;

and then, falling on his knees, said in the most piteous accent,

Have mercy Heaven;

In all this the audience saw an exact imitation of nature. . . . When in Bosworth field, he roared out,

A horse! a horse! my kingdom for a horse!

All was rage, fury, and almost reality. . . . It is no wonder that an actor thus accomplished made, on the very first night, a deep impression on the audience. His fame ran through the metropolis. The public went in

[3] *Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, Esq., Interspersed with Characters and Anecdotes of His Theatrical Contemporaries, The Whole forming a history of the Stage, whch includes a period of Thirty-six Years.* By Thomas Davies. 2 Vols. London, 1780.

crowds to see a young performer, who came forth at once a complete master of his art."[4]

The Dramatic Censor shows Garrick's physical fitness for the part:

"The Public have set up Mr. Garrick as a standard of perfection in this laborious, difficult part; and if we consider the essentials, his claim to such distinction will immediately appear indisputable; a very deformed person never rises above, and seldom up to the middle stature; it is generally attended with an acuteness of features and sprightliness of eyes; in these three natural points or Roscius stands unexceptionable. . . . MR. GARRICK also preserves a happy medium, and dwindles neither into the buffoon or brute; one or both of which this character is made by most performers."

It seems then, that the innovations of Garrick that called forth Quin's exclamation, "If this young fellow be right, then we have been all wrong," consisted in his identifying himself with the part as the actors of the heroic, traditional school never did, his abandonment of the "demi-chant," and his spontaneity and freedom of deportment. Among the scenes which took the popular favor were the one in Baynard Castle when, with an expressive gesture, he threw the prayer-book from him after the Lord Mayor had retired,[5] the tent scene, much talked of, and painted by Hogarth, and the death scene, Garrick being noted for acting such situations effectively. In these scenes he freed the interpretation of Richard from the conventional delineation of the "wicked tyrant" who was savage and furious, and nothing else. But in these characteristics he was not unheralded. We have seen that Ryan's sincere and vigorous acting had suggested much to Garrick, and as early as 1725, Macklin, a young Irish actor, had tried to introduce a more natural style at Lincoln's Inn Fields but had been discharged in consequence for trespassing upon the hard and fast traditions of the theatre.[6] But Macklin only

[4] *The Dramatic Censor; or Critical Companion.* 2 Vols. London, 1770. Essay on *Richard the Third, As Altered from Shakespeare by Cibber,* page 11.

[5] It is noted by Fitzgerald as a favorite action at this time with the ladies and gentlemen of the stage, when interrupted in reading, to throw their books into a brook or side scene.

[6] It was Macklin who rescued Shylock from low comedy, and who, at the very end of his career, had the courage to appear in Macbeth in Highland

suggested what Garrick made of practical effect, and it is, therefore, from him that we date the revival and maintenance of natural methods.

Garrick played Richard seventeen times during the season at Goodman's Fields, and then after a summer in Dublin, engaged for the next year at Drury Lane, where he continued for almost the whole of his career. During the next season, at Drury Lane, Richard was performed fourteen times, six of these being by Garrick.[7] In 1744–5, Garrick played Richard four times; in 1745–6 no bills with Garrick as Richard appear, but the part was taken by new actors. In the following seasons he appeared three or four times in the character, until in 1761–2 there seems to have been a revival of interest in the play, when Garrick and Mossop shared the part. This continued for several seasons, but with the appearance of new names such as Sheridan, Smith, and Holland, Garrick's appearances in Richard became rarer, until his last on June 5, 1776.[8]

During these twenty-five years the play had had a brilliant history. It was constantly used, was a favorite for benefits, was chosen for the Theatrical Fund performances, and was early found in the provincial theatres. While Garrick was by all means the leading Richard, the part was constantly presented at the other theatres by Quin, Ryan, and Sheridan. An interesting contest took place in 1746 at Covent Garden, when an agreement was made by which Garrick and

dress, instead of in the scarlet coat, silver-laced waistcoat, and wig and knee-breeches, in favor with Garrick, and in which he appears in Zoffany's portrait. Barry, a contemparary of Garrick, played Othello "in a full suit of gold-laced scarlet, a small cocked hat, knee-breeches, and silk stockings." His wife was "clad in the fascinating costume of Italy." Thos. Goodwin, *Sketches and Impressions, Musical, Theatrical and Social, 1799–1885.* New York, 1887. This is given on the authority of one Fred. Reynods, who had seen Garrick.

[7] This season is memorable for Peg Woffington's first appearance as Anne.

[8] In regard to his retirement, Genest says: "He was for some time inclined to end his course with the part he at first set out with; but upon consideration he judged, that, after the fatigue of so laborious a character as Richard, it would be out of his power to utter a farewell word to the audience . . . he therefore chose Don Felix (Murphy) . . . as being less fatiguing." *Op. cit.*, Vol. V, pages 497–8.

Quin appeared on alternate nights in "Richard the Third." It was a definite pitting of the old against the new, the traditional against the natural and spontaneous, and while the Richard of Garrick drew a crowded house, that of Quin gained little attention.[9] Quin before this had carried on a stirring rivalry at Covent Garden, and later, on October 29, 1774, "Richard the Third" was played at both houses on the same evening. At the time of Garrick's retirement from the stage in 1776, the Richards of the day were E. T. Smith and Henderson at Drury Lane, and Thomas Sheridan at Covent Garden. Smith was "most mediocre," rosy-faced, drowsy, level-toned, a Richard beyond comprehension. Henderson supported to the best of his considerable second-rate abilities the Garrick tradition from 1779 to 1785, when he was the leading attraction at Covent Garden, and was considered Garrick's successor. Other actors of Garrick's time who gained some reputation in the character of Richard the Third were Spranger Barry,[10] renowned for his wonderfully musical voice, and Mossop, who played frequently during Garrick's connection with Drury Lane, but for the most part in the years after Garrick's first achievements in this part.[11] There were also a number of incidental actors as Goodfellow, Reddish, Murphy, and Macklin, who at the advanced age of eighty-five undertook the part of Richard and played it four times, a remarkable achievement, even though the performance was called "hard and harsh."

At Garrick's first performance, the part of Queen Elizabeth was taken by Mrs. Steel and Lady Anne by Mrs. Giffard, but at Drury Lane Mrs. Pritchard usually took the part of the

[9] Davies, quoted by Genest, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, page 209.

[10] In the wooing of Anne, Barry was considered superior to Garrick, the tone of his voice being described as "happily insinuating," and his manner as "perfectly engaging."

[11] The *Dramatic Censor* says of some of these competitors: "Mr. Mossop displays great powers, Mr. Sheridan much judgment, and Mr. Smith considerable spirit; but had the first more delicacy, with less labour; the second more harmony, and less stiffness; the third more variation, with less levity, their merit would rise several degrees beyond what it is." Pages 12–13.

Queen, and Peg Woffington appears frequently as Lady Anne from 1743 until about 1750, when she went to Covent Garden, and the part was taken by Mrs. Davies. In 1776, Mrs. Siddons played Lady Anne twice to Garrick's Richard.[12] At Covent Garden, with Quin and Ryan, Mrs. Horton appears usually as Queen Elizabeth, though Mrs. Pritchard was there for a time, and Mrs. Cibber played both this part and Lady Anne occasionally.

The after-play was used throughout this period,[13] one of the most interesting being that given at Covent Garden on February 13, 1738, "The Winter's Tale" under the title of "The Sheep-shearing." In 1761, first at Covent Garden, the introduction of the Coronation spectacle became popular with all plays that would admit of it, and this was used frequently with "Richard the Third" in 1762–3, 1766 and 1769.[14] The play was supplied with an epilogue, at least once, on June 2, 1772, when it was performed for the Theatrical Fund.[15]

Between the age of Betterton and that of Garrick, threatrical conditions had made no great advance, and not until the later years of Garrick's management do we find the beginning of the revolution in staging which foreshadowed the work of Charles Kean and Irving. In Garrick's day the house was still comparatively dark even after his innovation of illuminating the stage by lights behind the proscenium, invisible to the audience, for he was hampered by the absence of a light like gas. The scene-shifting was noisy and clumsy, and the scenery had little

[12] The story is often repeated which gives Mrs. Siddons' opinion of Garrick's Richard. Sheridan remarked that it was not terrible enough, when Mrs. Siddons replied: "What could be more terrible? In one scene I was so much overcome by the fearful expression on his face that I forgot my instructions. I was recalled to myself by a look of reproof, which I never remember without a tremor."

[13] It is to be noted as a tribute to Garrick's unrivaled drawing power in Richard, that the after-farce seems not to have been used when he played, as it was frequently when Mossop, Smith, or others took the part.

[14] Genest speaking of Covent Garden, says: "The Coronation at this theatre was tacked only to appropriate plays, not to plays with which it had no connection, as at Drury Lane." *Op. cit.*, Vol. IV, page 654.

[15] Genest, *op. cit.*, Vol. V, page 327.

effect in the dim background of the stage. It was used too, with little intelligence, the setting being often a hodge-podge of odds and ends,[16] without regard to their fitness for the setting desired. In 1772, however, Garrick engaged the young Alsatian artist, De Loutherbourg, as scene painter, and thus prepared the way for the improvements of the latter part of the century. Although De Loutherbourg's work for Drury Lane began at the very end of Garrick's management. in these last years " Richard the Third " was frequently given and in the Irving collection of designs made by this artist, there are three for scenes on Bosworth Field. These, with the introduction of " raking " scenes, practicable bridges, gauze curtains for atmospheric effects, and ingenious devices for simulating sounds, show how great must have been the change in the character of the last scenes.[17]

Throughout the period great regard for costume, so far as richness of effect was concerned, persisted, but little was done for its propriety, as the portraits of the time show. In Hogarth's portrait of Garrick as Richard the Third the dress is Elizabethan,[18] with trunks and hose, ruffs at neck and wrists, and the short sleeveless fur-edged coat, showing the puffed sleeves of the tunic. This costume is probably the traditional one from the Shakespearian stage, and leads one to believe that Richard, even in Cibber's personation, never appeared in contemporary dress, whatever the minor characters may have done. Davies remarks that " Richard the Third " and " Henry the Eighth " were distinguished by the two principal characters being dressed with propriety,[19] though different from all the

[16] " The memory of no very aged persons may present, if closely urged, some not very brilliant impression of the miserable pairs of flats that used to clap together on even the stage trodden by Mr. Garrick; architecture without selection or propriety; a hall, a castle, or a chamber; or a cut wood of which all the verdure seemed to have been washed away." James Boaden, *Memoirs of the Life of John Philip Kemble,* page xiv.

[17] On the work of De Loutherbourg, see *The Pioneers of Modern English Stage-Mounting: Phillipe Jacques de Loutherbourg, R. A.,* by W. J. Lawrence. *Magazine of Art,* Vol. 18 (1895).

[18] See Racinet, *Le Costume Historique,* for proof of this.

[19] Quoted by R. W. Lowe in *Life of Betterton,* page 55.

rest; and this seems to have been true throughout Garrick's management.[20] Whether Davies by "propriety" meant that he thought that Richard was in the dress of the fifteenth century is not clear, but his archeological knowledge as to the proper costume of that time, was probably not in advance of that of his contemporaries.[21] The Dramatic Censor comments upon the subject:

"However historical relation admits doubts of that monarch's personal deformity, it was certainly well judged to make his external appearance on the stage, emblematic of his mind; and for the sake of singularity dressing him only in the habit of the times may be defensible; but what excuse can be made for shewing him, at his first entrance, in as elegant a dress as when king, I am at a loss to suggest; does he not, after his scene with Lady Anne, profess a design of ornamenting his person more advantageously? Macbeth, when king, is always distinguished by a second dress, why not Richard? a still greater breach of propriety appears in putting mourning upon none of the persons of the court but the ladies and children; though Richard pays all other external respect to the circumstances of his brother's death."[22]

After Garrick, the next great actor to essay this character was John Philip Kemble in 1783, and with him an entirely different conception of the part was inaugurated. Kemble's biographer, in speaking of Henderson who conscientiously carried on the tradition of Garrick, and comparing him with Kemble, says:

"The high-erected deportment, the expressive action, the solemn cadence, the stately pauses of that original tragedian, Kemble, with the magic of countenance and form to bear up his style, have by degrees won us from the school of ease and freedom and variety and warmth, and all the mingling proprieties of humour and pathos, as Shakspeare founded it, and as it was taught by the professor whom I have just named. The styles were certainly incompatible with each other. . . . The declamation of Mr. Kemble seemed to be fetched from the schools of philosophy—it was always pure and correct."

[20] See Boaden, *op. cit.*, page 184.

[21] In Fitzgerald's *History of the Stage* the same mistake is made in regard to Richard's dress at this time: "King Richard's troops appear in the uniforms of the soldiers in St. James's Park with short jackets and cocked-up hats. King Richard, indeed, wears the dress of his time, but not so Richmond; while the Bishop is stiffened into reformers' lawn sleeves, with trencher-cap and tassel" (Page 234–5).

[22] *Dramatic Censor*, page 10.

To show the principle on which the "most scientific" actor worked, he quotes from Sir Joshua Reynolds:

"I must observe that even the expression of violent passion is not always the most excellent in proportion as it is the most natural; so great terror and such disagreeable sensations may be communicated to the audience that the balance may be destroyed by which pleasure is preserved, and holds its predominancy in the mind; violent distortion of action, harsh screamings of the voice, however great the occasion, or however natural on such occasion, are, therefore, not admissible in the theatric art. Many of these allowed deviations from nature arise from the necessity which there is that everything should be raised and enlarged beyond its natural state; that the full effect may come home to the spectator, which otherwise would be lost in the comparatively extensive space of the theatre. Hence the deliberate and stately step, the studied grace of action, which seems to enlarge the dimensions of the actor, and alone to fill the stage."[23]

This is, therefore, the great classical period in the history of the play of "Richard the Third," when the canons of Reynolds in art, and the conceptions of the classicists in literature found histrionic expression in the school of Kemble.[24]

Kemble played Richard from 1783 to 1802 at Drury Lane, and at Covent Garden from that time to his retirement in 1817. At the latter theatre he for a time, *i. e.*, until 1810, took the part of Richmond to the Richard of George Frederick Cooke. Cooke, indeed, was Kemble's great rival in this play, and his appearance at Covent Garden, where he played Richard over twenty times during his first season, caused a great sensation. Dunlap, the biographer of Cooke, says of his acting in this part: "His superiority over all others, in the confident dissimulation, the crafty hypocrisy, and the bitter sarcasm of the character, is acknowledged by every writer who has criticised his acting. . . . His triumph in this character was so complete, that after a struggle, Mr. Kemble resigned it altogether to him."[25]

[23] Boaden, *op. cit.*, page 102.

[24] An analysis of Kemble's acting by Leigh Hunt is given in his *Critical Essays on the Performers of the London Theatres.*

[25] *Memoirs of the Life of George Frederick Cooke, Esquire, Late of the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden.* Vol. I, pages 147–8. Cooke used Roach's 1802 edition of *Richard the Third,* but inserted the four opening lines from Shakespeare in Richard's first speech and a few lines in his last speech in Act IV.

But Cooke left for America in 1810, and Kemble was without a rival until Kean's appearance four years later. During all these years Mrs. Siddons appeared frequently as Elizabeth with her brother, and gained here, as everywhere, praise for her interpretation of the part. Mrs. Powell and Mrs. Ward, two of the best known actresses of the day, also became identified with the parts of the Queen and Lady Anne.

While contemporary critics agree that Richard was not one of Kemble's great parts, yet in his staging and revision of the play he influenced its history considerably. Describing the conditions when Kemble began his work in this line, Boaden says: "The old scenery exhibited architecture of no period, and excited little attention . . . nothing could be less accurate, or more dirty, than the usual pairs of low flats that were hurried together, to denote the locality of the finest dialogue that human genius ever composed."[26] When new Drury Lane was built in 1794, Kemble engaged William Capon, a man well known for his antiquarian labors, as "scenic director" for the new theatre. This was the beginning of a brilliant era of new methods of staging the older drama. Kemble, like Macklin before him, had made an abortive attempt at "correct" staging and costume in his early days, and again in the revival of "Henry the Eighth" at Drury Lane in 1788; but with Capon, definite antiquarian research became a part of the theatrical business.[27]

The new Drury Lane had such a large stage that none of the old scenery and few of the properties could be used, and this gave an unusual opportunity to Capon to bring into use harmonious and correct settings for the plays. It now became the fashion to lavish vast sums on the revivals of old plays; when the theatre opened with "Macbeth," in 1794, "so profuse was the wealth of adjuncts in the banquet scene that the novelty was spoken of as 'a thing to go to see of itself.'" To meet the expense of this splendor the after-piece was omitted,

[26] *Op. cit.*, page 158.

[27] The work of Capon is described in an article by W. J. Lawrence in the *Magazine of Art*, 1895, on *Pioneers of Modern English Stage Mounting: William Capon.*

and all the money and labor were put upon the main feature of the evening. A list of Capon's most successful scenes include some of interest here:[28]

Six wings, representing ancient English streets; combinations of genuine remains, selected on account of their picturesque beauty.

The tower of London, restored to its earlier state, for the play of "King Richard the Third."

Six chamber wings, of the same order (*i. e.*, pointed architecture), for general use in our old English plays—very elaborately studied from actual remains.[29]

When Kemble became manager of new Covent Garden in 1809, he there carried on these archeological reforms, and the house became noted for truthful and uniform Shakespearian revivals.[30] Added to his efforts for greater splendor of production, Kemble exerted his influence beneficially in endeavoring to curb the desire of performers to play always great characters, and to get them to concur cheerfully in such a cast as should exhibit the full strength of the company, and do the utmost justice to the ideas of the poet. Kemble illustrated his policy by appearing with Cooke in the season of 1803 at Covent Garden as Richmond to Cooke's Richard.[31]

[28] Boaden, *op. cit.*, pages 316–7.

[29] Another scene, interesting because of its use in a related play of the time is "The Council chamber of Crosby House, for Jane Shore—a correct restoration of pristine state of the apartment so far as could be deduced from documentary evidence." Given by W. J. Lawrence, in the article on William Capon, cited above, page 290.

[30] The same kind of work had been going on at Covent Garden before Kemble's management, under Inigo Richards. Old Covent Garden had burned down on September 20, 1808. A description of the new building is given Boaden, *op. cit.*, pages 533–4.

[31] During this period the play appeared with such added attractions as *Blue Beard,* a splendid show with real elephants, as an after piece. In 1805 and again in 1806, Master Betty, aged fourteen years, "the tenth wonder of the world," an "infant Roscius," appeared as Richard the Third. He had played in London since 1804, appeared with the best actors of the day such as Cooke, Kemble, and Mrs. Siddons, and drew enormous crowds. In 1813, Betty, then a man, again essayed the part of Richard, but with poor success, and was not offered another engagement. At Bath, hov-

We find therefore, by the beginning of the nineteenth century, that "Richard the Third" was thoroughly changed in setting, but that the play-book of the eighteenth century still held the stage. In 1810, Kemble published a revision of Cibber's alteration, but the principal change consisted in shortening it,[32] resulting in the omission of one hundred and twenty-six and a half lines, and the addition from Shakespeare of four and a half lines with one and a half of his own. From Shakespeare he restored the lines at the beginning of Richard's first speech, curiously omitted by Cibber since they connect this play so definitely with the series concerned with Henry the Sixth:

> Now is the winter of our discontent;
> Made glorious summer by this sun of York;
> And all the clouds that lour'd upon our house
> In the deep bosom of the ocean buried.

The scenes in which the greatest excisions were made are Act III, Scene 2, where sixteen lines are taken from Lady Anne's speech on the unhappiness of her marriage, and twenty-six lines from the scene in Baynard Castle; and Act IV, Scene 4, where Richard's solicitation of Elizabeth is shortened by seventeen lines. The character of Sir William Brandon he substituted for Tressel. There are more frequent changes and greater variety of scene. Thus, in the first act, Scene 1 is in the Tower Garden, but for Richard's entrance a change is made to the court-yard of the Tower; in Act III, a new setting is given to the interview with Lady Anne; in Act IV, Richard

ever, he drew good audiences for a number of years. Byron refers to this vogue contemptuously in *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* thus,

> Though now, thank Heaven! the Rosciomania's o'er,
> And full-grown actors are endured once more.

In 1812, *Comus* was given with *Richard the Third* as an after piece. It had figured in the Jubilee Pageant in 1785 and later, with Kemble as Richard, and imitators, such as Carey, Charles Matthews, and Yates had found it a favorite subject for impersonations of leading actors.

[32] "J. P. Kemble revised Cibber's alteration of Richard the 3d—but 'damned custom had braz'd him so, that he was proof and bulwark against sense'—he digested the cold mutton, and even the spiders crawling upon hopes did not startle him." Genest, *op. cit.*, Vol. VIII, page 233.

speaks his soliloquy during the murder of the princes, in a "gallery in the Tower," and the mourning women meet him at "the city-gates." There is also indication of more elaboration of details, as the tolling of the bell during the funeral procession, while here Lady Anne and the procession *enter*, a change from the "dicovered" scene of Cibber, but which gave scope to Kemble's love of display, and an opportunity for the exercise of that archeological exactness upon which he prided himself. Martial music and flourishes are more frequently called for, and Richmond's victory is emphasized by the removal of Richard's body to the sound of trumpets, and the tableau at the end with all kneeling and shouting,

Long live Henry the Seventh, King of England!

But the changes, it is seen, are so slight that no essential difference is made in plan or conception, even in details. These however, met with favor, and appear with little variation in the best known editions from prompt-books of the time, Inchbald's "British Theatre" (1806–9),[33] and Oxberry's "New English Drama" (1818).[34]

It was this modified version of Cibber's "Richard the Third" that was used by the next and most renowned Richard of the nineteenth century, Edmund Kean. He appeared in London in 1814, three years before Kemble's retirement, and after his presentation of Richard the Third at his second appearance, the city rang with his fame, and Drury Lane, which had been seriously declining, became once more theatrically important. Byron, who was in London at this time, after seeing Kean, wrote in his diary, "Just returned from seeing Kean in Richard. By Jove! he is a soul! Life, nature, truth, without exaggeration or diminution. Richard is a man, and

[33] Volume 17. Mrs. Inchbald, whose text was evidently taken from the prompt-book before publication, records some changes in setting. Thus Richard soliloquizes in the presence-chamber during the murder of the princes, and Richmond's tent and the single encounters between Richard and Richmond are placed in a wood. Neither in this edition nor in Oxberry's is Tressel dropped from the characters in favor of Sir William Brandon.

[34] Volume 3.

Kean is Richard."[35] Coleridge said it was like "reading Shakespeare by flashes of lightning." The newspapers took pleasure in noting the resemblance of his name to that of Le Kain, the great actor of France who had displaced a conventional, studied method of acting for one natural and lively. Like Garrick, the greatest Richard among his predecessors, Kean was short and eminently fitted in face and form for the part; he was called "the great little man," had a face of wonderful expressiveness with piercing eyes, remarkable energy in his movements and great versatility. He recalled the best days of Garrick, with more of recklessness, less of order in his performance. Epithets such as Dumas' "Dèsordre et Génie"[36] were freely applied to this surprising person. J. P. Kemble said when asked his opinion, "Our styles of acting are so totally different, that you must not expect me to like Mr. Kean; but one thing I must say in his favor—he is at all times terribly in earnest."[37]

Kean's acting, after the classicism of Kemble and the "butcher-like representation" of which Lamb complained in Cooke's performance of Richard,[38] seemed to realize the richer, more complex and subtle conception of Richard's character held by such critics as Hazlitt, Coleridge and Lamb. I can do no better than to quote in full the most elaborate criticism of the play that came from these later critics.

[35] *Detached Thoughts,* Volume V, page 437 (ed. 1821–2). Byron says further: "Of actors, Cooke was the most natural, Kemble the most supernatural, Kean a medium between the two, but Mrs. Siddons worth them all put together, of those whom I remember to have seen in England." Another poet, Keats, devoted two of his very few prose pieces to Kean's acting. In *The Champion,* December, 1817, he praises his "intense power of anatomizing the passions of every syllable, of taking to himself the airings of verse." Keats' *Works,* ed. H. B. Forman, Vol. III, page 5.

[36] Dumas, drama, *Kean, ou Dèsorde et Génie,* was produced at the Porte Saint-Martin in 1836.

[37] Boaden, *op. cit.,* page 569.

[38] *On the Tragedies of Shakespeare,* London, 1855. Kean said of himself, "I have got Cooke's style in acting, but the public will never know it, I am so much smaller." Quoted by Mr. William Winter in *Shadows of the Stage,* page 75.

"It is possible to form a higher conception of the character of Richard than that given by Mr Kean (not from seeing any other actor, but from reading Shakespeare); but we cannot imagine any character represented with greater distinctness and precision, more perfectly articulated in every part. . . . He is more refined than Cooke; more bold, varied, and original than Kemble in the same character. In some parts he is deficient in dignity, and, particularly in the scenes of state business, he has by no means an air of artificial authority. There is at times a sort of tip-toe elevation, an enthusiastic rapture in his expectations of attaining the crown, and at others a gloating expression of sullen delight, as if he already clenched the bauble, and held it in his grasp. This was the precise expression which Mr. Kean gave with so much effect to the part where he says, that he already feels 'The golden rigol bind his brows.' In one who dares so much, there is indeed little to blame. The courtship scene with Lady Anne is an admirable exhibition of smooth and smiling villainy. The progress of wily adulation, of encroaching humility, is finely marked by his action, voice and eye. He seems, like the first Tempter, to approach his prey, secure of the event, and as if success had smoothed his way before him. Mr. Cooke's manner of representing this scene was more vehement, hurried, and full of anxious uncertainty. This though more natural in general, was less in character in this particular instance. Richard should woo not as a lover but as an actor—to show his mental superiority, and power of making others the playthings of his will. Mr. Kean's attitude in leaning against the side of the stage before he comes forward to address Lady Anne, is one of the most graceful and striking ever witnessed on the stage. It would have done for Titian to paint. The frequent and rapid transition of his voice from the expression of the fiercest passion to the most familiar tones of conversation was that which gave a peculiar grace of novelty to his acting on his first appearance. This has been since imitated and caricatured by others, and he himself uses the artifice more sparingly than he did. His bye-play is excellent. His manner of bidding his friends 'Good-night,' after pausing with the point of his sword, drawn slowly backward and forward on the ground, as if considering the plan of the battle next day, is a particularly happy and natural thought. He gives to the two last acts (sic?) of the play the greatest animation and effect. He fills every part of the stage; and makes up for the deficiency of his person by what has been sometimes objected to as an excess of action. The concluding scene, in which he is killed by Richmond is the most brilliant of the whole. He fights at last like one drunk with wounds; and the attitude in which he stands with his hands stretched out, after his sword is wrested from him, has a praeternatural grandeur, as if his will could not be disarmed, and the very phantoms of his despair had withering power to kill."[39]

[39] W. Hazlit, *The Characters of Shakespeare's Plays,* pages 149–50 (Phila., 1854).

G. H. Lewes, who was greatly impressed by Kean's acting, says of one

J. F. Molloy, Kean's biographer, in speaking of these first performances, mentions some of the scenes in which he achieved his greatest triumphs; his power of conveying "the idea of rage stifled beneath a calm exterior" when taunted by the little Duke of York; his exit when retiring to his tent, said by the critic of the "Morning Post" to be "one of the finest pieces of acting we have ever beheld, or perhaps that the stage has ever known"; and his death agony, which, the "Examiner" is quoted as remarking, "was a piece of noble poetry, expressed by action instead of language."[40] He tells how, "as the curtain fell the audience rose as one man, cheered

scene, "He had no gaiety; he could not laugh; he had no playfulness that was not as the playfulness of a panther showing her claws every moment. Of this kind was the gaiety of his Richard III. Who can ever forget the exquisite grace with which he leaned against the side-scene while Anne was railing at him, and the chuckling mirth of his 'Poor fool! what pains she takes to damn herself!' It was thoroughly feline—terrible yet beautiful." *On Actors and the Art of Acting*, London, 1875, page 10.

Genest, who did not like Kean and seldom says anything in his praise, notices the death scene particularly. In recording Kean's performance at Bath, July 14, 1815, he remarks, "Richard was Kean's best part—but he overdid his death—he came up close to Richmond, after he had lost his sword, as if he would have attacked him with his fists—Richmond, to please Kean, was obliged to stand like a fool, with a drawn sword in his hand, and without daring to use it." On June 15, 1819, he notes, "Kean on this night (and probably before) left off his absurd habit of collaring Richmond after he himself was disarmed." *Op. cit.*, Vol. VIII, pages 495 and 692.

[40] Does this mean that Kean omitted the death speech which Cibber gives Richard?

As Ryan had anticipated Garrick's manner, so in the case of Kean, George Frederick Cooke suggested his general method. Vandenhoff, in his *Leaves from an Actor's Note Book*, says that those who had seen both in *Richard the Third*, "do not hesitate to award to Cooke the palm for sustained power, and intense, enduring energy of passion; Kean excelled him probably in light and shade of expression." Kean's admiration for Cooke was well known, and was attested by his raising a monument to his memory in St. Paul's churchyard in New York, when he visited America in 1821. The well-known portrait of Kean as Richard the Third may be found in Tallis' *Dramatic Magazine*.

lustily, applauded wildly, declaring by word and action this new actor was great indeed."[41]

Three years after Kean's brilliant *début,* Kemble retired from the stage. Cooke had died in 1812 in Boston, and until the appearance of William Charles Macready in 1819, Kean held the part without a possible equal, and with Junius Brutus Booth as his only notable rival. Booth resembled Kean strikingly in person and he imitated him closely in his Richard the Third, and was for a time enthusiastically received.[42] But his fame in England was short-lived, for he went to the United States in 1821, and remained there. There were many other rivals of all classes, from the genteel and declamatory Charles Young, of the Kemble school, to the ridiculous Plunkett of Dublin, but Kean's preëminence in Richard the Third was undisturbed.[43] Kean's "leading ladies" of most note were Mrs. Glover for Queen Elizabeth, whom he used to frighten with his tragic earnestness, and Miss Faucit, the greatest English actress of the time, who played the part of Lady Anne in 1829.

[41] *The Life and Adventures of Edmund Kean Tragedian.* London, 1888, page 150.

[42] An account of his successful appearance is given by Macready in his *Reminiscences,* page 101. "A report had reached the managers of Covent Garden of a Mr. Booth (who in figure, voice, and manner so closely resembled Kean that he might be taken for his twin brother) acting Richard the Third at Brighton and Worthing with great success. An appearance at Covent Garden was offered to him with the promise of an engagement if successful. Accordingly on the 12th of February (1817) he appeared in Gloster, and certainly on his first entrance on the stage, with a similar coiffure and dress, he might have been thought Kean himself. With considerable physical power, a strong voice, a good deal of bustle, some stage experience, and sufficient intelligence to follow out the traditional effects of the part, he succeeded in winning the applause and favor of his audience, and repeated the performance on the following night." Then follows the account of Kean's dramatic method of proving his superiority to his rival, with which we are here not particularly concerned.

[43] A club called The Wolves, was formed to support him, and while they probably did not do all that was attributed to them, Genest thinks that it is clear "that there was some combination among Kean's friends to prevent any new performer from succeeding in Richard." This seems possible from the treatment given to a new actor, Meggett, when he undertook the part at Haymarket, in 1815. See Genest, *op. cit.,* Vol. VIII, page 486.

Aside from the "business," for which Kean's performance was remarkable,[44] he does not appear to have introduced many innovations in the staging. At his first appearance in 1814, at Drury Lane, new scenery, archeologically and historically correct, was painted for the occasion,[45] and therefore Kean found the setting better than any Richard before him. He is represented in a prompt-book of 1827 as making a slight change in the ghost scene, where the figures do not rise, but a curtain is drawn from the back of Richard's tent and they appear in the midst of cloud effects. Genest gives a suggestion of an innovation in noting that "the Lord Mayor was very properly played seriously."[46] That the Lord Mayor was a comic character in Elizabethan representations seems apparent, and the tradition had evidently persisted until public taste acquiesced in this change, as it did in Macklin's elevation of the character of Shylock. The costume throughout this period, used both by Kean and Kemble before him, is given by Oxberry in his "New English Drama" of 1818,[47] and shows the Elizabethan dress

[44] "Every personator of Richard must fight like a madman, and fence on the ground, and when disarmed and wounded, thrust with savage impotence with his naked hand,

'And sink outwearied, rather than o'ercome.'

Mr. Kean has passed this manner into a law, and woe be to him who breaks it. No one but Mr. Kemble can be allowed to parry like a schoolboy, and drop like a gentleman." Quoted from *The Champion,* February 16, 1817, by Asia Booth Clarke in *The Elder and the Younger Booth,* Boston 1882, page 15.

[45] Molloy, *op. cit.,* page 145. The building that had been opened with such splendor in 1794, burned down on February 10, 1809. Drury Lane was rebuilt and opened on October 10, 1812, with a larger stage and finer appointments. On that occasion Lord Byron supplied the Address. See Boaden, *op. cit.,* page 568.

[46] *Op. cit.,* Vol. VIII, page 692.

[47] "Gloster. 1st dress. Scarlet doublet, trunks, hose, hat, cloak and russet boots. 2d dress. Black ditto, ditto, trimmed with gold, crimson velvet robe, white hose, shoes, and plush hat. 3rd dress. Armour body, and hat.

"King Henry. Black velvet trunks, hose, and cloak.

"Richmond. Buff pantaloons, russet boots, armour body, scarlet mantle and black hat.

"Queen. White satin dress, trimmed with point lace and beads, point

such as Garrick had used. Here, however, all the characters are so dressed. We find certain personal additions to Richard's costume made by Kean, as the point lace collar which Garrick had invariably worn in this part, and which was given Kean by Wroughton, a fellow-actor.[48]

Kean, in 1820 and again in 1825, visited America, where Richard the Third was the most prominent character in his repertoire. In 1828, he played the part in Paris, at the Théâtre Français, where he excited curiosity but no great appreciation. Kean's popularity, in spite of his dissipated habits and consequent diminution of power, remained to the end. Hazlitt tells how prevailingly he had become the fashion: "If you had not been to see the little man twenty times in Richard, and did not deny his being hoarse in the last act, or admire him for being so, you were looked on as a lukewarm devotee, or half an infidel!"

This interpretation of Richard was kept constantly before the public, for it continued to be a favorite part with Kean to the end of his life,[49] was constantly chosen by him for opening his season at Drury Lane, and was his last play there. His influence upon the history of the play is suggested in these words of G. H. Lewes: "He largely increased the stock of 'business,' which is the tradition of the stage. Hamlet, Othello, Richard, Shylock, Lear, Sir Giles Overreach, or Sir Edward Mortimer have (sic?) been illuminated by him in a way neither actors nor playgoers commonly suspect. . . . Edmund Kean did much for Shakespeare. The acting edition of our greatest dramatist may now almost be said to be based

lace and muslin drapery. 2d dress. Black velvet trimmed with black crape; black crape veil, trimmed with bugles.

"Lady Anne. Black velvet dress, trimmed with bugles, black crape veil, trimmed with bugles.

"The other characters in variously colored doublets, trunks, hose and cloaks."

[48] Molloy, *op. cit.*, page 202, records that after his great success in Richard, Kean was presented with a gold snuff-box by Lord Byron, having a boar hunt in mosaic on the lid, and henceforth Kean adopted a boar as his crest as had King Richard.

[49] He died in 1833.

upon his conceptions of the leading parts. He invented much. His own quick, passionate sympathy saw effects where other actors had seen nothing."[50]

Charles William Macready acted Richard the Third as early as 1812–3 at Bristol, where his father was manager of the theatre, but he was entirely dissatisfied with the result, because "a humpbacked tall man is not in nature." Yet it was this part which afterwards was of importance in his attainment of a leading position on the London stage. It was in 1819 that he acted Richard first in London, at Covent Garden, where he scored a great success, playing it nine times, though at that period Kean was at the height of his reputation. In his "Reminiscences" he gives a full account of his reluctance at undertaking the part, and how he was actually driven to it by his manager, Mr. Harris. He tells of his despairing, but characteristically painstaking preparation for it:

"All that history could give me I had already ferreted out, and for my portrait of the character, the self-reliant, wily, quick-sighted, decisive, inflexible Plantagenet, I went direct to the true source of inspiration,[51] the great original, endeavoring to carry its spirit through the sententious and stagy lines of Cibber; not searching for particular 'points' to make, but rendering the hypocrisy of the man deceptive and persuasive in its earnestness, and presenting him in the execution of his will as acting with lightning-like rapidity."[52]

He goes on to describe the performance, and speaks of the enthusiasm of the audience particularly over his rendering of Buckingham's repulse, "I'm busy; thou troublest me! I'm not in the vein"; over his fevered impatience in the scene with Tyrrel after the murder of the princes, and tells how at the death "the pit rose again with one accord, waving their hats with long-continued cheers." After the performance, he was called for to announce the play of the next day instead of the one appointed to do this, and the practice was thus first introduced at Covent Garden of "calling on" the principal actor.

[50] *Op. cit.*, pages 19 and 29.

[51] The first expression of this that I have found. Quin thought he was playing Shakespeare's work until Garrick enlightened him.

[52] *Reminiscences*, edited by Sir Frederick Pollock, New York, 1875, page 141.

The papers gave enthusiastic accounts of it, some even acknowledging him equal to the great Richard of the day, Kean. Leigh Hunt's comparison of the two is of interest:

"Compared then with Mr. Kean, we should say that a division of merits, usual enough with the performance of such comprehensive characters as Shakespeare's has taken place in the Richards of these two actors. Mr. Kean's Richard is the more sombre and perhaps deeper part of him; Mr. Macready's the livelier and more animal part—a very considerable one nevertheless. Mr. Kean's is the more gloomy and reflective villain, rendered so by the united effect of his deformity and subtle-mindedness; Mr. Macready's is the more ardent and bold-faced one, borne up by a temperament naturally high and sanguine, though pulled down by mortification. The one has more of the seriousness of conscious evil in it, the other of the gaiety of meditated success . . . in short, Mr. Kean's Richard is more like King Richard, darkened by the shadow of his very approaching success, and announcing the depth of his desperation when it shall be disputed; Mr. Macready's Richard is more like the Duke of Gloucester, brother to the gay tyrant Edward IV., and partaking as much of his character as the contradiction of the family handsomeness in his person would allow."[53]

The success at Covent Garden provoked instant competition at Drury Lane, where Kean a few weeks later assumed the part with Elliston as Richmond, and with the announcement of "New Scenery, Dresses, and Decorations." For several evenings "Richard the Third" occupied both play-bills, and furnished subject-matter for comparative criticisms in the papers, and even for street-ballads and caricatures in glaring colors in the print-shop windows, representing the "Rival Richards."[54]

Leigh Hunt in the selection above quoted says, "It is to be recollected that Mr. Kean first gave the living stage that exam-

[53] *The Examiner.* Quoted in the *Reminiscences,* page 144.

[54] *Reminiscences,* page 145. Later opinions of Macready's Richard are found in Genest, under entry of May 23d, 1823. "He was very inferior to Kean, till the ghosts appeared . . . he was then superior, as having stronger physical powers . . . he arose from the couch with one of his arms quite naked above the elbow—every person noticed this stage trick, but no person could tell what Macready meant by it." Vol. IV, page 223. *The Times* on March 13, 1821, after his performance in his own version, said of the part generally, "His Richard is a performance of great merit, and would be still more complete, if he always retained his self-command." *Reminiscences,* page 162.

ple of a natural style of acting on which Mr. Macready has founded his new rank in the theatrical world." This suggests the interesting position which Macready held in regard to the two great schools of acting. He was "eclectic," and tried to combine the dignity of Kemble with the vivacity of Kean, the deliberateness and majesty of the one with the animal spirits and rush of the other. In his lines, he paid more attention to logical than rhythmic structure, in distinction to the accenting of measure strongly with the meaning secondary, as in the older school.

Soon after his first success in "Richard the Third," Macready, dissatisfied with the Cibber version, and always cherishing the hope of restoring the Shakespearian text to the stage, in 1821 attempted to return to the original play. That the "restoration" was only a partial one, we find from his account of it in his "Reminiscences:"

"An alteration of Cibber's 'King Richard III.' had been sent to me by Mr. Swift of the Crown Jewel Office, but varying so little from the work it professed to reform, that I was obliged to extend the restoration of Shakespeare's text, and it was submitted (March 12th, 1821) to the public ordeal.[55] The experiment was partially successful—only partially. To receive full justice, Shakespeare's 'Life and Death of King Richard III.' should be given in its perfect integrity, whereby alone scope could be afforded to the active play of Richard's versatility and unscrupulous persistency. But, at the time of which I write, our audiences were accustomed to the coarse jests and ad captandum speeches of Cibber, and would have condemned the omission of such uncharacteristic claptrap as

'Off with his head! so much for Buckingham!'

or such bombast as

'Hence, babbling dreams: you threaten here in vain.
Conscience, avaunt! Richard's himself again!'

In deference to the taste of the times, these passages as well as similar ones were retained." [56]

[55] The playbill announced, "Of the Tragedy hitherto acted under the title of King Richard the 3d, more than half is the exclusive composition of Cibber. The present is an attempt to restore (in place of his ingenious alteration) the original character and language of Shakespeare; in which no more extraneous matter is retained than the trifling passages necessary to connect those scenes between which omissions have necessarily been made for the purposes of representation."

[56] *Reminiscences,* page 162.

It was regarded rather as a rearrangement of Cibber's text than as a restoration of the original, according to "The Times" of the next day:

"At a period when Shakespeare is regarded almost with idolatry, any attempt to rescue the original text from the omissions and interpolations which successive ages have accumulated, must at least be viewed with favor; with that feeling we witnessed last night the representation of his 'Life and Death of King Richard III.', which was announced to be, with a few deviations, the text of the author. . . . The performance of last night was merely another arrangement and certainly inferior in dramatic effect to that of Cibber.[57] . . . The only scene of much value was that of the Council and the condemnation of Hastings."[58]

Genest gives some account of the performance:

"The first two acts went off with great applause, and the audience was evidently delighted at the idea of the original play being revived—in the 3d act the Bishop of Ely made his exit in so ludicrous a manner, that it threw a damp on the rest of the play—Egerton was much applauded in Clarence's dream—Mrs. Bunn (Margaret) made the greatest impression—such is the account of a gentleman who was present on this evening."[59]

This version was acted for a second time on March nineteenth, and then laid aside.[60] At Macready's next appearance in Richard the Third, which did not take place until 1831, at Drury Lane, when he played the part three times, the text was the Cibber form. Again he appeared in it five times in 1836–7, but during the period of his management of Drury Lane and his Shakespearian revivals there, from 1841–3, "Richard the Third" was not attempted.[61] Neither does it seem to have

[57] Although an American commentator says, "The bloated reputation of Cibber's interpolations he [*i. e.*, Macready] decried, and felt anguish at the innovations of even Dryden and Massinger." Francis, *Old New York*, page 245.

[58] *Reminiscences*, page 162 note.

[59] *Op. cit.*, Volume IX. Buckingham was played by the "imitator" Yates, and Queen Elizabeth by Mrs. Faucit.

[60] Genest gives as his reasons for its cold reception that "few like to acknowledge that they have been applauding wretched stuff," and that it was further due to the lack of foresight on the part of the management in not preceding the performance by suitable observations in the newspapers, and thus preparing the audience for the change.

[61] The play seems, however, to have been in his mind from time to time, as, in 1838, we find in the *Reminiscences* the following note, "Looked through the plays of Shakespeare to discover if any others could be

been in his repertoire in either of his visits to America in 1826 and in 1843, although at that time it seems to have been a favorite play with English "stars" for opening an American season. Indeed, while Richard the Third had been an important rôle in starting Macready on his successful theatrical career in London, he seems never to have been suited in figure or in disposition to this part, and it was never a favorite or a frequent rôle with him.[62]

Macready, as we have seen, did not attempt "Richard the Third" in the Shakespearian revivals under his management, but this play was among the first given by Samuel Phelps at Sadler's Wells Theatre, after the patent privileges were abolished.[63] Its production took place February 20, 1845.[64] The

available for revival. Decided that 'King Richard III.,' and afterwards, perhaps, 'King Henry V.' were the only ones. Looked at Schlegel's remarks on Richard." On December 23d of the same year he wrote: "Looked through the unused plays of Shakespeare for cementing lines for 'Richard III.'" He says in the account of his first attempt at a restoration of the original text: "At a later period, if the management of Covent Garden in 1837–9 had been continued, the play, with many others, would have been presented in its original purity." (Page 162.)

[62] One of the last appearances of Macready as Richard the Third is connected with a serio-comic incident which is highly characteristic of the sensitive and irritable actor, and at the same time reveals the degenerate state of Drury Lane fortunes. Bunn, the manager, planned a combined attraction in which the first three acts of *Richard the Third* were to be given with *The Jewess* and the first act of *Chevy Chase*. The rage and disgust of Macready, who was forced to appear as Richard, resulted in an attack by him upon Bunn, which caused him afterwards agonies of self-reproach and humiliation.

[63] The patent privileges, which restricted the legitimate drama to the three patent theatres during the main season, was abolished in 1843. The minor theatres at once turned to Shakespearian plays, but only at Sadler's Wells were these received with sufficient favor to warrant an extended us of them. The history of Sadler's Wells under the management of Samuel Phelps is one of the most interesting episodes of stage annals. At this theatre, at one time one of the most humble, he revived nearly all of Shakespeare's plays, and here fostered the best in the drama for nearly twenty years, at a time when the older houses were given over to spectacles and animal shows.

[64] It ran for twenty-four nights, according to *The Life and the Life-Work of Samuel Phelps*, by his nephew, W. May Phelps, and John Forbes-Robertson, London, 1886, page 69. Lounsbury, *op. cit.*, page 320, note, found it advertised for only twenty-one nights.

reports of the day speak of the remarkable care and attention with which it was staged, and note as especially beautiful the views of Cheapside and of the Tower, and the approach of the Mayor by water. The tent scenes were given as in Shakespeare, the two tents being set up before the audience, and the ghosts advanced between them "by some ingenious process, but so far only as to be dimly visible to the audience." A more important element of the performance was that the text used was Shakespeare's. This was modified by "such alterations only as were necessary either to reduce the play within acting length, or obviate some otherwise insurmountable difficulty . . . with occasionally the introduction of a few lines (Shakespeare's) to conclude an act or make a graceful exit."[65]

The play, although revived with such care and attention to details, was not repeated until the close of Phelps' management, in 1862, on November 23. On this occasion, strangely enough, Cibber's version was used, the reason avouched being that the actress available for Queen Margaret, Miss Atkinson, was unequal to the part.[66] This performance was repeated on January 4, and again on the 18th. Phelps, as Richard, gave an acceptable and conscientious presentation, but one in no way great; but he is of importance in the history of the play because of the thoughtful and artistic staging which he gave it, and because his was the first thorough and successful restoration of the original form.

During 1851–9, Phelps' work at Sadler's Wells was rivalled by that of Charles Kean at the Princess Theatre, but the productions here were on a much more splendid scale, and mark the culmination of the methods inaugurated by John

[65] Phelps and Forbes-Robertson, *op. cit.*, page 75. The play-bill read: "In order to meet the spirit of the present age, so distinguished for illustrating and honouring the works of Shakespeare, and with at least an honest desire of testing his truthful excellence over all attempted improvements, this restoration is essayed, in lieu of the alteration, interpolation, and compilement of Colley Cibber, which has so long held possession of the stage."

[66] Phelps and Forbes-Robertson, *op. cit.*, page 202. The part had been played by Mrs. Warner, who was at her best in severe and majestic characters, such as Queen Margaret.

Kemble. "Richard the Third" had its place in these gorgeous displays on February 20, 1850. It was staged with the greatest elaboration of the details of scenery and costume, as were all of Kean's revivals, a practice which won for him the sneering comment of a newspaper critic of the time: "The painter, the tailor, and the upholsterer are Mr. Kean's interpreters of Shakespeare." The play-bill shows a cast of one hundred and twenty-one; the funeral procession was large and impressive, including monks with torches, priests with a golden cross, banner-men bearing the banners of the arms of England, numbering in all fifty-nine; and the coronation scene matched it in splendor. No longer a few actors ran in and out to represent an army, but Richard is followed by fifty-eight of his men, appropriately distinguished as trumpeters, royal archers gorgeously dressed, banner-men in steel with various insignia, knights with white roses on their breasts and shields. Richmond's following is as complete, as appropriately dressed, and decorated with red roses. The dress differs materially in fashion from that used hitherto. In the "Fly Leaf," which the manager was accustomed to append to the play-bill upon the appearance of a new revival to prepare the audience for the innovations in architecture and costume, he gives his authorities at length.[67] Not only correctness, but great richness is shown in the costume, as in Richard's dress, which is described thus:

"Crimson velvet shirt, edged with sable fur, gold waistcoat with black velvet sleeves puffed with gold coming through the hanging sleeve of the shirt, gold waist-belt carrying a cross-hilted sword and dagger, purple stockings, order of garter, under left knee, gold collar of suns and roses, black velvet cap with jewel, high riding boots and spurs, and gauntlets. In Act II. the same, with crimson velvet shoes with pointed toes instead of boots. . . . Act IV. King's Dress. Long gown representing cloth of gold edged with ermine, purple velvet robe edged with ermine and ermine

[67] Meyrick's *Ancient Armour*, Col. C. H. Smith's *Ancient Costume of Great Britain*, Planché's unpublished work on the costume of Richard the Third, Strutt's *Dresses and Habits of the People of England*, Fairholt's *Costume in England*, Fosbroke's *Encyclopædia of Antiquities*, Dugdale's *Monasticon Anglicanum*, Shaw's *Dresses and Decorations*, Stothard's *Monumental Effigies*, Froissart's *Chronicles*, Pugin's *Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament and Costume*, and the Herald of Office.

cape, crimson stockings, purple velvet pointed shoes with cross-bars of gold, gold cord and tassels round waist, jewelled sword, diamond collar of suns and roses, gold and richly jewelled crown, without feathers, as worn by Henry VI. After the Coronation scene, instead of the coronation robe, a puce velvet open robe with hanging sleeves, the velvet cap edged with ermine. Act V. Suit of complete armor, with a surcoat emblazoned with the arms of England." [68]

Lady Anne's dress presented a markedly different appearance from the usual one for this part:

" Black velvet demi-train with hanging sleeves, and tight blue shirt under to the wrist, square body, a muslin chimesette to the throat, fold of linen under chin, cowl of white linen, large black veil, square velvet head-dress (shape of that worn by Neapolitan peasantry). Second dress: Surcoat of sea-green trimmed with gold and ermine, under-dress of orange-colored cloth with tight sleeves, cowl of silver, and jewelled head-dress."

As in the case of the performance at Sadler's Wells, Richard was thoughtfully, intelligently acted, but with none of the originality of the days of Cooke or Kean. It was a time of excellent second-rate talent, when the traditions that had gathered about this character were carried on by such men as George Bennett and Henry Marston.

In regard to the text, Kean set forth his views in the " Fly Leaf." This ran as follows:

" In selecting the play of ' King Richard the Third,' I have, upon mature consideration, decided on adopting the well-known version of Colley Cibber, instead of going back to the original text of Shakespeare. The text has been practically declared by the greatest ornaments of the drama, less fitted in its integrity for representation on the stage than almost any other generally acted play of the great poet; whilst, on the other hand, the tragedy, as modified by Cibber, being rather a condensation than an alteration of Shakespeare (the interpolations themselves being chiefly selections from his other plays), has been pronounced one of the most admirable and skilful instances of dramatic adaptations ever known. . . . With such distinguished precedents for my guide, I might well hesitate in reverting, on the present occasion, to the original text, even if their judgment had not been sanctioned by the voice of experience, and were it not also a fact that the tragedy of ' King Richard the Third,' as adapted by Cibber, is most intimately associated with the traditionary admiration of the public for those renowned and departed actors." [69]

[68] A portrait of Charles Kean as Richard may be found in Tallis' *Drawing-Room Table Book,* from the original painting by Reid.

[69] *The Life and Theatrical Times of Charles Kean, F.S.A.,* by John

This is interesting and shows the trend of public opinion, from the very fact that the manager thought an apology necessary.

The performance does not seem to have been repeated, nor did it meet with entire favor. It was given for only nineteen nights, a short "run" at this time, when plays were being acted for twenty weeks at a stretch. The public seemed to feel that in the superabundance of scenery and "effects," the play was almost left out, that the dramatic interest was being exchanged for something else of less value.[70]

After the performances of "Richard the Third" at Sadler's Wells in 1862, the play seems to have returned to its former position in the stock plays of the best houses. In the 60's and early 70's, Henry Irving was establishing his "monopoly of stage villains" in the provinces and London, and we find no greater Richard than the "robustious" Barry Sullivan at Drury Lane until Irving's performance of the play at the Lyceum in 1877. With this performance a new kind of Richard made his appearance, and the Shakespearian text received a fuller vindication than had been possible before. It was the first time on the modern stage that a great actor had appeared with the original form.

Irving's adaptation of the play consists entirely in cutting out certain scenes chiefly epic, but no characters are dropped except the children of Clarence, and there is no rearrangement of scenes. The omissions in detail are as follows.

Act I (Sh. I, 1, 2).—Chiefly shortened in the speeches of Lady Anne.

Act II (Sh. I, 3–11 end).—The speeches of the Queen and of Margaret are cut down. Most of the conversation of the murderers is omitted, making the murder of Clarence a short

William Cole, London, 1859, page 101. For the very slight changes, such as the omission of lines, etc., see Lacy's *Acting Edition of Plays*, Vol. 13 (*Richard the Third*). This gives the play as performed in 1854, at the Royal Princess's Theatre, London.

[70] A newspaper of the time remarks: "The little importance which Mr. Kean attaches to good acting needs no other proof than the fact of his generally taking the principal characters himself." On over-staging, see Macready's *Reminiscences*, page 685.

scene. The scene of the nobles about the dying King Edward is much shortened. The remaining scenes of Act II are omitted.

Act III.—The principal omissions are the scene between Hastings and the pursuivant, later Buckingham (Sh. III, 2), the leading of Rivers, Grey and Vaughan to death (Sh. III, 3), the speech of the scrivener (Sh. III, 6), and sections from the speeches of Buckingham and Richard in the scene in Baynard Castle (Sh. III, 7).

Act IV.—The act opens with Sh. IV, 2, the coronation scene. The part of Queen Margaret is omitted from this act, and the solicitation of Elizabeth is much shortened. The scene between Derby and Urswick is omitted.

Act V.—Scenes 1, 2 and 3, as far as the scene in the camp of Richmond, are omitted. The ghosts of Prince Edward, Rivers, Grey and Vaughan do not appear, and the others speak only to Richard. The play closes with the fall of Richard, and nothing is spoken after his second cry of

A horse, a horse, my kingdom for a horse!

Irving's Richard was much admired as a convincing, suggestive interpretation. The epithet most often applied to it was "intellectual," while the princely character of his rendering of the part was frequently commented upon. Tennyson, in analyzing his acting in this play, said: "I often wonder how he gets his distinctively Plantagenet look." The critics called him "splendidly Satanic," spoke of his superb monologue, and remarked how well the part displayed his personality, which was "peculiarly rich in the elements of the weird, the sinister, the sardonic, the grimly humorous, the keenly intellectual." Irving seemed to carry to finest culmination the conception of Richard's character which such romanticists as Hazlitt saw suggested in Edmund Kean's presentation, his subtlety, imagination; but in Irving's case with more of that "pride of intellect" which Coleridge took as the predominating note in Shakespeare's play.[71]

[71] The staging of the play while beautiful, was not extravagant. Indeed Irving, in his speech to the Garrick Club, cites this as an instance where success was not achieved through splendid mounting.

The play, although commended on all sides, was not repeated for twenty years, until 1896, nor was it given[72] in any of Irving's visits in America.[73] Moreover, at its later revival, the success was only partial.[74] These performances and Irving's presentation of the part are noteworthy, however, in the history of the play in marking the establishment of the Shakespearian text upon the stage, and at least the measurable vindication of its superiority, if not its complete victory over the altered form. It is significant to notice that in spite of the fact that in returning to Shakespeare, Irving had been heralded as foreswearing the melodrama of Cibber, his performance in the second revival of the play is described as "a little more highly colored" and as containing "here and there touches which almost verge upon the melodramatic." This seems in a measure to sum up the long history of the play from the melodramatic and un-Shakespearian performances of the eighteenth century, through the attempts to avoid these affects in the nineteenth century "restorations," to the unintentional recognition of the melodramatic in the Shakespearian play itself.[75]

[72] Except Act I, with which Irving closed his first engagement in America, November 24, 1883. See T. A. Brown, *History of the New York Stage*, page 305.

[73] In America, in the meantime, as early as 1871, the Shakespearian text was used at Niblo's Garden, New York, combined with great elaborateness of scenery and costume.

[74] A correspondent to *The Evening Post* for Wednesday, November 21, 1906, says: "The records of the London Lyceum do not show that the Irving revival of 'King Richard III.' was a profitable venture; while I had the distinguished actor's word for it that his personal achievement in the role was a matter of satisfaction to neither himself nor his clientele. He spoke to me, in 1901, in Philadelphia, to the effect that he regarded 'King Richard III.' and 'Coriolanus' as his chief mistakes in management."

[75] In Germany the stage version of Franz Dingelstedt is notable, as showing the Meiningen methods of individualizing the minor characters. The management of the ghost scene is also interesting, as one of the various attempts to make this scene effective and quasi-convincing. The stage directions read: "Der hintere Vorhangsimes Zeltes theilt sich langsam. Die ganze Tiefe der Bühne, in Wolken gehüllt, wird sichbar. Im Mittlegrund erscheinen auf einer Erhohung, in magischem, nich zu hellem Lichte, die Geister; im Hintergrunde das Innere des Zeltes Rich-

Thus have we followed the history of "Richard the Third" through one hundred and fifty years, from Garrick, who first made its possibilities evident to modern audiences and used it during his long career as one of his most successful plays, through the period of the classical, heroic interpretation of John Kemble and the impersonation of Kean, vivid and convincing especially on the emotional side, to Irving, when, after a lapse of fifty years, we again have an original conception of the character. Other lines of development have been followed in the successive experiments in staging made by Kemble, Phelps and Charles Kean, and in the attempts to "restore" the Shakespearian text, which with Irving attained a measureable success. That these efforts in restoration have met with only partial success may be explained, in part at least, by the

mond's, den man, heller als die Geister bleuchtet, ruhig auf seinem Lager schlummern, sieht. Richard liegt rechts auf der Bühne, sich unruhig hin und her wälzend; Richmond links in der Höhe. 'Zwischen beiden stehen die Geister, ihre Reden bald rechts herab in den Vordergrund, bald links hinauf in die Höhe richtend." *Theatre von Franz Dingelstedt, Richard III,* 1877. As in the preceding periods, so in the nineteenth century, the figure of Richard the Third appeared in other plays. In 1818, *Richard Duke of York* was performed at Drury Lane on December 22, and once afterward. This was a compilation of the three parts of *Henry the Sixth,* with the introduction of passages from Chapman and other Elizabethan dramatists. See Genest, *op. cit.,* Vol. VIII, page 640. Charles Kemble condensed the Henry the Sixth plays into a single one, which was never performed. He used in addition *Richard the Second* and *Richard the Third.* See Henry Irving Shakespeare, Vol. II. In 1757, C. F. Weisse produced a *Richard der Dritte,* but he disclaims any imitation of Shakespeare. The story appeared in France under the title of *Les Enfants d'Edouard,* written by Casimir Delavigne. Fechter "doubled" the characters of Buckingham and Tyrrel in this with great success, and is thus brought into some slight connection with the history of *Richard the Third.* (He seems never to have used the English play.) The *dramatis personæ* may give some idea of it; Edward the Fifth, Richard Duke of York, Richard Duke of Gloucester, Buckingham, Tyrrell, Queen Elizabeth, Lucy the Queen's maid, Emma and Fanny, court ladies, William the Queen's serving-man, Cardinal Bouchier, Archbishop of York, Digton, Forrest, Lords, etc. A play on Edward the Fourth and Elizabeth Grey appeared at Covent Garden on October 10, 1829, by Isabel Hill, called *First of May, or a Royal Love-Match.* It was acted eleven times. See Genest, *op. cit.,* Vol. IX, page 513.

fact that with the rejection of the Cibber text, which was frankly melodramatic according to the modern ideas of melodrama, and in so far represented a familiar equivalent for the heightened effects of the Elizabethan play, the "restored" "Richard the Third" appeals to literary rather than to dramatic interest. So far as the stage is concerned, there are evidences that the struggle for the Shakespearian form that has long closed for all the other plays, is destined to wage for an indefinite period in the history of "Richard the Third," for Cibber's form, while nominally despised by first-class actors and the critical public, is still holding the stage and is still preferred by a large part of the community whose opinions cannot be ignored.

VI

Richard the Third in America

The earliest recorded Shakespearian play in America—The Philadelphia Company—The first English company—Theatricals during the Revolution—The revival of theatrical activity after the war—The Old Park Theatre—Last days of the American Company—Cooke—Edmund Kean's visits to America—J. B. Booth—Forrest—Charles Kean—Some curious performances of "Richard the Third"—Edwin Booth—The "restoration" of "Richard the Third" at Niblo's Garden—Booth's version—Comparison with Irving's—Booth's contemporaries—General significance of the history of the play in America.

Dunlap, in his history of the American theatre, quite arbitrarily begins his narrative with the first English company that came to this country, merely noticing that "as early as 1749 it is on record that the magistracy of the city (Philadelphia) had been disturbed by some idle young men perpetrating the murder of sundry plays in the skirts of the town, but the culprits had been arrested and bound over to their good behavior after confessing their crime and promising to spare the poor poets for the future.[1]" This passage is interesting in that it suggests the existence of a native organization of actors in America at this early date, prior to the English company of 1752, and in that it gives early evidence of the attitude of the Quaker City toward players, a factor that afterwards had to be reckoned with in the efforts to establish the drama in that city. The first theatrical notice which has been preserved in this country is thought to relate to the later attempts of these same "idle young men." It reads as follows:

> By his Excellency's Permission,
> At the Theatre in Nassau Street,
> On Monday, the 5th day of March next (1750)
> Will be presented the Historical Tragedy of
> King Richard 3d!

[1] *A History of the American Theatre.* New York, 1832, page 17.

Wrote originally by Shakespeare.
and altered by Colley Cibber Esqr.
In this play is contained the Death of King Henry 6th;—the artful acquisition of the crown by King Richard;—the murder of the Princes in the Tower;—the landing of the Earl of Richmond, and the Battle of Bosworth Field.
Tickets will be ready to be delivered by Thursday next, and to be had of the Printer hereof.
Pitt, 5 shillings; Gallery, 3 shillings.
To begin precisely at half an hour after 6 o'clock, and no person to be admitted behind the scenes.[2]

This is the first recorded dramatic performance in New York, and while the opening play was probably one that the company had already given in Philadelphia, it is the initial Shakespearian performance in America of which we have any account.

The managers of the Philadelphia Company[3] were Messrs. Murray and Kean, the latter playing the leading rôles in tragedy and comedy. Thomas Kean is therefore, with odd coincidence of name, the earliest American Richard. We know almost nothing about him, or whether he was an amateur or professional actor, although the reception of his company in New York would indicate that they were something more than mere "idlers." The place of this performance was the first Nassau Street Theatre, situated between John Street and Maiden Lane. It was an improvised theatre in a house which had belonged to the estate of the Honorable Rip Van Dam, a two-storied building with high gables. The stage was raised five feet from the floor; the scenery, curtains and wings had been brought by the managers in their property trunks; a green drop-curtain was suspended from the ceiling; and the wings were made of a pair of paper screens. Six wax lights were in front of the stage, and the house was lighted by a chandelier made of a barrel hoop through which were driven a few nails

[2] Quoted from the *Weekly Postboy*, a continuation of the *New York Gazette*, published by James Parker, in *Records of the New York Stage from 1750 to 1860*, by Joseph N. Ireland, Vol. I, page 3.

[3] In a New York news item in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* of March 6th, 1750, they are referred to as "a Company of comedians from Philadelphia." *History of the American Theatre*, by George O. Seilhamer, Vol. I, page 6, note.

into which were stuck so many candles. The orchestra consisted of a German flute, a horn and drums, and the scenery included two drop scenes representing a castle and a wood, and bits of landscape, river and mountain.[4] Under such crude conditions the drama, in Shakespeare's "Richard the Third," was introduced, so far as we positively know, to the colonial town of New York.

This was the only Shakespearian play given by the company during its first season, but it was repeated on March 12, when the farce, "Beau in the Suds," was added, and on April 30 with the "Mock Doctor." In the second season in New York, on February 25, 1751, we find the first instance of the play being given for a benefit, a sure indication of its popularity, in this case for Mrs. Taylor, evidently the leading lady, and therefore the first Queen Elizabeth. An added evidence of its drawing powers is gathered from the announcement, which also gives an idea of an evening's entertainment of the time:

By his Excellency's Permission,
At the Theatre in Nassau Street,
(For the Benefit of Mrs. Taylor;)

On Monday the 25th Instant will be presented the tragical history of King Richard III. To which well be added a Ballad Opera called Damon and Phillida and a favourite Dialogue called Jockey and Jenny to be sung by Mr. Woodham and Mrs. Taylor. As there wasn't much company at Love for Love, the Managers took the Profit arising by that Night to themselves and gave Mrs. Taylor another Benefit; who hopes that the Ladies and Gentlemen that favour'd the other Benefit will be so kind as to favour hers with their Company.[5]

In the following seasons it was frequently so used, and these benefit announcements throw interesting light upon the *personnel* of the troupe, which at this time is supposed to have numbered at least seventeen. Thus one performance was given for the benefit of Master Dickey Murray, who probably represented the earliest Prince Edward or Duke of York; another was for Mr. Jago, "as he has never had a benefit before and is just out of prison"; and one was advertised for

[4] *A History of the New York Stage, from the First Performances in 1732 to 1901*, by T. Allston Brown. New York, 1903, Vol. I, pages 2–3.

[5] Seilhamer, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, page 9.

Mrs. Davis, " to enable her to pay off her time," showing that the practice of indenture obtained in theatrical enterprise as well as in other undertakings.

When the company is next heard of, the manager is Robert Upton, who on January 23, 1752, appeared as Richard, and thus is the second representative of the part in America. Upton had been sent as advance agent for the English company, but upon his arrival in New York, he seized the opportunity of a star engagement with native performers. Of this manager-actor we know little, and his season was a short one, as he soon returned to England. The company was reorganized however, and in existence for more than twenty years, but its work lay chiefly in the south and we have no further full accounts of the performances. We know that it was in Annapolis in 1752, an important plcae at that time, and that " Richard the Third " was given twice, the parts of Richard and Richmond being taken by Wynell and Herbert of the English Company which had just come over.[6]

From this meager account of the Philadelphia Comedians it is seen that, whether made up of amateurs or professional actors who had found their way to America, the organization was probably of native origin, and, long before the establishment of an English company here, attempted to reproduce in this country what was most popular in London at the time. In this early transplanting of the British drama across the Atlantic, " Richard the Third " is found to be the first Shakespearian play attempted of which we have any record, and seems to have proved one of the most successful, and one constantly in requisition for special theatrical occasions.[7]

[6] Seilhamer, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, page 33.

[7] The late Judge Charles P. Daly established the existence of a playhouse in New York as early as 1733, but finds that it was principally used for the exhibition of puppet shows and such entertainments. There is also evidence that in Williamsburg, Va., the drama had been cultivated as early as 1736, from the notice in the *Virginia Gazette* of September 10th, which read: " This evening wil be performed at the Theatre by the young Gentlemen of the College, the Tragedy of ' Cato,' and on Monday, Wednesday and Friday next will be acted the following Comedies by the young Gentlemen and Ladies of this country—The ' Busybody,' the ' Recruiting

In the meantime, in England, the American field offered tempting prospects for speculation in dramatic as well as in other lines. In 1752, therefore, William and Lewis Hallam, said to have been of Goodman's Fields,[8] organized a company which arrived here on September 5 of that same year. There are rumors of earlier English companies here. Anthony Aston, the contemporary of Colley Cibber and the continuator of his "Lives of the Actors," said that he had acted in New York in 1732, and Moody, an actor in Garrick's company at Drury Lane, is supposed to have visited Jamaica in 1745, and there carried on the first dramatic enterprise in America. But this company brought over by Lewis Hallam (for William Hallam was merely the "backer," and did not accompany the actors to America), seems to be the first regularly organized for the American field. They went to Williamsburg, Virginia, since the south offered more encouragement to theatrical performances than the Puritans or Dutch in the north, or the Quakers in Philadelphia. Only two of their performances during the first season have been recorded, the first, according to Dunlap (who obtained the account from Lewis Hallam, Jr.), being "Merchant of Venice"[9] with "Lethe" as the after piece,[10]

Officer' and the 'Beaux Stratagem.'" Quoted by Seilhamer, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, page 39. There is evidence of a play-house at Williamsburg even earlier, as is shown by the description of the town given by Hugh Jones in *The Present State of Virginia,* published between 1710 and 1723. He writes: "Not far from hence is a large area for a market place, near which is a play-house and good bowling green." *American Historical Record,* March, 1872. There are evidences of a theatre of some kind in existence in New York in 1736; and in Boston in 1750 two young Englishmen, assisted by young men of the town, gave a performance of Otway's *Orphan* at a coffee-house in King Street. Beyond bare reference and shadowy tradition however, little is known of these earliest native efforts.

[8] Seilhamer does not accept this tradition, but thinks that they came from a provincial theatre.

[9] In 1852 a centennial celebration of the introduction of the drama into America was held in Castle Garden, when *The Merchant of Venice* was given in commemoration of its performance at Williamsburg on September 5th, 1752. The Philadelphia comedians had played *The Merchant of Venice* as early as 1751.

[10] John Esten Cooke has used the situation of this performance for the

and the other " Othello " with " Harlequin Collector." In 1753 the company went to New York. Among the earliest plays there was " Richard the Third,"[11] which was given " by particular desire," on November 12, with " Devil to Pay." The cast was as follows:

Richard	Mr. Rigby.
Henry VI	Mr. Hallam.
Prince of Wales	Master L. Hallam.
Duke of York	Master A. Hallam.
Richmond	Mr. Clarkson.
Buckingham	Mr. Malone.
Norfolk	Mr. Miller.
Stanley	Mr. Singleton.
Catesby	Mr. Adcock.
Lieutenant	Mr. Bell.
Queen Elizabeth	Mrs. Hallam.
Lady Anne	Mrs. Adcock.
Duchess of Rutland	Mrs. Rigby.[12]

Of this Richard we know nothing, except that his acting of the French doctor in " The Anatomist " made that piece the most popular one in the company's repertoire. He was evidently the leading actor, playing tragedy and high comedy parts.[13] The theatre in which they played was one built for them on the site of the house in Nassau Street used by the older comedians.

In 1758 Hallam was again in New York, and built another theatre on Cruger's Wharf, where on February 7, 1759, " Richard the Third " was given with " Damon and Phillida." The Richard was probably Harman, a recruit from England, with his wife as Lady Anne, and Mrs. Douglass, formerly Mrs. Hallam, as Elizabeth, while young Hallam played Richmond, a " star " cast for those days. The conditions must have been

central interest in his *Virginia Comedians.* Great liberty is taken with dates, however, the performance being placed in 1763, and the parts of some of the actors are confused.

[11] The other Shakespearian plays were *Lear,* on January 14, 1754, and *Romeo and Juliet* on the 28th.

[12] Seilhamer, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, page 53.

[13] Rigby was the first representative in America of Romeo and of many other stock characters. See Ireland, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, page 18.

most primitive, for the building was evidently little more than a barn, and was soon after demolished.

In the following seasons at Philadelphia, Annapolis and New York, "Richard the Third" constantly appeared and was a favorite, as before, for benefits. A notable performance of these early days was that at the Southwark Theatre in Philadelphia, where "Richard the Third" was given on December 5, 1766, the first Shakespearian play performed in this first permanent theatre in America.[14] At this time the part was taken by Lewis Hallam the younger, long a favorite and now the leading actor of the country. Douglass, in the meantime, was building a permanent theatre in New York in John Street, which was opened on December 7, 1767, and where "Richard the Third" was played on the 14th.[15] The audience on this occasion was the attraction rather more than the fortunes of the hero, for a Cherokee delegation, visiting General Gage at the time, was present at the play and excited much curiosity. The Pennsylvania Gazette of December 17th had the following item:

"The expectation of seeing the Indian chiefs at the play on Monday night occasioned a great concourse of people. The house was crowded, and it is said great numbers were obliged to go away for want of room.

"The Indians regarded the play, which was 'King Richard III,' with seriousness and attention, but as it cannot be supposed that they were sufficiently acquainted with the language to understand the plot and design and enter into the spirit of the author, their countenances and behavior were rather expressive of surprise and curiosity than any other passions. Some of them were much surprised and diverted at the tricks of Harlequin."[16]

[14] During this season the first performance of *Cymbeline* in America took place on June 29, 1767. Garrick's version was used. Godfrey's *Prince of Parthia,* not the first American play, as has been asserted, but the first written, acted and printed in America, was played for the first and only time during this season.

[15] The other Shakespearian plays of the season were *Cymbeline, Romeo and Juliet, Lear, Merchant of Venice, Henry the Fourth, Macbeth, Othello, Hamlet,* and Garrick's version of *Much Ado, Catherine and Petruchio.* See Seilhamer, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, pages 213–218.

[16] Seilhamer, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, pages 42 and 219. Another interesting notice of a visit of an Indian "emperor" and "empress" to the theatre is given on page 220. The pantomime here given was *Harlequin's Vagaries,* which had highly pleased the Indians when at the theatre in Williamsburg in 1752.

The benefit of the three Misses Storer, on May 2, 1768, shows the character of an evening's entertainment when the play was only a part of the attraction. "Richard the Third" was the piece; between the second and third acts Foote's interlude of "Taste" was performed, and between the third and fourth acts Miss Storer sang the celebrated song, "Sweet Echo"; the entertainment ended with the farce, "Miss in her Teens." Another theatrical attraction is indicated in the notice of the benefit of Mr. and Mrs. Douglass on June 14, 1773, when the prologue to "Richard the Third" was delivered by Mr. Douglass "in character of a Master Mason."[17]

During the following seasons before the Revolution "Richard the Third" continued to be popular and frequently played, until on October 24, 1778, Congress passed a resolution recommending a suspension of all amusements, and thus brought to a close the colonial period of the American stage. Throughout this period Lewis Hallam had held the part of Richard without a rival, for Rigby seems to have disappeared from the bills very soon. In appearance Dunlap describes the former as "of middle stature or above, thin, straight, and well taught as a dancer and fencer";[18] and according to John Bernard in his method was "formed more on the model of Quin than of Garrick."[19]

Another contemporary wrote:

"No one could tread the stage with more ease . . . In tragedy it can not be denied that his declamation was either mouthing or ranting; yet a thorough master of all the tricks and finesse of his trade, his manner was both graceful and impressive, 'tears in his eyes, distraction in his aspect, a broken voice, and his whole function suiting with forms to his conceit.' He was, . . . at Philadelphia as much the soul of the Southwark Theatre as ever Garrick was of Drury Lane."[20]

Of the women who had taken the part of Queen Elizabeth, Mrs. Douglass was the most notable. She had played "legitimate" rôles at the Wells Theatre, such as Lady Percy in

[17] Ireland, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, page 60.

[18] *Op. cit.*, page 81.

[19] *Retrospections in America*, page 265.

[20] *Memoirs of a Life Chiefly Passed in Pennsylvania*, by Captain Graydon. Quoted by Seilhamer, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, page 202.

"Henry the Fourth," Desdemona, and Angelica in "Love for Love," and her name is unbrokenly connected with the leading parts on the American stage from 1752 to the Revolution. Mrs. Harman who played the part of the Duchess of York in 1766–7 and Anne in 1759–60, is of interest as being the daughter of Charlotte Charke and grand-daughter of Colley Cibber. She seems to have been a useful member of the company and was, according to her obituary, "a just actress, possessed much merit in low comedy, and dressed all her characters with infinite propriety, but her figure prevented her from succeeding in tragedy and genteel comedy." Another Elizabeth was Mrs. Morris, for a time the greatest attraction in the company, a tall stately woman of the Siddons type, invariably described as piquing the public with "a very mysterious manner."

These pre-Revolutionary performances offer little of note in themselves, and no performer in them is now remembered. Of the actual conditions which obtained we know little, but they probably differed in no wise from those of traveling companies in England.[21] Of most interest in this colonial period is the natural persistence here of the older method of acting, when in England the star of Garrick was at its meridian; and the predominance of the one American Company which enjoyed a monopoly of the theatrical field akin to that of the licensed houses in London.

The Continental Congress had put a period to theatrical activity as far as its jurisdiction extended, but the stage offered a grateful resource to the British officers stationed in the larger cities in the enforced idleness of winter quarters.[22] Under General Burgoyne in Boston theatricals were very popular, but we have little information about the repertoire, except

[21] It is interesting to find some features of the early history of the drama repeated in America, as shown in the laws against players, the prevalence of strolling companies, the necessity of recommendations when going from one place to another, and the persistence of the audience upon the stage. This last was abolished by Douglass in 1761.

[22] For a full discussion of this entertaining chapter in American stage history, see Seilhamer, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, Chapters II, III and IV.

that it included Mrs. Centlivre's "Busybody," Rowe's "Tamerlane," and Hill's "Zara." Of the performances in New York our information is more extensive. In 1777, the company opened the John Street Theatre, jocularly called Theatre Royal, with Fielding's "Tom Thumb," and until 1781, performed throughout the successive seasons with some marked degree of success, and with the favor of Generals Howe and Clinton. It was inevitable that "Richard the Third" should have been chosen for performance, but the first record of it that we have is in the second New York season, on March 6, 1779, when it was given with "The Lying Valet." It was repeated on March 18, a "new comic dance" being substituted for the farce, and again on April 26th, these closely recurring repetitions indicating a favorable reception. In the third season we have records of three performances of "Richard the Third," on March 6, 1780, when it was announced that the characters would be "dressed in the Habits of the times," suggesting the acquisition of stage costumes from some quarter, on March 18, and on April 19.[23] In the last season it appeared once, on May 28, with "The Mayor of Garratt."

When Clinton's Thespians, as they were called, began their performances, the young subalterns took the parts of women, but in the second season they announced that these parts were to be performed "by young ladies and grown gentlewomen who never appeared on any stage before." Later, at least one professional actress was numbered among them, Mrs. Tomlinson, who had been a member of the American Company from 1758 to 1772. She had been off the stage nearly six years at this time, but, with her knowledge of stage-craft, she was no doubt a valuable member of this amateur company. The leading lady in New York in 1779, was a young English girl, to whose acting high praise is given. It is conceivable that, in the performances of "Richard the Third," she should have represented Elizabeth, and Mrs. Tomlinson the Duchess of York. Dunlap has identified some of the performers in these plays, as Major Williams, of the artillery, in the part of Rich-

[23] The farces were *Polly Honeycomb, Lethe,* and *Hob in the Well.*

ard, Captain Stephen Payne Adye, Artillery and Judge Advocate, in that of Henry the Sixth, and Captain Thomas Shreve of the Lord Mayor.[24] The young and handsome Major André, while in New York as Clinton's aide, probably took part in these plays, although we do not know what parts he assumed. He gave efficient help as scene painter when the Thespians were in Philadelphia in 1778, and these scenes were used for many years after the Revolution.[25]

There is some evidence that the Continental officers craved like entertainment, and attempted theatrical performances in Philadelphia in 1778, but Congress promptly put a stop to it on the grounds that " frequenting play-houses and theatrical entertainments has a fatal tendency to divert the minds of the people from a due attention to the means necessary for the defense of the country and the preservation of their liberties."[26] According to a letter written by the French minister on November 24, the prohibition came just in time to prevent " a public (theatrical) performance, given by army officers and Whig citizens."[27]

In the south, away from the immediate seat of operations, theatrical activities revived as early as 1781, when, in spite of the resolutions of Congress in 1778, a Baltimore company built a theatre and gave a season from January to June, 1782. The history of this company is of little importance, most of the names were new and soon disappeared from stage annals, but it is of some slight interest here that " Richard the Third " figured as the play with which the Baltimore theatre opened, and therefore the one which marked the revival of the drama in the south. Mr. Wall, the manager, took the leading part and his wife the part of Elizabeth. After another season in Baltimore in which " Richard the Third " was performed

[24] Lieutenant Spencer of the Queen's Rangers probably figured in these plays, for in 1785, we find him in Bath performing *Richard the Third.* Dunlap, *op. cit.,* page 54.

[25] A description of one of these scenes is given by Durang in his *History of the Philadelphia Stage,* and quoted by Seilhamer, *op. cit.,* Vol. II, page 31.

[26] Seilhamer, *op. cit.,* Vol. II, pages 51–2.

[27] *Ditto,* page 52.

twice, the company, under the management of Dennis Ryan, came to New York. Here "Richard the Third" was given on August 13, with the after piece, "The Citizen," by Murphy. The principal parts were taken by amateurs, perhaps some of the military Thespians. Thus, Queen Elizabeth was by a "lady," and Richard, Richmond, Tressel, and the lieutenant of the Tower by "gentlemen."

During the Revolution, the American Company had been in Jamaica from 1779 to 1782, but when the war was over, Hallam returned to Philadelphia and New York and felt the public pulse with a series of "entertainments."[28] When, after these were favorably received, he ventured to announce regular plays, it was still necessary to appease the anti-theatrical element, particularly strong among the Quakers. "Richard the Third" was revived in Philadelphia, therefore, in the guise of a "moral dialogue," under the title of "Fate of Tyranny." So it was announced on July 23, 1788, and on November 1,[29] but the prohibitions against dramatic performances were repealed in 1789, and the play then emerged under its proper title.

Hallam opened the John Street theatre in 1785 with Henry, who had brought from England the best company yet seen in

[28] The advertisement for one of these suggests that *Richard the Third* may have been foisted upon the public unaware. Thus, in the entertainment given at Philadelphia on December 2, 1784, the first part is announced thus: "A serious investigation of Shakespear's morality illustrated by his most striking characters faithfully applied to the task of mingling profit with amusement. On the first evening the instability of human greatness; the inevitable and miserable consequences of vice; the piercings of a wounded conscience and the divine attributes of mercy will be represented according to the animated descriptions of the illustrious bard." This entertainment opened with a "Monody" to the memory of the Chiefs who had fallen in the cause of American liberty, and closed with a "Rondelay" celebrating the independence of America. Quoted by Seilhamer, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pages 165–6. Another entertainment on the 14th of January, 1785, advertises Garrick's Ode on dedicating a building to Shakespeare, two scenes from Loutherbourg's Eudiphusicon, much admired in London at the time, and Garrick's favorite address by an impoverished poet, all these showing the dependence on London attractions.

[29] Seilhamer, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pages 245 and 248.

America. "Richard the Third" figures no less than three times during this season with Hallam as Richard. A notable performance was that on February 3, 1787, when "Richard the Third" and "The American Citizen," were acted in honor of the arrival of the ship, "Empress of China," from Canton, this vessel having been the first with the privilege of presenting the American flag in Chinese waters.[30] Later, when New York became the national capital, we find it frequently given, figuring as one of the chief plays during the last days of the supremacy of the original American Company.

The theatrical situation became greatly changed during the last years of the century. The American Company no longer held the ground undisputed, for these years are marked by a growth of theatrical enterprise and the consequent rise of managers who rivaled each other in securing the best English talent available. Among the recruits which the envoy of the American Company brought from England at this time, the most important was John Hodgkinson. In the season of 1793–4 he made his first appearance at John Street in tragedy as "Richard the Third," and he remained the leading Richard of the company during its remaining years at this theatre.[31] A contemporary description of Hodgkinson's performance of this part is tempered with more restraint than usually shown when reporting the impression made by a "star." It ran thus:

"Though we do not pretend to say that Mr. Hodgkinson equals a Kemble, yet he certainly did great justice to the part. His action was violent, as the character requires, and at the same time not unstrained. If we must censure him, it is for his manner of speaking—he lets his voice fall too suddenly, speaking, to borrow a term from music, in octaves; he, however, excels any that ever appeared here in the character of Richard."[32]

[30] T. A. Brown, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pages 8–9.

[31] *A Narrative of his Connection with the Old American Company. From the Fifth of September, 1792, To the Thirty-First of March, 1797,* by John Hodgkinson. New York, 1797. This gives some account of the theatrical business transactions of the time, but throws little light on stage conditions. He does give an item about the orchestra, which he says "was composed of about six musicians, some of whom were incapable of their business."

[32] Seilhamer, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, page 61.

Later he was called the "American Kemble," while John Bernard, who greatly admired him, gave him the name of the "provincial Garrick"; and these titles do not seem to have been due entirely to hyperbole, for Hodgkinson's successes at Bath and Bristol before he came to America, were notable. He is described by Dunlap who was closely associated with him, as "six feet ten inches in height, but too fleshy to appear tall—well formed in the neck, chest, shoulders and arms, but clumsy in his lower extremities, his ankles being thick and his knees inclining inward. His face was round, his nose broad, and his eyes, which were of unequal sizes, gray, with large pupils and dark eyelashes. His complexion was almost colorless and his hair dark-brown." With such personal qualities, his adoption of the Kemble manner was inevitable. Mrs. Melmoth, who played the part of Elizabeth to Hodgkinson's Richard, had been a successful actress at Drury Lane in 1776–7, before that at Covent Garden; and while her figure was at this time ill-adapted for most parts, her acting was excellent enough to render her a leading performer.

In the meantime Thomas Wignell had opened the Chestnut Street Theatre in Philadelphia,[33] built on the model of Covent Garden, with scenery painted from designs by De Loutherbourg and both scenery and wardrobe imported from England. "Richard the Third" was given in this new theatre on April 21, 1795, probably with James Fennell as Richard and Mrs. Whitlock as Elizabeth. In Boston under Powell, and in Newport under Joseph Harper, theatrical companies were making their way against public opposition and in these places "Richard the Third" was in constant requisition. It seems unnecessary to follow its fortunes in all of these centers, and therefore

[33] It was at this theatre that Mrs. Merry (Elizabeth Brunton), considered a rival of Mrs. Siddons, and the first actress of eminence to cross the Atlantic, was introduced to the American public. I have found no record of her appearance in *Richard the Third,* but it is more than probable that it was in her repertoire. Aside from her importance in connection with the stage in this country, Mrs. Merry is of some curious interest as being the means of bringing America into touch with the Della Cruscan vogue of the day, for her husband, Robert Merry, Della Crusca, accompanied her and here spent the last years of his life.

the history of the play will hereafter be noted in New York only, as being typical of its history elsewhere.

The last performance at the John Street Theatre took place on January 13, 1798, and with the opening of the Park Theatre[34] on January 29 of the same year, a new era began for New York theatricals. This was the first well-equipped theatre in New York, for the John Street house was a barn-like building of modest pretensions. A description of the new theatre in the Daily Advertiser of January 31, tells us:

"The stage was everything that could be wished. The scenery was executed in a most masterly style. The extensiveness of the scale upon which the scenes are executed, the correctness of the designs, and the elegance of the painting, presented the most beautiful views which the imagination can conceive. The scenery was of itself worth a visit to the theatre."

It opened under the management of Hodgkinson and Willian Dunlap, and was the house that for a half century presented the best of dramatic and histrionic art in America. In the history of this theatre we find "Richard the Third" in the regular stock repertoire, constantly given, used to open the season, the attraction year after year, and the last tragedy acted in this house fifty years later. It was therefore the last tragedy given under the management of the old American Company, which first presented this play in Nassau Street, for their history ends with this theatre.

At the beginning of these fifty years we find Hodgkinson taking the leading parts. After he left New York in 1802, Thomas A. Cooper, who after a promising trial in London, had engaged with Wignell at Phidadelphia in 1797, became the leading tragedian in New York, and, after his predecessor's death, in 1805, in America.[35] He was a "paramount favorite with the public" for thirty years, and kept this position even after the advent of George Frederick Cooke, and until the

[34] A picture of the first Park Theatre, copied from a rare print, may be found in *The American Historical Record* of March, 1872.

[35] Cooper was educated by Godwin, and had been trained for the stage by Holcroft. He became a leader in the social life of New York, and was allied by marriage with some of the best families of the state. His second wife was the Sophy Sparkle (Miss Mary Fairlie) of Irving's *Salmagundi*. Ireland, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, page 156.

appearance of Kean and Booth.[36] John Bernard ranks him high, and speaks of him as " endowed with great genius, and the highest qualifications in face, voice and person," but as having little or no art and never striving to attain it.[37] He was of the Kemble school, declamatory, stately, " worthy of imitation both by pulpit and bar," says a contemporary, but his " Richard the Third " is denominated by the same authority " an execrable performance."[38]

The erratic Fennell, already mentioned as one of Wignell's company in Philadelphia, an actor of some note in English and Scotch theatres and boasting the acme of theatrical experience in having acted with Mrs. Siddons, seems to have taken Cooper's place during the latter's absence in Europe in 1804. We have several records of his appearance up to 1810, just before Cooke's arrival. He was a towering person, with a full fleshy face, and deep solemn voice, his coldness and stiffness fitting him for characters like Brutus, and his Richard showing the same Kemble-like qualities as that of his predecessors.[39]

Up to the arrival of George Frederick Cooke, therefore, we find that the theatre in America had made rapid advance toward more cosmopolitan conditions. While the only actor of more than third-rate ability seems to have been Hodgkinson, all of the three last mentioned are of interest as exhibiting the Kemble tradition in America. They represented at that time a *new* school. Jonathan Oldstyle, commenting upon the actors of the day,[40] says that they " prefer walking upon plain

[36] Ireland, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pages 156–7.

[37] *Op. cit.*, page 267.

[38] F. C. Wemyss, *Twenty-Six Years of the life of an Actor and Manager*, page 96. Although I find no record of it, Mrs. Whitlock, Mrs. Siddon's sister, called the "American Siddons," probably played in *Richard the Third* with Cooper. She seems to have been of the Kemble type, masterful, yet graceful, and with an exquisite voice.

[39] Fennell's biography, as it appears in his *Apology* (Philadelphia, 1814), filled with Utopian schemes and experiments in salt-making, bridge-building, and what not, is of more interest than his achievements on the stage.

[40] Mrs. Villiers, whom Irving mentions in *Salmagundi* as the Lady Macbeth of the day, also figured in *Richard the Third* when Fennell was leading man. Knickerbocker Edition, 1871, pages 14–17.

ground to strutting on the stilts used by the tragic heroes of my day," and speaks of the ranting and roaring tragedian as almost banished from the New York stage. The staging of plays could be favorably compared with the practice in London, although the enthusiasm for archeological reproductions seems not yet to have reached our shores. Irving shows that there was the same incongruity in costume here as in the London theatres, remarking that the performers dress for the same piece in the fashions of different ages and countries, " so that while one actor is strutting about the stage in the cuirass and helmet of Alexander, another, dressed up in a gold-laced coat and bag-wig, with a *chapeau de bras* under his arm, is taking snuff in a fashion of one or two centuries back, and perhaps a third figures in Suwarrow boots, in the true style of modern buckism."[41] We find no records of innovation in any line, and see here as in London, the Cibber text the exclusive one, and with no further changes than were probably introduced in following Kemble.

The most important event for the American stage, and for the history of the play in this country, in bringing it into unprecedented prominence, was the arrival of George Frederick Cooke in 1810. He opened his engagement in America with " Richard the Third," and played it frequently during the season. With the same play he began all of his successive engagements, and appeared in it repeatedly throughout his connection with the New York stage, which continued until 1812. The acting of Cooke, his London success, his appearance with Kemble, and his later rivalry with Edmund Kean, have already been touched upon and need not be repeated here. His career

[41] *The Letters of Jonathan Oldstyle, Gent.* By the author of the *Sketch Book.* Oldstyle's correspondent, speaking of some of the efforts made for more congruous stage appointments, says: " The honest King of Scotland, who used to dress for market and theatre at the same time, and wear with his kelt and plaid his half boots and black breeches, looking half king, half cobbler, has been obliged totally to dismiss the former from his royal service; yet I am happy to find, so obstinate is his attachment to old habits, that all their efforts have not been sufficient to dislodge him from the strong hold he has in the latter. They may force him from the boots—but nothing shall drive him out of the breeches."

in America was short, but filled with unprecedented triumphs that were lessened only by his own weakness in giving himself up to his evil habits. His acting, the first of a preëminent artist that America had seen,[42] left its impress on this country for many years. Fennell, the leading actor here at the time, modified his method after seeing the great English actor, and others made him the subject of minute imitation. Among these John Duff was the best known, his Richard being "so closely after the manner of Cooke, as to require the keenest scrutiny to detect a variation"; and the "extraordinary imitation of Cooke" by a certain Mr. Bibly is also recorded.[43]

The coming of Cooke to America in 1810, prepared the way for the greater Edmund Kean, whose first visit occurred in 1820. He opened his engagement with "Richard the Third" as had Cooke, and it was his important rôle during this and his later visit in 1825.[44] There seems little to add to what has already been said concerning Kean in his English career. His visits are important chiefly because of the indication they give of the attractions of an American engagement, and his influence here seems not to have been so widespread as that of Cooke or particularly of Booth. The American records of his successes differ quite markedly in tone from those written on the other side of the Atlantic, for here an offensive attitude later dubbed "a certain condescension in foreigners," was noticed and resented.

Between Kean's first and second visits his great imitator,

[42] A detailed description of Cooke's Richard the Third is given in *Memoirs of the Life of George Frederick Cooke, Esquire, Late of the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden*, by William Dunlap, New York, 1813, Vol. II, pages 391–4. Cooke was the first of the great English "stars" to cross the Atlantic. The Park Theatre managers tried to induce John Kemble and Mrs. Siddons to come to America for an engagement, but the dread of the ocean voyage overruled any attractions that might attend an American tour.

[43] Ireland, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pages 297 and 308.

[44] In connection with Kean's opening appearance as Richard at the Park, on his second visit, one of the worst riots in our history occurred, because of the resentment of his conduct in Boston in 1821. See T. A. Brown, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pages 27–8.

or as some of his biographers would have it, his great double,[45] Junius Brutus Booth, came to America. His first appearance was on October 5, 1821, in the New Park Theatre, the finest one New York had yet had, with a large, commodious stage and well illuminated with patent oil-lamps. Booth's initial appearance was in "Richard the Third," a part he constantly used until the end of his career thirty years later. His Richard needs few words of description,[46] for it was a wonderfully close counterpart of Kean's in general method and in detail, though according to contemporary witnesses, with greater emphasis upon what was terrible in the character rather than upon its pathetic possibilities. Booth was for years without a rival, and "the little lunatic giant of the stage," with his impassioned manner, overwrought emotions and awe-striking impersonations seemed to appeal to the American audience in a greater degree than did the undoubtedly more subtle interpretation of Kean.[47]

An explanation of this may be found in the career of Edwin Forrest, the first great native actor of America, whose appearance as "Richard the Third"[48] took place on January 23, 1827, at the Bowery Theatre.[49] Forrest's interpretations, as did Cooke's and Booth's, emphasized the darker and more ter-

[45] Notably in *The Elder and Younger Booth,* by Asia Booth Clarke, Boston, 1882.

[46] An analysis of Booth's Richard is given in *The Tragedian; An Essay on the Histrionic Genius of Junius Brutus Booth,* by Thomas R. Gould. New York, 1868.

[47] A thrilling account was given by Count Joannes (George Jones) to T. A. Brown, who reports it in his *History of the New York Stage* (Vol. I, page 108), of a real fight between himself and Booth when he was playing Richmond to the latter's Richard. Booth, intoxicated and half insane, thinking himself a real Richard, made a savage attempt to kill his enemy. The audience, believing it to be excellent acting, applauded enthusiastically. It was only when Booth, exhausted and half fainting, was pinioned to the floor, that the play could end with some appearance of order.

[48] Forrest had played Richmond to Kean's Richard during the latter's second visit to America in 1825.

[49] This was a new house at the time, and notable in our stage annals as making the first experiment in American theatres in lighting with gas, a most important innovation in regard to stage setting.

rible aspects of character. It was a time when America was not entirely freed from the crudity of the colonial period, and the actor of popular favor was one whose emotions were violent and patent, and who had a genius for making brilliant points, rather than for illuminating every part of the character. But while Forrest enjoyed the greatest popularity and gained the highest reputation in such a violent part as Metamora, his Richard was never greatly in favor. This may have been due to his conception of the character. His friend and biographer, James Rees (Colley Cibber), says it was an original one, making Richard "towering and lofty, equally impetuous and commanding . . . a royal usurper, a princely hypocrite—a tyrant and a murderer of the house of Plantagenet." He tells us that his idea of Richard's person Forrest took from the portrait in the fifth volume of the "Paston Letters," and from the representation of the Countess of Desmond, whose flattering description of Richard at a royal party as the handsomest man in the room, except his brother, Edward IV, stands in direct opposition to the usual descriptions, such as More's.[50] His justification, he claimed, was based upon historical authority, and he refused, when Shakespeare was urged as the final authority for the stage, to "so distort Richard."[51] So in his dressing of the part he entirely disregarded the traditional deformity, as he credited Richard with the skill to disguise it. Forrest's biographer rather naïvely avers that, "if he could have impressed his audience with the same idea he had of it, we should have had an American actor to claim the honor of being the best that ever trod the stage."[52] It is certainly of interest to find that the princely conception does, in some measure, anticipate the later ideas of Irving and Edwin Booth, a conception, however, which required a more complex psychology than

[50] *The Life of Edwin Forrest. With Reminiscences and Personal Recollections.* Philadelphia (1874), pages 252–4.

[51] This is curiously based on the assumpton that Richard is "the only one who descants upon his personal defects." A reference to the speeches of Margaret or Anne, it would seem, would have disproved this.

[52] Rees, *op. cit.*, page 256.

Forrest's to make convincing.[53] The Edwin Forrest edition of "Richard the Third,"[54] for he had his own version of the Cibber text, shows few changes from the original, except frequent omission of lines, the introduction of the four from Shakespeare at the beginning of the opening soliloquy, adopted by most performers at this time, and the retention of Richmond's prayer in the tent scene, and of a few lines in the wooing scene which were omitted in the original Cibber version. The play ends with Richard's dying speech and a tableau of soldiers crying "Long live Henry the Seventh, King of England!"

A new but shortlived interest entered into American theatricals when Charles Kean, after first establishing his reputation in America in 1830, in the character in which his father had been so distinguished, returned in 1846 and gave "Richard the Third" in the Park Theatre, "with unexampled magnificence of scenery, dresses, armors, banners, equipments and properties of every kind, at a cost of ten thousand dollars." The first performance was given on January 7, and the play ran for three weeks, an unprecedented length in America.[55] These performances, elaborate in setting, unequalled in correctness and splendor, were a repetition of those already presented in London, and have been discussed. The history of elaborate staging at this time came to an early end. In 1848, Hamblin, the manager of the Park Theatre, used the scenery that Kean had left and gave a splendid performance of "Richard the Third," acting the leading part himself, but the play, in those first days of the extreme popularity of the opera, failed to attract. This attempt, aside from exhibiting the public preference at the time, has some added interest from

[53] One of the interesting facts in regard to Forrest's performances is that, in 1837, Charlotte Cushman played Queen Elizabeth to his Richard at the Park Theatre. See Ireland, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, page 220.

[54] *Richard III. No. 5 of the Edwin Forrest Edition of Shakespearian Plays. Correctly marked with the kind permission of the Eminent Tragedian, from his own prompt-book, and as acted by him at Niblo's Garden, N. Y. Under the Management of James M. Nixon, Esq.* (No date), New York.

[55] Ireland, *op. cit.*, page 450.

the fact that it was the last tragedy performed in the Park Theatre, for, a few days after, the theatre was destroyed by fire, and with it all of the properties that had given to America the first example of gorgeous staging.[56]

During the first fifty years or so of the nineteenth century, accompanying this succession of English luminaries upon our stage, such a grotesque procession of youthful prodigies and incongruous histrions makes its appearance, that it seems worth while to give some attention to this curious and, in some respects, significant chapter in our stage annals. While the history of the youthful prodigy in America may be said to date from the performances of John Howard Payne,[57] the first recorded appearance of a boy Richard is in January, 1821, when Master George Frederick Smith, a boy of eleven years, after playing Young Norval in Home's "Douglas," essayed this part. He seems to have had only a measurable success, for Ireland records that he was "somewhat attractive for a few nights;"[58] but he was brought forward again in March, 1822. In 1831, we hear of a little son of Mrs. Jones, an actress, introduced on the stage at The Bowery as a prodigy in "Richard the Third," but quite decidedly disappointing his mother's hopes.[59] Master Joseph Burke, eleven years of age, acted Richard so well that "none sneered at the absurdity of a child's assuming such parts."[60] Master Mangeon's performance at The Bowery on June 7, 1832, had "some boyish merit,"[61] and we find the mention of a Master Bowers from

[56] The Park Theatre burned down December 16, 1848. With it went the last vestige of the old American Company, which first appeared at the Nassau Street Theatre in 1753. Ireland, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pages 525–6.

[57] The only native American of celebrity on the stage until the appearance of Forrest. He made his first entry in 1809, at the age of seventeen, as young Norval.

[58] Ireland, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, page 373.

[59] *Ditto*, page 506.

[60] Ireland, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, page 642. He made his debut in Cork as Tom Thumb when five years of age. For his remarkable performances in drama and music, see Hutton, *Curiosities of the American Stage*, pages 229–230.

[61] *Ditto*, Vol. II, page 23.

Philadelphia at the Park Theatre in June, 1834.[62] Stranger still, it was a part assumed by tiny heroines. The "infant wonder" of 1838 was Miss J. M. Davenport, aged eleven years, who played Richard to her mother's Queen Elizabeth. Probably the most youthful Richard on record is one of the famous Bateman sisters, Ellen, who when four years of age, played this part, her sister Kate, two years older, taking the part of Richmond. This remarkable exhibition took place on December 10, 1849, at the Broadway Theatre.[63]

During these years several women made some reputation in the character. In 1827, at The Bowery, Mr. and Mrs. H. A. Williams gave a performance in which Mrs. Williams took the part of Richard and her husband played Richmond. A Mrs. Herring, who played Queen Elizabeth to Booth's Richard in 1833, appeared in the title rôle on June 27, 1835, and was said to have shown "a force and vigor truly astonishing."[64] A few years after, Mrs. Pritchard, an actress "with the taint of the Ring attached to her," performed Richard in an appropriately "spirited" manner. In 1836, Mrs. H. Lewis opened her season at the Park Theatre as Richard the Third, and later her engagement at the Franklin Theatre as star with the same part. Annie Hathaway and Fanny Herring played Richard and Richmond together in 1860,[65] and the Batemans in 1861 repeated at the Astor Place Theatre the characters which they had played as children.

"Richard the Third" seems to have lent itself to all kinds of theatrical ventures. As in London it had been given at Astley's as a circus attraction,[66] so at the Bowery Theatre in

[62] *Ditto,* page 114.

[63] Clara Fisher, called "a Kean in miniature," is about the first of whom we have any record as figuring in *Richard the Third,* but her juvenile efforts were confined to England, where, when she was six years old, she appeared in a burlesque masque called *Lord Flinnip,* introducing the fifth act of *Richard the Third.* Ireland, *op. cit.,* Vol. II, page 536.

[64] Ireland, *op. cit.,* Vol. II, page 88.

[65] T. A. Brown, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, page 336.

[66] A spirited defence of such a setting for the dramas of Shakespeare appears in a letter of Thomas Wooler, a manager, to Elliston of Drury Lane, in 1833, where he writes: "What think you of mounting Shake-

1840, Charles Mason used the battle scene of Act V to exhibit an equestrian performance. The versatile Charlotte Crampton played Richard at the Chatham Theatre and in the last act performed wonderful feats with her trained horses. Later in a benefit at the New Bowery Theatre in 1862, Richard is presented on horse-back in the battle scene by Harry Seymour, and the device found favor in subsequent performances. This play was used in many an eccentric attempt, such as that of Elder Addams, the Mormon preacher-actor, who gave a strange exhibition on November 29 and 30, 1847, at the Bowery Theatre, or the ridiculous feats of Count Joannes, well-known to the New York stage forty years ago, or of Dr. Landis from Philadelphia with his imaginary company,[67] which closed the history of theatrical performances in Tammany Theatre. As early as 1866, at the Neu Stadt, "Richard the Third" was on the boards of a German theatre, and it remained in the repertoire of the Bowery Theatre when it was opened as a German house in 1879, and called The Thalia. Here Herr Possard played Richard on January 7 and March 7, 1888.

Here, as in England, apt imitators saw a ready field, and we find James H. Hackett giving imitations of Kean's Richard and T. McCutcheon of J. B. Booth's in "The Man About

speare's heroes, as the bard himself would rejoice they should be? Why not allow the wand of Ducrow (the noted equestrian), to aid the representation of his dramas, as well as the pencil of Stanfield? 'Saddle White Surrey' in good earnest, and, as from The Surrey you once banished these animals, and have taken them up at Drury Lane, think of doing them justice. . . . Instead of niggardly furnishing Richard and Richmond with armies that do not muster the force of a serjeant's guard, give them an efficient force of horse and foot. . . . Richard should march to the field in the full panoply of all your cavalry, and not trudge like a poor pedlar, whom no one would dream of 'interrupting in his expedition.' He might impressively dismount in compliment to the ladies; and when in the field he cries, 'My kingdom for a horse!' the audience might fairly deem such a price only a fair offer for the recovery of so noble an animal." Quoted by Frost, *Circus Life*, pages 81–2.

[67] The doctor was on the stage in costume, while the parts of Lady Anne, Richmond, and others were read from behind screens, and Richard alone "roared and bellowed." T. A. Brown, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, page 87.

Town." Nor could this play escape the national *penchant* for caricature. In 1842 "Richard Number Three," a musical burlesque, appeared at Mitchell's Olympic. Chanfrau, noted for his imitations, especially of Forrest, appeared in "Richard III in Dutch" in 1869, a comic piece in which the actor Glenn had figured at The Bowery four years before. This seemingly favorite burlesque found its way to the Theatre Comique in the same year, where it was acted by Robert McWade. A travesty of "Richard the Third," called "Bad Dickey,"[68] was a feature at Tammany Theatre, and was repeated at Union Square. As late as 1890, D. L. Morris, the German comedian, performed in a burlesque of "Richard the Third" at Koster and Bial's.[69]

These peculiar representations are a comment upon the attitude toward the play and an indication of the theatrical taste of the time. They were not confined to the second-class theatres, where such entertainments are to be expected, but took place even in the venerable Park Theatre, and in The Bowery, which in its early days was one of the leading houses in New York. They furnish significant evidence of the popularity of the tragedy, the extreme familiarity of the audiences with it, and illustrate the opportunity in the play for striking and extraordinary situations, which so easily pass over into the grotesque.

[68] The *dramatist personæ* give some idea of its character, thus: Richard, Henry King, Bucky Gammon, Richmud, Stand and Lie, Catspaw, Rarcliffe, Lieut. Jenkins, Gnawfork, Oxhead, Tarheel, Cuffy, Sally Ann, Mrs. McKween, Dutch Bess of New York. T. A. Brown, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, page 273. Fanny Herring played the comic Richard.

[69] "Legitimate burlesque," according to Mr. Hutton in *Curiosities of the American Stage*, began in United States with the production of John Poole's celebrated travesty of *Hamlet*, one of the earliest of its kind by George Holland on March 22, 1828. This led managers to importing, and our native authors to writing travesties upon everything in the standard drama. So we had burlesques of *Anthony and Cleopatra, Douglas, Macbeth, Othello, Romeo and Juliet, Manfred, The Tempest, Richard the Third,* and many others. These were at the height of popularity between 1839 and 1859. Wm. Mitchell was the leading man in these burlesques, and *Richard Number Three* was one of his famous parts. Later John Brougham was a leading American burlesque actor.

With the appearance of Edwin Booth a new era began in the history of this play in America, for our greatest actor gave the newer conception of the character of Richard, consonant with the later critical study of Shakespeare, and was the first to make a successful restoration of the original text to our stage. Booth's earliest appearance had been in this play, when in 1847 he made his *début* as Tressel to his father's Richard, as did all the sons of J. B. Booth in succession.[70] His first appearance in New York took place at Burton's Theatre, in this play, on May 4, 1857, after his triumphs in the West, where his first substantial success had been gained in this part at San Francisco in 1852.[71]

Edwin Booth's Richard has always been highly praised. It was less ferocious, less brutal than his father's, more subtle, and illustrated the character not only by throwing the great moments of the play into strong relief, but also by a consistent illumination of the calmer scenes. As his father's method resembled Kean's, and both were modelled on Cooke's, so in his earlier interpretations he followed their lead in such terrific parts as Richard, Sir Giles Overreach, Pescara, and others. As he grew older he discarded most of these, though keeping Richard the Third, but to that character giving the finer, philosophic cast which distinguished his Hamlet and Richelieu. So his king was not a tyrannical ruffian, but a wily, cunning, consummate Plantagenet. Here in America we see, therefore, the same transition from the older Kean tradition, as it had been somewhat brutalized by Booth and Forrest, to that subtler conception of Irving. He dressed carefully for the part, but his "make up" included "no distortion of limp or hump." He is said to have based his idea of the personal appearance of Richard upon the portrait in the House of Lords, and to have been influenced in his conception of the character by Lord Lytton's presentation of Richard in "The

[70] The tradition of the Booth family in America is comparable to that of the Kembles in England.

[71] His life in the West had been filled with strange adventures, not least among them being his performance of Richard the Third before King Kamehameha IV, when in the Sandwich Islands.

Last of the Barons." The stage business was always carefully arranged, with the utmost precision, even to the characteristic toying with the ring upon his finger, or the sheathing and unsheathing of his dagger. In Booth's interpretation the emphasis is not upon the historical sources, but upon the poetic conception as given by Shakespeare.[72] The return to history had begun with Kemble; it is only the later nineteenth century actors that conceived the idea of going to the original author for their inspiration for the part.

Before considering Booth's restoration of the original form of the play, a word must be said about a similar attempt which preceded it. In 1871 the managers of Niblo's Garden advertised "a grand Shakespearian revival, in the performance of the tragedy of Richard III, with an ensemble of cast, scenery and accessories such as has never been attempted in this country." They announced that "for months preparations have been making in Europe, and are now being completed here, for the production of this great historical play, on a scale worthy its immortal fame," in order to make this "not only a great dramatic success, but an incident marking an epoch in the history of the American stage." In regard to the text, although confessing that "some important modifications and certain excisions" of the original had been made, they averred that they had entirely disregarded the Cibber version. T. A. Brown, evidently from extra-information, says that the text was "reconstructed" by Charles A. Calvert,[73] that disciple of Phelps, who for so many years carried on in Manchester a work similar to that of Sadler's Wells. The music was "in the main founded on Old English melodies popular at the time." The chief actor, James Bennet, brought from England for the occasion, was to appear on horseback, and all was to be the most elaborate and the most correct ever seen in America.[74] But in spite of the enthusiasm of the advertiser, and

[72] For a discussion of Edwin Booth's acting, see *Shadows of the Stage* and *The Life and Art of Edwin Booth,* both by Mr. William Winter.

[73] *Op. cit.,* Vol. II, page 210.

[74] These details were given in a small pamphlet, evidently patterned after *The Fly-Leaf* which used to accompany Charles Kean's elaborate produc-

the supreme efforts of the managers, the revival did not attract. Bennet was distinctly weak, and the text was only partly successful. At the end of a week, Neil Warner was put in Bennet's place, the Cibber text replaced the one that had been so carefully prepared, with the addition, however, of the dream and murder of Clarence which had made a "hit"; and the play in this form ran for three weeks. Even Count Joannes, who was the attraction for the last night of the four weeks' run, scored a success! The history of this attempt resembles that of similar attempts in England; Phelps returned to the Cibber form, and Macready's adaptation was played but one night. This revival seems to have been undertaken primarily for the sake of the novelty gained by extraordinary setting, and by the use of the original text as something hitherto unattempted here, rather than for the sake of making a serious appeal for the rehabilitation of the Shakespearian form, in and for itself.

At this time Booth was still using the Cibber form of the play, and continued to do so until 1878, when as the opening performance of the season at his own theatre,[75] he introduced his adaptation of the original. It ran successfully for two weeks, marking an epoch in the history of the play in America as did Irving's revival of "Richard the Third" the year before at The Lyceum, London.

The editor of the Edwin Booth version of "Richard the Third," Mr. William Winter, summarizes the changes made by the adaptor thus:

"Changes of the original have been made, in both the arrangement of the scenes and the distribution of the text. Portions of the original have been omitted. The portions retained, however, have been taken from the original, and from no other source. The text has been but slightly altered, and that in only a few places. No new material has been introduced."

To see how it differs from other adaptations, we may note briefly the changes in successive acts and scenes.

tions. In this a long list of authorities was given, among them some American Shakespearian scholars, as R. G. White and others.

[75] Booth's Theatre was situated on the southeast corner of Sixth Avenue and Twenty-third Street. It burned down in 1883. To preserve the memory of this noted play-house, a bust of Shakespeare has been placed in the front of the building now occupying the site.

Act I, Scene 1.—The Hastings episode is cut out; otherwise the scene is merely shortened, and concludes with the wooing of Anne.

Scene 2.—Richard's soliloquy. Located in " another street."

Scene 3.—Scene of the quarreling nobles, *i. e.*, the same as in Shakespeare. The first act ends at this point.

Act II.—The dream and murder of Clarence.

Act III, Scene 1.—This opens with the reconciliation of the nobles and the Queen about the sick-bed of the King, gives a few lines of the lamenting scene, and closes with Richard's preparation for testing the attitude of Hastings. The epic scenes in Shakespeare, Act II, Scenes 3 and 4, and Act III, Scene 1, the entry of the young king into London, are omitted.

Scenes 2 and 3.—The testing of Hastings by Catesby, and his indictment and condemnation by Richard, closing with the picture of the consternation in the Council Room after Richard's outburst. The intervening scenes are omitted.

Act IV.—The scene at Baynard Castle, considerably shortened.

Act. V.—This corresponds in general with Act IV in the Shakespearian text, though with much shortening, and the omission of the scene of the women lamenting before the Tower, and the short scene at Lord Derby's house.

Act VI.—Shakespeare's Act V becomes the sixth act in Booth's arrangement, and coincides practically with it. The first scene is omitted, and there is considerable rearrangement of the later scenes and lines. The play ends with the fall of Richard.[76]

Comparing this with Irving's adaptation of practically the same date, it is seen that the American adaptor has taken greater liberties with the text. Irving's changes consisted in omitting certain scenes, for the most part epic in character, in shortening such parts as those of Queen Margaret and Queen Elizabeth, and in eliminating Richmond's part in the ghost scene, as in the Cibber version. None of the characters are omitted except the very unimportant ones of Clarence's chil-

[76] *Shakespeare's Tragedy of King Richard III, As Presented by Edwin Booth.* Edited by William Winter. New York, 1878.

dren. Booth, on the other hand, has cut out thirteen of the thirty-seven characters, among these the princes, the latter a most radical change both from Shakespeare and from the version to which the public was most accustomed; he has made a materially different division of acts and scenes to bring into prominence the episodes connected with Clarence and Hastings, scenes which in former restorations had proved the most successful ones; he has preserved almost in its entirety the archaic figure of Queen Margaret, and the appearance of the ghosts both to Richard and Richmond.[77] While both have cut down the play to nearly half its length, Booth omits the greater number of lines,[78] and takes more liberty in shifting and rearranging. Booth's adaptation was successful, but as in the case of Irving's, was not generally adopted.[79] It seems to be only a master interpretation such as Irving or Booth gave, that has been able to make the poetry of Shakespeare preferred on the stage to the theatrical possibilities of the Cibber version.

The staging of this play marked a distinct advance, but rather in permanent theatrical appliances than in any unusual gorgeousness of setting such as had characterized the " restoration " at Niblo's Garden. According to a writer of 1870, who describes Booth's Theatre, this was the first house in America to use the modern arrangement of side wings placed obliquely to the spectator.[80] This gives the illusion of distance and great spaciousness, as the older employment of flat wings could not, necessary for the best effects in such a play as " Richard the

[77] Such an arrangement, a simple matter on the Elizabethan stage, as we have seen, here brings into requisition the most elaborate contrivances of scenery and lighting. The stage directions read: " After a few vivid flashes of light the scene becomes illuminated and shows the ghosts and the distant tents of Richmond."

[78] Irving omits 1435 lines, Booth 1558.

[79] Booth himself seems to have felt little satisfaction in his success, according to the report which Professor Brander Matthews, of Columbia University, gives of a conversation with him. He told Professor Matthews that he had made a mistake in taking up Shakespeare in preference to Cibber as the latter was a better acting play.

[80] *Booth's Theatre; Behind the Scenes. Appleton's Journal,* 1870.

Third." In costuming, properties, and setting, Booth's Theatre stood for perfection, and was the direct forerunner of the best equipped New York theatres of to-day. With the performance of this version during Booth's life-time we close the history of the play in America.

Little need be said of Booth's contemporaries in this part. His brother, Wilkes Booth, of lamentable fame, played Richard with all the ferocity and verve of his father.[81] A description of his performance shows perhaps the most extreme development of the older conception among the younger actors. It is given by T. A. Brown, in his "History of the New York Stage," thus:

"As Richard he was different from all other tragedians. He imitated no one, but struck out into a path of his own, introducing points which older actors would not dare to attempt. In the last act he was truly original, particularly where the battle commences. With most tragedians it is the custom to rush on the stage, while the fight is going on, looking as if dressed for court. Wilkes Booth made a terrible feature of this part of the performance. He would dart across the stage as if he 'meant business'; then again he would appear 'seeking for Richmond in the throat of death.' His face was covered with blood from wounds supposed to have been received in slaying those five other Richmonds he refers to; his beaver was lost in the fray, his hair flying helter skelter, his clothes all torn, and he panted and fumed like a prize fighter. In this character he was more terribly real than any other actor I ever saw."[82]

The Wallacks, Lawrence Barrett, John McCullough, J. W. Keene, all rose to respectable eminence in the part, but nothing of note marks their performances. The Cibber text was used by these actors, and the traditional lines in interpretation seem to have been followed. Not until Richard Mansfield appeared, did we have a fresh conception, or a new version, this time a compromise between Shakespeare and Cibber.[83]

The history of "Richard the Third" in America, aside from the excesses and incongruities which have at times marked its

[81] A story similar to that told of Count Joannes and the elder Booth, is recounted of Wilkes Booth when he was acting Richard with Tilton, and became so infuriated that he drove him over the footlights.

[82] Vol. I, page 510.

[83] This is described in Mr. Winter's *Shadows of the Stage,* in the chapter on *Richard Mansfield as Richard the Third.*

production, is not without a sober interest. The frequency of its telling situations, the patent quality of its emotions, the possibility of adequate representation with small means, which adapted it to the crudest conditions and made it a favorite with strolling companies in England, assured its success in the barn-like theatres and with the provincial audiences of early America. So we find it first among tragic representations here, and later, as in England, holding a prominent place throughout the history of our stage. It is significant that, with the appearance of great American actors, we have distinct innovations; Forrest introduced an individual conception counter to that holding the stage at the time but later realized by a great actor; Booth an adaptation and successful restoration of the Shakespearian text. In staging and general conception of the part, America has throughout reflected the conditions in England, as it has constantly induced the actors from that country to perform here. But, on the other hand, America has sent Forrest and Booth to England, and both were welcomed as of the great ones. The present situation in America is as it is in England in regard to this play; the struggle for the "Richard the Third" of Shakespeare is still "on," and until others as great as Booth appear to confirm his work, it seems likely to continue.

VII

Conclusion

At the end of the long history of this play, a few words should be said in conclusion. We have noted the character of Shakespeare's "Richard the Third" as showing within it the marks of the three great influences of the early Elizabethan period, the chronicle, the tragedy of Marlowe, and the revenge play of Kyd; we have found in its presentation traces of the popular drama as well as the use of the typical devices of the Elizabethan stage, although it seems to have been markedly free from such elaborate effects as are suggested by the directions in many of the plays of the period; we have seen that during the Restoration another play on the subject, showing all the characteristics of the heroic tragedy and the changed conditions of staging, took its place, and influenced the later appearance of Shakespeare's play. With the version of "Richard the Third" by Colley Cibber, we find it entering upon its modern era, and see in its revision an effort to replace the archaic elements of the original by the correspondingly popular devices of the eighteenth century stage. We have shown that for one hundred and fifty years this play held the stage undisputed, long after the other dramas of Shakespeare had been finally "restored," and that the last thirty years of its history have been marked by a struggle between the original and the revision, a struggle which is not yet at an end.

But what is most striking in the history of this play is the evidence which it gives of the perennial interest in the villain-type. Shakespeare's "Richard the Third" was preceded by a line of villain plays, which helped to fix the character, and to connect with it certain attributes which it has always retained. In "Cambyses," as well as in "Richardus Tertius" and "The True Tragedy," we find evidences of a growing conception of the villain, which affected the later productions.

With the appearance of Marlowe's Machiavelian heroes, and of Kyd's vengeful types, new elements were added. That Richard was an historical personage had little effect upon the development of this hero, for he had already been converted into a saga figure, and it was to this that Shakespeare turned. The conception of Richard, while generally permanent, has suffered some change as it has been interpreted to the public since the Elizabethan age. We have seen that, as the ideas of proper tragic form and subject have changed, so this character has illustrated new modes of thought, and differing emotional reactions upon the central idea of the play. The Elizabethan Richard shows far more of the medieval type of the infallible, tyrannical despot, with a greater element of bombast and oratorical splutter than do the later Richards. In the late seventeenth century, we find the hero torn between love and ambition, an impossible and uninteresting conception to the earlier audience, who wished its villains of purer dye. Again, in the eighteenth century, Richard becomes a quieter character, and although still oratorical, is less bombastic in the hands of the better actors, the older interpretation persisting, however, with the second-rate performers. There is here no less brutality, nor is there less action, but it is all of a more sardonic cast. The nineteenth century we have seen developing the subtler side of Richard's villainy, dwelling upon motives, recalling his kingly characteristics, and producing a hero of decidedly more thoughtful nature. But through all these changes, and indeed because of its adaptability to them, the play, ever since the days when Queen Elizabeth " was pleased at seeing Henry VII in a favorable light," has been unflaggingly attractive, and the character of Richard has ever elicited unfailing interest. It is true indeed, that Richard the Third has not been the favorite rôle of any great actor since the time of J. B. Booth, but that it is not performed so frequently as in the days of Garrick and Kean, is to be explained by the same conditions which cause the other plays of Shakespeare to appear only occasionally on the stage today.

This interest of the audience in the villain play, in the presentation of the unavoidable balking by fate of man's assump-

tion of unlimited power, in the tremendous dramatic irony of the situations, was reinforced from the beginning by the favor of the actors for a play that gave an unprecedented opportunity for the " star." The part has always been considered of extreme difficulty, making enormous demands upon the actor, greater than those of Hamlet, Iago, or Lear, but at the same time, from the " variegated character " of Richard, offering great possibilities. Its concentration of interest upon the hero, while lessening the advantage of dramatic contrast, has nevertheless made it a favorite play with actors in all ages. While it has lent itself thus, to one of the worst abuses of acting in the over-emphasis of the chief character, it has at the same time been the touchstone for breadth, subtlety of conception of character, and ingenuity in " business," from Burbage to Irving. It has, therefore, been a prominent rôle with every well-known actor except Betterton (and he performed the part of Richard in " The English Princess "), from the time of its original appearance to the present day.

Perhaps for that reason the history of this play shows plainly the succession of schools of acting. From time to time, an actor has been hailed as giving a *new* interpretation of the part, or as showing a more *natural* method. So the older has been repeatedly outgrown, as it hardened into convention or departed from the fresher perception. Burbage was of a new school; later Garrick reformed the older method as it had been preserved in Betterton; Kean reacted against the formality of Kemble; and he was in turn regarded as artificial by Irving and Booth. We find a repetition of the same problem from generation to generation. Nor has the ultimate, natural conception been reached by an Irving or a Booth, according to present critics, for the language used in a recent review of the acting of Mr. William Mollison of London sounds much like that of reviewers in the heyday of the older " stars." The writer says of his performance of Richard, " not only is it entirely new alike in fact and spirit, but it does an enormous deal toward making that sinister personage a really feasible, appealing character for a modern audience." He describes the actor's idea of Richard as " a preferably

understandable man of action, a truculent, brisk, hustling, aggressive fellow, hard as nails, of enormous vigor and personality, and a grim, rough humor." He speaks of the wooing of Anne and the parleying with Margaret as displaying a Richard "delightfully humorous, gay, insolent, aggressive, full of the right 'alacrity of spirit and cheer of mind.'" And as has been said of great actors before him, we find that "the way Mr. Mollison thundered out the 'White-livered runagate, what doth he there?' made the whole audience hold its breath."

That "Richard the Third" has persisted upon the stage in spite of all the changes in theatrical taste, and through revision into what many have considered a degraded form, is an evidence of its dramatic excellence, which under all conditions seems to have been unimpaired. The figure of a great, masterful character, untroubled by scruple, unappalled by conscience, of supreme intellectual force, working out his ends, regarding his fellow-creatures as mere puppets of his will, and at last, overtaken by the consequences of his crimes, dying valiantly and desperately, has persisted in Cibber's version and in the revisions of the Cibber text, as it was in Shakespeare. It is to this large conception that audiences and actors have constantly turned. It is a play of startling effects, of patent development of character, of inevitable situations. While it is still marked by the peculiarities of its Elizabethan origin in the figure of Margaret, in the very presence of the Marlowean type of hero, in the staging, yet the appeal through the universal note of the motives, and the reality of the language, especially in the speeches of Richard, have assured its everlasting popularity.

As we have seen, "Richard the Third" contains archaic elements which are not found in any other play which has survived on the stage, and which have been an effectual bar to its "restoration." Thus, it has been possible to "restore" the Shakespearian form of "Macbeth" or "King Lear" without the violence to modern stage conventions that would have been felt in the case of the original form of "Richard the Third." On the other hand, since it has been found capable of adaptation to modern methods, it is the only chronicle play (using

the term in its narrower significance), that holds the stage today. Besides, "Richard the Third," although it re-appeared during the vogue of classical canons in tragedy, escaped with little mutilation, and was never made into a "regular" play. Nor was it violated by such inappropriate transformations as disfigured some of the other Shakespearian plays; as "Macbeth" for instance, by the introduction of music and dancing and sirens in the place of the witches; or "The Tempest" when converted into opera; nor did it undergo the conversion of tragedy into comedy, as in the case of Tate's "Lear," and Howard's "Romeo and Juliet," or suffer the introduction of a distinctly romantic element, as in Crowne's "Henry the Sixth." The greatest violence to structure consists in its fusion with a part of "Henry the Sixth," but this was done by no means after the extreme fashion of D'Avenant's "Law against Lovers," in which "Measure for Measure" and "Much Ado" are forced to come into line. Indeed, it is generally conceded that Colley Cibber, while ruthlessly destroying the poetry of the play, did make it "fitter for the stage," as he set out to do, by concentrating, modernizing, and shortening.

The career of this play, as we have seen, has been a most romantic one. Presented at first by the best company of London, and possibly at Court, it became the favorite of strolling comedians, inaugurated the Shakespearian drama in America in primitive colonial structures, was played for Cherokee Indians, before the Hawaiian king, in German-American theatres, under the guise of "moral lectures," as travesty, burlesque, circus attraction, by children's and by women's companies. It has been depended upon for benefits, has always been a favorite as a first performance; it has figured in some of the greatest theatrical triumphs, and some of the most interesting events of stage history have centered about it. It has been the object of ambition for every aspirant to histrionic fame, and has probably launched a greater number of actors upon their careers than any other play.

Looked at from a larger point of view, this play is of interest, not only from the side of popular taste, but from the side of general social devolopment. Its humor bespeaks an age of

cruder sensibilities, as is seen in the evident delight in deformity in the original presentation. The ignoring or softening of Richard's ugliness in later interpretations has a far-reaching significance. The appreciation, also, of the complexity of this character in the latest portrayals shows an advance in the conception of the nature of evil, when compared with the unshaded villainy of the earlier Richards.

It was pointed out by Schlegel long ago and has been often repeated, that the dramas of Shakespeare take the place of a national epic in English literature. In such an epic Richard the Third gathers about him the racial conception of what is consummately evil. And so the conception of Richard has become engrafted within the ideals of our dramatic literature in a peculiar manner, as a persistent habit of thought, to which we are constantly attracted by its long line of associations or by the tradition of its perennial appeal. And, as about the character and the play certain ideals of the villain and of the tragic have clustered from the earliest days of English drama, it still today retains a real significance and lends itself constantly to newer and wider application and adaptation.

VIII

Bibliography

Anonymous. Elizabethan Stage Theories. Littell's Living Age, Vol. 247 (1905).

The Dramatic Censor; or Critical Companion. 2 vols. London, 1770. Essay on Richard the Third, as Altered from Shakespeare by Cibber.

The Laureate; or the right side of C. C.; containing explanations, amendments, observations, on a book, entitled: "An Apology for the life . . .," etc. London, 1740.

The Life and Times of that Excellent and Renowned Actor, Thomas Betterton, etc. London, 1888.

Albright, Victor E. A Typical Shaksperian Stage: The Outer-Inner Stage. New York, 1908.

American Historical Record, March, 1872.

Appleton's Journal, 1870. Booth's Theatre; Behind the Scenes.

Archer, William. William Charles Macready. London, 1890.

The Elizabethan Stage. Quarterly Review, April, 1908.

Aston, Anthony. A Brief Supplement to Colley Cibber, Esq.; his Lives of the late famous Actors and Actresses. Reprinted in Lowe's edition of Cibber's Apology.

Baker, D. E., Reed, I., and Jones, S. Biographia Dramatica. A Companion to the Playhouse, etc. 3 vols. London, 1812.

Baker, G. P. The Development of Shakespeare as a Dramatist. New York, 1907.

Baker, H. Barton. History of the London Stage and its Famous Players. London, 1904.

Our Old Actors. 2 vols. London, 1878.

Bankside Shakespeare. Edited by Appleton Morgan. The Shakespeare Society of New York, 1888–.

Bernard, Bayle. Early Days of the American Stage. Tallis' Dramatic Magazine, 1850.

Bernard, John. Retrospections of America, 1797–1811. New York, 1887.

Boaden, James. Memoirs of the Life of John Philip Kemble, Esq. Including a History of the Stage, from the time of Garrick to the present period. London, 1825.

Booth, Edwin. Richard the Third. The Prompt Book. Edited by William Winter. New York, 1878.

Brandl, A. Introduction to Schlegel-Tieck Shakespeare.

Brodmeier, C. Die Shakespeare-Bühne nach den alten Bühnenanweisungen. Weimar, 1904.

Brown, T. A. A History of the New York Stage, from the First Performances in 1732 to 1901. 3 vols. New York, 1903.

Cambridge Shakespeare. Edited by Clark and Wright. Third ed., 1891.

Chase, L. N. The English Heroic Play. New York, 1903.

Churchill, G. B. Richard the Third up to Shakespeare. Berlin, 1900.

Cibber, Colley. An Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber by Himself. Edited by R. W. Lowe. London, 1889. 2 vols.

The Dramatic Works. 4 vols. London, 1760.

Clarke, Asia Booth. The Elder and Younger Booth. Boston, 1882.

Cole, J. W. The Life and Theatrical Times of Charles Kean, F.S.A. 2 vols. London, 1859.

Collier, J. P. The History of English Dramatic Poetry. Three parts. London, 1831.

Corbin, J. Shakespeare and the Plastic Stage. Atlantic Monthly, March, 1906.

The Elizabethan Hamlet. New York, 1895.

Coryat, Thomas. Coryat's Crudities. 3 vols. London, 1776.

Courthope, W. J. A History of English Poetry. 4 vols. New York, 1895.

Cunliffe, J. W. The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy. Manchester, 1893.

Davies, Thos. Dramatic Miscellanies. 3 vols. London, 1785.

Delius, N. Über das Englische Theatrewesen zu Shakspere's Zeit. Bonn, 1853.

Dohse, R. Colley Cibber's Bühnenbearbeitung von Shakespeare's Richard III. Bönner Beiträge zur Anglistik, Vol. II. 1899.

Doran. "Their Majesties Servants." 2 vols. New York, 1880.

Downes, J. Roscius Anglicanus, or an Historical Review of the Stage from 1660 to 1706. A Fac-simile Reprint of the Rare Original of 1708. With an Historical Preface by Joseph Knight. London, 1886.

Dunlap, William. A History of the American Theatre. New York, 1832.

Edwin Forrest Edition of Shakespearian Plays. No. 5. Richard III. Correctly marked . . . from his own prompt-book, and as acted by him at Niblo's Garden. New York. No date.

Eversley Shakespeare. Edited by C. H. Herford. 10 vols. 1902.

Fennell, J. Apology for His Life. Philadelphia, 1814.

Fleay, F. G. A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama, 1559–1642. London, 1891. 2 vols.

A Chronicle History of the London Stage, 1559–1642. 1890.

Life of Shakespeare. 1886.

Fitzgerald, P. A New History of the English Stage from the Restoration to the Liberty of the Theatres, in Connection with the Patent Houses. 2 vols. London, 1882.

The Life of Garrick. 2 vols. London, 1868.

The Kembles. 2 vols. London, 1871.

Frost, T. Circus Life and Circus Celebrities. London, 1875. The Old Showmen and the Old London Fairs. London, 1874.

Furness, Horace Howard, Jr. A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. The Tragedy of Richard the Third. Philadelphia, 1908.

Genee, R. von. Uber die schenischen Formen Shakespeare's in ihrem Verhältniss zur Bühne seiner Zeit. Shak. Jahrbuch, Vol. 26.

Genest, J. Some Account of the English Stage from 1660 to 1830. 10 vols. Bath, 1832.

Gildersleeve, V. C. Governmental Regulation of the Shakespearean Drama. New York, 1908.

Gildon, C. The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton, the late eminent Tragedian. London, 1710.

Gould, T. R. The Tragedian; An Essay on the Histrionic Genius of Booth. New York, 1868.

Greg, W. W. Henslowe's Diary. London, 1904. Part I. Text.

Griggs, W. Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles. Richard the Third.

Hale, E. E., Jr. The Influence of the Theatrical Conditions on Shakespeare. Modern Philology, Vol. I (1903).

Halliwell-Phillipps, J. O. Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare. 6th ed., 1886.

Haslewood, J. The Secret History of the Green Room, etc. 2 vols. London, 1793.

Hazlitt, Wm. Characters of Shakespeare's Plays. Lectures on the Dramatic Literature of the Age of Elizabeth. London, 1848.

Henry Irving Shakespeare. Edited by Henry Irving and F. A. Marshall. 8 vols. New York, 1888–90.

Hentzner, P. A Journey into England, in the Year MDXCVIII. Edited by Horace Walpole. 1757.

Heywood, Thos. An Apology for Actors. Reprinted from the edition of 1612 for the Shakespeare Society. London, 1841.

Hodgkinson, J. A Narrative of his Connection with the Old American Company. From the Fifth of September, 1792, to the Thirty-First of March, 1797. New York, 1797.

Hubbard, F. G. Repetition and Parallelism in Earlier Elizabethan Drama. Modern Lang. Asso. Pub. 1905.

Hunt, Leigh. The Examiner.

Hutton, R. Curiosities of the American Stage. New York, 1891.

Inchbald, E. The British Theatre. Richard the Third, Vol. 17. London, 1806–9.

Ireland, J. N. Records of the New York Stage from 1750 to 1860. 2 vols. New York, 1866.

Irving, H. B. The English Stage in the Eighteenth Century. Fortnightly Review, Vols. 85 and 86 (1906).

Kilian, E. Die scenischen Formen Shakespeare's in ihrem Verhältniss zur Bühne seiner Zeit. Jahrbuch, Vol. 28.

Shakespeare auf der Modernen Bühne. Shak. Jahrbuch, Vol. 36.

Knight, J. Life of Garrick. London, 1894.

Lamb, C. On the Tragedies of Shakespeare. London, 1855.

Lawrence, W. J. A Forgotten Stage Conventionality. Anglia, Vol. 26 (1903).

Pioneers of Modern English Stage Mounting. Magazine of Art, Vol. 18.

Stage Scenery in the Eighteenth Century. Magazine of Art, Vol. 18.

Some Characteristics of the Elizabethan Stuart Stage. Englische Studien, Vol. 32 (1902).

Music in the Elizabethan Theatre. Shakespeare Jahrbuch, Vol. 44 (1908).

Lacy. Acting Edition of Plays. Vol. 13, Richard III.

Lee, Sidney. The Life of Shakespeare. 1898.

Lewes, G. H. On Actors and the Art of Acting. New York, 1880.

Lowe, R. Thomas Betterton. New York, 1891.

Lounsbury, T. R. Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist. New York, 1902.

Lowell, J. R. Shakespeare's Richard the Third. In Latest Literary Essays and Addresses. 1892.

Macready, W. C. Reminiscences. Edited by Sir Frederick Pollock. New York, 1875.

Malone, E. Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the English Stage. Vol. III of Edition of Shakespeare's Works. 1790.

Manningham, J. Diary. Edited by J. Bruce. Camden Society Pub., Vol. 99.

Mantzius, K. The History of Theatric Art. 3 vols. 1904.

Meyer, E. Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama. Literarhistorische Forschungen, Vol. I.

Molloy, J. F. The Life and Adventures of Edmund Kean, Tragedian. London, 1888.

Moorman, F. W. The Pre-Shakespearian Ghost. Shakespeare's Ghosts. Modern Lang. Review, 1906.

Murphy, A. The Life of David Garrick, Esq. Dublin, 1801.

Ochelhäuser, W. Über Richard III. Shak. Jahrbuch, Vol. III (1868).

Ordish, T. F. Early London Theatres. London, 1894.

Oxberry, W. New English Drama. London, 1818. Vol. III, Richard III.

Pepys, S. Diary. Edited by H. B. Wheatley. London, 1896.

Phelps, W. M., and Forbes-Robertson, J. The Life and Life-Work of Samuel Phelps. London, 1886.

Racinet, A. Le Costume Historique. Paris, 1873.

Rees, J. (Colley Cibber). The Life of Edwin Forrest. Philadelphia, 1874.

Regel, M. Über Englisches Theatrewesen zu Shakespeare's Zeit. Prague, 1895.

Reynolds, G. F. Some Principles of Elizabethan Staging. Modern Philology, 1905.

Schelling, F. E. The English Chronicle Play. New York, 1902.

Seilhamer, G. O. A History of the American Theatre. 3 vols. Philadelphia, 1891.

Spedding, J. On the Corrected Edition of Richard III. New Shakespeare Society Transactions, 1875.

Stoll, E. E. John Webster. Cambridge, 1905.

Tallis' Dramatic Magazine and General Theatrical and Musical Review. New York and London, 1850.

Thorndike, A. H. The Relations of Hamlet to Contemporary Revenge Plays. Pub. Modern Lang. Asso., 1902.

Introduction to Belle Lettre Series Edition of Beaumont and Fletcher's The Maid's Tragedy and Philaster. 1906.

Tragedy. 1908.

Trench, W. F. A Mirror for Magistrates, its origin and influence. Edinburgh, 1898.

Tupper, J. W. The Relation of the Heroic Play to the Romances of Beaumont and Fletcher. Pub. Modern Lang. Asso., 1905.

Vincke, G. F. von. Shakespeare auf der Englischen Bühne seit Garrick. Gesämmelte Aufsätze zur Bühnengeschichte, No. 6.

Wright, J. Historia Histrionica. Reprint in Lowe's edition of Cibber's Apology, of the edition of 1699.

Ward, A. W. A History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queen Anne. 3 vols. 1899.

Wemyss, F. C. Twenty-Six Years of the Life of an Actor and Manager. 2 vols. New York, 1847.

Winter, William. Shadows of the Stage. New York, 1892.

The Life and Art of Edwin Booth. New York, 1893.

INDEX.

The index includes the names of plays, playwrights, actors, theatres and companies.