

DECEIVED FROM WITHIN: MONSTROSITY
AND VILLAINY IN WILLIAM
SHAKESPEARE'S
RICHARD III

By

KIRSTIN MARIE BONE

TRICIA MCELROY, COMMITTEE CHAIR
FREDERICK WHITING
STEVEN D. BURCH

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in
the Department of English in
the Graduate School of
the University of
Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2013

Copyright Kirstin Marie Bone 2013
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

William Shakespeare's Richard III has been the victim of a gross crime: For four hundred years, he has been condemned as a dastardly villain. Scholars and performers alike have declared that Richard is obviously evil, but little do they realize that they have been deceived. Richard's villainy is not as apparent as it would seem, but instead is a construction that comes from within the play itself. Ultimately, this construction is Shakespeare's, and, like a magnifying glass, it is meant to direct our attention to the fallacy of conflating deformity and villainy. We are not meant to believe the relationship presented in the text; instead, we are meant to question it. By critically examining how Richard's identity shifts from a valorous war hero in the *Henry VI* plays to the destructive Machiavel of *Richard III*, a more nuanced and dynamic representation of Renaissance monstrosity emerges. Shakespeare's text functions as an exploratory space that challenges his audience to consider the nature of internal discourse and the role of deformity in shaping a man's nature. In doing so, it can be shown that deformity did not equate to evil; instead, the only true course to villainy was through a person's actions.

DEDICATION

For my parents, Mathew and Paula Bone: Because of you I was bold, brave, beautiful, and a Bone. Thank you for believing in me, even when I did not believe in myself.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Just as no man is an island, no thesis can truly be created in isolation. For that reason, I would like to express my gratitude to Tricia McElroy, my thesis committee chair, for her fearless leadership and unfailing support throughout this difficult process. I would also like to express gratitude to Steve Burch and Fred Whiting, my committee members, for the time, support, and insight they offered. I could not have asked for a better group of people to work with on this project. Thank you, also, to the University of Alabama English Department and the Hudson Strode Program in Renaissance Studies for allowing me this opportunity. Thank you especially to Alexandra Cook, David Ainsworth, Edmond Williams, Karen Gardiner, Claudia Romanelli, and Cassie Smith for their excellent instruction during my time in Alabama.

I am also deeply grateful for William Shakespeare and King Richard III—two men without whom this thesis simply would not be possible. William, thank you for writing such a magnificent play. Richard showed special kindness in allowing his body to be found this year, which was one of the greatest gifts my research has ever received. Thank you, Richard, for making my winter into a glorious summer of discovery and learning. On a similar note, thank you to the theatre companies who have been brave enough to produce *Richard III*, especially those I have cited within my thesis.

My endless thanks go most especially to my parents for their emotional support and love: Through sickness and in health they have been my champions. I would also like to thank Kinsey Christensen, Anna Westfall, Shaelyn Smith, and Philip Valdes for their time, assistance, and support during the revision process. Finally, thank you to my students for putting up with me.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER TWO: A MONSTROUS CHANGE.....	18
CHAPTER THREE: CONCLUSION	44
REFERENCES	46
APPENDIX.....	49

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In 1485 the body of a warrior was tossed into a shallow grave at the Greyfriars Priory near modern-day Leicester. No mourning or reverence accompanied the burial—only celebration. He was laid into the ground naked and anonymous. This warrior was a king who had lost his crown and his life. His burial site became obscured after Henry VIII's dissolution of the monasteries, nunneries, and priories in 1536 and 1539. Without the landmark of the monastery, the location of the grave became known only to those who remembered where the old building had been, and finally was lost all together for five hundred years.

Many had sought the body of this lost king—for his body was a crucial piece of evidence—hoping to find proof for their theories concerning his life and death. Finally, in 2012, the Richard III Society—an organization dedicated to revising the history of the lost king—made a more vigorous attempt to find the missing grave. Phillipa Langley, head of the Looking for Richard Project, claims that it was a hunch that led her to the body:

The first time I stood in that car park, the strangest feeling just washed over me. I thought: “I am standing on Richard's grave.” I came back again about a year later, thinking my earlier reaction was just nonsense, and the feeling was stronger than ever—only this time somebody had painted an R on a parking space. ... They dug in that spot and the leg bones were first revealed. (Kennedy)

The discovery of the long lost king was hushed and uncertain. For five months a team of geneticists worked to confirm the identity of the man – hoping it would be Richard III. On February 4, 2012, the news at last broke that Richard III had been found, and, what was more,

the curvature of the skeleton's spine and DNA testing confirmed that Richard III had suffered from scoliosis. Langley and the Richard III Society triumphantly announced that this discovery would enable them to "Begin to tell the true story of who he was" (Burns, Cowell, and Wade 2).

The "real" Richard was born in 1452 to Richard Plantagenet and Cecily Neville. Richard's life was dominated by the War of the Roses, a conflict that pitted his family, the House of York, against their cousins, the House of Lancaster. As a child, Richard was named Commissioner of Array for the Western Counties and went on to have an independent command (Kendall 34-40). His older brother, Edward, became king in 1461, and at that time Richard was named the Duke of Gloucester. In 1483, Edward died and his son, Edward V, took the throne. The new king was only twelve-years-old, and Richard was named Lord Protector because of his valorous service during the War of the Roses. Within a year, the young king and his brother were declared illegitimate by an act of Parliament, known as *Titulus Regius*, and Richard ascended to the throne. After Richard's coronation, Edward V and his brother disappeared. Common belief held that Richard had the princes murdered. This situation inspired a rebellion, led by Henry Stafford, the Duke of Buckingham, and Henry Tudor. The conspiracy ruptured into civil war, and on August 22, 1485 Richard went to silence his enemies forever at the Battle of Bosworth Field. In the event, Richard was abandoned by his allies, surrounded, and slain in battle. With Richard's death, the Plantagenet dynasty ended and the Tudor reign began.

Richard's life has been heavily embroidered since his defeat at Bosworth Field. Sir Thomas More's *The History of King Richard III* (1557) paints Richard as "troublesome and tyrannical" (1). Richard's evil is presented as both physical and interior deformity: "He was little of stature, evill featured of limbes, crooke-backed, the left shoulder much higher than the right, hard favoured of visage" and "malicious, wrathfull and envious" (6-7). More even claimed that

Richard was born “feet forward” and “not untoothed,” which was a sure sign that “Nature changed her course in his beginning” (7). More's *History* is polarized: Richard is the dastardly villain and Henry Tudor, the Earl of Richmond, is the heroic savior. Writing during the reign of Henry VIII, More crafts a story supporting the Tudor claim to the throne and glorifying the king he serves. Raphael Holinshed continued these themes in *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (1587).¹ Holinshed claims that Richard's reign was full of “mischeefs thicke” since “a thing euill gotten is neuer well kept.” Richard is charged with “the lamentable murther of his innocent nephues, the yoong king and his tender brother,” even though nothing could be “openlie prooued” concerning their deaths (734). Holinshed uses circumstantial evidence—such as Richard's ascent to the throne just prior to the princes' deaths—to condemn Richard as the epitome of vice. Ultimately, Holinshed believes the “best death” during Richard's reign was “his owne” (734). In direct contrast to Richard stands Henry Tudor, who took the throne in order to “mainteine iustice and concord” with the “voice of the people” ratifying his election, because of his popular appeal (Holinshed 760). Henry is presented as a saint-like figure who restores virtue and justice to England by praying over the body of the fallen king. The portrayal of Richard as a villainous hunchback infiltrated popular culture and exaggerated history.

William Shakespeare's play, *The Tragedy of Richard III* (1592), is widely perceived as belonging to and continuing the “Tudor mythology” of More and Holinshed's accounts.

Shakespeare's Richard commits evils acts: He seduces Anne (whose husband and father-in-law he killed), he hires the murderers who kill Clarence, and he actively works to destroy the two princes. Shakespeare adapts elements from More and Holinshed's texts, but *Richard III* is more mutable than its textual predecessors. The complexity of Shakespeare's Richard stems directly

¹The authorial history of the *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* is a complex one. Holinshed was the principal author of the original text, but subsequent editions were published after his death. For more information on the textual history of this text, see The Holinshed Project website (english.ox.ac.uk/holinshed).

from its genre: Since *The Tragedy of Richard III* (*Richard III*) is a play, it is fundamentally different from More's impassioned narrative and Holinshed's historical account because of phenomenology. Richard physically manifests on the stage, via an actor, and audiences encounter that performance within a limited time and space. This interaction is powerful because the images from a performance can be assigned to a text, but rarely can an audience assign themes from the text to a performance in progress. The dramatic portrayal of Richard also unique because he is not the villain from beginning to end, but instead fluctuates through multiple identities. This early Shakespeare play presents a rudimentary framework typical to the early Renaissance, which he developed further in *Othello*, *Macbeth*, and *Julius Caesar*, depicting the villain as a dynamic portrayal of mutable identity and deceit. Macbeth and Richard, for example, are both “apparently capable warriors who glory in warfare, both burn with ambition to be king, both are willing to destroy those who stand between them and the throne or threaten their security once they achieve that lofty height, and both are ultimately consumed by the flames for which they ignited the tinder” (Hart 827). *Richard III* is a significant work, because it marks an important point in Shakespeare's artistic growth. More than that, though, it also “captivates” audiences, even though it is not as complex in language and structure as the later plays, such as *Macbeth* and *Hamlet* (Hart 824). The dynamic portrayal found in Shakespeare's *Richard III* is so powerful that it has become the primary source for common conceptions about Richard, even though it is a fictitious representation. Drama has overshadowed or even displaced history.

Langley's declaration that Richard's “true” story needs to be told harkens back to a long-standing division in Ricardian scholarship, a perpetual “winter of discontent” between two factions: traditionalists and revisionists. On one side of the field stand the traditionalists, mostly academics who are influenced by the accounts of More, Holinshed, and Shakespeare for their

work. These scholars, such as Linda Charnes and Evalee Hart, widely believe that Richard is “evil from the beginning of the play” (Hart 826). Even more importantly, for traditionalists, Richard's deformity is the outward manifestation of his inward evilness. These scholars approach *Richard III* through different critical methodologies but return to the same basic conclusion: The nature of Richard's evil is a closed case. On the other side of the debate, the Richard III Society stands as the pinnacle of the revisionist model: Their mission is to “promote, in every possible way, research into the life and times of Richard III, and to secure a reassessment of the material relating to this period, and of the role of this monarch in English history” (“About Us”). The claim of the Richard III Society, and similar organizations, is that Richard III was the victim of Tudor slander, a figure maligned by both history and popular culture. Revisionists believe that Richard's true and noble nature can be reclaimed through evidence, such as the king's body. Shakespeare's Richard, to revisionists, is evil because he is deformed, and so these groups attempt to prove that Shakespeare's representation of Richard's body was incorrect. In proving this failure, the Richard III Society believes Richard's good name will be restored. The relationship between the disabled body and Richard's character is not accessible through extant objects, but Langley claims that, “Scientists claim you can't see character in bones—but for me, you kind of can. ... [Richard] had an incredibly powerful, strong work ethic” (Kennedy). Richard's bones somehow transcend time, carrying messages in the marrow, in order to speak to the “real” Richard. By discovering Richard's body, the revisionists believe history will finally be freed from the Tudor myth makers, though this position requires a considerable amount of fancy footwork in order to negotiate Richard's actual deformity.

A detective novel, *The Daughter of Time* (1951) by Josephine Tey, started a trend of trying to reclaim the historical Richard through artifacts. In this book, Inspector Alan Grant,

while hospitalized, frets away his hours in “the prickle of boredom” (Tey 16). Knowing Grant considers himself to be an authority on reading features, one of his friends brings him pictures of historical figures involved in famous mysteries in order to help alleviate this boredom. One portrait in particular catches his attention:

It was the portrait of a man. A man dressed in the velvet cap and slashed doublet of the late fifteenth century. A man about thirty-five or thirty-six year old, lean and clean-shaven. He wore a rich jewelled collar, and was in the act of putting a ring on the little finger of his right hand. But he was not looking at the ring. He was looking off into space.

...

The expression in the eyes—that most individual and arresting expression—had defeated [the artist]. So had the mouth: he had not known how to make the lips so thin and so wide look mobile, so the mouth was wooden and a failure. What he had bet succeeded in was the bone structure of the face: the strong cheekbones, the hollows beneath them, the chin too large for strength.

Grant paused in the act of turning the thing over, to consider the face a moment longer. A judge? A soldier? A prince? Someone used to great responsibility and responsible in his authority. Someone too conscientious. A worrier; perhaps a perfectionist. A man at ease in a large design, but anxious over details. A candidate for gastric ulcer. Someone, too, who had suffered ill-health as a child. He had that incommunicable, that indescribable look that childhood suffering leaves behind it, less positive than the look on a cripple’s face, but as inescapable. (Tey 29-30)

Grant turns the postcard over and discovers that the man he has described in such vivid detail is Richard III—a figure supposedly synonymous with evil. Tey uses this device to suggest that Richard's historicity can be reread through an examination of extant pieces, such as the portrait of Richard. This reevaluation of character through objects began the attempts to figure out who Richard “really” was.

Though the revisionists try to reclaim Richard through objects, they abjure the validity of most written texts. Revisionists consider More’s *The History of Richard III*, Holinshed’s *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, and even Shakespeare’s *Richard III* as “gross anomalies” and “nonsense” (Weir 33). The revisionists seem particularly concerned with

Richard's deformity or, rather, his alleged lack of one: Portraits of Richard have been x-rayed in order to reveal the addition of a greater slope to the king's shoulders, his armor has been extensively studied for possible clues, and the recent discovery of Richard's body is viewed as a triumph for the revisionists. The revisionists claim that Shakespeare and More misrepresented the extent of Richard's deformity, which clearly means they must have misrepresented other facets of his life as well. Now the revisionists can supposedly prove Richard's innocence, just through his DNA. While the attempt to find the truth is valiant, it is strange that so much of their argument relies on proving that Richard was not disabled. Even Tey makes a point of claiming that Richard's features seem to convey childhood illness rather than deformity. Is it then impossible for Richard to be deformed and good or ordinarily formed and evil? For the revisionists, such would seem to be the case.

At the heart of the Ricardian dilemma, then, is the perceived relationship between disability and character. In the historical accounts and dramas, Richard III is portrayed as a deformed tyrant. This portrayal does not mean the traditionalists are right in how they read Richard; in fact, the revisionists are right to question these texts. However, both groups are making the mistake of correlating deformity with villainy. Traditionalists have been too focused on the supposedly obvious nature of Richard's evil, while the revisionists are trying to reread Shakespeare's fictional Richard in order to reflect the new information about the historical Richard. Neither approach allows Shakespeare's text to be a nuanced and complex representation of both deformity and evil—a representation we cannot recuperate via the historical Richard.

Current scholarship of Shakespeare's *Richard III* focuses on the body and its relationship to villainy. Some scholars, like Charnes, argue that deformity functions as the outward manifestation of inner evil—a physical expression of spiritual illness. Charnes claims the

hunchback represented a “special stigma” during the Renaissance that was “useful because of its obviousness as the antithesis of noble physical bearing” (25). The shape of Richard’s body, in her reading, functions as a blatant signifier for moral and social deviance. She goes on to describe Richard as a “stock villain” whose complexity as a character is “produced *only in relation* to the reified conventions that also and simultaneously hypostatize him as 'historical Vice” (29). Charnes reads Richard’s body as a social *deus ex machina*—she believes his deformity would force the audience and the other characters in the play to read Richard as a morally corrupt character and symbol of impending strife. Like a god appearing on stage to rectify a complicated snarl in a plot, Richard's deformity signals social cues that would alleviate any responsibility for the audience to negotiate the transformation Richard undertakes. By interpreting Richard's deformity as the manifestation of historical and literary tradition, Charnes is then able to explicate how Richard intends to use kingship to eradicate his stigma: “In seeking the crown, Richard seeks no less than a new body: the body implied by 'the King's body” (Charnes 32). By becoming king, Charnes' Richard would trade his disfigured body for a more perfected self. Richard “reads' the signs of his own body” as undesirable and hopes to gain “control over the social construction, perception, and manipulation of bodily signifiers” (Charnes 32). The transformation would then be focused on reforming constructions of identity but without altering perceptions of monstrosity.

Charnes’ argument relies on deconstructing what Richard's deformity would have meant to the Renaissance audience but also jumps to reading sources from Richard's lifetime, such as *Monsters and Marvels* by Ambroise Paré, a famous surgeon during the fifteenth century. In this text, Paré wrote prodigiously on the status of monsters as emblems of “God’s wrath or glory” (3). Charnes discusses Paré’s text as a manifestation of “overemployment” in response to

“*traumatic* events”—the appearance of a monster functioned as a simple way to alleviate the anxieties surrounding a sociopolitical trauma (26). She reads Richard’s deformity as a way to quantify and eliminate anxieties surrounding the War of the Roses, just as monsters manifested in early modern Europe during times of political or social strife. Were this true, Richard’s deformity would not condemn him to evil but instead represent the evil of his society. But, for Charnes, monstrosity is little more than the ultimate plot device: An author or surgeon could explain the corruption of a person by giving him or her a deformity. The outward deformity immediately signifies internalized distortion, removing all complexity from the character. While this reading begins to grapple with the complexities of monstrosity, Charnes seems unwilling to allow this issue to function on multiple levels. For Charnes, monsters are always relegated to being unchangeably villainous.

Majorie Garber interprets Richard as “deformity’s theorist and manipulator, not only ‘descanting’ upon it, but projecting and displacing its characters onto others” (39). Garber’s Richard transfers his deformity onto others, such as England or young York, and presents himself as the cure for this condition. The process of displacing deformity is, to Garber, a move that can be traced directly to Shakespeare, who deformed history through his play. Shakespeare enacted this deforming by overwriting the historical Richard with his deformed signifier Richard. Richard’s body not only functions as a readable text, but also as an encoding of history’s need to be “deforming and *un*forming—with the object of *re*forming—the past” (36). Deformity becomes the symptomatic framework through which the major historical trauma, the War of the Roses, can be understood and resolved within the play. History is literally malformed as it manifests in Richard’s distorted body, and Shakespeare is presented as either “an unwitting dupe of More, Hall, and Holinshed, or as a co-conspirator, complicit in their design” to present

Richard as “unworthy of the throne, as unhandsome in person as in personality” (30). The fictional Richard overshadows the historical as deformity: “A self-augmenting textual effect,” has contaminated “the telling of Richard's story as well as Richard's story itself” (Garber 40). She specifically examines the way in which “history is indeed shown by the play to be a story that is deformed from the outset, by its very nature”—using the complicated history surrounding Richard (both as a historical and fictional character) in order to explore Shakespeare's authorship of metahistory (37). Garber portrays Richard as a master puppeteer who rewrites and deforms his world in order to achieve a different identity—an identity that is never fully achieved. Richard, in this reading, however, is nothing more than Shakespeare's tool in reforming actual history. By positioning Shakespeare as deliberately trying to alter history, Garber seems to align him with the Tudor mythmakers, which seems unfair. Shakespeare frequently pushed against the standing histories, using his own interpretations of events to critique his society, in plays like *Macbeth* and *King Lear*. *Richard III* seems to be part of the Shakespearean tradition, since it asks the reader to reconsider Richard. But both Garber and Charnes dismiss Richard's deformity as a manifestation of evil. These scholars both acknowledge his struggle for a new identity but do not view him as achieving actual transformation

More recent scholarship on Shakespeare's *Richard III* has focused on using alternate lenses, such as gender and nature, in order to justify both Richard's villainy and deformity. Ian Frederick Moulton, a gender theorist, posits that Richard represents “patriarchy's inability to control the masculine aggressivity it fosters”—which is to say that Richard's deformity results from the trauma of “structural incoherence” in a patriarchal system (Moulton 253). Because of the War of the Roses, normative masculine power was disrupted, which in turn allowed Richard to exceed the bounds of nature. Though Moulton claims this stance is free of the historical

constraints of Garber's argument, the necessary acknowledgment of the extant patriarchal society and the destabilizing impact of civil war seems to draw Shakespeare's Richard back into the historical framework. Reading the war in terms of gender is fruitful when trying to understand the family relationships present in both the *Henry VI* plays and *Richard III*, but its place in understanding Richard's deformity seems less productive. Greta Olson's claim that Richard's deformity can best be approached through examining the "trace associations of the criminal with the animal into the past," on the other hand, seems to be more useful (302). Olson uses the correlation between "non-human qualities" and "inhuman crimes" to explore the way in which Richard's deformity is perceived by the other characters in the play. She relies heavily on the descriptive language of characters such as Queen Margaret and Anne in order to examine the animalistic tropes, gesturing to the bestiaries of the early modern period. Her approach seeks to ground itself simultaneously in both Shakespeare's and Richard's historical periods in order to validate her approach. Though her discussion of the text is insightful, it suffers from the persistent issue dominating Ricardian scholarship: Namely, scholars conflate Richard's deformity with his villainous actions. In doing so, many of the nuances present in both *Richard III* and *3 Henry VI* are glossed over, which in turn neglects other, more dynamic interpretations.

Of the scholars who have addressed Richard's deformity, only a handful have allowed the hunchback and withered arm to function as anything other than an immediate emblem of internalized evil. Michael Torrey, in his article "'The plain devil and dissembling looks': Ambivalent Physiognomy and Shakespeare's *Richard III*," explores Richard's deformity in relation to "physiognomical theory," which examines how the "body discloses his inner nature" (125). Torrey labels Richard as a "*deformed deceiver*" who "reproduces the surprising ambivalence of physiognomical discourse" (126). The distorted form of Richard's disabled body

does not immediately signify that Richard's soul is equally malformed. Torrey's Richard successfully deceives the other characters within the play, through the ambiguity of his deformity. The audience, on the other hand, is not deceived by Richard's deformity and can perceive his villainy. This approach allows Richard a new level of mobility, since he is able to at least deceive within the play, but still ultimately condemns him to being demonstrably evil by virtue of his form.

Both traditionalists and revisionists make a key mistake: They ignore the complex Renaissance view of monstrosity. Charnes gestures briefly to this issue when she references Paré, whose work on monstrosity acts as the first birth defect manual. Her treatment of his work, though, is dismissive. She claims his work is overwrought and demonstrates "his own failure" in offering a true understanding of disabilities (Charnes 24-6, 173). Many scholars, including Ricardians, treat monstrosity as a "phenomenon at the best trivial and at the worst tasteless" (Daston and Parks 22). Monstrosity is seemingly too transparent, too obvious a signifier to bother examining. Yet both monstrosity and deformity function as important critical tools in examining "earlier conceptions of nature" and "the changing relationship between popular and learned culture" during the early modern period (Daston and Parks 22). As a natural construct, deformity functioned as a way to read the normative. The natural body could be placed in conversation with the deformed body, which would give an "eminent value to specific repetition, to morphological regularity, to successful structure" (Canguilhem and Jaeger 29). Deformity and monstrosity could thus function as a natural aberration—a scientific creation. At the same time, though, disabilities could be simultaneously read through a religious lens.

Monster broadsides, the sixteenth-century equivalent of tabloids, presented deformity in relation to morality. These texts often featured a "banner headline, a gruesome picture, and some

sensational moralizing verse” (Cressy 32). The monster broadside functioned as an instructional tool, because it created parallels between the horror of deformity and the woes of sin. This positioning was necessary, because “contemporaries expected to find moral, religious, or political meaning in aberrations of nature” (Cressy 35). Monsters were not viewed as nightmarish figures so much as the disfigured agents of God. The monster was used to “understand the inscrutable workings of God, to predict the future in an unstable world, or to amend your sinful life” (Cressy 35). The deformed body was a readable text—a signifier of God’s will at work in the world. For example, the Chychester monster of Sussex broadside (1562) features a poem describing how God sends “tokens truly, straunge ... / To make hys foes a fearde” (See Appendix A). This text creates a direct relationship between God and the creation of monsters: He sends them in order to show society His plan. After the broadsides became popular, deformity gained even more meanings: It appeared “most frequently in the context of a whole group of related natural phenomena: earthquakes, floods, volcanic eruptions, celestial apparitions, and rains of blood, stone and other miscellanea”—divine prodigies and monstrous marvels (Daston and Park 23). These monsters could act as portents of great good, such as the coronation of a new monarch, or of great evil, such as war. The moralizing monster functioned on multiple levels of meaning: It could be “treated with curiosity and compassion,” “provide opportunities for freak-show entertainment,” or “instill fear” (Cressy 29, 35). These figures were treated with urgency, and the messages the monsters represented were treated with *gravitas*. The Renaissance people read monsters as both the manifestation of sin and glory—a warning and a reward. Monstrosity was not, as some scholars claim, a result of the exterior but the interior.

The relationship between the internal self and the exterior form has already been addressed by Katharine Eisaman Maus in her book *Inwardness and Theater in the English*

Renaissance. Her thesis reacts against both the new historicist and cultural materialist movements: She seeks to avoid “dismantling the Renaissance distinctions between inward and outward” by instead “analyzing some of the ways the distinction matters” (28). Maus creates a framework for exploring the boundaries between the interior and exterior selves, through which Shakespeare’s Richard can be reexamined. Originally, Richard has been viewed as functioning as a one-dimensional monster—a disabled person who is evil because of his deformity. I believe, however, that Richard begins as an externalized monster, which means that his deformed body has no impact on the content of his soul. After he chooses to steal the crown, however, Richard transforms into an internalized monster—a vice character whose choices place him in opposition to societal laws. The “terrifying *normality*” of the internalized monster makes them invisible—there are no physically manifest signs of the internal distortion; the internalized monster only manifests through villainous actions (Jarvis 329). To differentiate between these terms, I will be relying on language originally used by the Renaissance actor Robert Armin to describe the types of fools: artificial and natural. Though both types of fools were considered educational figures, the natural fool was born foolish while artificial fools “[made] themselves fooles, likeing the disguisies, / To feede their owne mindes and the gazers eyes” (B2). Similarly, a natural monster is the subject of a monstrous birth—an aberration sent by Providence—whose deformity is physically manifest. Natural monsters are monstrous by virtue of their form. Artificial monsters are created through actions: By internalizing criminal acts, artificial monsters engender a transformation that places them in opposition to the dictates of order within their society. Artificial monsters are not scourges sent by God to warn the wicked; instead, they are sinners in need of punishment.

It is difficult to encounter Shakespeare's Richard in his complete context, because *Richard III* is rarely performed as part of the tetralogy for which it serves as conclusion.² Many scholars and theatre companies approach Richard strictly through *Richard III*, which is rather like reading only half of a book. By restricting Richard's journey to just one play, the issue of his deformity becomes paramount to both critical and theatrical engagement with the text. Some of the most famous productions of *Richard III* within the past thirty years are known specifically for the lengths to which Richard's deformity was taken, such as the 1984 Royal Shakespeare Company's production starring Antony Sher. This production presents Richard on crutches, which allows him to alternately hobble or even hop across the stage—drawing on the image of the “bottled spider” from act four, scene four (See Appendix B). In *Year of the King*, Sher wrote of the perils of portraying Richard: “Perhaps a whole false body could be built, not just the hump, to avoid having to contort myself and the strain or risk of injury that would entail” (137). The physical demands of the role were so high that Sher underwent intensive physical training in order to avoid injury; his training kept his injuries to a minimum but did not eliminate them entirely. The price of playing a hyper-deformed Richard has not been exclusive to Sher's production. In 1992, Simon Russell Beale portrayed Richard as “quite doubled over, his movement very off balance to one side” with “a stick and a hump” (Brown; See Appendix C). After five months in the role, Beale slipped a disc and was forced to step out of the role. Ciaran Hinds, who took over Beale's role, decided to keep his portrayal of the crippledness to a

2 Anton Lesser, in *Players of Shakespeare 3: Further Essays in Shakespearian Performance* (1993), discusses in detail the different experiences he had in playing Richard: once in an isolated production and once in the full tetralogy adaptation, *The Plantagenets*. See his essay, “Richard of Gloucester in *Henry VI* and *Richard III*,” for further information. Kristin M. Smith focuses on the literary connection between the plays by examining the arc of imagery between the parts of the tetralogy in her article “Martial Maids and Murdering Mothers: Women, Witchcraft and Motherly Transgression in *Henry VI* and *Richard III*” (2007). Waldo F. McNeir, in his article “The Masks of Richard the Third” (1971), surveys scholarly approaches to the place of *Richard III* within the tetralogy.

minimum: “A twist of a limp and ... a gloved hand” (Brown). He made this decision in order to avoid the possibility of injury—it had nothing to do with Shakespeare's script.

As productions have continued to address the issue of Richard's deformity, the representations have only become more and more extreme—a move that survives because *Richard III* is typically performed in isolation. Theatre has exaggerated the image of Richard as a twisted, helpless creature: In 2002, Kenneth Branagh made Richard's deformity even more extreme. Branagh's Richard is first shown “stripped to his underpants on a grotesque machine ... designed to support his malformed body while he sleeps,” and the opening speech is delivered while Richard “writhes pitably around on the floor, struggling to get into the leg iron and corset that allows him to stand straight and walk” (Spencer; See Appendix D). This production also used deformity explicitly to motivate Richard: He has the princes murdered because they injure his back. Deformity overtook Richard's story and became the driving element for his transformation. In 2012, Kevin Spacey's Richard also placed greater emphasis on his deformity. In this production, Richard was unable to function without his leg brace and crutch (See Appendix E). The deformity was exaggerated in order to illustrate Richard's growing isolation and his eventual incapacitation. During the coronation scene, Spacey's Richard slips and is unable to rise without Buckingham's help. The final scene, where Richard is slain, repeats the falling imagery when Richard is knocked over and unable to rise, which leaves him as easy prey for Richmond. In each of these portrayals, Richard is isolated from both the earlier plays of the tetralogy and his former identity as a war hero. By portraying Richard as extremely deformed, each production reinforces the stereotype that Richard was incapable of moving so much as an inch without assistance—either in the form of another person or a prop. What happens, then,

when Richard is placed back into his proper narrative arc? The dynamic of his character changes, becoming more complex and less static.

In this thesis, I will argue that our desire to conflate Richard's deformity with his villainy do not come from history but instead from within the play. This construction does not serve the obvious purpose scholars have assigned to it for the past four hundred years: It is Richard—not the other characters—who formulates the relationship between his disfigured body and his evil choices. He makes this move in order to displace the guilt for his actions onto his deformity, not because he truly believes his body dictates his soul but to create a scapegoat in order to alleviate his conscience. Richard's correlation between villainy and natural monstrosity should not be taken at face value. Ultimately, this construction is Shakespeare's, and, like a magnifying glass, it is meant to direct our attention to the fallacy of conflating deformity and villainy. We are not meant to believe the relationship presented in the text; instead, we are meant to question it. By critically examining how Richard's identity shifts from a valorous war hero in the *Henry VI* plays to the destructive Machiavel of *Richard III*, a more nuanced and dynamic representation of Renaissance monstrosity emerges. Shakespeare's text functions as an exploratory space that challenges his audience to consider the nature of internal discourse and the role of deformity in shaping a man's nature. In doing so, it can be shown that deformity did not equate to evil; instead, the only true course to villainy was through a person's actions.

CHAPTER TWO

A MONSTROUS CHANGE

In order to truly examine Richard's character and the transformation he undertakes, it is necessary to begin where his journey starts: the *Henry VI* plays. These plays reveal Richard's character; *Henry VI Part 2* establishes Richard as naive yet loyal, while *Henry VI Part 3* presents Richard as a war hero—capable and valorous. Richard's father, the Duke of York, clearly establishes his son as being both noble and worthy. In *Henry VI Part 2*, the Yorks and Lancasters are in the midst of an exchange of insults when Richard chimes in. Lord Clifford, a Lancastrian, turns on Richard: “Hence, heap of wrath, foul indigested lump, / As crooked in thy manners as thy shape” (5.1.3147-8). This moment is the first time Richard's deformity is mentioned, and it comes crucially at a moment where the lords are calling one another names. The insults serve as verbal sparring, whereby each side attempts to prove superiority through cleverness. By attacking Richard's deformity, Clifford attempts to undermine the Yorks' claim to the throne. York, however, immediately refuses to let the insult stand, even though it comes during such an exchange. He says, “Nay, we shall heat you thoroughly anon” (5.1.3149). The deformity is immediately dropped, because York is willing to defend his son's honor. Despite its presence in a bout of name-calling, this insult serves as a foundation for our understanding of Richard's deformity within the discourse of the War of the Roses.

York does not view Richard's deformity as a signifier for evil; instead, he measures his son's worth through Richard's actions. At the start of *Henry VI Part 3*, Richard is presented as his brothers' equal, both in physical prowess and his ability to lead. Richard first appears in *Henry VI*

Part 3 as a triumphant warrior: He throws Somerset's head down at his father's feet and proclaims, "Thus do I hope to shake King Henry's head" (1.1.23). Were he hobbling about on crutches or unable to stand on his own, Richard would be unable to participate in the war discourse that dominates the tetralogy. By establishing Richard as a successful warrior—one capable of killing and beheading a non-disabled fighter—Shakespeare presents his character as both physically able and competent. Immediately, reading Richard through the complete tetralogy pushes against the current reading of his character, since neither scholarship nor theatre allows Richard to be a war *hero*.

York continues to push the idea of Richard as a figure of nobility in *Henry VI Part 3* when he claims, "Richard hath best deserved of all my sons" (1.1.20). Clarence and Edward, Richard's brothers, are outshone by their younger brother, who continues to be a force to be reckoned with throughout the play. Richard is the most active warrior in *Henry VI Part 3*: He kills the younger Clifford (2.6.1299-1304), the Lancastrian heir Prince Edward (5.5.2935), and King Henry VI (5.6.3052). In killing these men, Richard makes it possible for his family to successfully take the throne. These deaths are not considered murder but are instead "natural" and licensed "violent ... crimes" as part of "military service" (Pasupathi 336). His actions do not go against nature, but instead reflect a fulfillment of societal expectations.³ Richard is not a murderer but a hero. Reinterpreting this heroism in *Of Deformity*, Francis Bacon claimed that a deformed person's distinguished service stems from the need to "free themself[f] from scorn; which must be either by virtue or malice" (147). By demonstrating valor in combat, Richard was elevated above the expectation that "his deformity is a clear sign that he is odious and wicked" (Torrey 123). Richard strives to live up to the identity prescribed to him by his father—seeking

³This moment does suggest that, perhaps, there is a societal illness at work, as Garber seem to suggest. See Garber's *Shakespeare's Ghost Writers: Literature as Uncanny Causality* for further discussion on this subject.

to be the best son and continue to earn his father's approval. Regardless of why Richard chooses to be noble, it remains that he acts with valor and honor. Throughout the early portion of *Henry VI Part 3*, deformity is a marginalized aspect of Richard's character, because his identity derives more clearly from his success in battle.

At the end of the first act, though, Richard's support system fails when his father is murdered by young Clifford and Queen Margaret. In the next scene, Richard and Edward are waiting for news of their father; they are uncertain whether York has been captured, killed, or freed. Edward notices that Richard seems upset, to which Richard replies, "I cannot joy, until I be resolved / Where our right valiant father is become" (2.1.635-6). Closer to his father than either of his brothers, Richard's happiness seems dependent on his father's well being, making the threat to York's safety also a threat to Richard's stability. For Richard, it is "prize enough to be [York's] son," because of their father's valor and nobility (2.1.654). Without the duke's example and protection, Richard's identity is threatened. When York's death is revealed, Richard declares that he "cannot weep" and that he will "venge [York's] death, / or die renowned by attempting it" (2.1.706, 714-5). Richard decides to undertake a course of action that veers from the noble path his father held him too: Blind revenge is a selfish decision, especially compared to the valor of trying to end the war. Through this choice, Richard attempts to recreate the stabilizing force of his father's presence through exaggerating chivalric demands but ultimately undermines his own progression.

Richard attempts to reform the support structure he craves around his eldest brother, the newly crowned King Edward IV. After the coronation, Edward declares that his younger brothers will both receive titles, which would create the patriarchal system Richard needs to maintain a stable identity. However, Richard does not like the title his brother means to give him:

the Duke of Gloucester. Richard asks if he can “be Duke of Clarence ... for Gloucester’s dukedom is too ominous” (2.6.1360)—referring to the first Gloucester, Thomas of Woodstock, who led a rebellion against King Richard II in 1388, and whose murder was later ordered by that king. Edward dismisses Richard’s request as a “foolish observation,” and Richard becomes the Duke of Gloucester (2.6.1362-3). Through the assignment of this title, Edward dictates what role his brother will fulfill; just as York designated Richard as valorous, Edward scripts him as a rebel. The familial bonds further disintegrate when Clarence temporarily abandons his brothers and joins Henry’s side. Feeling as though “his brothers’ actions destroy the possibility of an identity founded upon an allegiance to the nuclear family” (Maus 19), Richard feels abandoned by his brothers, as though their lack of love for him is expressed through their betrayal of the family. Richard abjures his brothers and, rather than supporting Edward’s claim, decides to undertake a course of action that seems contrary to his noble nature. In a monologue, Richard curses Edward—wishing “no hopeful branch may spring” from Edward’s line—before declaring his desire for the throne (3.2.1615). There can only be one king, one sun, in the sphere of England’s monarchy, and Richard intends to be that king. The lack of loyalty in Richard’s family contributes more to his developing villainy than his deformity.

After Edward denies Richard fraternal love and patriarchal support, the youngest York begins to refuse all forms of affection. Richard claims “cold premeditation” stems from a lack of affection: “Love forswore me in my mother’s womb” (3.2.1622, 1642). Matriarchal love becomes suddenly suspect, as though Richard’s mother determined his nature by virtue of her internalized failings. Richard goes on to reject even self-love by attacking his deformity—defects that did not matter to him so long as they did not matter to his father. Richard no longer sees

himself as York's most worthy son, the triumphant war hero, but rather the crippled humpback marginalized by the court. He claims a lack of affection destroyed his body:

And, for I should not deal in her soft laws,
She did corrupt frail nature with some bribe,
To shrink mine arm up like a wither'd shrub;
To make an envious mountain on my back,
Where sits deformity to mock my body;
To shape my legs of an unequal size;
To disproportion me in every part. (3.2.1643-9)

This speech is the first time Richard's deformity is fully cataloged, but the description should not be taken at face value. Richard is in a state of bewilderment and flux, since he has suffered a destabilizing loss, and the twisted transformation from hero to villain ensues. With each description, it would be easy to imagine Richard folding in on himself. His arm, which had cut off Somerset's head and stabbed King Henry VI, weakens; his back twists, crushing him; and, his legs bow until he limps rather than striding about like the warrior he was. A literal transformation takes place through Richard's language, and he outlines a course of action that will further remove him from his valorous wartime identity. Moreover, Richard develops a "rhetoric of deformation, calling attention to the novelties of his physical shape and the ways in which that shape liberates him from the constraints of conventional courtly deportment" (Garber 43). The reprieve from guilt inherent in this self-making rhetoric allows Richard to believe he can write a future outside the boundaries of his society; he assumes he can cheat others, because nature cheated him of fair proportion. Richard makes a choice that creates a one-to-one correlation between evil and *action* rather than evil and deformity: He decides to steal the crown. Ultimately, Richard is guilty of conflating his own deformity and villainy. Through this scene, Shakespeare pushes against the conception that physical distortion directly corresponds to internal distortion.

Along with this choice comes a repeated pattern of introspection: Richard interrogates his identity in relation to his deformity. Richard undertakes this self-examination in order to displace his guilt onto an imagined other, most often his disabled body. The first instance of this interrogation comes right after Richard murders King Henry VI. Richard begins by expressing doubts. He says, “What, will the aspiring blood of Lancaster / Sink in the ground? I thought it would have mounted” (5.6.3058-9). The examination of Henry's blood reflects a hesitance; slaying an enemy on the battlefield is more honorable than murdering a disarmed prisoner. Richard attempts to remove his sense of guilt by placing the blame on his deformity:

I, that have neither pity, love, nor fear.
Indeed, 'tis true that Henry told me of;
For I have often heard my mother say
I came into the world with my legs forward:
Had I not reason, think ye, to make haste,
And seek their ruin that usurp'd our right? (5.6.3065-71)

Richard examines his deformity in relation to his potential for evil. His legs, which he describes as imperfectly formed, came first in order to allow Richard to seek revenge faster. This image, however, could have an alternate meaning, since Richard's success as a warrior had been so dependent on his rigor in battle. If he was born with his legs first, it seems equally plausible it signals his readiness to redeem his family name—not necessarily to destroy his family. Henry, not Edward, usurped the throne (or so Richard and his family believed). Richard's supposed defect could point to a predisposition towards being noble and valorous rather than evil and unfeeling.

Yet Richard continues to develop his inclination towards evil by discussing his teeth. He says,

The midwife wonder'd and the women cried
“O, Jesus bless us, he is born with teeth!”
And so I was; which plainly signified

That I should snarl and bite and play the dog.
Then, since the heavens have shaped my body so,
Let hell make crook'd my mind to answer it. (5.6.3072-7)

This reading of his deformity seems to directly feed into the traditional reading of Richard as being predisposed to evil. He claims that his teeth were a signifier that he was born to be a dog, but his reading of this sign seems forced. Dogs are also read as extremely loyal creatures who defend their home and family from all ills. Richard's earlier status as a war hero more directly relates to this other reading of his dog imagery, which yet again undermines the traditional interpretation of his deformity. His final conclusion, that he must have a crooked mind because he has a crooked body, can also be read as a moment of doubt. Richard does not say, "My body is crooked, so my mind must follow" but instead says, "let hell make crook'd my mind," which implies that his body does not directly inform the content of his soul. The warping of his mind is a possibility—not yet a reality—that Richard means to give way to; his reading of his deformed body is both incomplete and uncertain. Richard knows that his body is deformed, but the meaning of that deformity is undecided. He chooses to read it as a signifier for evil, which acts as an attempt to avoid taking responsibility for his actions. Like Lady Macbeth's "unsex me here" speech, Richard attempts to divorce himself from the feelings of guilt and fear generated by his plan to take the throne. Richard asks that "'love' ... be resident in men like one another / and not in me" (5.6.3079-81). This statement implies that he is trying to deny his feelings of love in order to carry out the actions he believes will give him the stability he lacks. Love, both as an "emotional characteristic and as a relationship," acts as an "institution of sameness" Richard denies in order to begin his transformation (Maus 48). The refusal of love is repeated in order to reinforce the transformation, as though repetition makes it real. Richard's trajectory towards

murder is not as gleeful and certain as it would seem, but instead an undertaking full of fear and doubt stemming from disappointment in his family's lack of loyalty.

Richard continues to interrogate his deformity in *Richard III*, which acts as an ideological bridge between the last two parts of the tetralogy. At the end of *Henry VI Part 3*, Richard attempts to paint himself as the villain, and this theme is yet again addressed in the opening monologue of *Richard III*. He begins by reminding the audience what has occurred in the last play: “Now is the winter of our discontent / Made glorious summer by this sun of York” (*Richard III* 1.1.1-2). The war is over, peace has come to England, and everything seems well once more. Richard goes on to describe how “Grim-visaged war” has put the accoutrements of battle away and is instead “caper[ing] nimbly in a lady's chamber” (1.1.10, 13). But, Richard cannot enjoy the celebration. He launches into a lengthy description—one even more involved than the speech in *3 Henry VI*—concerning his deformity:

I, that am not shaped for sportive tricks,
Nor made to court an amorous looking-glass;
I, that am rudely stamp'd, and want love's majesty
To strut before a wanton ambling nymph;
I, that am curtail'd of this fair proportion,
Cheated of feature by dissembling nature,
Deformed, unfinish'd, sent before my time
Into this breathing world, scarce half made up,
And that so lamely and unfashionable
That dogs bark at me as I halt by them;
Why, I, in this weak piping time of peace,
Have no delight to pass away the time,
Unless to spy my shadow in the sun
And descant on mine own deformity. (1.1.15-28)

Richard goes to great lengths to portray himself as so distorted and malformed that he is practically inhuman—even dogs do not recognize him as human! This monologue seems to provide an obvious grounding for theatrical productions like the Sher and Branagh versions. After all, Richard clearly describes himself as being extremely deformed. He seems certain that

no one could ever enjoy his deformity, except by delighting in his suffering. But, this overt reading of the monologue is limiting. By reading Richard's journey through the full tetralogy, this moment does not act as a concrete expression of his deformity. Instead, this soliloquy is a moment of exploration and resolution. By this point in his trajectory, Richard has determined that he will be evil, but he is still in the process of convincing himself that this course of action is legitimate.

Richard's deformity acts as a scapegoat throughout *Richard III*—allowing Richard to hide from his choices for most of the play. In this opening scene, he harkens back to his earlier success by mentioning the single sun of York who had brought peace to England. Most, if not all, readings of this play assume Edward is the sun of York,⁴ but it is Richard who buried his family's troubles by murdering the Lancastrian king—not Edward. When Richard's brothers “destroy the possibility of an identity founded on an allegiance to the nuclear family,” the family's success becomes fractured and Richard's valor is marginalized (Maus 49). In the opening lines, Richard stumbles to create a new interior—in order to compensate for the sudden lack of selfhood—and he finds this identity by using his deformity to justify his actions. The vivid description of Richard's deformity becomes introspective: Like scholars, Richard begins to view his disability as his sole characteristic. This trait begins to define Richard's journey and swallows his earlier achievements. Richard tells himself he is not fit to be a lover and has no option but to choose evil: “Since I cannot prove a lover, / To entertain these fair well-spoken days, / I am determined to prove a villain” (1.1.29-31). The word choice in this sequence paints a deliberate image of a man not yet committed to a course of action and who sees only two

⁴Spacey's *Richard III* features a television screen with a video of Edward paused on it; Ian McKellen's *Richard III* (1995) makes a point of having Richard announce the opening lines in front of an audience and gesturing to Edward on “this son of York” (8:28); the 1955 Laurence Olivier *Richard III* uses an elaborate coronation sequence as the inciting incident for Richard's opening speech, implying that Edward is the sun via a look Olivier gives (8:34).

possible options: villain or lover. By saying “determined” Richard shows the audience he is not yet a villain—dismantling Hart's claim he is evil from the very beginning of the play. Instead, Richard means to undergo a transformation that will take him from a natural to an artificial monster. This metamorphosis is “driven by” what Brian Jarvis calls “dreams of ‘becoming,’” a need to radically alter identity (333). As Richard narrates his deformity, he begins to inhabit the identity of villain as he constructs it.

Richard's transformation is not a solitary venture: He has an accomplice. Throughout the play, Gloucester addresses monologues to the audience, often to reveal his own thoughts or to remind them of the events found in *Henry VI Part 3*. This gesture creates a “special intimacy with the audience” that makes them feel “confident that Richard's self-disclosure to [them] is entirely reliable” (Maus 54). These soliloquies and asides act like a conversation between the character and the outside world, and Richard clearly seems aware of his position as existing within the confines of a play⁵. He recapitulates the storyline, reveals his plans, and shares his triumphs—all for the benefit of the audience. The self-awareness inherent in Richard's speeches indicate he is communicating via monologue rather than soliloquy—a necessary differentiation, since soliloquies are pieces of dialog “spoken by one person that is alone or acts as though he were alone” (Pfister 127). Through this tactic, Richard separates himself from the main action of the play, which signifies his initial status as a natural monster. Unlike the artificial monster, natural monsters functioned outside of the social sphere as a warning and were often ostracized because they reminded the creating culture of its sins. Similarly, Richard removes himself from the action of the play—by breaking the fourth wall—in order to inhabit his deformity. Richard

⁵He frequently and comfortably breaks what is known in theatre as the “fourth wall” - the barrier that separates the world of the play from the audience.

uses the description of his deformity and the relationship with the audience in order to outline how his presentation of his outward and inward selves will be handled.

Contrary to what traditionalists might argue, Richard succeeds as a deceiver because the physical form did not immediately signify the content of the soul. Richard compares himself to Judas, who “cried 'all hail!' when he meant all harm” (*3 Henry 6* 5.7.3127-8). This guise covers Richard's intentions towards his brothers: “Plots have I laid, inductions dangerous, ... / To set my brother Clarence and the king / In deadly hate the one against the other” (1.1.32-36). Richard pits the brothers against one another, building on the earlier lack of loyalty, because he knows they are likely to destroy each other in the ensuing conflict. His place in this conflict is that of the silent puppeteer: Richard must sit back and pretend to be the same loyal, loving man he was in *3 Henry 6*. In doing so, Richard maintains his innocence and removes two major stumbling blocks without losing his own power of influence. Neither Clarence nor Edward perceive Richard as a threat, because “his deformity ... fails to signify evil to them” (Torrey 141). Richard ignores his deformity to maintain a sameness that masks his villainous intentions.

George, the Duke of Clarence, places the most trust in Richard, which is his downfall. Richard has started rumors of a prophecy that ‘G’ will murder King Edward IV’s heirs, and Clarence is to be imprisoned in the Tower of London because of these rumors. Richard's true intentions are hidden as he feigns concern: The Duke of Gloucester commiserates with his brother and blames the queen for Clarence’s fate—an explanation Clarence quickly latches on to (1.1.67-80). The brothers steal a few moments of conversation, during which Richard promises to go “unto the king” in order to rectify “this deep disgrace in brotherhood” (1.1.111-6). During *Henry VI Part 3*, Richard and Clarence frequently conspired together—establishing a firm bond between the two. For example, when Elizabeth appears before the court to sue for her husband’s

land, Richard does not even wait to hear the conversation and immediately tells Clarence that Edward's lasciviousness will determine the successfulness of the woman's petition (3.2.1481-3). Clarence and Richard have an extended conversation in asides that shadows the main dialog between Edward and Elizabeth:

EDWARD: How many children hast thou, widow? Tell me.

CLARENCE: [*Aside to RICHARD*] I think he means to beg a child of her.

RICHARD: [*Aside to CLARENCE*] Nay, whip me then: he'll rather give her two.

ELIZABETH: Three, my gracious lord.

RICHARD: [*Aside to CLARENCE*] You shall have four, if you'll be ruled by him.
(3.2.1500-6)

The younger brothers undermine Edward's authority, which in turn strengthens their bond. Richard uses this previous alliance against Clarence, who expects his younger brother will save him. By destroying Clarence, Richard begins to fulfill our expectations of his deformity—Machiavellian deception, cruelty, and rebellion (Bacon 146-7). This shift in character marks a turn from externalized monstrosity, which was dependent on a purely physical manifestation of distortion, to internalized monstrosity. Richard's turn from a natural to artificial monster is an attempt to free himself from scorn, but this time through violence against his family. Clarence, unaware of the change in his brother, believes that Richard will continue to be a hero—this time by saving Clarence from the Tower of London. By placing trust in Richard, Clarence demonstrates the complicated relationship between physiognomy and deformity: Richard's "ability to deceive [them] repeatedly complicates the semiotic status of his deformity" (Torrey 141). If Clarence followed the typical principles of physiognomy, he would not have entrusted Richard with his life; instead, Clarence still views Richard as noble and valorous. The supposedly blatant signifier of Richard's deformed body does not represent danger or villainy; instead, Richard's distinguished actions from *Henry VI Part 3* define Clarence's perception of his youngest brother. Clarence literally takes Richard at face value. As the guards lead Clarence to

the Tower of London, Richard proclaims a perverted sense of love for his brother: He loves Clarence for making his dastardly plans that much easier to achieve.

Lady Anne, the Lancastrian Prince Edward's widow, confronts Richard's truth value without successfully determining whether his exterior reveals or masks his internal self. Unlike Clarence, though, she acknowledges the possible disparity between Richard's internal and exterior selves. Before proceeding with Clarence's murder, Richard encounters Anne as she accompanies Henry VI's body through the streets. This scene “displays a Richard whose narcissistic posturing translates ill-design (“misshapen thus”) into “proper” or handsome appearance—and thus to proprietary and appropriative behavior, made possible by his flouting of the conventional proprieties” (Garber 49). Richard works against his state as a natural monster through his manipulation of Lady Anne, and he takes upon himself the traits of a man who is whole by refuting typical roles. When the scene begins, Anne is mourning over the body of Henry VI, whom Richard murdered at the end of Henry VI Part 3. She curses Richard:

If ever he have child, abortive be it,
Prodigious, and untimely brought to light,
Whose ugly and unnatural aspect
May fright the hopeful mother at the view;
And that be heir to his unhappiness! (1.2.194-8).

Her words paint Richard's deformed body as the worst blight possible for a mother to face: “The fantasy child who is to be the only offspring of Richard and Anne is Richard himself” (Garber 45). In naming such a child, Anne creates a circle of deformity that hangs over her throughout the seduction; if she succumbs to Richard, she has named her own fate. By drawing on themes of the prodigious and unnatural, Anne positions Richard as a monstrous figure, but she is unable to maintain this reading in his presence.

Upon Richard's entry, Anne vehemently unleashes a verbal attack on him. She calls him a "fiend," "the devil," "dreadful minster of hell," and a "lump of foul deformity" (1.2.208-31). Anne is "positioned in rhetorical equilibrium with Richard" through her "powerful, confrontative, and aggressive" language (Charnes 45). Her "warrior-like" position is undermined when Richard subjects himself to her authority and offers to let her kill him (Charnes 44-5). Anne goes from cursing Richard to agreeing to marry him within twenty-one lines, but throughout the conversation her responses to him vacillate between spiteful hatred and meek acceptance. This fluctuation partially stems from what Charles Ross calls a "strange and unexplained fascination" or "female folly" (qtd. Garber 30). But Anne also responds to Richard's shifts between his outward appearance and glimpses of his true self. When Richard dissembles by claiming he could love Anne better than her late husband, Prince Edward, she reacts violently by spitting on Richard and wishing "it were mortal poison" (1.2.315-330). This moment is strange to the audience because of Richard's claim that he is without love. By presenting himself as motivated by love, Richard is fully enacting the deceptive tactics that have not yet been fully realized—Clarence was a minor deception compared to this scene. Anne, who claimed to hate Richard, seems to recognize the incongruity of Richard's confession, and she reacts with vehemence. But it is not Richard's body that tells her of his crimes. Her major conflict with Richard lies in his actions: Henry VI's body is the evidence for the "pattern of [Richard's] butcheries" (1.2.228). She hates Richard because he murdered her husband and her father-in-law—his actions condemn him. Richard attempts to blame others for the murder, even going so far as to claim Henry was "slain by Edward's hand," but Anne refutes him at every turn. As Richard attempts to deceive her, his seduction proves unfruitful. He says her "beauty was the cause of that effect," to which she replies, "If I thought that, I tell thee, homicide / These nails

should rend that beauty from my cheeks” (1.2.301-6). Richard's artificial monstrosity is not yet developed enough for this deception to be successful. He has not yet committed any actions that would distort his internal self—he has not yet committed murder outside of war.

When Richard admits to having killed Henry, his dissembling becomes ambiguous as truth helps to mask the elements of deception. Richard offers Anne a dagger, telling her that if her “revengeful heart cannot forgive” then she should “let [his] soul forth” (1.2.358-60). She begins to move towards him - “she offers at it with his sword” - but Richard interrupts with his confession of murder. Anne hesitates. Her anger dissipates, and she drops the sword. Unable to kill him, Anne says, “Arise, dissembler,” which shows her lingering awareness of his dual nature, before admitting that she “will not be the executioner” (1.2.372-3). Richard has won: He has deceived her. From this moment on, Richard dominates the conversation and Anne takes the defensive.

Anne seems to recognize her tenuous position and begins to evaluate Richard's truthfulness. Anne's confession “I would I knew thy heart” (1.2.381) suggests “she dimly perceives, even as she succumbs to him, that she cannot see his true intentions figured in his body but instead must see into his interior” (Torrey 143). The conflict of the scene no longer centers on Richard's murderous actions, but instead the invisibility of his internal discourse. Anne, who seemed so certain of his evil moments before, suddenly is uncertain as to what extent Richard is deceiving her (1.2.382-4). She quickly succumbs to his desires: Anne agrees to marry him. Her farewell is stunted and confused, as though Richard's dissembling has befuddled her: “Since you teach me how to flatter you, / Imagine I have said farewell already” (1.2.409-10). Anne “exits both charmed and ... for the moment, at least, his body no longer disgusts her, nor does it represent for her a signal of his villainy” (Torrey 144). The complex emblem of his

deformed body only threatens Anne when he tries to function as an internalized, artificial monster; when Richard functions as a natural monster, she is entranced by the abnormality of his role. After she leaves, Richard again turns to his accomplice, the audience, to brag of his success. He asks, “Was ever woman in this humor woo'd? / Was ever woman in this humor won” (1.2.420-1). The entire scene becomes part of a series of minor deceptions leading to true evil: murder. Richard says, “I'll have her; but I will not keep her long” (1.2.422). Anne, like Clarence, has been deceived, and she has placed her life in the hands of a man who intends to kill her.

It is only after Richard successfully deceives Anne that Clarence is confronted by Richard's transformation. Clarence experiences the first signs of doubt through a dream he has while in the tower. He says,

Methoughts that I had broken from the Tower,
And was embark'd to cross to Burgundy;
And, in my company, my brother Gloucester;
Who from my cabin tempted me to walk
Upon the hatches: ...
As we paced along
Upon the giddy footing of the hatches,
Methought that Gloucester stumbled; and, in falling,
Struck me, that thought to stay him, overboard,
Into the tumbling billows of the main (1.4.842-54).

If—as Julia Fawcett, David T. Mitchell, and Sharon L. Snyder have argued—Richard's deformed body were strictly emblematic of evil, the “well-minded” Clarence (*3H6* 4.8.2548) would immediately identify his nightmare narrative as originating from his contact with Richard. Contrary to being threatening, Richard's deformity is a cause for brotherly concern and aid. Clarence is not repulsed by his brother's 'misshapen figure' knocking into him, instead he tries to preserve Richard's life - even with his very own. Rather than blame Richard for being knocked into the ocean, Clarence blames himself: “I have done those things, / which now bear evidence against my soul” (1.4.899-900). Clarence believes his own internalized wrong-doing is to be

blamed for so dreadful a nightmare—the perceived artificial monster at work within him. He does not even consider Richard as the true threat within the nightmare framework.

Moments after this nightmare, Clarence is forced to confront Richard's deception. Two murderers, whom Richard hired, come to the Tower to assassinate Clarence. The murderers engage Clarence in conversation, which further illuminates Richard's character prior to the beginning of the play. Clarence quickly discerns the murderers' purpose and believes that Edward is behind it. "I will send you to my brother Gloucester," Clarence says, "who shall reward you better for my life / than Edward will for tidings of my death" (1.4.1056-8). When the murderers reveal who has sent them, Clarence refuses to believe it: "O, do not slander [Richard], for he is kind" (1.4.1069). Up until the moment of death, Clarence believes in Richard's faithfulness as a brother. Richard's initial goodness is so lingering that Clarence, even on the point of death, cannot see the shift in his brother's character.

This point in the play marks Richard's true descent into artificial monsterhood. Prior to this point, Richard could have returned to his previous characterization and supported Edward's claim to the throne—living happily ever after as the Duke of Gloucester. After Clarence's murder, however, Richard's interior monstrosity begins to overtake his character. Richard's transformation does not go unnoticed: The Duke of Buckingham notices Gloucester's intentions. Buckingham hates Queen Elizabeth and her family, but Edward forces the two parties to reconcile (2.1.1149-62). After this moment of forced politeness passes, Richard enters and announces Clarence's murder. Chaos ensues and Edward has to be helped to his chambers. The stage empties, and Richard is left alone with Buckingham. Almost conversationally, Richard says, "Mark'd you not / How that the guilty kindred of the queen / Look'd pale when they did hear of Clarence' death" (2.11261-3). Like a chameleon, Richard shifts his outward self to reflect

the concerns of his newest target, and Buckingham is immediately complicit. With a simple “We wait upon your grace,” Buckingham falls into Richard's snare—this time, though, functioning as the more immediate accomplice (2.1.1268). For the first time, Richard does not turn to the audience to find a compatriot, but instead looks within the play. The audience is left in the cold as Richard continues to change.

As Richard changes, he attempts to remake Buckingham in his image. In the next scene, Gloucester and Buckingham enter together, a joint deception waiting to be unleashed on Elizabeth and her family. Buckingham soothes the tears of the Duchess of York and Queen Elizabeth by reminding them that, though Edward is dead, the “harvest of his son” will be fruitful for them all and should “gently be preserved” (2.2.1389-93). He pretends concern for the nation, just as Richard feigned affection for Anne, and urges the nobles to fetch the princes. A party is quickly assembled, and Buckingham's advice is construed as the epitome of wisdom. After the nobility exit, however, Buckingham and Richard reveal their intentions to go with the coronation party in order to “part the queen's proud kindred from the king” (2.2.1424). Unaware of Richard's intention to steal the throne, Buckingham believes Gloucester will simply isolate the princes so the queen's family loses control. Like Anne and Clarence, Buckingham is unable to discern Richard's interior self, which causes the transformation to fail.

When Prince Edward arrives in London, Richard and Buckingham are waiting to receive him. The ensuing scene is marked by a frenzy of asides, perhaps indicating that Richard is experiencing a climax in his transition. All other obstacles—Edward, Clarence, Henry—have been swept out of Richard's way, and only the two princes remain as the last vestiges of the proper line of inheritance within the realm. “Protecting, nurturing and assisting the [princes] is fundamental to ... just political order,” because of their status as rightful heirs to the throne (qtd.

Campana 20). The eleven-year-old prince has the potential to restore balance to the kingdom, but he is little more than a pawn in the adults' machinations. Prince Edward seems precociously aware of both his uncertain position and Richard as a possible threat: "If I live until I be a man, / I'll win our ancient right in France again, / Or die a soldier, as I lived a king" (3.1.1662-4). Were his survival ensured, Prince Edward would not have included the "if I live" that qualifies the rest of the statement; he recognizes the precarious mortality of childhood. Richard's push for the princes to stay at the Tower of London seems to alert the prince to the threat his uncle represents. Just before the two princes leave the scene, the younger prince declares that he "shall not sleep in quiet at the Tower" (3.1.1715). He fears Clarence's ghost, because his grandmother told him of the murder. Prince Edward cuts in with, "I fear no uncles dead" (3.1.1719). Richard slyly asks if the princes fear any living uncles, to which Edward says: "An if they live, I hope I need not fear. / But come, my lord; and with a heavy heart, / Thinking on them, go I unto the Tower" (3.1.1720-3). Once again, the prince uses ambiguous terms, like "if" and "hope," to describe the situation, which indicates a strong awareness of his position. It is possible that he is referring to Hastings and Rivers—who are absent because Richard had them imprisoned—but this interpretation does not seem likely. Prince Edward is the only character throughout the play to notice Richard's asides:

RICHARD: [aside] So wise so young, they say, do never live long.

PRINCE EDWARD: What say you, uncle?

RICHARD: I say, without characters, fame lives long (3.1.1649-51).

Edward displays powers of perception that go beyond what other characters demonstrate. His awareness of Richard's aside seals his fate; Richard's monstrous interior must remain hidden at any cost.

Buckingham, who was complicit in Richard's deceptions, sets himself up for destruction when he believes Gloucester would not lie to an accomplice. After the princes are declared illegitimate, Richard at last attains the crown. His coronation is resplendent, and all seems well in England. Buckingham, who has been lured into complacency, believes Richard will fulfill their earlier pact: The king promised Buckingham lands and titles in return for his assistance in achieving the crown. Richard begins to turn on Buckingham when he asks if he should “wear these honors for a day” or should “they last, and we rejoice in them” (4.2.2586-8). He lures Buckingham into proclaiming: “Still they live and for ever may they last” (4.2.2589). Richard seizes upon this declaration, claiming that his position will never last so long as Prince Edward lives. This issue—that Edward lives—is repeated three times, and with each instance Buckingham becomes more withdrawn. Finally, Richard declares, “Tut, tut, thou art all ice, thy kindness freezeth: / Say, have I thy consent that they shall die” (4.2.2604-5). This statement causes Buckingham to bow out, which removes him from Richard's inner circle. Once again, Richard is alone in his enterprise.

Richard's duplicity is so complex that it cannot be connected to his physical form; instead, we must take Richard as being stronger in actions than anything else. Earlier, he proved his valor through war crimes. Now, he seeks to prove his evil through the murder of children. The “death of children anchors Richard's infamy” because it makes him “the monstrous child-killer whose ruthless stratagems and vicious seductions violate temporal narratives of a future secured by the triumph of innocent youth” (Campana 23-4). The princes are the keystone to political order within the country, but they also function as pure vessels who could remove the taint from the crown. After the princes are declared illegitimate, they are less of a political danger and more of a “threatening perspicacity” - the former prince's ability to see through

Richard's guise, even for a moment, reveals how fragile his interior construct is. Richard seems to believe the elimination of the princes will solidify his transformation, but he does not want to dirty his hands with the crime. This hesitance to kill the princes indicates Richard has not eradicated his conscience nor the warrior's code of conduct—merely repressed them out of cowardice. Richard only commits murder (with his own hands) in war situations, such as the assassination of an enemy king or killing a foe in battle. In *Richard III*, he achieves murders by ordering others to carry them out, which shows a reluctance to transgress against the warrior's code he abided by in the previous plays. Richard hopes to convince Buckingham to commit the murders for him so the guilt will not rest on his shoulders. Throughout this sequence, Richard does not consult his original accomplice, the audience. As his evil actions compound, Richard is drawn into the action: “The Richard who seemed to delight in knowing that he was playing in a play becomes the Richard who is trapped in the illusion” (Mooney 48). Richard’s position as mere emblematic warning is enveloped by his growing participation in his world. Artificial monstrosity has made Richard almost unrecognizable to the audience.

The transformation from natural to artificial monstrosity can be interrogated through Richard’s shift from monologue to soliloquy. Throughout most of the play—in fact, from the very beginning—Richard speaks to the audience about his plans and motivations. The viewer becomes an accomplice to Richard’s machinations, and every subsequent act of villainy is a fulfillment of Richard’s outlines. When Richard begins to fixate on the murder of the princes, however, the asides cease. His last address to the audience comes just moments before Buckingham returns to the stage. For a brief moment, Richard explains what is occurring and the action he must take:

I must be married to my brother’s daughter,
Or else my kingdom stands on brittle glass.

Murder her brothers, and then marry her!
Uncertain way of gain! But I am in
So far in blood that sin will pluck on sin:
Tear-falling pity dwells not in this eye. (4.2.2651-7)

This moment acts as a monologue because Richard includes explication similar to his opening speech. The audience is not just told what must be done but also the reasoning behind it. Richard must marry the princess, because his grasp of the crown is tenuous at best. The king is reluctant to commit to further action—he acknowledges the irrevocability of his choices for the first time.

Buckingham is equally reluctant to murder the princes: When he returns, Buckingham claims “the earldom of Hereford and the moveables” Richard had promised him (4.2.2688). Buckingham hopes to deflect the murder of the two princes by making his request, but it also shows his emerging doubt. If Buckingham still trusted Richard, the duke would not desperately press—as he does six times during the scene—for the promised lands and titles. As Buckingham makes his demands, Richard evades him by discussing Richmond and asking for the time. Finally, losing patience, Richard tells Buckingham, “Thou troublest me; am not in the vein” to give him anything (4.2.2719). Buckingham is outraged, because Richard has betrayed his trust.

The Duke of Buckingham is the only one of Richard's victims who fully realizes the king's artificial monstrosity. During the civil war, Buckingham remains loyal to Richard, even though the king never granted him the lands and monies promised. A flood disperses Buckingham's army, however, and Richard orders the duke brought before him (4.4.3341-4, 3371). As Buckingham waits to speak to Richard, the duke realizes he is going to die. He says, “All-Souls' day is my body's doomsday” and “the determined respite of my wrongs” (5.1.3408, 3415). Buckingham, like Clarence, blames himself for the fate that awaits him—the actions he committed against Edward and his family condemning him. But, Buckingham acknowledges that Richard will “split [his] heart with sorrow” and be the agent of destruction (5.1.3422).

Buckingham submits to the inevitable declaring, “Wrong hath but wrong, and blame the due of blame” (5.1.3425). His death is the result of his evil actions—the artificial monster at work within him—but also the work of Richard's distorted interior.

After Buckingham dies, Richard is abandoned by all but a few of his henchmen. Without anyone to manipulate, Richard is forced to return to his earlier interrogation of himself. This time, though, the examination finds true monstrosity. On the night before his death, Richard is completely transfigured. The natural monster of the first two acts has devolved into the artificial, and Richard rebuilds the fourth wall—drawing away from the audience. Richard replaces the monologues and asides with soliloquy after he suffers through a hellish nightmare. This dream, unlike Clarence's, does not act as a self-interrogation. Rather, Richard is forcibly examined by the ghosts of his victims, who are no longer deceived by the disparity between his external and internal monstrosity. Richard's natural monstrosity is not of interest to the ghosts; instead, they focus on the transgressions of the artificial monster. The ghosts present a parade of blame and guilt, which pushes Richard beyond monstrosity and into an entirely different identity. Prince Edward, the Lancastrian heir, is the first ghost to visit Richard. He reminds Richard to “think, how thou stab'dst me in my prime of youth” (5.3.3595-6). Just as Richard's journey began on the battlefield, he is at first confronted with the murders he committed as part of war; the trajectory of Richard's transformation is mapped out through the ghosts who visit him. King Henry VI is the next to appear, and he reminds Richard how the king's “anointed body / By thee was punched full of deadly holes” (5.3.3603-4). Henry's murder came after Richard's decision to steal the throne but still qualified as a war crime, since it ended the War of the Roses. By mentioning the anointed body, Henry gestures towards the divine implications of having killed a king. The weight of this guilt is reiterated in Henry's repetition of the ghostly command: “Despair, and die!

/Harry the Sixth bids thee despair, and die” (5.3.3605-6). Prince Edward repeated this command only once, but the divine monarch repeats it twice—perhaps once for the body physical and one for the body politic, representing a dual murder. The House of Lancaster condemns Richard and reminds him that his interior is not hidden from the eyes of God.

Clarence continues the examination of Richard's interior when he appears. Once again, the ghost makes a point of revealing how he died: “I, that was wash'd to death with fulsome wine, / Poor Clarence, by thy guile betrayed to death” (5.3.3614-5). This accusation reflects Richard's move from killing by deed to killing by word. Unlike Edward and Henry, Clarence is murdered by betrayal and guile—tools of the artificial monster. He, like the ghosts before him, orders Richard to “think on me” and “despair, and die” (5.3.3616-7). The weight of Richard's deformity is nothing in comparison to the weight of guilt piled on his uneven shoulders by the wrathful ghosts. Sir Thomas Vaughan and Lords Rivers, Grey, and Hastings all add their cries to Clarence's condemnation of Richard. Hastings in particular calls Richard, “Bloody and guilty, guiltily awake,” which is the first time a character calls the king outright culpable for his crimes (5.3.3635). The situation continues to degenerate. Anne and the young princes appear, condemning Richard as well, before the last ghost arrives: Buckingham. His entrance is different, because he does not ask Richard to remember him. Instead, the duke declares he is “The last was I that helped thee to the crown; / The last was I that felt thy tyranny” (5.3.3665-6). This declaration reveals Richard's isolation, both in power and in battle. Richard has no friends—only enemies—and he cannot escape his crimes. Buckingham condemns him with a final command:

O, in the battle think on Buckingham,
And die in terror of thy guiltiness!
Dream on, dream on, of bloody deeds and death:
Fainting, despair; despairing, yield thy breath! (3668-71)

In his nightmare, Richard is confronted with his crimes and their associated guilt, which he has not yet faced. The ghosts strip away Richard's confident facade and leave behind nothing but the crumbling remnants of the artificial monster. Guilt, despair, and death await the doomed king.

The force of the ghosts' condemnation wakes Richard with a start—he is disturbed by their ability to see his interior self—and blames his “coward conscience” for his fear (5.3.3681). The “ruthless” and “vicious” killer who had “no trouble avoiding the pitfalls of love and compassion” has rediscovered his conscience (Campana 23-4). If Richard had no conscience, the ghosts' threats would have been hollow rattling; instead, they terrorize the monster into making a confession:

Cold fearful drops stand on my trembling flesh.
What do I fear? myself? there's none else by:
Richard loves Richard; that is, I am I.
Is there a murderer here? No. Yes, I am:
Then fly. What, from myself? Great reason why:
Lest I revenge. What, myself upon myself?
Alack. I love myself. Wherefore? for any good
That I myself have done unto myself?
O, no! alas, I rather hate myself
For hateful deeds committed by myself!
I am a villain (5.3.3684-93).

In this moment of fear and doubt, Richard is at his most human. He trembles from the force of his conscience, because neither his deformity nor the war can absolve him of the crimes he has committed. All that remains, after all the guises are stripped away, is Richard. Just Richard. The man who began his journey as a war hero—the most worthy of York's son—sits in his tent terrified like a child in the dark. Richard loathes himself for falling from grace and destroying, as neither of his brothers were able to, the sacred bonds of the family unit. Transgression after transgression twisted Richard into an utterly unrecognizable figure: The murderer, the villain. This transformation was neither spontaneous nor physical but born out of actions. Richard chose

to steal the throne, Richard chose to kill his brother, Richard chose to kill the princes, Richard chose to destroy himself. Like each of his victims throughout *Richard III*, Richard slays himself not in deed but through words. He no longer needs to prove himself a villain; he is a villain. In declaring himself utterly transformed, Richard disqualifies himself as king—he is not worthy, even in his own eyes. Richard all but begs Richmond to commit the best murder of the play: Richard's.

CHAPTER THREE

CONCLUSION

The journey Richard takes over the course of *Henry VI Part 2*, *Henry VI Part 3*, and *Richard III* is not the static, obvious route so many scholars and performers have assigned him. Richard is not the blatant signifier of evil, simply by virtue of his deformed body. If that were the case, Richard would not have earned the title of worthy son, war hero, and noble brother in the earlier parts of the tetralogy. The distorted form of Richard's body did serve an emblematic function: He was a multifaceted omen who warned of his society's unrest, the wrath of God, the glory of God, and even the importance of morphological regularity. Traditionalists and revisionists have made a mistake in approaching the complex imagery of Richard's deformity by claiming disability directly corresponds to a distorted interior. This reading does not help these readers follow the development of Richard's character, nor does it prove the historical Richard's culpability. All this reading proves is that Ricardian scholarship needs to allow Shakespeare's Richard to function as a dynamic character who moves through multiple selfhoods. These identities do not stand in conflict with one another, fracturing the tetralogy and ruining our perception of Richard; instead, the mutability of his character creates a multifaceted portrayal of guilt and monstrosity—both artificial and natural. This representation forces us, as readers, to reevaluate our conceptions of both *Richard III* and deformity. We are challenged to look beyond the simplistic reading of deformity equating to evil; instead, we are asked to see how the boundaries between interior and exterior selves can be twisted and warped.

Richard shows us, through his encounters with Clarence, Anne, and Buckingham how the exterior presentation can mask an invisible interior. These boundaries and the mutability inherent to them are important because they establish a space of exploration. Shakespeare grappled with the relationship between external deformity, internalized choices, and the perceptions of others, but he by no means came to any definite answers on what these things meant. If anything, *Richard III* is a foundational text which allows scholars to view Shakespeare's artistic growth as he moves from this early play and on to the more complex—in characterization, language, and structure—portrayals of these themes. The field of battle is awaiting a resurrection of scholarship, and the exhumation of Richard's bones should mark a turning point in scholarship. It is easy, deceptively so, to dismiss this play as overwrought or unimportant, because of how scholarship has treated it, and it is time to reevaluate this stance. In many ways, though, Richard is like anyone else: His deformity does not define his character – at least, not in Shakespeare's play. By focusing on the deformity, by restricting Richard to a single facet, we strip him of his complexity and bury him in a shallow reading of the play. Just as we have unburied the remains of the historical Richard III, it is time to uncover Shakespeare's *Richard III* and reconsider our perceptions of it.

REFERENCES

- "About Us." *Richard III Society*. Richard III Society, n.d. Web. 04 Mar. 2013.
- Armin, Robert. *Foole Upon Foole, or Sixe Sortes of Sottes*. Folger Shakespeare Library. n.d. Web. 24 Sep. 2010.
- Bacon, Francis. *The Works of Francis Bacon, Lord Chancellor of England*. Comp. Basil Montagu. Vol. 16.1. London: William Pickering, 1825. Print.
- Bates, A. W. *Emblematic Monsters: Unnatural Conceptions and Deformed Births in Early Modern Europe*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005. Print.
- Brown, Georgina. "Diary: Greatness thrust upon him: Simon Russell Beale played Richard III as a humpback and paid for it with a slipped disc. Which gave Ciaran Hinds just over a week to step into his shoes..." *The Independent*. The Independent, 3 Feb. 1993. Web. 10 Feb. 2013.
- Burns, John F., Alan Cowell, and Nicholas Wade. "Bones Under Parking Lot Belonged to Richard III." *The New York Times*. The New York Times Company, 4 Feb. 2013. Web. 4 Feb. 2013.
- Campana, Joseph. "Killing Shakespeare's Children: The Cases of Richard III and King John." *Shakespeare* 3.1 (2007): 18-39. Print.
- Canguilhem, Georges, and Therese Jaeger. "Monstrosity and the Monstrous." *Diogenes* 10 (1962): 27- 42. Web. 13 March 2012.
- Charnes, Linda. *Notorious Identity: Materializing the Subject in Shakespeare*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1993. Print.
- Cressy, David. *Travesties and Transgressions in Tudor and Stuart England: Tales of Discord and Dissension*. New York: Oxford UP, 2000. Print.
- D., John. *A discription of a monstrous Chylde, borne at Chychester in Sussex, the. xxiiii. daye of May. This being the very length, and bynges of the same*. London: Leonard Askel, 1562. *Early English Books Online*. ProQuest LLC. Web. 10 Oct. 2011.
- Daston, Lorraine J., and Katharine Park. "Unnatural Conceptions: The Study of Monsters in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century France and England." *Past & Present* 92 (Aug. 1981): 20-54. Web. 2 April 2012.

- Garber, Marjorie B. *Shakespeare's Ghost Writers: Literature as Uncanny Causality*. New York: Methuen, 1987. Print.
- Hart, Evalee. "A Comparative Study: 'Macbeth' and 'Richard III.'" *The English Journal* 61.6 (Sep. 1972): 824-30. Web. 10 Dec. 2012.
- Holinshed, Raphael. "Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland." *The Holinshed Project*. Oxford University, 2008. Web. 25 Feb. 2013.
- Jarvis, Brian. "Monsters Inc.: Serial Killers and Consumer Culture." *Crime, Media, Culture* 3.3 (2007): 326-44. Print.
- Kendall, Paul M. *Richard the Third*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1955. Print.
- Kennedy, Maev. "It's like Richard III wanted to be found." *The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media Limited, 5 Feb. 2013. Web. 5 Feb. 2013.
- Maus, Katharine Eisaman. *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1995. Print.
- Mooney, Michael E. *Shakespeare's Dramatic Transactions*. Durham: Duke UP, 1990. Print.
- More, Thomas. *The historie of the pitifull life, and unfortunat death of Edward the Fifth, and the then Duke of Yorke, his brother with the troublesome and tyrannical government of usurping Richard the Third, and his miserable end*. London: Thomas Payne, 1641. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 10 Jan. 2013.
- Olson, Greta. "Richard III's Animalistic Criminal Body." *Philological Quarterly* 82.3 (Summer 2003): 301-24. Web. 6 Nov. 2013.
- Paré, Ambroise. *On Monsters and Marvels: Translated with an Introduction and Notes by Janis L. Pallister*. Trans. Janis L. Pallister. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago, 1982. Print.
- Pasupathi, Vimala C. "Coats and Conduct: The Materials of Military Obligation in Shakespeare's *Henry VI* and *Henry V*." *Modern Philology* 109.3 (February 2012): 326-51. Web. 26 Dec. 2012.
- Pfister, Manfred. *The Theory and Analysis of Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991. Print.
- Moulton, Ian Frederick. "A Monster Great Deformed': The Unruly Masculinity of Richard III." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 47.3 (Autumn 1996): 251-68. Web. 8 Nov. 2012.
- Shakespeare, William. *Henry VI Part 2*. *Opensource Shakespeare*. George Mason U, 2012. Web. 1 Oct. 2012.
- . *Henry VI Part 3*. *Opensource Shakespeare*. George Mason U, 2012. Web. 1 Oct. 2012.

---. *The History of Richard III. Opensource Shakespeare*. George Mason U, 2012. Web. 1 Oct. 2012.

Spencer, Charles. "Branagh brilliantly conjures up the psycho in the basement of imagination." *The Telegraph*. Telegraph Media Group Limited, 21 Mar. 2002. Web. 10 Feb. 2013.

Tey, Josephine. *The Daughter of Time*. New York, NY: Scribner Paperback Fiction, 1995. Print.

Torrey, Michael. "'The plain devil and dissembling looks': Ambivalent Physiognomy and Shakespeare's *Richard III*." *English Literary Renaissance* 30.2 (2000): 123-53. Web. 5 Aug. 2012.

Weir, Alison. *The Princes in the Tower*. New York: Ballantine, 1992. Print.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

The Chychester Monster of Sussex Broadside (1562)

A description of a monstrous Childe, borne at Chychester in Sussex, the xxiiii. daye of May.
This being the very length, and by gues of the same. M. CCCC. LIIJ.



Whoe shall see this, in place hath met
Although, he longer doth see
He taketh truly, it change hath sent
To make his time a feast.

It had they thereby, might take remoyce
If there yll life mispent
That some of late, their fears of heare
When to small faulten repent.

Whiche the earth had nourished
With heretofore brought
The best that shee, her body was
With heretofore spent about.

To call them then, to shewly life
If heere theye laugh and haue
The best content of men and life
With theye love all content.

With his preache most earnestly
That it his not repent
That theye and heere have heretofore
That theye have not repented.

Whiche heere has no remorse
Though heere heere change hee
That either waye the best
With about all time of age.

Whiche heere hee and his therefore
By iudice sent of God
In captiue had, here all heere
That theye hee felt the sin.

Whoe heere heere were the children
In captiue brought and hee
Whiche heere heere of God was hee
Whiche heere heere hee hee.

The reare before Wharston came
The heere a heere hee
Whiche heere heere, and cause a lame
Whiche heere heere hee hee hee.

As others doe, and heere hee
In making it as heere
Whiche heere heere, theye heere hee
As heere heere heere hee hee.

The heere heere heere and hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee.

The heere heere heere, before the end
Of all things heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee.

Whoe heere heere, boye of hee
The heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee.

Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee.

Whoe heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee.

Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee.

Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee.

Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee.

Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee.

Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee.

Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee.

Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee.

Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee.

Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee
Whiche heere heere heere hee.

Printed at London, by
Leaugh whet for Francis Goddard, in
the year of our Lorde 1562.

APPENDIX B

Anthony Sher in the Royal Shakespeare Company's *Richard III* (1984)



APPENDIX C

Simon Russell Beale in the Royal Shakespeare Company *Richard III* (1992)



APPENDIX D

Kenneth Branagh as Richard in the 2002 Sheffield Crucible production of *Richard III*



APPENDIX E

Kevin Spacey as Richard III in the Old Vic 2012 Production

