



*"A dog, a rat, ... a cat to scratch a man to death!":
Olivier's Richard III and Popular Cultures*

CATESBY:

Dispatch, my lord: the duke would be at dinner.
Make a short shrift, he longs to see your head.

*(Hastings, regarding in great bitterness Catesby, Ratcliffe,
and Lovell in turn, pronounces the following lines of contemporary doggerel.)*

HASTINGS:

The Cat, the Rat, and Lovell the dog
Rule all England under the Hog.

RATCLIFFE:

Come, come, dispatch.

LOVELL:

'Tis bootless to exclaim.

(Olivier and Dent)

So Lord Hastings goes to his death in Laurence Olivier's iconic 1955 film *Richard III*, connecting a Technicolor fantasy London to legendary apocrypha. Hastings's lines of doggerel are (unsurprisingly) extra-textual additions to Shakespeare's play. As the stage directions above suggest, the two-line insult incorporating the names of the king's closest advisors and the heraldic badge of the king himself was contemporary to the historical Richard III. The fate of the poem's author, William Collingbourne, is well documented, and is often held up to demonstrate the cruelty of Richard Gloucester. "Abbreviated shorter by the head and [...] divided into four quarters" (Holinshed 422) for "making a foolishe rime" (Campbell 347), Collingbourne's additional crime of conspiring to fund an invasion attempt by the future Henry VII is mentioned by Holinshed but often overlooked by history (Potter 148-49).

Regardless of Collingbourne's exact crimes, his crude poem demonstrates how sections of contemporary London society viewed King Richard III even before the alleged character assassinations of More, Legge, Shakespeare, and Cibber. The presence of the rhyme in Olivier's film raises an interesting dilemma. The source of the poem is beyond question, but the same cannot be said for the provenance of the lines' addition to Shakespeare's play. In this paper, I seek to clarify the point at which the "Cat, the Rat and Lovell the dog" poem was added to adaptations of Shakespeare's *Richard III*. This investigation explores the few circulating theories on the piece's provenance, and proposes an unlooked-to modern connection point between poem and play. Furthermore, the connection between Olivier's adaptation and his historical sources demonstrates the critical dramaturgical interplay between film and prior intertexts. Connections between Olivier's film on the one hand and popular culture, historical fact, and apocryphal detail on the other have been under-examined, and this critical detective work effectively uncovers the provenance and significance of dramaturgical choices in Shakespearean adaptations. As dramaturgical sources, "popular cultures" act as units of construction upon which a filmic adaptation is built, and at the same time provide texture, detail, and context. In this case, an obscure piece of doggerel reveals an intertextual exchange between adaptation and sources beyond Shakespeare's text. As a result, it enriches and extends the adaptation in a manner reflecting Shakespeare's own use of popular cultures and historical elements.

* * *

The unfortunate William Collingbourne was a "poeticall schoolemaister [and] corrector of breefs and longs" (Holinshed 422) who once held the post of Sergeant of the Pantry to Edward IV (Seward 162-63). Collingbourne is known almost exclusively for the "foolishe rime" nailed to the door at St. Paul's rather than for his pro-Richmond agitating, which is more likely the primary reason for his grisly fate. Cited as a historical curio, indictment of tyranny, or moralistic warning, Collingbourne's death is recorded by Fabyan, Holinshed, and in *The Mirror for Magistrates*, but is ignored by More and Vergil. The rhyme for which Collingbourne was known gradually faded into obscurity, periodically cited in anthologies of curious puns. The poem virtually dropped from all usage until Sir Walter Scott's *The Antiquary* (1816),

in which an amateur historian identifies a man named Lovell with the Collingbourne lines (16). The poem rarely surfaced in the ensuing two centuries, exceptions being Agatha Christie's *Postern of Fate* in reference to Stevenson's *The Black Arrow*, and J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban* as a title heading ("Cat, Rat, and Dog" 358). The literary obscurity of Collingbourne's famous lines is evident. Olivier's anachronistic transference of the clumsy poem to the condemned Sir William Hastings raises more questions than are addressed by simple inspired dramaturgy. With no evidence of the poem's addition to *Richard III* prior to Olivier's film, including stage drama, we find the obscure reference resurfacing significantly in a most anachronistic of places: popular detective fiction.

* * *

Foremost in the popular defenses of the reputation of Richard III is mystery novelist Josephine Tey, a *nom de plume* for reclusive author Elizabeth MacKintosh.¹ The controversial but much-admired 1951 mystery novel *The Daughter of Time* followed her earlier stage-play *Dickon* (written under another assumed name, Gordon Daviot). MacKintosh's novel and stage-play fit the author's "penchant for rehabilitating rogues who are destroyed by the ambition of friends and the excitable stupidity of mobs" (Roy 29); and both attempt to clear the name of Richard III from the ravages of what some believe is a savage form of victors' history.

Undoubtedly MacKintosh's most famous work, *The Daughter of Time*, was a popular success "greeted with delight by the critics" (Roy 142). The novel's conclusions—that Richard III was slandered by the true criminal, Henry VII—have since been brought into serious question (Townsend 211-24, for example). Even so, MacKintosh's meticulously researched investigation served to fuel fresh debate over Richard's character. *The Daughter of Time* follows the investigative process of convalescent Scotland Yard detective Allan Grant, who re-examines historical material in order to satisfy a suspicion that the man in the official portrait of Richard III (currently housed at the National Portrait Gallery in London) could not possibly be the monster he is suspected of being. A protracted examination of inconsistencies in several fictional sources along with More and Vergil lends credence to Grant's suspicion. This summary is not an endorsement or rejection of MacKintosh's theories, but it is difficult to move far beyond the revelation of MacKintosh's selective reading, withheld evidence, and even suggested plagiarism (Townsend 212-14) to believe that *The Daughter of Time* is any more than entertaining fantasy.

MacKintosh's play *Dickon* takes a similar tack to that of *The Daughter of Time*, but places Richard of Gloucester (familarly "Dickon" to his loving family, including his wife Lady Anne and adoring niece Princess Elizabeth) as protagonist. Richard is loyal, gentle, and steadfast in contrast to the scheming Woodville family, and later, John Morton and William Stanley. *Dickon* demonstrates MacKintosh's determination to destabilize conventional perceptions of Richard III, and dramaturgically anticipates later events, including the reign of Richmond as Henry VII (212), the marriage of Richmond and Elizabeth (231), and the blackening of Gloucester's reputation (201). The significance of *Dickon* for this argument is in proof of a fortuitous connection between MacKintosh and Olivier. As paragraphs below will

demonstrate in more detail, there is significant evidence to suggest that Olivier was at least casually familiar with both *Dickon* and *The Daughter of Time*. In a 1955 radio interview with Jinx Falkenberg of the National Broadcasting Corporation and Alexander Clark of the American Richard III Society, Olivier notes that MacKintosh had approached him in 1944, suggesting that he follow up his stage *Richard III* with the title role in *Dickon*, and he claims that he had "been convinced for years" of Richard's innocence (Falkenberg). MacKintosh's prominence had been assured in the 1930s with a highly successful production of her play *Richard of Bordeaux* starring John Gielgud, and Olivier himself appeared in her *Queen of Scots* in 1934 (Holden 79-80). Olivier was aware of MacKintosh's interest in Richard's cause, and he cited *The Daughter of Time* as an important contribution to the pro-Gloucester cause (Falkenberg). While no documents explicitly prove that Olivier was specifically inspired by MacKintosh's novel, there is enough circumstantial evidence to draw some useful conclusions. With this contextual information in place, we may move forward into the intertextual examination of these materials.

* * *

Allan Grant, the ailing detective of *The Daughter of Time*, employs a standard line of questioning when addressing perceived inconsistencies in More, Vergil, and several elementary history texts. Each visitor to his hospital bed is quizzed over his or her knowledge of King Richard, and his suspicion is aroused as he realizes that almost every detail is either a dramatic embellishment or an apocryphal flourish. Three facts delivered to the credulous Grant's ears are of significant interest for the current argument. First, MacKintosh achieves what Garber observes as an effect of *mise en abyme* (121) by referencing her own play *Richard of Bordeaux* (written as Gordon Daviot) as the primary source of Grant's knowledge of King Richard the Second (47). Grant had "seen" this clearly admirable production four times, and, even more interestingly, had seen it at the New Theatre: the very venue that Olivier's *Richard III* dominated in 1944. MacKintosh places her narrative within a world familiar to her London readership, enhancing the realism of her claims. Referencing the very theatre in which Olivier performed similarly allies her to the performing tradition of Olivier and his associates.

Even more significantly, one visitor to Grant's room responds to his request for information on Richard III thus:

I once saw Olivier play him. The most dazzling exhibition of sheer evil, it was. Always on the verge of toppling over into the grotesque, and never doing it. (32)

MacKintosh's novel was written directly following Olivier's success with *Richard III* at the New Theatre in 1944-45 and its subsequent tours and revivals, which ran until 1949 (Colman 572-74). To reference directly the stage performance that inspired Olivier's film piques interest in other possible connections. It should be noted that a mention of Olivier in a successful and popular detective novel that directly references the subject matter of his upcoming film would almost certainly attract as notoriously a detail-oriented researcher as Olivier to read the fiction (see

Olivier, *On Acting* 186-87, for example). Regardless of Olivier's true familiarity with *The Daughter of Time*, MacKintosh further contextualizes her novel within popular culture. Similar to her reference to *Richard of Bordeaux* and the New Theatre, MacKintosh identifies her fiction with Olivier's iconic *Richard III*.

MacKintosh's cultural references return us to Collingbourne's poem in Olivier's film. As mentioned, the poem is an obscure footnote easily overlooked in the complexities of the Wars of the Roses, and it is primarily forgotten in literary history until a third visitor to Grant's bedside engages him in the following exchange:

"Do you know anything about Richard III?"

"Nothing except that he croaked his nephews, and offered his kingdom for a horse. And that he had two stooges known as the Cat and the Rat."

"What!"

"You know: 'The Cat, the Rat, and Love Our Dog (*sic*), Rule all England under a Hog."

"Yes, of course. I'd forgotten that. What does it mean, do you know?"

"No, I've no idea." (90-91)

Not long later, the same visitor returns with an answer:

I've discovered who the Cat and the Rat were, incidentally. They were entirely respectable knights of the realm: William Catesby and Richard Ratcliffe. Catesby was Speaker of the House of Commons, and Ratcliffe was one of the Commissioners of Peace with Scotland. It's odd how the very sound of words makes a political jingle vicious. The Hog of course was Richard's badge. The White Boar. (97)

There are several interesting aspects to MacKintosh's citation of Collingbourne's doggerel. A meticulous researcher by all accounts (see Weinsoft, for example), MacKintosh cites this fact casually, mixing apocrypha (that Richard killed the Princes) with dramatic fiction ("my kingdom for a horse" appears in the anonymous *True Tragedy of Richard the Third* as well as Shakespeare) and obscure chronicle fact (the Cat, the Rat). Bewilderingly, however, MacKintosh misinterprets the sense of Collingbourne's poem. The "viciousness" that MacKintosh's character excuses is certainly more correct than her adjusted assessment implying that these were fond nicknames for beloved counselors. That Collingbourne himself is not mentioned is again surprising, as the unfortunate man's fate is example of an accessible, well-documented story that is reduced from a traitor's doom to a slanderer's folly.

What is most baffling is MacKintosh's misquotation of Collingbourne's lines: Lovell is simply absorbed and ignored, leaving the "dog" reference unexplained. Obviously, quotations change over time, and Collingbourne's poem is no different: even a comparison of the version in Olivier's memoir to the version in Olivier's film, shows variance (Lovell our dog / Lovell the dog). With her interpretation, however, MacKintosh entirely excludes Francis, the Viscount Lovell (1454-1487) from consideration. Indeed, the man is not mentioned at any point in MacKintosh's novel, a surprising omission given his prominence in both the life of the historical Richard III and Shakespeare's text. Even more interestingly, if we return to *Dickon*,

we find that Lovell is the *only* one of Gloucester's counselors to appear. Catesby and Ratcliffe are nowhere to be seen, nor are they mentioned. Clearly, for this reason, the Collingbourne poem is not cited in *Dickon*, although it seems incomprehensible that MacKintosh would not have come across the Collingbourne incident in researching Holinshed or Fabyan. MacKintosh was obviously aware of Lovell's existence, and his character in *Dickon* takes on the responsibilities that Ratcliffe, Catesby, Lovell, and Tyrell assume in Shakespeare's play. To exclude his name not only from the doggerel poem (even when the poem is reinterpreted from Collingbourne's original insult) but from the entire history of Richard III seems an inexplicable omission. This oversight is not corrected at any point in MacKintosh's novel, and there is no extant match at any time that reflects "Love our dog" (or even "Love all our dog") as an alternative for Collingbourne's slander.

Even considering this sticking-point, the presence of the Collingbourne verse in MacKintosh's book, a novel that Olivier almost certainly read, is an encouraging link between the two works. However, this is not to say that Olivier cribbed ideas from MacKintosh's novel. While MacKintosh is selective with information in *The Daughter of Time*, her use of chronicle and historical sources demonstrates a keen researcher's eye.² If we take into account the scarcity of references to Collingbourne in the opening half of the twentieth century, MacKintosh's novel certainly saved the doggerel couplet from utter obscurity. Julie Pridmore endorses this conclusion, suggesting that Collingbourne's verse "was not thoroughly re-examined until the publication of Josephine Tey's novel *The Daughter of Time* in 1951" (96). With this connection uncovered, we may return to Olivier's use of the lines, problematized by several varying opinions on the origin of the text.

To begin with Olivier himself, we come across the most prominent stumbling-block to linking Hastings's final words to MacKintosh's research. Olivier's second memoir, *On Acting*, discusses the creation process for each of his Shakespeare films. Olivier credits both Colley Cibber and David Garrick as co-contributors to his *Richard III* screenplay, explaining their contribution as follows:

Actors (David Garrick) and playwrights (Colley Cibber) have tried to enhance the part over the years; Cibber's adaptation was the standard acting text for a century. "Off with his head! So much for Buckingham!" is not Shakespeare. And when Hastings is arrested by Catesby, Ratcliffe, and Lovell and says, "The cat, the rat and Lovell our dog / rule all England under the hog," that's not Shakespeare but a contemporary doggerel which adds to the play's image of Richard. A rare Shakespearean event, when the part's the thing and not the play. (82, original emphasis)

Problematically, this account accompanies Olivier's discussion of his 1944 Old Vic stage production. If this chronology is to be taken as correct, it would mean that the addition of Collingbourne's poem was *not* inspired by MacKintosh's novel, as the stage-play preceded it by some seven years. Indeed, this introduces the possibility that Olivier's stage-play inspired MacKintosh's novel reference. This possibility also neatly explains the poem's absence in *Dickon*, which most likely preceded Olivier's play. Furthermore, this chronology might also explain the inaccuracy of the line

in MacKintosh's novel, although it is unfathomable that such a detail would not be corrected in either the research or the editorial process. Unfortunately, the wartime production of *Richard III* was poorly archived (typically under the circumstances); and, to infer from Levenson,³ it is likely that actors rehearsed with paperback New Temple editions, which were either destroyed or lost (49). Consequently, there is no extant prompt-book for Olivier's stage production, and no way to know whether Collingbourne's words did indeed appear in the Old Vic production.

Olivier's account would suggest that the poem was part of the stage script, but if we compare his two memoirs to each other, we find enough contradictions to question the reliability of either. For example, in his 1982 *Confessions of an Actor*, Olivier suggests that he developed Richard's reedy voice by "start[ing] in the thin voice old actors had always put on when they did an imitation of Irving" (110). In 1986's *On Acting*, however, Olivier's story changes, and he muses that he "must have heard the voice somewhere before, maybe on a bus or a train, in a church or from a politician's—who knows? But there it is, and has remained to haunt me ever since" (80). In the earlier autobiography Olivier is deferential to the 1942 Donald Wolfitt *Richard III* (109), while in the latter he calls it disappointing (78). What are we to believe? On the whole, it becomes clear on rereading that Olivier is less eager in his 1986 autobiography to credit influences than he was in the 1982 version: the later edition is the memoir of a man who seeks plaudits for certain decisions he has made alone. Terry Coleman notes that *On Acting* was less an autobiography as an "apparently [...] verbatim" transcription of ten taped interviews between Olivier and a colleague, actor Gawn Grainger (181). The contradictions of *On Acting* appear to be the product of a bravura set of interviews, and undermines the veracity of Olivier's connecting "the Rat, the Cat, and Lovell our dog" to the stage production. However, since we have no material evidence that such a line either was or was not included in Olivier's stage version, it is prudent to examine the few other possibilities for the line's provenance in a dramatic context.

* * *

To locate alternative sources to Shakespeare for line additions, logic dictates that we begin with the two actors credited in Olivier's film for their additions and "some interpolations" (Olivier and Dent). Colley Cibber and David Garrick are doubtless the two most significant post-Shakespearean figures in the proliferation of *Richard III*, and their roles have been extensively surveyed elsewhere (see in particular Richmond 48-105 and Colley 15-61). Cibber's revision of Shakespeare's play arguably saved the piece from obscurity, but the truly important influence was Garrick's 1741 decision to adopt Cibber's 1718 edition as his personal vehicle. Cibber's clumsy bluster was preferred to Shakespeare in the eighteenth century while Garrick's virtuosity in the role ensured the long-term success and imitation of the adaptation. Cibber's and Garrick's influence on the work is irrefutable (for better or worse), and alterations were numerous: but did those changes include Collingbourne's slander?

Beginning with Cibber's version of the play, we immediately notice that the character of Hastings, who speaks the doggerel in Olivier's version, has been

omitted. The line could feasibly be spoken by another character, but it is of such gravity that it could not be spoken by any but one soon to die, or equal in status to Gloucester. The cursing of the women is also curtailed, and Gloucester's most vocal enemy, Queen Margaret, is similarly excised. A thorough search of both the 1700 and 1718 editions, with a specific eye to cursers and enemies including Lady Anne, the Duchess of York, Queen Elizabeth, and Richmond, comes up short. Furthermore, Lovell does not appear in Cibber's *Richard III*, considerably defusing Collingbourne's quadruple insult. Gloucester relies on only Catesby and Ratcliffe until the mid-nineteenth century. Collingbourne's poem is nowhere to be found in either first or second editions of Cibber's play. This problematizes several conclusions: director and playwright Russell Lees in the DVD commentary accompanying the Criterion Collection *Richard III* confidently asserts:

This line, "the Cat, the Rat, and Lovell the Dog, rule all England under the Hog" does not appear in Shakespeare's play. During Richard's time, however, historically someone posted this phrase around London. It was picked up and became a kind of children's rhyme, and Colley Cibber included it in his version of the play.

With such vagaries as "someone" posting a phrase "around London" that "became a kind of children's rhyme," this conclusion is merely an assumption. Olivier's use of lines including "Conscience avaunt! Richard's himself again" and "Off with his head! So much for Buckingham" might suggest to the careless that all unfamiliar lines must also be Cibber's. It is, of course, possible that additional lines emerged in Cibber's version in performance, but the trend of the time would suggest that it is unlikely these would have gone undocumented. As Laurie E. Osborne reminds us, the eighteenth century is notable for the proliferation of "performance editions": the publication of prominent prompt-book versions of plays with all textual cuts either entirely omitted or unacknowledged (171). A "performance edition" would literally become "Garrick's *Richard III*" rather than "Shakespeare's *Richard III*" to profit from a stage success. If Collingbourne's doggerel had made its way into Garrick's *Richard III* (or the versions of his competitors, including Quin, Kemble, and Cooke), then it would certainly have emerged in one of the numerous performance editions memorializing a specific interpretation of Cibber's script. Extensive searching of the prompt-book archive at the Folger Shakespeare Library yields no such additions at any time in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, nor do the lines appear in the editions of Kean, Kemble, Macready, and Bridgman, all of which are considerably altered. As a result, it can be categorically stated that Cibber had no role in adding Collingbourne's lines to Shakespeare's work.

What of Garrick? While the great actor has been almost entirely exonerated by the above criterion, the popular (but, it must be noted immediately, not peer-reviewed) Internet Movie Database, or IMDb website (www.imdb.com), complicates matters further. A website devoted to listing details of film productions past, present, and future, the IMDb features a "trivia" section relating to each film. Olivier's *Richard III* has an extensive listing on this website, and cites the film's original authorship by Shakespeare (play); Cibber (textual alterations); Garrick (textual alterations for

his version of the play); and Olivier (uncredited). Most significantly, however, the "trivia" section boldly states that "Hastings's line 'The cat, the rat/And Lovell the dog/Rule all England under the hog' is from eighteenth-century actor David Garrick's alteration of the play." Once again, I hasten to add that this information is not monitored in any way, so I am not suggesting that it is authorized or reliable. I merely cite the reference to note how Garrick's name is invoked when alteration is discussed. Even Olivier at times feels Cibber and Garrick are interchangeable:

I quite expect, now, to be accused of vandalism. And yet some of the most famous lines like "Richard's himself again" and "Off with his head, so much for Buckingham" are not Shakespeare's at all, but were added later by *Garrick or Cibber*, who thought nothing of adding scenes adapted from *Henry V* to their productions! (Manvell 48, my emphasis)

Olivier uses Cibber and Garrick to distance himself from sole responsibility for his decisions, a tactic questioned by *The Times* critic, warily eying "the suspect name of Colley Cibber [...] joined by David Garrick to suggest that adapters other than Sir Laurence have been at work" (qtd. in Davies 176). Co-opting Garrick's name in an authorial role has less to do with his contributions to the structure of *Richard III* and more with banking on Garrick's legacy as the greatest of Gloucesters.⁴ Indeed, as Albert E. Kalson points out, "Garrick, who played Richard repeatedly until his retirement in 1776, never added a line to the work but tightened it still further by deleting 78 lines. [...] That Garrick's cuts were never restored to performance is a tribute by the actors who succeeded him [and] [...] to his astuteness as theatrical producer" (iii, my emphasis). Stone and Kahrl echo a similar sentiment, suggesting that while Garrick did restore several of Shakespeare's lines to Cibber's text, the actor's primary editorial drive was "in the nature of cuts in order to speed up the play" (257). A closer examination of extant prompt-books from Garrick's era demonstrates that some of Cibber's less successful additions are excised, but there is no evidence of addition, and certainly not two or three lines of doggerel contemporary to King Richard III whose effect is so minor that their inclusion is dramaturgically redundant.

* * *

Having established that neither Cibber nor Garrick can be confidently credited with this addition, we return to the possibility that Elizabeth MacKintosh's research for *The Daughter of Time* can be pinpointed as the moment when William Collingbourne's poem returned to the wider consciousness. Both Olivier and MacKintosh are keen researchers, and adherence to what might problematically be called "source" is a priority for Olivier, as witnessed in his decision to name his first Shakespearean film officially *The Chronicle History of King Henry the Fifth with His Battell Fought at Agincourt in France* (sic). Olivier's use of Shakespeare's Q1 title (which neatly incorporates the chronicle) connects him with both the performative and historical heritage of the work, much in the way that he later invokes Garrick for *Richard III*. With this precedent for acknowledging the past in mind, it follows that Olivier was indeed

influenced by MacKintosh's novel. An artist with a self-professed fixation on the smallest of details (Tynan 19) and clear "self-confidence in the number of his own words he wrote into Shakespeare" (Holden 283), Olivier did not so much "borrow" ideas as he was inspired to seek out details within MacKintosh's sources. Olivier was certainly not ignorant of chronicle and contemporary sources prior to encountering MacKintosh's book and stage-play, but the confluence of imagery within MacKintosh's writings and Olivier's films—both of which refer to source—is a persuasive hint that MacKintosh intercedes between Olivier and chronicle.

The richly textured historical detail of Olivier's film (even disregarding the artificial beauty and cleanliness of sets and costumes) demonstrates several points of entry for comparison to MacKintosh's novel. Comparing MacKintosh's account of the Battle of Bosworth with Olivier's, we see several motifs emerge to satisfy the eagle-eyed historian, motifs which once more point to Olivier's relationship with MacKintosh's research.



As Detective Grant's investigation concludes, he considers the details of Richard's death, and images of legendary and apocryphal origin that resurface in Olivier's film. After noting the courage Richard had demonstrated in battle, Grant considers the symbol of kingship itself:

"That was the crown that was found in a hawthorn bush afterwards."

"Yes. Set aside for plunder probably."

"I used to picture it one of those high plush things that King George got crowned in, but it seems it was just a gold circlet."

"Yes. It could be worn outside the battle helmet." (202)

This exchange brings us to the central image throughout Olivier's film: the royal crown. Constantly fetishized by Olivier's camera, crown imagery frames the film and symbolizes Richard's fortunes in battle. Several sources suggest that Richard wore his crown into battle,⁵ including the anonymous *Ballad of Bosworth Field* ("he said, 'give me my battell axe to my hand, / sett the crowne of England on my head soe hye!'" [257]), and Vergil ("he came to the fiede with the crowne upon his head, that therby he might ether make a beginning or ende of his raigne" [225-26]). That Olivier replicates MacKintosh's description of a gold cirlet is unsurprising: Grant's surprise that Richard had not fought in full coronation regalia is clearly unfounded. Regardless, this connection is strengthened by the fate of Olivier's cirlet, left hanging in the hawthorn bush of legend just as MacKintosh describes it.

The hawthorn bush is a detail of general, apocryphal knowledge used for centuries to explain the "crown and tree" motif adorning the standard of Henry VII. Virginia K. Henderson, however, questions the veracity of this legend, noting Sydney Anglo's research that reveals no mention of a hawthorn bush in relation to Henry VII or Bosworth until the reign of James I (237). Henderson points out that no contemporary writers, including Vergil, the Croyland Continuator, Hall, Holinshed, Shakespeare, Bacon, or the anonymous balladeers, mention this detail (238). If Henderson's argument is correct, and the legend did not emerge until the seventeenth century (259), she leads us to one of two conclusions. As the story could not be found in the chronicle sources, either Olivier used a well-known legend already at his disposal or he noted it in MacKintosh's novel and chose to adopt the detail. The concurrence between the gold cirlet and the hawthorn bush suggests the latter. Once more, Olivier benefits from MacKintosh's exhaustive research to add a memorable flourish; and he anchors his film to a symbol in accord with his own prologue, which asserts that "the history of the world [...] would be a dry matter indeed without its legends" (Olivier and Dent).

Finally, Detective Grant makes reference to a shocking chronicle image:

You don't like to think of a man you've known and admired flung stripped and dangling across a pony like a dead animal. (203)

The desecration of Richard's body, "not exactly in accordance with the laws of humanity" (Croyland Continuator), is a well-documented fact. Chroniclers who attest to this image include More ("haryed on horsebacke dead, his here in despite torn and togged lyke a cur dogge" [85-86]), Vergil ("nakyd of all clothing, and layd uppon an horse bake with the armes and legges hanginge downe on both sides" [226]), Fabyan ("naked as he was borne, cast behinde a man, and so caried unruerently ouertwharte the horse backe" [520]), and Holinshed ("trussed behind a purseuant of arms, [...] his head and armes hanging on the one side of the horse, and his legs on the other side, and all besprinkled with mire and bloud" [446]). The proliferation of this image and uncertainty about the historical King Richard's final resting-place are other historical obscurities foregrounded by MacKintosh's novel. Olivier uses the details to display Richard's Garter, reminiscent of his battle gallantry, but simultaneously to contrast with the undignified final conveyance of

the king's body. The collision of details in this final sequence points to a central source of information, and MacKintosh is unique in featuring all three: coronet, hawthorn bush, and horseback burial.

* * *

Tracing Olivier's design to the chronicle source explains the seemingly disjointed battle sequence that *Saturday Review* critic Arthur Knight calls "remote and confused, with lots of soldiers and lots of horses but a lack of identification" and "a series of shots that seem to have been collected at random, generating no mounting tension [...] all giving way abruptly to Richard's stumbling entrance shrieking 'a horse'" (26). This disjuncture makes more sense compared to Holinshed's account of the Battle of Bosworth:

Now being inflamed with ire, and vexed with outrageous malice, [Richard] put his spurs to his horse, and rode out of the side of the range of his battell, leauing the vant-gard fighting; and like a hungrie lion ran with speare in rest toward him. The earle of Richmond perceiued well the king furiouslye comming toward him, and bicause the whole hope of his wealth and purpose was to be determined by battell, he gladlie proffered to incounter with him bodie to bodie, and man to man. King Richard set on so sharplie at the first brunt, that he ouerthrew the earles standard, and slue sir William Brandon his standard bearer [...] and matched hand to hand with sir Iohn Cheinie, a man of great force and strength, which would haue resisted him: but the said Iohn was by him manfullie ouerthrowen. And so he making open passage by dint of sword as he went forward, the earle of Richmond withstood his violence, and kept him at the swords point without aduantage, longer than his companions either thought or iudged: which being almost in despaire of victorie, were suddenlie recomforted by sir William Stanleie, which came to his succors with three thousand tall men. At which verie instant, king Richards men were driuen backe and fled, & he himselfe manfullie fighting in the middle of his enimies, was slaine, and (as he worthilie had deserued) came to a bloudie death, as he had lead a bloudie life. (444)

Olivier recreates this chronicle reportage almost exactly.⁶ Richard keenly observes the battle before charging with "outrageous malice" at Richmond and Stanley, striking down several horsemen including the standard-bearer. Olivier intertwines Shakespeare and Holinshed, using the chronicle reportage of Stanley's reinforcements as an opportune moment to distract him from engaging Richmond and to be unhorsed. Richard is "driuen backe and fled" into a shallow glen, isolated and ringed with hawthorn bushes, calling for a horse. Overwhelmed while "manfullie fighting in the middle of his enimies," Olivier's stylized death struggle was purportedly based on the throes of a dying kitten (Coleman 267) and his crucifix-like presentation of his sword hilt recalls Henry Irving's identical gesture (Day 4). Constance Brown suggests in her influential 1967 "Re-Evaluation" that Olivier's portrayal of Richard's death is historically accurate, citing More: "King Richarde [was] slain in the field, hacked and hewed of his enemies handes" (Brown 28; More 85-86). Still more satisfactorily, however, Vergil's description (which echoes

Holinshed) resembles Olivier's interpretation: "king Richerd alone was killyd fyghting manfully in the thickest presse of his enemyes" (224). Both chronicle accounts demonstrate not only that Olivier sought historical sources, but that he read widely beyond Holinshed.

* * *

The connection between *The Daughter of Time* and *Richard III* demonstrates a critical dramaturgical relationship reliant on interplay between sources past and present. Indeed, Olivier's use of contemporary popular culture as inspiration directly parallels Shakespeare's own adaptation of chronicle source: popular cultures remain a vital factor in collecting dramaturgical detail. The texturing of *The Daughter of Time* is deepened by an understanding of the structure of *Dickon*, much as *Richard III* is validated in its connection to historical fact, apocrypha, and dramatic history. There is little to suggest that Olivier's primary inspiration was MacKintosh's novel, but no evidence suggests that Collingbourne's doggerel lines were extant in popular form prior to *The Daughter of Time*, let alone connected to Shakespeare's or Cibber's play. In demonstrating the link between Olivier and MacKintosh, we solidify the connection between Olivier and his chronicle sources, and supply the final link in the cyclical source-bound relationship between *The Daughter of Time* and both stage and screen versions of *Richard III*.

Toby Malone
University of Toronto, Canada



Notes

¹ All of MacKintosh's works listed in this essay—*The Daughter of Time* written as Josephine Tey and *Dickon, Richard of Bordeaux*: and *Queen of Scots* as Gordon Daviot—are credited to the author's birth name of Elizabeth MacKintosh to ensure clarity.

² This includes “fulsome praise” for a novel, *The Rose of Raby* (a Guy Paget work that MacKintosh incorrectly attributes to the fictional Evelyn Payne-Ellis, as Marjorie Garber notes [121]) while rejecting More and Vergil, much to Townsend's chagrin (213).

³ Levenson persuasively argues that New Temple editions were preferred in Old Vic rehearsals, and were used for both the 1935 Gielgud-Olivier and 1960 Franco Zeffirelli productions of *Romeo and Juliet*.

⁴ Garrick was the greatest, evidently, until Olivier himself. After Gielgud gifted Edmund Kean's sword to Olivier—a sword passed through the generations via Chippendale, Irving, and Kate Terry—Olivier declined to pass it forward, preferring to keep it under a bed (Coleman 176). The implication here is that Olivier considered himself the final word in the interpretation of *Richard III*, which has not necessarily proved to be incorrect.

⁵ Richard wore his crown in contrast to Richmond, who, as Shakespeare suggests, likely used body doubles to conceal his identity: “I think there be six Richmonds in the field: / Five have I slain today instead of him” (*Richard III* 5.5.11-12).

⁶ This detail is embellished by the addition of occasional anachronisms in the deaths of some of Richard's followers. Norfolk is hit with an arrow and tumbles from a low bridge into a stream, and Catesby is mercilessly garroted.

Works Cited

- “The Ballad of Bosworth Field.” *Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript. Ballads and Romances, Volume III*. Ed. Hales and Furnivall. London, 1868. 233-59.
- Brown, Constance. “Olivier's *Richard III*: A Re-Evaluation.” *Film Quarterly* 20:4 (1967): 23-32.
- Campbell, Lily B., ed. *The Mirror For Magistrates: Edited from Original Texts in the Huntington Library*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1938.
- Christie, Agatha. *Postern of Fate*. London: Collins, 1973.
- Coleman, Terry. *Olivier: the Authorized Biography*. London: Bloomsbury, 2005.
- The Croyland Continuator. *The Croyland Chronicle: Part IX. The Third Continuation of the History of Croyland Abbey: July, 1485—April, 1486 with Notes*. Online Plain-Text Edition. <<http://www.r3.org/bookcase/croyland/croy9.html>> 21 Nov. 2008.
- Davies, Anthony. “The Shakespeare Films of Laurence Olivier.” *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film*. Ed. Russell Jackson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. 167-86.

- Day, Gillian. *Shakespeare at Stratford: King Richard III*. London: Thomson Learning, 2002.
- Fabyan, Robert. *The Concordaunce of Hystories*. Online Plain-Text Edition. <<http://www.r3.org/bookcase/fabyan/Fabyan.html>> 21 Nov. 2008.
- Falkenberg, Jinx. "Laurence Olivier, Alexander Clark on *Richard III*: A Radio Interview Transcript." *Richard III Society Website*. <<http://www.r3.org/mckellen/friend2.html>> 21 Nov. 2008.
- Garber, Marjorie. *Shakespeare and Modern Culture*. New York: Pantheon, 2008.
- Henderson, Virginia K. "Retrieving the 'Crown in the Hawthorn Bush': The Origins of the Badges of Henry VII." *Traditions and Transformations in Late Medieval England*. Ed. Douglas Biggs, Sharon D. Michalove, and A. Compton Reeves. Leiden: Brill, 2002. 237-59.
- Holden, Anthony. *Olivier*. London: Max, 2007.
- Holinshed, Raphael. *Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland, Vol. 6*. Online Plain-Text Edition. <<http://www.r3.org/bookcase/holinshed/>> 21 Nov. 2008.
- Kalson, Albert E. "Introduction." *Shakespeare's King Richard the Third, a Historical Play*. Facsimile edition. Adapt. John Philip Kemble. London: Cornmarket, 1972. i-iii.
- Knight, Arthur. "Sir Laurence and the Bard." *Saturday Review*, 10 Mar. 1956: 26. Folger Shakespeare Library Cuttings Collection.
- Lees, Russell. "DVD Commentary." *William Shakespeare's Richard III: The Criterion Collection*. Dir. Laurence Olivier. Perf. Laurence Olivier, Ralph Richardson, and John Gielgud. London Films, 1955. DVD Criterion, 2004.
- Levenson, Jill L. *Shakespeare in Performance: Romeo and Juliet*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1987.
- MacKintosh, Elizabeth [Josephine Tey]. *The Daughter of Time*. New York: Simon, 2005.
- . [Gordon Daviot]. *Dickon. Plays I*. London: Davies, 1953.
- . [Gordon Daviot]. *Queen of Scots. Plays II*. London: Davies, 1953.
- . [Gordon Daviot]. *Richard of Bordeaux*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1933.
- Manvell, Roger. *Shakespeare & the Film*. New York and Washington: Praeger, 1971.
- More, Sir Thomas. *The History of King Richard III*. Ed. Sister Wendy Beckett. London: Hesperus, 2005.
- Olivier, Laurence, and Alan Dent. "Richard III." Unpublished Shooting-Script, 1954. Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington DC.
- Olivier, Laurence. *Confessions of an Actor: An Autobiography*. London: Simon, 1982.

— — —. *On Acting*. London: Holiday House, 1986.

Osborne, Laurie E. "Rethinking the Performance Editions: Theatrical and Textual Productions of Shakespeare." *Shakespeare, Theory, and Performance*. Ed. James C. Bulman. Oxford and New York: Routledge, 1996. 171-88.

Potter, Jeremy. *Good King Richard? An Account of Richard III and his Reputation 1483-1983*. London: Constable, 1983.

Pridmore, Julie. "Reconstructing the Middle Ages: Some Victorian 'Medievalisms.'" *Kleio* XXXII (2000): 84-102.

"*Richard III* (1955)—Trivia." *The Internet Movie Database*. <<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0049674/trivia>> 21 Nov. 2008.

Rowling, J. K. *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*. London: Bloomsbury, 1999.

Roy, Sandra. *Josephine Tey*. Boston: Twayne, 1980.

Scott, Sir Walter. *The Antiquary*. Ed. David Hewett. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1995.

Seward, Desmond. *Richard III: England's Black Legend*. London: Country Life, 1983.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedy of King Richard III*. Ed. John Jowett. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. *The Black Arrow: A Tale of the Two Roses*. London: Penguin, 2007.

Stone, George Winchester, Jr., and George M. Kahrl. *David Garrick: A Critical Biography*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1979.

Townsend, Guy M. "Richard III and Josephine Tey: Partners in Crime." *The Armchair Detective* 10 (1977): 211-24.

The True Tragedy of Richard the Third. Ed. W. W. Greg. London: Malone Society, 1929.

Tynan, Kenneth. "The Actor: Kenneth Tynan Interviews Laurence Olivier." *Tulane Drama Review* 11.2 (1966): 71-101.

Vergil, Polydore. *Anglica Historia, Books 23-25*. Ed. Henry Ellis. London: Nichols, 1846.

Weinsoft, Judy R. "Strutting and Fretting His Hour upon the Stage: An Analysis of the Characterization of Richard in Shakespeare's *Richard III* and Gordon Daviot's *Dickon*. A lecture presented at the Oregon Shakespeare Festival August 27, 1993." *Richard III Society Website*. <<http://www.r3.org/judy.html>> 21 Nov. 2008.