The Digital RICHARD III Text Research Toolset

**TEXT MODE**

1. Provides a scrollable text of the play at the left of the screen as shown on Pages 2 and 3.
2. Highlights each word or aspect of the text for which there is a Quarto vs. Folio variant.
3. Exhibits the 1st Quarto vs Folio alternative for each of over 1000 textual variants.
4. Exhibits emendations specified by the editors of any of the seven respected editions listed below.
5. Provides comments on the “contested” choices by the editors cited.

**Quarto oriented editions:**
- William G. Clark and Wiliam A. Wright (1864) Cambridge University Press

**Folio oriented editions:**
- Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine (1996) Folger Shakespeare Library
- James R. Siemon (2009) Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare
- David Bevington (1997) Pearson Longman

**HISTORY MODE**

1. Provides narrative of play as 70 concise plot element descriptions alongside the text.
2. Describes plot elements and events as being accurate to history, based on history, or fictitious.
3. Provides separate descriptions of events according to modern historians, Tudor sources, and Medieval sources, including detailed citations to the following sources:

**Modern Historians:**
- Christopher Gravett (2003) Tewkesbury 1471
- P. W. Hammond (1990) The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury
- Paul Murray Kendall (1955) Richard III

**Tudor Sources:**
- Hall's Chronicle (1550) Edward Hall, 1809 edition

**Medieval Sources:**
- The Crowland Chronicle (1596) Unknown, Edited by Henry T. Riley, 1856 edition
- The History of King Richard III (1513) From: Three Books of Polydore Virgil's English History
THE TEXT

There are over 900 Quarto vs. Folio variants in the texts of King Richard III. The text used in the RICHARD III Text Research Toolset is a Folio-based text.

In terms of the percentage of Quarto vs. Folio variant choices among the five Folio-based texts studied, the Howland Research text is closest to David Bevington’s Pearson text and to the Folger text edited by Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine.

Text Options: Scroll Text
Select Act, and text will advance with option of selecting Scene
Select Scene, and text will advance to beginning of Scene

Text Mode and History Mode selection options available at upper right of screen
Text Mode is described below
History Mode is described on facing page

Additional selection options available at all times at lower right of screen
Genealogy covering full range of historical characters in play
Text Screen Tutorial - Expanded version of overview below
History Screen Tutorial - Expanded version of facing page

TEXT MODE

With Text Mode selected, each word or line which is variant between the 1597 1st Quarto and the text appearing in the Folio of 1623 is highlighted in "dusty red."

To the right of each variant are several points of information as described below.

For each variant, there is a three-section cell labeled Quarto - Folio - Emendation. The choice in our text appears in red, whether it be the Quarto or Folio option or an Emendation. If none of the respected texts studied offers an emendation, "n/a" appears in that cell. If a word or passage is unique to the Folio text, it is noted in red in the Folio cell, and n/a appears in the other two cells. Likewise for passages unique to the Quarto text.

In cases where the choice of Folio-based editors is unanimous or nearly so, no comment is made.

When editors have made arguments for differing choices, appropriate comments are included.
**HISTORY MODE**

With **History Mode** selected, the narrative of the play is expressed as 70 "plot elements."

A cryptic description of each element is inserted in the text at the beginning of the plot element, such as in the example, "Clarence is escorted to be imprisoned in the Tower."

**HISTORY MODE WITH "MORE DETAIL & REFERENCES" SELECTED**

To the right of each brief plot element description is package of information, including:

- **Narrative:** An expanded description of the plot element
  
  **Historical Analysis:**
  - Accurate - Aspects of the plot element that are accurate to history (green dot)
  - Based on history or Controversial - Aspects that are based on history (yellow dot)
  - Fictitious - Aspects that are speculative or downright fictitious (red dot)

Users have the option of selecting "More Detail & References" as described below.

The "Expanded Perspectives" screen for any Plot Element included the following:

- **Modern:** The consensus of Modern Historians as to what actually happened and why
- **Tudor:** The event according to Tudor sources such as the Chronicles of Hall and Holinshed
- **Medieval:** The event according to sources contemporary to the time (Virgil, Crowland, Mancini)

There is a greater degree of agreement between Medieval and modern sources than Tudor.

Also, there is a remarkable concordance between the characters and events of history and the play. However, aspects of Richard's character are speculations woven into the fabric by Shakespeare.

An aspect of Shakespeare's genius is that historians are still struggling to rescue Richard's reputation.
A note on edited texts of *KING RICHARD III*

and the Howland Research text utilized in this project

Richard III has come down to us in the form of two substantive texts, the 1st Quarto of 1597 and text appearing in the iconic Folio of 1623. More than 200 lines are unique to the Folio text, while about 50 are unique to the Quarto. Since the passages involving these lines are not direct substitutes for each other, both can be included in a conflated text. However, it is not possible to conflate the 900+ variant and transposed words appearing in lines that are otherwise identical. Editors are forced to choose between variants, or to emend their texts if both are obviously corruptions.

We studied five Folio-based texts, the closest to 100% pure being the Cambridge text of editor, Janice Lull. Lull's policy was to let stand anything that could “possibly” have appeared in the manuscript behind the Folio text as printed. Nonetheless, in terms of the 900 variant words, her text is 3% short of being a pure Folio text, having 24 Quarto readings and six emendations. This editing effort is important because it helps confirm that contaminants in Elizabethan texts were often introduced by scribes and the compositors who set the type. A few cases where the manuscript and the printed copy are both available enable scholars to quantify the range of variance caused by this factor. Of course, among corruptions there can be many that can make sense. As we were confronted with each of such pairs of variants, if we preferred the Quarto reading based primarily on metering, the Quarto reading became our choice.

We theorized that our theatre-oriented editorial policy might produce a percentage of Quarto choices slightly higher than any of the five respected Folio-based editions. Upon charting the editorial choices for all 900+ variant words in the most recent texts from Cambridge (Janice Lull), Arden (James R. Siemon), Folger (Barbara Mowatt & Paul Werstine), Riverside (G. Blakemore Evans), and Pearson (David Bevington), we found that our text has 96 quarto readings, 11 more than David Bevington’s much respected text. While not radically different, our text represents a new point on the spectrum of Folio-based texts, and may reflect a slight refinement in editorial emphasis.