

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ

**ДЕРЖАВНИЙ ВИЩИЙ НАВЧАЛЬНИЙ ЗАКЛАД
«ДОНБАСЬКИЙ ДЕРЖАВНИЙ ПЕДАГОГІЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ»
ГОРЛІВСЬКИЙ ІНСТИТУТ ІНОЗЕМНИХ МОВ**

ГРАНІ ІСТОРІЇ

ЗБІРНИК НАУКОВИХ ПРАЦЬ

Випуск 2 (10)

Слов'янськ
2019

УДК 94 (477)

Г 77

Свідоцтво про державну реєстрацію друкованого засобу масової інформації
№ 23066-12906Р від 11.12.2017 р.

*Рекомендовано до друку вченою радою
Горлівського інституту іноземних мов
(протокол № 3 від 23.10.2019 р.)*

Редакційна колегія:

Головний редактор: **В. М. Докашенко**, доктор історичних наук, професор
Відповідальний секретар: **В. В. Концур**, кандидат історичних наук, доцент

Члени редколегії:

І. М. Грідіна, доктор історичних наук, професор
Г. П. Докашенко, доктор історичних наук, професор
В. В. Сокирська, доктор історичних наук, доцент
О. В. Стяжкіна, доктор історичних наук, професор
Н. Р. Темірова, доктор історичних наук, професор
І. Я. Тодоров, доктор історичних наук, професор
М. В. Тортіка, доктор історичних наук, доцент
С. М. Швидкий, доктор історичних наук, доцент

Рецензенти:

Л. Л. Бабенко, доктор історичних наук, Полтавський національний педагогічний університет імені В.Г.Короленка

О. О. Баковецька, доктор історичних наук, Миколаївська філія Київського національного університету культури і мистецтв

Г 77 **Грані історії**: зб. наук. праць. Спеціальний випуск – матеріали
III Всеукраїнської науково-практичної конференції «Бахмутська
старовина: краєзнавчі дослідження – 2019». Слов'янськ: Вид-во
Б. І. Маторіна, 2019. Вип. 2(10). 197 с.
ISBN 978-617-7780-15-0

У збірнику наукових праць розглядаються різноманітні аспекти актуальних проблем ідентичності, ментальності, самосвідомості в регіональній історії Донеччини, джерелознавчі та історіографічні проблеми, локальні аспекти економічної історії, історії повсякденності, історична біографістика та усна історія в регіональному вимірі.

Для науковців, викладачів, студентів, всіх, хто цікавиться історичною регіоналістикою, зокрема історією Донецького краю.

ISBN 978-617-7780-15-0

УДК 94 (477)

5. <http://m.ritmearasia.org/news-2015-10-31-objdet-li-sirijskij-pozhar-centralnoaziatskujuulicu-20340.05.12.2015.13:20>
6. <http://visionofhumanity.org/indexes/terrorism-index/>

УДК 930.23-059.1

Kontsur V. V., Tymchenko N.V.

THE ENGLISH KING RICHARD III: AN ATTEMPT OF AN OBJECTIVE VIEW OF THE HISTORICAL FIGURE

In modern historical science, the English King Richard III of the York Dynasty (1452–1485) is one of the most controversial figures. The controversy surrounding the figure of Richard III has not subsided for centuries, with the result that two irreconcilable camps have been formed: the supporters praise the King's name while his haters defame the king in every way.

There are many works written about Richard III, but the most famous is William Shakespeare's historical play *Richard III* (1592-1593), which portrays the king as a murderous psychopath, a heartless ruler with a terrible appearance. During the course of the play *Richard III* the audience is made aware that Richard is responsible for the deaths of Henry VI and his son Prince Edward, Richard's brother the duke of Clarence, Earl Rivers, Richard Grey, Vaughan, William Hastings, the Princes (Richard's nephews) who stood between him and the throne, the duke of Buckingham and his own queen, Anne Neville. To crown it all, he usurped the throne. Collectively these are the 'crimes' of Richard III.

Although no one knows for sure the fate of Richard's nephews and no evidence connects Richard to his brother's or other's deaths, the king's reputation never recovered and it was Shakespeare who threw away any doubts about Richard's involvement. The existence of a monstrous image of Richard III was the impetus for the beginning of his demythologization. The members of the Richard III Society believe that Shakespeare's characterization is unfair [8].

In this study, an attempt was made to examine some scientific works on the historical Richard III and to find out whether the literary portrait of the king, created by Shakespeare, corresponds to his historical prototype.

The analysis of the bibliography of the question shows that Shakespeare's sources were the Tudor chroniclers, hostile to Richard. Dr Rosemary Horrox maintains that Shakespeare's *Richard III* is not history. It was written within the context of the 'Tudor myth' designed to demonstrate the providential nature of the Tudors' accession to a throne to which they had no legitimate claim. Initially the myth involved blackening the Yorkists, whom the Tudors succeeded, but from the outset this blackening was partial, targeting Richard III rather than his brother Edward IV. Within *Richard III* itself the emphasis is inevitably on Richard's own wickedness as the justification for Henry VII's seizure of power. The play piles up the murders: of kings, of family, of friends – all done without scruple, even with enjoyment [11].

The first defenders of King Richard III had already appeared by the end of the 16th century. Dr Lesley Boatwright proves that no defence of Richard appeared in print in Tudor times, but at least one appears to have been circulating privately in the

1590s [4]. Sir George Buck wrote his *History of King Richard the Third* in 1619. The *History* is in five books. Book III refutes various accusations made against *Richard*, including his deformities. Book V discusses Richard's virtues and good works. Buck not only made use of documentary sources, he cited them so that others could evaluate their validity. But Buck's defence did not generate a passionate debate. In 1655 Bishop Fuller was regarding it as a whitewash of Richard III [5].

In 1768, Walpole, England's first real Prime Minister, published his *Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of King Richard the Third*. He thought that Richard's name had been blackened so that Henry VII, 'a mean and unfeeling tyrant', should appear in a better light [3].

Sharon Turner, a professional historian who in 1830 published his *History of England in the Middle Ages*. He was the first historian to view Richard's career in terms of its times. Turner insists that Richard's times were violent and '[he] did not live in an age of modern moral sensibility'. He believed that Richard had taken the crown 'with the approbation of most of the great men, both of the church and the state, then in London' – but also that he had murdered the Princes to clear his way to do so [7].

In 1844 Caroline A. Halsted published a two-volume biography, *Richard III as Duke of Gloucester and King of England*. She used many original sources, and printed many of those sources as appendices to rescue Richard's memory from 'unfounded aspersions' [1].

Clements Markham published his book *Richard III: His Life & Character Reviewed in the Light of Recent Research*, in 1906. Keith Dockray states that it is 'the most fervent and thorough vindication of the king ever to appear in print' [6]. The first part recounts Richard's life and times, and the second part tackles the accusations made against him [2].

It is obvious that common sense, intellectual curiosity and documentary research led to the availability of decent evidence for an alternative reading of events and motives but scholars and public, in general, continued to follow the stereotype of Richard the Bad, so a new enlightenment was needed.

The Ricardian studies were proceeded the 20-21st centuries. In 2012, a University of Leicester archeological team tracked Richard's skeleton to a site that once held Greyfriars Church, exhumed it from beneath a parking lot and identified it as Richard's remains. The discovery and identification of Richard III's remains provided an opportunity to re-evaluate his personality, especially in light of what is now known about his physical condition [9].

Ironically, at the disposal of historians there are portraits and detailed verbal descriptions of all the English rulers of the XV century, the only exception is Richard III. Apparently, this can be explained by the fact that Richard III ruled for only twenty-six months [10].

The well-known horrid image of Richard III has been formed mainly under the influenced of Shakespeare who portrayed the king as the 'poisonous bunch-backed toad'. Perhaps Shakespeare wanted to reflect the medieval idea that an evil mind must dwell in a twisted body. Tudor propaganda succeeded in creating a hunchbacked, crooked, lame dwarf with a withered arm, but if one takes an attempt to examine what was said about Richard III' appearance by the people who really met

him, or have a look at his portraits, a rather different picture of him emerges.

At least two dozen painted portraits of him are known to have survived to the present day. The officially-held view of Richard III at the Tudor court was that he had been an evil usurper, deformed in body and mind, and it is interesting to note that it was at just about the same time as the portrait was painted that this idea received powerful endorsement in the work of the historian Polydore Vergil [10].

The earlier portraits of Richard III belonging to the Society of Antiquaries show no sign of deformity. Although they were not painted in his lifetime but were based on the originals that could have been painted from life [10]. The discovery of Richard's remains in 2012 made it possible to add a further fascinating point about his portrait image. On examining the skull, the forensic anthropologist Caroline Wilkinson found a strikingly close correspondence between its contours and those of Richard's face as shown in the Antiquaries portrait and in the well-known, though much later, portrait in the National Portrait Gallery [9].

Later portraits, further from the lost originals, painted to fit in with the established myth, show uneven shoulders and a villainous countenance. The raised shoulder of the Windsor portrait can be shown under X-ray to be a later addition to a painting with a normal shoulder line [10]. Moreover, historic Richard died at the age of 32 but painters gradually increased the apparent age of the king, to emphasize his depravity, to display what can be called poetically "the ageing of the soul".

There is no contemporary evidence that Richard III suffered from any visible physical problems. The only surviving description of the king is provided by a Silesian visitor, Nicolas van Poppelau, who spent time at Richard's court in 1484 and described the king as lean, with delicate arms and legs and that he was '*three fingers taller*' than Poppelau himself. The Crowland Chronicler, Mancini and de Commynes, none of them were particularly pro-Richard witnesses, they did not mention any deformity, although they must have either met Richard themselves, or, as in the case of Mancini, spoken to those who had [10].

Even the hostile witnesses agreed on Richard's bravery and prowess in battle, so any disablement must have been slight enough not to affect his use of weapons or control of his horse. As Sir Winston Churchill said in his *History of the English Speaking Peoples*: 'No-one in his (Richard's) life time seems to have remarked these deformities, but they are now very familiar to us through Shakespeare's play' [10].

One of the most important outcomes from the Greyfriars dig and the identification of King Richard III's remains was the confirmation that he had adolescent on-set scoliosis. This is a condition which usually develops between the ages of 10 to 18 and for which there is no known cause: it results in the spinal column bending to the side which can result in one shoulder being slightly higher than the other, in the case of Richard III's skeleton the right shoulder [10].

The evidence clearly shows the king did not have kyphosis, which can result in a hunchback, contrary to the historical myths about his physical appearance. Kyphosis is a forward bend of the spinal column when the head is pushed forward and down onto the chest. The legend of Richard's hunchback began in the early days of the new Tudor dynasty when it was expedient to denigrate the reputation of the dead king. Care should always be taken when using the word '*hunchback*' in the context of either kyphosis or scoliosis.

Thanks to Shakespeare's play the world knows King Richard III as a murderous psychopath. The members of the Richard III Society asked psychologists to re-analyze Richard's character. After examining biographies and other secondary literature, psychologists Mark Lansdale, PhD, and Julian Boon, PhD, of the University of Leicester concluded that the king likely suffered from anxiety, not psychopathy. The psychologists believe Richard would probably have shown narcissistic tendencies just as any medieval monarch and very little evidence of any sociopathological trends above and beyond the normal. They focused instead on other personality traits Richard exhibited, such as loyalty, piety and a strong sense of right and wrong. Richard also possessed a need for control that would have tended toward the authoritarian. This is reflected in the changes Richard made to the legal system in his twenty-six months on the throne and is consistent with his actions as Lord Protector and King right up to his final ill-fated charge on Bosworth Field. The two psychologists diagnosed Richard with intolerance of uncertainty, a trait linked to generalized anxiety disorder. That diagnosis, often associated with a need for security, fits with Richard's history. The king's curved spine may also have affected his personality [8].

Summing up, it can be stated that the fixation of Richard's physical disabilities in historical works was the result of the Tudors' desire to defame the memory of the last king of the York dynasty. The longer the list of crimes of Richard III became, the more terrible deformities appeared in the appearance of the monarch. Beginning with the second quarter of the XVI century, the portraits of the king were increasingly converging with his verbal descriptions; the notion that Richard III was a hunchbacked tyrant was generally accepted. At the same time, neither the publication of *History of King Richard the Third*, nor the publication of other works led to a change in the situation. The formation of Richard III's mythological image was completed in the play *Richard III*. William Shakespeare not only reproduced as a deliberate truth all the cliches and rumors of the time regarding the appearance of Richard III, but also developed them by adding new features. Thus, Shakespeare has radically changed the semantic accents. In Tudor historiography, the ugliness of Richard III was just the means that made his crimes more believable. In the *Historical Chronicles* Richard's physical impairment becomes the root cause of his actions. It is the impossibility of living, like other people, that pushes Richard to frenzied cruelty and fight for the crown. Actually, only in Shakespeare's dramas, the "mythological" Richard finds true life – this is no longer a stilted figure of political pamphlets, but a seemingly real character with a tremendous negative charm.

It can be argued that by the middle of the 17th century, the demonization of Richard III's appearance was completed in historiography, drama, and art. When the Tudor myth-makers got to work, they had a foundation upon which to build. Richard III undoubtedly was a complex human being who lived in a difficult period. Consideration of him as such, rather than as a monstrous caricature, takes us a few small steps closer to understanding the motivations behind the actions by which history remembers him.

SUMMARY

The article is devoted to the historical figure of King Richard III of England.

This king went down in history as a murderous psychopath with a terrible appearance owing to the play by Shakespeare *Richard III*. An attempt was made to give an alternative perspective on Richard's personality by examining a variety of historical sources, taking into account recent archaeological findings and psychologists' diagnoses. The authors conclude that there is a significant difference between the historical figure of Richard III and the character described by W. Shakespeare.

Keywords: Richard III, W. Shakespeare, alternative view, Tudor dynasty, myth-making.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Статтю присвячено дослідженню історичної постаті англійського короля Річарда III. В історію цей король увійшов як психопат-убивця з жахливою зовнішністю завдяки п'єсі В. Шекспіра «Річард III». Здійснено спробу дати альтернативний погляд на особистість Річарда через вивчення різноманітних історичних джерел з урахуванням нещодавніх археологічних знахідок. Автори роблять висновок, що між історичною постаттю Річарда III та образом, який змалював В. Шекспір, є суттєва різниця.

Ключові слова: Річарда III, В. Шекспір, альтернативний погляд, династія Тюдорів, міфотворення.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНОЇ ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1. Caroline A. Halsted, *Richard III.: As Duke of Gloucester and King of England*. In 2 volumes, 1844.
2. Clements Markham, *Richard III: His Life & Character Reviewed in the Light of Recent Research*, London, 1906.
3. Horace Walpole, *Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of King Richard the Third* Release Date: December 28, 2005 [eBook #17411]. Access Mode: <http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/17411/pg17411-images.html>
4. Lesley Boatwright, *Richard's earlier defenders: their motives and methods*. Access Mode: http://www.richardiii.net/2_5_0_riii_controversy.php#play
5. Kincaid A.N., ed., *The History of King Richard the Third* by Sir George Buck, Gloucester, 1982. p. xv.
6. Keith Dockray, *William Shakespeare, the Wars of the Roses and the Historians*, Stroud, 2002, p. 166.
7. Paul Murray Kendall, *Richard the Third*, London, 1955, p. 428.
8. *Richard III: Psychopath or mere control freak? Psychologists weigh in*. Access Mode: <https://www.apa.org/monitor/2013/06/richard>
9. *Richard III – Re-evaluating his personality – University of Leicester*. Access Mode: <https://www.le.ac.uk/richardiii/science/psychology.html>
10. *Richard III Society. His Appearance*. Access Mode: http://www.richardiii.net/2_4_0_riii_appearance.php
11. *Rosemary Horrox, History, Chronicle and Myth*. Access Mode: http://www.richardiii.net/2_5_0_riii_controversy.php#play