INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University Microfilms International
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

8423095

Rauchut, Edward A.

SHAKESPEARE'S "TIMON OF ATHENS": PROBLEMS OF ATTRIBUTION, TEXT, SOURCES, CHRONOLOGY AND INTERPRETATION

City University of New York PH.D. 1984

University Microfilms International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Shakespeare's Timon of Athens: Problems of Attribution, Text, Sources, Chronology and Interpretation

by

Edward A. Rauchut

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in English in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1984

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in English in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

March 26, 1984
date

Chairman, Examining Committee

March 27, 1984
date

Executive Officer

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

PREFACE

The aim of this dissertation is to survey criticism on five problems in Shakespeare's Timon of Athens: attribution, text, sources, chronology, and interpretation. Each problem raises further questions which contribute to the critical controversy still surrounding this puzzling play. In general, the survey of criticism which follows reveals a history of divergent and contradictory opinion.

Timon's attribution, for example, has been consistently disputed over the past 150 years. Heywood, Wilkins, Chapman, Day, Middleton, and Field have all been identified as original authors or as revisers of the play. More often, however, Shakespeare's assumed collaborator has remained anonymous.

Problems of text begin with Timon's initial publication in the first Folio (1623), where, it is suggested, the play was used to fill a gap left by the removal of Troilus and Cressida. Consequent textual "irregularities," which were often accounted for by theories of attribution, are also viewed as signs of an unfinished text. In 1847, for example, Hermann Ulrici (Shakespeare's Dramatic Art) suggested that Timon is unfinished, an idea that was to gain wide critical acceptance

when, in 1930, E.K. Chambers (William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems) also argued the "unfinished" theory of the play. Nevertheless, the idea of an unfinished text was at the same time vigorously disputed. More recently, bibliographical critics have blamed Timon's "irregularities" on practices of the printing house--an idea which, however, signals a return to eighteenth-century explanations of Timon's textual "irregularities." Problems of Timon's text, I hope to show, still remain unresolved.

Turning to sources, the extent of influence, indeed, even the sources themselves, are still disputed. No critical consensus has been reached on Shakespeare's use of Plutarch, Lucian, the MS. Timon play, or Painter.

Timon's date has also never been determined. Some critics argue that there is insufficient internal and external evidence to ever fix a date. Others speculate from 1598 to 1610.

Finally, with regard to problems of interpretation, critical opinion is perhaps most divergent. Timon is described in extremes which range from Christ to an indiscriminate man-hater. The play itself is called a morality, a satire, a tragedy, an experimental play, an academic play, and, as the following section on "Type of Play" records, generic classification

continues to be an area of speculation.

To summarize, divergent and contradictory criticial opinion still surrounds Timon of Athens. And, as I hope to show in the following surveys of problems of attribution, text, sources, chronology, and interpretation, Timon remains today an intriguing critical enigma.

OUTLINE

CHAPTER I

PROBLEMS OF ATTRIBUTION

This chapter traces questions of Timon's authorship in general, as well as two theories of revision: 1) Shakespeare began Timon and it was later worked over by another playwright; and 2) another playwright began the play and Shakespeare later revised it. Objections to these theories are also recorded.

CHAPTER II

PROBLEMS OF TEXT

The first section, "Timon in the First Folio (1623)," records attempts to account for the puzzling circumstances surrounding the initial publication of Timon in the first Folio. In the following sections, origins and development of the idea that Timon, as it appears in the first Folio, is an unfinished play are traced, as is opposition to this "unfinished" theory. Five following sections deal in bibliographical terms with Timon's textual "irregularities": "Timon Set from Stage Copy," "Timon Set from Corrupt Foul Papers,"

"Textual 'Irregularities' Originate in Printing House," and "Textual 'Irregularities' Caused by Compositors."

CHAPTER III

PROBLEMS OF SOURCES

The first four sections in this chapter trace source criticism on "Plutarch," "Lucian," "MS. Timon," and "Painter." These are followed by sections on "Missing Sources," and "Other Sources, Analogues, and Allusions," which also records Timon tradition and Shakespeare's handling of the Timon story.

CHAPTER IV

PROBLEMS OF CHRONOLOGY

This chapter surveys attempts to date Timon.

CHAPTER V

PROBLEMS OF INTERPRETATION

Chapter V begins with twenty-two sections which provide a critical survey for each of the play's characters. There is

also a section on "Timon and Alcibiades Parallels," which surveys criticism that compares or contrasts the two characters. "Timon and Alcibiades Plots" traces commentary on the Timon "main plot" and the Alcibiades "subplot."

A section on SCENES AND INCIDENTS surveys criticism on "First Banquet (and Masque)," "Second Banquet," and "End of Play."

The section CRITICISM AND COMMENTARY contains a survey of generic criticism in "Type of Play." Further divisions in this section include: "Timon Tragedy," "Timon Satire," "Timon not Satire," "Timon Morality," and "Miscellaneous." Other sections in CRITICISM AND COMMENTARY include: "Was Timon Performed?" "Themes, Images, and Words," "Greeks and Athens," "Economic Plight of the Aristocracy," "Talents," "Paragone," "Fortune," "Essex and Timon," "Shakespeare as Timon," and "Miscellaneous." Finally, there is a "Survey of Commentary on Acts and Scenes."

A Conclusion attempts to summarize all findings. The Bibliography lists all works cited.

A NOTE ON FORMAT AND FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THIS DISSERTATION

The format of citation in the following survey is based on the critical appendices in The New Shakespeare Variorum edition of the plays. The work, date, and author are followed by a quotation, and, finally, a volume and page number. Editions cited are in most cases the first. Exceptions, as well as all other material, are listed in the Bibliography (pp. 590-613).

Further development for this dissertation project was suggested at the Meeting of Variorum Editors held at the Convention of the Modern Language Association, December 1978. At this meeting, Robert K. Turner and Richard Knowles, Co-General Editors of the New Variorum Shakespeare, appointed me Assistant Editor of the New Variorum Timon of Athens. A version of this dissertation will form the appendices of the Variorum Timon of Athens.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I--PROBLEMS OF ATTRIBUTION

Attribution in General.....2-9
Theories of Revision--In General.....10-14
Shakespeare as Reviser.....15-18
Other Authors Revise Shakespeare.....19-26
Revision Theory--Arguments Against.....27-34
Attribution of Acts and Scenes.....35-48
Attribution Chart.....49-53

CHAPTER II--PROBLEMS OF TEXT

Timon in the First Folio (1623).....55-60
Timon Unfinished.....61-73
Timon Unfinished (Reasons).....74-79
Timon Unfinished because of Theme.....80-83
Timon Not Unfinished.....84-86
Timon Set from Stage Copy.....87-88
Timon Set from Corrupt Foul Papers.....89
Textual "Irregularities" Originate in Printing House.....90-92
Textual "Irregularities" Caused by Compositors.....93-97
Shakespeare's Bad Writing Causes "Irregularities".....98-99

CHAPTER III--PROBLEMS OF SOURCES

Lucian.....101-117
MS. Timon.....118-137
Painter.....138-141
Plutarch.....142-150
"Lost" Sources.....151-156
Other Sources, Analogues, and Allusions (and Timon Tradition)157-170

CHAPTER IV--PROBLEMS OF CHRONOLOGY

Problems of Date.....172-183

CHAPTER V--PROBLEMS OF INTERPRETATION

(CHARACTERS)

Timon in General.....184-193
Timon--"Flaws" and "Faults".....194-214
Timon as Misanthrope.....215-216
Timon--Generosity and Friendship.....217-229
Timon and Money.....230-234
Timon and Athenian Society.....235-237
Timon and Fortune.....238-240
Timon's Orations.....241-248
Timon's Transition.....249-251
Timon--Appearance and Reality, Words and Reality.....252-254
Timon as Idealist.....255-261
Timon as Satirist.....262
Timon as Christ.....263-265
Timon as Topical Figure.....266-267
Shakespeare as Timon.....268-269
Timon Does Not Learn From His Experiences.....270-272
Timon's Death.....273-275

Timon (and Timon) and Other Shakespearean Plays and Characters.....276-290

Alcibiades in General.....291-300
Alcibiades (in III.v).....301-315
Alcibiades (in IV.iii, and V.iv).....316-327

Timon and Alcibiades Parallels.....328-338
Timon and Alcibiades Plots.....339-344

Apemantus.....345-357
Apemantus (in IV.iii).....358-360

Poet and Painter (in I.i).....361-366
Poet and Painter (in V.i).....367-370

Flavius.....371-379

Amazons.....380-381
Banditti.....382-383
Cupid.....384-385

Fortune.....386-389
Hostilius.....390
Lords.....391
Lucilius.....392
Messenger, Soldier, Epitaphs.....393-398
Old Athenian.....399-401
Page and Fool.....402-406
Phrynia and Timandra.....407-411
Sempronius.....412
Senators.....413-415
Strangers.....416-418
Ventidius.....419-421
"Women".....422-424

(CRITICISM AND COMMENTARY)

First Banquet and Masque (I.ii).....425-432
Second Banquet (III.vi).....433-437
End of Play.....438-440

Type of Play:

Timon Tragedy.....441-443
Timon Morality.....444-449
Timon Satire.....450-453
Timon Not Satire.....454-455
Timon Academic Play.....456-457
Timon Experimental Play.....458-459
Type of Play--Miscellaneous.....460-464

Themes, Images, and Words.....465-483
Beasts.....484-485
Was Timon Performed?.....486-493
Timon's Versification.....494-498
Shakespeare's Dramatic Technique.....499-508
Act-Scene Division.....509-510
Talents.....511-515
Greeks and Athens.....516-524
Patronage.....527-529
Timon and the Plight of Jacobean Aristocracy.....527-529
Essex and Timon of Athens.....530-531
Material "Missing" from Timon.....532-533
Timon a Failure.....534-537
Timon and Art and Music.....538-539
Timon and the Paragone.....540-541

Timon and Usury.....542-543

Criticism and Commentary (Act and Scene Review).....544-570

Miscellaneous.....571-574

Conclusion.....575-589

Bibliography of Editions.....590-593

Bibliography.....594-616

CHAPTER I

PROBLEMS OF ATTRIBUTION

ATTRIBUTION (IN GENERAL)

The Works of William Shakespeare (1857-66), Richard Grant White: "There is an intensity in the hatred, and a relish in its expression, which could only spring from the profoundest knowledge of mankind. But other parts are just as clearly not Shakespeare's;--so clearly that any critic who should say, like Coleridge, that he found 'the same vigorous had at work throughout' this play, would expose the unsoundness of his own judgment hardly less than Schlegel did when he pronounced Thomas Lord Cromwell, Sir John Oldcastle, and A Yorkshire Tragedy, 'not only unquestionably Shakespeare's,' but worthy 'to be classed among his best and maturest works'" (Vol. 10, 201).

"Ueber Shakespeare's Timon of Athens" (1867), Nicolaus Delius writes that Shakespeare revised a play (now lost) written by an unknown playwright who he believes may be George Wilkins (pp. 335-61).

"On the Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1869), F.G. Fleay: "People look at a handwriting, and say, 'This is not Smith's; he writes better than that.' They read a play, and say, 'This must be Shakspere's, it is so good.' The expert knows that men write sometimes well and sometimes badly; but that in the handwriting and the poem, alike, there is a

character or style which cannot deceive. In this case I address myself to the expert, and have no doubt, whatever, of the verdict" (p. 151).

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (1886), Henry N. Hudson:

> The folio copy is in certain respect remarkable. Some parts are set forth in a most irregular manner, being full of short and seemingly-broken lines, with many passages printed as verse, which cannot possibly be read as such; yet the sense is generally so complete as to infer that the irregularity came from the writer, not from the transcriber or the printer. In these parts, moreover, along with Shakespeare's rhythm and harmony, we miss also, and in an equal degree, his characteristic diction and imagery: the ruggedness and irregularity are not those of one who, having mastered the resources of harmony, knew how to heighten and enrich it with discords, but of one who was ignorant of its laws and incapable of its powers. Other parts, again, exhibit the sustained grandeur of the Poet's largest and most varied music. And in these parts the true Shakespearian cast of thought and imagery comes upon us in all its richness, welling up from the deepest fountains of his genius, and steeped in its most idiomatic potencies. (Vol. 15, 183)

The Works of Shakespeare (1888-90), Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall: "No one now maintains that the whole play is the work of Shakespeare; that about half is his, and that the other half is the composition of an inferior writer, has been accepted as an established fact by all modern critics" (Vol. 7, 3).

On Shakespeare as reviser:

> We assume that during his reading of Plutarch Shakespeare's attention was arrested by the story of Timon; that it struck him that the character of Timon might be made effective for the stage, and that not having time or inclination to work up a complete plot into a regular five-act play he availed himself of a "Timon" which was in the hands of his theatre at the time. This play had perhaps been a failure in its existing shape, and the company were therefore glad to embrace Shakespeare's offer to remodel it. Accordingly he rewrote about half of it, and hastily revised the rest, leaving this for the most part untouched, but inserting or altering a few lines or phrases here and there. But before he had had time to give the whole a final revision it was called for by the manager, and hurried upon the boards. These assumptions will account both for the general unity of plan as well as for the signs of incomplete revision observable here and there. (Vol. 7, 4)

Timon of Athens (1890), William J. Rolfe: "It is generally agreed by recent critics that the play is not all Shakespeare's, but they differ in their ways of explaining the divided authorship" (p. 10). After reviewing critical opinion, Rolfe writes that he believes that another author revised Shakespeare's unfinished work (p. 10).

The Temple Shakespeare (1899-1902), Israel Gollancz: "In all probability Shakespeare's unfinished Ms., containing the main parts of the play already written out, with the general plan merely outlined, was worked up after Shakespeare's death into the play we possess. It cannot be finally determined whether

this elaboration was undertaken for stage-production, or for the purpose of fitting it for a place in the first Folio, when the editors had resolved to change the position of Troilus and Cressida" (Vol. 29, 212).

"The Sources of Timon of Athens" (1903-04), W.H. Clemons:

> The conclusion is evident and seems irresistible--that the hand which used the sources was the original hand. As it may further be observed that the portions assigned by practically all to the unknown playwright are in every instance mere expansions of the facts mentioned in the genuine parts of the play, we may rest assured that the unsatisfactory condition of this drama as it appeared completed in the First Folio and as it is printed today may not be laid to the charge of Shakespeare. (p. 222)

A Life of William Shakespeare (1904), Sir Sidney Lee: "there is some ground for the belief that Shakespeare's coadjutor in 'Timon' was George Wilkins, a writer of ill-developed dramatic power" (p. 252).

"Timon of Athens and the Irregularities of the First Folio" (1907-08), Joseph Quincy Adams: "If my interpretation of the irregularities is correct, the difficulty lay wholly in Troylus and Cressida. Timon of Athens was involved by mere accident: the irregularities have no bearing on the authorship of the play" (p. 63).

The Problem of Timon of Athens (1923), Thomas Marc

Parrott: "Timon must always remain a play for a study rather than for the stage, and the problem that confronts the student is to determine first how much of Shakespeare can be found in the work; and, secondly, how it comes to be there. Curiously enough the existence of this problem was unsuspected until about a century ago" (p. 4).

Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us (1935; rpt. 1960), Caroline F.E. Spurgeon: "The effect made upon us by studying the images in Timon of Athens is as confusing and unsatisfactory as that of the play as a whole. They fall into approximately the usual proportions, and with some marked exceptions, every single one of them is as clearly and characteristically Shakespeare's as if he had signed his name after each" (p. 343).

"Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1946), A.S. Collins: "In fact, the unending variety of his dramatic experiments is so obvious that it should be easy to see that, if Timon is the most striking of his experiments, it is by that all the more surely Shakespeare's, a bold departure typical of him and not of any other" (p. 97).

Shakespeare's Tragedies and Other Studies in Seventeenth Century Drama (1950), Clifford Leech: "because Shakespeare's hand is indubitably evident at every important moment of the play, I do not think it much matters what theory of Timon's

composition we hold to: we can be sure, from what is certainly Shakespeare's, of the general current of his ideas in the treatment of this theme" (p. 114).

The Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957; rpt. 1968), J.C. Maxwell: "E.H. Wright's monograph, The Authorship of Timon of Athens [1910]. . . gave Shakespeare more of the play than had most earlier disintegrators" (p. x).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "A theory that Shakespeare worked on Timon only spasmodically and perhaps over a period of years is also quite possible but difficult to substantiate with evidence of any weight" (p. xlii).

"Acts IV and V of Timon of Athens" (1959), Winifred M.T. Nowottny: "I think Timon to be the work of two hands and, whilst I am convinced that there is no compelling case for supposing Shakespeare to have written any more of Acts I to III than the dialogue of Timon and Flavius in Act II, scene 2, the area of my bafflement on the authorship question is, precisely, from IV.iii.464 (the entry of Flavius, after the thieves' exit) to the end of the play" (p. 497).

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1969), Charlton Hinman: "There is now pretty general agreement that Timon of Athens is not a collaborative work, partly by someone other than Shakespeare. It is consistent in mood and temper; the

execution of all its parts seems firmly governed by a single general scheme; the patterns of image and idea recur throughout; details which all critics have found characteristically if not uniquely Shakespearean are scattered through the very passages which are in other respects so far below the expected standard, and the flaws which mar these are by no means peculiar to them alone. The play is of a piece, and Shakespearean" (p. 1138).

The Canon of Thomas Middleton's Plays: Internal Evidence for the Major Problem of Authorship (1975), David J. Lake:

> The prose-verse mixture of I.ii is unlike Shakespeare, but very like Middleton, whose authorship of I.ii (and much else in Timon) was first suggested by William Wells ["Timon of Athens," N&Q, 12 ser., 6 (1920), 266-69] and promptly supported by Dugdale Sykes [Sidelights (1924)]. Sykes, it is true, also claimed the presence of John Day in a few sections of the play, on rather slender evidence; but it will not affect the argument here if this claim is ignored. What is common to Wells and Sykes is that they are fairly sure of Middleton's presence as the main author of I.ii, III.i-vi, IV.ii.30-50, and IV.iii. 458-536; that they believe him to have been the original author, revised by Shakespeare; and that they base their case on versification and parallels of word and phrase to Middleton's plays, especailly to the early comedies. (pp. 280-81)

Nevertheless, Lake concludes by noting that "convincing proof of the authorship of Timon is lacking at present" (p. 286).

Studies in Attribution: Middleton and Shakespeare (1979),

MacDonald P. Jackson redefines and extends Middleton's canon through word frequency attribution techniques and suggests Middleton's contribution to Timon.

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight: "the differences of style, as well as the more important differences in the cast of thought, which prevail in the successive scenes of this drama, are so remarkable as to justify the conclusion that it is not wholly the work of Shakspere" (Vol. 1, 333).

Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art (1881), Edward Dowden: "This portion of the play ["the story of Alcibiades"], if not written by Shakspere, was written either under Shakspere's direction or by one who had a certain comprehension of his method as an artist" (pp. 346-47).

The Henry Irving Shakespeare (1890), H.A. Evans: "No one now maintains that the whole play is the work of Shakespeare; that about half is his and that the other half is the composition of an inferior writer, has been accepted as an established fact by all modern critics" (Vol. 7, 3).

Timon of Athens (1890), William J. Rolfe: "It is generally agreed by recent critics that the play is not all Shakespeare's, but they differ in their ways of explaining the divided authorship" (p. 10).

Timon of Athens (1895), William J. Rolfe writes that

Timon's pagination does not fit the Folio because only part of the play is Shakespeare's (pp. 10-14).

The Temple Shakespeare (1899-1902), Israel Gollancz: "Timon contains a good deal of non-Shakespearian alloy" (Vol. 29, vi).

Shakespearean Tragedy (1904; rpt. 1956), A.C. Bradley: "Shakespeare did not write the whole play. It seems to consist (1) of parts that are purely Shakespearean (the text, however, being here, as elsewhere, very corrupt); (2) of parts untouched or very slightly touched by him; (3) of parts where a good deal is Shakespeare's but not all (e.g., in my opinion, III.v., which I cannot believe, with Mr. Fleay, to be wholly, or almost wholly, by another writer" (p. 445).

A Life of William Shakespeare (1904), Sir Sidney Lee: "Although Shakespeare's powers showed no sign of exhaustion, he reverted in the year following the colossal effort of 'Lear' (1607) to his earlier habit of collaboration, and with another's aid composed two dramas--'Timon of Athens' and 'Pericles'" (p. 251).

The Yale Shakespeare Timon of Athens (1919), Stanley T. Williams:

> The exact circumstances of the writing of Timon

> of Athens will probably remain conjectural, but that the play is not wholly Shakespeare's creation is certain. Double authorship is constantly proclaimed by singularities of workmanship and by technical problems involving inconsistencies in character and action. Regular and highly irregular verse, rhymed and unrhymed lines, dignified prose and prose that is absurdly flat follow each other in capricious fashion. Poetry as lofty as that of King Lear is linked to doggerel, and scenes unquestionably written by Shakespeare suddenly become inane under the influence of another hand. By means of internal evidence of this character scholars have tried to determine how much of the play was written by Shakespeare and how much by the unknown assistant. (p. 123)

The Problem of Timon of Athens (1923), Thomas Marc Parrott: "Timon must always remain a play for a study rather than for the stage, and the problem that confronts the student is to determine first how much of Shakespeare can be found in the work; and, secondly, how it comes to be there. Curiously enough the existence of this problem was unsuspected until about a century ago" (p. 4).

Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama (1924; rpt. 1966), H. Dugdale Sykes: "It is generally agreed that Timon of Athens was not wholly written by Shakespeare, and that considerable portions of the text as printed in the First Folio are from some inferior hand" (p. 1).

"The Theme of Timon of Athens" (1934), John W. Draper: "For about a century, Timon of Athens has been ascribed to dual, or even multiple, authorship, partly on the basis of aesthetic and stylistic tests, partly because of inconsisten-

cies of detail, and especially because of its apparent disunity of plan" (p. 30).

"The Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1940), Ralph A. Haug provides a useful survey of the revision theory, noting early supporters, Charles Knight (1838), Nikolaus Delius (1867), G.C. Verplanck (1847), Benno Tschischwitz (1869), and "the first important modern work. . . of F.G. Fleay, whose paper, 'On the Authorship of Timon of Athens' was read to the New Shakespeare Society in 1874" (p. 227). Haug goes on to mention K. Deighton (1905), E.H. Wright (1910), J.M. Robertson (1917), T.M. Parrott (1923), H.D. Sykes (1924), Dixon Wecter (1928), and E.K. Chambers (1930) (pp. 227-30).

A Literary History of England (1948), Tucker Brooke: "Stylistically, as far as Shakespeare's part goes, it [Timon] most suggests King Lear, and it is animated by the same bitter wrath against ingratitude" (p. 539).

A History of English Literature (1950), Hardin Craig: "Authorship is also in dispute. One theory makes it a play begun by Shakespeare and completed by other hands. Whether this is true or not, Timon of Athens, as a work of art, seems never to have been worked out in its complete proportions" (p. 268).

The Meaning of Shakespeare (1951; rpt, 1963), Harold C.

Goddard: "Timon of Athens is one of the doubtful plays in the sense that its Shakespearean authorship has often been questioned. It was apparently put in the First Folio to take the place of Troilus and Cressida when the play was moved from the position originally assigned to it among the Tragedies. This fact lends a certain plausibility to the view that someone besides Shakespeare may have had a hand in its composition, a view which, in turn, is given some support by the disparity in merit between its best and its worst passages" (Vol. 2, 172).

"Acts IV and V of Timon of Athens" (1959), Winifred M.T. Nowottny: "I should perhaps mention, in order to clarify for the reader the point of view from which I write this article, that I think Timon to be the work of two hands and, whilst I am convinced that there is no compelling case for supposing Shakespeare to have written any more of Acts I to III than the dialogue of Timon and Flavius in Act II, scene 2, the area of my bafflement on the authorship question is, precisely, from IV.iii.464 (the entry of Flavius, after the thieves' exit) to the end of the play" (p. 497).

REVISION THEORY--SHAKESPEARE AS REVISER

The Works of William Shakespeare (1857-66), Richard Grant White: "either. . . the play was sketched by another dramatist, who himself furnished only inferior Scenes, Shakespeare writing all those of most importance, or. . . it is made up of an older play which Shakespeare undertook to furbish and emblish, and upon which he was led to bestow more labor than he at first intended, without, however, making his rifacciamento complete" (Vol. 10, 203). White, however, does not choose between these two possibilities.

The Plays of Shakespeare (1858-60), Howard Staunton: "The immediate archetype of the play, however, was probably some old and now lost drama, remodelled and partially rewritten by our author, but of which he permitted much of the rude material to remain, with scarcely any alteration. It is upon this theory alone we find it possible to reconcile the discordance between the defective plan, and the faultless execution of particular parts,--between the poverty and negligence observable in some scenes, and the grandeur and consummate finish displayed in others" (Vol. 2, 459),

The Works of Shakespeare (1866), Alexander Dyce believes Timon is an "old piece, which, recast and improved by Shakespeare, forms the tragedy before us" (Vol. 6, 504).

"Uber Shakespeares Timon" (1867), Nicolaus Delius argues

that both Pericles and Timon of Athens were written in part by George Wilkins and later revised by Shakespeare (pp. 335-61).

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight:

> the differences of style, as well as the more important differences in the cast of thought, which prevail in the successive scenes of this drama, are so remarkable as to justify the conclusion that it is not wholly the work of Shakspere. . . . Timon of Athens was a play originally produced by an artist very inferior to Shakspere, and which probably retained possession of the stage for some time in its first form; that it has come down to us not wholly re-written, as in the instance of the Taming of the Shrew, and the King John, but so far remodelled that entire scenes of Shakspere have been substituted for entire scenes of the elder play; and lastly, that this substitution has been almost wholly confined to the character of Timon, and that in the development of that character alone, with the exception of a few occasional touches here and there. (Vol. 1, 333)

Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society (1874), B. Nicholson: "One of the three questions raised in the Paper may, I suppose, be considered as settled--that, namely, of the double authorship. So in the main the second, the parts attributable to Shakspere. But as to the third, I would wish to set forth some of the evidence which appears to me to render it probable that Shakspere overwrote an older play, rather than that his unfinished work was added to" (p. 249).

"Shakespeares Antheil an dem unter seinem Namen veröffentlichten Trauerspiel Timon" (1882), G. Kullman examines the theories of Delius, Charles Knight, Tschischwitzsche, Fleay, and Ulrici (pp. 196-213), and then suggests that Shakespeare rewrote an earlier play which was later revised by another author (pp. 213-45).

Shakespeare and Chapman (1917), J.M. Robertson: "Shakespeare simply never completed his revision in full detail" (p. 129).

"Timon of Athens" (1920), William Wells: "Everything points to the conclusion that the original Timon was an early work of Middleton's, no later, certainly, than Michaelmas Term (1607). It was probably revised by Shakspeare some five or six years later" (p. 269).

Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama (1924; rpt. 1966), H. Dugdale Sykes: "I find plain evidence that two authors [Middleton and Day] were concerned in the original play, which Shakespeare revised. . . . it is necessary that I should emphasize the importance of the hypothesis that the original draft was itself the work of more hands than one, because this affords an explanation of certain peculiarities of the play that have given rise to much discussion and conjecture--the imperfect

co-ordination of certain scenes, the confusion in the names of some of the characters, and other puzzling divergences and contradictions presented by the text. All these can readily be explained on the hypothesis that in Timon of Athens we have an imperfect recast by Shakespeare of a collaborative play" (p. 2).

William Shakespeare (1936), George Brandes: "Timon of Athens has come down to us in a pitiable condition. The text is in a terrible state, and there are, not only between one scene and another, such radical differences in the style and general spirit of the play as to preclude the possibility of its having been the work of one man" (p. 556). On Shakespeare's revision: "He probably used some other contemporary play, belonging to the theatre, which had proved a failure in its original form, and which both his company and his own inclinations urged him to thoroughly recast. It was not so entirely rewritten, however, that we can look upon the play as actually the work of Shakespeare--there are too many traces of another and a feebler hand; but the vital, lyrical, powerful pathos is his and his alone" (p. 558).

REVISION THEORY--OTHER AUTHORS REVISE SHAKESPEARE

Shakespeare's Plays (1844-47), Gulian C. Verplanck: "the conclusive argument against this opinion [that the play is unfinished] is, that the play does not, except in a very few insulated passages, resemble the unfinished work of a great master. . . . On the contrary, it is like such a work left incomplete and finished by another hand, inferior, though not without skill, and working on the conceptions of the greater master" (Vol. 3, 92). Verplanck gives this account of Timon's composition:

> He [Shakespeare] poured forth his soul in those scenes and soliloquies, the idea of which had invited him to the subject; while, as to the rest, he contented himself with a rapid and careless composition of some scenes, and probably on others, (such as that of Alcibiades with Senate,) contenting himself with simply sketching out the substance of an intended dialogue to be afterwards elaborated. . . . The absence of all trace of the piece from this time till it was printed in 1623, induces the supposition that in this state the author threw aside his unfinished work, perhaps deterred by its want of promise of stage effect and interest, perhaps invited by some more congenial theme. When, therefore, it was wanted by his friends and "fellows," Heminge and Condell, after his death, for the press and the stage, some literary artist like Heywood was invited to fill up the accessory and subordinate parts upon the author's own outline; and this was done, or attempted to be done, in the manner of the great original, as far as possible, but with little distinction of his varieties of style. (Vol. 3, 92-93)

Mr. Shakespeare's Comedies Histories Tragedies and Poems (1857-66), Richard Grant White: "Shakespeare wrote a large part, and all the more important parts, of Timon; but the rest, not inconsiderable in bulk, is the work of a very inferior artist" (Vol. 5, 310). White does not identify Shakespeare's reviser, but after ascribing the Shakespearean portions, he notes that "the rest of the play is by another dramatist, who was an unskilful worker and a dull and clumsy fellow" (Vol. 5, 310).

"Timon Ein Kritischer Versuch" (1869), B. Tschischwitz argues that Shakespeare had begun the play, abandoned it, and that another playwright had later revised it (pp. 160-97).

"On the Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1874), F.G. Fleay: "The object of the present paper is to shew that the nucleus, the original and only valuable part of the play, is Shakspere's; and that it was completed for the stage by a second and inferior hand" (p. 130). "The evidence of general style, however, appears to me strongly to confirm the conjecture that Cyril Tourneur was the second author. If we could find out the date of his death it might help to determine the question as to when his part was written: but, so far as I know, there is no reason whatever why he should not have written it in either 1608 or in 1623" (p. 138).

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (1886), Henry N. Hudson:

> Shakespeare's approved severity of taste and strength of judgment at that period of his life, together with his fulness and quickness of resource, could hardly have endured to retain certain parts in so crude and feeble a state as we find them. For the parts supposed to be borrowed are so grossly inadequate in style and spirit to those acknowledged to be his, that it seems incredible he should have suffered them to pass. Surely if he had thus undertaken to remodel the work of another, he could hardly have rested from the task, till he had informed the whole with a larger measure of that surpassing energy and wealth of thought and diction which mark the part of Timon himself; showing that the Poet's genius was then in its most palmy state. (Vol. 15, 185-86)

Hudson goes on to support Verplanck's [1844-47, above] theory of revision:

> Shakespeare planned the whole drama substantially as we have it, made an outline of all the parts, including the whole course and order of the action, wrote out the parts of Timon in its present form, added, besides, some whole scenes as they now stand, and furnished some passages for others; but, perceiving more and more, as he went on, the unfitness of the theme for his purpose, finally gave up the work, and threw it aside unfinished: that this was afterwards taken in hand by some third-rate workman, who retained all that Shakespeare had written, and wrote out the rest in accordance, as nearly as might be, with the original play, this view clearly legitimates the supposal that here the Poet's choice of subject grew from personal sympathy with the mood and temper of mind displayed in Timon, and not from

> his judgment of dramatic fitness. For so his interest would naturally draw first to those parts which voiced his prevailing mood; and then begin to flag and fall away as soon as, on coming to those where such personal respects had no place, his dramatic judgment regained the upper hand. (Vol. 15, 186)

Timon of Athens (1890), William J. Rolfe: "There is little difficulty in separating Shakespeare's part from that of the other writer, whoever he may have been; and there would be less or none, were it not for the fact that in some scenes we have the work of the two hands mixed, the finisher of the play having attempted to rewrite portions of it, but blending more or less of the original gold with his baser metal" (pp. 13-14). The date of this revision is "probably some years earlier than 1623," and the reviser is Tourneur (p. 14).

The Works of William Shakespeare (1895), William Aldis Wright: "it may be that the manuscript of Timon was imperfect, and that the printing was stayed till it could be completed by some playwright engaged for the purpose. This would account for the manifest imperfections at the close of the play" (Vol. 7, vii).

The old Arden Timon of Athens (1905), K. Deighton: "To me such work looks like that of some player to whom the editors, failing to find portions known once to have existed, had entrusted the task of putting together the incomplete mater-

ial--perhaps, as Ulrici suggests, made up in part from actors' copies" (p. xxi).

Shakespeare (1907), Sir Walter Raleigh: "Shakespeare, the artist, had no further use for Timon; Shakespeare the popular playwright, laid his hand on the discarded fragment of a play, and either expanded it himself, or, more probably, permitted another to expand it, to the statutory bulk of five acts" (p. 115).

The Authorship of Timon of Athens (1910), Ernest Hunter Wright: "Unless our reasoning is wrong, the singularities and inconsistencies we noted in the play when starting are the product of a man of small ability, writing probably in haste, and seemingly without an intimate acquaintance with the play he was augmenting, or at least without good judgment of its needs. . . . Shakespeare was the first writer to touch the play" (pp. 101-02).

The Yale Timon of Athens (1919), Stanley T. Williams:

> The exact circumstances of the writing of Timon of Athens will probably remain conjectural, but that the play is not wholly Shakespeare's creation is certain. Double authorship is constantly proclaimed by singularities of workmanship and by technical problems involving inconsistencies in character and action. Regular and highly irregular verse, rhymed and unrhymed lines, dignified prose and prose that is absurdly flat follow each other in capricious fashion. Poetry as lofty as that of King Lear is linked to doggerel, and scenes unquestionably written

> by Shakespeare suddenly become inane under the influence of another hand. By means of internal evidence of this character scholars have tried to determine how much of the play was written by Shakespeare and how much by the unknown assistant. (p. 123)

On Shakespeare's priority: "This belief in Shakespeare's priority has grown, and, unless some new subversive evidence appears, can hardly be shaken" (p. 129).

"Timon of Athens" (1920), William Wells: "In fixing upon the 'adapter,' as he is customarily called, one attribute must be allowed to him--he had a sense of humour, fine to touchiness. Also, he was fully grounded in the knowledge of the seamy side of life, and he could lay open and castigate the deceitful voice of the sycophant who 'spreads such easy pitfalls to entrap a nobler animal than himself.' This poet's habits of composition favoured prose and verse indiscriminately, while he mixed with the latter a large number of rimed couplets. This character exactly suits Thomas Middleton, and, as will be seen from the evidence brought forward, 'Timon of Athens' must be referred to an early period in his career" (p. 267).

The Problem of Timon of Athens (1923), Thomas Marc Parrott: "I suggest, then, that the unfinished Shakespearian manuscript was handed over to Chapman to finish for the stage. He would, no doubt, accept it only for the sake of the fee.

But he was quite incapable of the skill required to complete the fragment along Shakespearian lines" (p. 30). "[T]he manuscript as it came back from Chapman was thoroughly overhauled, cut down, and patched up by some third writer, possibly by Field himself, and was then equipped with the elaborate stage directions that prove it was prepared for the stage" (p. 31). "Timon consists of an unfinished play by Shakespeare, additions by Chapman and a revision by a third hand" (p. 32).

"Timon of Athens" (1926), S.R. Golding: "Nor do I agree with his [Sykes', 1924] theory that the original draft of 'Timon' was written by two dramatists and then revised by Shakespeare. Is it conceivable that Shakespeare, with his long dramatic experience and his profound knowledge of stagecraft, would have revised with such colossal ineptitude and left in such an execrable condition the heterogeneous composition known as 'Timon of Athens?'. . . To me, the hypothesis of a Shakespearian revision, even of the work of three or four writers and however hastily executed, appears untenable; for it is scarcely credible that in the period of his maturity, William Shakespeare had so degenerated in his art that he could not approach the mediocre performance of his youth" (p. 275). Golding argues that Wilkins revised the play.

"Shakespeare's Purpose in Timon of Athens" (1928),

Dixon Wecter: "It seems to me that there is one solution which has been generally overlooked--namely that Shakespeare was the original author but that he actually wrote a full five-act play, probably not much inferior to Coriolanus, and that this play some time before the publication of the Folio suffered deliberate mutilation, that certain scenes were completely rewritten and even names changed" (p. 703). "It appears. . . that Middleton's slashing of the play occurred not only within Shakespeare's life-time but within a year or two of the original writing. That Shakespeare probably would have found it profitless or distasteful to revise his own play in the manner proposed, I shall presently suggest" (p. 704).

[In The Leopold Shakespeare (1877), F.J. Furnivall combines the Unfinished Theory with the idea that the play was revised by another author when he states, "One does not wonder that he [Shakespeare] left it unfinished, and let its completer do what he liked with it" (p. lxxxiv).]

REVISION THEORY--ARGUMENTS AGAINST

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (1886) Henry N. Hudson: Shakespeare "could hardly have endured to retain certain parts in so crude and feeble a state as we find them. For the parts supposed to be borrowed are so grossly inadequate in style and spirit to those acknowledged to be his, that is seems incredible he should have suffered them to pass. Surely, if he had thus undertaken to remodel the work of another, he could hardly have rested from the task, till he had informed the whole with a larger measure of that surpassing energy and wealth of thought and diction which mark the part of Timon himself; showing that the Poet's genius was then in its most palmy state" (Vol. 15, 185-86).

The old Arden Timon of Athens (1905), K. Deighton: "As to me the amount of inferior matter is much smaller than is assumed by Hudson [Hudson, 1886, above], these objections do not weigh so heavily. I indeed reject the theory, but rather on the ground that of the earlier play scarcely anything would remain" (pp. xxi-xxii). And on Fleay's theory of revision: "I differ. . . from Fleay in assigning a very much larger proportion of the play as we now have it, and in holding with Verplanck that in almost all the

scenes he had at least sketched out the substance of the dialogue. But I would not attribute the botching to Heywood (Verplanck), or to Tourneur (Fleay), or to Wilkins (Eltze), for I do not believe that any of these would have left such glaring inconsistencies" (p. xx).

William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems (1930), E.K. Chambers:

> They [critics] differ as to whether Shakespeare was the originator or a reviser of the play. And they differ as to their selection of a second hand. Thus a draft or fragmentary play by Shakespeare is held to have been rehandled by Heywook (Verplanck), Tourneur (Fleay in 1847), Wilkins (Fleay in 1886), Chapman and perhaps Field (Parrott), Middleton (Wells). And again Shakespeare is held to have rehandled the work of Wilkins (Delius), Chapman (Robertson), Day and Middleton (Sykes). Some of the writers are discreet enough to leave the second hand anonymous. None of the theories seem to me convincing in detail, and their very multiplicity suggests that their exponents are on the wrong track. Moreover, most of these are compelled to admit that the revision, by whomsoever accomplished, was itself blundering or incomplete. . . . I do not doubt that it [Timon] was left unfinished by Shakespeare, and I believe that the real solution of its 'problem', indicated long ago by Ulrici and others, is that it is unfinished still. (Vol. 1, 482, 483)

"The Theme of Timon of Athens" (1934), John W. Draper:

"For about a century, Timon of Athens has been ascribed to dual, or even multiple, authorship, partly on the basis of

aesthetic and stylistic tests, partly because of inconsistencies of detail, and especially because of its apparent disunity of plan. Stylistic tests are dubious at best, for matters of taste are always debatable. Indeed the parts ascribed seem to supplement one another in developing the theme of usury. . . . Although the last century of scholarship has doubted Shakespeare's writing of large parts of Timon of Athens, the present study leads one rather to agree with Hazlitt and the other earlier critics who found in the play a'unity' of 'design' that they attributed to Shakespeare's hand throughout" (p. 30).

Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us (1935), Caroline F.E. Spurgeon: "The effect made upon us by studying the images in Timon of Athens is as confusing and unsatisfactory as that of the play as a whole. They fall into approximately the usual proportions, and, with some marked exceptions, every single one of them is as clearly and characteristically Shakespeare's as if he had signed his name after each. . . . my evidence leads me to assign to Shakespeare a much larger part of this incoherent and unsatisfactory play than has hitherto generally been attributed to him" (pp. 343, 344).

"Timon of Athens, Act V, Scene 3" (1938-39), Paul H. Kocher: "The parallels given above even when taken all to-

gether, are, of course, far from establishing Shakspere's authorship of Timon, Act V, Scene 3, but they have an evidential value which may well justify a reopening of the question" (p. 242).

"The Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1940), Ralph A. Haug: "anyone who would be employed to revise the play would be a man of the theatre. Chapman, Tourneur, Day, Middleton were skillful dramatists. I cannot see that they would be more likely than Shakspere to make a number of little mistakes, either as original authors or revisers. And if Mr. Robertson is correct, and Shakspere revised this work of Chapman, he surely would give little evidence of having learned much about the construction of plays in his fifteen years in the theatre had he turned in the play as it is. On the basis of the mistakes, the revision theory would leave one or both who had a part in the play miserable bunglers; a theory that Timon is an unrevised first draft leaves no one responsible, since we may feel sure that they would have been eliminated in revision" (p. 234). "The final objection to the critics is on esthetic grounds. From the time of Fleay the custom in criticizing the play has been that followed in the first part of this paper--breaking it up into parts and

judging on the basis of fragments. But such an approach misses the most vital point about the play--that the whole is greater than the parts, and that if Shakspere discarded the classical unities, there was unity of tone, of design, of effect in his plays: the only kind of unity that matters. If this unity is not present in our play, there may be genuine reason to doubt its authorship; if it is present, it is almost impossible to see how there can be two hands working on it" (p. 244). "[I]t is obvious that Timon of Athens has one tone, continued throughout; one effect and this effect Shaksperian. This must establish a strong probability that this play is by one author, and that author is Shakspere" (pp. 247-48).

"Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (1942), Una Ellis-Fermor: "It is an unfinished play, then, that I should like to consider it, a play such as a great artist might leave behind him, roughed out, worked over in part and then abandoned; full of inconsistencies in form and presentation, with fragments (some of them considerable) bearing the unmistakable stamp of his [Shakespeare's] workmanship scattered throughout. Such a text makes it difficult to believe 'another hand' has been at work upon it, for the confusion, whether it affects details of style of the relations of characters and scenes, is precisely what that hand would have been paid to reduce to order" (p. 271).

An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948), Hardin Craig: "It has been plausibly argued that Shakespeare wrote only certain scenes and that Chapman, or another dramatist, finished it sufficiently for the stage; but agreement is forestalled by the thought that Chapman, or any other competent dramatist of the time, would have done better work" (p. 246-47).

"Timon of Athens" (1948), J.C. Maxwell: "it is much easier to attribute the inconsistencies and loose ends of our text to a single author who had not finally revised his work than to suppose that a second author, called in to complete and tidy up an unfinished play, should have entirely failed to do so and should instead have introduced confusion for the first time into a draft which. . . had hitherto been free from it" (p. 195).

Shakespeare's Prose (1951; rpt. 1963), Milton Crane: "However jumbled an appearance the text as a whole presents, the arrangement of prose and verse in several scenes bears witness that the play is the product of Shakespeare's maturest period" (p. 171).

The Meaning of Shakespeare (1951; rpt. 1963), Harold C. Goddard: "the most convincing, if the most imponderable, evidence in this matter of authorship is musical." Goddard then compares two lines from Othello and two from Timon: "Such

resemblances will mean little to those not given to listening for echoes. But to those who are, it is the same voice. And few things identify like a voice" (p. 174).

"On Certain Proper Names in Shakespeare" (1951), Robert Adger Law: "Shakespeare's choice of names was fortuitous. Yet some examples given may have a slightly larger bearing on the problem of Shakespeare's authorship of one or two plays termed 'doubtful,' as well as on his early acquaintance with North's Plutarch. To be specific, this means a bit more evidence for Shakespeare's authorship of. . . the plays of Timon of Athens and The Winter's Tale" (p. 65).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver:

> It may safely be said of all the theories of revision and collaboration that they contradict each other; that they fail to explain such features of the play as are really exceptional, and notably the versification; and that they continually disregard equivalent problems in other Shakespearian plays. Theories of collaboration can be revived, if at all, only on bibliographical grounds, on the argument that different spellings in the text imply different spellings in the copy and therefore two authors. I have tried to show both that the theory of transcript as part of the copy is more probable and that too much must not be made of variant spellings of proper names in any Elizabethan play. (pp. xxiii-xxiv)

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann: "it cannot be sufficiently emphasized that though Timon is riddled with

inconsistencies and loose ends, this does not set it apart from Shakespeare's other works but rather confirms its authenticity. The notes at the end of Bradley's Shakespearean Tragedy, as also Laqueur's further discoveries in Shakespeare Dramatische Konzeption (1955), suggest that loose ends were the unavoidable secondary manisfestations of his genius, and there would be more cause for disquiet if they were absent" (p. 18).

"Why the Sweets Melted: A Study in Shakespeare's Imagery" (1965), C.H. Hobday: "It is difficult to believe that Shakespeare wrote such halting verse as Apemantus' lines[in I.ii], it is even more difficult to believe that a second writer shared his [Shakespeare's] mental association of flattery with pomp, fool, and poison. This evidence, therefore, would seem to support the view that Timon is the rough draft of an unfinished play by Shakespeare, rather than the work of two hands" (pp. 12-13).

ATTRIBUTION (ACT I)

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (1886), Henry N. Hudson: "In i. 2, which is all Anonymous, the Steward, or one who performs the office of the Steward, is called Flavius; but, in the latter part of ii. 2, which is certainly Shakespeare, Flavius is given as the name of one of Timon's servants who is not the Steward. In the Shakespeare portions, in fact, the folio never designates the Steward by his proper name, but only by that of his office" (Vol. 15, 188).

Shakespeare and Chapman (1917), J.M. Robertson: "the banquet scene (I.ii) is not Shakespeare's: it is pure Chapman" (p. 131).

"Timon of Athens" (1920), William Wells: "the second scene [of Act I] is undoubtedly non-Shakespearian" (p. 267).

The Problem of Timon of Athens (1923), Thomas Marc Parrott assigns I.i to Chapman (p. 7).

Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama (1924; rpt. 1966), H. Dugdale Sykes: "This scene [I.i], as far as the entry of Apemantus (1-178), is mainly Shakespeare's, but preserves traces of the original draft. From the entry of Apemantus to the end of the scene (178-293) it is chiefly Day's" (p. 30). On I.ii: "This long scene, admittedly non-Shakespearean, is chiefly, if not wholly, Middleton's" (p. 32).

"The Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1940), Ralph A. Haug: "most critics, with the exception of Professor Parrott [1923, above], give by far the greater share of the first scene to him [Shakespeare]" (p. 231). "None of the critics who do not allow him [Shakespeare] the entire play ascribes any part of this scene [I.ii] to Shakspere" (p. 232).

The Canon of Thomas Middleton's Plays: Internal Evidence for the Major Problem of Authorship (1975), David J. Lake:

> I have deliberately avoided entangling the authorship problem of Timon with the vexed question of the variant forms /Apemantus/ versus /Apermantus/ and Flavius versus Steward; but it is interesting to observe that Charlton Hinman believes that these and other variants "inevitably suggest different hands," which might be scribal but are "much more likely" to be authorial (Printing and Proof-reading of the First Folio, II, 285). /Apermantus/ and Flavius co-occur only in I.ii, the scene which gives the strongest impression of being nearly pure Middleton. To hazard a guess, I would suggest that the copy for I.ii might have been a Middleton autograph; for the rest of the play it must have been something different (p. 286, n. 2)

ATTRIBUTION (ACT II)

The Pictorial Edition of Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight: "The whole thing [II.ii] wants the spirit of Shakspere, and it wants also the play upon words which he almost invariably employed upon such occasions. The Fool, the Page, the cynic, and the Servants, are simply abusive" (Vol. 1, 335).

"On the Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1874), F.G. Fleay comments on the Steward's remark, "Pray draw near" (II.ii.50):

> When Timon has demanded an explanation of the steward and the steward has desired the duns to cease their importunity till after dinner, he adds to them, "Pray you walk neere! I'le speak with you anon;" and straightaway gives the explanation desired: but the playwright who improved the drama wanted Apemantus to talk nonsense to the Page and Fool of a harlot (unknown in the rest of the piece): so he makes the steward say, "Pray draw neere!" and go out with Timon, apparently to have out their explanation. Caphis and Co. do not draw neere, but stop to talk to Apemantus. When we've had enough of that, in come Timon and the steward, who again says, "Pray you walk neere," which the creditors do this time, and Timon and the Steward go on with their talk as if they had never left the stage to say anything outside. This prose part must be accepted or rejected with the prose in Act i. Sc. 1. (p. 132)

"Timon of Athens" (1920), William Wells: "Act II is nearly all Shakespeare's, though Middleton is evident in the second scene" (p. 267).

Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama (1924; rpt. 1966), H. Dugdale Sykes: "This short scene [II.i] is always given to Shakespeare, and is no doubt substantially his" (p. 35). On II.ii: "Shakespeare is here revising Middleton, except in the portion of the scene between the entry and exit of Apemantus, which is substantially Day's" (p. 35).

"The Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1940), Ralph A. Haug:

> What are these errors [in II.i]? Ventidius (Ventigius, sometimes in the Folio) who had been released from jail, becomes an heir on the death of his father and comes to Timon's banquet--all this in about fifteen minutes (I, ii, 1-7). This is an error that a writer might easily make with a minor character, but one which a reviser would pounce upon at once. The steward is called Flavius here, but that is evidently not his name (I, ii, 162). (The Folio here calls him Flavius, but later Stew.). A servant announces senators to the feast, but the senators do not come in (line 180). Timon says that he plans to make a gift to Alcibiades, but nothing more is heard of it (line 227). It seems much more plausible that these are the errors of the author, working rapidly, rather than the work of a reviser. (p. 234)

"Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (1942), Una Ellis-Fermor: "The second act. . . shows as yet no signs of weakness. Where the first act had been extended and in parts almost leisurely, as fits the induction to an inner action of vast scope, this second act is correspondingly rapid" (p. 276).

Ellis-Fermor believes that the second act is clearly Shakespeare's.

ATTRIBUTION (ACT III)

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight: "We venture to express a conviction that very little of the third act is Shakspere's. The ingratitude of Lucullus in the first scene, and of Lucius in the second, is amusingly displayed; but there is little power in the development of character--little discrimination. The passionate invective of Flaminius is forcible; but the force is not exactly of Shakspere. The dialogue between the Strangers, at the end of the second scene, is unmetrical enough in the original. . . . The third scene has the same incurable defects. . . . The fourth scene we venture to say most distinctly that it is not Shakespere's" (Vol. 1, 335-36). On III.v: "The scene between Alcibiades and the Senate consists of about a hundred and twenty lines.--Of these lines twenty-six form rhyming couplets. This of itself is enough to make us look suspiciously upon this scene, when presented as the work of Shakspere. . . . The whole of the senate scene in Timon is singularly unmetrical; but whenever the verse becomes regular it is certainly not the metre of Shakspere" (Vol. 1, 336).

A Life of William Shakespeare (1904), Sir Sidney Lee: "Shakespeare's colleague [George Wilkins] was responsible for nearly the whole of acts III and V. But the character

of Timon himself and all the scenes which he dominates are from Shakespeare's pen" (p. 252).

The Authorship of Timon of Athens (1910), Ernest Hunter Wright:

> Sundered from all else in the play, this scene [III. v] claims itself spurious by its very insulation. To motivate the last half of the play, the writer must get Alcibiades banished. Let us suppose that in his hurry he fell in with the first plan that occurred to him, without thinking overmuch how well or ill that plan would fit the play. Let us even assume that he was none too familiar with the play. The allowances will perhaps help us to explain why he makes Alcibiades anger the senate with pleas for mercy to the unknown author of an unknown crime; why he meanwhile quite forgets the play on which he is working, and writes in a scene which has not the slightest reference to Timon or the remotest relation to anything whatsoever that takes place in the half of the play preceding. The introduction of a crime and criminal, both alien to the plot and both unheard of elsewhere in the play, to motivate a scene which has so little relevancy to the scenes preceding that it might as well have come from Hamlet, will not be considered the expedient of Shakspere. The technic of the verse--to waive the mediocrity of style as patent--puts the authorship beyond dispute. (p44)

Shakespeare and Chapman (1917), J.M. Robertson: "I agree that the Senate scene [III.v] is not Shakespeare's: the thesis debated, the style, the verse, and the vocabulary, are all Chapman's" (p. 131).

"Timon of Athens" (1920), William Wells: "Scene 4 is clearly not Shakspeare's, though there is nothing outstanding to connect

it definitely with Middleton" (p. 267). On III.vi: "Shakespeare scarcely appears in the third act, his only important contribution being the last speech of Timon in the sixth scene" (p. 267).

Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama (1924; rpt. 1966), H. Dugdale Sykes on III.i-iv: "For proof that the first two scenes of the third act are Middleton's see pp. 24-9, above. There is perhaps one Shakespearean touch in III.ii. . . . The short third scene. . . is also Middleton's. . . . There is general agreement that Shakespeare can have had nothing to do with the fourth scene" (p. 36). On III.v: "This scene (Alcibiades and the Senators) also seems to be chiefly Middleton's" (p. 37). On III.vi: "There is no Shakespeare in this (the mock-banquet) scene except in Timon's speech, and possibly the long prose grace that precedes it,though this is rejected by Fleay" (p. 40). "There is one strong suggestion of Middleton's hand in the final portion of this scene--the exclamation of the Third Lord: 'Push! did you see my cap?' 'Push!' as Mr. Wells has observed, is one of Middleton's commonest expletives. It is seldom used by other authors of the time; never by Shakespeare" (p. 41).

ATTRIBUTION (ACT IV)

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight: "The second scene of the fourth act, between the steward and the servants, has some touches undoubtedly of the master's hand; the steward's speech, after the servants have left, again presents us the rhyming couplets, and the unmetrical blank verse" (Vol. 1, 338).

"Timon of Athens" (1920), William Wells: "The first scene of Act IV, is all Shakespeare's, but Middleton is seen in the beginning of scene ii, and in the speech of Flavius, after the exit of the other servants. Scene iii., again, is mainly Shakespeare's, though the Middleton stratum occasionally peeps through. 'Beast! Slave! Toad! Aspic! Serpent! Viper!' of 'The Mayor of Queensborough.' The dialogue between Timon and Flavius, sometimes assigned to Shakespeare, is also Middleton's, who must be credited with the creation of the one worthy character of the play" (p. 268).

Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama (1924; rpt. 1966), H. Dugdale Sykes: On IV.i: "There can be no doubt that this is pure Shakespeare" (p. 41). On IV.ii: "It is clear that the first half of this scene to the point where the Steward parts from the servants (1-29) was written, or rewritten, by Shake-

speare. The last twenty-two lines I have (with some hesitation, owning to the wretched quality of the verse) attributed to Middleton" (p. 42). On IV.iii:

> (A) 1-276. [Timon, Alcibiades, Apemantus.] Shakespeare with slight traces of earlier work.
> (B) 276-400. [Timon, Apemantus.] Day. (One speech only rewritten by Shakespeare.)
> (C) 400-543. [Banditti, Steward.] Shakespeare revising Middleton. (p. 42)

"The Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1940), Ralph A. Haug on IV.i: "The first part is the affecting leave-taking of the servants--perhaps the most moving lines of the play. The concluding twenty-one form a sententious monologue for the steward. There are several short lines. . . . There is a clue in this passage to the significance of the short lines: none of them rhyme, though many of the full lines do. If they were not meant to stand as they are, and I believe they were not, the lack of rhymes among them points to hasty writing. The unrhyming lines (in the passages from Lear and Othello all the lines are couplets) in Timon may indicate hasty writing at a time when the rhymes did not come readily" (p. 240).

[In Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society (1874), B. Nicholson makes the following remarks on the attribution of IV.ii: "Act iv, sc. 2, so far at least as to the parting

of the servants, is not quite Shakspere's, but was certainly, I think, overwritten by him; there are lines wholly different from the rhythm of the second author, but having rhythm and stlye of Shakspere" (p. 251).]

ATTRIBUTION (ACT V)

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight: "The scene between the Poet and the Painter [V.i], at the commencement of the fifth act, is so unmetrical, that it has been printed as prose by all modern editors, and we scarcely know how to avoid following the example" (Vol. 1, 338). Knight goes on to attribute only i.120-231 of the fifth act to Shakespeare (Vol. 1, 338).

The Temple Shakespeare (1899-1902), Israel Gollancz: "The Fifth Act of the play gives the best clue to the solution of the problem [of attribution]. It certainly produces the impression of having been left roughly sketched by Shakespeare, whose touch is manifest in the more important speeches, especially those belonging to the character of Timon. The third scene, however, is clearly not Shakespeare's" (Vol. 29, 211).

A Life of William Shakespeare (1904), Sir Sidney Lee: "Shakespeare's colleague [George Wilkins] was responsible for nearly the whole of acts III. and V. But the character of Timon himself and all the scenes which he dominates are from Shakespeare's pen" (p. 252).

"Timon of Athens" (1920), William Wells: "Shakespeare's hand is manifest in the prose opening of Act V., although this

is usually put upon the other poet, and these three lines from that part of the scene recognized as Shakespeare's--'He and myself/Have travailed in the great shower of your gifts,/And sweetly felt it.'--are surely a remnant of the earlier Middleton play. For the rest, I am not so sure that Middleton wrote the eight-line scene. It sounds to me more like Shakespeare's, though,indeed, a long way from his best" (p. 268).

Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama (1924; rpt. 1966), H. Dugdale Sykes: On V.i: "This is chiefly Shakespeare's, but there are occasional traces of the earlier draft throughout the scene" (p. 46). On V.ii: "This short scene is usually given to Shakespeare. As Dr. Wright says, it 'has not been doubted' to be his. But it is too short to enable one to arrive at a definite conclusion. The style of the Messenger's speech is certainly Shakespearean" (p. 47). On V.iii: "These ten lines cannot be Shakespeare's" (p. 47). On V.iv: "Nothing need be said of this final scene, except that its style is Shakespearean" (p. 48).

"Timon of Athens, Act V, Scene 3" (1939), Paul H. Kocher: "The almost universal opinion of critics has long been that this brief ten-line scene was written not by Shakspere but by some other author, probably Middleton or Chapman" (p. 237). But by examining parallel passages, Kocher comes to believe that

Shakespeare wrote the scene: "The parallels given above even when taken all together are, of course, far from establishing Shakspere's authorship of Timon, Act V, Scene 3, but they have an evidential value which may well justify a re-opening of the question" (p. 242).

"The Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1940), Ralph A. Haug: "There is one scene in act five that saddens anyone loyal to the Shaksperian authorship theory. The third scene cannot be called unfinished, for the lines are regular enough. Its utter flatness reminds us that Shakspere could, sometimes, write very badly" (p. 241).

ATTRIBUTION CHART (ACT I)

	SHAKESPEAREAN	NON-SHAKESPEAREAN
Knight (1867)	i	ii
Hudson (1881)	i.1-185; 249-65; 248-93	i.186-248; 266-83; ii
Fleay (1878)	i.1-185; 249-64; 284-93; ii	i.186-248; 265-83
Rolfe (1882, 1895, 1906)	i.1-185; 249-64; 284-93	i.186248; 265-83; ii
White (1883)	i.1-176	i.177-293; ii
Gollancz (1896, 1899)	i.1-188	i.189-93; ii
Wright (1910)	i	ii
Williams (1919)	i.1-188; 250-65	i.189-49; i.266-83; ii
Wells (1920)		i; ii
Parrott (1923)	i.95-151; 249-64; 284-93	i.1-94; 152-248; 265-83; ii
Sykes (1924)	Finds it impossible to determine Shakespeare's slight revisions of a Middleton-Day play.	
Chambers (1925)	i	most of ii
Brandes (1936)	i (?)	ii
Haug (1940)	i, ii	
Nowottny (1959)		i, ii

ATTRIBUTION CHART (ACT II)

	SHAKESPEAREAN	NON-SHAKESPEAREAN
Knight (1867)	i; ii.1-46; 129-242	ii.47-128
Hudson (1881)	i; ii.1-46; 132-95; 204-42	ii.47-131; 196-203
Fleay (1878)	i; ii.1-46; 132-94; 204-42	ii.47-131; 195-203
Rolfe (1882, 1895, 1906)	i; ii.1-46; 132-242	ii.47-131
White (1883)	i; ii.1-46; 132-242	ii.47-131
Gollancz (1896, 1899)	i; ii.1-46; 125-242	ii.47-124
Wright (1910)	i; ii.1-46; 132-142	ii.47-131
Williams (1919)	i; ii.1-45; 133-95; 206-43	ii.46-132; 196-205
Wells (1920)	i	ii
Parrott (1923)	i; ii.1-46; 132-242	ii.47-131
Sykes (1924)	(See Act I.)	
Chambers (1925)	i; ii	
Brandes (1936)		i; ii
Haug (1940)	i	ii
Nowottny (1959)	ii	i

ATTRIBUTION CHART (ACT III)

	SHAKESPEAREAN	NON-SHAKESPEAREAN
Knight (1867)		i-vi
Hudson (1881)	vi.27-115	i-vi.26; vi.116-32
Fleay (1878)	vi.95-115	i-vi.94; vi. 116-32
Rolfe (1882, 1895, 1906)	vi.95-115	i-vi.94; vi.116-32
White (1883)	i.31-56	i.57-60; ii; iii; v; vi
Gollancz (1896, 1899)	vi.98-115	i-vi; vi.116-32
Wright (1910)	i; ii; vi	iii; iv; v
Williams (1919)	vi.99-116	i; ii; iii; iv; v; vi.1-98
Wells (1920)		i; ii; iii; iv; v; vi
Parrott (1923)	i.1-51; ii; vi	i.52-66; iii; iv; v
Sykes (1924)	(See Act I.)	
Chambers (1925)		i; ii; iii; iv; v
Brandes (1936)	vi	i; ii; iii; iv; v
Haug (1940)	i; ii; iii; iv; v; vi	
Nowottny (1959)		i; ii; iii; iv; v; vi

ATTRIBUTION CHART (ACT IV)

	SHAKESPEAREAN	NON-SHAKESPEAREAN
Knight (1867)	i; iii	ii
Hudson (1881)	i; ii.1-29; iii. 1-465; 476-543	ii.30-50; iii.466-75
Fleay (1878)	i; ii.1-28; iii.1-291; 363-98; 414-53	ii.29-50; iii.292-362; 399-413; 454-543
Rolfe (1882, 1895, 1906)	i; ii.1-28; iii.1-291 363-98; 414-53	ii.29-50; iii.292-362 399-413; 454-543
White (1883)	I; ii; iii	
Gollancz (1896, 1899)	i; ii.1-29; iii.1-291; 363-98; 414-53	ii.30-50; iii.292-362; 399-413; 454-543
Wright (1910)	i; ii.1-29; iii.1-291; 376-463; 479-508; 530-43	ii.30-50; iii,292-375; 464-78
Williams (1919)	i; ii.1-29; iii.1-292 376-466	ii.30-50; iii.467-545; iii.293-375 (?)
Wells (1920)	i; iii (but Middleton is "evident")	ii ("beginning" is Middleton's)
Parrott (1923)	i; ii.1-29; iii.1-239; 248-90; 371-454	ii.30-50; iii.240-47 291-370; 455-543
Sykes (1924)	(See Act I.)	
Chambers (1925)	i; iii.1-463	ii; iii.464-543
Brandes (1936)	i; ii; iii	
Haug (1940)	i; ii; iii	
Nowottny (1959)	i; ii; iii.1463	iii.464 to end (?)

ATTRIBUTION CHART (ACT V)

	SHAKESPEAREAN	NON-SHAKESPEAREAN
Knight (1867)	i.120-231; ii; iv	i.1-119; iii
Hudson (1881)	i; ii; iv	iii
Fleay (1878)	i.57-231; ii; iv	i.1-56; iii
Rolfe (1882, 1895, 1906)	i.57-231; ii; iv	i.1-56; iii
White (1883)	i.38-231; iv	i.1-37; ii; iii
Gollancz (1896, 1899)	i.60-231; iv	i.1-56; ii; iii
Wright (1910)	i; ii; iv	iii
Williams (1919)	i.60-231; ii; iv	i.1-59; iii
Wells (1920)	i ("opening" Shakespeare's)	ii; iii; iv
Parrott (1923)	i.119-231; ii; iv	i.1-118; iii
Sykes (1924)	(See Act I.)	
Chambers (1925)	ii; iii	i
Brandes (1936)		i; ii; iii
Haug (1940)	i; ii; iii	
Nowottny (1959)	i.115-231; iv.70-85	i.1-114; ii; iii; iv.1-69

CHAPTER II

PROBLEMS OF TEXT

TIMON in FIRST FOLIO

The Works of William Shakespeare (1857-66), Richard Grant White: "The first folio is the only source of the text of Timon of Athens; and there it is found in a very corrupt state. Its versification in certain Scenes was probably never smooth, but in this regard it has doubtless suffered greatly in the printing office or in transcription" (Vol. 10, 204).

"On the Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1874), F.G. Fleay: The Folio editors "took the incomplete Timon, put it into a playwright's hands, and told him to make it up to 30 pages. Hence the enormous amount of padding and bombast in his part of the work" (p. 137).

Timon of Athens (1890), William J. Rolfe believes that when Troilus and Cressida was withdrawn from the Folio, Timon was used to take its place. But Rolfe disagrees with Fleay's idea that the play was then padded to fill out thirty pages: "it is not likely that he [another playwright] would have come almost ten pages short of the mark, doing little more than half of the task assigned him. Surely he could easily have supplied plenty more 'padding' of that inferior sort, if it had been wanted" (p.13). Rolfe also feels that the Folio editors knew that Timon was Shakespeare's in part only, and were therefore reluctant to include it in the Folio (pp. 11-12).

The Temple Shakespeare (1899-1902), Israel Gollancz: "Troilus and Cressida would just have filled the space of pages 80 to 108; and judging from the fact that its second and third pages are numbered 79 and 80, one may perhaps safely assume that Timon took its place in the Folio. . . . The doubtful authorship of a great deal of the play accounts, in all probability for the unsatisfactory state of the text" (Vol. 29, 209, 210).

"Timon of Athens and the Irregularities in the First Folio" (1907-08), Joseph Quincy Adams writes that because of possible copywrite problems, Troilus and Cresida was removed from the first Folio, and "it was decided to fill the space with Timon of Athens" (p. 57). Adams argues, however, that Troilus and Cressida had not been set up in type, printed, and then torn from the Folio. He believes that when the editors encountered copywrite difficulties, they estimated the length of Troilus, and then held that much space for it in the Folio. Adams thus refutes Fleay's theories on Timon's place in the Folio: "In answer to Mr. Fleay's statement, 'This space. . . would have just held the Troylus and Cressida,' it is sufficient to reply that the space would have been too much by three pages. In no way could Troylus and Cressida be made 'just' to fill the space" (p. 59).

Adams describes the printing of Timon in the Folio:

A hitch came in the printing of Troylus and Cressida

> after three pages of the play had been printed as a part of quire gg. The printers expected ultimately to continue with the play; hence they left the gap, pp. 78-108, and continued with Julius Caesar. Before the end of the book had been reached, Timon was selected to fill the gap. After Timon had been printed (and perhaps after the Catalogue had been struck off) the managers ordered the printing of Troylus and Cressida. Since there was no other place for it, the play was inserted between the Histories and the Tragedies. In making these changes the printers made as much use as possible of the original quire gg, losing only one leaf. This leaf, by accident, crept into the Sheldon and Morgan folios. (p. 63)

Finally, Adams argues that Folio irregularities "have no bearing on the authorship of the play." "If my interpretation of the irregularities is correct, the difficulty lay wholly in Troylus and Cressida" (p. 63).

The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare (1942), W.W. Greg argues that the differences in spelling in Timon indicates that the play is not, as is often argued, the work of two hands, but that our text is based on the author's foul papers, which were never corrected (p. 149).

Shakespeare's Tragedies (1951), G.B. Harrison: "Timon of Athens was included with the Tragedies by the editors of the First Folio but apparently as an afterthought. They had originally intended to print Troilus and Cressida between Romeo and Juliet and Julius Caesar, but some difficulty arose and Troilus was held up; Timon was then used to fill up the space" (p.253).

Textual Problems of the First Folio: Richard III, King Lear, Troilus and Cressida, 2 Henry IV, Hamlet, Othello (1953), Alice Walker:

> This had, in fact, been perfected when, for some reason, further work on Troilus and Cressida was suspended and it was not resumed until after Timon of Athens (the last play to be printed except for Troilus and Cressida) had been inserted in the space left for the latter after Romeo and Juliet. At this stage, when the colophon and preliminaries (including the Catalogue, from which therefore Troilus and Cressida is absent) were ready, printing of the play was resumed and it was inserted, with separate signatures, without pagination, other than what survived on the original gg4), and with a non-committal running title, between the Histories and Tragedies. (p. 71)

The Shakespeare First Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History (1955), W.W. Greg: "There is, of course, no doubt that it was printed from foul papers that had never been reduced to anything like order. It must be borne in mind that Timon was inserted at the last moment in the place long reserved for Troilus and Cressida, and it is quite possible that the editors did not in the first place intend to print it at all, and only decided to do so when something was needed fill the gap" (p. 411).

"The Prentice Hand in the Tragedies of the Shakespeare First Folio: Compositor F" (1957), Charlton Hinman: "Similarly, after quire rr came quires Gg-hh: work on King Lear was inter-

rupted to allow for the printing of Timon of Athens (along with the end of Romeo and Juliet)" (p. 281).

Act Division in Elizabethan and Jacobean Plays 1583-1616 (1958), Wilfred T. Jewkes: "the text bears many of the characteristics of Ralph Crane. It is tidy, with careful punctuation, a profusion of hyphens, bare stage directions and the massing of entrances characteristic of some other plays in the Folio thought to have been his work" (p. 191).

The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare (1963), Charlton Hinman:

> Henry VIII was produced by two compositors. The whole of Timon, on the other hand, proves to have been set by one man, Compositor B.
>
> Just why Timon was not printed sooner can hardly be said with assurance, but we may reasonably suppose some such course of events as the following--
> (i) Henry Walley, who owned the Troilus copyright, objected to Jaggard's use of this play. Work on Folio Troilus, already begun, was accordingly stopped.
> (ii) Work on Troilus was stopped and Romeo (except for its last part-page) was independently finished; but Jaggard continued to hope that a satisfactory agreement with Walley could be reached. Original sheet*gg3; 4, containing both the end of Romeo and the first three pages of Troilus, could thus be used; Troilus and Cressida could still appear between Romeo and long-since-completed Julius Caesar in the finished book. Pending negotiations, therefore, Jaggard's workmen went ahead with Hamlet and Lear.
> (iii) It became clear by the time quire rr had been finished that no satisfactory agreement was likely to be reached as regards Troilus. So quires Gg

and hh, containing Timon of Athens (and, on Ggr, a resetting of the end of Romeo), were now produced. (Vol. 2, p. 282)

The Work of William Shakespeare (1842), J. Payne Collier notes the "apparent want of finish" in some parts of Timon (Vol. 6, 501).

Shakespeare's Dramatic Art (1846; rpt. 1896), Hermann Ulrici: "I think that the unquestionable inequality of the drama, apart from the equally unquestionable corruption of the text, seems to lie in the decidedly greater hurry and carelessness with which some portions have been worked out, compared with others. . . . I conjecture, therefore, that Shakespeare originally made a rapid and hurried sketch of 'Timon of Athens,' only that this was done with greater hurry and carelessness than usual" (Vol. 1, 523).

Über die Quellen, aus denen Shakespeare den Timon von Athen entnommen hat (1873) [not seen; no pub. available; no pagination available], A. Müller (According to J.C. Maxwell [1957; rpt. 1968], Müller "regarded it as possible that the play was unfinished, but also thought that the Folio had to print from an imperfect copy" [p. xi]).

The Leopold Shakspere (1877), F.J. Furnivall: "One does not wonder that he [Shakespeare] left it unfinished, and let its completer do what he liked with it" (p. lxxxiv).

"Shakespeare's Timon von Athen" (1888), Wilhelm Wendlandt writes that Timon is faithfully printed from Shakespeare's unfinished draft:

> Das Resultat meiner Forschung ist dieses: dass die Kritik, da sie weder die Glaubwürdigkeit der Folio I untergraben kann, noch die Aufführung des Timon von Athen vor der Ausgabe dieser ersten Sammlung, also auch keine Schauspielerrollen, nach denen das Stück theilweise für den Druck zusammengestellt sein könnte, anzunehmen berechtigt ist, noch den geistig hervorragenden "Vorgänger," dessen Stück Shakespeare bearbeitet haben soll, überzeugend nachzuweisen, d.h. namhaft zu machen im Stande ist, noch von einem späteren Redaktor vor der Folio I das geringste Positive weiss, sich mit der Annahme bescheiden muss, dass diese Tragödie, in Anbetracht der ausseren, in der Ueberlieferung und der Aehnlichkeit mit den Dramen der letzten Periode des Dichters, sowie der inneren, in Idee der Komposition und Gedankenfülle der Charakteristik liegenden Gründe fur die durchgängige Autorschaft Shakespeare's. . . und dass diese handschriftliche Kladde auf nicht mehr zu erittelnde Weise in den Bereich von Heminge und Condell und als solche unverändert in die Folio-Ausgabe von 1623 übergegangen ist. (p. 109)

The Works of Shakespeare (1888-90) Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall:"But before he [Shakespeare] had time to give the whole [of Timon] a final revision it was called for by the manager, and hurried upon the boards. These assumptions will account both for the general unity of plan as well as for the signs of incomplete revision observable here and there" (Vol. 7, 4).

"Shakespeare's Classical Plays" (1893), James T. Foard calls Timon a "Titanic fragment, and unformed boulder of the Cyclopean Age" and goes on to argue that it is nevertheless more finished than Coriolanus (pp. 333-71).

Shakspere and His Predecessors (1896), F.S. Boas: "Timon of Athens, as it stands, cannot represent a complete, genuine Shaksperean work. The contrast between the noble verse and imagery in the finer scenes, and the haulting metre and insipid dialogue of other parts, is too striking to be entirely attributed to the dramatist in the maturity of his powers. Yet these inequalities have been exaggerated, and all attempts to rigidly separate the genuine from the spurious parts of the work must be viewed with suspicion" (p. 495).

The old Arden Timon of Athens (1905), K. Deighton: Shakespeare "threw aside his unfinished work, perhaps deterred by its want of promise of stage effect and interest, perhaps invited by some more congenial theme" (p. ix). "[I]t seems possible that the play in the editors' hands was as complete as it now is, but that portions were still wanting, and that, in default of their recovery, it was determined to print the manuscript in its imperfect state" (p. xv).

Shakespeare (1907), Sir Walter Raleigh: Timon is "a

first sketch of King Lear, set aside unfinished because the story proved intractable and no full measure of sympathy could be demanded for its hero" (p. 115).

The Problem of Timon of Athens (1923), Thomas Marc Parrott: "What Shakespeare left behind him was neither a scenario, needing only to be filled in, nor a play complete, so far as it went needing only to be supplemented, but a thing of shreds and patches which only the master's hand was capable of weaving together into the fabric of a finished play. Neither Chapman nor any of his fellows could have performed this task" (p. 29). "[T]he unfinished Shakespearian manuscript was handed over to Chapman to finish for the stage" (p. 30).

William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems (1930), E.K. Chambers: "I do not doubt that it [Timon] was left unfinished by Shakespeare, and I believe that the real solution of its 'problem,' as indicated long ago by Ulrici [1846; rpt. 1896, above] and others, is that it is unfinished still" (Vol. 1, 482).

The New Temple Timon of Athens (1934), M.R. Ridley: "The more one studies the play, the more one comes to feel that many passages are not so much 'corrupt' in the ordinary sense, as simply unfinished rough drafts that were to have

been worked over. And if that is so, emendation is idle" (p. 111).

The Complete Works of Shakespeare (1936), George Lyman Kittredge: "In IV,3,356, Apemantus tells Timon that a poet and a painter are in sight; but it is the Banditti who come up (399). Both the Poet and Painter have vanished; they do not enter until the beginning of Act V. Such flaws and irregularities--as well as the defective interweaving of the two main strands of the plot, the Timon story and the Alcibiades story--are adequately explained by the obvious fact that Shakespeare never really finished the play. This theory is practically proved by Timon's epitaph (V,4,70-73). It consists of two inconsistent couplets.. . . Doubtless he worked on the play at different times, and, as we have seen, he never actually finished it" (pp. 1045-46).

"The Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1940), Ralph A. Haug: "we have here a rough draft, the first sketch of a drama, in which some parts are complete, some in a state approaching completion, and others in a chaotic condition" (p. 233). "Timon is an unrevised first draft" (p. 234).

"Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (1942), Una Ellis-Fermor lists four theories for an unfinished text:

1) that Shakespeare rewrote an older, unfinished Timon; 2) that Shakespeare left Timon unfinished and that it was completed by another playwright; 3) that the Folio version is corrupt; or 4) that we now "have merely an unfinished play in which the other 'hand' is negligible or non-existent" (p. 270). She believes that Shakespeare wrote the play and simply "left it unfinished" (p. 274).

Editorial Problems in Shakespeare (1942), W.W. Greg: "It can hardly be doubted that the play was set up from foul papers that had never been reduced to order" (p. 149).

Shakespeare and the Nature of Man (1942), Theodore Spencer: "The play is by no means a satisfactory unity, and there are three possible explanations for the rough condition in which it has survived. It may be a re-working by Shakespeare of an incomplete play by somebody else, it may be a re-working by somebody else of an incomplete play by Shakespeare, or it may be entirely Shakespeare's, but left incomplete by him. Each theory has its strong advocates, but, though I am inclined to agree with Sir Edmund Chambers in believing that the last theory is correct and that the play as it stands is all Shakespeare's, it does not matter for our purpose which theory we accept" (p. 180).

Shakespeare's Satire (1943), Oscar James Campbell:

"If we now understand that Timon of Athens is Shakespeare's first attempt to write a tragical satire, we may partly understand why he did not complete the work. We have seen that the first three acts remain a kind of unfinished sketch of dramatic action. Only the last two acts have been given a form that seems nearly final. And it is precisely these last two acts which demand effective satiric writing. Only after Timon had become a 'naked gull' did his emotions reach the intensity which naturally explodes in angry derision. Naturally in these parts of the drama Shakespeare found a chance to test his satiric powers. Neither his imagination nor his poetic interest was fired by anything in the first three acts as he outlined them. He seemed unable to devise a plot which could become the natural history of the development of a figure who like Timon was at once tragic and ridiculous" (p. 195).

"Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1946), A.S. Collins: "The signs of an unfinished play are there, as notably in the incursion of the Fool" (p. 102).

Elizabethan and Jacobean (1946), F.P. Wilson considers the play unfinished and suggests that the "unfinished state of Timon of Athens may be a confession that [Shakespeare] had blundered in choosing a theme for a tragedy" (p. 117).

An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948), Hardin Craig: Timon "was left by its author incomplete. . . . The play resembles nothing so much as a first draft with certain sections well done and others hardly more than the raw materials written hastily" (pp. 246, 247).

"Timon of Athens" (1948), J.C. Maxwell: "it is much easier to attribute the inconsistencies and loose ends of our text to a single author who had not finally revised his work than to suppose that a second author, called in to complete and tidy up an unfinished play, should have entirely failed to do so and should instead have introduced confusion for the first time into a draft which. . . had hitherto been free from it" (p. 195).

A History of English Literature (1950), Hardin Craig: "Timon of Athens resembles nothing so much as an incomplete work of Shakespeare, a tragedy abandoned because of the unsuitability of its subject" (p. 268).

The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery (1951), Wolfgang H. Clemen: "Timon impresses us as a play that is not quite perfect and complete" (p. 176).

Shakespeare's Prose (1951; rpt. 1963), Milton Crane: "That the play is unfinished can be scarcely doubted" (p. 171).

"Shakespeare Learns the Value of Money: The Dramatist at Work in Timon of Athens" (1953), Terence Spencer calls the idea that Timon is unfinished "one of the most important outstanding problems of Shakespearian scholarship" (p. 75). Spencer considers the varying value of a talent throughout the play "to substantiate the surmise of several modern investigators that parts of our text of Timon have never been reasonably completed, polished, or corrected for performance" (p. 75).

"Timon and the Conceit of Art" (1955), W.M. Merchant calls Timon "this apparently unfinished play" (p. 252).

The Shakespeare First Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History (1955), W.W. Greg: "There is, of course, no doubt that F was printed from foul papers that had never been reduced to anyting like order" (p. 411).

Act Division in Elizabethan and Jacobean Plays, 1583-1616 (1958), Wilfred T. Jewkes: "It is generally agreed that the confused state of the text of this play, and its general sketchiness, particularly in the central portion, make it almost certain that it was printed from an author's manuscript, 'foul papers' indeed, and that it represents a rough, sketchy first draft to the play" (p. 189).

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme suggests that Shakespeare left Timon unfinished because it was a study of Coriolanus: "Shakespeare had realized his mistake and started again on the right track" (p. 124).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "The loose ends in the plot are further reason for believing in the theory of Timon as an unfinished play" (p. xxvii).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner calls Timon an "incomplete draft of a play" (p. 137).

"Timon of Athens" (1963), David Cook: "we have no more than an advanced draft of Timon" (p. 94).

"Shakespeare's Greeks" (1964), Clifford Leech calls Timon a "rough draft" which "had not been brought to a point of completion" (p. 16).

Shakespeare's Occasional Plays: Their Origin and Transmission (1965), J.M. Nosworthy: "It is now generally accepted that the five-act tragedy of Timon was never completed, and the precise nature of the copy underlying the Folio text remains a mystery" (p. 225).

Timon of Athens (1965), Maurice Charney: "There is general agreement that Timon of Athens is an unfinished play. . . . There can be no doubt that the play as it appears in Shakespeare's First Folio of 1623 is unfinished" (pp. xxi, xxii).

"Why the Sweets Melted: A Study in Shakespeare's Imagery" (1965), C.H. Hobday: "If it is difficult to believe that Shakespeare wrote such halting verse as Apemantus' lines, it is even more difficult to believe that a second writer shared his mental association of flattery with pomp, fool, and poison. This evidence, therefore, would seem to support the view that Timon is the rough draft of an unfinished play by Shakespeare, rather than the work of two hands" (pp. 12-13).

Shakespeare the Craftsman (1969), M.C. Bradbrook writes that Timon "is perhaps not a full play at all" (p. 166). She later argues, however, that it is not unfinished.

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1969), Charlton Hinman: "The peculiarities in question may not, it is true, provide a sound basis for generalization about Shakespeare's usual working methods, about the procedures he followed when writing his other plays; but they probably give us the clearest view we are ever likely to get of a Shakespearean manuscript in process of completion" (p. 1138).

"Timon of Athens" (1969), L.C. Knights: "There seems to be no doubt that Timon of Athens is an unfinished play: not in the sense that it lacks a conclusion, but in the sense that it has not been finally worked over for presen-

tation on the stage" (p. 1). But Knights also finds Timon "very much more than a mere draft; it is a play moving towards completion" (p. 1).

"Jacobean Tragedy and the Mannerist Style" (1973), Cyrus Hoy: "Pieta Rondanini is unfinished, and so, I suspect, is Timon of Athens" (p. 60).

The Riverside Shakespeare (1974), Frank Kermode: "We may accordingly regard Timon as an unfinished but wholly Shakespearean play" (p. 1441).

"Theme in Timon of Athens" (1974), Michael Tinker: "If we accept the thesis, that the play is unfinished, it seems to me that we must admit that a play with so many obvious and carefully developed structural elements must have been very near to completion" (p. 77).

The Canon of Thomas Middleton's Plays: Internal Evidence for the Major Problem of Authorship (1975), David J. Lake: "Timon must be a rough draft: it is certainly in a theatrically unviable condition, bristling with loose ends" (p. 280).

"Timon of Athens and the Rhetoric of No" (1976), Marianna da Vinci Nichols: "the true reason the play was never polished and revised is that Shakespeare tired of rhetorical experiment" (p. 39).

"Timon of Athens: The Rage of Disillusion" (1979),

Handelman: "All the questions about its [Timon's] authorship, which stem from the many confusions and disjunctions in the text, indicate an unfinished play which somewhere broke down, would not allow itself to be composed" (p. 48).

"Timon of Athens and Buddhism" (1980), G. Wilson Knight: "The text is unrevised and at times faulty, as though Shakespeare put it aside unfinished" (p. 105).

[In Shakespeare's Tragedies (1951), G.B. Harrison makes the following remarks on the play: "The likeliest explanation is that of E.K. Chambers, that Timon, as it stands in the Folio, is the draft of a play which Shakespeare never finished, and that 'the passages of chaotic verse in particular look very much like rough notes, hastily jotted down, to be worked up later'" (p. 255).

Shakespeare's Dramatic Art (1846; rpt. 1896), Hermann Ulrici: "Shakespeare's state of mind about the time of the composition of the piece, must have been somewhat like that of Timon's, otherwise it is scarcely conceivable how he could have felt himself, even momentarily, attracted by this subject, which was not by any means specially suited for dramatic purposes" (Vol. 1, 532).

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (1886), Henry N. Hudson: "the subject is certainly illadapted to dramatic uses. . . . So that the most likely conclusion in this case seems to be, that some ill-starred experience, such as human life offers to most men who are observant and thoughtful enough to be capable of it, had planted in him so strong a sympathy with the state of feeling predominant in Timon, as to turn the scale against his better judgment as a dramatic poet and artist" (Vol. 15, 184).

On the play's theme as cause of abandonment:

> Shakespeare planned the whole drama substantially as we have it, made an outline of all the parts, including the whole course and order of the action, wrote out the parts of Timon in its present form, added, besides, some whole scenes as they now stand, and furnished some passages for others; but, perceiving more and more, as he went on, the unfitness of the theme for his purpose, finally gave up the work, and threw it aside unfinished: that this was afterwards taken in hand by some third-rate workman, who retained all that Shakespeare had

> written and wrote out the rest in accordance, as nearly as might be, with the original play. This view clearly legitimates the supposal that here the Poet's choice of subject grew from personal sympathy with the mood and temper of mind displayed in Timon, and not from his judgment of dramatic fitness. For so his interest would naturally draw first to those parts which voiced his prevailing mood; and then begin to flag and fall away as soon as, on coming to those where such personal respects had no place, his dramatic judgment regained the upper hand. (Vol. 15, 186)

Shakespeare: A Survey (1925), E.K. Chambers: "It is tempting to suppose that the deep waters closed over Shakespeare's head while he was still elaborating the play, and that when he faced the world once more in his new mood the inclination to finish the task had left him" (p. 276).

William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems (1930), E.K. Chambers: "It is, perhaps, a subjective view that he [Shakespeare] dealt with it [Timon] under conditions of mental and perhaps physical stress, which led to a breakdown. In any case he seems to have abandoned it, and never to have taken it up again" (Vol. 1, 483).

Shakespeare and the Nature of Man (1942), Theodore Spencer: "Perhaps it was because Shakespeare was aware that he had started down a dramatic blind alley that he left the play unfinished--in trying to account for what he did it

is always wise, since we are dealing with so consummate a craftsman, to suggest technical explanations first. But few Shakespearean critics, and I confess I am not among them, have resisted the temptation to go further, and to see in the fact that Shakespeare left Timon unfinished an indication of a change in Shakespeare's attitude toward the nature of man. Sir Edmund Chambers, one of the most cautious of scholars, has even suggested that at this time of his career, Shakespeare had a nervous breakdown, and that thereafter the intensity of the tragic vision was physiologically impossible; it was more than Shakespeare could stand [Chambers, 1930, above]" (p. 184).

Shakespeare's Satire (1943) Oscar James Campbell: "So even those who realize that Timon of Athens is not a tragedy made chaotic by the insurrection of Shakespeare's emotions of despair and disgust will not give it their unqualified approval. . . . Just because it is tragical satire, it is not attuned to Shakespeare's nature or to the intensities of his genius. Even those informed by historical study of the author's purpose in composing Timon of Athens will quite properly continue to assign it a low place in the canon of Shakespeare's works" (p. 197).

A Literary History of England (1948), Tucker Brooke: "there is a plausibility in Sir Edmund Chamber's suggestion [1930, above] that the incompleteness of the play might be due to a physical breakdown (not recorded), which could have cut short the poet's tragic period and put an end for evermore to these strenuous analyses of the human mind" (p. 539).

An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948), Hardin Craig: "There was disillusionment in the mind of Shakespeare when he wrote King Lear. It is just possible that it carried over into Timon of Athens" (p. 248).

Shakespeare's Tragedies (1951), G.B. Harrison: "Chambers [1930, above] was right in supposing that Timon of Athens was never finished, but the reason was not mental breakdown but sheer boredom" (p. 270).

Shakespeare's Tragedies (1950), Clifford Leech: "Partly it [Timon] is a tragedy manqué, failing of its effect because it was no longer possible for the dramatist to feel and to communicate a sense of pride in the central figure he was creating" (p. 124).

"Timon of Athens" (1963), David Cook: "It is easy to see why Shakespeare might seize on the subject of Timon in a period of troubled thinking and warring moods, and the reason he failed to finish the work was that, in the event, the hero

proved too negative a vehicle for his thinking, and the whole fabric of the play too destructive at a time when his thoughts were slowly gestating the new positive ideas of the final group of plays" (p. 94).

"Shakespeare's Misanthrope" (1973), Harry Levin: "Should the limitation be ascribed to the character o to the playwright? Could it be that Shakespeare, so adept and far-ranging in his sympathy, was balked at the portrayal of antipathy? It seems clear that he, who empathized with such numerous and varied themes, found this an uncongenial one" (p. 94).

The Riverside Shakespeare (1974), Frank Kermode:

> So strident is the tone of declamatory hatred in the second half of Timon that some critics accuse Shakespeare of a loss of control, even suggesting that to have written this play and left it in a rough state could have been a consequence of some mental disorder. But these thin harsh tones are the tones of Timon's hysteria, not Shakespeare's; and the verse no more than the structure of the play suggests loss of control or the indulgence of some private loathing. . . . In fact, we cannot hope to know the reason for the abandonment of the work at so late a stage. Perhaps the lack of a true climax at the end of the play made it seem finally unsatisfactory to the playwright. Whatever the explanation, it obviously had nothing to do with loss of power of control. (p. 1444)

The Canon of Thomas Middleton's Plays: Internal Evidence for the Major Problem of Authorship (1975), David J. Lake: "Timon must be a rough draft: it is certainly in a theatrically unviable condition, bristling with loose ends" (p. 280). "Shakespeare and his fellows of the King's Men came to realise that no amount of patching could turn Timon of Athens into an attractive play for the Globe or Blackfriars, and hence it was never finished for production" (p. 286).

"Timon of Athens and the Rhetoric of No" (1976), Marianna de Vinci Nichols: "the true reason the play was never polished and revised is that Shakespeare tired of rhetorical experiment" (p. 39).

"Timon of Athens: The Rage of Disillusion" (1979), Susan Handelman: "All the questions about its authorship, which stem from the many confusions and disjunctions in the text, indicate an unfinished play which somewhere broke down, would not allow itself to be composed. . . . Shakespeare does not believe in his own art, and that is why the play is unfinished" (p. 48).

TIMON UNFINISHED BECAUSE OF "THEME"

The Works of Shakespeare (1851-56), Henry N. Hudson: "the subject [of Timon] is certainly ill-adapted to dramatic uses" (Vol. 8, 6).

A Study of Shakespeare (1880), Charles Algernon Swinburn: "No subject could possibly be more unmanageable" (p. 213).

Shakespeare (1907), Walter Raleigh: "But if, as seems likely, Timon is a first sketch of King Lear, set aside unfinished because the story proved intractable and no full measure of sympathy could be demanded for its hero, the position is explained. Shakespeare, the artist, had no further use for Timon; Shakespeare, the popular playwright, laid his hand on the discarded fragment of a play, and either expanded it himself, or, more probably, permitted another to expand it, to the statutory bulk of five acts" (p. 115).

The Problem of Timon of Athens (1923), Thomas Marc Parrott: "It is possible. . . to find a reason for the unfinished state of Shakespeare's Timon. . . . . To make a play out of this theme ["ingratitude"], it was necessary to invent a number of incidents, and weave them together into a coherent plot leading up to the climax. . . . Invention was not Shakespeare's forte; he preferred to take his plots ready

made. And in the absence of any true plot in the Timon theme involved him in arduous and perhaps unsatisfactory labour" (pp. 27-28).

Shakespeare and the Nature of Man (1942), Theodore Spencer: "It is difficult to resist the conclusion that the old misanthropic story was at this time sympathetic to Shakespeare, just as, if we accept the view that the play as we now have it is all his, it is difficult not to conclude that he abandoned it because he saw that the story could not, from its very nature, be turned into a first-class play" (p. 180).

Elizabethan and Jacobean (1946), F.P. Wilson: "The unfinished state of Timon of Athens may be a confession that [Shakespeare] had blundered in choosing this theme for a tragedy" (p. 117).

An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948), Hardin Craig: "Shakespeare's Timon of Athens is a play which contains some of the best of Shakespeare's writing, but. . . it is possible that Shakespeare sickened of the dramatically unworkable subject and never finished it in detail" (p. 247).

A History of English Literature (1950), Hardin Craig: "Timon of Athens resembles nothing so much as an incomplete work of Shakespeare, a tragedy abandoned because of the unsuitability of its subject" (p. 268).

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1954), Charles Sisson: Timon is based "upon a theme and story which did not lend itself to perfection in form" (p. 910).

Timon of Athens (1957; rpt. 1968), J.C. Maxwell: Timon offers us "the sight of Shakespeare at the height of his powers struggling with material which even for him proves recalcitrant" (p. xlii).

The New Adren Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "Shakespeare was influenced by dramatic difficulties inherent in the subject. . . . One is the problem of making a great tragic hero out of a man who by hypothesis lacks depth or profundity. . . . The other problem is similarly created by the fact that the story does not lend itself to treatment in drama" (p. li).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner: "It is idle, perhaps, to speculate upon why Shakespeare abandoned the play, but it may have been in part his realization that the redemption of a secondary character [Alcibiades] after the damnation of his hero could not effect [sic] for his audience the feeling of reconciliation at which he aimed" (p. 139).

"Timon of Athens" (1963), David Cook: "It is easy to

see why Shakespeare might seize on the subject of Timon in a period of troubled thinking and warring moods. . . . And it is. . . quite feasible that the reason he failed to finish the work was that, in the event, the hero proved too negative a vehicle for his thinking, and the whole fabric of the play too destructive at a time when his thoughts were slowly gestating the new positive ideals of the final group of plays" (p. 94).

"Shakespeare's Misanthrope" (1973), Harry Levin, "Could it be that Shakespeare, so adept and far-ranging in his sympathy, was balked at the portrayal of antipathy? It seems clear that he, who empathized with such numerous and varied themes, found this an uncongenial one. It would be significant if his uncertainties over Timon of Athens marked his transition from tragedy to romance" (p. 94).

TIMON NOT UNFINISHED

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1954), Charles Jasper Sisson: "Taking into account the lamentable state of the text, one can nevertheless conclude to a finished play, imperfect certainly, and negligent even, upon a theme and story which did not lend itself to perfection in form, but gave scope for much splendid writing" (p. 910).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann: "If Shakespeare were so much in earnest it would be extraordinary if he brought a tragedy to the verge of completion and then abandoned it. The high degree of foresight and planning evident in the works of his maturity reduces to absurdity the customary assumption that he blundered through Timon, drew up in dismay at the end and flung his abortion aside" (p. 14).

Timon of Athens (1965), Maurice Charney: "Miss Ellis-Fermor's thesis [that the play is unfinished] has done great harm to the appreciation of Timon because it suggests that the play is not only unfinished (in the sense of its lacking any final revision), but that it is a mere collection of jottings and rough sketches without any integral coherence. . . . It seems to me that Timon is completely finished in conception: its structure makes good sense as a whole, its characters are

well adapted to the overall plan, and its style, tone, imagery, and dramatic handling all contribute to a unified imaginative vision" (p. xxii).

The Tragic Engagement: A Study of Shakespeare's Classical Tragedies (1968), Judah Stampfer: "The play has its difficulties; but the suggestion that Shakespeare left it incomplete in rough draft does not come to grips with the deepest among them. Indeed, it distracts attention from their consideration" (p. 188).

Shakespeare the Craftsman (1969), M.C. Bradbrook: "this is simply a different kind of play and not an incomplete draft" (p. 166).

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1969), Charlton Hinman: "Emphatically, then, Timon is not a mere fragment. It is complete, or at least very nearly so. But the manuscript from which the Folio text was printed was evidently one that still needed a good deal of revision, larded as it was with inconsistencies and irregularities of various kinds" (p. 1137).

"Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Dr. Faustus (1970), Anne Lancashire: "The play is perhaps not essentially unfinished at all, for its roughness in versification, and minor inconsistencies, such as the different monetary values

given at different points in the play to the Attic talents, need only be marks, not of an unfinished work, but of authorial (very) foul papers, and careless printing" (p. 44).

"Genera mixta and Timon of Athens (1977), William W.E. Slights: "A generic study such as the one I present here may lend some credence to Charney's conclusion that the play is not unfinished without denying that further revision could have eliminated some problems in the text" (p. 40).

"Timon of Athens and the Morality Tradition" (1977), Lewis Walker finds that Shakespeare's design has "unity and coherence" (p. 175).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "The evidence presented by the Folio text is complex and ambiguous, and some features do not seem to me to fit into the unfinished-play concept" (p. 187). "It is certainly hazardous to conclude from this 'talent muddle' that Shakespeare was engaged in a revision of the figures that he failed to complete because he abandoned the play. . . . Nor does the often-invoked duplication of Timon's epitaph in 5.4.70-73 prove that Shakespeare abandoned the play before fully revising it" (p. 193).

TIMON SET FROM STAGE COPY

The Works of Shakspear (1725), Alexander Pope writes that the play's structural irregularities are the result of Timon having been set from a corrupt "Prompter's Book" or "Piece-meal Parts written out for the use of the actors" (Vol. 1, xvii).

The old Arden Timon of Athens (1905), K. Deighton, speculating on the attribution of II.ii and IV.iii, suggests that rather than being the work of another playwright, these scenes look "more like the work of some player to whom the editors, failing to find portions known once to have existed, had entrusted the task of putting together the incomplete material--perhaps, as Ulrici suggests, made up in part from actor's copies" (p. xxi).

The Problem of Timon of Athens (1923), Thomas Marc Parrott: "Timon, as it appears in the Folio, was no doubt printed from the play-house copy. This copy. . . consisted first of a Shakespearian draft, full and perfect in some places and broken and sketchy in others. It was then enlarged, possibly doubled in length by Chapman's additions, which would be inserted in their proper places" (p. 32).

"The Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1940), Ralph A. Haug: "No record has survived of any contemporary stage presentation. . . the Folio text bears some evidence of having been printed from an acting version" (p. 227).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "It is certain that the copy for Timon was not prompt-copy or any kind of manuscript that had been used in a theatre" (p. xviii). Oliver then goes on to argue that the false exit at IV.iii.377-95 "is also not likely to stand in a prompt-book" (p. xviii). Finally, the stage directions which are often used to support the argument that the text is based on theater copy are, Oliver believes, "the kind characteristic of foul papers rather than of prompt-copy" (p.xviii).

TIMON SET FROM CORRUPT FOUL PAPERS

The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare (1942), W.W. Greg: "It can hardly be doubted that the play was set up from foul papers that had never been reduced to order" (p. 149).

The Shakespeare First Folio (1955), W.W. Greg: "There is, of course, no doubt that F was printed from foul papers that had never been reduced to anything like order" (p. 411).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "part of the copy was Shakespeare's own foul papers but. . . another part was a transcript. . . a transcript made by Ralph Crane, the scribe who prepared many dramatic scripts in the early 1620s and whose transcripts are thought to have been the copy for at least five of the other plays in the First Folio" (p. xix).

TEXTUAL PROBLEMS ORIGINATE IN THE PRINTING HOUSE

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (1886), Henry N. Hudson argues against the idea that Timon was set from corrupt stage copy: "the play is singularly unsuited to the stage; and the failure of modern research to find any contemporary notice of its performance strongly argues it to have been so regarded at the time: all which would naturally render it less likely to suffer in the manner supposed" (Vo. 15, 185).

The Works of William Shakespeare (1895), William Aldis Wright: "it may be that the manuscript of Timon was imperfect, and that the printing was stayed till it could be completed by some playwright engaged for the purpose. This would account for the manifest imperfections at the close of the play." But Wright seems to withdraw from this position when he goes on to note that "it is difficult to conceive how the printers came to miscalculate so widely the space required to be left" (Vol. 7, vii).

The Life of Timon of Athens (1919), Stanley T. Williams: "This theory [that Timon was set from stage copy] would be more tenable if there existed positive proof that the play was frequently acted before 1623. But such proof is not to be had. Opportunity for interpolation by the players was almost certainly limited. This theory has, generally speaking, given way before

more vigorous hypotheses" (p. 127).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver also argues a theory of compositorial practice which, he believes, explains certain textual problems which had been used as evidence of divided authorship:

> The late Philip Williams, shortly before his death in 1955, announced his bleief that Timon was set from a fair transcript made by the same scribe who prepared the manuscript from which the folio text of Coriolanus was set, his evidence being apparently larger spellings which he found in both texts and considered not typical of the folio compositors. I myself think it probable that part of the copy was Shakespeare's own foul papers but that another part was a transcript made by Ralph Crane, the scribe who prepared many dramatic scripts in the early 1620's and whose transcripts are thought to have been the copy for at least five of the other plays in the First Folio. (p. xix)

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner writes that "cuts were made for purposes of performance" (p. 194), and that the present text reflects "some influence from a stage version" (p. 196). Soellner does not, however, view this influence as a corruption:

> When the suggestion of an influence by the actors in Timon (or for that matter, on other plays) has been made in the past, this influence has generally been thought as corrupting. Our brief inquiry intimates that this is not the only way to look at it. The performance features of the text, particularly the stage directions, allow us to consider it as a

> theatrical document. . . . At any rate, we should be careful not to overstate the deficiencies of the text. It certainly does not vitiate a detailed and organic criticism; it does not lack any significant details, nor is it replete with loose ends. Rather, it represents a fully planned play executed with care in all important aspects. (p. 200)

TEXTUAL IRREGULARITIES CAUSED BY COMPOSITORS

Textual Problems of the First Folio: Richard III, King Lear, Troilus and Cressida, 2 Henry IV, Hamlet, Othello (1953), Alice Walker: "Compositors A and B worked on the Folio throughout and were responsible for the majority of the texts. They set all the plays printed in 1623 with the possible exception of the two reprints among the Tragedies, Titus Andronicus and Romeo and Juliet. They both worked on The Winter's Tale, Richard II and the succeeding Histories and Tragedies down to, and including, Hamlet. B was solely responsible for Lear, Othello, Antony and Cleopatra, Cymberline and Timon" (pp. 10-11).

"New Approaches to Textual Problems in Shakespeare" (1956), Philip Williams, Jr.: "For the later period, a like study of the second quarto of Hamlet might be applied to Timon of Athens to support Greg's belief that Timon was set from unfinished foul papers, or my belief that it was set from a fair transcript made by the same scribe who prepared the manuscript from which the folio text of Coriolanus was set. The trivia of analytical bibliography can sometimes be put to good use" (p. 6). Williams also believes that Timon was set by compositor B.

"The Prentice Hand in the Tragedies of the Shakespeare First Folio: Compositor E" (1957), Charlton Hinman:

> (2) Work on Troilus as the immediate successor to Romeo and Juliet was only well begun when it was abruptly discontinued; but the gap thus left between Romeo and Caesar (long since printed) was not quickly filled. It was eventually filled, though very imperfectly, by Timon of Athens. The printing of Timon (and with it a reset version of the last half-page of Romeo) thus appears to mark the final abandonment of the original play for Troilus. In any event, Timon (quires Gg and hh) was not begun until after quire rr had been set--and set jointly by E and B. The new E-B partnership had been established and was working. It had completed quire pp, produced quires qq and rr, and was presently to turn out quire ss. But Timon of Athens, which falls between quires rr and ss, was set wholly by Compositor B. Compositor E was at hand during part of the interval, for he appears to have done the distributing that immediately preceded B's setting, first of Gg3, then of Gg4^{v}; and he clearly set part of quire ss while B was at work on the later pages of Timon: forme ss3^{v}:4 is in fact an intercalary forme, set wholly by E, between the fourth and fifth formes of quire hh; and the second ss forme, also wholly by E, falls between the last hh forme and an ss forme set jointly by B and E. The partners , in short, were both available; but one of them had no share whatever in the setting of Timon of Athens. Again, therefore, we find a highly irregular method of working, but also one that is eminently reasonable if Compositor E was unable to deal completely with the manuscript copy from which Folio Timon must have been set. (pp. 17-18)

The Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957; rpt. 1968), J.C. Maxwell: "Unfortunately, although in his last pronouncement on the subject Dr Williams [1956, above] refers to 'my belief that [Timon] was set from a fair transcript made by the same scribe who prepared the manuscript from which the folio text

of Coriolanus was set', he does not produce his evidence. The mere fact that such an acute scholar held this view is important, but all I can do is to record my own failure to discover anything that helps to decide the question. If what lies behind the Folio text,whether immediately or with a transcript intervening, is a rough draft, there is little that need surprise us in that text. The compositor is the notoriously peccant B, and he has certainly contributed his quota of errors, but the general impression is of an honest and fairly successful attempt to reproduce what must have been a very difficult copy, even if a transcriber has shouldered some of the burden (and fallen into some of the pitfalls) of deciphering it" (p. 88).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "Compositor B has been proved careless. He is likely to omit words and make other errors. . . and he will sometimes set prose as verse or verse as prose, either to make the layout of the page look more attractive or simply to fit a predetermined number of words into a given space" (p. xvii).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann: "The authorities are agreed that Jaggard's Compositor B set the whole of Timon, yet I think that there is some indication for two men in the transmission" (p. 18).

The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare (1963), Charlton Hinman: "Since the whole of Timon was set by one man, Compositor B, it is interesting to observe not merely that the names of certain characters are differently spelt and abbreviated in different places but that the variant spellings fall into more or less well-defined groups. . . . In a text set by a single compositor this kind of thing can only be taken to reflect peculiarities in the copy, and such patterned alterations inevitably suggest different hands. I do not propose to debate here whether these hands are scribal or (as for various reasons seems to me much more likely) authorial. But Greg recently wrote: 'There is, of course, no doubt that [Folio Timon] was printed from foul papers that had never been reduced to anything like order' (SFF, p. 141). Hence I feel bound to point out that if this is so, and if we are to suppose that Shakespeare alone was responsible for these same foul papers, the spelling peculiarities just mentioned need a good deal of explaining. They need explaining, indeed, whatever hypothesis is advanced as to the nature of the copy for Folio Timon. For they are certainly not of printing-house origin" (Vol. 2, 285).

Shakespeare the Craftsman (1969), M.C. Bradbrook: "What

we have is based on the author's manuscript, 'rough work' indeed but not corrupt--partly recopied, and set up, as Hinman tells us, by the wicked Compositor B, while the boy prentice distributed the type. Part being recopied by the company's scrivner accounts for some inconsistencies" (p. 166).

[See also "Timon in Folio."]

SHAKESPEARE'S BAD WRITING CAUSES TIMON'S "IRREGULARITIES"

The Plays of William Shakespeare (1765), Samuel Johnson: "There is something elaborately unskilful in the contrivance of sending a soldier, who cannot read, to take the epitaph in wax, only that it may close the play by being read with more solemnity in the last scene" (Vol. 6, 271-72). Taken in context, the implication here seems to be that the incident is not based on a transmission from a corrupt text, but that the confusion is caused by Shakespeare's carelessness.

The Plays of William Shakespeare (1785), George Reed on V.i: "I am afraid many of the difficulties which the commentators on our author have employed their abilities to remove, arise from the negligence of Shakespeare himself, who appears to have been less attentive to the connection of his scenes, than a less hasty writer may be supposed to have been" (Vol. 8, 464).

Shakespeare (1907), Sir Walter Raleigh:

> The machinery is carelessly put together, and the writing, in these outlying parts of the play, is often flat. The critics have been busy with this case, and have called in the inevitable collaborator. . . . The problem is a very difficult one, and these conjectures are ingenious, but have not led to a convincing result. They are vitiated by the superstition which refuses to assign to Shakespeare any hasty or careless work. Yet he was a purveyor to the public stage, and surely must have been pressed, as the modern journalist is pressed, to supply needed matter. Many authors who

> have suffered this pressure have settled their account with their conscience by dividing their work into two kinds. Some of it they do frankly as journey-work, making it as good as time and circumstance permit. The rest they keep by them, revising and polishing it to satisfy their own more exacting ideals. Shakespeare did both kinds of work. (p. 113).

"The Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1940), Ralph Haug: comments on V.iii: "There is one scene in act five that saddens anyone loyal to the Shakesperian authorship theory. The third scene cannot be called unfinished, for the lines are regular enough. Its utter flatness reminds us that Shakspere could, sometimes, write very badly. . . . However, this is merely a short 'functional' scene; it carries on a necessary action of the play, and it was meant to do no more" (p. 241)

CHAPTER III

PROBLEMS OF SOURCES

SOURCES--LUCIAN

"Remarks on the Plays of Shakespear" (1710), Charles Gildon: "This play is plainly taken from Lucian's Timon, and I wonder that Shakespear rather chose to give Roman names to his persons" (Vol. 7, 373).

The Works of Shakespear (1725), Alexander Pope: "The hint of part of this play taken from Lucian's Dialogue of Timon" (Vol. 5, 5).

The Works of Shakespear (1747), William Warburton writes that Apemantus' character is drawn from Lucian (Vol. 6, 172).

The Plays and Poems of William Shakspeare (1794), Edmond Malone writes that Shakespeare "could not have [read] Lucian, there being then no translation of the dialogue" (Vol. 12, 5).

"Timon of Athens" (1859), William Maginn analyzes the tone of Lucian's Misanthropos and concludes that Shakespeare did not use the comedy as the source of his tragedy (pp. 187-231).

The Works of William Shakespeare (1865), Richard Grant White: "We may be sure that Shakespeare's Greek was not sufficient to enable him to read Lucian in the original, and we know of no translation of the Dialogues into English earlier than 1638. But there were French and Latin versions; and either from one of these, or from some friend, or some ante-

cedent dramatist, who could read Greek, it seems clear that Shakespeare derived an acquaintance with Lucian's work sufficient to enable him to fill up with many characteristic traits the meagre sketch he found in Plutarch" (Vol. 10, 198). Nevertheless, White believes that Shakespeare got his Lucian from a missing source: "But although he might have become acquainted with [Lucian] in a French or Latin version, it is far from probable that such knowledge as he had of it reached him through some narrative or dramatic work, all trace of which has perished; unless, indeed, we find vestiges of an antecedent play in the very tragedy before us" (Vol. 10, 200).

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight:

> There can be no doubt, we think, that a great resemblance may be traced between the Greek satirist and the English dramatist. The false friends of Timon are much more fully described by Lucian than Plutarch. The finding the gold is the same,--the rejection of it by the Timon of Shakespere is essentially the same:--the poet of the play was perhaps suggested by the flatterer who came with the new ode;--the senator with his gratulations is not very different from the senators in the drama;--the blows and stones are found in both the ancient and the modern. (Vol. 1, 340)

Knight also feels that Shakespeare got his Lucian from a missing source: "The Timon of Shakspere is in many respects essentially different from any model with which we are ac-

quainted, but it approaches nearer, as Mr. Skottowe first observed, to the Timon of Lucian than the commentators have chosen to point out: 'It has been deemed a satisfactory conclusion that he [Shakespeare] derived none of his materials from Lucian, because no translation of the dialogue of Timon is known to have existed in Shakspere's age. But it should rather have been inferred, from the many striking coincidences between the play and the dialogue, that Lucian had some influence over the composition of Timon, although the channel through which that influence was communicated is no longer to be traced'" (Vol. 1, 339).

"Timon Ein Kritischer Versuch" (1869), B. Tschischwitz notes the existence of Italian and French translations of Lucian and argues that Shakespeare could have used these for Timon (p. 196).

The Works of William Shakespeare (1875), Richard Grant White also considers Lucian a source (Vol. 10, 198).

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (1886), Henry N. Hudson:

> Malone thinks the Poet could not have borrowed directly from Lucian, because there was then no English translation of the dialogue in question. In the first place, however, it would be something hard to prove this, the only evidence being, that no such translation of that date has come down to us. In the second place, there is known to have been both a Latin and an Italian version of Lucian at that time; and it is altogether likely that

> Shakespeare knew enough of both these languages to be able to read a piece of that kind. (Vol. 15, 191)

The Works of Shakespeare (1888-90), Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall: "Lucian's Dialogue, Timon or Misanthropos. . . [contains] a picture of Timon which has evidently furnished the framework of the play" (Vol. 7, 3). Nevertheless, Irving and Marshall also believe that Shakespeare did not read Lucian:

> No translation of the Dialogue either in English or French existed in his day, but we need not suppose him to have ever read the Dialogue itself; an adaptation of the story would be all that would be necessary; and this he would find ready to hand if there existed a play on the subject of Timon founded upon Lucian and actually in possession of the stage. The existence of some such play was first assumed by Knight, whose theory has been accepted by Staunton, the Cambridge editors, and Delius, and offers a satisfactory explanation of the relationship of our play to Lucian. (Vol. 7, 4)

"Shakespeare's Classical Plays" (1893), James T. Foard argues that both Painter and Lucian are sources of Timon. Shakespeare had not used the MS. Timon: "For so much as he was indebted to Lucian. . . the poet was also indebted to his little knowledge of Latin and Greek" (pp. 333-71).

Shakspere and His Predecessors (1896), F.S. Boas:

> A. . . narrative of the misanthrope's career had been given in one of Lucian's dialogues, and though,

> as far as we know, this had not yet been translated into English, details from it probably reached Shakspere through some intermediate source. One of these may possibly have been the MS. Timon, which, though containing matter more suited to an academic than a popular audience, antitipates a number of leading incidents in Shakspere's drama, especially the mock farewell banquet to the false friends, and the fidelity of the steward to his fallen master. (p. 495)

The Temple Shakespeare (1899-1902), Israel Gollancz: "It seems almost certain that, directly or indirectly, the Dialogue exercised considerable influence on the conception of the drama, though we know of no English or French version of Lucian's work that Shakespeare could have used; but perhaps the other author of the play possessed the Greek which our author lacked" (Vol. 29, 214).

"The Sources of Timon of Athens" (1903-04), W.H. Clemons: "the use of Roman instead of Greek names (Lucius, Lucullus, Flaminius, Servilius, &c.,) suggests a Romance medium for the Lucian. Consequently, since Shakespeare probably knew Italian and certainly knew something of French, the impossibility of his direct acquaintance with Lucian's work is removed" (p. 220).

A Life of William Shakespeare (1904), Sir Sidney Lee: "The dramatist may, too, have known a dialogue of Lucian entitled 'Timon,' which Boiardo had previously converted into a comedy under the name of 'Il Timone'" (pp. 251-52).

The old Arden Timon of Athens (1905), K. Deighton: "It has been debated whether Shakespeare went directly to Lucian for those parts in the story which both have in common. By many critics a negative is returned to the question because no translation into English had been published in his day. This assertion, of course, means nothing more than that we know of no such work. But there was a Latin translation and one in Italian, to either of which Shakespeare may have had access. And even though he had 'small Latin and less Greek,' it would have been no great feat of scholarship to read Lucian" (p. xxvii).

On Shakespeare's borrowings from Lucian:

> Timon gives two talents to Philiades as a dowry for his daughter, and frees Demeas from a debtor's prison; Plutus is represented as formerly having been in his service (cp. I. i. 278, 279); he digs up gold, though as, in the play, having no wish to use it for his own enjoyment; on his wealth being noised abroad, a poet comes with a song of the new-fashioned dithyrambs; a senator eagerly hurries to offer congratulations; and these and others are greeted with blows and stones. (pp. xxvii-xxviii)

Deighton also hears "echoes of Lucian's language which do not look as if they were accidental" in the following: Lucian, v. 109, 110/Timon I.i.63-65; Lucian, x.119/ Timon III.iv.61, 62; Lucian xli.153/ Timon IV.iii.26; Lucian, xlvi.160/ Timon IV. iii.28, 29; Lucian, xliii.155/ Timon IV.iii.48, 49; Lucian, xxxvi,148/ Timon IV.iii. 76, 77; Lucian, xli,154/ Timon, IV.

iii.133, 134; Lucian, xviii.129/ Timon, IV.iii.243; Lucian, xxxii.145/ Timon, IV.iii.270; Lucian, xlii.155/ Timon, IV.iii. 531-33; Lucian, lvii.175/ Timon, V.i.116-18 (pp. xxvii-xxx).

Die Timonlegende: Eine Entwicklungsgeschichte des Misanthropentypus in der antiken Literatur (1906), Franz Bertram argues Shakespeare's use of a French or Italian translation of Lucian (pp. 83-88).

"The Timon Plays" (1910), J.Q. Adams: "the 'dowry' incident [I.i], which does not appear in Plutarch, or in the manuscript play Timon, appears both in Lucian and in Shakespeare. . . . The fact that this incident occurs in Timon of Athens but not in the manuscript play Timon, indicates that Shakespeare had access to the Lucian narrative through some other channel than the school play. What this channel was no one has yet been able to discover" (p. 524). Adams lists Shakespeare's borrowings from Lucian, as well as ten pages of parallels from Lucian and Shakespeare's accounts of Timon (pp. 512-21). Shakespeare also took "material by the handfulls" from Lucian's The True History (p. 512).

Classic Myth in the Poetic Drama of the Age of Elizabeth (1912), Harriet Manning Blake: "The bugbear has seemed to be that Shakespeare probably did not read Greek and there is no

known early English translation [of Lucian], while the old academic play does not show the qualities which Lucian's and Shakespeare's Timon possess in common. . . . It would not have been necessary for Shakespeare to read either in Greek or in translation the story about whom his friends were talking" (p. 12).

Timon of Athens (1919), Stanley T. Williams:

> The amount of Shakespeare's obligation to Timon the Misanthrope in Lucian's Dialogues has been rather widely disputed. When Shakespeare's play was written there existed no English translation of Lucian's Dialogues. Unless the tale of Shakespeare's Greek is discredited, he cannot be believed conversant with the original. If he was influenced it must have been through existent French or Italian translations. Shakespeare's tragedy includes no passages traceable to Lucian which cannot as readily be ascribed to the old play or another source of later date than Lucian. Yet the absence of evidence has failed to convince certain critics that Shakespeare was not directly affected by the Dialogues. "The Timon of Shakespeare," says W.H. Clemons [1903-04, above], "is not the Timon of popular Elizabethan stories. In the depth and tone of his misanthropy, Lucian's Timon is the true type of Shakespeare's Timon." (pp. 111-12, n. 2)

"Lucian and Boiardo in Timon of Athens" (1931), R. Warwick Bond: "Timon's great wealth, extravagance, ruin, and appeal to fair-weather friends; his self-imposed exile, discovery of treasure, visitation by and stern repulse of

former flatterers" are all Lucianic in origin (p. 52). On Shakespeare reading Lucian:

> He might, just possibly, study the dialogue in Erasmus' Latin translation, which first appeared at Lyons 1535, though the dedication therein of this particular dialogue to Thomas Ruthall, bearing date "Londini, Anno MDIIII," states it to have been made on the eve of his leaving England that year. The whole of Lucian was translated by Jakob Motsheym of Strassburg in 1538; and Tschischwitz [1869, above] enumerated three Italian versions published at Venice, "before 1527," and in 1535, and in 1551, respectively; besides "Lucien, traduit par Filbert Bretin. Imprime par Abel L'Angelier, Paris, 1582." (p. 53)

Nevertheless, Bond is convinced that "None of these, surely, can rival Boiardo's work as a probable source for Shakespeare" (p. 53).

On Timon in general: "the whole of the first three Acts (save for Alcibiades and Apemantus) rests on the retrospective details supplied by the Greek Dialogue" (p. 53). On the character of Shakespeare's Timon: "From a remark of Hermes (c. 8), that Timon's ruin was wroght less by pity and good nature than by simplicity and lack of insight into character, comes Shakespeare's picture of the great spendthrift, avoiding all that is unpleasant, allowing himself to expand in a foolish glow of lazy benevolence, and prompted as much by love of admiration and flattery as by real charity" (p. 53). On the Poet in Timon: " [he] is created from Gnathonides who offers

his dithyrambic ode in Lucian's c. 46" (p. 53). On Timon's gifts: "The gifts to his servant and Ventidius have their origin in those to Philiades and Demeas (cc. 4, 49)" (p. 53). Finally, "In Demeas' speeches we have the germ of the large part allotted by Shakespeare to the Senate or individual senators; while Demeas' fiction of the repulse of the Peloponnesians by Timon at Acharnae (c. 50) is the origin of those genuine exploits of Timon on the field referred to by Alcibiades" (p. 54).

"The Theme of Timon of Athens" (1934), John W. Draper notes that the idea of Timon as a prodigal originates in Lucian (p. 22).

Timon of Athens (1934), M.R. Ridley: "[Shakespeare] could have arrived at it [Lucian's Dialogue] through the medium of a translation which does not appear to have existed. . . . The apparent connection in many points between the play and the dialogue does strongly suggest that either Shakespeare had more Greek than he has been credited with, or that he was working over the production of an author who had read Lucian. It may be noticed that Timon had been in Shakespeare's mind as early as L.L.L." (pp. viii-ix).

William Shakespeare (1936), George Brandes: "in some form or another [Shakespeare] made acquaintance with Lucian's

hitherto untranslated dialogue Timon, which contained many incidents giving fulness to the story, and from which he appropriated the discovery of the treasure, the consequent return of the parasitic friends, and Timon's scornful treatment of them" (p. 557).

The Complete Works of Shakespeare (1936), George Lyman Kittredge: "From Lucian came Timon's discovery of gold and the return of the parasites, whom Timon drives away with blows; also the visit of the Senators, with their promise of 'special dignities'" (p. 1045).

Small Latine and Lesse Greeke (1944), T.W. Baldwin: "The dialogue on Timon, which Edward alludes to in 1547 [I Dialoghi Piacevoli, Le Vere Narrationi, Le Facete Epistole di Luciano Philosopho. Di Greco In Volgare tradotte per M. Nicolo da Lanigo. . . In Venetia, 1551], was toward the end of the current school collection. The allusion by Edward at the proper time is probably conclusive that he had read the Latin collection in his third year at school, before he was ten. At the same tender age, William Shakespeare might well have acquired all the knowledge of Lucian which someone has displayed in Timon of Athens, even though the idea that Shakspere ever had such erudite knowledge has much befluttered the critical dovecotes" (Vol.1. 215-16).

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1954), Charles Jasper Sisson calls Lucian a source of Timon (p. 910).

Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare (1957-75), Geoffrey Bullough: "The development of the Timon legend into a tale of excessive liberality, base ingratitude, disillusionment, withdrawal and revenge was due to the dialogue of Timon, or the Misanthrope by Lucian of Samosata (c. A.D. 125-180)" (Vol. 6, 227). "Much of Shakespeare's material derives ultimately from Lucian's Timon" (p. 239). "No English translation of this dialogue in Tudor times is known, but the dramatist may have read it in Erasmus' Latin version, in Italian, or in French" (p. 239). Bullough notes the following borrowings from Lucian:

> Mercury's criticism of Timon provides the idea for Shakespeare's portrait of "the great spendthrift, avoiding all that is unpleasant, allowing himself to expand in a foolish glow of lazy benevolence, and prompted as much by love of admiration and flattery as by real charity" (R.W. Bond). Lucian is also the final source for the scenes in which Shakespeare's Timon shows his lavish generosity to friends in need, and for those in which they refuse to help him. Thus Shakespeare's Timon frees Ventidius from imprisonment for debt (I.i.95-110) as Lucian's Timon has helped Demeas. Similarly when Timon gives Lucilius money to marry the rich Old Athenian's daughter (I. i.110-52) this recalls Philiades in Lucian, who received "a whole farm and two talents for his daughter as a reward for his praises." The servile Poet in Acts I and V was probably suggested by Gnathonides who

> offered Timon a dithyrambic ode.
>
> Timon's declaration that he deserves help from the Senators "even to the state's best health" (II. 2.198-200), which is supported by their later apologies and request that he lead the defence of Athens against Alcibiades (V.i.139-67) may have been suggested by Demeas's fictions about Timon's feats in war. . . . When Timon takes the name "Misanthropos" (IV.3.54) this seems to derive rather from the same resolve in Lucian. . . . In Apemantus the influence of Plutarch and Lucian may be combined. (pp. 239-40)

The Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957; rpt. 1968), J.C. Maxwell: "Shakespeare had a general familiarity with the Lucianic version, on which, indeed, his plot is based. No English translation of the dialogue is known to have existed in the early seventeenth century, but it was accessible in Latin, French and Italian, and there was nothing to prevent Shakespeare from consulting some more learned friend if he found it necessary" (p. xviii).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "Various attempts to 'prove' Shakespeare's use of the dialogue by the citation of 'echoes of Lucian's language'--as in Deighton's old Arden edition of the play [1905, above]. . . are most unconvincing. . . . But the verdict must, I think, be 'not proven', particularly as the tone of Lucian is, pace Clemons [1903-04, above], different from Shakespeare's: Lucian may be cynical but behind the cynicism is a kind of joviality

that neither Shakespeare nor any of his characters displays" (p. xxxvii). Oliver goes on to note that there was no known English translation of Lucian that Shakespeare could have read. But he feels that Shakespeare "could, perhaps, have known, or known of, any one of three in Italian or one in French" (p. xxxvii). Shakespeare could also have read Erasmus' Latin translation of the Dialogues, which "are known to have formed part of the curriculum of at least one grammar school in the sixteenth century. If Shakespeare had somewhat vague memories of Lucian studied at school some twenty-five years before and only in a Latin translation, then I can well believe that his play would have exactly the kind of distant relationship with the original Greek that Timon of Athens has" (p. xxxvii).

Among the material that Shakespeare may have borrowed from Lucian, Oliver lists the following:

> Timon's kindnesses to friends, including the release of one (like Ventidius) from imprisonment for debt and the aiding of another in the matter of a marriage dowery; the hypocritical offers of money to Timon only when he does not need it (again like Ventidius); the notion of flattering praise of Timon in specially composed words; Timon's refusal to be bluffed by the protestations of parasites after he digs up unwanted gold, and his driving them away; and, not least, the suggestion that a wiser man would have made more discriminating use of his wealth than did Timon in his earlier days of good fortune. (p. xxxvi)

"A Note on King Lear and Timon of Athens" (1960), Isabel Hyde believes that both plays show Shakespeare's familiarity with Lucian (pp. 19-20).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann:

> no pre-Shakespearian English translation of Lucian is known; we must assume, therefore, that Shakespeare read Lucian in French, Italian or Latin versions, or in the Greek original, or that Boiardo's by no means widely circulated play transmitted the relevant matter from the dialogue, or that Shakespeare could lay hands on a lost source, to which various critics have resorted, gains some strength from the resemblances between Shakespeare's and the MS. Timon for which no extant source gives a hint: especially from the coincidence that both plays stage "mock banquets" which terminate with the throwing of food (stones, water) at the guests, and both give Timon a "faithful steward" who repines at his prodigality but seeks him out to help him after his ruin. For, since Shakespeare's Timon remained apparently unperformed, and unpublished till 1623, since the academic MS. Timon would be equally unheard-of, a lost common source might be the easiest explanation of the surprising links between the two plays. (pp. 3-4)

Nevertheless, a little later on Honigmann remarks, "Shakespeare may well have looked at the Greek too, Filbert Bretin's Les Oeuvres de Lucian (Paris, 1582/3) seems his likeliest source" (pp. 8-9).

"Shakespeare's Misanthrope" (1973), Harry Levin: "Shakespeare's principal source is the Timon of Lucian" (p. 90).

The Riverside Shakespeare (1974), Frank Kermode: "[Lucian]

had not been translated into English, but was available in Latin, French, and Italian versions. . . . Although Lucian refers to instances of Timon's earlier munificence, he is chiefly concerned with the Timon that Shakespeare treats in the second half of the play. His dialogue had already been used by Italian writers, but it is likely that Shakespeare knew them" (p. 1442).

"The Date and Production of 'Timon' Reconsidered" (1975), James C. Bulman, Jr.: "the troublesome similarities between Timon and Timon of Athens which have caused scholars to conjecture a lost common source may in fact indicate Shakespeare's indebtedness to Timon; that Shakespeare may have derived most if not all, of his Lucian source material through Timon" (p. 127).

Shakespeare the Craftsman (1969), M.C. Bradbrook: "Shakespeare's main source, Lucian's Dialogue of Timon, in its sardonic deflation of gods and men, is echoed in the rancour of Apemantus, who is used by Timon and his friends as a kind of whetstone of wit" (pp. 148-49).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "Shakespeare, as much as he drew plot details from Plutarch and Lucian or the Lucianic tradition, including

probably the Timon comedy, owed very little to them for the character of his hero and even less for the tragic vision of his play" (p. 204). "The second most important source for the main plot, Lucian's dialogue 'Timon the Misanthrope,' presents a particular problem: it is impossible to say how Shakespeare knew it" (p. 206).

The Complete Works of Shakespeare (1980), David Bevington: "Timon of Athens also makes use, through intermediary versions, of the dialogue called Timon, or The Misanthrope, by the Greek satirist Lucian" (p. 1250). Bevington does not suggest what these "intermediary versions" are.

[See also "Lost Sources."]

SOURCES--MS. TIMON

The Plays of William Shakspeare (1778), George Steevens:

> Mr. Strutt the engraver, to whom our antiquaries are under no inconsiderable obligations, has in his possession a MS. play on this subject. It appears to have been written, or transcribed, about the year 1600. There is a scene in it resembling Shakspeare's banquet given by Timon to his flatterers. Instead of warm water he sets before them stones painted like artichokes, and afterwards beats them out of the room. He then retires to the woods attended by his faithful steward, who (like Kent in K. Lear) has disguised himself to continue his services to his master. Timon, in the last act is followed by his fickle mistress, &c. after he was reported to have discovered a hidden treasure by digging. The piece itself (though it appears to be the work of an academick) is a wretched one. (Vol. 8, 317-18)

The Plays and Poems of William Shakspeare (1794), Edmond Malone: "To the manuscript play mentioned by Mr. Steevens, our authour, I have no doubt, was also indebted for some other circumstances. Here he found the faithful steward, the banquet-scene, and the story of Timon's being possessed of great sums of gold which he had dug up in the woods: a circumstance which he could not have from Lucian, there being then no translation of the dialogue that relates to this subject" (Vol. 12, 5).

Shakspeare in His Times (1817), Nathan Drake: "We have fixed on the year of 1602 rather than 1601, for the era of composition of our author's play, as it. . . allows more scope for the production of the elder drama [the MS. Timon] and, at the same time, more opportunity to our poet to have become

familiar with a comedy which, there is reason to think, from its pedantic style, was never popular, and certainly never was printed" (Vol. 2, 79).

The Dramatic Works of William Shakespeare (1826), Isaac Reed also cites the MS. Timon as a source (Vol. 8, 1).

Timon [the MS. Timon] (1842), Alexander Dyce: "This play was evidently intended for the amusement of an academic audience. That it really was acted, a strong presumptive proof is afforded by the stage-direction at page 79. . . . I leave to others a minute discussion of the question, whether or not Shakespeare was indebted to the present piece" (pp. vi-vii). On Shakespeare's knowledge of the MS. play: "I shall merely observe, that I entertain considerable doubts of his having been acquainted with a drama, which was certainly never performed in the metropolis, and which was likely to have been read only by a few of the author's particular friends, to whom transcripts of it had been presented" (p. vii).

The Works of William Shakespeare (1857-66), Richard Grant White: "Few of its [the MS. Timon's] readers will be inclined to dissent from its learned editor's [Dyce's, above] opinion, that Shakespeare was unacquainted with it; but there is a trifling coincidence between the dead academic and the living popular tragedy" (Vol. 10, 201). White goes on to suggest that Shakespeare "might have heard an account" of the MS. play (Vol. 10,

201).

The Plays of Shakespeare (1858-60), Howard Staunton:

> The basis of Shakespeare's "Timon" was long supposed to be an anonymous piece, the manuscript of which was in the possession of Mr. Strutt, and is now the property of Mr. Dyce [Dyce (1842), above]. But this manuscript was printed in 1842, for the Shakespeare Society; and although it is found to have one character, Laches, who is a coarse counterpart to the faithful steward, Flavius, and two or three incidents, particularly that of the mock banquet, where the misanthrope regales his parasites with stones, painted to look like artichokes, which correspond in some measure with transactions in the piece before us, there is not the slightest reason for believing Shakespeare ever saw it. (Vol. 2, 459)

The Works of William Shakespeare (1864-67), Alexander Dyce: "That our poet had any acquaintance with it [the MS. Timon], I much doubt; for it certainly was never performed in London,--being a drama intended solely for the amusement of an academic audience" (Vol. 6, 505).

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight: "Mr. Dyce says, 'I entertain considerable doubts of his [Shakespeare's] having been acquainted with a drama which was certainly never performed in the metropolis, and which was likely to have been read only by a few of the author's particular friends, to whom transcripts of it had been presented' [Dyce (1842), above]. We have little doubt, however, that

Timon was familiar to the stage before Shakspere took up the subject; although it is tolerably evident that the play which Mr. Dyce has given to the world was not the play which Shakspere, as we believe, partly made his own" (Vol. 1, 338).

Uber die Quellen aus denen Shakespeare den Timon von Athens entnommen hat (1873), Adolf Müller believes that Shakespeare owes nothing to the MS. Timon.

"On the Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1874), F.G. Fleay: "Timon throws water on them [his "friends" in III.vi], which apparently freezes before it reaches them, so that they feel it on their bones, and are pelted with stones, like the guests in the old Timon play, which Shakspere, I feel sure, never read" (p. 134).

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (1886) Henry N. Hudson: "The resemblance between Lucian and Shakespeare is especially close in the apostrophe of Timon upon finding the gold; and, as the anonymous play has no such resemblance, this infers that the Poet's borrowings from Lucian were not made through that medium" (Vol. 15, 193).

The Works of Shakespeare (1888-90) Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall: "There is. . . no reason for thinking that [the MS. Timon] was ever acted in London, or that Shakespeare ever saw it. It is possible that it may have been known to the writer

of the old Timon which Shakespeare rewrote, or that both these plays may have drawn upon a common original now lost source" (Vol. 7, 4).

Timon of Athens (1890), William J. Rolfe: "in the opinion of Dyce (who edited the piece for the Shakespeare Society in 1842 [see above]), this was never performed in London, being intended solely for an academic audience, and it is improbable that Shakespeare ever saw it" (pp. 14-15).

"Shakespeare's Classical Plays" (1893), James T. Foard argues that Shakespeare did not use the manuscript play as a source. Shakespeare's debt, Foard believes, is to Painter and Lucian :"For so much was he indebted to Lucian. . . the poet was also indebted to his little knowledge of Latin and less Greek" (see pp. 333-71).

Shakspere and His Predecessors (1896), F.S. Boas: "the MS. play Timon, . . . though containing matter more suited to an academic than a popular audience, anticipates a number of leading incidents in Shakespeare's drama, especially the mock farewell banquet to the false friends, and the fidelity of the steward to his fallen master" (p. 495). On Shakespeare's use of the MS. Timon to obtain his Lucian:

> Lucian's dialogues. . . had not yet been translated

> into English, [and] details from it probably reached Shakespeare through some intermediate source. One of these may possibly have been the MS. play Timon. (p. 495).

The Temple Shakespeare (1899-1902), Israel Gollancz: "The Ms. play entitled Timon, written about the year 1600, and edited for the Shakespeare Society in 1842, was intended solely for the amusement of an academic audience; there is not the least evidence that it was ever seen by Shakespeare" (Vol. 29, 213).

"The Sources of Timon of Athens" (1903-04), W.H. Clemons lists "the Academic Timon Play" among Timon's sources (p. 214). Clemons cites Dyce (1842, above), who "thought it unlikely that it could have been known to Shakespeare because of the obscurity of its appearance; and later writers have in general followed Dyce's views" (p. 217). On what Shakespeare may have borrowed from MS. Timon: "The academic play alone actually introduced Timon in his period of prosperity, its Laches is the only known predecessor of Flavius and of all the extant sources it is unique in containing a banquet scene" (p. 217). On Shakespeare seeing a performance of the MS. play:

> The title page to the 1603 Quarto of Hamlet says that it already had been "acted in the two Universities of Cambridge and Oxford." This would bring Shakespeare and his theatrical company to the place where the

> Timon play had been while yet some memory of it remained fresh. In fact it is not likely that Shakespeare was wholly out of touch with the universities and their interests. For instance, he would pass through Oxford on his way to and from Stratford-upon-Avon, and his intimate friendship with the Oxford D'Avenants is well known. Moreover there was a considerable number of these academic plays being staged in Elizabethan times, and in this period when the playwright's nets were dragging all life and literature for materials, it is hardly conceivable that these could entirely escape notice. Therefore, while it is evident that the Timon play was not used as a source by Shakespeare in the way in which he used the "True Tragedy" or the "Taming of a Shrew," yet is appears both possible and probable that some account of its main plot came, by word of mouth perhaps, to his knowledge, and that this account, just as happened with George Whetstone's "Promos and Cassandra" or the "True Chronicle History of King Leir" or the "Famous Victories of Henry V," was pressed into service when he himself took up the story for dramatic purposes. (pp. 218-19)

A Life of William Shakespeare (1904), Sir Sidney Lee: "An extant play on the subject of 'Timon of Athens' was composed in 1600, but there is nothing to show that Shakespeare and his coadjutor were acquainted with it" (p. 251).

The old Arden Timon of Athens (1905), K. Deighton: "There was also an old play of Timon circiter 1600, which contains many of the incidents used by Shakespeare, though none, I think, which he could not have derived elsewhere, unless it be the return of the faithful steward to join his master in his self-imposed exile" (p. vii).

"Notes on Some University Plays" (1907-08), G.C. Moore Smith: "This [the MS. Timon] is clearly an academical play, but its authorship, date and place of production are not known. I should be inclined however to assign it to Cambridge and to the years 1581-90" (p. 143).

"The Timon Plays" (1910), Joseph Quincy Adams: "The sources of the play [Timon of Athens] were Lucian's Misanthropos and The True History, from which the author took not only the plot, but also material by the handfulls" (p. 512). "It is not impossible that the play [MS. Timon]. . . was presented to a London audience" (p. 522). Adams lists the material found only in the manuscript Timon and in Shakespeare's play:

> 1) The faithful steward, who warns his master against coming bankruptcy, repairs to him in the fields, and refuses to leave him in spite of hard words; 2) The banquet; note that in both plays the banquet is given by Timon after he was a recognized bankrupt, and after he had been turned down by all his friends; that the steward assists Timon; that the false friends come unsuspiciously; and that Timon beats them from the table. Evidently we must conclude that Shakespeare had direct or indirect access to the anonymous play, or that both plays are indebted to some common source. (p. 522)

The Authorship of Timon of Athens (1910), Ernest Hunter Wright:

> That comedy [the MS. Timon], unless some document is

> lost, was certainly a source; Lucian may have been used in addition. That Shakspere should have known the old play does not seem so extraordinary as has frequently been thought. . . .It is. . . by no means impossible, or even unlikely, that he should have heard of the academic play; and in the absence of any other explanation for certain striking features in his own Timon, we must believe that he heard at least one account of it. He need not necessarily have seen or read it; a description of it might have served his purpose. (p. 22)

The Tudor Drama: A History of English National Drama to the Retirement of Shakespeare (1911), C.F. Tucker Brooke: "it seems probable that the play before us [MS. Timon]--in spite of an air of academic exclusiveness which is carried even to the length of quoting Greek in the original--was known to Shakespeare, and that it supplied him with important elements in his tragedy which he could have procured from no other source known" (p. 411).

Shakespeare and Chapman (1917), J. M. Robertson: "As to the academic comedy he [Wright (1910), above] argues, fairly enough, that Shakespeare may very well have heard of it even if he had not seen it, and that nothing more is required to explain his introduction of the mock banquet and the faithful steward" (p. 135).

The Yale Timon of Athens (1919), Stanley T. Williams:

> It is probable that one such source was an old

> Elizabethan comedy of Timon of Athens, acted about 1600. More or less faithful analogues may be found in the old play for the following incidents: Timon's betrayal by the parasites; the mock-banquet; Timon's exile; the finding of the gold; and, though less certainly, the episodes of the Old Athenian and Ventidius. Since these incidents occur also in Lucian's Dialogues, such evidence proves only that Shakespeare drew either from one or both of these sources. But the mock-banquet and the all-sacrificing steward are to be found in the old play and not in Lucian. (pp. 111-12)

"Lucian and Boiardo in Timon of Athens" (1931), R. Warwick Bond:

> It looks as if Shakespeare might be indebted to it, yet it is not apparent how he could know of this MS. piece, and its large introduction of superfluous characters and incidents might be a borrower's effort to assert originality or infuse comedy. Can we be sure that Steeven's date (1600) for the MS. is near enough? Put at 1608 the anonymous piece might find a far closer model in the relations and characters of Kent and Lear (produced 26 December, 1605) than in the Parmeno of Boiardo; and there still remains the possibility that the author drew on an earlier play on the subject, containing the false banquet, and now absorbed in the Folio play. (p. 66).

Bond also lists material in the MS. play that he feels anticipates Timon of Athens:

> 1. It has nearly three Acts showing Timon's extravagant life with companions before his ruin is announced by a shipwrecked sailor.
> 2. A faithful servant. . . .
> 3. A pretended banquet. . . .
> 4. Two brief invocations by Timon of the sun, not in Lucian or Boiardo.
> 5. Timon having quitted the city, followed by Laches,

> at the end of Act IV, is found (Act V, Sc. ii) digging with him in 'fields' without motive suggested, and again in V.iii, when he finds gold. (p. 65)

William Shakespeare (1936), George Brandes: "It [MS. Timon] seems to have been written for some academic circle, and in it we find the faithful steward and the farewell banquet with which the third act closes. In the older drama, Timon throws stones, painted to resemble artichokes, at his guests" (p. 557). Brandes, however, argues that Shakespeare did not know of the manuscript play and used another play, now missing, as a source:

> We have no proof that Shakespeare was acquainted with this particular work [the MS. Timon]. He probably used some other contemporary play, belonging to the theatre, which had proved a failure in its original form, and which both his company and his own inclinations urged him to recast. It was so entirely rewritten, however, that we can look upon the play as actually the work of Shakespeare--there are too many traces of another and feebler hand; but the vital,lyrical powerful pathos is his, and his alone. (pp. 557-58)

Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies (1950), Willard Farnham: "Probably before 1600 and perhaps between 1581 and 1590 an academic author wrote an English play on Timon. Stage directions indicate that it was put on stage, and it seems to have been intended for the amusement of a school or university audience. . . . the

academic play has much that is not found in any other version of the Timon story, and it has some features that are found elsewhere only in Shakespeare's Timon" (p. 62). On the elements common to both plays: "a servant who is faithful to Timon, a mock banquet given by Timon to the friends who have failed him in his time of need, and invocations made by Timon to the sun after misfortune has come to him" (p. 62). On the date of the manuscript play: "the academic play on Timon. . . is apparently earlier than Shakespeare's tragedy" (p. 69).

"Note sur les Sources de Timon of Athens" (1954), Georges A. Bonnard writes that the anonymous play is indebted to King Lear (pp. 59-69).

Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare (1957-75), Geoffrey Bullough: "It is unlikely that Shakespeare could ever have known the academic Timon, since there is no evidence that it was played publicly or at the Inns of Court" (Vol. 6, 235). Like Bonnard (1954, above), Bullough thinks that the MS. Timon drew upon King Lear : "It is much more likely that the academic Timon drew on Shakespeare's King Lear than that it independently combined material from the old Leir play and Sidney's romance" (Vol. 6, 235). On the date of the MS. Timon: "I incline to

date the academic Timon after Shakespeare's play, and after the publication of the first Quarto of King Lear (1608)" (Vol. 6, 235).

The Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957; rpt. 1968), J.C. Maxwell writes that the "date of the anonymous play is uncertain" (p. xix). Maxwell cites two elements common to both plays: "the two most notable links are the banquet to the false friends, at which, in the anonymous play, Timon pelts his guests with stones painted as artichokes, and the presence of a faithful steward, Laches, who is insulted and dismissed by Timon (I.5), but returns to serve him in disguise (2.2), and remains with him after his ruin. This is beyond coincidence; one play must be indebted to the other, or both to a common source" (p. xix). On Shakespeare's possible use of the MS. play: "With some reluctance, I am inclined to suppose, then, that Shakespeare somehow came across the anonymous play. If it was a London school play, as Adams thinks, he could have been dragged to see it by some fond father of his acquaintance" (p. xxi).

"Did Shakespeare Use the Old Timon Comedy?" (1958), Robert Hillis Goldsmith: "There is. . . no insurmountable barrier to Shakespeare's having known and used the academic

comedy. In fact, I find additional evidence that Shakespeare did draw upon the anonymous play as a source--not only for Timon of Athens but for elements in King Lear as well" (p. 32). On the date of the MS. play, and Bond's argument (1931, above) that the anonymous Timon follows Timon and Lear:

> R.W. Bond questions whether the anonymous playwright may not be Shakespeare's debtor rather than his creditor, whether Laches may not be modelled upon Kent rather than the other way around. Such a supposition would put the academic Timon play in 1608, after the printing of the First Quarto of Lear. Steevens thinks that "It appears to have been written or transcribed, about the year 1600," [Steevens (1778), above] although he gives no reason for assigning this date. H.C. Hart, in his edition of Jonson's plays, argues that the old Timon play was a source for several scenes in Jonson's Every Man Out (1599), Cynthia's Revels (1600-1601), and The Poetaster (1601), and therefore was written before 1600. Baskervill notes a parallel between Macilente's closing speech, in which he casts off his envious humour, and the epilogue in which "Timon doffs Timon" (1.7), but he is unwilling to conjecture "which of the two plays influenced the other." Whether Jonson's three plays influenced or were influenced by the academic Timon, their similarities would seem to point to a date either slightly after 1601 or earlier than 1599 for the Timon comedy. G.C. Moore Smith [1907-08, above], however, assigns a much earlier date to the anonymous play. Because of an apparent verbal borrowing from the Cambridge play Pendantius (ca. 1581), Smith puts the old Timon comedy somewhere between 1581 and 1590. Although we cannot date the academic Timon precisely, we can be reasonably sure that it is an earlier play than Shakespeare's King Lear. (pp. 37-38)

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "It was difficult enough to understand how Shakespeare could have known this play (which, judging from its erudite and pedantic references, was intended for an academic audience) even, on the evidence of an allusion to Ben Jonson's Every Man out of his Humour, it was vaguely dated '1600'" (p. xxxix). Based on possible borrowings from King Lear found in the anonymous Timon, Oliver, following Bonnard's lead (1954, above), thinks that "the old Timon play is more likely to have followed Shakespeare's Timon that to have preceded it" (p. xxxix). Oliver entertains the idea that Timon and the manuscript play may share a common, lost source: "Perhaps some such source will one day be found" (p. xl).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann: "While it was once taken for granted that the MS. Timon preceded Shakespeare's and independently drew upon the hypothetical 'lost source' for features found also in Timon of Athens but missing from other Timon histories, the possibility that the academic play was later than Shakespeare's has not been urged more seriously [by Bond and Bonnard]. And quite apart from this possibility, the concurrences of the two plays as against the earlier Timon tradition are not nearly as significant as has sometimes been too lightly allowed" (pp. 11-12). On the date of the MS. Timon: "an im-

partial judge would, I think, decide that an exact dating of the MS. Timon is at present impossible, that a date after 1600 is much more likely than one before, and that a date after Timon of Athens is quite as feasible as one before" (p. 12). On R.H. Goldsmith on the MS. Timon (1958, above): "[I have] no confidence in R.H. Goldsmith's argument that Shakespeare knew the MS. Timon before composing Lear and Timon. . . . To say that a 'network of correspondences ties together the three plays: Timon of Athens, King Lear, and the Timon comedy' (Goldsmith, p. 32) is to call 'correspondences' what are the flimsiest coincidences, and, far worse, to overlook that most of these 'correspondences' much more probably go back to Lucian. Unfortunately, Goldsmith did not bring Lucian into his discussion, which invalidates his findings" (p. 12).

"The Comedy of Timon: A Reveling Play of the Inner Temple" (1966), M.C. Bradbrook: "I venture to affirm that the little piece [the MS. Timon] reveals not only some interest but some merit if read as a law students' burlesque of Shakespeare's Timon, presented probably at the Christmas revels and almost certainly at the Inner Temple" (p. 83). "I cannot think that any ordinary schoolmaster would have been permitted to teach his charges to utter such things in the presence of their parents

so that the theory that The Comedy of Timon is a school play seems unlikely, even if other evidence did not so strongly point to the lawyers" (p. 95).

The parodies of Shakespeare's Timon that Bradbrook finds in the manuscript play include the "ridiculous scene in which three outcasts are seen digging in different parts of the stage. [This] parodies the great last scenes of Shakespeare's Timon" (p. 98). "The imagery of Timon as an earthly Jove is mocked very extensively, and this implies, I would think, that Shakespeare's Timon had been seen, since it is in Shakespeare's scene of the mock banquet that the image of Jove is most powerfully presented, as a spectacle" (p. 99):

> Given all these scrappy, pervasive, broken echoes of Shakespeare's play, it seems that the author of the Comedy must have seen that play; even if some of the echoes are not very strong, it is the cumulative effect of them that tells. . . . The Comedy represents a breakdown of what had originally been lucid. But as the riotous Timon is not depicted outside Shakespeare and this Comedy, it follows that the author of the Comedy was the copyist, not vice versa. (p. 100)

On the date of the MS. Timon: "If Shakespeare's Timon of Athens was designed for the new Blackfriars Theater (1609) or was moved there after a performance at the Inns, this reference of 1611 [from the register of the Inner Temple] would give

a suitable date for The Comedy of Timon, which burlesques Shakespeare" (p. 103).

"Shadwell and the Anonymous Timon" (1967), John Edmunds: "Speculation as to how Shadwell might have gained access to the old play is unprofitable, but if it was produced at Cambridge, as G.C. Moore Smith [1907-08, above] supposes, the text could have remained there, and have been seen by Shadwell as a student. Alternatively, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the manuscript was in the hands of a family sufficiently close to, and interested in, the theatre to make it available to both Shakespeare and Shadwell in turn" (p. 221).

Shakespeare the Craftsman (1969), M.C. Bradbrook: "A farcical Comedy of Timon. . . survives in a fragile manuscript, which must have come from legal circles, probably from the Inner Temple" (p. 150).

The Riverside Shakespeare (1974), Frank Kermode: Shakespeare "does. . . seem to have known an English academic play called Timon, which was not published until 1842. The date of this play is unknown, but it is probably though not certainly earlier than Shakespeare's, and the similarities, which include a fake banquet and a faithful steward, make it fairly certain either that Shakespeare had seen it or that the play had a common source, now lost" (p. 1442).

"The Date and Production of 'Timon' Reconsidered" (1975), James C. Bulman, Jr.: "Scholars for years have been inclined, like Bradbrook, to believe that Shakespeare never could have seen Timon. But if Timon was performed at the Inns of Court c. 1601-2, it is likely that Shakespeare did see it; for he had close associations with the Inns, and especially with Middle Temple, where his own Twelfth Night and perhaps Troilus and Cressida and Timon of Athens, were performed. This likelihood leaves incredulous scholars naked of their alibi. Shakespeare could have seen Timon; thus he could have borrowed from it" (p. 127). Thus, according to Bulman, "Shakespeare may have derived most, if not all, of his Lucian source material through Timon" (p. 127). On Bradbrook [1966, 1969, above] on the MS. Timon:

> Bradbrook found ample evidence within Timon itself to support her claim that it was performed during Christman revels at the Inner Temple. She had no external proof. A few of the allusions she located seem to me indisputable; others, more tenuous. Taken all together, however, they provide fairly conclusive evidence for her case. (pp. 113-14)

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "If the comedy [the MS. Timon] spoffed Lear along with Jonson's satires and contemporary dramatic fashions, a date of 1605 or 1606 would be appropriate for it; the date of

1607, to which I incline for Shakespeare's Timon, would also be quite apt" (p. 209). Soellner disagrees with Bonnard's speculation (1954, above) that "Shakespeare and the anonymous author had a common source," but sees "merit in one of Bonnard's other claims, namely, that the comedy echoes Lear" (p. 208). On Shakespeare's debt to the MS. Timon: "The evidence, such as it is, points to some connection between the comedy and Shakespeare's Timon and to Shakespeare as the borrower. . . . It seems to me likely. . . that Shakespeare knew the comedy and borrowed from it" (pp. 207, 209).

SOURCES--PAINTER

The Plays and Poems of William Shakspeare (1794), Edmond Malone:

> Shakspeare undoubtedly formed this play on the passage in Plutarch's Life of Antony relative to Timon, and not on the twenty-eighth novel of the first volume of Painter's Palace of Pleasure; because he is there merely described as "a man-hater, of a strange and beastly nature," without any cause assigned; whereas Plutarch furnished our authour with the following hint to work upon. "Antonius forsook the citie, and companie of his friendes,--saying, that he would lead Timon's life, because he had the like wrong offered him, that was offered unto Timon; and for the unthankfulness of those he had done good unto, and whom he tooke to be his friendes, he was angry with all men, and would trust no man." (Vol. 12, 5)

The Works of William Shakespeare (1857-66), Richard Grant White: "The story of Timon, however, was generally known in Shakespeare's day, in the literature of which it was referred to. He might have first read it as a youth in Paynter's Palace of Pleasure, a book with which we know he was well acquainted, and the first volume of which, published in 1567, contains a novel "Of the straunge and beastlie nature of Timon of Athens, enemie to mankinde, with his death, buriall, and epitaphe" (Vol. 10, 200).

The Works of William Shakespeare (1964-67), Alexander Dyce believes that Shakespeare was "intimately acquainted" with "The

Palace of Pleasure [by Painter,--see the Twenty-Eighth Novel of vol. i,--'Of the straunge and beastlie nature of Timon of Athens, enemie to mankinde, with his death, buriall, and epitaphe']" (Vol. 6, 504).

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (1886), Henry N. Hudson: "The most popular authority for the character of Timon of Shakespeare's day was Paynter's Palace of Pleasure, in the first volume of which, published before 1567, 'the strange and beastly nature of Timon of Athens, with his death, burial and epitaph' is briefly set forth" (Vol. 15, 190).

The Works of Shakespeare (1888-90), Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall: "Painter's Palace of Pleasure, novel 28 [is] one of three of the play's sources, the other two being Plutarch and Lucian" (Vol. 7, 3).

Timon of Athens (1890), William J. Rolfe: "Shakespeare was acquainted with the story of Timon through Paynter's Palace of Pleasure, from which he had taken the plot of All's Well" (p. 14).

The Temple Shakespeare (1899-1902), Israel Gollancz: "Shakespeare was also acquainted with Paynter's story of Timon, in the Palace of Pleasure" (Vol. 29, 214).

"The Sources of Timon of Athens" (1903-04), W.H. Clemons:

"Both Painter's novels and North's Plutarch were certainly known to Shakespeare and were used by him. In the former is to be found the source of 'All's Well that Ends Well' and also in part, perhaps, of 'Romeo and Juliet'" (p. 215).

A Life of William Shakespeare (1904), Sir Sidney Lee: writes that Shakespeare and his "coadjutor" "doubtless derived a part of their story from Painter's 'Palace of Pleasure'" (p. 251).

Timon of Athens (1919), Stanley T. Williams calls Painter the play's "dynamic or inspirational source" (p. 111).

"The Theme of Timon of Athens" (1934), John W. Draper: "Shakespeare's Timon is ruined through the virtue of generosity: Plutarch and Painter depict him simply as the misanthrope, and give only the merest hint that the cause of his reverses was some 'wrong' or ingratitude" (p. 21).

Timon of Athens (1934), M.R. Ridley: "Shakespeare could have drawn upon Paynter's Palace of Pleasure" (p. viii).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "The often-repeated suggestion that Shakespeare could have derived the same material from another of his favorite source-books, William Painter's Palace of Pleasure (1566), may safely be rejected. Painter's twenty-eighth novella 'Of

the straunge and beastlie nature of Timon of Athens, enemie to mankinde', traces back eventually to Plutarch, probably through intermediate versions of the story. . . . it will be clear that Painter would need to be regarded as a supplementary source and not as an alternative to North" (p. xxxiii).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "Neither does Shakespeare seem to have owed much, if anything, to the story as told in William Painter's Palace of Pleasure (1566), which depends largely on Mexia. And it should be said that neither Mexia nor Painter portrayed a particularly evil society to which Timon's misanthropy was a reaction. Painter, in fact, spoke of Timon's beastliness rather than that of the Athenians" (p. 212).

[In "Shakespeare's Classical Plays" (1893), James T. Foard: "For so much as he was indebted to Lucian. . . the poet was also indebted to his little knowledge of Latin and less Greek."]

[See also "Lost Sources."]

SOURCES--PLUTARCH

"Attempt to ascertain the Order of Shakspeare's plays" (1790), Edmond Malone argues that Plutarch, rather than Lucian, is the play's primary source (Vol. 1, 372).

The Plays and Poems of William Shakspeare (1794), Edmond Malone: "Shakspeare undoubtedly formed this play on the passage in Plutarch's Life of Antony relative to Timon. . . Plutarch furnished our authour with the following hint to work upon. 'Antonius forsook the citie, and companie of his friendes,--saying, that he would lead Timon's life, because he had the like wrong offered him, that was offered unto Timon; and for the unthankfulness of those he had done good onto, and whom he tooke to be his friendes, he was angry with all men, and would trust no man'" (Vol. 12, 5).

The Works of William Shakespeare (1856-66), Richard Grant White cites North's Plutarch (1579) as a source (Vol. 10, 197).

The Works of William Shakespeare (1864-67), Alexander Dyce notes that the Timon story is in "the English Plutarch [North's translation,--see the Life of Antony]" (Vol. 6, 504).

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (1886), Henry N. Hudson cites Plutarch "as given in North's translation of Plutarch, 1579)" as one of Shakespeare's sources (Vol. 15, 190).

The Works of Shakspere (1888-90), Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall note that Timon appears "as a historical character. . . in Plutarch's Antonius, which Shakespeare was probably reading about 1606 for his Antony and Cleopatra" (Vol. 7, 3).

Shakspere and His Predecessors (1896), F.S. Boas: "Timon of Athens may be conveniently included in the Plutarch series of plays. Its chief source is a passage in the biographer's life of Antony, where he compares the triumver's conduct after the battle of Actium to that of Timon, 'a citizen of Athens that lived about the war of Peloponnesus.' In Plutarch's pages Shakspere found a brief account of Timon's self-banishment from his ungrateful fellow men, of his relations to Alcibiades and Apemantus and of his burial on the sea-shore" (pp. 494-95).

The Temple Shakespeare (1899-1902), Israel Gollancz: "A passage in Plutarch's Life of Antonius (North's Plutarch) containing a short account of Timon may have attracted Shakespeare to the subject of the play" (Vol. 29, 212-14).

"The Sources of Timon of Athens" (1903-04), W.H. Clemons lists "Plutarch as translated by North" among the play's sources (p. 214).

The old Arden Timon of Athens (1905), K. Deighton: "The story of Timon was well known in Shakespeare's day, and he

himself in Love's Labour's Lost refers to 'critic Timon.' For details he appears to have drawn from three sources--Painter's Palace of Pleasure, Plutarch's Life of Marcus Antonius, and directly or indirectly, from Lucian's Dialogue entitled Timon or the Misanthrope" (p. vii).

Die Timonlegende Eine Entwicklungsgeschichte des Misanthropentypus in der antiken Literatur (1906), Franz Bertram writes that Shakespeare used Plutarch, as well as Lucian in French or Italian translation.

"The Timon Plays" (1910),J.Q. Adams: "It may be stated with positiveness. . . that Shakespeare went directly to the Timon narrative in North's Plutarch" (p. 522). Here Shakespeare found "the characters Apemantus and Alcibiades, the incident of the fig tree, the meal with Apemantus, and the two epitaphs. In short, he used up every bit of material contained in the Plutarch story" (p. 522).

The Authorship of Timon of Athens (1910), Ernest Hunter Wright:

> Plutarch could give him little; but that little he used to the full. Plutarch buried his Timon on the sea-shore; our dramatist also "taught him to make vast Neptune weep for aye on his low grave." Plutarch told how Timon offered the Athenians a tree on which to hang themselves; an incident finely realized in the play. Timon's two epitaphs

> in Plutarch are combined as one in the play. But Plutarch's two main hints were the characters of Apemantus and Alcibiades. These were indeed hints only; two or three sentences about each man, from which the dramatist developed two important characters and the double contrast of the play. All that Plutarch says of Apemantus is that he was like unto Timon and that Timon once protested he could eat more comfortably in Apemantus' absence. The protest is repeated in the play. . . . In Plutarch's sketch of Timon, Alcibiades is merely mentioned as the only man whom Timon loves--because he knows that Alcibiades will one day prove the bane of Athens. The motive recurs in the play; and the character, taking on some general traits from Plutarch's separate Life of Alcibiades, becomes a kind of Fortinbras in the drama, fighting out the wrongs at which Timon can only curse. (pp. 16-17)

Timon of Athens (1919), Stanley T. Williams: "the more the passage in Plutarch is studied the more certainly does it appear that this or a later work based upon Plutarch, such as Painter's Palace of Pleasure (1566), is the dynamic or inspirational source of our play" (p. 111).

"Lucian and Boiardo in 'Timon of Athens'" (1931). R. Warwick Bond: "Beyond Plutarch's bare allusion to 'wrong offered' to Timon and to Antony's citation of him as a parallel for ingratitude shown to himself by supposed friends, we hear nothing from him or his translators of any life of Timon preceding his misanthropy" (p. 52).

"The Theme of Timon of Athens" (1934), John W. Draper: "Shakespeare's Timon is ruined through the virtue of generosity:

Plutarch and Painter depict him simply as the misanthrope, and give only the merest hint that the cause of his reverses was some 'wrong' or ingratitude" (p. 21).

Timon of Athens (1934), M.R. Ridley: "In North's Plutarch, in the life of Antonius, there is a short account of Timon" (p. viii).

The Literary History of England (1948), Tucker Brooke: "the theme seems to have come to Shakespeare's notice in Plutarch's Life of Antony" (p. 529).

Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies (1950), Willard Farnham: "The tragedy is not properly called Plutarchan, despite the fact that two versions of Timon's epitaph found in North's translation of Plutarch are used in the play. The Timon who becomes a beast and finds a den for himself in the woods--the Timon who has most call upon Shakespeare's poetic power--is not in Plutarch at all. He is a creation of authors later than Plutarch" (p. 67).

"On Certain Proper Names in Shakespeare" (1951), Robert Adger Law:

> Allusions in Plutarch's Antony to Timon, Apemantus, and Alcibiades, and in his Alcibiades to Timandra, the hero's mistress, are only to be expected, but not so in the other cases. Two of Plutarch's biographies are given to Lucullus and Flaminius, Servilius he names as an ancestor of Brutus, while Lucilius

> will be remembered as the Roman soldier who tried to save Brutus' life by claiming to be Brutus on the battlefield of Philippi. Ventidius was a general under Marc Antony who wisely refused to gain too many victories in Antony and Cleopatra, and Philotas was the physician reporting to Plutarch's grandfather that Antony had eight wild boars roasted whole for the dinner of twelve guests. Flavius, an historical tribune, makes the opening speech in Julius Caesar, Hortensius has a place in Plutarch's Life of Sylla as an officer of his, and he is guided on one occasion by Chaphis, "our countryman." Sempronius was a fellow-consul with Scipio Africanus, while Varro, whose name is also in Antony and Cleopatra, was a friend of both Pompey and Caesar. Isidore,seems to be Isidorus, a sea-captain slain by Lucullus. Lucius and Titus are familiar Latin praenomina repeated in the names of many men in Plutarch. These eighteen names, all found in North's Plutarch italicized so that they easily catch the eye as one turns North's pages, exhaust the full roster of the dramatis personae in Timon of Athens, with the exception of Phrynia, a second mistress of Alcibiades. This name, I believe, Shakespeare invented, deriving it either from the land of Phrygia, spelled out in prominent capitals close to the name of Timandra in the 1579 edition of North, or from Phrycicus, a powerful enemy of Alcibiades, or from a combination of the two names. (pp. 61-62)

"Note sur les Sources de Timon of Athens" (1954), Georges Bonnard writes that Shakespeare used both Lucian and Plutarch's "Life of Antony" (pp. 60-61).

The Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957; rpt. 1968), J.C. Maxwell: "Plutarch, Lucian and the anonymous Timon seem, then, to be the only sources of any moment" (p. xxi).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "That Shakespeare's main source for the story of Timon was

North's Plutarch is certain. Sir Thomas North's English translation of Amiot's French translation of Plutarch's Greek Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans, published in 1679 and again with additions in 1595, provided also much of the material for Julius Caesar, Coriolanus, and Antony and Cleopatra; and from the section of the life of Mark Antony telling how, after the defeat in the battle of Actium, Antony dwelt for a time in 'his solitary house he had built by the sea, which he called Timoneon' and followed the general example of Timon, Shakespeare learnt his basic facts" (p. xxxii).

Oliver believes that Shakespeare got the following material from Plutarch:

> Timon lived in solitude and hated mankind because he had been deceived by his friends and had suffered under their ingratitude; that the only men whose company he would tolerate were Alcibiades (and that because Timon predicted that one day Alcibiades would bring harm to Athenians) and Apemantus (who was of similar disposition and could be the butt of Timon's insults); that he once invited the Athenians to hasten to hang themselves on his fig-tree before he cut it down; and that, in addition to an epitaph on him made by the poet Callimachus. . . there was another written by Timon himself which was inscribed upon his tomb on the sea-shore. (p. xxxii)

The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art (1960), Robert C. Elliott: "Timon's misanthropy resulted from 'the unthankfulness of those he had done good unto, and whom he tooke to be his frendes' [Plutarch]" (p. 141).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann:

> It has long been known that Shakespeare's Greek and Roman names, when added to or altered from his source, were frequently extracted from Plutarch, but, so far as I am aware, no one has shown how many of these in Timon were borrowed from a single life, a Roman life which wafted into the Greek story so much alien atmosphere. The Timon anecdote in the "Marcus Antonius" names only three principals, Timon, Alcibiades, and Apemantus (IV.382-283); the "Alcibiades" adds only Timandra (II.169). Six other names come straight from the "Marcus Antonius": Lucius (VI.319), Hortensius (322), Ventidius (335), Flavius (349), Lucilius (380), Philitus (Philotas, 329). This can be no accident. (p. 4)

For Honigmann, Plutarch's "Marcus Antonius" is "the most interesting of. . . neglected sources. . . from which Shakespeare seems to have lifted, consciously or unconsciously, much that was to prove serviceable for his plays" (p. 4).

The Riverside Shakespeare (1974), Frank Kermode names Plutarch as Shakespeare's "principal source" (p. 1442).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner:

> That Shakespeare used [Plutarch's "The Life of Marcus Antonius"] proceeds from his transcribing two epitaphs of Timon, one that Plutarch ascribes to Timon himself and the other that he assigns to the Poet Callimachus (5.4.70-73). Plutarch's account is the primary warrant for the linkage between Timon and Alcibiades and for Timon's association with Apemantus. Shakespeare accentuated two features of Plutarch's story to make

them significant for the pessimistic implications of the play. The first of these is Plutarch's suggestion that Timon suffered from the ingratitude of his friends. . . . The second touch lies in "The Life of Alcibiades" that Alcibiades would bring about the ruin of Athens. Shakespeare's Timon echoes this sentiment (4.3.105-30), which may also have been a general incentive for Shakespeare's making Timon call on soldiers and war as allies in the destruction of mankind. But the character bears no resemblance to Shakespeare's. He is a vituperator, not a great spender and wild hater, and he does not leave Athens. Apemantus is said to have imitated his manners rather than becoming, as in Shakespeare, a kind of model for the later Timon. Altogether, Plutarch's Timon is hardly more than a nuisance, the proverbial "critic Timon" (Love's Labor's Lost, 4.3.168) as Shakespeare seems to have conceived him in his earlier years. (pp. 205-06)

LOST SOURCE

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1839-43), Charles Knight: "Timon of Athens was a play originally produced by an artist very inferior to Shakspere, and which probably retained possession of the stage for some time" (Vol. 1, 333).

Shakespeare's Plays (1844-47), Gulian C. Verplanck: "this Timon [the earlier, lost play mentioned by Knight, above]. . . may possibly have been the medium through which he [Shakespeare] derived one or two incidents from Lucian. We must then presume the existence of another and more popular drama, on the same subject, of which all other trace is lost, and of a piece which, if it even existed, could not have been from any despicable hand; for the portions of the Shakespearian drama ascribed to it, however inferior to the glow and vigour of the rest, are yet otherwise, as compared with the writings of preceding dramatists, written with no little dramatic spirit and satiric humour. This is surely a somewhat unlikely presumption" (Vol. 3, 92).

The Plays of William Shakespeare (1858-60), Howard Staunton: "The immediate archtype of the play, however, was probably some old and now lost drama, remodelled and partially re-written by our author, but of which he permitted much of the rude material to remain, with scarcely any alteration. . . . These resemblances

are no doubt merely owing to both plays being founded on a common origin; for the subject was evidently familiar to the stage long before we can suppose Shakespeare to have produced his version" (Vol. 2, 459).

The Works of William Shakespeare (1857-66), Richard Grant White: "Manifestly, then, Shakespeare, in writing certain passages of Timon of Athens, took hints from Lucian's as from Plutarch's portraiture of the Greek misanthrope. But although he might have become acquainted with the former in a French or Latin version, it is far more probable that such knowledge as he had of it reached him through some narrative or dramatic work, all trace of which has perished" (Vol. 10, 200).

The Works of William Shakespeare (1864-76), Alexander Dyce: "there was some old drama now lost, of which Shakespeare made use for this tragedy, and of which not a few traces may be found in it, is, I think, sufficiently manifest, though Coleridge, speaking of our author's play in his Lectures, declared that 'he saw the same vigorous hand at work throughout'" (Vol. 6, 505).

"Ueber die Quellen aus denen Shakespeare Timon von Athen entnommen hat" (1873), Adolf Müller notes similarities in Shakespeare's Timon and the manuscript play, especially in the character of the faithful steward and the episode of the mock

banquet, and assumes the existence of a lost source, which was used by both Shakespeare and the author of the manuscript play.

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (1886), Henry N. Hudson: "There are indeed some close resemblances of incident between this play [the anonymous, manuscript Timon] and Shakespeare's; but none such as to infer any thing more than a drawing from a common source" (Vol. 15, 190).

The Works of Shakespeare (1888-90), Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall: "The existence of such a play [a lost Timon play] was first assumed by Knight, whose theory has been accepted by Staunton, the Cambridge editor and Delius, and offers a satisfactory explanation of the relationship of our play to Lucian" (Vol, 7, 4).

The Temple Shakespeare (1899-1902), Israel Gollancz: "There is no definite evidence of an older play on the subject that could have been the original of Shakespeare's, nor are the inferior portions strikingly suggestive of the style of the old-fashioned productions superseded by Shakespeare's revisions or recasts" (Vol. 29, 213).

"The Sources of Timon of Athens" (1903-04), W.H. Clemons: "There are those who have fallen back on that resource so familiar to Shakespeare critics, a lost play on Timon, from which the

author of 'Timon of Athens' got his Lucian, and in which both he and the academic writer found the originals of the steward and of the banquet scene. But though, of course, this possiblity is always present, such a conclusion is at best very unsatisfactory--already there are too many lost plays. It is much preferable to use those writings which we have and can know, if only it can be shown that they are sufficient in themselves" (p. 221).

"The Timon Plays" (1910), Joseph Quency Adams, Jr.: "it is certain that Timon of Athens and the manuscript play contain parallel incidents not found in either of the classical versions. . . . Evidently we must conclude that Shakespeare had direct or indirect access to the anonymous play, or that both plays are indebted to some common source" (p. 522).

William Shakespeare (1936), George Brandes: "we have no proof that Shakespeare was acquainted with [the manuscript Timon]. He probably used some other contemporary play, belonging to the theatre, which had proved a failure in its original form, and which both his company and his own inclinations urged him to thoroughly recast" (pp. 557-58).

"Note sur les Sources de Timon of Athens" (1954), Georges A. Bonnard argues that Shakespeare did not know the manuscript Timon. He also suggests, however, that there was a now missing common source for both Shakespeare and the author of the anon-

ymous work. Bonnard believes that Shadwell knew this lost work and that he based the love-intrigue in his version of Timon on it. (pp. 63-69).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver:

> It was difficult enough to understand how Shakespeare could have known this play. . . . Now Bonnard, pointing to the possible borrowings from King Lear, suggests that the old Timon play is more likely to have followed Shakespeare's Timon than to have proceeded it--yet cannot have been based on it, since Shakespeare's play was not published until 1623 and was apparently never acted. The only solution seems to be a common source; and Bonnard, noting the coincidence that Shadwell, in his rewriting of Shakespeare's tragedy towards the end of the century, gave Timon a false mistress as did the author of the old Timon play--and citing from the Arabian Nights a very interesting parallel to the full Timon legend, with Arabic or Bysantine accretions, assumed, probably in Italy, a fuller form than that known in antiquity, a form known to Shakespeare, to the unknown author of the "old" Timon, and to Shadwell, and used by them independently in turn.
>
> Perhaps some such source will one day be found. (pp. xxxix-xl)

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner: "I would suggest that Shakespeare found in some earlier Timon play, now lost, a dramatic situation which might be used to pose the problem of an 'unregenerated Lear'" (p. 138, n. 1).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann: "since Shakespeare's Timon remained apparently unperformed, and unpublished till 1623, since the academic MS. Timon would be equally unheard-of,

a lost common source might be the easiest explanation of the surprising links between the two plays" (p. 4).

"The Date and Production of 'Timon' Reconsidered" (1974), James C. Bulman, Jr.:

> Oliver [1959, above] merely repeated the frustration of many scholars when he resorted to speculation about a 'common source', now lost, in order to explain the troublesome similarities between the two plays (p. xxxix). Adams [1910, above] had mentioned this 'common source' as a possibility frought with difficulties (p. 522). Bond blithely adopted it as his second alternative (p. 66); and Bonnard [1954, above] thought that he had found it in a tale from the Arabian Nights (pp. 65ff.). Perhaps Honigmann [1961, above] stated the case of previous scholars most honestly when he admitted, 'since Shakespeare's Timon remained apparently unperformed, and unpublished till 1623, since the academic MS. Timon would be equally unheard-of, a lost common source might be the easiest explanation of the surprising links between the two plays' (p. 4). (p. 113)

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "It is even possible to suppose, as does G.A. Bonnard [1954, above], that there was a common source, now lost, on which both Shakespeare and the author of the comedy drew, although this theory is too speculative to hold much attraction" (p. 207).

[See also the source section on "Lucian."]

OTHER SOURCES, ANALOGUES, AND ALLUSIONS

The Works of William Shakespeare (1864-67), Alexander Dyce: "from Jack Drum's Entertainment (1601): 'Come [come, now] I'll be as sociable as Timon of Athens' (sig. B 4)" (Vol. 6, 504).

"The Sources of Timon of Athens" (1903-04), W.H. Clemons: "The comic poets Aristophanes (Aves. i 1548; Lysistrata, l. 809], Plato [cf. Reference in Plutarch's Life of Antonius], Phrynichus [cf. Monotropos, a frag. Klein, Geschichte des Dramas, vol. II, p. 73], and Antiphanes [cf. Klein, Geschichte des Dramas, vol. II, p. 214]--the last two appearing to have used Timon as a principal character--seem to have treated him merely as a comic figure" (pp. 209-10). Clemons goes on to note the following allusions:

> an allusion to Timon is found in a life of his namesake, the philosopher, by Diogenes Laertius [Diog. Laert. IX], and Pausanias [Book I, chap. XXX, 4]. . . . Suidas [cf. sub ἀπορρῆγας] contains a scholium of Neanthes of Cyzicum on the Timon passage in the 'Lysistrata,' which locates the burial place of the Misanthrope. There is a reference in one of the doubtful epistles of Plato the Philosopher [Epistle 14, ed. Hermann vol. VI, p. 67] also, and Stobaeus [Florilegium, ed. Meineke, vol. I, p. 239] puts an apothegm into Timon's mouth. Plutarch mentions Timon as the friend of Alcibiades in his life [Alcibiades, 4] of the latter, and in the life of Antony [Antonius, 38] gives a fuller account of the Misanthrope. . . . Strabo [cf. Binder, Timon der Mis-

> anthrop, pp. 11, 12] further records that Antony. . . [termed] the hut to which he retired a Τιμώνιον . . . . In fact Timon appears to have furnished inscriptions for epitaphs or epigrams by at least six other poets of minor renown [cf. Binder, Timon der Misanthrop, pp. 11, 12]:--King Ptolemaeus, Hegesippus, Zenodotus of Ephesus, Leonidas of Alexandria, Julian the Egyptian, and an anonymous versifier.
>
> Cicero [Tusc. IV, II; Lael. XXIII] mentions Timon at least twice, and there are allusions to him in Libanius [μελετη . Cf. Binder, Timon der Misanthrop, p. 13] and in Pliny's Natural History. (pp. 211-12)

Clemons also cites these "Elizabethan" allusions:

> In Guilpin's Skialetheia, a collection of epigrams and short satires dated about 1598, occurs the line, "Like hate-man Timon in his cell he sits." "Jack Drum's Entertainment," a comic play produced about 1601 and possibly written by Marston, contains this passage: "But is all the brewers' jades in the town can drag me from the love of myself, they shall do more than e'er the seven wise men of Greece could. Come, come; now I'll be as sociable as Timon of Athens." Similar references are found in Thomas Lodge's "Wits Miserie and the World's Madness" [1596. Found in Hunterian Club Pub., No. 47, p. 100], in Richard Mulcaster's "Positions" [1581. Ed. by Quick in 1888] in Dekker's "Satiromastix" where the expression, "turn my Muse into a Timonist" is found [Dekker's Dram. Works, Lond. 1873, vol. I, p. 258], and Shakespeare, himself, has an early allusion to Timon in "Love's Labour's Lost" [:] "And critic Timon laugh at idle toys" (pp. 213-14)

On Shakespeare's possible use of Boiardo's Il Timone:

"while admitting the possibility that Shakespeare might have known this Italian comedy, on the grounds of internal evidence

I think that Boiardo may safely be disregarded as a source of the 'Timon of Athens'" (p. 215). On Barckley's "Palace of Pleasure": "Shakespeare may, very probably indeed, have known it. But he could get nothing from it, so that it too may be considered of negative importance" (p. 215)

"The Timon Plays" (1910), J.Q. Adams: "The first [Elizabethan Timon play] is a moral interlude by Beaumont and Fletcher, The Triumph of Time; the second, an anonymous manuscript play, Timon; the third, Shakespeare's Timon of Athens" (p. 506).

"The Theme of Timon of Athens" (1934), John W. Draper: lists these Timon allusions: M.I. De l'Espine's A Very Excellent and Learned Discourse (London, 1592); S. Rowlands' The Melancholy Knight (ed, Hunterian Club, No. 24, p. 7), R. Brathwait's English Gentleman (London, 1633). "Lyly, Mulcaster, Greene, Lashe, Lodge and Dekker show Timon. . . as the 'stock exponent of misanthropy" (p. 22).

The Authorship of Timon of Athens (1910), Ernest Hunter Wright: "There is nothing to indicate that [Shakespeare] knew Boiardo or Caretto. We cannot prove the negative, of course; he may have read their plays; but if he did, he made no use of them in his own" (p. 16).

Wright also traces the Timon tradition. He notes that

the hero of Phrynichus' comedy, Misanthrope (415 B.C.) refers to himself as Timon. Prometheus in Aristophanes' Birds calls himself the Timon of the gods. Cicero calls Timon a cynic philosopher (Tusc. IV.ii), as does Seneca (Epi. II.iv.7). Pliny the elder classes Timon with Heraclitus, Pyrrho, and Diogenes (Nat. Hist. VII.19). Aristoxenus of Tarentum identifies Apemantus as Timon's companion (Diogenes Laertius, I.ix.107). Mention of the Timon story is found in Strabo (Geography, XVII. 9). Lucian's comedy, Timon the Misanthrope, "closes the tradition in the ancient world; for the few references to Timon left before the silence of the Middle Ages shut down on him add little to his story--nothing, in fact, of interest to the student of Timon" (p. 11). Wright then notes Boiardo's Il Timone (c. 1494), Galleotto del Caretto's Timone (ante 1497). Painter's Palace of Pleasure, Lyly's Euphues, Richard Mulcaster's Positions (1581), Robert Green [six references to Timon--The Cord of Fancy, Grosart Ed., IV, 40; III, 79; IV, 139; VII, 285; IX, 106; IX, 129], Spenser's Daphnaida, Nashe's Christ's Tears over Jerusalem (Grosart, ed. IV, 139), Thomas Lodge's Wit's Misery (Hunterian Club Pub., No. 47, p. 100), Edward Guilpin's Skialethia (1598, ed. J.P. Collier, Miscellaneous Tracts, p. 18), John Marston's Jack Drum's Entertainment (Act I, l. 314),

Dekker's Satiromastix (l. 2502), Shakespeare's Love's Labour's Lost (IV.iii.169), and Sir Richard Barckley's Felicity of Man (1598) (pp. 8-13).

The Yale Shakespeare's Timon of Athens (1919), Stanley T. Williams: "It is possible,though by no means probable, that Shakespeare had read two plays of the Renaissance, Boiardo's Il Timone (written about 1494) and Galeotto del Caretto's play of the same name (written about 1497)" (p. 116). On Barckley's Felicity of Man (1598): "it is clear that he [Shakespeare] took nothing from it that he might not have had from Painter's Palace of Pleasure" (p. 116).

"Aristophanes' Influence on English Writers" (1925), Louis E. Lord suggests that "Aristophanes'" [Antiphanes'?] lost Timon "may have furnished through Plutarch and Lucian some of the material for Timon" (pp. 155-73).

"Lucian and Boiardo in Timon of Athens" (1931), R. Warwick Bond: "John Alday's translation (?1566, 1574, 1581) of Pierre Boaistuau's tale in Theatrum Mundi (French trs. 1558) had perhaps a better claim to notice even than Painter's" (p. 52). On Timon, IV and V: "the last two acts of Timon of Athens correspond to the action presented in Lucian and Boiardo" (p. 57).

On Timon and Boiardo: "[Timon] exhibits distinct traces,

both in language and treatment, of Boiardo's, from which I take it he [Shakespeare] derived all his Lucianic matter" (p. 55). On Boiardo and Timon's speeches in IV:

> While the large proportion of soliloquy is proper to the subject-matter and partly represented in Lucian, the first two of those added by Boiardo in his Act I, Sc. iv and Act III, Sc. i, correspond both in position and purport to the first two in the fourth Act of Shakespeare, each of which contains an idea found in its Italian counterpart: (1) that beasts have more feeling for their kind than man for his, (2) the wish that earth would pervert her nature to man's destruction. (p. 63)

Other elements found in Boiardo and not Lucian include:

> mention of a woodland life, of possible shelter in a cave, of roots as a philosopher's food, of the change of the seasons, the fall of the leaf, and human helplessness in the inclemency of winter which the beasts are naturally equipped to meet. . . . Again, only in Boiardo and Shakespeare, not in Lucian, do we get either a re-hiding, or an abjuration, of the treasure: and the strong emphasis laid by both poets on gold as a source of mental anxiety and moral corruption. . . . Lastly, Boiardo has set [Shakespeare] the example of qualifying the base world of the Greek satirist with two amiable figures, Parmeno and Syrus, who seem to be the originals of the faithful servant Flavius and the sympathetic servant Flaminius. (p. 64)

Bond also suggests that John Florio's First Fruites (1578) and Second Frutes [sic] (1591) contain "many phrases that reappear in Shakespeare's plays" (p. 66). Bond also argues that Shakespeare may in fact have read Boiardo's Il Timone in John Florio's library.

"Aspects of Primitivism in Shakespeare and Spenser" (1940), Thomas P. Harrison suggests that FQ may have influenced Shakespeare's primitivism, as witnessed in Act IV of Timon. (pp. 39-71.

"Misanthropy in Shakespeare" (1941), John E. Hankins believes that Shakespeare would have discovered Timon's type of misanthropy, characterized by his loathing of man's bestial lust, in Wilkinson's translation of Aristotle's Ethics, The Ethiques of Aristotle (1547) (pp. 115-30).

"Timon of Athens: The Disruption of Feudal Morality" (1947), E.C. Pettet: "Setting Shakespeare's Timon against this real-life social background [the economic problems of the times], we cannot be satisfied with the common superficial view that regards him as a mere abstract type of the prodigal" (p. 323). "I have tried to show that Timon represents feudal rather than Ideal Bounty and Friendship and that he is an ideal placed not merely in an actual society of 'wealth and selfishness' but in the actual society of Shakespeare's own day, where the forces of commercialism and early capitalism were slowly and surely disrupting the values and morality of the feudal order" (p. 329).

Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies (1950), Willard Farnham traces the Timon tradition from Plutarch's Lives ("the first important classical contribution

to the story" [p. 51]), Lucian's Timon, or the Misanthrope, Boiardo's Timone Comoedia (1487), Pedro Mexía's La silva de varia lección (1540), Claude Gruget's Les Diverses Leçons de Pierre Messie (1552), Pierre Boaistuau's Le Théâtre du monde, où il est faict un ample discours des miseres de l'homme (1558), John Aladay's Theatrum Mundi (1581), Painter's Palace of Pleasure (1566), Sir Richard Barckley's Discourse of the Felicitie of Man (1598), and the anonymous Timon (c. 1600), Timon references in Robert Greene, Thomas Lodge, and Edward Smith, to, finally, Montaigne's "Of Democritus and Heraclitus" (1603) (pp. 50-67).

The Elizabethan Malady: A Study of Melancholia in English Literature from 1580 to 1642 (1951), Lawrence Babb: "Timon is not characterized as a melancholy man. . . in the classical sources. . . or in William Painter's Palace of Pleasure (novel 28). The author of the play known as the 'academic' Timon does not seem to have thought of the hero as a melancholic, although there is some incidental mention of melancholy in it" (p. 94).

Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare (1957-75) Geoffrey Bullough cites the following sources and analogues: Timon is mentioned in Aristophanes' Birds and Lysistrata. He is named in two lost comedies: Monotropos by Phrynichus (5th

century), and in a play by Antiphanes (4th century). Neanthes of Cyzisus (c. 200 B.C.) wrote a life of Timon. In addition, Timon was the subject of epigrams and epitaphs by other poets besides Callimachus. Cicero mentions Timon in his fourth Tusculan oration. Strabo names him in his Geography. In Description of Attica Pausanias writes of "the tower of Timon." Plutarch writes of Timon, in the first century A.D. Lucian of Samosata (c. A.D. 125-180) composed Timon, or the Misanthrope. It is "thought probable that Lucian got the plan of his dialogue from the lost comedy by Antiphanes. This cannot be proved, but certain ingredients may well have originated in Aristophanes' comedy of Plutus (388 B.C.)" (Vol. 6, 227). Bullough notes that Erasmus translated Lucian's Timon into Latin (the first printed edition of Lucian appeared in Greek in 1494-96). "In England in Shakesperae's time something of Lucian was known to Gabriel Harvey, Thomas Lodge, Marlowe, Nash, Dekker and Ben Jonson. Dekker indeed satirized Jonson as 'Lucian' in Satiromastix, IV,2. Jonson drew on Lucian for his Poetaster, IV,5, and for Volpone" (Vol. 6, 229). Matteo Maria Boiardo's Timone was performed in 1487. Pedro Mexia's La Silva de varia lección appeared in print in 1542: "This was translated into French by Claude Gruget (1552), and from French into English by William Painter whose Nóvel 28 in his Palace of Pleasure told

'Of the straunge and bestlie nature of Timon of Athens'" (Vol. 6, 231).

Bullough sees similarities between the manuscript Timon and Jonson's Every Man Out of His Humour, Cynthia's Revels, and Poetaster. He also compares Apemantus with Diogenes in John Lyly's Campaspe (1584). Bullough dismisses Montaigne's essay, "Of Democritus and Heraclitus" as an influence on Apemantus' character (Vol. 6, 241-42).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959) H.J. Oliver: "Elizabethan literature abounds in references to Timon's misanthropy and to Timonists; and the allusions are found in Lyly, Greene, Nashe, Lodge, Dekker and Marston, to mention only the more prominent dramatists" (p. xl).

The Power of Satire: Magic,Ritual, Art (1960), Robert C. Elliott on IV.iii.354-75: "It is a conventional wit-combat in invective, much like that described by Horace in the 'Journey to Brundisium': the contest is scurrility between Sarmentus and Messius at which Horace and Maecenas and Virgil laughed" (p. 159).

"Timon of Athens and Its Dramatic Descendants" (1964), G. Wilson Knight traces the Timon tradition from Richard Brome's The City Wit to Yeat's The King's Threshold (pp. 99-109).

"Silver at the Bottom of the Melting-Pot" (1964), Richard Morton examines Shadwell's Timon (pp. 126-50).

"Shakespeare's Timon of Athens: An Examination of the Misanthrope Tradition and Shakespeare's Handling of the Sources" (1969), Peter Pauls considers Pierre Boaistuau's Le Theatre du monde (1558) [translated into English by John Alday as Theatrum mundi, The Theater or Rule of the World (1566, rpt. 1574, 1581)], and Richard Barckley's A Discourse on the Felicity of Man (1598; rpt. 1603, 1631) among Timon's primary sources: "before there can be a re-evaluation of this play, it must be understood that indirect sources play a greater role in shaping a work for which the direct sources prove to be unsatisfactory. Because the standard sources for this play do not satisfactorily explain or account for Shakespeare's peculiar handling of the Timon legend, an attempt will be made in later chapters to single out those indirect sources which could have had a significant shaping influence" (p. 3).

Not in Timon's Manner: Feeling, Misanthropy, and Satire in Eighteenth-Century England (1975), Thomas R. Preston traces the history of the Timonian misanthrope from Lucian and Plutarch to Shakespeare and Jonson.

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "R.W. Bond's argument [1931, above] that Shake-

speare knew and used Boiardo's Il Timone [is] not persuasive; as Bond himself admits, the non-Lucianic elements of the Italian comedy do not appear in Shakespeare's play" (pp. 206-07). On Pliny's treatment of Timon in the Historia naturalis:

> No matter that he may have conflated here Timon of Athens with Timon of Phleius, a skeptic philosopher and baiter of other philosophers; the point is that he took Timon seriously. Also, he confirmed an earlier brief diagnosis by Cicero of Timon's misanthropy as a sickness of the soul, intense, persistent, and deeply rooted. In the inveteracy of his hatred, Shakespeare's Timon is in the tradition of Pliny and Cicero [Tusculan Disputations, 4:11] rather than of Plutarch and Lucian. (p. 211)

On Pedro Mexia's La silva de varia leccion (1540):

> Features of the Plinian-Ciceronian Timon, the unbending hater, appeared in various Renaissance versions of Timon's life. Of these, the most influential was Pedro Mexia's in La silva de varia leccion (1540), translated into French by Claude Griget [sic] . . . . Mexia followed Plutarch's account of events; however, he made Timon live not in Athens but in a hut in the fields. He emphasized his strangeness, isolation, and remorseless hate even beyond death. Timon's burial at the seaside was for Mexia an express gesture of his scorn of men: he chose it to be protected against them by the waves. It is doubtful, however, that Shakespeare knew Mexia's story since it was not in the partial version of the collection translated by Thomas Fortescue (1571). (p. 212)

On Painter: "Neither does Shakespeare seem to have owed much, if anything, to the story as told in William Painter's

Palace of Pleasure (1566), which depends largely on Mexia" (p. 212). On Boaistuta: "Boaistuta could have inspired Shakespeare to create some of the comic apostrophes and images of his misanthropic speeches" (p. 213). On Barckley: "Barckley's Discourse repeats and reinforces many of Boaistuau's pessimistic themes and adds others" (p. 214). "Another strong theme of Barckley's likely to have had an effect on Shakespeare's conception of the Athenian milieu is that of mutability and fortune. . . . I may add that the Discourse is also the most likely source for Shakespeare's making 'nothing' into a key of his tragedy" (p. 215). "Barckley, it appears, was of primary importance for the transmission of the moral and philosophical pessimism Shakespeare infused into his drama of ideas, a pessimism that drew on Socrates, Plato, Diogenes, skepticism, Stoicism, the Bible, the Fathers of the Church, and whomever or whatever also was appropriate" (p. 216).

Soellner believes that Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa of Nettescheim's De vanitate artium et scientiarum (1530), translated by James Sanford in 1569 (rpt. 1575) "was certainly one of Barckley's sources, as it was that of Thomas Nashe and many another Elizabethan and Jacobean satirist and moralist" (p. 216). "In all likelihood, not only Barckley but also Shakespeare knew this exploitable book, and I think that there

are indications in Timon that he did" (p. 216).

"Timon of Athens: The Iconography of False Friendship" (1980), Clifford Davidson cites Cicero's De Amicitia, "a work which specifically mentions the negative case of Timon, an unusual man without desire for or need of friends, as an example of the adverse of the ideal" (p. 185).

CHAPTER IV

PROBLEMS OF CHRONOLOGY

DATE OF TIMON

Shakspeare and His Times (1817), Nathan Drake accepts Steeven's date of the manuscript Timon comedy as circa 1600 and suggests the influence of Jonson's Every Man out of his Humour (1599). He dates Timon 1602. (Vol. 2, 477).

The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare (1821), Edmond Malone: "Timon of Athens was written. . . in the year 1610" (Vol. 13, 245).

The Dramatic Works of William Shakespeare (1826), Samuel Weller Singer agrees with Malone's date of 1610 (Vol. 8, 3).

Shakespeare's Plays (1844-47), Gulian C. Verplanck cites Coleridge and places Timon "as of the epoch of Measure for Measure, the revised Hamlet, and Lear" (Vol. 3, 3).

Shakespeare's Dramatic Art (1846), Hermann Ulrici: "Timon of Athens is one of Shakespeare's last works, perhaps his very last production" (Vol. 1, 532). He dates the play 1611-12 (Vol. 2, 411).

The Works of William Shakespeare (1851-56), Henry N. Hudson: "the internal evidence, so far as there is any, all makes for a place somewhere in the period between 1600 and 1606; the same period which gave us Measure for Measure, Hamlet, Othello, and Lear" (Vol. 8, 6).

The Works of William Shakespeare (1857-66), Richard Grant

White: "The date of the production of this tragedy, in the form which it has come down to us, is uncertain. There is an entire absence of external evidence upon that point, and also of other internal evidence than its style. This places it among the plays which we owe to the last period of Shakespeare's productive life. His work upon it was probably performed between 1605 and 1610" (Vol. 10, 204).

The Works of William Shakespeare (1864-67), Alexander Dyce: "At what date it was written we cannot ascertain; probably about 1610, to which year Malone assigns it" (Vol. 6, 504).

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of William Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight calls Malone's date (1610) "very harmless. . . pedantry" (Vol. 1, 343), but suggests no date himself.

"On the Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1874), F.G. Fleay: "[Shakespeare's] share of the play was written undoubtedly about 1606" (p. 136).

Shakespeare et l'Antiquite (1879), Paul Stepfer dates Timon 1608: "c'est-à-dire à une époque où les trois tragédies romaines étaient faites, et où Shakespeare lisait depuis huit ans au moins son Plutarque anglais" (Vol. 1, 235).

The Works of Shakespeare (1888-90), Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall: "As to the date at which Shakespeare revised the play we have nothing but internal evidence to go upon. This would assign it to the same period as Lear, Antony and Cleopatra, and Coriolanus, and, as Professor Dowden puts it, 1607 is a date which cannot be far astray" (Vol. 7, 6).

Timon of Athens (1890), William J. Rolf: "The date of Shakespeare's part of the play can be fixed only by the internal evidence of the style. . . . The date of the completion of the play by Tourneur, or whoever it was, cannot be fixed even approximately. The work may have been done at any time after Shakespeare threw it aside, and before the publication of the folio in 1623. If, as we have supposed, the play had been acted, it was probably some years earlier than 1623" (p. 14).

Shakspere and His Predecessors (1896), F.S. Boas: "it [Timon] may be dated in all probability about 1607-1608" (p. 495).

The Temple Shakespeare (1899-1902), Israel Gollancz: "Aesthetic and metrical considerations would place it [Timon] after Hamlet and before the opening of Shakespeare's last period,--that is, about the time of Macbeth, Othello, and Lear" (Vol. 29, 214).

Shakespearean Tragedy (1904; rpt. 1956), A.C. Bradley links Timon to Troilus and Cressida, Measure for Measure, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth, Antony and Cleopatra, and Coriolanus as members of the "Third Period (to 1608?)" (p. 80, n. 1).

A Life of William Shakespeare (1904), Sir Sidney Lee believes that Timon and Pericles, two collaborative works, were written in 1608, a year after Lear (p. 251).

The old Arden Timon of Athens (1905), K. Deighton: "Though the date of composition can only be inferred, the style, habit of thought, and metrical indications alike point to some date between 1606 and 1610" (p. vii).

Shakespeare (1907), Sir Walter Raleigh: "This play occurs only in the Folio, and cannot be exactly dated. It is usually placed after the four great tragedies, and immediately before Antony and Cleopatra--that is to say, about the year 1607" (p. 112).

The Problem of Timon of Athens (1923), Thomas Marc Parrott: "I suggest that Shakespeare began a play on this topic shortly after he had finished Lear--say, in 1606" (pp. 25-26).

Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama (1924; rpt. 1966), H. Dugdale Sykes: "We have a number of Shakespeare's plays written about the time (1607-9) that this play [Timon] was composed, but in none of these, nor indeed in any play in

the Folio, is there anything in the least akin to these battledore and shuttlecock bouts between Timon and Apemantus" (p. 12).

"Shakespeare's Purpose in Timon of Athens" (1928), Dixon Wecter: "we may well assume ca. 1605 as a date for the Shakespearean portions [of Timon]. . . . Middleton's slashing of the play occurred. . . within a year or two of the original writing" (p. 704).

William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems (1930), Sir Edmund Chambers: "Timon clearly belongs to the tragic period, but there is little to fix its exact date. . . . On the whole, I incline to put the work on Timon between Coriolanus and Pericles in 1608" (Vol. 2, 483).

"The Theme of Timon of Athens" (1934), John W. Draper dates the play "about 1608" (p. 20).

Timon of Athens (1934), M.R. Ridley does not suggest a date of composition: "For this there is no external evidence" (p. vii).

The Jacobean Drama: An Interpretation (1936; rpt. 1961), Una Ellis Fermor places Timon after Lear, adding that Timon "defines the theme that Lear had touched" (p. 264).

The Complete Works of Shakespeare (1936), George Lyman Kittredge: "the subject of Timon may have impressed itself on

Shakespeare's mind when he was reading Plutarch with a view to his Antony and Cleopatra [1605-08]" (p. 1046).

Shakespeare's Life and Art (1939), Peter Alexander groups Timon with Troilus and Cressida, writing that both plays were intended for an academic audience (p. 183).

The Art and Life of William Shakespeare (1940), Hazelton Spencer writes that Shakespeare began Timon, abandoned it to write Lear, and "after he had expressed the best things in it incomparably better," Shakespeare never returned to Timon (p.353, n. 19).

Shakespeare and the Nature of Man (1942), Theodore Spencer: "But Timon of Athens, which was apparently written immediately after Coriolanus (the date is uncertain; it may have come immediately after Lear)--Timon is a very different affair" (p. 179).

An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948), Hardin Craig: "In style the play is late,but possibly not much later than King Lear" (p. 103).

Shakespeare's Tragedies and Other Studies in Seventeenth Century Drama (1950), Clifford Leech: "Timon may precede Antony and Cleopatra in the actual date of its composition" (p. 114).

Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier (1950), Willard Farnham: In Timon Shakespeare "concluded an exploration of human ingratitude which he had begun, just before, in Lear" (p. 44).

"Recent Studies in Shakespeare's Chronology" (1950), James G. McManaway: "Lacking objective evidence, commentators agree on a date between 1605 and 1608" (p. 30).

Poets on Fortune's Hill: Studies in Sidney, Shakespeare, Beaumont & Fletcher (1952), John F. Danby: "Timon. . . is the aftermath of King Lear" (p. 128).

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1954), Charles Jasper Sisson: "The play cannot well be dated except approximately from its powerful, compressed style, at a late period of Shakespeare's writing, but before the new manner and atmosphere of his latest plays, during the years of his close study of Plutarch for dramatic purposes and near to the years of Coriolanus and Antony and Cleopatra (p. 910).

"Timon and the Conceit of Art" (1955), W.M. Merchant: "the fifth act. . . anticipates the more penetrating intuitions of King Lear" (p. 257).

The Slave of Life: A Study of Shakespeare and the Idea of Justice (1955), M.D.H. Parker: "It is arguable, but unlikely, that Timon of Athens was written before Lear" (p. 143).

"Timon of Athens" (1957), R.P. Draper: "Timon of Athens is a transitional play, in which Shakespeare is feeling his way towards a treatment of the subjects of evil and destruction and of the clash of the ideal and the real which is rather different from that in the tragedies [but which gives] a hint of the theme of regeneration, as developed in The Winter's Tale" (p. 200).

The Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957; rpt. 1968), J.C. Maxwell writes that Timon is "not earlier than 1606" (p. xiv). He finds a topical allusion at III.iii.32-33, "and this would perhaps be more apt after than before the Gunpowder Plot" (p. xiv).

"Did Shakespeare Use the Old Timon Comedy?" (1958) Robert Hillis Goldsmith: "Although we cannot date the academic Timon play precisely, we can be reasonably sure that it is an earlier play than Shakespeare's King Lear. . . . That the sketchy Timon of Athens came as a foreshadowing rather than as 'an after vibration' to King Lear is an attractive theory and fits the evidence I have presented" (p. 38).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "That the composition of Timon can ever be assigned to an exact date seems unlikely" (p. xl). Nevertheless, because

Timon shares Plutarch as a source with Antony and Cleopatra and Coriolanus, Oliver dates the play 1607-08 (p. xli).

"A Note on King Lear and Timon of Athens" (1960), Idabel Hyde writes that, based on Shakespeare's use of Lucian's Timon as a source for both plays, Timon precedes Lear (pp. 19-20).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner: "Bradley, I believe, showed a keener instinct than most recent commentators when he held that Timon was written immediately after Lear, in late 1605 or 1606, and that it was followed closely by Macbeth" (p. 137).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann: "the traditional bracketing of Timon and King Lear has done. . . harm. . . . the forms of Timon and King Lear are so utterly unlike that their collocation can only be misleading. . . . If a point of reference is required, the most useful would be Troilus, with which it has much more affinity than I have been able to demonstrate" (p. 20).

Shakespeare: The Problem Plays (1961), Peter Ure: "TIMON OF ATHENS (1605 or 1608-09)" (p. 8).

The Signet Timon of Athens (1965), "I agree with E.K. Chambers in placing Timon after Coriolanus as the last of Shakespeare's tragedies, written sometime around 1608" (p. xxxvi).

"The Comedy of 'Timon of Athens': A Reveling Play of the Inner Temple" (1966), M.C. Bradbrook dates the manuscript Timon 1611 and Timon of Athens 1609-10 (p. 103).

The Tragic Engagement: A Study of Shakespeare's Classical Tragedies (1968), Judah Stampfer: "Its irregular verse form and character attribution make it difficult to date on internal grounds; yet metrical tests, together with elements of imagery and tone, place it between 1605 and 1608, with resemblances to King Lear suggesting the former date" (p. 185).

Shakespeare the Craftsman (1969), M.C. Bradbrook: "the actual music for the masque (music was a tradition at Blackfriars) survives in manuscript at the British Museum, and adds to the probability that the play was completed. Described as 'The Amasonians' Masque', it is written in a hand that Dr Brett, of King's College, would date as between 1610 and 1620" (p. 164). Bradbrook goes on to suggest that Timon was written for a performance at Blackfriars, and she dates the play "late in 1609" (p. 166).

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1969), Charlton Hinman: "There is general agreement that Timon of Athens must have been written sometime between 1604 and 1609 (after Othello

but before the last romances), though whether it is really 'the still-born twin of Lear' (1605-06) or belongs rather to the period of Antony and Cleopatra and Coriolanus (1607-08) is by no means clear" (p. 1139).

The Reverside Shakespeare (1974), Frank Kermode: "The date of the play is uncertain. . . . One may. . . note the similarily between the two 'beast-gods,' in Coriolanus and Timon; and the style of the verse--though since the play is unrevised one cannot build even as much as usual on this--seems closest to Coriolanus. Without any certainty, then, one may conjecture 1607-08" (p. 1442).

"The Date and Production of 'Timon' Reconsidered" (1976), James C. Bulman, Jr.: "Shakespeare may have written Timon of Athens quite earlier than the Roman plays, perhaps even earlier than King Lear" (p. 127).

"Genera mixta and Timon of Athens" (1977), William W.E. Slights: "characteristic of the stage satire of the early seventeenth century (the best evidence suggests a date for Timon around 1607-08) is a conscious distinction between the author and his satiric persona" (p. 41).

"Timon: Shakespeare's Magnyfycence and an Embryonic Lear" (1978), Ruth Levitsky places Timon and Lear together but does not say "which came first, the chicken or the egg" (p. 120).

"Word Links Between Timon of Athens and King Lear (1978), Eliot Slater: "the word links support the view of those who consider that Timon was written at about the same time as Lear, or rather earlier; and it is a massive item of evidence against Chamber's view of Timon as a later play than Coriolanus" (p. 149).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "Considerations based on the economic and social conditions of England between 1606 and 1608 support a dating of the play in these years" (p. 203). "There is one possible topical reference [III.iii.33-36] in the play that, if accepted, goes far toward proving a date of 1606 or 1607" (p. 203). "The Gunpowder Plot made references to setting realms on fire under the pretext of religion particularly topical during the year or two following it, that is, 1606 or 07" (p. 204). On placement of Timon in the canon: "I tend to put Timon after Lear but before Coriolanus" (p. 202).

The Complete Works of Shakespeare (1980), David Bevington: "Timon of Athens appears to have been written between 1605 and 1608, and is often grouped with King Lear (c. 1605) on grounds of stylistic and thematic similarity" (p. 1250).

CHAPTER V

PROBLEMS OF INTERPRETATION

TIMON IN GENERAL

The Works of Shakespeare (1888-90), Henry Irving and Frank Marshall: "The attachment of this servants to Timon is a proof of the inherent goodness of his heart. Had he been a mere hard-hearted, selfish prodigal, he would never have had so devoted a follower as Flavius, who, although unable to save him, was able to wring from him in his bitterest mood the confession that one honest man was left in the world" (Vol. 7, 13).

"Lucian and Boiardo in Timon of Athens" (1931), R. Warwick Bond sees a similarity in Cato's death and Timon's: "this passionate assertion of the higher nature, this inability to compromise, carries something of the grandeur of the death of Cato" (p. 68).

The State in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman Plays (1940), James Emerson Phillips considers Timon's nobility: "Throughout the first three acts of Shakespeare's play there are indications that Timon is to be considered a man of such dignity and merit. . . . But the principle element in Timon's nobility is his virtue" (p. 139). "The Senate itself, speaking for Athenian society, eventually admits that Timon's virtue and nobility have gone unrewarded" (p. 140).

"Timon of Athens" (1948), J.C. Maxwell notes that Timon is ruined when the play opens: "It is customary to contrast Timon

in his prosperity with Timon after his fall, and I do not think sufficient stress has been laid on the fact that when the play opens he is already ruined" (p. 198).

Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies (1950), Willard Farnham notes that Shakespeare's Timon runs counter to Timon tradition: "When Shakespeare made Timon into a tragic figure who could not only repel but also attract sympathy and who could even win true admiration, he went counter to the main body of tradition concerning the famous Athenian man-hater" (p. 50).

Shakespeare's Tragedies (1951), G.B. Harrison: "Timon is a personification; from Reckless Prodigality he has been transformed into Mad Misanthropy" (p. 262).

"The Literature of Patronage, 1580-1630" (1952), Patricia Thomson considers Timon as patron of the arts: "Shakespeare's Timon is an excessively bountiful though undiscriminating patron. His extravagant generosity renders him bankrupt. . . . Yet at the beginning of the play he is, on the surface, all that a suitor could wish. . . Shakespeare, though fully alive to Timon's grave deficiencies, argues, in the early part of the play, a patron's case" (pp. 271-72).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann: "I do think, too, that a recognition of Timon's extraordinary emotionalism

will explain why he seems to differ so radically from the other tragic heroes. . . Timon reduces all his experiences. . . to overwrought posturing and rhetoric. . . . perhaps, then, the vagueness of his characterization serves a purpose in the analysis of unwise magnaminity" (p. 16).

Shakespeare: The Problem Plays (1961), Peter Ure notes that Timon is like Dryden's heroic characters: "We contemplate him with amazement because he goes so far; but after a while the amazement palls, just as the magnified creatures of Dryden's heroic plays--'as far above the ordinary proportion of the stage, as that is beyond the words and actions of common life'--at first may make us gasp and stretch our eyes, but later begin to languish before our desire that they should do more than just parade their excess" (p. 50).

"Timon of Athens" (1963), David Cook sees similarity between Timon and the Athenian senate: "Timon is paralleled with the Senate: each demands or assumes an unattainable absolute standard of conduct. The self-protective canker in the state is legislation by fear; Timon's canker, that of the individual, is fear of living in actuality and facing the complexity of man's condition" (p. 94).

Shakespeare in His Time and Ours (1968), Paul N. Siegel: Timon is "an idealization of the new Tudor aristocracy, which

practiced old-time hospitality as one of the feudal traditions it assimilated, spent money freely in maintaining its position and acted as the patron of literature" (p. 156).

Shakespeare the Craftsman (1969), M.C. Bradbrook compares Timon to Jove: "justification for associating him with Jove and the metal Sol in a very special way is found in the most obvious place--Lucian's Dialogue of Timon, Shakespeare's source; where Zeus sends Plutus to the exiled Timon, and an enthusiastic flatterer proposes that Timon's statue shall be set up beside Athena's with a thunderbolt in his hand and an aureole of rays" (p. 155).

"Timon of Athens" (1969), L.C. Knights writes that Timon does not say much about money: "But--and here comes the difficulty--when Timon first gives expression to his outraged feelings and curses Athens, in forty lines of invective the only reference to money is short, incidental and indirect (IV.i.1-12)" (p. 8). When Timon loses his money, however, he has lost everything: "This is what happens to Timon. When his supports are removed, 'when the means are gone that buy this praise', he is left, like Lear, with 'nothing'--nothing, that is, but a vision of a completely evil world that partly, of course, reflects a social reality, but is also an expression of his own self-hatred and self contempt" (p. 10).

The Riverside Shakespeare (1974), Frank Kermode: "Greek time, or timos, means both 'personal honor' and 'value', the price of a thing. And the noun timoria means both 'assistance' and 'vengeance.' Timon, as it were, is exploring the etymology of his own name when his criterion shifts from an assumption of personal integrity in everybody to a knowledge that everything has its price in gold and that this is the world's 'honor.'" (p. 1443).

"Theme in Timon of Athens" (1974), Michael Tinker denies Timon nobility: "Earlier critics tended to think of Timon as a noble man who, betrayed by his friends, rejected mankind entirely and became a misanthrope. More recently critics perceive that there is really nothing essentially noble about Timon in the first half of the play" (p. 77).

Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective (1976), Larry S. Champion argues that Timon's character is not flat: "Timon's character is not flat; Shakespeare attempts to give it dramatic interest through development from prodigality, to naively idealistic rationalization, to self-pity, to a hatred that grows by degrees from his desire for immediate vengeance in kind, to his denunciation of false friends, his repudiation of his homeland and his few faithful companions, and finally his awesome execrations upon the entire race and his attempts to utilize his new-found

wealth to provoke its destruction by war, repine, and disease" (p. 202). Champion also feels that Timon's character is "too rigidly drawn, both in prodigality and misanthropy, the result of Shakespeare's determination to prevent the spectators' close emotional identification with the character" (p. 217).

"Timon of Athens and the Rhetoric of NO" (1976), Marianna da Vinci Nichols examines language and Timon's character: "Obviously, silence is not an option to the poet who must dramatize negation and also portray his unredeemed absolutist as tragic. One strategy is to make language function simultaneously as a mirror of character and as a subject or theme. The result is a play filled with reiterative language about the essence of language--breath, breathe, word, speak, spirit, curse, and the like --so that speeches draw attention to themselves as rhetorical inventions" (p. 30).

"Timon of Athens and the Morality Tradition" (1977), Lewis Walker: "In the morality tradition, eating and drinking, whether in banquet hall or tavern, are sure signs of sensuality. Timon continually indulges in these two activities and encourages others to do likewise. In addition to inviting everyone to dine, he makes specific references to food and drink" (p. 163).

Walker also suggests a relation between the play's masques and Timon's character:

> the masque is central to the meaning of Timon's character and actions. By presenting the masque as a part of the banquet, the playwright has created a logical relationship between two elements of worldiness that are only haphazardly related in the moralities. . . . In Timon Shakespeare is able to deploy both in service of his artistic design by subordinating one to the other. The banquet, although it has allegorical overtones, is also a very real part of the play's action; the five senses, on the other hand, are presented in a masque that is a formal commentary on the banquet and on Timon. (p. 168)

"Timon: Shakespeare's Magnyfycence and an Embryonic Lear" (1978), Ruth Levitsky notes Timon's resemblance to Diogenes: "Timon's resemblance to the Diogenes figure consists not only in his rejection of society and of the comforts of civilization. It is also evident in his last encounter with Flavius. A significant anecdote concerning Diogenes involves his search with the aid of a lantern, in broad daylight, for one honest man. The implication is, or course, that in Diogenes' opinion no such man exists. Now, Timon aspires to just such a degree of misanthropy after his disillusionment, but the loyalty of Flavius makes it impossible for him to become the absolute cynic. . . . It is with some regret that Timon admits he must 'proclaim one honest man'" (p. 115).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner feels that Timon is a young man: "Shakespeare evidently conceived him as rather young. Timon betrays a young

man's attitude toward age when he explains the senators' refusal to come to his aid: 'These old fellows/Have their ingratitude in them hereditary' (2.2.218-19). When later the poet thinks of appealing once more for his patronage, he speaks of a work dedicated to a young man: 'It must be a personating of himself; a satire against the softness of prosperity, with a discovery of the infinite flatteries that follow youth and opulency' (5.1.33-35)" (p. 67). Soellner also writes that Timon is not a victim of any system, nor are his friends merely doing what the system gives them a right to do. All are put in a situation that tests their capacities as human beings even more than as members of a particular society" (p. 122).

"Timon of Athens: The Iconography of False Friendship" (1980), Clifford Davidson sees Timon as a magician:

> Timon's "bounty" might well have seemed on the level of the play's spectacle to function with the efficacy of "magic" which has the "power" to conjure "these spirits"--i.e., parasites--"to attend" him (I.i.6-7). But magic also involves deception or "juggling," as Macbeth and Marlowe's Doctor Faustus learned. . . . Timon thus has been like a magician attempting to create artificial bonds of loyalty and friendship. The illusion lasts as long as Timon's gold with iconographic appropriateness gives him the appearance of potence; when it is all spent, the revels at his house are ended. (p. 193)

Davidson also sees Timon as Icarus: "it appears that Shakespeare was thinking of him in terms of the iconography of Icarus, for Icarus also had 'with mountings up alofte' in the sky 'Came headlonge downe, and fell into the Sea,' when the sun melted away the feathers fixed by wax to his artificial wings" (p. 196).

TIMON--"FLAWS" and "FAULTS"

The Plays of William Shakespeare (1778), George Steevens notes the play's "powerful warning against that ostentatious liberality, which scatters bounty but confers no benefits, and buys flattery, but not friendship" (Vol. 8, 458).

"On the Dramatic Character of Timon of Athens" (1785), William Richardson:

> Shakespeare, in his Timon of Athens, illustrates the consequences of that inconsiderate profusion which has the appearance of liberality and is supposed even by the inconsiderate person himself to proceed from a generous principle, but which, in reality, has its chief origin in the love of distinction. Though this is not the view usually entertained of this singular dramatic character, I persuade myself, if we attend to the design of the poet in all its part, we shall find that the opinion now advanced is not without foundation. (p. 193)

The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare (1790), Edmond Malone lists Timon's "flaws": "1. That boundless prodigality with his Steward so forcibly describes and laments; and 2. his becoming a Misanthrope, and abjuring the society of all men for the crimes of a few" (Vol. 8, 136).

"Remarks on the Life and Writings of William Shakespeare" (1846), Thomas Campbell argues that Timon's hate has lowered him on the chain of being. He calls the character "a human mad-dog" (p. 87).

The Works of Shakespeare (1888-90), Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall: "His weakness is a facile good-nature, which leads him to make friends indiscriminately with everyone; he is not at the pains to form any estimate of the true character of those who flock to enjoy his hospitality, but lavishes upon them his riches with an unwise prodigality: for he has no thought for the future; with a careless magnificence he seeks only to gratify the momentary impulse of generosity, and although not a helpless victim to flattery, he is not insensible to the 'feast-won, fast-lost' popularity which follows" (Vol. 7, 12).

"Timon of Athens" (1926), Ralph Roeder finds that Timon's "tragic flaw" is his "extremism". He also cites Apemantus' admonishion to Timon: "the middle of humanity thou never knewest, but the extremity of both ends" (IV.iii.300-01) (pp. 453-60).

The Wheel of Fire (1930), G. Wilson Knight: "Timon's 'fault' is essential love, essential nobility, unmixed with any restraining faculty of criticism. He is spontaneous in trust and generosity. 'Every man has his fault', say Lucullus, 'and honesty is his' (III.i.30). The heart's-gold of Timon is alloyed with no baser metal of intellect" (p. 218).

> There is no tragic movement so swift, so clean-cut, so daring and so terrible in all Shakespeare as this Timon. We pity Lear, we dread for Macbeth: but the awfulness of Timon, dwarfting pity and out-topping sympathy, is as the mountain, whither we look and

> tremble. Deserting Athens, he steps from time into eternity. The world of humanity tilts over, and is reversed. We see now, not with the aspiring Spirit of Love that has scorned mankind forever . . . . Thus Timon preserves the grander harmony of loneliness and universal loathing, and fronts his destiny, emperor still in mind and soul, wearing the imperial nakedness of Hate. This unswerving majesty is a grander thing than the barbaric fury of Othello, or the faltering ire of Lear. The heart's good in Timon has seen the ungrateful and miserly greed that would coin for use the infinite of a great soul's love. (p. 242)

"The Theme of Timon of Athens" (1934), John W. Draper: "The prodigal Timon of the earlier acts seems to be rather a fool; and the misanthropic Timon of the later acts seems, if not a knave, at least an unpleasing portrait of vengeful cynicism: and yet Shakesperae clearly expected his audience to sympathise with Timon" (p. 20). The "paradox" of Timon's character is that he is "a bankrupt wastrel whose downfall we are expected to lament" (p. 21). Arguing his thesis, Draper feels that it is not Timon's extravagence alone that causes his fall: "'usury' was the immediate and obvious cause that wrecked the ancient families: and 'usury' and penalties for 'date-broke bonds' are explicitly stated as the cause for Timon's loss of his vast estates that had stretched as far as Lacedaemon" (p. 24).

An Approach to Shakespeare (1938; rpt. 1956), D.A. Traversi: "Timon is too isolated in his suffering, and his denunciation of the human environment is too extensive, too generalized,

to carry complete conviction" (p. 192).

Shakespeare (1939), Mark Van Doren: "Timon is not so much a man as a figure . . . . Our fears for him are not real. Neither is our pity for him real" (p. 253).

"The Psychology of Shakespeare's Timon" (1940), John W. Draper: "Shakespeare has depicted a psychological evolution in Timon appropriate to his actions in the original story and also to the change in point of view that the dramatist intended: his sanguine nature, through bitter adversity, gives place to the choleric, and this in turn burns out to a bitter melancholy, which possibly runs its course to madness, or at all events concludes with suicide" (p. 525).

The State in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman Plays (1940), James Emerson Phillips, Jr.: "The tragic flaw in Timon's nature is the excess of feeling which renders him incapable of reasonable action" (p. 144).

Shakespeare and Other Masters (1940), Elmer Edgar Stoll writes that Timon's emotions "are in excess of the occasion" and that Timon brings about his downfall (see pp. 20, 275).

"Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (1942), Una Ellis-Fermor: "our complaint concerning Timon is not that we do not see enough of him, but that, in spite of the length of time during which he occupies the stage, he fails to leave a deep, coherent impression of his personality . . . . There is no individual-

ity. . . . We do not know him and we do not know about him. Indeed, we begin to wonder whether he is not, himself, the greatest of the unrelated elements in the play" (pp. 280, 281).

On Timon as the play's chief weakness:

> The character of Timon is inadequate to the theme and the action does not knit together his fate and that of the other people in the play. We have no impression of greatness in Timon commensurate with the tragic experience of which he is apparently the responsible exponent, and we miss the familiar Shakespearean relating of character to society and circumstance which itself, in the Shakespearean system, gives rise to action. . . . Here is the rarest of all weaknesses in Shakespeare's work, an element which is not wholly functional; a character which does not convince us. . . . Shakespeare chose the wrong character to support the theme. . . . How Shakespeare, with his unsurpassed artistic and psychological sureness, came to make so colossal a blunder is a matter on which we dare not conjecture. (pp. 282-83)

Ellis-Fermor asks these questions about Timon's character:

> If we begin to ask ourselves some of the questions to which Shakespeare generally provides unobtrusive answers, how many of them can we in fact answer? What is the source of his wealth; is it inherited or acquired? If acquired, by what means did he acquire it? Who were his parents and when did they die--if indeed they are dead? How long has he been an orphan--if he indeed is? Has he no blood relations? How and where was he brought up? If it was out of touch with courts, why are we not told so? If in court, why is he so little aware of its pitfalls? How old is he? If he is very young, why has he not some of the characteristics of youth? Why, above all, is he not in love? If he is of mature age, why is he such a fool? And why again, in that case, does he bear no signs of the experience he must have met, above all, the acute knowledge of man that palace intrigue would have given to a strong

> intelligence? Shakespeare, who could reveal with such delicate discrimination the precise effect that the court of Cymbeline has had on each personality that has come within its influence, did not lack the skill to do this for Timon, upon whose fortunes court-life is the determining influence.
>
> Why, then, did Shakespeare, who elsewhere allows us to discover details of this kind, who builds a character into its society and uses those ties to reveal its operations, not do so here? Why did the poet who surrounded Hamlet in a web of circumstance give us this man who not only has no past but has no close connections in his present world, no parents, brothers, sisters, wife, mistress or friend? How can we imagine in Timon a man of strong and mature personality when he has not strong relationships in the present and shows no signs of their having moulded him in the past? And such a theme as this play seemed to design can only, we need hardly say, be imaged in a personality of the greatest power, the wide scope and the highest spirit and intelligence: his kinsman, in the plays that lie nearest in mood, are, after all, Hamlet, Ulysses, Troilus, and Lear. (pp. 281-82)

Shakespeare and the Nature of Timon (1942), Theodore Spencer:

> The universality, as it were, is its own enemy--it becomes mere generalization, and we may say that if Coriolanus has not enough universality to rank it with the great tragedies, Timom has too much; there is not, in the individual situation or character of Timon, any change, psychological or otherwise, that can really move us, as we are moved by Macbeth or Othello. There is no purgation, and we feel only an abstract kind of sympathy. Timon's angry disillusionment at what he sees under the new circumstances is so complete that Shakespeare's presentation of it can take only the form of a series of set pieces, of satiric tableaux, which may express a bitter arraignment of the reversal of Nature's order, but which have only a fortuitous dramatic coherence. (pp. 183-84)

"Excessive Goodness a Tragic Fault" (1944), Ruth L. Anderson: "The point of view that one may be 'too noble for the world' and so bring evil upon oneself and others carries over into Shakespeare's plays as a tragic fault. In Timon of Athens it becomes the primary theme" (p. 86). Anderson suggests that what Timon needs is "practical wisdom which gives a man penetrating judgement against such evils as flattery and permits him to dissemble" (p. 95). "He is 'undone by goodness' and the reason why he is undone is that doubt and suspect were placed in his heart too late. The play is an excellent embodiment of the practical outlook on life characteristic of the Renaissance" (p. 95).

"The Isolation of the Shakespearean Hero" (1944), Theodore Spencer argues that Timon's alienation fails to engage the audience's emotions (see pp. 313-31).

L'Humour de Shakespeare (1945), Louis Cazamian believes that Timon is a humor character (p. 173).

In "Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1946), A.S. Collins: "No man could be such a fool as Timon in respect of his money . . . . what matters is why Timon is so completely insulated from reality" (p. 100).

An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948), Hardin Craig: "Timon belongs, according to species, to a third class. He does

not know about the race, mistakes a part for the whole, wakes up too late, and gets out of bed on the wrong side" (p. 247-48). "He has no human ties and no involvements of personality" (p. 249).

"Timon of Athens" (1948), J.C. Maxwell: "Timon is not merely emotionally self-indulgent but also presumptuous . . . . It is not merely that he lives in an unreal world: he is soaring, like Icarus . . . . into a sphere that is not his as a man and a private individual. The honours he aspires to are now royal, now even divine. Right to the end he clings to these presumptions, and when he finally takes leave of the world, it is as a king manque, and with an exhortation to his macrocosmic counterpart to join him in oblivian" (p. 200). Timon's bounty "is presumptuous and must inevitably be frustrated" (p. 201).

Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies (1950), Willard Farnham: "The tragedy of Timon is that of a man who has an all-consuming love for humanity but, when he finds that he himself is not loved, lets this love turn to all-consuming hate" (p. 44). Farnham gives a sympathetic interpretation of Timon's character. He believes that the audience should forgive Timon his faults: "And when we find that the waves shed tears upon his body instead of vexing it, we see fully that Shakespeare's intention of leaving in our minds a man-hater worthy of sympathy, instead of one worthy of detestation" (p. 76). Timon's end, therefore, is to be pitied and

forgiven:

> But though Nature might not offer Timon as another paragon of her gentler workmanship, there was material in his violent being to make it proper that she should weep for and forgive his faults. It is proper that she should shed tears on his grave and forgive even those profound faults that led him finally to have unnatural scorn for the tears of suffering humanity. We are reminded that Timon's good steward when he pities his fallen master, meditates on the way "noblest minds" can be brought by vile friends to "basest ends" (IV.iii.464). (p. 75).

Farnham goes on to describe Timon as a "deeply flawed hero":

> In putting Timon to dramatic use Shakespeare apparently chooses for the first time to present a deeply flawed hero such as we have found to be characteristic of his last tragic world. He chooses for his hero a man who in the Renaissance has generally been thought unworthy of mankind's sympathy. He lets him have all the faults that have been credited to him by unsympathetic tellers of his story. He tries to make us see these faults in the light of sympathy, but does not try to minimize them, as Nature herself seems to forgive them. (p. 77)

Shakespeare's Tragedies and Other Studies in Seventeenth Century Drama (1950), Clifford Leech: "the passion rises spontaneously within the man, is part of his nature and ready to sprout in due time. It has not, I think, been hitherto noted that Timon resembles Leontes in this: his fatal weakness is the desire for munificent splendour, to which he is incited by no compulsive figure in the play" (p. 116). Earlier he is

foolish as well as liberal, blind to the nature of the situation; later he is reduced to railing, to calling down plagues on his enemies and the world at large" (p. 118). Leech also provides a list of things that Timon should know:

> He ought to be able to recognize the warm-heartedness of Flavius and the other servants, to see if for his support when at last he realizes that Flavius is honest; he should know that Alcibiades was no party to his wrongs; and, moreover, he knew nothing worse than poverty. (p. 118)

The Elizabethan Malady; A Study of Melancholia in English Literature from 1580 to 1642 (1951), Lawrence Babb: "It would not be accurate to say that Timon of Athens presents a kindly portrait of its hero. The writer is more interested in his vagaries than sympathetic with them. His psychic disorder, however, is due to a mistaken faith in human nature; his quarrel with the world is valid. The author's attitude is not satiric" (p. 95).

Shakespeare's Tragedies (1951), G.B. Harrison: "Timon is simply reckless Prodigality; he has no human relations, no wife, child, parent, friend or even mistress. He remains therefore a type for whom we may feel neither intimacy nor common interest" (p. 258). "Timon is. . . incurably an optimist with no sense of reality" (p. 259). "From the beginning to the end he is essentially stupid. . . . It never occurs to Timon to blame

himself for an elementary lack of common prudence" (p. 267). Shakespeare, in fact, "seems not to have regarded Timon as a tragic figure" (p. 267). In general: "The conception of Timon's character is another weakness in the play, for the moral values are confused and perverted; and a moral sense . . . . is an essential ingredient of true tragedy" (p. 267).

"Timon of Athens" (1957), R.P. Draper finds that Timon is "a man who is guilty of 'riot'. He does not realize . . . . the limits set to generosity by purely economic factors" (p. 196).

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme: "Professor Knight's essay . . . seems to me to amount finally to just this, a sentimentalisation of the central figure, producing a grotesque black and white analysis of the action of the play" (p. 108).

In the new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver, citing Peter Alexander, finds that Timon's tragedy "is not that he is reduced to poverty and cast off, but that the godlike image of man in his heart is cast down, and his dreams of human fellowship destroyed" (pp. xlvii-xlviii).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner: "Timon, like Lear, is brought by evil to a denial of God and his moral order and to a negation, like that of Lear upon the heath, of the difference between man and beast" (p. 138). "Timon's greatest crime in the first two acts is merely folly

in worldy matters, a folly which proceeds from indulgence in human feeling to the exclusion of reason" (p. 139). "Timon is a fool in worldly matters, but he is not evil" (p. 139). Ribner also identifies Timon's "wrong moral choice": "Timon denies the existence of all moral law and negates the difference between man and beasts" (p. 144). "Timon himself has become a symbol of death, as his invitation to the Athenians to hang themselves from his tree may attest" (p. 150).

In Shakespeare's Life and Art (1961), Peter Alexander writes that Timon's "tragedy is not that he is reduced to poverty and cast off, but that the godlike image of man in his heart is cast down, and his dreams of human fellowship destroyed" (p. 184).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann: "The 'isolation of the hero' occurs also with the Duke in Measure for Measure, with Pericles, with Henry VIII, differently each time, but one may legitimately regard this as deliberate, not as a fault which Shakespeare would have swept away in miraculous last-minute reworking" (p. 15).

"Timon of Athens" (1963), David Cook:

> In the first half of the drama Timon plays the god, far above all other men, aloof and indiscriminately munificent; in the second half he becomes the animal, alone and rejecting all fellow contact. In neither case will Timon consider or accept man's real condition. (p. 84)

On Timon's extremes: "like Richard II and Coriolanus, though for different reasons, Timon cannot bear mediocrity: he must be all-significant or a cipher; life must appear a Utopia or a Hell. Timon will not accept the human condition with its confusions and compromises. He must be more, or less, than man. If he cannot be a god, he must become a beast" (p. 92).

Shakespeare and Christian Doctrine (1963), Roland Mushat Frye: "Timon's basic error consists in focusing entirely upon one side of man's nature while ignoring the other, is that he is totally lacking in balance" (p. 204). Frye cites Calvin with reference to Timon: "'It is a goodly thing to play the philosopher in wilderness far from the company of men: but it agreeth not with Christian gentleness as it were for hatred of mankind to fly into desert and solitariness, and therewithal to forsake those duties which the Lord hath chiefly commanded'" (p. 203).

Frye also cites Luther on the pride of Diogenes, a type of pride which Frye finds similar to Timon's: "Luther's remark about Diogenes exemplifies a similar judgment: 'Such proud and arrogant wretches develop from these hypocrites that they abuse and defy everybody, even kings and emperors. They do not want honor, yet they seek honor and the worship of all the world because of their 'holiness'" (p. 227-28). On Timon's pride:

> Timon is not castigating his pride but rather feeding it, in subtle guise, with the affection of humility . . . . Luther's remark about Diogenes exemplifies a similar judgment: "Such proud and arrogant wretches develop from these hypocrites that they abuse and defy everybody, even kings and emperors. They do not want honor, yet they seek honor and the worship of all the world because of their 'holiness.'" Timon's particular affection represents much the same form of 'holiness' as that which Luther found in Diogenes, and both represent a perverse pride in debasement. (pp. 227-28)

"'Smoke and Luke-Warm Water': A Note in Timon of Athens" (1964), Malcolm Ware: "Timon's fault, indeed his tragic flaw, is his naive, all-embracing generosity; and when he finds himself abandoned by those persons he thought would be most eager to assist him in his own difficulties, the shock of reality causes an abrupt change in his character" (p. 342).

Timon of Athens (1965), Maurice Charney: "Timon seems to be on the road to that bitter self-knowledge demanded by tragic recognition, yet he never progresses any further, and the tragedy, at least from the point of view of Aristotle's Poetics, remains truncated and fragmentary. In his hysterical, martyrlike sufferings, Timon does not turn inward as do so many of Shakespeare's tragic protagonists; instead, he begins to gloat over the possibility of being brilliantly and historically revenged in a mock-banquet" (p. xxvi).

Language as Symbolic Action (1966), Kenneth Burke: "Of the three traits that Freud specifically associates with the 'anal' character (orderliness, stinginess, obstinacy), the third figures most obviously. Timon's gift of persevering in his role as the perfect misanthrope is extreme. We have just been considering the ways in which the motives of parsimony are involved. As for the sense of orderliness: It is kept in constant agitation, both by the quality of Timon's language and by the extreme slovenliness of his ways either as host or as a dedicated voluntary exile from the human race" (p. 122).

"The Last Tragic Heroes" (1966), G.K. Hunter: "Timon the indiscriminate hater of men has the same hunger for the absolute as Timon the indiscriminate lover. If we recoil from the inhumanity of the former we must also recoil from the latter" (p. 15).

"Timon's Imitation of Christ" (1966), Jarold W. Ramsey: "The formula of his tragedy is, I believe, that of a severely limited man trying to follow certain Christian moral directives without moderation, in the face of a fallen human nature, for which these directives do not account" (p. 164).

"Alcibiades' Revolt in Timon of Athens" (1967), Leonard Goldstein: "Gratitude, mercy, pity, friendship have no meaning in exchange relations, of which law is the chief expression. And it is this recognition of the nature of the new social relations

as embodied in a pitiless law, that constitutes the tragedy of the play: once Timon discovers that money-relations are meaningless, devoid of morality, he faces nothingness, and in this nothingness he cannot long survive" (p. 261).

"Timon of Athens and the Growth of Discrimination" (1967), R. Swigg:

> It is a dishonest world, and Timon, sustaining the disequilibrium of reality, is its patron and martyr. Confused, he cannot tell the difference between a genuine man and a false, between deep and spurious feelings, between words and facts. From such confusion arises the crisis of Timon and Athens . . . . The lone, bitter Timon now displays himself as the supreme, indiscriminating figure of the play, exemplifying the absurdity of generalization. He takes his limited experience of the evil in some men, inflates his partial glimpse into a total philosophy, and applies it universally, without exception, to everything: the individual, 'particular' situation is rendered the 'general' scheme of life. If Timon sees whores with wigs and paint, they become an image of the greater world of facade; if Timon sees theives, their earthly trade seems a miniature of grand robbery at work in the universe; if Apemantus wishes to lead a bestial life, Timon immediately expands the wish into prophecy of a totally bestial world preying on itself; if Timon sees one representative soldier, Alcibiades, it is a sign for total war. (pp. 390,91)

Shakespeare the Craftsman (1969), M.C. Bradbrook: "To the end . . . the figure of Timon remains ambiguous and paradoxical" (p. 161).

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1969), Charlton Hinman: "For one thing Timon's errors seem more ridiculous than

frightening, and it is hard to take very seriously the disaster to which they lead. The crimes of Macbeth and the follies of King Lear percipitate evils which plague all mankind, and are the more terrible because committed by men who have impressive intellectual and spiritual capabilities" (p. 1139).

"Timon of Athens: Tragedy or Satire?" (1969), Robert E. Morsberger: "Timon is a slave to self-centered pride; and . . . he never learns the lesson of humility. Therefore the tragedy, inasmuch as there is a tragedy, is not that Timon loses his wealth and discovers the hollowness of his friends but that he becomes incapable of love and forgiveness" (p. 64). On Timon's rage: "Timon cannot be content to curse mankind alone; he extends his hatred to curse the sun, moon, and every aspect of existence. And for what? Because his friends are ungrateful. Surely the motivation is inadequate, and M.M. Reese justly comments that, 'Timon only displays the peevishness of a child who has lost his toys'" (p. 66).

"Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Dr. Faustus" (1970), Anne Lancashire: Timon "moves from one extreme position to another, and each extreme gives him only a partial view of life. Thus, through extremism Timon rejects true knowledge of the world" (p. 39). "Faustus and Timon both sin through pride, the greatest of the seven deadly sins: Faustus through pride in his intellectual

abilities; Timon through pride first in material prosperity and then in his own bitterness" (p. 41).

Shakespeare: The Dark Comedies to the Last Plays: From Satire to Celebration (1971), R.A. Foakes: "Timon's very virtues become in a sense his vices; his generosity will not allow others to be bountiful to him, and he acts as though Plutus the god of gold were his steward" (p. 86). Timon is a "man of absolutes: completely noble, generous and free, he yet shows that bounty mars men, who may not act like gods" (p. 86).

"The Ending of Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1973), Richard D. Fly: "Timon's intransigent separation of himself from society, then, suggests when seen in the wider symbolic context of the play, the essential and timeless imperfection of man--the eternal gap between his ideals and his actual nature" (p. 248).

"Jacobean Tragedy and the Mannerist Style" (1973), Cyrus Hoy: "Timon in his exile is alone with his hate for mankind, and his periodic shouting matches with Apemantus or Alcibiades but confirm the finality of his alienation, of which he is indeed an archetypal figure" (p. 58). And alienation, Hoy notes, is "'the key to mannerism'" (p. 58).

"Theme on Timon of Athens" (1974), Michael Tinker: "It is important to stress Timon's opinion of himself in the first part of the play, because it contrasts sharply with his opinion

later . . . . Timon clearly has a high opinion of him lf at this point. But why this high opinion? Because he is bountiful, and as he says, 'We are born to do benefits' (I.ii.99-100). His high opinion of himself is unjustified, and Timon will learn its falseness all too soon" (p. 781).

On Timon's tragedy:

> The existence of Flavius gives the lie to Timon's neat little syllogism: all men are evil; I am a man; therefore, I am evil. But all men are not evil. Flavius is good . . . . The tragedy lies in Timon's inability to reject the syllogism even after its major premise has been proven false. If he accepts the possibility that man can be good, then he must also accept the responsibility to be good himself. He must give up the easy life of Misanthropos. He must accept values beyond bread--beyond the material world. And he cannot. Timon drives Flavius away . . . . Timon has not missed, but rejected, his chance to rise above himself. His self-condemnation is complete. (p. 85)

Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective (1976), Larry S. Champion: "In his attempt to create a perspective in which the personal and public flaw receive equal emphasis in which tragedy is provoked both by the culpability of the individual and the pervasive evil in the characters who surround him--Shakespeare seems purposefully to minimize Timon's sympathetic qualities; and he eliminates the anagnorisis altogether, probably intending to provide in Alcibiades the qualities that redeem humanity from Timon's general curse" (p. 203). "Timon's character is

too rigidly drawn . . . . the result of Shakespeare's determination to prevent the spectators' close emotional identification with the character . . . . Then too, the characters surrounding Timon are strangely impersonal, labeled only by profession or occupation" (p. 217).

"Timon, Cupid, and the Amazons" (1976), Robert C. Fulton, III, on the lines "No porter at his gate,/But rather one that smiles and invited/All that pass by" (II.i.10-12): "Timon's is a house of prostitution" and "Timon has come to fulfill the function of both usurer and bawd" (p. 291).

"Timon of Athens and the Morality Tradition" (1977), Lewis Walker: "Timon is guilty of abuse of the senses" (p. 167).

"Timon: Shakespeare's Magnyfycence and an Embryonic Lear" (1978), Ruth Levitsky: "If the play is an exemplum or a debate, concerned with the virtue of magnificence, as I have argued, I think we must grant that the lesson implied is the complete failure of the Stoic-Cynic conception of this virtue" (p. 118).

"Timon is Shakespeare's Athens" (1980), Robert S. Miola: "Timon's banquet embodies the confusion of democratic Athens. In similar fashion, Timon himself embodies the confusion of democratic man. According to Plato's description in the Republic, the democratic man spent all his life indulging his appetite. He bought into his home all manner of insolence, anarchy, and

waste; he rejected good advice, lavished money on unnecessary pleasures, and alternated from one extreme to another" (p. 26). Timon's "tragic flaw" is "his blindness to the necessity of making distinctions between virtue and vice" (p. 26).

TIMON as MISANTHROPE

Shakspere--His Mind and Art (1881), Edward Dowden: "The misanthropy of Timon was less a crime than a cruel disease, to which no one could be liable who did not possess a potential nobleness of nature" (p. 345).

"The Elizabethan Malcontent" (1948), Theodore Spencer: "Timon. . . after he discovers the depths of human selfishness and hypocrisy, turns into this kind of misanthropic character rather than into a malcontent. The malcontent is more actively an agent of evil than the misanthrope; the misanthrope relieves himself chiefly through words, the malcontent plans action--revenge, or rebellion--against the order of society" (p. 531).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "Shakespeare must, I think, have started from the 'fact' of Timon's misanthropy, a misanthropy for which he was proverbial and, incidentally, not admired; and the question 'What might conceivably have reduced a man to this condition?' he offered the answer 'the shock that betrayal might give to a noble but not profound mind'" (p. xlvii).

"Timon of Athens" (1963), David Cook: identifies "Timon's fury as a private jaundice resulting from his failure to buy love by means of lavish distribution of favours" (p. 91).

"Shakespeare's Timon of Athens: An Examination of the Misanthrope Tradition and Shakespeare's Handling of the Sources" (1969), Peter Pauls argues the influence of John Adlay's translation of Pierre Baistuau's Theatrum Mundi and Richard Barckley's A Discourse of the Felicitie of Man on Shakespeare's dramatization of the traditional Timon.

"The Figure of the Malcontent in Shakespeare" (1971), Robert B. Bennett treats Cassius, Jacques, Hamlet, Timon and Coriolanus.

"Shakespeare's Misanthrope" (1973), Harry Levin:

> Legend has preserved him in the posture of a reclusive curmudgeon in his prime he had personified the image of a gregarious prodigal. The problem of recreating that earlier personality, and registering the stages of alienation and decline, was one is overtake the flexibility and resoursefulness of Shakespeare himself. His philanthropist is one man, his misanthropist another. (p. 91)

"'Hate-Man Timon': A Study of Misanthropy in Shakespeare's Plays" (1978), Maryann Ruth Lisk examines Shakespeare's presentation of misanthropy in light of Elizabethan attitudes and practical stage considerations

TIMON'S GENEROSITY and FRIENDSHIP

"On the Dramatic Character of Timon of Athens" (1785), William Richardson: "He is not so solicitous of alleviating the distress of obscure affliction as of gratifying those who enjoy some degree of distinction or have it in their power to proclaim his praises" (p. 199).

"Timon of Athens" (1859), William Maginn argues that Timon is a misanthrope because he gives for his own selfish pleasure and not to please others (pp. 187-231).

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight: "If Timon had possessed one friend with whom he could have interchanged confidence upon equal terms, he would have been saved from his fall, and certainly from his misanthropy" (Vol. 1, 342).

The Wheel of Fire (1930), G. Wilson Knight: "His generosity lacks wisdom but it is itself noble; his riches reflect the inborn aristocracy of his heart; his pleasures, like his love of friends, are in themselves excellent, the consummations of natural desire and in harmony with the very spirit of man's upward endeavour towards the reality of art, and the joys of civilisation, and love universal" (pp. 210-11).

"Timon of Athens: The Disruption of Feudal Morality" (1947),

E.C. Pettet:

> But we must allow something for the necessary grand gestures and high colouring of drama, and essentially Timon is a portrait of the ideal feudal lord living up to the full obligation of bounty and housekeeping. . . . He is the patron of poets and painters; he stands in a patriarchal relation to his servants and instantly makes Lucilius a handsome money-present when it is a question of smoothing his marriage with the daughter of a thrifty Athenian bourgeois. . . . Like Antonio, he believes, for instance, in free loans as an act of charity, and when he hears that his friend Ventidius has been imprisoned for debt, he opens his purse as swiftly as Antonio was prepared to open his for Bassanio. (pp. 324, 325)

On Timon's gift to Lucilius (I.i):

> More significantly, perhaps, this feudal ethos represented in Timon is brought out by his interview with the old Athenian. . . an old Athenian lodges a complaint against Timon's servant Lucilius, now, penniless as he is, is aspiring to the hand of his daughter. This Athenian belongs by candid confession ('I am a man That from my first have been inclined to thrift') to the new cash-nexus world of Shylock, and, having brought his daughter up in an expensive style, he makes it plain in a horsedealer's speech that he is aiming at a wealthy marriage for her. His blunt request is that Timon should forbid Lucilius the girl's company. Timon, however, out of gratitude for Lucilius' past service, decides to present him with a sum equivalent to the girl's dowry, and prevails on the old man to accept Lucilius as his prospective son-in-law. Such an act of generosity is striking enough and would hardly have been introduced by Shakespeare had he intended Timon to be nothing more than a senseless prodigal. But possibly even more impressive is the clash of values brought out in the dialogue between

> Timon and the old man: for the Athenian his daughter's marriage is a mere financial transaction with the financial threat of disinheritance hung over the girl's head if she dares to disobey him. (p. 325).

An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948), Hardin Craig:

> It is wrong to think of him as a wastrel and spendthrift, for, had the world been as fine in character as Timon was, there would have been no disaster. Timon's spending was set down as a mark of his nobility in the ancient world and was so understood in the Renaissance. Let us not intrude any bourgeois parsimony into the tale of Timon of Athens. It was noble to spend, and Timon was a spender. (p. 247)

The Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957; rpt. 1969), J.C. Maxwell: "Whatever other judgements may be made on Timon, he is certainly the prodigal" (p. xxv).

In the new Arden edition of Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver notes "the noble generosity of Timon" (p. xliii).

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme: "his generosity, real and extensive though it is, is realized in terms of wealth alone" (p. 110). Citing Maxwell, Gomme notes that "the Lucilius episode breaks the similarity of Timon's response to each one of his adulators in turn: 'but at the same time it does not show the subtle corruption exercised by the materialistic spirit of Athens. Timon cannot overcome it; he can only outbid it in its currency of gold--and it is a further irony that he cannot, by

now, even do that'"(p. 110).

The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art (1960), Robert C. Elliott:

> Timon's entrance reveals him in his most characteristic stance: distributing largesse, buying love, like Lear, at so much per talent. He rescues Ventidius from creditors. . .--the tone of complacency jars. He endows his servant Lucilius that he may marry the daughter of a very thrifty Athenian. . . . Throughout the first part of the play this grotesque metamorphosis operates: nobility becomes the disgorgement of gold. (p. 149, 150)

On Timon's "indiscriminate" giving: "He is a man so victimized by the excess of a good quality, generosity, so blinded by his indiscriminate love of all humanity, that he is incapable of seeing the reality about him" (p. 152-53).

"Timon of Athens" (1963), David Cook: "His well-meaning favours knaves, smothers real friendship, and ruins his own estate, thus preventing the judicious and constructive generosity he could be offering. . . . The constant impression is that the result of Timon's ready dispensing of cash is drunkenness, debauchery, orgy and waste. . . . Timon squanders money to maintain his own conception of himself. . . . Timon's bounty is seen as a 'humour', a wilful obsession: 'There's no crossing him in's humour' declares the Steward" (p. 87).

"Smoke and Luke-Warm Water: A Note in Timon of Athens"(1965),

Malcolm Ware: "Timon's fault, indeed his tragic flaw, is his naive, all-embracing generosity; and when he finds himself abandoned by those persons he thought would be most eager to assist his own difficulties, the shock of reality causes an abrupt change in his character" (p. 343).

Language as Symbolic Action (1966), Kenneth Burke:

> If there are dubious passages, others seem better candidates for the charge. For instance, the scenes in which we see Timon's friends letting him down seem overly schematic. The movement was necessary, but it is executed a bit too bluntly. Though one might conceivably believe that Timon's former beneficiaries would abandon him somewhat, the ingratitude as here enacted seems too prompt, pat, and total. (p. 119)

"Timon's Imitation of Christ" (1966), Jarold W. Ramsey: "The general idea is, of course, fundamental to Christ's teachings: Timon's phrasing of it is most closely matched by one of His corollaries from the Golden Rule, in the Sermon on the Mount: 'And if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what hope have ye? For sinners also do even the same.' (Luke, vii, 34) and by the quotation of Christ in Acts, xx.35: 'It is more blessed to give, than to receive'--a 'rich fault,' in other words. Timon's general concept of the divine precedent for human charity is best glossed by one of Christ's first instructions to the apostles, in Matt., x.8: 'freely ye have received, freely give'" (p. 167)

"Timon of Athens and the Growth of Discrimination" (1967), R. Swigg:

> The materialistic code to which the old Athenian subscribes is typical: his daughter must go in marriage not to a poor lover like Timon's servant but to high bidders, for 'I have bred her at my dearest cost' (I.i.127). But so powerfully rife is the cash-ethic that Timon's benevolent solving of the marriage problem is as completely regulated by its rules as was the old Athenian's posing of the problem in the first place; for, to Timon all that seem to decide the question are the simple responses of feeling. . . yet, in fact, wealth is the arbiter. (p. 387)

On Timon giving gold at the end of the play: "But Timon's dispensation of his wealth a second time and with more obvious irresponsibility (in a setting independent of the Athenian commercial scene) places the guilt decisively, once and for all, upon himself" (p. 390).

Shakespeare in His Time and Ours (1968), Paul N. Siegel: "It is through his great goodness, his love of mankind, that Timon has been undone. He had the bounteousness, the spirit of giving, that characterizes gods but that causes men to come to their ruin in this world of greedy self-seeking, just as, it might be said, a deity taking the form of man suffered humiliation and agony at the hands of those who were incapable of appreciating him" (p. 53).

The Tragic Engagement: A Study of Shakespeare's Classical Tragedies (1968), Judah Stampfer: "Timon, noble, judicious, a

Renaissance prince and patron of the arts, dowers the daughter of an Athenian citizen, rescues a friend from debtor's prison, and sets him on his feet. This is not the generosity of a tough, free man, bolstering his allies and next of kin, but the largesse of a model of civic maturity" (pp. 191-92). "Timon's older humanism of friendship and the human bond is grotesquely unreal. He was not plotted against or betrayed, only flattered, sucked dry, and moved away from as beside the point. His demand for decency is as embarrassingly dated as a demand for a bustle" (p. 208).

"Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Dr. Faustus (1970), Anne Lancashire: "The Everyman nature of the play, however, makes clear that admiring Timon the prodigal is precisely what we are not intended to do. As with Faustus, we are to admire Timon's potential for goodness but to condemn his misdirected use of his powers. And Timon, like Faustus, is to be condemned not only at the beginning but also at the end of the play, for he willfully rejects, like Faustus, the proper course of action, and, asserting the meaninglessness of life, chooses eternal death" (p. 42).

Shakespeare: The Dark Comedies to the Last Plays: From Satire to Celebration (1971), R.A. Foakes: "Other men do not exist for him except as objects of his bounty, or projections of himself, and in his self-love he forbids others to give, or

even to repay. His bountiful nobility is perverted by a refined selfishness, which blinds him to the practices of others; in a way he forces his 'friends' to treat him as a fool, who, properly flattered, makes his flatterers rich. As they have used him for a gold-mine, so they cast him off when his wealth is gone, and the self-centered generosity of the rich Timon is transformed inevitably into its obverse, a self-misanthropy" (p. 86).

The Riverside Shakespeare (1974), Frank Kermode: "comparisons between the treachery of Timon's friends and the betrayal of Christ by Judas. . . . are perhaps the most remarkable single feature of the play: 'It grieves me to see so many dip their meat in one man's blood' (I.ii.40-41); 'the fellow that sits next to him, now parts bread with him, pledges the breath of him in a divided draught, is the readiest man to kill him' (I.ii.46-49); 'Who can call him/His Friend that dips in the same dish' (III.ii.65-66) (p. 1443).

Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective (1976), Larry S. Champion: "More specifically, in the early acts Shakespeare surrounds the central character with various commentators on the state of his wealth, effectively establishing both Timon's improvident nature and the avaricious duplicity of his friends and associates" (p. 204).

> Throughout the first act, then, Timon plays the role of lavish dispenser. Susceptible to flattery, however, and taking obvious pride in his ability to meet another's needs, he does so without regard for merit of his gifts or the state of his own affairs. And it is to these shortcomings, rather than to any

> virtues of largess, that the spectators' attention is directed through the remarks of the various pointer characters. (p. 206)

"Fortune and Friendship in Timon of Athens" (1976-77), Lewis Walker: "Timon's relationship with his friends is not direct; Fortune acts as intermediary. No matter how Timon expresses his idea of friendship, Fortune always plays a major role as a sort of broker between friends" (p. 588). Timon "seeks friends as if they were gifts of Fortune, thereby making inevitable that they will not be 'steadfast'" (p. 591). Finally, "There can be little doubt that in Timon of Athens Shakespeare is showing how Fortune affects relationships between human beings by presenting thorough perversion of the ideal of true friendship" (p. 598).

"Timon of Athens and the Morality Tradition" (1977), Lewis Walker: "Timon's fatuous faith in the power of wealth can be partly explained as an allegorical convention, borrowed from the moralities, to emphasize his worldliness" (p. 161)

"A Dream of Friendship: Themes in Timon of Athens" (1978), Gavin Bantock: The play is not only about misanthropy but about the nature of friendship.

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "Timon's notion of friendship. . . combines idealism and foolishness" (p. 71). "The idea of basing friendship on

(an idea that Timon does not actually practice) runs counter to classical and Renaissance conceptions of friendship. Cicero's De amicitia, the Renaissance primer on friendship, decried utility in selecting friends and declared that friendship is not cultivated because of need" (p. 71).

Soellner argues that Timon is not a prodigal:

> The pre-misanthropic Timon is too individualistic and too human to resemble the stereotype of the prodigal except in a few superficial features. He is certainly quite different from the morality figure of Prodigality in The Contention Between Liberality and Prodigality (1602) or the Theophrastian character of the Unthrift in Joseph Hall's Characters of Virtues and Vices (1608), both of which are crude and profligate. Timon's prodigality is not self-degrading, and it is debatable where his generosity ends and his prodigality begins. The prodigality, to a large degree, is an outgrowth of his warm and sensuous nature; but this nature, unfortunately, is not subject to the control of reason. In this respect, Timon's first banquet of friendship is highly revealing. As a celebration of friendship, it evokes the shadow of the Platonic banquets celebrated in the Renaissance. (p. 70)

Soellner comments on a Renaissance notion of charity:

> The breakdown of the old welfare system made many feel with Malynes that charity had grown cold and that men were becoming either misers or prodigals. If one believes tha preachers, nobody was doing his share. The position of the aristocrats, of course, made their failure most evident. It should be said that many of them did better than Timon, but aristocratic performance was haphazard at best.

> It thus attracted criticism particularly from the frugal Puritans, who disliked the conspicuous consumption of the aristocrats and their imitators. Their abundant sermonizing and moralizing on charity would have sensitized Shakespeare's audience to Timon's deficiencies. (p. 123)

Soellner, like Richardson (1785), notes that Timon gives to those who do not need his aid: "Timon does not base his actions on personal needs and wants as does the egotistic society around him; nevertheless, he contributes to the economic and moral malaise by giving to those who are not in need and who want more than they receive" (p. 111). On Timon's charity:

> Timon clearly violates the safeguards of charity as sermons and tracts postulated them. The three major stipulations were that only those in need should be supported, that the giving should be according to means and not exhaust the substance of the giver, and that it should be done without ostentation and hope of reward. We have already noted Timon's curious conception of what is "need." Timon signally violates the second stipulation, one that is explained in a Jacobean tract on charity: "We must not let flow out faster than it cometh in but still preserve the main stock." Timon's wrongheaded giving is underlined by this same image of flowing. (p. 123)

Soellner also believes that Timon's giving violates classical ideas on generosity:

> Yet even if liberality according to ancient notions becomes the measurement, Timon fails. According to Aristotle's discussion of this virtue

> in the Nichomachean Ethics (4.1-2), a discussion that influenced Renaissance notions of charity, liberality was the mean between the excess, prodigality, and the defect, stinginess: a liberal man is one who gives to the right people at the right time and fulfills the conditions of right giving. He will purchase and hold property as a necessary condition of having the means to give: he will acquire wealth inasmuch as it is a necessary condition of having the means to give. He will not deplete his substance unless it is to save his friends from ruin. According to Aristotle's definition, Timon cannot be called liberal; he practices the vice that is the excess of this virtue, prodigality. (p. 124).

"Timon of Athens: The Iconography of False Freindship" (1980), Clifford Davidson: "A putto behind the figure representing Magnanimity in the Hertel edition of the Iconologia pours forth the contents of a cornucopia with careless generosity. Hence Timon is said to 'pour out' kindness (I.i.273-274)" (p. 187).

Davidson also comments on excess and covetousness:

> As a Renaissance playwright, he [Shakespeare] could not have wished to isolate mere business matters and the tabulation of accounts as the stuff upon which his imagination might work. Timon is most certainly not a lesson in holding onto one's money, for Shakespeare surely accepts the Renaissance dictum that to have a too tight fist is far less desirable than to have a too open hand. Typical is Sir Francis Bacon's statement that 'sins of defect are justly accounted worst than sins of excess; because in excess there is something of magnanimity,--something, like the flight of a bird, that holds kindred with heaven; whereas defect creeps on the ground like a reptile. (p. 192)

"Timon in Shakespeare's Athens" (1980), Robert S. Miola: "Timon displays his tragic inability to distinguish between true and false needs, between the deserving and undeserving. Such undiscriminating liberality was not likely to be construed in Shakespeare's time as generosity, the virtuous exercise of a charitable heart. More probably, it was seen as an example of "Prodigalitie,' the vicious satisfaction of 'fond desires' for self-esteem through material possessions" (p. 24).

[See also "Lucilius."]

TIMON and MONEY

The State in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman Plays (1940), James Emerson Phillips, Jr.: "According to Alcibiades it is lust for gold, a disproportionate emphasis on material welfare, which has turned the Senate from its appointed vocation of government. It will be remembered that in Renaissance political thinking a government which ruled for its own selfish purposes, for the increase of its own wealth at the expense of others, was considered nothing short of tyranny" (p. 130).

"Patterns of Tempo in Shakespeare's Timon" (1948), John W. Draper: "modern capitalism. . . re-placing the economy of the Middle Ages; and Shakespeare, in Timon of Athens, expresses his disapproval of this change not only in the words but in the very tempo of the lines" (p. 194).

"Timon of Athens"(1959), Andor Gomme writes that Shakespeare does not know how to treat money: "The three scenes in which Timon's servants are repulsed by his false friends have a monstrous comedy in which the Lords are caricatured. They suggest that here is the material less for tragedy than for satiric comedy. And the choice of subject-matter prompts this too: as in the other play in which money appears as the dominant interest--The Merchant of Venice--Shakespeare seems not to know exactly

how to treat it. It was something that Jonson could manage perfectly, but it produced, of course, an analysis of society far less profound than Shakespeare at his greatest was able to achieve" (p. 124).

Shakespeare: The Problem Plays (1961), Peter Ure finds that much of Act III is taken up with the depiction of "the commercial world of Athens--as bad a place as Volpone's Venice--that comes under the lash in the three brilliantly varied and horrid scenes. . . which show what happens when Timon's flatterers are asked to help him out" (p. 48).

"Shakespeare and the Neo-Chivalric Cult of Honor" (1964), Paul N. Siegel: "The principle of the bond, the business contract, which has no provision for mercy and exalts the cash nexus above every tie of human feeling, governs the members of the senate who exact the payment of his life from Alcibiades' friend and push Timon into bankruptcy by demanding payment of his loans from them" (p. 68).

"King Lear and Timon of Athens" (1964-65), Jan Simko: "Timon, who was incapable of appreciating the value of money since he did not earn it by his own labour, was not aware that the time was over when 'honour' had been considered the highest virtue" (p. 327).

Language as Symbolic Action (1966), Kenneth Burke:

> Perhaps, so far as the social ingredients in our "second nature" are concerned, this play is as radical in its concerns as is the anarchistic formula: "property is theft." There is what Marx would call the motive of "primitive accumulation," a motive of self-aggrandizement tinged also by the insecurity of such accumulation, the ways in which, in effect, private property severs one's bond with others, while also putting a person in constant jeopardy of loss. The contrary impulse, to share with others, was institutionalized in many cultures, one way being precisely the "lordly" habit of sharing one's bounty with a host of retainers (a variant of such promiscuous giving as many primitive tribes exemplify by the practice known as potlach, a way of distributing goods by giving, quite as in our society we distribute goods mainly by getting). (p. 122)

"Timon of Athens and the Growth of Discrimination" (1967) R. Swigg: All values in Timon of Athens, Swigg notes, are quantitative: "The qualitative can only be seen through the medium of the quantitative, and because of this perverse confusion the finer values are degraded by their association with the materialistic" (p. 388).

"Timon of Athens" (1969), L.C. Knights: "Timon of Athens, in so far as it is a direct satire on the power of money, can be seen as Shakespeare's response to certain prominent features in the economic and social life of his own day. And satire. . . has the kind of bite that makes it relevant to any acquisitive society, our own as much as Shakespeare's" (p. 8).

Knights comments on topical economics and on Timon's invectives on money in IV.iii.1-18, and IV.iii.24-41: "All this has an obvious relevance to the England of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Professor Laurence Stone. . . documents very fully indeed the scramble for rewards at Court, the lavish expenditure on all forms of conspicuous display, the heavy dependence on credit and luck breaks, the intense greedy competitiveness of those for whom Fortune's Hill was a vivid symbol for a very present reality. There is no difficulty here. Timon of Athens, in so far as it is a direct satire on the power of money, can be seen as Shakespeare's response to certain prominent features in the economic and social life of his own day" (p. 8).

"Language and Currency in Timon of Athens" (1975), W.H. Bizley considers the medieval concept of "the bounteous presence," the vocabulary of equity and exchange, and the ambiguity of values that underlies the tragic structure of Timon.

"Shakespeare's Moral Economics and Timon of Athens" (1977), John Joseph Ruszkiewicz: The play is concerned with contemporary moral-economic theories and concepts.

"Timon of Athens and the Rage of Disillusion" (1979), Susan Handelman: "In Timon, money has replaced the mediating power of the idealized woman (Blake's Emanation which joins man

to man, but for him ultimately hermaphroditic), but instead of providing a way for contraries to mutually exist, marry, mingle, and create, money destructively converts opposites into negations of each other and Timon becomes Misanthropos" (p. 52).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "The dramatization of specious and shifting values is one of the subtlest touches of Timon. It links the play with the other'Greek' one, Troilus and Cressida, and makes both supreme documents of Shakespeare's reaction to the changing times" (p. 125).

"Timon of Athens: The Iconography of False Friendship" (1980), Clifford Davidson: "A famous classical proverb attributed to Pythagoras. . . 'Among friends all things are common,' and Cicero writes: 'there should be among (friends) a communitie of participation of al their gooddes purposes and willes without any exception'" (p. 193).

TIMON and ATHENIAN SOCIETY

The State in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman Plays (1940), James Emerson Phillips, Jr.: "Timon thought of Athenian society much as Shakespeare's contemporaries thought of society, as a hierarchy embracing all classes and culminating in 'the specialty of rule'" (p. 128). "Without exception the great misanthropic outbursts which characterizes the last two acts of the drama are directed against Athenian society as a whole" (p. 138).

"Timon of Athens" (1948), J.C. Maxwell notes that Timon cannot escape the materialistic corruption of Athens: "Timon cannot really escape it; he can only outbid it in its own currency of gold--and it is a further irony that he cannot, by now, even do that" (p. 198). "This first scene has foreshadowed the approaching fall, and has shown us in some measure how even the more genuinely fine sides of Timon's nature are corrupted by the spirit of his society, but on the whole we have so far seen him at his best" (p. 199).

On I.i: "This first scene has foreshadowed the approaching fall, and has shown us in some measure how even the more genuinely fine sides of Timon's nature are corrupted by the spirit of his society" (p. 199).

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme: "It is true. . . that the framework adopted by Shakespeare does not make possible

the kind of social analysis which appears to be being attempted. Timon is shown, I have suggested, a product of the society in which he lives, and his failure of moral and intellectual awareness is the failure of the society. But the crude outlines in which the situation is drawn give no proper scope for the irony which was one of the greatest achievements of this phase of Shakespeare's work. In fact at times the play reads like a grotesque" (p. 123).

"Timon of Athens" (1963), David Cook: "whatever Timon's limitations, his society has, of course, no justification for treating him as it does: society is, in fact, ruthlessly and painstakingly indicted in the first half of the play" (p. 88).

"King Lear and Timon of Athens" (1964-65), Jan Simko: "Timon, who was incapable of appreciating the value of money since he did not earn it by his own labour, was not aware that the time was over when 'honour' had been considered the highest virtue" (p. 327).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "As much as Timon acts counter to the practice of his entourage, he has unthinkingly accepted its commercial ethos" (p. 126). "As much as we find his extravagant spending and his wild hatred extreme, we realize that both behavior patterns are protests, the first unconscious and the second conscious,

against a society Malynes thought dragonish and Hobbes, more's the pity, natural" (p. 128).

TIMON and FORTUNE

"Timon of Athens" (1948), J.C. Maxwell: "We have the well-worn apologue of the hill of Fortune, and the hope, after a vivid description of Timon's prodigality, 'long may he live in fortunes' (293). No audience could doubt what that meant" (p. 198).

"Timon of Athens" (1957), R.P. Draper notes that Timon's fall is foretold in the allegory of Fortune at the beginning of the play: "Timon's downfall is already imminent at the beginning of the play--the state of his purse as revealed by the faithful steward, Flavius, tells us that--and the consequences of his downfall are already foreshadowed in the Poet's account of Fortune's hill" (p. 195-96).

"Timon of Athens" (1963), David Cook: "emulates the indiscriminate generosity of an abstract deity like Fortune" (p. 85).

"Fortune and Friendship in Timon of Athens" (1976-77), Lewis Walker:

> It is curious that critics, in dealing with the difficulties of Timon of Athens, have failed to consider thoroughly the allegory of Fortune in the opening scene. . . . no one has attempted to apply the allegory in any detail to the play, seeking to understand the character of Timon in terms of the ideas of Fortune it evokes. (p. 577)

Walker argues that Timon is subject to the control of Fortune:

"The Poet's description, in its insistence on the enslaving effects of Timon's wealth on his followers, does not make Timon the enslaving force. Instead, Fortune and her gifts are the agents responsible for the trouble" (p. 579). Walker ties the two mentions of Timon's military service (V.i.145-46; 158-62) to Fortune: "The playwright simply wants to show another way in which Timon's and Alcibiades's situations are similar with respect to fortune, and therefore invents some past military exploits for Timon which are clearly associated with 'fortune' or wealth and prosperity lent to men by the fickle goddess. Once he has made this connection, Shakespeare is through with Timon's military career" (p. 584). "The men who flatter [Timon] are acting as Fortune's surrogates. Although they are certainly not allegorical figures, they are more excessive in their flattery than one would expect in naturalistically depicted characters" (p. 587). On Timon giving money for his servant's marriage: "The point of this episode is that any generosity, no matter how noble, which is based on the gifts of Fortune, can have no lasting effect" (p. 588). On Fortune and friendship:

> Timon's relationship with his friends is not direct; Fortune acts as intermediary. No matter how Timon expresses his idea of friendship, Fortune always plays a major role as a sort of broker between friends. This is made painfully obvious at a later point in the banquet, when one of the visiting Lords

> voices the wish that Timon might once "use" the "hearts" of his friends, "whereby we might express some part of our zeals" (I.ii.83-84). (p. 588)

Timon "seeks friends as if they were gifts of Fortune, thereby making it inevitable that they will not be 'stedfast'" (p. 591). Timon's wealth, moreover, conspires to blind him to his friends' true worth: "Timon's continuing inability to perceive the true nature of his flattering friends probably has something to do with this idea of Fortune's shutting out the truth from a rich man" (p. 591). Walker concludes, "There can be little doubt that in Timon of Athens Shakespeare is showing how Fortune affects relationships between human beings by presenting a thorough perversion of the ideal of true friendship" (p. 598).

TIMON'S ORATIONS

"Lucian and Boiardo in Timon of Athens" (1931), R. Warwick Bond writes that Acts IV-V correspond to Lucian and Boiardo's accounts of the Timon story: "Only the last two Acts of Timon of Athens correspond to the action presented in Lucian and Boiardo" (p. 57). Bond also believes that Timon's first two speeches in Act IV are influenced by Boiardo: "While the large proportion of soliloquy is proper to the subject-matter and partly represented in Lucian, the first two of those added by Boiardo in his Act I, Sc. iv and Act III, Sc. i, correspond both in position and purport to the first two in the fourth Act of Shakespeare, each of which contains an idea found in its Italian counterpart: (1) that beasts have more feeling for their kind than man for his, (2) the wish that earth would pervert her nature to man's destruction" (p. 63).

"Timon of Athens: The Disruption of Feudal Morality" (1947), E.C. Pettet:

> In the narrower field of Shakespearian criticism the tendency has been to explain these outbursts as the outcry of an extravagant, distorted misanthrope--and, of course, Timon applies this label to himself--awakened too late to a realization of 'man's ingratitude'; and this explanation has often been plausibly reinforced by the suggestion that Shakespeare himself was still in the black depression of his tragic period and had lost all grip of himself and his art. However, with due respect

> for the insight of proverbial comment and for a well-established critical view, we must reject both of these interpretations. As the Timon of the first Act is not an abstract type of the prodigal but an ideal feudal lord, the representatives of specific medieval values, a dispenser of feudal bounty, so the Timon of the last two Acts is not a symbol of savage rage and timeless misanthropy or of protest against human ingratitude but a man shattered and disillusioned to the point of madness by his discovery that the traditional beliefs he has lived by are no longer the beliefs of the world around him. (p. 328-29)

"Timon of Athens" (1957), R.P. Draper comments on Timon's speech at the start of IV.iii:

> It is here that the ambiguity of "gold" contributes the play's meaning, far more even than it contributed to The Merchant of Venice. Timon's idealistic communism belongs to the Golden Age, but he lives in the Iron Age, when as Ovid paradoxically said, gold was first discovered--gold, that is, in the sense of material wealth and all the abuses that go with it. In his disillusionment Timon sees this kind of gold as the source of all evil, that which undermines order, subverts all values, and levels all distinctions. This is expressed by Timon in his devastating soliloquy at the beginning of IV.iii in language strongly reminiscent of Lear in his madness. But in this speech there is even more than the perception of disorder; there is a feeling of revulsion against mankind. Timon's disgust goes so far that it causes him to identify human life with principle of corruption. Images of fertility run through the speech, but counteracted by images of disease and degradation. Timon's very prayer to the sun is a contradiction of the two adjectives with which he qualifies the sun. . . . Using ambiguities which alchemy also caused to be attached to gold (the alchemists claimed

> that the philosopher's stone would cure veneral disease and "make old bawds young") Timon speaks of the transmuting power of gold--though the point of his speech is that it is not gold that really transmutes, but its corrupting influence that makes men love disease for the sake of gold. (p. 196-97)

"Acts IV and V of Timon of Athens" (1959), Winifred M.T. Nowottny comments on Timon's oration at IV.i.1-41: "The first diatribe (IV.i.i-41) calls for the subversion of the degrees and duties of ordered society and its conclusion decisively rejects the 'accommodations' of civilization in the words 'Nothing Ile beare from thee/But nakednesse, thou detestable Towne'" (p. 493).

"The second diatribe (IV.iii.1-23) is an exposure of the falsity of the myth of Order and a restatement of the structure of society as a function of Fortune operating upon the basic villainy of man's nature; it reaches its climax, just before the discovery of the gold, in a call for the destruction of mankind. The gold provokes a third diatribe (IV.iii.26-47), in which gold as a symbol of Fortune is seen as confounding abstract categories of value and as transforming or transferring human attributes. This progression from a repudiation couched in terms of society's own current myth, to the construction of a new myth of Fortune and man's villainy, and thence to the discernment that the physical substance of gold. . . has the powers,

usually attributed only to the divine, of conferring blessing and the attraction of adoration and veneration" (p. 493-94).

On IV.iii.176-96: "Timon. . . discovering that though he is sick of man's unkindness, is still prompted by Nature to eat, turns to scrutinize her and addresses her as the "Common Mother", the main drift of the speech being that Nature is indifferent, neutral, showing no principle of discrimination, whether between the 'proud Childe (arrogant man)' and the 'venom'd Worme', or between the normal and what is 'abhorred'; she merely 'Teemes and feeds all'" (p. 496).

IV.iii.329-49: "Timon is moving towards inversion of the whole argument from'the book of the creatures' and indeed towards inversion of the whole argument from 'correspondences'" (p. 490).

IV.iii.376-93: "he speaks of his sickness with 'this false world', the phrase sums up not only his experiences of so-called friendship but also his vision of a world devoid of any true source of values (whether in society, man or nature) and he immediately goes on, as indeed the inner logic of his repudiation demands, to address that power which he now discerns to be greater than anything in the world, namely, his gold--seen, now, as cancelling every bond between man and what is godlike. . . and finally as being itself, impossibly, a god" (p. 496).

On the speech on universal thievery (IV.iii.427-53):

"the myth of Natural Law is challenged by the myth of Natural Thievery, just as the myth of Order in society was challenged by the myth of Prostitution" (p. 497).

The Life of Timon of Athens (1965), Maurice Charney: "Timon's soliloquy outside the walls of Athens in the next scene (IV.i) has none of the meditative soul-searching qualities of the soliloquies in Hamlet or Macbeth; it is purely an oration by one with no onstage audience. Timon's vision of chaos in this scene is so radical that it fails to be convincing. It is perhaps not more extreme than Lear's speeches on the heath, but it has no psychological terror and passion to support the violent rhetoric, and the intensity of the language seems to be separated from any occasion which might have caused it. This leads to some odd side-effects, even to an irreverent feeling of sick humor in some of the most hysterical imprecations" (pp. xxvii-xxviii).

"Why the Sweets Melted: A Study in Shakespeare's Imagery" (1965), C.H. Hobday compares Timon's speech (III.vi.82-93) to Richard III's speech on flatterers (Richard III, I.iii.47-53): "The two passages have several terms in common, but their effect is totally different. Richard's speech is fundamentally comic. . . . Timon's speech. . . is profoundly tragic" (p. 4).

Language as Symbolic Action (1966), Kenneth Burke: "Invective, I submit, is a primary 'freedom of speech,' rooted extralinguistically in the helpless rage of an infant that states its attitude by utterances wholly unbridled. In this sense, no mode of expression could be more 'radical,' unless it be the closely allied motive of sheer lamentation, undirected wailing. And perhaps the sounds of contentment which an infant makes, when nursing or when being bedded or fondled, mark the pre-articulate origins of a third basic 'freedom,' praise" (p. 120).

"Timon of Athens" (1969), L.C. Knights comments on topical economics and Timon's invectives on money in IV.iii.1-18, and IV.iii.24-41: "All this has an obvious relevance to the England of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Professor Laurence Stone. . . documents very fully indeed the scramble for rewards at Court, the lavish expenditure on all forms of conspicuous display, the heavy dependence on credit and lucky breaks, the intense greedy competitiveness of those for whom Fortune's Hill was a vivid symbol for a very present reality. There is no difficulty here. Timon of Athens, in so far as it is a direct satire on the power of money, can be seen as Shakespeare's response to certain prominent features in the economic and social life of his own day" (p. 8).

"Shakespeare's Misanthrope" (1973), Harry Levin: "he [Timon] cannot be said to have moved from one extreme to the other through the medium of introspection; nor does he, as an ascetic hermit, engage his thoughts in spiritual meditation. The first scene of IV constitutes a soliloquy merely because, for the first time it would seem, he stands alone" (p. 92).

Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective (1976), Larry S. Champion also notes Timon's speech at the start of Act IV.i: "Renouncing his homeland. . . Timon delivers his first soliloquy as he looks back upon the walls of Athens. In a vicious malediction he calls for the destruction of the city and of all mankind through an inversion of values that would produce incontinent matrons, disobedient children, rebellious slaves, defiled virgins, murderous bankrupts and heirs, and universal impiety to the gods. He appeals further for plagues, infectious fevers, sciatica, and general leprosy to descend upon the race" (p. 210).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "Nobody before or since has ever drawn up such awe-inspiring rhetoric, and the question arises regarding what resources Shakespeare drew on for this art" (p. 137). Soellner then suggests influence from Christian pessimistic tradition:

> Shakespeare's success in the rhetoric of cosmic destruction, I believe, derives to a large degree from his skillful adaption of Christian pessimistic traditions of nature and their incor-

> poration into the cosmic curses conventional in tragedy. (p. 138)

Specifically, Soellner suggests that Shakespeare is working here in the contemptus mundi tradition (p. 138).

TIMON'S TRANSITION

Shakespeare (1939), Mark Van Doren: "Timon's transformation is from a madman to a fool, from a flashing phoenix to a naked gull . . . . The author's interest is entirely confined to the absolutes of Timon's illusion and disillusion. Not only has he taken no pains to motivate his hero's change of mind, for the episode of the friends' ingratitude is perfunctory; he has taken no pains whatever to put more than lyric force into Timon's utterances before and after. The play is two plays, casually joined at the middle" (p. 249).

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme: "Timon has failed to achieve a proper response to his situation: his failure is at once an intellectual and a moral one. And the result, when the crisis comes, is the catastrophic slide from one end of the (same) scale to the other. As far as Timon is concerned the transformation is astonishingly abrupt (though not, I think, unconvincingly so): in one short scene the whole direction of his general attitude is reversed. From him we get nothing more in preparation for the desperation of the final acts" (p. 115).

The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art (1960), Robert C. Elliott: "Timon's abrupt plunge into misanthropy is psychologically and dramatically sound. He is a man of excess; from

his cave he repeats the excesses of his court, substituting hate for love, but dealing out gold as lavishly as before" (p. 156).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner:

> The action was designed to stress the scenes of Timon's misanthropic fury beside his cave, and this part of the play is in its most complete state. Shakespeare did not fill in details of the subplot which might have made the parallel between Timon and Alcibiades more clear, and he did not develop a reason for Timon's degeneration which would be dramatically as satisfying as his explanation of the suffering of Lear. (p. 138)

"Shakespeare's Misanthrope" (1973), Harry Levin:

> The first three acts attempt to trace, so to speak, the etiology of Timon's malaise. The treatment is somewhat diagrammatic, as in a morality play. Instead of the psychological insight that revealed step by step, how Macbeth could become steeped in blood or an Othello corrupted by unworthy suspicions, we are confronted with the overt theatricalism of a Leontes overcome by jealousy in a single instantaneous seizure. (p. 91)

Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective (1976), Larry S. Champion;

> Indeed, Shakespeare pointedly does not portray Timon in those moments curcial to his decision to turn his back upon society and all his acquaintances. In II,ii he does admit that his steward has repeatedly warned him of the mounting difficulties and dangers of his excessive liberality, only to be rebuked for his efforts. Here, however, he is still convinced that his friends, as soon as they are informed of his plight, will quickly and graciously

> leap to his support; if he has acted 'unwisely', he has not given 'ignobly' (171); and now he expects to reap the benefits of having associates who will be anxious to return his kindness. Then, abruptly, on his next appearance Timon has become a raging demon whose fury and venom, broadcast upon all in earshot, are as immoderate and ill-advised as his earlier prodigality. (p. 209)

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner:

> Renaissance psychology had no problems in explaining sudden and astonishing metamorphoses of the kind undergone by Shakespeare's tragic heroes including Timon: it attributed them to changes of humor. In terms of humor physiology and psychology, Timon is transformed form the sanguine complexion with its high spirits, joie de vivre, and hearty hospitality into a frenzy of choler, which, like other extreme humoral states, can be described as melancholy, the "melancholy adust" that comes from the burning of the original humor. (p. 65)

> Timon's feeling of joy and elation, of happiness among his friends, gives way when his illusion of their goodness is shattered and they, whom he really entertained and overwhelmed with gifts, become merciless creditors. His nausea turns into universal hatred. If it is argued that the "ordinary" ingratitude of Timon's friends is not a serious enough cause for such a change, the argument betrays a rather complacent attitude about human wickedness and about violations of basic social mores and codes. Timon is justified in conceiving this ingratitude as symbolic of general human evil rather than as a commercial meanness restricted to one time and place. (p. 76)

TIMON--APPEARANCE AND REALITY, WORDS AND REALITY

Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature (1846), A.W. Schlegel:

> Timon was a fool in his generosity; in his discontent he is a madman; he is everything wanting in the wisdom which enables a man in all things to observe the due measure. Although the truth of his extravagant feelings is proved by his death, and though when he digs up a treasure he spurns the wealth which seems to tempt him, we yet see distinctly enough that the vanity of wishing to be singular, in both the parts that he plays, had some share in his liberal self-forgetfulness, as well as in his anchoritical seclusion. (p. 418)

"Timon and the Conceit of Art" (1955), W.M. Merchant:

> decitful appearance, is attached to the character of Timon himself; in his generosity he is not what he seems, and criticism, when it is directed for the first time against him, is made not in the comparatively neutral terms of art, which Timon has used in the opening scene, but with the theological overtones of sin and judgment . . . . Timon is involved . . . in the same condemnation as his treacherous friends; that, even though it be in a lesser degree, he too is but "out-side", appearance not fulfilling the ideal which he professes . . . . Timon's dark condemnation of painting, that in its rendering of reality, searching below superficial appearance, it exceed nature, has had an early, ironic fulfillment. Men are certainly not what they seem; they are treacherous, self-seeking flatterers. But neither is Timon what he seems; his generosity has in its excess become corrupted into prodigality and "riot". (pp. 253, 254).

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme: "Timon, because he has committed himself to making the outside the sign of the in, to taking the outside as the whole of the man, when he makes his wrongs his outsides, cannot wear them carelessly and does bring his heart into danger" (p. 113).

The Hyacinth Room: An Investigation into the Nature of Comedy, Tragedy, & Tragicomedy (1964), Cyrus Hoy: "The lack of congruence between words and intentions, not to say words and deeds, is as crucial to the tragedy of Othello as the tragedy of Hamlet or Lear or Timon of Athens" (p. 165).

"Timon of Athens and the Growth of Discrimination" (1967), R. Swigg: "Just as the unfeeling Senate disposes of a condemned man 'in a few words' (III.v.97), so Timon, with his strange irresponsibility towards reality, disposes of his lands 'in a breath.' Because of this, the validity of the spoken word under Timon is weakened by its divorce from reality" (p. 389).

On painting in I.i.159: "'Painting' here hovers between meaning that which concerns man's 'nature' and that which most reveals it, whether the 'nature' so concealed or revealed is evil or good. But Timon chooses the 'outside' man who conceals his inner nature, and affirms the code of surface-living subscribed to by Athens" (p. 390). When Timon talks about art to the Poet and the Painter in the last act, "It is here, under the heading

'art' (both as a deceptive skill and as straightforward, true 'being'), that evil and good, appearance and reality, are drawn together in a new conjunction" (p. 393).

"Jacobean Tragedy and the Mannerist Style" (1973), Cyrus Hoy: "With its tragic sense of the contradictory nature of things, of the appalling chasm that separates appearance from truth, the play is in fact one of Shakespeare's most mannerist performances, and its mannerist features extend to the different degrees of reality which it exhibits" (p. 60).

"Timon of Athens and the Rhetoric of NO" (1976), Marianna da Vinci Nichols:

> Timon of Athens is about language, as Hamlet is about action and Othello about sexual jealousy. Timon treats words as realities rather than as symbols for reality, taking his heroic stance as rigid idealist incapable of ordinary discourse and therefore vulnerable to ordinary men . . . . The . . . absolutist view of language in the late acts with their sweeping lyrical speeches confirms him as deluded about the nature of reality. Then, no longer a rich courtier, he is unaware that the relation of words to action has been severed. Rhetoric becomes the only obstacle between Timon and self knowledge; words build up the walls of his solitude, a universe of barrenness, sterility and beastliness. (p. 30)

TIMON as IDEALIST

Shakespeare and His Times (1817), Nathan Drake: "The inherent goodness of Timon on the one hand, and his avarice of praise and flattery on the other are vividly brought out through the medium of his servants" (Vol. 2, 448). "They, in their humble intercourse with their master, have intimately felt the native benevolence of his disposition, and, to the disgrace of those who have revelled in his bounty, are the only sympathizers in his fate" (Vol. 2, 449).

The Dramatic Works of William Shakspere (1826), Samuel Weller Singer: "Shakspere seems to have entered entirely into the feelings of bitterness which such conduct was likely to awaken in a good and susceptible nature, and has expressed it with vehemence and force" (Vol. 8, 2).

Shakespeare's Dramatic Art (1846), Hermann Ulrici gives this sketch of Timon:

> To idealize is the vital principle of his mental activity. Thus has he idealized himself first of all not subjectively only, but likewise, objectively; his acts are in perfect conformity with his thoughts. . . . This idealizing humour, this exuberance of fancy and feeling, bring him eventually to a complete knowledge of himself. (p. 240)

The Works of William Shakespeare (1872), Henry N. Hudson writes that Timon's liberality "proceeds from an ideal and perhaps somewhat self-willed view of mankind. . . . And because his love thus proceeds upon ideal grounds, therefore, when the revulsion comes he is equally undiscriminating and self-willed in his hate" (Vol. 8, 18-19).

A Study of Shakespeare (1880), Charles Swinburne: "Timon is doubtless a man of far nobler type than any monomaniac of the tribe of Macarius, but his immeasurable superiority in spiritual rank to the hermit fathers of the desert serves merely to make him a thought madder and a grain more miserable than the whole thebaid of Christomaniacs rolled into one" (p. 213).

Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art (1881), Edward Dowden contrasts Alcibiades' practicality to Timon's idealism: "Shakspere. . . remains remote and unmoved in the presence of such a practical, succesful, unideal character [Alcibiades]. We discern that in his secret heart he knew there was a more excellent way. 'The children of this world,' Shakspere would say, 'are wiser in their generation than the children of light.' Let us borrow from the children of this world the secret of their success. Yet we cannot go over to them; in spite of danger and in spite of weakness, we remain the children of light" (p. 349).

Shakspere and His Predecessors (1896), F.S. Boas:

> But Timon's fatal error at this crisis is that he does not stop to consider how far he is himself accountable for what has happened, and whether there is any surer way into men's hearts than prodigal hospitality. His idealism of nature proves his ruin, for, wrenched out of its original shape, it recoils in the form of savage hatred of humanity. (p. 499)

The Wheel of Fire (1930), G. Wilson Knight:

> Timon himself is the flower of human aspiration. His generosity lacks wisdom, but is itself noble; his riches reflect the inborn aristocracy of his heart; his pleasure, like his love of friends, are in themselves excellent, the consummations of natural desire and in harmony with the very spirit of man's upward endeavour towards the reality of art, the joys of civilization, and love universal. Timon's world is poetry made real, lived rather than imagined. . . . He would build a paradise of love on earth. . . . Timon is a universal lover, not by principle but by nature. His charity is never cold, self-conscious, or dutiful. He withholds nothing of himself. . . . his chance of doing good to his servant whose lack of wealth forbids his desired marriage is one of those god-sent adventures in kindness that make the life of Timon a perpetual romance. His heaven is to see the young man's eyes brimming with joy. (p. 211-12)

"The Theme of Timon of Athens" (1934), John W. Draper: "If usury then was responsible for. . . social disintegration and the misery it entailed, one can easily see why Antonio and even Timon were so sympathetic to an Elizabethan audience, which saw itself, like them, in the clutches of griping creditors" (pp. 26-27).

An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948), Hardin Craig: "Timon is the completely fine gentleman of antiquity who suffers a destructive shock when he finds out what his beloved fellowmen are really like" (p. 248).

"Timon of Athens" (1948), J.C. Maxwell, tracing the play's critical fortunes, notes that Van Doren (1939), and G.W. Knight (1930) had sentimentalized the play and that Oscar Campbell's (1943) criticism is in a part a reaction against this sentimentalization (p. 205).

Shakespeare's Tragic Fortune: The World of His Final Tragedies (1950), Willard Farnham:

> For by the Christian standard Timon's terrible wrath is evil, not righteous, and Shakespeare's age was Christian enough to assume, that the possessor of such wrath makes in gross form the error of confusing the sin with the sinner and hating the wrongdoer instead of the wrong done. . . . Many pre-Shakespearean writers of the Renaissance condemn the Timon of legend for his sinful and unnatural hatred of mankind. In Shakespeare's Timon there is all that these writers condemn, and it is given a new awfulness; but it is also given nobility. . . . In the comments of critics there is a violent conflict of aversion and admiration for Timon, and this conflict may be taken as a measure of the paradox in his character. (p. 47, 48)

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme:

> The sentimentalisation of Shakespeare's 'noble heroes' is a process to which people seem to be continually attracted. It stems presumably from a perhaps unconscious feeling that we are, in a tragedy, being invited always to feel with the 'hero', even to identify ourselves with him, and the consequent desire to think as well of him as possible. . . . And Professor Knight's essay, the only considerable recent attempt that I know to establish the play as a complete and major work of art, seems to me to amount finally to just this, a sentimentalisation of the central figure, producing a grotesque black and white analysis of the action of the play. (p. 108)

Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "Timon is, in fact, not presented as an ideal, any more than are the other tragic heroes: indeed, ideal heroes probably do make tragedy impossible" (p. xlv).

The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art (1960), Robert C. Elliott: "The many references to Timon's nobility must be discounted by our awareness of who utters them and why, and Timon himself must seem more gullible than heroic" (p. 153).

Shakespeare and Christian Doctrine (1963), Roland Mushat Frye: "Hooker. . . declares that it is a part of men's natural endowment that their duty is 'no less to love others than themselves.' . . . Timon utterly ignores this aspect of his relation to others, though it was accessible to him through natural

reason, even apart from revealed theology" (p. 202). "Timon's basic error consists in focusing entirely upon one side of man's nature while ignoring the other, so that he is totally lacking in balance" (p. 204).

"Shakespeare and the Neo-Chivalric Cult of Honor" (1964), Paul N. Siegel: "Timon is not, as Pettet says: '. . . a portrait of the ideal feudal lord living up to the full obligation of bounty and housekeeping'; he is rather an idealization of the new Tudor aristocracy, which practiced old-time hospitality as one of the feudal traditions it assimilated, spent money freely in maintaining its position, and acted as the patron of literature" (p. 66).

"Timon of Athens and the Growth of Discrimination" (1967), R. Swigg: "Just as the unfeeling Senate disposes of a condemned man 'in a few words' (III.v.97), so Timon, with his strange irresponsibility towards reality, disposes of his lands 'in a breath.' Because of this, the validity of the spoken word under Timon is weakened by its divorce from reality" (p. 389).

Shakespeare in His Time and Ours (1968), Paul N. Siegel:

> It is through his great goodness, his love of mankind, that Timon has been undone. He had the bounteousness, the spirit of giving, that characterizes gods but that causes men to come to their ruin in this world of greedy self-seeking, just as, it might be said, a deity taking the form of man suffered humiliation and agony at the hands of those who were incapable of appreciating him. (p. 53)

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "Timon. . . is the equivalent of an aristocrat or at least a member of the upper gentry in Shakespeare's England, a man whose wealth depends primarily on land" (p. 118).

The Complete Works of Shakespeare (1980), David Bevington: "Timon differs from us chiefly in being an idealist, in expecting that men will repay kindness with gratitude. We know, as do Timon's sympathetic servants, that most men are not like that" (p. 1251).

TIMON as SATIRIST

The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art (1960), Robert C. Elliott finds that both Timon and Apemantus are satirists: "To identify both Timon and Apemantus as satirists is by no means, of course, to imply that they are identical" (p. 165).

"Genera mixta and Timon of Athens" (1977), William W.E. Slights argues that Timon is Shakespeare's satiric persona (p. 41). Yet Slights goes on: "It is impossible to expose Timon because mask and self have become one and the same" (p. 55).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner argues that Timon is not a satirist: "Timon is a pessimist, a nihilist, a prophet of annihilation; above all, he is a misanthrope. Among Shakespeare's heroes, who are all extremists, he is the most extreme; to call him a satirist is to put him into a frame from which he breaks" (p. 19).

TIMON AS CHRIST

The Wheel of Fire (1930), G. Wilson Knight: "Timon, in love or hate, bears truly a heart of gold. He is a being apart, a choice soul crucified. . . . when Timon's servants part to wander abroad separated, they are as disciples of the Christ meeting after the crucifixion" (p. 235).

"Acts IV and V of Timon of Athens" (1959), Winifred M.T. Nowottny: "Timon. . . repudiates. . . society at its very foundation and preaches as Anti-Christ his ironic message of salvation" (p. 497).

Shakespearean Tragedy (1962), Roy W. Battenhouse writes of the "Man-centered Greekish analogue which unwittingly apes Christian charity" (p. 92).

Shakespeare and Christian Doctrine (1963), Roland Mushat Frye: "If it is at all relevant to make theological commentary on Timon, it will certainly not be that he is a type of Christ. He will scarcely even appear to be a type of normal humanity" (p. 178). "While Shylock hates one man, Timon hates all men. In view of this fact, it is particularly puzzling to find Timon referred to by the theologizers as a type of Christ" (p. 178).

"Timon's Imitation of Christ (1966), Jarold W. Ramsey: "Timon before his ruin is a rather foolish, single-minded, will-

fully blind, but morally blameless character; in his 'allegorical' mode, he stands for an extreme version of Christian morality which seems not to admit compromises, though human nature demands it" (p. 166).

Ramsey assigns a Christian interpretation to the following incidents in the play: Timon's "friends" deny him three times and Peter denies Christ three times (p. 168); he calls Timon's throwing water at his guests in III.vi a "mockery of the baptism ritual" (p. 168); in IV.ii.17-25 Ramsey recognizes Timon's servants as his "apostles" (p. 169); IV.ii.37-41 "sums up the injustice of and the grim Christian paradox of Timon's ruin" (p. 169); in IV.iii.472-74 "Flavius identifies" Timon's "parallel to Christ even more explicitly" (p. 169); Ramsey sees similarity between Timon's cave and Christ's tomb:

> In this final phase of Timon's parody of Christ, after his rejection by men, he dwells for a time in a suggestive cave, emerging to condemn all humanity. And the parodic pattern is completed when, instead of rising from the cave to be transfigured, he descends from it to be merely obliterated in the sands of the seashore. (p. 169)

Shakespeare in His Time and Ours (1968), Paul N. Siegel:

> The representation of Timon as Christ image reaches its climax in a scene whose significance has not been realized, that is, the scene in which his creditors beset Timon on all sides. "Creditors? Devils!" he exclaims (III.iv.105). In both

> the medieval allegories of the debate between Justice and Mercy and in the numerous medieval versions of Satan's suit before the divine tribunal for the souls of men due him, Christ was represented as paying the debt of man to the Devil, who frequently appeared as a usurer. . . . Timon, urging his creditors in his anguish to cut out his heart and tell out his blood to satisfy the debt which he has contracted because of his love of man, recalls, like Antonio, baring his chest to give "this devil" Shylock (IV.i.287) his pound of flesh, the crucifixion of Christ. (p. 54)

"The Ending of Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1973), Richard D. Fly: "And if allusions to Christ are occasionally suggested in the early scenes of the play, Timon's diatribes here in the final moments reverberate against the Gospel story. Timon now appears, as Winifred M.T. Nowottny first observed, as a kind of Anti-Christ preaching to his supplicants an 'ironic message of salvation'" (p. 247).

"Jacobean Tragedy and the Mannerist Style" (1973), Cyrus Hoy:

> Timon, with his huge invective against mankind, is acting on the injunction of Edgar at the close of Lear, speaking what he feels, not what he ought to say, and achieving thereby a rare coherence of intention and word whose only precedent hitherto in Shakespearian tragedy has been Cordelia, with her refusal to speak other than as she feels. But the achievement is totally self-destructive, and Timon ends as some monstrous parody of Christ: one who dies for hate of mankind. (pp. 59-60).

TIMON AS TOPICAL FIGURE

"Shakespeare's Purpose in Timon of Athens" (1928), Dixon Wecter identifies Timon as Essex:

> I propose to set forth several curious similarities between Shakespeare's Timon and Robert Devereaux, Second Earl of Essex. I do not maintain the previous thesis that Timon is in every particular a faithful portrait of the Earl, but rather that in building up the character of the Athenian lord Shakespeare wrote into the play the Southampton judgement on the crying injustice of the Essex affair. (p. 707)

Shakespeare's Military World (1956), Paul Jorgensen:

> It is perhaps no mere coincidence that one of the ablest "disintegrative" explanations for the rough condition of Timon of Athens as a play is based upon a partial identification of Timon with Essex. In "Shakespeare's Purpose in Timon of Athens", Dixon Wecter proposed that Shakespeare originally wrote "a full five-act play, probably not much inferior to Coriolanus, and that this play some time before the publication of the Folio suffered deliberate mutilation" . . . . In defense of Wecter's contention, it can be said that his reconstruction of Timon's character is closer to Essex's real nature than is to be found on most attempts of this sort. (pp. 279-80, 281)

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner finds a similarity in Timon and James I:

> Timon also fails the third test of charity, to "cast in secret, as on the waters, not to be seen

and praised of men, for that is mere hypocrisy." He gives ostentatiously, in a sweeping quasi-royal vein, distributing, as it were, kingdoms to his friends (1.2.219). To give like a king in Shakespeare's time, one needed to be one, and a growing number of Jacobeans, unhappy about the extravagance of King James, thought that even he should reduce his expenditures. (pp. 123-24)

Shakespeare's Plays (1847), Gulian C. Verplanck: "In Timon the plot is made to turn upon a single incident, and is used merely as a vehicle for the author's own caustic satire, or wrathful denunciation of general vice" (Vol. 3 3).

Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art (1881), Edward Dowden: Shakespeare "could not so fully and fearlessly enter into Timon's mood, because he was now past danger of Timon's malady. He had learned to strive with evil and to subdue it; and he now learned to forgive" (p. 340). Shakespeare "recognized in the Athenian misanthrope one whom he had known, an intimate acquaintance, the Timon of Shakspere's own breast" (p. 340).

William Shakespeare (1936), George Brandes: "In Timon. . . Shakespeare put his own thoughts and feelings into the mouths of the various characters of the play" (p. 562). "All that [Shakespeare] has lived through these last three years, and all that he has suffered from the baseness of other men, is concentrated in this colossal figure of the desperate man-hater, whose wild rhetoric is like a dark essence of blood and gall drawn off to relieve suffering" (p. 570).

The Meaning of Shakespeare (1951; rpt. 1963), Harold C. Goddard: "Timon himself shows in what direction Shakespeare might have been carried if he had surrendered to bitter thoughts and emotions instead of controlling them, if he had thrown up the dramatic profession in despair" (Vol. 2, 173).

Shakespeare: The Problem Plays (1961), Peter Ure: "Timon's misanthropy is no statement of the poet's own judgment on the world" (p. 51).

"Shakespeare's Misanthrope" (1973), Harry Levin: "Shakespeare himself was far from being Misanthropos, so very far from hating all mankind, that for once his negative capability got in the way of his dramaturgy" (p. 94).

TIMON DOES NOT LEARN FROM HIS EXPERIENCES

Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies (1950), Willard Farnham: "Under the impact of human beastliness Lear does not himself become a beast, but Timon does. Lear has in him that which allows regeneration through suffering, but Timon has not" (p. 45).

Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "Nor is it quite true to say, as some have said, that where Lear is redeemed by suffering, Timon goes unchanged to his grave . . . . Timon passes beyond worldly hate to a different state, a willingness for death" (p. xli).

The Tragic Engagement: A Study of Shakespeare's Classical Tragedies (1968), Judah Stampfer: "He has gained no insight into himself, society, the drift of events, but is bouncing away with vitality like a rubber ball off a wall" (p. 207).

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1969), Charlton Hinman: "His sufferings have not brought him to an awareness of his own imperfections; they have embittered but not magnified him. One of his chief deficiencies as a tragic hero is certainly his incapacity for spiritual growth" (p. 1139).

"Jacobean Tragedy and the Mannerist Style" (1973), Cyrus Hoy: "He is in every way a paradoxical creation: broken by suffering but uninstructed by it" (p. 60).

Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective (1976), Larry S. Champion: "The curl's observations do indeed articulate the spectators' attitude toward Timon, in whose experiences they have found no point of identification. They have seen in him no growth in wisdom or compassion through suffering, no purgation of selfishness; instead, in the self-pity, the vengefulness, the repudiation of his city and of all mankind, the curses, and the attempts at destruction, there is only his steady descent into the privacy of selfishness and hatred, into the fearful isolation and meaninglessness of a life that fails to touch and affect the lives of others in a positive way" (p. 212).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner:

> Preconceptions about tragedy have made some critics insist on an angnorisis with the peripeteia of the complex tragic plot; he understood by it simply the discovery by the hero of the disastrous outward turn of events, not a process of self-search. Nor did Renaissance theorists, as far as I know, require the tragic hero to come to an understanding of his psychological and moral condition; this postulate comes out of the didacticism of our own age. In Aristotle's and the Renaissance theorists' sense, Timon has an angnorisis when he realizes that he has been duped by his friends. It is true, of course, that some of Shakespeare's tragic heroes go further in the acknowledgement of their own responsibility for their fall than Timon does . . . . But to claim that these heroes achieve full insight is to exaggerate. (p. 25)

It is natural for us to wish that Timon would achieve some greater self-knowledge, some understanding beyond the recognition of the folly of his giving. Dramatically, this is unthinkable. No self-knowledge in the humanistic sense can occur since it would require of Timon a recognition that he lacked temperance; after this an outbreak of misanthropy would be impossible. Nor does the moral frame established by Shakespeare make us expect Timon to gain such knowledge: temperance presupposes measure and norm, and the play does not provide these; there is no character that is not in some manner corrupted or corruptible. Timon's reactions cannot be viewed as a deviation from definite human standards; the play presents no such standards, and if we supply them, we do so at our peril. Given the world in which Timon lives, his reaction, even if startling in its singularity, is not exactly indecorous or outrageous. (p. 77)

TIMON'S DEATH

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight: "The novelist of the 'Palace of Pleasure' thus explains Timon's choice of 'his everlasting mansion:'--'He ordained himself to be interred upon the sea-shore, that the waves and surges might beat and vex his dead carcass'" (Vol. 1, 343).

Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies (1950), Willard Farnham:

> The grave on the seashore is in various versions of Timon's legend. Plutarch, it will be remembered, says that Timon was buried on the shore and that the sea chanced to surround his tomb and make it inaccessible. Later tellers of the Timon legend embroidered this matter of burial. According to one account, the unsociable Timon left orders that he should be burried at the brink of the sea and that care should be taken to place his grave where the eaves would make approach to it difficult or impossible. This account appears in English in the stories of Alday and Barckley. But for Painter, following another account, has it that Timon wished to be buried near the sea because of a desire even more perverse than a desire for privacy in daath. Says Painter: "By his last will he ordained hymself to bee interred vpon the sea shore, that the waues and surges mighte beate, and vexe his dead carcas." Shakespeare is closer to Painter when he deals with Timon's burial. His Timon, like Painter's, wishes to have the sea beat upon his body. Yet in Shakespeare's Timon there is not so much a spirit of surliness when he plans to have his grave placed near the sea as there is a spirit of sad weariness. . . . And when we find that the waves shed tears upon his body instead of vexing

> it, we see fully Shakespeare's intention of leaving in our minds a man-hater worthy of sympathy, instead of one worthy of detestation. (p. 76)

Shakespeare's Occasional Plays: Their Origin and Transmission (1965), J.M. Nosworthy: "The final scenes in the Folio text are perplexing, but the redundant account of Timon's death and the preservation of two conflicting epitaphs, suggests conflation of alternative endings" (p. 225-26).

Shakespeare the Craftsman (1969), M.C. Bradbrook: "Timon had 'out stretched his span.' His death was then natural and not a suicide; in plague time a man was indeed known to dig his own grave and lie down in it to die" (p. 159).

"The Ending of Timon of Athens" (1973), Richard D. Fly: "Timon's suicide is the ontological analogue to his former repudiation of society--on both levels a demand for the bliss of nothingness. Timon's suicide leaves the universe totally devoid of meaning, and informed by a vision of absurdity and futility" (p. 251).

"Shakespeare's Misanthrope" (1973), Harry Levin: "The moribund moment, which figures so importantly in most of Shakespeare's tragedies, is evaded here. This does not seem to be a suicide, but rather an expected dissolution. After so vocal and long-drawn-out a rejection of existence, what would be left to say?" (p. 93).

"Timon: Shakespeare's Magnyfycence and an Embryonic Lear" (1978), Ruth Levitsky: "To question whether he actually takes his own life seems to me no more than to quibble. Certainly he wills his own death, writes his own epitaph, and predicts his own end in terms which imply that he will his own quietus make" (p. 116).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "After Timon's willful and desperate search for self-destruction, it must be due to suicide of some sort, but the sting of the deed is lessened by its occurring offstage and by not being described" (p. 49).

The Leopold Shakspere (1877), F.J. Furnivall: "Other links besides its cursings, between it [Timon] and Coriolanus, are, Alcibiades taking revenge, by invasion, on Athens, as Coriolanus does on Rome; the Senators' ingratitude, and subsequent appeal for mercy, to the wronged invader, in each play. With Antony and Cleopatra, Timon is allied, by its story taken partly from Plutarch's Life of Antony, by the name Ventidius in both plays, by a certain gorgeousness of colour over the early part of Timon. Timon's gold-poison speech reminds us of Romeo's to the apothecary. The completer's Lucullus-talk, in iii.I., seems to me suggested by Shallow's in 2 Henry IV iii.2" (P. lxxxiv). On Timon and Lear: "Timon is like Lear in thinking he can buy love with gifts. His character is weak and vain, as we see by his foolish indulgence and ostentatious generosity; and his weakness is shown just as strongly by his after-rushing to the other extreme, hate of all men, women, and children, and his native land, because his own friends disappoint him" (p. lxxxiv).

Introduction to the Literature of Europe (1880, Henry Hallam: "Timon of Athens is cast, as it were, in the same mould as Lear: it is the same essential character, the same

generosity more from wonton ostentation than love of others, the same fierce rage under the smart of ingratitude, the same rousing up in that tempest of powers that had slumbered unsuspected in some deep recess of the soul" (Vol. 3, 297).

Shakespearean Tragedy (1904; rpt. 1956), A.C. Bradley "Both plays [Timon and Lear] deal with the tragic effects of ingratitude. . . . In both plays occur repeated comparisons between man and the beasts" (p. 246). In "Note C," "King Lear and Timon of Athens," Bradley compares the plays on four points: "(1) The likeness between Timon's curses and some of the speeches of Lear in his moments of madness. . . . (2). . . references to the lower animals. . . . (3). . .many likenesses in word, phrase and idea. . . . (4)The likeness in style and versification" (pp. 443, 444).

Life of Shakespeare (1904), Sir Sidney Lee: "Timon is cast in the mould of Lear" (p. 252).

The Problem of Timon of Athens (1923), Thomas Marc Parrott: "The theme, the ruin of a frank and generous soul by ingratitude, public and private, is no unfit subject for tragedy, the treatment of this theme in Timon presents some very effective scenes, yet as it stands it is simply an impossible play" (p. 3).

Shakespeare's Life and Art (1939), Peter Alexander comments on Timon and Troilus: "there is a similarity in their construction. Troilus, as internal and external evidence suggests, was written for a special and no doubt an academic audience" (p. 183).

"Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (1942), Una Ellis-Fermor: "Even a few of the details of Timon's conduct suggest a likeness between his character and Lear's at a similar stage of their fortunes; autocracy and imperiousness tinge his generosity with insolence. Some resemblance between their experiences may therefore be intended; a headlong caree , to be brought up suddenly by a change of fortune; the reason unseated; the character, ill-balanced already, being totally unfitted to survive the shock" (p. 273). On Act IV in Timon: "It relates itself closely to Troilus and Cressida on the one hand and to Lear on the other, the two plays which seem to stand nearest to Timon in their mood and interpretation" (p. 279).

"Excessive Goodness a Tragic Fault" (1944), Ruth L. Anderson: "In their grief both Timon and Lear turn away from society. Both look upon the world as a place devoid of honesty where chaos supplants order. Both cry out against the procreative forces of the universe. Both reflect upon the mere necessities of life. . . . they address the elements. . . . They discard their clothes" (p. 94).

"Timon of Athens" (1948), J.C. Maxwell: "The difference between [Timon] and Lear after their falls is that Lear learns by his misfortune as Timon does not" (p. 204).

Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies (1950), Willard Farnham: "The bond of substance between Timon and Lear is remarkable, and its existence is well recognized. The reader needs only to be reminded of its character. Each of these plays is a tragedy of atrocious human ingratitude in which repeated comparisons are made between men and beasts, and in which the idea is expressed that man is declining to a beastly state. . . . In each play the hero gives away large worldly possessions, finds himself dependent upon those he has benefited, trusts blindly that in their gratitude these will show generosity to him, receives cruelty from them instead of generosity, lays curses upon the human nature in which he once placed his trust, and falls into madness or insensate fury" (pp. 39-40).

The Meaning of Shakespeare (1951; rpt. 1963), Harold C. Goddard hears in Timon echoes from King John, The Merchant of Venice, As You Like It, Cymberline, Hamlet, Coriolanus, Troilus and Cressida, and King Lear (Vol. 2, 173). "If Troilus may be called the intellectual twin of Hamlet, Timon might be called

the emotional twin of King Lear (or better perhaps its dark satellite)" (Vol. 2, 172).

Poets on Fortune's Hill: Studies in Sidney, Shakespeare, Beaumont & Fletcher (1952), John Danby: "Timon. . . is the aftermath of King Lear" (p. 128).

Shakespeare's Tragedies (1952), G.B. Harrison: "The play [Timon] opens with a passage on the pattern of the first scene of Antony and Cleopatra" (p. 256). "Apemantus is another of the professional snarlers, own brother to Thersites" (p. 257).

The Slave of Life: A Study of Shakespeare and the Idea of Justice (1955), D.M.H. Parker: "Like Lear, Timon has lived foolishly in a world of appearances and is disillusioned; like Lear he curses human nature, but unlike Lear, he is not saved" (p. 143).

"Timon of Athens" (1957), R.P. Draper: "Timon's last words. . . look forward to the sea-imagery of Pericles and The Tempest and the unearthly music of the religious element in the last plays" (pp. 199-200). Draper also notes similarities in Timon and Volpone's remarks on gold (pp. 198-99).

The Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957; rpt. 1968), J.C. Maxwell: "Lear learns by his misfortune as Timon does not. . . . One might express the difference between Lear and Timon by

saying that Lear in affliction comes to see as he never did before; Timon does not undergo the ultimate ordeal of madness, and the utmost he attains to is to see through particular shams and injustices" (p. xxxvii).

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme: "The play which it is obviously tempting to compare Timon with is Coriolanus. There is an apparent similarity of plot (Coriolanus looking rather like a fusion of Timon and Alcibiades), which prompts the view that Timon might have been in some sense a study for the latter play" (p. 124).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "Like Lear, Timon takes at their face value protestations of love; just as Lear overlooks Cordelia's worth because of her plain bluntness, so Timon disregards the warnings of the unsociable Apemantus; and just as Kent is the one man true to Lear, so the Steward is true to Timon, and each has to hear his protests against his master's folly overruled" (p. xli).

The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art (1960), Robert C. Elliott: "Lear's disillusionment brings insight. . . . Timon's does not; he is incapable of breaking out of the circle of hatred he has drawn about himself" (p. 160).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner:

"Lear attains salvation because he learns through suffering to recognize the goodness of Cordelia in spite of the evil of Goneril, and in his death he is united with this goodness and with God. Timon is damned because although he comes to perceive that Flavius is 'one honest man' (IV.iii.504), rather than embrace this goodness, he attempts to destroy it as unnatural, and in doing so forfeits his own humanity" (p. 141).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann: "I fear that the traditional bracketing of Timon and King Lear has done. . . harm. . . . the forms of Timon and King Lear are so utterly unlike that their collocation can only be misleading. . . . If a point of reference is required, the most useful would be Troilus. . . . a coterie audience, especially one made up of termers, would resolve many of its [Timon's] difficulties, both of value and technique" (p. 20).

Shakespeare: The Problem Plays (1961), Peter Ure: "His [Timon's] situation, driven out into the wilderness by ingratitude, is very like Lear's. . . . As he [Lear] opens his mind at length to the truth about himself, pain alters to insight, and he is able to overcome the poisons of ingratitude and the desire to punish. This never happens to Timon. The poisons blacken all his vision, even though his enemies are commoner and smaller than Lear's" (p. 50). Citing Maxwell (1957; 1968 , above): "'One might express the difference between Lear

and Timon by saying that Lear in affliction comes to see as he never did before; Timon does not undergo the ultimate ordeal of madness and the utmost he attains is to see through particular shams and injustices'" (p. 50).

"Timon of Athens" (1963), David Cook: "There is an attempt to dramatize Timon's last denial of mankind differently and more fully in Act V. This depends on the appeal to Timon by the city of Athens in time of crisis to come and save them, and Timon's refusal. . . . Unfortunately. . . Timon has never been a crucial figure in the state. So that, unlike the decision which is forced on Coliolanus, with the whole dramatic weight of the play behind it, the situation in Timon appears contrived, and largely fails of its effect" (p. 93).

"Silver at the Bottom of the Melting Pot: Dryden's Troilus and Shadwell's Timon" (1964), Richard Morton compares Shakespeare's Timon with Shadwell's revision (pp. 126-50).

"Timon of Athens and Its Dramatic Descendants" (1964), G. Wilson Knight traces three Timon themes as they "are reworked by later dramatists" (pp. 99-109).

"King Lear and Timon of Athens" (1964-65), Ján Šimko: "Each play deals with the radical turn of fortune of a person of high social standing. . . . Both are uncritically free to let themselves be blinded by premeditated false flatteries. . . .

Both give away everything that is of importance. . . . Neither Lear not Timon is a creature wholly of this earth" (pp. 321, 322).

Timon of Athens (1965), Maurice Charney: "Both [Timon and Lear] deal with the theme of ingratitude and its overpowering effects on Lear and Timon, who both react with fierce indictment of man and society. But in Lear this indictment touches the protagonist, too, and leads him to a bitter self-awareness which is not present in Timon" (p. xxxiv). "Timon is especially close to those dark, satirical plays that put a strong emphasis on sexual corruption: Measure for Measure, Hamlet and Troilus and Cressida" (p. xxxv). Charney sees similarities between Apemantus and Thersites: "Timon and Coriolanus are both tragedies that cannot be judged by the standards of Aristotle's Poetics: in neither play does the tragic protagonist have much awareness of what is happening to him and there is no tragic recognition" (p. xxxvi).

"The Last Tragic Heroes" (1966), G.K. Hunter: "Timon's sentiments. . . do not tell us anything very penetrating about Athens. Lear's effort to understand makes his vision more complex; Timon's hatred merely simplifies. His mind remains so monomaniacally fixed in hatred of society that it is obviously as dependent on Athens now as it was in the old days of acceptance.

The mind in exile is not here a point of refuge and new growth; Timon remains the creature of his society, only maimed by his inability to accept it" (p. 14).

"Timon of Athens and Morality Drama" (1967), David Bergeron: "I want to show the relationship of Timon to a specific morality play--Everyman. By viewing the thematic and structural similarities between these two plays we can come to a new understanding of how Timon owes at least a partial debt to medieval drama" (p. 182).

Shakespeare in His Times and Ours (1968), Paul N. Siegel: "the function of Coriolanus, is split between Alcibiades and Timon. Like Coriolanus, Alcibiades foregoes his intention of razing his country, but Coriolanus's scapegoat role is played by Timon, the unwitting cause of his change of mind" (p. 160).

The Tragic Engagement: A Study of Shakespeare's Classical Tragedies (1968), Judah Stampfer: "His [Timon's] character curiously parallels Hotspur's. Thus, a lord says of Timon '. . . nought but humours sways him' (III.vi.106-107), echoing his steward, 'There is no crossing him in's humour' (I.ii. 156). So, when Worcester blames Hotspur for 'want of government' (1 Henry IV, III.i.178), Lady Percy corrects him as 'altogether govern'd by humours' (1.228). From an attainable ideal, goodness

has become a quirk of character" (p. 196).

"Timon of Athens: Tragedy or Satire" (1969), Robert E. Morsberger: "Timon has certain affinities with other of Shakespeare's plays. Like Hamlet, Timon is a disillusioned idealist who indulges in invective against the rottenness of the world; like Thersites, Timon curses and despises society, condemning it with the imagery of beasts and of letchery More particularly Timon resembles King Lear. There is the same theme of ingratitude, there are similar curses, there is a faithful servant, and there are the references to beasts in both plays. But there is a vital difference between Lear and Timon; for Lear learns and is enobled by his suffering, whereas Timon is merely degraded and never attains Lear's illumination and ability to forgive" (p. 63).

"Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Dr. Faustus" (1970), Anne Lancashire: "In Timon the fall of the protagonist from material prosperity is a process extending through three acts; but it takes place, otherwise, almost exactly on the Everyman pattern--and this pattern exists in none of Shakespeare's known probable sources, nor in the old Timon, in which the protagonist does ask friends for help, but not in the patterned series of requests and refusals that we have in Shakespeare's play" (p. 37).

"Parallel to the Knowledge of Everyman is a 'mercy figure' in Timon who offers 'redemption' of a kind, through true knowledge of the world, to the protagonist. This mercy figure is Apemantus" (p. 38). "Unlike Everyman, he is made so bitter by his experience with false friends and fickle fortune that he cannot accept redemption; and, like Lear, he rails against his fellowmen. . . without ever coming to Lear's (or Everyman's) realization of his own faults" (p. 39).

"Jacobean Tragedy and the Mannerist Style" (1973), Cryus Hoy: "Timon, with his huge invective against mankind, is acting on the injunction of Edgar at the close of Lear, speaking what he feels, not what he ought to say, and achieving thereby a rare coherence of intention and word whose only precedent hitherto in Shakespearian tragedy has been Cordelia, with her refusal to speak other than as she feels" (p. 59).

"Timon of Athens and the Morality Tradition" (1977), Lewis Walker: "Timon's relationship to the generic Mankind figure" is examined (p. 159). Walker also notes some morality conventions that he feels Shakespeare uses in Timon, e.g. music, which is "clearly intended to reflect the pagan pomp of Herod's court" (p. 161). "There are other ways in which Timon differs from the Mankind figure. It must be acknowledged that he is

conspicuously free from some of the meaner vices associated with his prototype, who is frequently addicted to gaming, robbery, and violence" (p. 171).

"Timon: Shakespeare's Magnyfycence and an Embryonic Lear" (1978), Ruth Levitsky: "I do not. . . see in it [Timon] the Everyman pattern (reversed or otherwise) which Ann [sic] Lancashire finds there" (p. 107). "Timon learns nothing about himself or about the gods as a result of his adversity; he learns only what Apemantus has always known, that other men are evil" (p. 112). Timon, Levitsky believes, is similar to Skelton's play, but it is not a great play. On Timon and Lear: "Lear is a greater play than Timon partly because one does feel the magnificence of the effort made by the old King (or for that matter by the weaker Gloucester), whereas Timon, intentionally or unintentionally, demonstrates almost exclusively the farcical elements in the claims made by pagan philosophy that man through his own efforts can achieve this magnificence" (pp. 111-12).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner:

> we should not stipulate that a tragic hero must attain a "tragic perception" like Lear's. For that matter, critics often exaggerate the extent of Lear's

> self-knowledge and its significance for his tragedy. Undoubtedly he gains a fleeting understanding of his and man's nature that goes beyond Timon's, but the major impact of this attainment on the tragedy is that it is useless for practical purposes since it comes too late. Timon gains a clear and sharp understanding of the sycophants and usurers around him and generalizes it into the nature of man and the world. This knowledge may be faulty as a universal insight, but this does not matter for the tragic quality of the play; what does matter is that Timon finds it as impossible to live with this knowledge as does Lear. (p. 18)

Soellner also compares Timon and Coriolanus: "In the large degree of namelessness and in the frequent use of professional or class designations, Timon resembles Coriolanus with its first, second, and third senator, first and second soldier, and several numbered but unnamed citizens. In both plays, such non-individualized characters help to create a panorama society, and the picture is unpleasant" (p. 85). On Timon and Volpone: "Shakespeare may have been influenced [in Timon's speech on gold in IV.iii]. . . by the similar technique of Ben Jonson in Volpone" (p. 109). On Timon and Prospero: "[it] is tempting to contrast the vanity of Timon's destructive and nihilistic art with the success of Prospero's optimistic and life-affirming one. . . . Yet this comparison is unilluminating for several reasons" (pp. 141, 142). On Timon and Lear: "With regard to socioeconomic issues. . . Timon may be said to be closer to Lear [than Coriolanus] since both castigate the luxury and extravagance or the rich more explicitly than Coriolanus" (p. 202).

On Timon and Coriolanus:

> Timon is closer to Coriolanus than to Lear. Timon and Coriolanus are placed in similar situations: prominant citizens, they are alienated from their societies because of banishment and turn against their native states. Both conceive of themselves as victims of fortune and ingratitude. . . . In addition, Alcibiades has some affinities to both Coriolanus and Aufidius: a professional soldier turned rebel, he leads an army against his native city like Coriolanus; yet, like Aufidius, he is a pragmatist who resists being ensnared by tragedy. (pp. 201-02)

The Complete Works of Shakespeare (1980), David Bevington: "Timon feels he must, like Volpone and Mosca, devise for. . . hypocrites a suitable comeuppance, consisting of a farewell banquet in which their crass expectations are rewarded with a mocking litany of curses and a dinner of water and stones" (p. 1251). "Timon experiences little of the compassionate love that comes to Lear in his madness, but he at least faces the bleakness of human existence with unbending honesty" (p. 1252).

ALCIBIADES (in general)

Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art (1881), Edward Dowden: "Alcibiades, who is of an active, practical, unideal character, is not able to discover wisdom in the suffering of evils, which, by opposing them, a man may end" (p. 347).

Shakespeare: A Survey (1925), E.K. Chambers: "Alcibiades ought to mean something, and is introduced as though he were going to mean something; and the reader very naturally resents the discovery of how very little, if anything, he does in the end mean. Nor is it a question of structure. There are certain scenes or parts of scenes, in which the expression is so halting, so lacking in the golden mastery of speech, as to raise doubt whether they can be Shakespeare's" (p. 269).

"The Theme of Timon of Athens" (1934), John W. Draper: "The Elizabethan attitude towards usury is the key to Timon of Athens: it gives the purpose to the play, which former scholars could not find; it explains the change in Timon, links to the former acts the final episode of Alcibiades' revenge, and so gives unity and character to the plot" (p. 29).

Shakespeare (1939), Mark Van Doren: "There are three malcontents: Timon, Apemantus, and Alcibiades" (p. 253).

The State in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman Plays (1940), James Emerson Phillips, Jr.: "Timon's cry is against an evil society; Alcibiades' cry is against the political rulers who have caused that evil. From a sixteenth-century point of view, however, the enemy of the two men is the same" (p. 138).

"Patterns of Tempo in Timon of Athens" (1948), John W. Draper: "Timon's soldierly counterpart, moreover, the brave and choleric Alcibiades, reflects military virtue disregarded in a state where greedy usury dominates policy" (p. 188).

An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948), Hardin Craig: "There was also Alcibiades, an Athenian soldier, who was betrayed by time-serving politicians in his own country and vilely misused" (p. 247). "[T]he story of Alcibiades is hardly developed at all, and, if Shakespeare had any plans with reference to it, they were never realized" (p. 247). Alcibiades is "an unreflective doer" (p. 249), and his part is "downright inconsistent" (p. 253).

Shakespeare's Tragedies and Other Studies in Seventeenth Century Drama (1950), Clifford Leech: "This triumph of Alcibiades at the end of the play is in many ways strange. . . . He is, indeed, distantly approaching the character of Prospero" (pp. 115, 116).

Shakespeare's Tragedies (1951), G.B. Harrison: "Even Alcibiades is but vaguely sketched as a typical gay young soldier" (p. 259). "War" is also "represented by Alcibiades" (p. 264).

The Slave of Life: A Study of Shakespeare and the Idea of Justice (1955), D.M.H. Parker: "But the First Senator, far from believing with Alcibiades that 'pity is the virtue of the law, and none but tyrants use it cruelly', remains convinced that 'nothing emboldens sin so much as mercy', and Alcibiades, who will not take this for his answer, is, like Kent, banished for his pains" (p. 145).

Shakespeare's Military World (1956), Paul A. Jorgensen: "On the stage, in his military garb, he [Alcibiades] would have been strikingly distinct from the gaudy revelers. His later prominence is of course sudden, but dramatically and frighteningly so. He enters at precisely the right time, just as War enters suddenly in his appropriate act in Histriomastix. And like War, Alcibiades is less a person than an impersonal force" (p. 194). "[H]e requires only slight motivation, especially in a play that is abnormally dedicated to a study of society" (p. 283).

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme: "His triumph at the

end suggests an attempt to give an answer to the problem set by Timon's reaction to his world and to Athens. But though he himself has been part of that world and has reacted against it, he hardly represents a distinct and reputable standard of his own: he is in fact nowhere given enough body, enough moral substance, to take that part in the development of the action and theme of the play which he has to bear at the end" (p. 123)

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "It may well be that more of them ["facts" from Plutarch] would have been worked in if the play had been further tightened up; in any case, it is worth noting that what many readers have felt to be an ambiguity in the character of Alcibiades is already in North and that there is ample warrant for Shakespeare's hesitation to admire unreservedly the man of action who can too easily take arms, particularly against his own country" (p. xxxiv).

The Power of Satire: Magic Ritual, Art (1960), Robert C. Elliott: "It is difficult to know what to make of Alcibiades. The Emperor Hadrian's remark in the fictional Memoirs by Marguerite Yourcenar is apt: 'Alcibiades has seduced everyone and everything, even History herself. . . . ' Shakespeare's characterization may in part be an example. In Plutarch's Life Shakespeare found a portrait of a man dazzlingly brilliant but fatally unstable. Plutarch has high praise for Alcibiades' eloquence, his wit and courage, his talents in general; but he is consistently severe on

Alcibiades' dishonesty, his licentiousness, his chameleon-like qualities: 'the unconstancie of his life, and waywardnes of his nature and conditions'" (p. 154).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960) Irving Ribner: "Alcibiades, like Gloucester, undergoes a parallel progression, but unlike Timon he accepts the proffered chance of redemption" (p. 138). "He learns at the end what Timon never learns, that good may exist in spite of evil, and he is redeemed from the fury which has possessed him" (p. 141). "The redemption of Alcibiades is drawn also in political as well as personal terms, for it brings an end not only to the troubled passions within him, but also to the political chaos in Athens" (p. 145).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann: "Plutarch gave Shakespeare no authority for Alcibiades' military hostilities before the walls of Athens, nor for his more or less compulsory entry" (p. 7).

"Shakespeare and the Neo-Chivalric Cult of Honor" (1964), Paul N. Siegel: "Alcibiades. . . is representative of a surviving feudal militarism unmodified by humanism" (p. 66). "Fusing the humanistic virtues with the chivalric military virtues which have been his, he has become capable of regenerating Athens, strengthening her in foreign war, as Henry V did in England, while nourishing

the arts and prompting internal order. To do so, however, he has had to reject dictates of the neo-chivalric cult of honor which here. . . could only bring destruction" (p. 70).

"Alcibiades' Revolt in Timon of Athens" (1967), Leonard Goldstein: "It is indeed strange that in Timon Shakespeare does not see in Alcibiades' successful revolt the same bouleversement of the natural order of things he had expressed in the earlier plays and that he manifests interest in a 'strong man who will exercise power with benevolence" (p. 256).

Shakespeare in His Time and Ours (1968), Paul N. Siegel: "Alcibiades. . . is representative of a surviving feudal militarism unmodified by humanism" (p. 156). "Like Coriolanus, [Alcibiades] is a man of war in some ways deficient in human feeling" (p. 157). "Like Coriolanus, Alcibiades foregoes his intention of razing his country, but Coriolanus's scapegoat role is played by Timon, the unwitting cause of his change of mind" (p. 160).

The Tragic Engagement: A Study of Shakespeare's Classical Tragedies (1968), Judah Stampfer: "Alcibiades. . . embodies the high-water mark of Shakespeare's willful hero. He has personal loyalty, not patriotism; a pair of mistresses, not a wife; a military camp, not a home; and a proud, direct sense of his honor, his force, and his grasp of truth, which make trivial

the paraphernalia of civilized living" (p. 186). "[I]n Plutarch Alcibiades is decadent, ostentatious, insolent, rash, and criminally ambitious, all well suited to Timon's Athens" (p. 196).

"Alchemy and Timon of Athens" (1970), David M. Bergeron: "He [Alcibiades] wants to change the base metal of Athens into something higher and nobler by establishing the golden principle of justice and order" (p. 370).

Shakespeare: The Dark Comedies to the Last Plays (1971), R.A. Foakes:

> This is no champion of good against evil, no golden boy, like Malcolm cleansing Scotland, or Edgar returning as a knight in shinning armour to joust with and defeat the evil embodied in Edmund, but the general Alcibiades, who carries prostitutes in his train, defends murderers, and is content with 'defil'd land' as his home. He is merely a soldier, doing what he conceives to be his duty, and acting for private reasons as much as for public welfare, as he goes to Athens partly to carry out a private revenge. (p. 86)

"Alcibiades , the adaptable man l'homme moyen sensuel, the descendant of Claudius. . . . The flexible man, the more skilful politician, survives in the world of these plays--Alcibiades, Octavius, Aufidius" (p. 87).

Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective (1976) Larry S. Champion: "[I]n the experience of Alcibiades and his development as a character foil to Timon, Shakespeare apparently attempts to

provide something akin to the anagnorisis and the restitution of right reason in the individual and in the society at large which are characteristics of his earlier tragedies" (pp. 213-14). "Alcibiades' mercy seems to arise not from wisdom and compassion gained from adversity but from a position of total strength that can dictate its own terms; and, lacking any intrinsic relationship with Timon's, his actions fail to lend meaning and impact to the experience and death of the protagonist" (p. 217).

"Fortune and Friendship in Timon of Athens" (1976-77), Lewis Walker: "Each of Alcibiades' appearances makes a serious point, but the different points are incompatible as expressions of the same persona. This is true both on the allegorical and the naturalistic levels; there is simply no dramatic justification for such radical change" (p. 584).

"Timon: Shakespeare's Magnyfycence and an Embryonic Lear" (1978), Ruth Levitsky: "The function of Alcibiades. . . is. . . to state the case for the opposition: he totally rejects the Stoic attitude of indifference to honor, fame, and reputation--an attitude subscribed to by Apemantus and the Senators, as well as by the Timon of the later scenes" (p. 117).

"Truth and Timon of Athens" (1979), Lesley W. Brill: "Only Alcibiades threatens to flesh out as a character of some

complexity, but we see so little of him that he remains no more than a passably honest and energetic soldier and politician" (p. 21).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979)

Rolf Soellner: "If, in spite of his sufficient prominance, Shakespeare's Alcibiades remains something of a puzzle, I shall argue that this is by design, a design consistent with Plutarch's portrayal of the man" (p. 51). Soellner cites Renaissance political theorists on Alcibiades:

> Renaissance political theorists were more severe with Alcibiades. He was the main culprit of the Athenian defeat by Sparta for Louis Leroy in his commentary on Aristotle's Politics (translated into English in 1598) and for Jean Bodin in The Six Books of a Commonweal (translated in 1606). According to Bodin, Alcibiades brought about political instability by changing the government into a democracy, which Bodin conceived in Aristotelian terms as the rule of the populace. Incidentally, somewhere in the background literature Shakespeare would have gathered the idea that Alcibiades had trouble with the Athenian "senate"--Leroy and Lydgate used this romanizing term for the oligarchy, a term that should not surprise us in Timon.
>
> Alcibiades certainly did not have good press in Shakespeare's England. A quite negative satirical portrayal of his character was that by Thomas Lodge in Wit's Misery and the World's Madness (1596). Shakespeare is likely to have known the book; it carries the famous reference to the Ur-Hamlet. According to Lodge's curious genealogy, Alcibiades was a descendant of one of Satan's seven ministers, that is, the deadly sins, specifically the son of Leviathan (Pride). Lodge saw the degradation of his own time evidenced by London's being replete with vainglorious, boastful, and quarrelsome rakes. These, he said, play gallant courtiers near St. Paul, pride themselves on ancestors, stratagems, and policies, and "sail by the wind of his fortune, become

> chameleons like Alcibiades, feeding on the vanity of his tongue with the foolish credulity of their ears." Lodge's characterization of Alcibiades has some resemblance to that of Alcibiades' friend in Shakespeare's play, at least if we take the senators' word for his quarrelsomeness and riotous living. (p. 52)

On Alcibiades' homosexuality: "Perhaps Shakespeare was aware of Alcibiades' reputed homosexual tendency. If so, he thought of him as a bisexual since a page is later shown to carry letters from a courtesan to him as well as to Timon (2.2.86)" (p. 53). Soellner summarizes Plutarch's influence on Shakespeare's portrayal of Alcibiades:

> Shakespeare's characterization of Alcibiades before he becomes master of Athens in the fifth act is. . . in the Plutarchian pattern. Alcibiades is indeed subtle, adaptable, and various. He is ingratiating to the point of effeminacy, but his soldiership is never in question. His lax morals are evident when we see him accompanied by prostitutes. He is ambitious, but he does not consume himself with passion; and he is greatly flexible in the pursuit of his goals, as when he does not press his appeal for Timon's help. He is not a man to give way to boundless anger like Timon--it is as if he were characterizing himself when he describes his comrade who killed an opponent as a man who knows how to control and manage his anger. Shakespeare may have been induced to emphasize the temperamental contrast between Alcibiades and Timon because of a notable distinction Plutarch made in this respect between Alcibiades and Coriolanus: the latter was a man who, "following his choleric mood, would be pleased with nothing," whereas Alcibiades,"when he saw they [his countrymen] repented them of the injury they had done him, came to himself and did withdraw his army." This is quite Alcibiades' procedure at the end of Shakespeare's play. (p. 57)

ALCIBIADES (in III.v)

Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature (1846), A.W. Schlegel: "The only thing which may be called an episode is the banishment of Alcibiades, and his return by force of arms. However, they are both examples of ingratitude, the one of a state towards its defender, and the other of private friends to their benefactor" (pp. 417-18).

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight: "The scene between Alcibiades and the Senate consists of about a hundred and twenty lines.--Of these lines twenty-six form rhyming couplets. This itself is enough to make us look suspiciously upon this scene, when presented as the work of Shakspere. . . . The whole of the senate scene in Timon is singularly unmetrical; but whenever the verse becomes regular it is certainly not the metre of Shakspere" (Vol. 1, 336).

Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art (1881), Edward Dowden: "Alcibiades comes before the Athenian senate to plead on behalf of the life of a friend who had slain one who wronged his honor. . . . It was precisely such plain loyalty of friendship as this shown by Alcibiades which Timon had not found, and, not finding which, he had abandoned himself to desperation" (p. 347).

The old Arden Timon of Athens (1905), K. Deighton: "Its [III.v's] language may have been tampered with--it certainly is corrupt in several lines,--but it is, in my opinion, absolutely necessary as leading up to the concluding events of the play, as contrasting the character of the two chief actors, and as showing the Senators to be equally ungrateful to both, hard-hearted, unpatriotic, and richly deserving the lofty contempt with which Timon receives their refusal to help him" (p. xix).

The Authorship of Timon of Athens (1910), Ernest Hunter Wright:

> Sundered from all else in the play, this scene proclaims itself spurious by its very insulation. To motivate the last half of the play, the writer must get Alcibiades banished. Let us suppose that in his hurry he fell in with the first plan that occurred to him, without thinking overmuch how well or ill that plan would fit the play. Let us even assume that he was none too familiar with the play. The allowances will perhaps help us to explain why he makes Alcibiades anger the senate with pleas for mercy to the unknown author of an unknown crime; why he meanwhile quite forgets the play on which he is working, and writes in a scene which has not the slightest reference to Timon or the remotest relation to anything whatsoever that takes place in the half of the play preceding. The introduction of a crime and criminal, both alien to the plot and both unheard of elsewhere in the play, to motivate a scene which has so little relevancy to the scenes preceding that it might as well have come from Hamlet, will not be considered the expedient of Shakspere. The technic of the verse--to waive the mediocrity of style as patent--puts the authorship beyond dispute. (p. 44)

"The Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1940), Ralph A. Haug: "III,v, is rejected by all the critics [as being Shakespeare's]" (p. 238). "The argument that says the best and worst lines of this scene are both the completed work of one man does not seem tenable. As in any piece of work left unfinished, some parts are much better done than others" (p. 239). "The opening address of Alcibiades to the senate. . . has at least some of the feeling of Othello's great speech to another senate. And the rest of the verse throughout the scene has the same note of dignity and high-mindedness" (p. 238).

The State in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman Plays (1940), James Emerson Phillips, Jr.: "According to Alcibiades it is lust for gold, a disproportionate emphasis on material welfare, which has turned the Senate from its appointed vocation of government. It will be remembered that in Renaissance political thinking a government which ruled for its own selfish purposes, for the increase of its own wealth at the expense of others, was considered nothing short of tyranny" (p. 130). "In the climactic outburst of this scene, therefore, Alcibiades goes beyond the immediate effects, injustice to his friend and banishment for himself, to suggest the ultimate causes. He shows the Athenian Senate to be a governing head which has placed its own selfish greed before

justice, mercy, and the welfare of the whole state" (p. 131). "Critics have been so concerned with trying to explain the bad verse and the unknown soldier in the fifth scene of Act III that they have failed to stress the real importance of this disputed scene to the dramatic structure of the play. At this point Alcibiades comes into conflict with the tyranny of the Senate, and he suffers much as Timon suffers" (pp. 142-43).

"Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (1942), Una-Ellis-Fermor: "Either, it is clear, the scene belongs to some alternative action or sub-plot which was finally discarded, in which case it has presumably strayed into the text as did, according to one theory, the re-written passages of Love's Labour's Lost, or it is an essential part of the action of the play as it was planned and its supporting scenes are lost or were never written. It may be noticed that, though it has as it stands no connection with the preceding action of the play, it has some kinship with the theme, for the changes are rung here, as all through the play, on the contrast between generous friendship and ingratitude" (p. 278). "It becomes increasingly difficult to resist the idea that a series of passages is missing containing such essential parts of the story as would have made the structure of the last three acts solid by relating Timon clearly to Alcibiades and both to Athenian

politics" (p. 279).

"Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1946), A.S. Collins: "There are two master keys to the play--the Three Strangers in III.ii, and the great scene (III.v) of Alcibiades before the senate. The first lets us into the secret of the nature of the play, its Morality nature: the second is the key to the play's very heart, the nature of its feeling; and until that is fully apprehended, the argument of the play remains cold, intellectual, and obviously, from the many dissatisfied critics, a bad argument. Yet perhaps only the first key is really needed, for the First Stranger says all that need be said, and the scene before the Senate only drives home the lesson,though it also leads to the development of a further truth, the difference between Idealism (Timon) and Realism (Alcibiades) in their reaction to the world's ingratitude" (p. 98). On the Senators' reaction to Alcibiades: "Unaccustomed human feeling battering at their hearts' door begets their furious anger. The soldier shall die, and Alcibiades shall be banished. Nothing must break into the cold security of their money-getting: they are for law, for money is more than men and law than mercy" (p. 104).

The Meaning of Shakespeare (1951; rpt. 1963), Harold C. Goddard: "The fifth scene of Act III is a perfect little play

that repeats the main situation in Measure for Measure, tinctured with a strong likeness to the occasion when Henry V tries out the three traitors, and with remoter echoes of the court scene in Merchant of Venice. . . . The entire scene is a tissue of contradictions expressly contrived, one would suppose, to set us thinking of the relations of crime, law, war, and justice" (Vol. 2, 175, 176),

Shakespeare's Tragedies (1951), G.B. Harrison: "It is now the turn of Alcibiades to feel the ingratitude of man. One of his friends has killed an enemy in quarrel, and the Senate have condemned him to death. Alcibiades begs for life. The man had defended his honour and had served the State bravely in battle; but the judges are merciless and, when Alcibiades pleads his own deserts and is denied, he grows abusive and is immediately banished. Then, left to himself, he curses the Senate and Athens. . . . There is an echo here of Coriolanus, likewise banished by an ungrateful City" (p. 260).

The Slave of Life: A Study of Shakespeare and the Idea of Justice (1955), M.D.H. Parker: "But the First Senator, far from believing with Alcibiades that 'pity is the virtue of the law, and none but tyrants use it cruelly', remains convinced that 'nothing emboldens sin so much as mercy', and Alcibiades, who

will not take this for his answer, is, like Kent, banished for his pains" (p. 145).

Shakespeare's Military World (1956), Paul A. Jorgensen:

> The motivation for Alcibiades' turning upon his country is achieved by Shakespeare in a single scene (III.v). The scene is made of maximum dramatic impact and generalized significance by employing the stereotype of the soldier pleading with civil law. Though it is recognizably in the genre of the trial scene, there are enough variations made on the conventional type to make it interestingly new. Alcibiades is pleading not for his own life, but for that of a soldier friend. His civil indiscretion is not the same as that of his friend--murder--but simply the rough insistence of his pleading, for which he is rewarded by banishment. The irony and special originality of the scene lie in the fact that Alcibiades as a soldier is condemned not for a crime but for using defensive tactics that normally served to clear soldiers of an alleged crime. (p. 283)

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme: "[T]he position of Alcibiades is hard to account for fully. His triumph at the end suggests an attempt to give an answer to the problem set by Timon's reaction to his world and to Athens. But though he himself has been part of that world and has reacted against it, he hardly represents a distinct and reputable standard of his own: he is in fact nowhere given enough body, enough moral substance, to take that part in the development of the action and theme of the play which he has to bear at the end" (p. 123).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner: "[T]o Alcibiades the senators [are] representatives of humanity in the large" (p. 151).

Shakespeare's Life and Art (1961), Peter Alexander: "In a cold passion for strict law, bred of their love of personal security, they [the Senators] condemn the soldier to death" (p. 183).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann: "Alcibiades' pleasing in III.v, as though in a court of law, would enthrall such an audience [law students at Gray's Inn], even if the accused does not appear" (p. 18).

"Timon of Athens" (1963), David Cook: "Act III, sc. v is central to the whole play. . . . The first Senator's reply, 'Nothing emboldens sin so much as mercy', recalls the debate between Isabella and Angelo. This passage is highly relevant to the whole play. The issue is concentrated in Alcibiades' lines, 'To be in anger is impiety;/But who is man that is not angry?/ Weigh but the crime with this.' In short, he insists that man's fallibility must be taken into account in balancing justice against mercy" (p. 93).

"Shakespeare and the Neo-Chivalric Cult of Honor" (1964), Paul N. Siegel: "The principle of the bond, the business contract,

which has no provision for mercy and exalts the cash nexus above every tie of human feeling, governs the members of the senate who exact the payment of his life from Alcibiades' friend and push Timon into bankruptcy by demanding payment of his loans from them" (p. 68).

Timon of Athens (1965), Maurice Charney:

> Act III, Scene v, is the first and only full scene of the subplot. It is well written and fully written. . . . Although the scene has no plot links with what preceds, it does have a strong thematic connection with it. The Athenian senators show the same ingratitude to a benefactor of their state as they did to Timon. This scene plays an important part in developing the tone and mood of Athens, so that when Timon's mock-banquet and revenge follow in the next scene, we are glad to see the tables turned on the greedy, usurious senators. Alcibiades' banishment in this scene foreshadows the self-exile of Timon at the end of the next scene. (. xxvii)

"Timon of Athens and the Jacobean Duel" (1965), G.R. Waggoner:

> In this scene the senators assert that duelling is a bloody crime; that he who kills must be killed and that the punishment for duelling must be death; mercy would encourage duels; courage is no excuse; true courage is represented by suffering and bearing injuries--"To revenge is no valour, but to bear" (III. v. 39); violence and riotous living result from the same animal fury that causes the duel. (p. 307)

Waggoner summarizes Alcibiades' argument to the Senators:

> Alcibiades, by contrast, argues that the law should be merciful; that his friend's deed was not premeditated; that his friend is virtuous; that he showed honorable courage in the duel; when his reputation and honor were fatally damaged, the duel was necessary, and so his friend, soberly controlling his anger, entered upon the duel justly and in a fair spirit; if patient bearing of wrong is right and honorable behavior, what of war--are not women braver than soldiers and the fettered prisoner a better model than a just judge; wisdom does not reside in merely suffering injustice; his heroic military deeds in his country's wars deserve consideration; the condemned man's friends will act as security for his future conduct; it is better that he should die in battle for his country than be condemned for this duel; only the dotage, usury, concern for riches, and lack of respect for honor and service to country on the part of the senators can explain their attitude. (p. 307)

"Alcibiades' Revolt in Timon of Athens" (1967), Leonard Goldstein: "Siegel [1964, 1968] tends to see the intensity of Alcibiades' reaction to the Senate as a result of the 'toughness of the adherent of the neo-chivalric cult of honor' . . . to which the Senate, as bourgeois, were entirely insensitive. In other words, the intensity of Alcibiades' resentment derives from a resentment of the bourgeois and the latter's commercial values" (p. 258). "In effect, Alcibiades' revolt is a revolt against the new bourgeois ethos" (p. 265).

Shakespeare in His Time and Ours (1968), Paul N. Siegel: "The values of Alcibiades and those of the senators are opposed to each other. Alcibiades is concerned only with honor, they with

money. His defense before the senate of his friend, who he states killed a man in a duel only after having been grately provoked and in hot blood, has merit according to Christian humanist theory, but it reveals the touchiness of the adherent of the neo-chivalric cult of honor in its praise of the 'noble fury and fair spirit' with which his friend, 'seeing his reputation touched to death,' (III.v.18-19) opposed his foe" (p. 157). "[T]he senator's words, like Shylock's boasts of how he bears his injuries with a 'patient shrug'. . . are only pharasaical [sic] self-righteousness; the senate itself knows no forebearance or charity" (p. 158) "[T]his lack of either charity or gratitude. . .links the scene of Alcibiades' banishment with the previous scene in which Timon is beset by his creditors" (p. 158).

"Plot-Echoes in Shakespeare's Plays" (1969), Ernest Schanzer: "The monstrous ingratitude of the Athenian senators, who not only refuse to grant Alcibiades his request for the life of his friend but condemn him to perpetual banishment, mirrors the equally monstrous ingratitude of Timon's false friends, which was shown in the preceding scenes" (p. 111).

"Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Dr. Faustus" (1970), Anne Lancashire: "This scene [III.v] is apparently entirely original with Shakespeare" (p. 40).

"The Ending of Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1973), Richard D. Fly: "Withdrawal from society, whether forced or willingly undertaken, is seen as a frighteningly absolute gesture: an annihilating confrontation with chaos and nothingness" (p. 250).

"Theme in Timon of Athens" (1974), Michael Tinker: "I find in this scene [III.v] a confrontation between two opposing sets of values: Alcibiades representing non-material values, and the Senate representing purely material ones" (pp. 79-80). "The first encounter between Alcibiades and the Senate, which Miss Ellis-Fermor finds so hard to account for, is one of the more significant scenes in the play. It illustrates, among other things, the quite specific differences between Alcibiades and Timon. Alcibiades, like Timon, is prepared to give his possessions for his friends. . . . However, although Alcibiades and Timon are both willing to give up their possessions, Alcibiades' giving is towards a specific end. Timon gives indiscriminately, Alcibiades for a purpose" (p. 79).

Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective (1976), Larry S. Champion: "Alcibiades' banishment, like Timon's self-renunciation, results in total estrangement from his homeland" (p. 214).

"Fortune and Friendship in Timon of Athens" (1976-77),

Lewis Walker: "Each of Alcibiades's appearances makes a serious point, but the different points are imcompatible as expressions of the same persona. This is true on both the allegorical and the naturalistic levels" (p. 584).

"Timon: Shakespeare's Magnyfycence and an Embryonic Lear" (1978), Ruth Levitsky: "Following [Alcibiades'] plea for leniency for his friend, we have what can only be called a debate over the relative merits of Aristotelianism and Stoicism with reference to honorable action and the use of the passions on the one hand and apathy and endurance on the other" (p. 117).

"Timon in Shakespeare's Athens" (1980), Robert S. Miola:

> Since the Athenians institutionalized their banishments in the ostracismon--the annual expulsion of the city's best and most powerful men to prevent the possible rise of demagogues--their practices gained special notoriety in the Renaissance. LeRoy, glossing Aristotle's derogatory reminiscences, declared that Athenians banished the good, powerful, and wise because they "delighted to abate and humble" the great, thereby giving "vent, as it were, to the venome of their malice." Pedro Mexia, another compiler of classical lore, likewise complained of the "unkinde and unaduised ingratitude" which often resulted in the perversion of Athenian justice. And when recalling the banishment of Themistocles, Alcibiades, Damon, Aristides, and Cimon, Plutarch expressed the same opinion he voiced in the Life of Alcibiades--namely, that the custom was instituted by the common people "rather to satisfie their envie, then for to remedy their feare." (p. 27)

On the placement of the banishment scene: "The vices of envy and ingratitude, as manifested in the exile or execution of the good, thus align themselves with the vices of the disorderly banquet. With this in mind, we can see that Shakespeare's inclusion of an unjust banishment--that of Alcibiades--in the middle of his play (III.v) is appropriate and understandable" (p. 27). On Alcibiades' character: "Alcibiades. . . is a paradoxical figure who resists categorization. While he appears in Shakespeare's play as the faithful soldier who has served his country courageously, the loyal friend who seeks to save a comrade's life, he is also portrayed as a choleric rebel who resolves to destroy his own city" (p. 27). On the audience's attitude toward Alcibiades during the trial scene: "Contemptable as the Senators are, however, their growing distrust of Alcibiades accords with our own, and hence we cannot avoid feeling a grudging respect for their arguments. . . . it becomes difficult for the audience to fault the Senate's claims about the sanctity of the law and the justice of the punishment, despite the loathsomeness of the administration. As in the reaction to Alcibiades, then, the spectator's emotions are forced into conflict with his judgment, thus making a clear-cut, simple response to the characters and issues impossible" (p. 28).

On the trial itself: "Shakespeare develops the familiar scene--the unjust banishment of the good man by the envious many--into a powerful image of Athenian disorder. In Athens the virtuous individual ends up esposing a doctrine of social anarchy and revolution, while the corrupt Senators mouth pious moral formulas. Justice, honor, and virtue are nowhere to be found. And this is precisely the point. In a democracy there is no center of authority, no clear voice of reason to settle contraversies, to make judgments" (p. 28).

[See also the III.v section in "Attribution," "III.v," "Senators," "Greeks and Athens," "Timon and Money," and "Unfinished Theory."]

ALCIBIADES (IV.iii, and V.iv)

Shakspere and His Predecessors (1896), F.S. Boas: "We turn with relief from the dissonances of the main plot to the spectacle of the soldier-statesman using the 'olive' with the sword, and inaugurating a new and sounder era in the Athenian commonwealth" (p. 503).

The Authorship of Timon of Athens (1910), Ernest Hunter Wright: "In Plutarch's sketch of Timon, Alcibiades is merely mentioned as the only man whom Timon loves--because he knows that Alcibiades will one day prove the bane of Athens. The motive recurs in the play; and the character, taking on some general traits from Plutarch's separate Life of Alcibiades, becomes a kind of Fortinbras in the drama, fighting out the wrongs which Timon can only curse" (pp. 16-17).

"Primitivism in Shakespeare and Spenser" (1940), Thomas P. Harrison: "the primitive ideal is weighed against the ideal which insists actively upon a restoration of the course of 'regular justice.' Once more in Athens the laws of man rule, preventing the chaos which Timon had fled and which he had rightly designated as bestial. In Alcibiades' lines, which close the play, an ideal far removed from that of primitive retirement eloquently speaks" (p. 71).

The State in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman Plays (1940), James Emerson Phillips, Jr.: "So in Timon of Athens the social and political corruption is wiped out before the end of the play. Alcibiades' function in the drama is the achievement of this reformation" (p. 145). "Finally, the general makes it clear that he considers the wrongs done to both Timon and himself to have been caused by the infection which he is about to destroy at its source" (p. 146).

"Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1946), A.S. Collins: "Sanity, with common decency, is restored: there shall be human-heartedness again. And Alcibiades has achieved it, the common sensual man, whose ideals are tempered with weakness. He, like Henry V, is the better ruler. The disillusioned idealist is broken and mad, but Alcibiades can cleanse and then forgive. Alcibiades can succeed because he is more in harmony with the 'perpetual-sober gods' (IV.iii.500), whom 'the general and exceptless rashness of Timon offends. It is a view consonant with Shakespeare elsewhere" (p. 107).

An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948), Hardin Craig: "He [Shakespeare] introduces a positive element of redemption and consolation opposed to the bitterness of Timon. It looks as if Shakespeare or another had tried to make the play assume

the conventional form of tragedy. This seems borne out also in the last three scenes of the play, in which the rather inconsistent Alcibiades appears as a restorer of normal social life--a sort of Richmond or Octavius" (p. 253).

Shakespeare's Tragedies and Other Studies in Seventeenth Century Drama (1950), Clifford Leech: "This triumph of Alcibiades at the end of the play is in many ways strange. He is a rebel, unjustly exiled it is true, but ready at once to take up arms against the established government, asserting his will against the order of the state. . . . No rebuke is ever administered to him for this offence against 'degree.' . . . We are evidently a long way from the ideas of the history plays, when usurpation was a dreadful thing, even if the monarch was scarcely fit to rule. . . . It is as if Shakespeare is now prepared to see goodness in the domination of a strong man who will exercise his power with benevolence. He is, indeed, distantly approaching the character of Prospero" (pp. 115, 116).

"Timon of Athens" (1957), R. P. Draper: "Alcibiades is the dominant figure of the last scene, and, much as he has in common with those restorers of order who appear in most of the tragedies--Fortinbras, Edgar, Malcolm, for example--he differs from them in that he seems to foreshadow the regenerative theme of the last plays" (p. 199).

The Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957), J.C. Maxwell: "As the scene [IV.iii] stands, the presence of Phrynia and Timandra provides an occasion for Timon's invective, but scarcely helps to elucidate the Alcibiades' theme. I should be reluctant to regard it as intended to indicate that the claims of Alcibiades in the final scene to regenerate Athens are to be taken cynically" (p. xl).

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme: "His [Alcibiades'] triumph at the end suggests an attempt to give an answer to the problem set by Timon's reaction to his world and to Athens. But though he himself has been part of that world and has reacted against it, he hardly represents a distinct and reputable standard of his own: he is in fact nowhere given enough body, enough moral substance, to take that part in the development of the action and theme of the play which he has to bear at the end" (p. 123).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "He [Alcibiades] is the Fortinbras who restores order only after the tragic hero is dead" (p. xlix).

The Power of Satire: Magic, Art, Ritual (1960), Robert C. Elliott: "The most discreditable blot on Alcibiades, however, is that with no qualms he enjoys the company of two of Shakespeare's foulest woman, the whores Phrynia and Timandra" (p. 155). "The Senators plead, in short, for precisely the virtues

that Timon lacked; for Timon was never, from beginning to end, able to discriminate between the healthy and the infected. Whatever our misgivings about Alcibiades, he speaks at this moment as one aware of heroic responsibilities; he acceeds to the Senators' plea: the guilty will be 'set out' from the innocent, and only they shall fall. . . . Alcibiades' tone helps to create a sense of reasserted sanity" (p. 161).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner: "The delight which Timon takes in the coming destruction of his city prepares for and sets off the contrasting regeneration of Alcibiades which will assure the salvation of Athens as well" (p. 150). "Alcibiades brings not only retribution but forgiveness" (p. 152). "This offer [the Senators' offer of peace at V.iv.49-54] Alcibiades accepts, and in this acceptance is his redemption. He will use the force of arms to assert order and justice rather than to bring the chaos which Timon had anticipated in the sack of Athens. The guilty will be punished, but the innocent will know a new felicity, and order will be restored" (p. 152).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann: "Plutarch gave Shakespeare no authority for Alcibiades' military hostilities before the walls of Athens, nor for his more or less compulsory entry" (p. 7).

Shakespeare: The Problem Plays (1961), Peter Ure: "He [Alcibiades] is shown as a victim of Athenian ingratitude, and eventually returns to purge the corrupted city" (p. 45).

"Shakespeare's Greeks" (1964), Clifford Leech: "Alcibiades is no simple embodiment of virtue; he is, for example, utterly unlike Richmond who, at the end of Richard III, was in a simple way to bring good in place of evil. Rather, he is an imperfect man who yet at his best wants justice for Timon and good order and honour for Athens" (p. 18).

"King Lear and Timon of Athens" (1964-65), Ján Šimko: "here Shakespeare has provided the play (which is not a tragedy, although it presents the tragic fate of one person) with a positive and promising ending. It is the strong man that Shakespeare placed here his hope [sic] with a view that he would be strong enough to bring about a redress of all wrongs by the forces of evil" (p. 338).

"Alcibiades' Revolt in Timon of Athens" (1967), Leonard Goldstein: "if those who have harmed Alcibiades are dead, who are the spotted whom the Senate will select out for execution? Presumably Timon's usuring enemies. This appears to mean that the massive attack on the corrupting role of money and the criminality of usury culminates in Alcibiades' extirpating usury from Athens" (p. 268). "While Timon goes down in tragic defeat, Alcibiades seeing the error of his ways accepts and then attempts

to reform Athens" (p. 276).

"Timon of Athens and the Growth of Discrimination" (1967) R. Swigg: "Alcibiades is again before the Senate, but the roles have changed: he is now their judge, not they his. . . . In the figure of Alcibiades are joined the best of those two life-experiences--youthful compassion balanced with aged authority" (pp. 393, 394). "[I]n this ritual enactment of trust [between Alcibiades and the Senators] 'promise' is complemented by 'performance' again, and the equilibrium of reality is established. It is a complete reinstatement of language--words backed by deeds--and, by being so, the act of trust redeems the besmirched concept of 'honour.. . . Now the words of Alcibiades which seem so 'nobly spoken' (1. 63) have a 'noble meaning' (1. 59) because Alcibiades is empowered to meet 'promise' with 'performance'; and, in a mutually correcting balance, the 'olive' of peace and mercy is joined to the 'sword' of power and justice" (p. 394)

The Base String: The Underworld in Elizabethan Literature (1968), Normand Berlin:

> Surely, the appearance of Alcibiades in the company of two diseased wenches would tend to lower him in the audience's estimation. Surely, Shakespeare realized

> this. Yet, Shakespeare does present Alcibiades with the whores, which leads one to suspect that Alcibiades must know the whores in order to rule successfully. Is knowledge of the underworld through contact necessary for the proper understanding of the basic moral premises by which all men must live, and is not such knowledge necessary for those who wish to rule a state on principles of justice and love. Othello, Lear, and Timon seem to indicate this, as does Henry IV, where Hal studied his underworld companions. For Shakespeare the underworld seems to be the fruit on the forbidden tree; it must be chewed for the proper knowledge of good and evil. (p. 211)

Shakespeare in His Time and Ours (1968), Paul N. Siegel: "When Timon gives him [Alcibiades] gold for his discontented soldiers and bids him spare not an old man, matron, maid or infant of Athens, drawing a graphic picture of horror, Alcibiades, dismayed, indicates that he renounces his previous intention of levelling Athens" (p. 160). "No longer a ruthless destroyer, he is now [V.iv] a soldier-statesman who will toughen the fibre of Athens after it has gone soft through a prolonged peace but will not bleed it to death in a lengthly war" (p. 161).

The Tragic Engagement: A Study of Shakespeare's Classical Tragedies (1968), Judah Stampfer: "Structurally [Alcibiades'] closing speech parallels that of Lucius in Titus Andronicus, Richmond in Richard III, even Malcolm in Macbeth, being uttered by the redeeming healer of a state wracked by civil war; but here, peace and war are two 'leeches' prescribing to each other, a

vastly different closing vision from the traditional one" (p. 194).

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1969), Charlton Hinman: "The imperfections which suggest that Shakespeare left the play unfinished are very numerous but are also relatively trifling. . . . One of these is centered on Alcibiades. Some of the problems associated with his character and function are minor. Though we are given no real opportunity to know him in the first part of the play, what kind of man he is may be sufficiently revealed in the scene which ends in his banishment. . . . But what can be made of their [Timon and Alcibiades'] entirely different reactions to Athenian ingratitude? Does this contrast really show that Timon has far greater spiritual worth than his less sensitive but more successful friend, or is this only its imperfectly realized aim? Does it not in fact rather diminish than augment the stature of the protagonist in our eyes?" (p. 1138).

"Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Dr. Faustus" (1970), Anne Lancashire: "Alcibiades' final actions and speeches provide us with the proper perspective on the life and death of Timon. Alcibiades, like Timon, has been injured by Athens and has turned against it, but he has been able to realize that 'all. . .

have not offended' (V.iv.35), and thus has truly 'pass[ed] by' (V.iv.73) Timon, who has become 'nothing' (V.i.187) indeed, in the pagan eternal death which matches Faustus' Christian damnation" (p. 40).

The Riverside Shakespeare (1974), Frank Kermode: "he [Alcibiades] comes like Richmond or Malcolm against the corrupt city. He will restore order, using mercy with justice, the olive with the sword. . . . Remedy lies, if anywhere, in Alcibiades' course of action, not in self-exile and universal hate" (p. 1444).

"Theme in Timon of Athens" (1974), Michael Tinker: "Timon is dead. Alcibiades returns to Athens, not to destroy it, but to restore it. . . . I would suggest. . . that Alcibiades in sparing Athens affirms the basic theme. He acts with mercy, a decidedly non-material value. . . . He is, however, capable of recognizing and accepting humanity in others, as Timon is not. . . . It is the ultimate irony that Timon, who could not forgive himself, is forgiven by something even more impersonal than himself--the sea. But he is also forgiven by Alcibiades, who at the end calls him 'noble'" (p. 87).

Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective (1976), Larry S. Champion: "in the experience of Alcibiades and his development as a character foil to Timon, Shakespeare apparently attempts to provide

something akin to anagnorisis and the restitution of right reason in the individual and in the society at large which are characteristic of his earlier tragedies" (pp. 213-14).

"Fortune and Friendship in Timon of Athens" (1976-77), Lewis Walker: "the nature of Fortune's favor is confirmed by the presence of the 'brace of harlots,' a symbolic representation of that favor particularly appropriate to soldiers" (p. 583).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "By making Alcibiades into a character who fails to inspire assurance and by not providing a conclusive ending for the play, Shakespeare refrained from lightening the pessimism. . . . In dealing with Athens, Alcibiades may be said merely to apply principles of ordinary Realpolitik, but these have never made good moral prescriptions. Moreover, Alcibiades' credentials as champion of good against evil are weakened by his lax morality and excessive flexibility" (p. 62).

"Timon in Shakespeare's Athens" (1980), Robert S. Miola: "And while there may be a kind of victory in Timon's refusal to sully his hands with native soil, the advantage of the contrast with Alcibiades cannot be denied to the soldier who displays a capacity for forgiveness, growth, discrimination, and constructive action. What is equally clear, Alcibiades' unique position in and out of the traditional role suggests that any

central authority, even one which is compromised, is more likely to provide order and administer justice than a democracy, the chaos of misrule" (p. 30).

[See also "End of Play," "Timon and Alcibiades Parallels," and "Phyrnia and Timandra."]

The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare (1826), Samuel Weller Singer: "Timon frets himself to death; Alcibiades regains his lost dignity by violence" (Vol. 8, 3).

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight: "The banishment of Alcibiades is perfectly unconnected with the misanthropy of Timon;--the return of Alcibiades takes place after Timon's death. We feel no interest in either event" (Vol. 1, 336).

The Leopold Shakspere (1877), F.J. Furnivall: "Shakspere sympathizes with Timon, as always with the sufferers, rather than with the practical Alcibiades, who takes the right means to revenge himself for his countrymen's ingratitude to him" (p. lxxxiv).

Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art (1881), Edward Dowden: "Alcibiades, who is of an active, practical, unideal character, is not able to discover wisdom in the suffering of evils, which, by opposing them, a man may end. . . . Alcibiades, for daring the anger of the Senate, is sent into perpetual banishment. He, like Timon, is compelled to experience the ingratitude of his fellows. But Alcibiades has been living in the real world, and is able immediately to assign its place

to this ingratitude and baseness in a world which evil and good are mingled" (p. 347). "Yet the idealist Timon was infinitely interesting to the imagination of Shakspere. The practical and limited character of Alcibiades was esteemed highly by him, but did not really interest him" (p. 349).

The Works of Shakespeare (1888-90), Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall:

> Like Timon, Alcibiades is wronged, but he does not unpack his heart in words and fall a cursing. He is a successful man of the world, who takes prompt measures to right his wrongs, and his triumph over the offending senators forms a fitting sequel to the story of Timon's barren misanthropy. . . . Had Timon possessed the practical virtues of the victorious commander he would have been saved from despair, and the catastrophe would have been averted; but as we lament over the wreck of a noble nature, we feel that there are nobler things in the world than prosperity, and that failure may sometimes command a deeper respect than success. (Vol. 7, 12)

William Shakespeare (1936), George Brandes: "Where Timon merely hates, Alcibiades seizes his weapons; and when Timon curses indiscriminately, Alcibiades punishes severly but deliberately. He does not tear down the city walls and put every tenth citizen to the sword, as he is invited to do; he only seeks vengeance on his personal enemies and those whom he considers guilty. But Timon, like Hamlet, generalises his bitter experiences,

and loathes everything that bears the form or name of man. When Athens sends to entreat him to take the command and save the city from the violence of Alcibiades, he is harder and colder, and a hundred times more bitterly relentless, than Coriolanus, who, after all, could bow to entreaty, or than Alcibiades, who is satisfied with a strictly limited vengeance. Timon's loathing of life and hatred of humanity is consistent throughout" (p. 561).

The State in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman Plays (1940), James Emerson Phillips, Jr.: "Timon's cry is against an evil society; Alcibiades' cry is against the political rulers who have caused that evil. From the sixteenth-century point of view, however, the enemy of the two is the same" (p. 138). "[T]he two men suffer in the same way for the same reason, but Alcibiades is moved to corrective action by the injury against which Timon can do no more than rant" (p. 144).

"Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1946), A.S. Collins: "The disillusioned idealist is broken and mad, but Alcibiades can cleanse and then forgive. Alcibiades can succeed because he is more in harmony with the 'perpetual-sober gods' (IV.iii 500), whom 'the general and exceptless rashness' of Timon offends. It is a view consonant with Shakespeare elsewhere"

(p. 107).

"Timon of Athens" (1948), J.C. Maxwell: "The contrast is not (Collins, p. 90) between Idealism and Realism, but between inhuman excess and a balanced humanity" (p. 206).

The Meaning of Shakespeare (1951; rpt. 1963), Harold C Goddard: "Timon is not banished from Athens by law; but, overcome by the ingratitude of the false friends who flattered and fawned upon him in his prosperity only to desert him utterly at the first whisper of adversity, he banishes himself" (Vol. 2, 176).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: Alcibiades "is the Fortinbras who restores order only after the tragic hero is dead; still more, he is the Octavius, the Aufidius--the man who survives partly because he has a clearer view of things and is more efficient, but partly because (it is the thought that recurs most often in Shakespeare) efficiency has been brought at the price of a certain loss of sensitivity. Timon, like Hamlet, Coriolanus and Antony, has a greater soul than the man of action with whom he is contrasted" (p. xlix).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner: "Alcibiades, like Gloucester, undergoes a parallel progression, but unlike Timon he accepts the proffered chance of redemption" (p. 138). "Alcibiades is wronged by the Athenian senate as fully

as Timon is wronged by his false friends. The two themes are linked in that both men suffer the effects of unnatural ingratitude; Alcibiades has given Athens his blood, Timon his money; each is rejected in return. Alcibiades, however, has been the man of action, unlike Timon the man of feeling, and his perversion of values appears in a lust for revenge" (p. 141). "[W]e are shown the death of Timon and the contrasting redemption of Alcibiades. Timon rejects the offer of the Athenian senators to atone for the injuries society has done him. Their mission to Timon's cave prepares the audience for Alcibiades' march against Athens which will bring the play to its climax. The delight which Timon takes in the coming destruction of his city prepares for and sets off the contrasting regeneration of Alcibiades which will assure the salvation of Athens as well" (pp. 149-50).

Shakespeare's Life and Art (1961), Peter Alexander: "The Athenians treat Timon as they treated the soldier [defended by Alcibiades in III.v]. Their gratitude to the man who has spent a fortune in the defence of the state, and in befriending his fellow citizens, turns to indignant censure the moment they are asked to repay a little of what they owe. What threatens their person or their purse is given short shrift" (p. 183).

"Shakespeare and the Neo-Chivalric Cult of Honor" (1964), Paul N. Siegel: Timon is "an idealization of the new Tudor aristocracy, which practiced old-time hospitality as one of the feudal traditions it assimilated, spent money freely in maintaining its position, and acted as the patron of literature. . . . Alcibiades, however, is representative of a surviving feudal militarism unmodified by humanism" (p. 66).

"Alcibiades' Revolt in Timon of Athens" (1967), Leonard Goldstein: "That Alcibiades was meant generally as a contrasting positive character to the finally negative and tragic Timon, has generally been agreed upon. Alcibiades can adjust to the situation while Timon cannot, and therein lies the latter's tragedy" (p. 276).

Shakespeare in His Time and Ours (1968), Paul N. Siegel: "It is this lack of either charity or gratitude, a lack expressed in terms of insistence on the payment of a debt, which links the scene of Alcibiades' banishment with the previous scene in which Timon is beset by his creditors" (p. 158).

"Plot-Echoes in Shakespeare's Plays" (1969), Ernest Schanzer: "The monstrous ingratitude of the Athenian senators, who not only refuse to grant Alcibiades his request for the life

of his friend but condemn him to perpetual banishment, mirrors the equally monstrous ingratitude of Timon's false friends, which is shown in the preceding scenes. In this way Shakespeare heightens his picture of the rottenness of the Athenian ruling class" (p. 111).

"Timon of Athens: Tragedy or Satire?" (1969), Robert E. Morsberger: "Alcibiades too is treated unjustly, goes into exile, and swears revenge. But Alcibiades, with quite as much cause for complaint as Timon, keeps his touch with humanity and learns to forgive in the end" (p. 65).

"Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Dr. Faustus" (1970), Anne Lancashire: "Alcibiades, like Timon, has asked Athenians for help and has been refused; and, like Timon, he next turns against the city, which he has previously served so faithfully (as Timon served his friends). Unlike Timon, however, Alcibiades manages eventually to balance his newly-acquired knowledge of evil with a realization of the goodness also to be found in the world" (p. 40).

"The Ending of Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1973), Richard D. Fly: "Timon commands a centrifugal movement away from society towards total isolation and death--a movement suggesting tragedy and eliciting emotions associated with

catharsis. Alcibiades is less fully portrayed as the leader of a centripetal movement back into reunion with society--an action suggesting primarily history and eliciting communal emotions" (p. 246). "Alcibiades and Timon are not to be compared to see which one makes the more resonable response to Athenian ingratitude; rather, they are to be understood as responding to two totally different human conditions, and in both cases their response is equally valid" (pp. 248-49).

"Theme in Timon of Athens" (1974), Michael Tinker: "although both Alcibiades and Timon are willing to give up their possessions, Alcibiades' giving is towards a specific end. Timon gives indiscriminately, Alcibiades for a purpose" (p. 79). "Alcibiades has no illusions about mankind. . . . Timon, on the other hand, thinks men are faultless and never doubts that his friends will help him until they have in fact not helped him" (p. 79). "The ending of the play emphasizes the theme. . . that insofar as man rises above the level of the beasts--above the level of Timon--he does so by acts such as Alcibiades', by the deliberate choice not to live by bread alone. Alcibiades, by affirming those values that Timon sought to deny, brings humanity back to the world" (p. 88).

Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective (1976) Larry S. Champion:

"Timon repudiates the overtures of repentance from the senators, refuses to aid the besieged city, and dies in bitter isolation tossing a final curse against the human race from his grave. Alcibiades, on the other hand, entertains the emissaries from the city, agrees to withhold his attack in return for autocratic powers, and--though still tainted by a degree of self-interest--is resorbed into the society from which, like Timon's, his departure had been so violent" (pp. 214-15). "[T]here is only a tenuous relationship between the actions of Timon and those of Alcibiades. . . . the subplot [is] developed at an awkwardly late point in the action and the motivation which prompts Alcibiades' pleas for his friend's life and the Senate's drastic reaction dangerously superficial" (p. 216).

"Truth and Timon of Athens" (1979), Lesley W. Brill: "Critics who find Timon praiseworthy for his idealism or nobility generally blame Alcibiades for base pragmatism. Those who dislike Timon are apt to find in Alcibiades the moral and norm of the drama" (p. 19).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner:

> By making Alcibiades into a character who fails to inspire assurance and by not providing a con-

> clusive ending for the play, Shakespeare refrained from lightening the pessimism. He evidently did not wish to have Timon's faultiness set off by a contrasting example of goodness. Consequently, the foil relationship between the two characters is very subtle, and it tends to make us think somewhat better of Timon than of Alcibiades. Both are faced with ingratitude, but only Timon is really its victim. Both react angrily on the basis of a grudge that they generalize into a quarrel with Athens, but Alcibiades' anger remains colored by personal goals whereas Timon abandons all considerations of himself. In dealing with Athens, Alcibiades may be said merely to apply principles of ordinary Realpolitik, but these have never made good moral prescriptions. Moreover, Alcibiades' credentials as champion of good against evil are weakened by his lax morality and excessive flexibility. (p. 62)

[J.C. Maxwell makes the following remarks in his introduction to the Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957; rpt. 1958): "Shakespeare has evidently relied on the contrast between Timon and Alcibiades. . . to convey much of his meaning, and it is perhaps here that we are most conscious of the incompleteness of the draft. Most critics have seen the importance of the contrast between Timon and Alcibiades and their respective responses to Athenian baseness . . . The contrast is not. . . between Idealism and Realism, but between inhuman excess and balanced humanity. Alcibiades can see what is wrong with Athens--'banish usury' (3.5.101), and he is not provoked to indiscriminate hatred. Only the outlines of the theme are indicated, but the intention is clear" (pp. xxxviii, xxxix). See also Maxwell, 1948, above.]

[See also the sections on "Timon," "Alcibiades in General,"

"Alcibiades, III.v," and "Timon and Alcibiades Plots."

TIMON AND ALCIBIADES PLOTS

"Remarks on the Plays of Shakespear" (1710), Charles Goldon: "It is plain that the Plot is not regular as to Time, or Place, but the Action may be look'd on as pretty uniform, unless we wou'd make the Banishment, and the Return of Alcibiades an under Plot, which yet seems to be born of the main Design" (Vol. 5, 374).

Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art (1881), Edward Dowden: "in Timon of Athens, the story of Alcibiades, so ill connected by external points of contact with that of the principal character, fulfills the same ethical and aesthetic purpose that the secondary plots fulfil in Lear, in Hamlet, and in The Tempest" (p. 346).

Shakspere and His Predecessors (1896), F.S. Boas: "Its main plot lacks sufficient action, and dwindles in its latter stages into mere passionate declamation. . . its underplot with Alcibiades as hero, though its subtle variation on the main theme is essentially Shaksperean, is not closely enough interwoven into the texture of the piece" (p. 495).

The Works of Shakesperae (1888-90), Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall: "Alcibiades is only remotely connected with the main story" (Vol. 7, 12).

"The Theme of Timon of Athens" (1934), John W. Draper: "The Elizabethan attitude towards usury is the key to Timon of Athens: it gives the purpose to the play, which former scholars could not find; it explains the change in Timon, links to the former acts the final episode of Alcibiades' revenge, and so gives unity to character and to plot; it gives a reason for Shakespeare's change in attitude toward the Timon of tradition; and, by showing that he meant the play to be a commentary on current life, it explains his utter disregard of classical authenticity" (p. 29).

"Timon of Athens: The Disruption of Feudal Morality" (1947), E.C. Pettet: "there is at least one visible thread that links" the Alcibiades plot "to the main fabric. Fundamentally, Alcibiades' quarrel with the Athenian Senate of business men is not that it refuses to show mercy to his friend, not that it is ungrateful for that friend's past services to the State, but that it is punishing him for an act that is not really criminal at all: his friend has done nothing more than draw his sword on a point of honour 'seeing his reputation touch'd to death', and in Alcibiades' eyes there is no essential difference between a private act of this kind and the act of a State in going to war. Likewise, from the feudal standpoint Alcibiades' friend has done no wrong: he is, as F.S. Boas

aptly describes him, 'the victim of the chivalric principle of honour'" (p. 336).

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1954), Charles Jasper Sisson: "The play. . . certainly presents problems, not only to the over-nice critic. Its structure is loose and improvised. The Timon story and the Alcibiades story are ill woven together" (p. 910).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "With an absolute minimum of chronological narrative, Shakespeare has set off against each other the reactions of one man to different situations, and the reactions of different men to the same situation. . . . Any plot link between Alcibiades and Timon, then, would have been gratuitous; it would have cut across the constructional principle of the play" (pp. x viii,xlix).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner: "The action was designed to stress the scenes of Timon's misanthropic fury beside his cave, and this part of the play is in its most complete state. Shakespeare did not fill in details of the subplot which might have made the parallel between Timon and Alcibiades more clear, and he did not develop a reason for Timon's degeneration which would be dramatically as satisfying as his explanation of the suffering of Lear" (p. 138).

Ribner describes the function of the Alcibiades plot: "Imperfect as the details of the sub-plot may be, it is obvious

that Alcibiades was designed both as contrast and as parallel to Timon: to illustrate the similar effect of the world's evil upon a different kind of personality and thus lend a universal range to the theme" (p. 142). Nevertheless, "Shakespeare did not fill in details of the subplot which might have made the parallel between Alcibiades and Timon more clear" (p. 138).

"Timon of Athens" (1963), David Cook: "The action centered on Alcibiades is no mere irrelevant incident" (p. 93).

"Shakespeare and the Neo-Chivalric Cult of Honor" (1964), Paul N. Siegel: "The Alcibiades subplot parallels the Timon plot, for commercial Athens, thinking only of money, is ungrateful to both, but Alcibiades is not merely a weaker Timon. Timon is not, as Pettet says: '. . . a portrait of the ideal feudal lord living up to the full obligation of bounty and housekeeping'; he is rather an idealization of the new Tudor aristocracy, which practiced old-time hospitality as one of the feudal traditions it assimilated, spent money freely in maintaining its position, and acted as the patron of literature" (p. 66).

The Life of Timon of Athens (1965), Maurice Charney:

> Act III, Scene v, is the first and only full scene of the subplot. It is well written and fully written. . . . Although the scene has no plot links with what precedes, it does have a strong thematic connection with it. The Athenian senators show the same ingratitude to a benefactor of their state as they did to Timon. This scene plays an important part in developing the tone

> and mood of Athens, so that when Timon's mock-banquet and revenge follow in the next scene, we are glad to see the tables turned on the greedy, usurious senators. Alcibiades' banishment in this scene foreshadows the self-exile of Timon at the end of the next scene. (pp. xxvi-xxvii)

"Plot Echoes in Shakespeare's Plays" (1969), Ernest Schanzer: "Whereas in King Lear the relation of sub-plot to main-plot is principally one of close parallels, while the contrasts between them play a subordinate part, in Timon of Athens it is above all the contrasts between sub-plot and main-plot which are significant. Shakespeare makes Alcibiades Timon's foil by showing how very different he reacts to the Athenian's ingratitude (instead of seeking refuge in misanthropy he collects an army, conquers Athens, and purifies the state). By means of this juxtaposition Shakespeare, in habitual way, silently comments upon Timon's response to his misfortunes" (p. 111).

"The Ending of Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1973), Richard Fly: "the most serious and damaging disjunction in what M.C. Bradbrook calls 'this drama of gaps,' appears in the appar nt lack of coherent synchronisation between the Alcibiades su plot and the Timon main action" (p. 242). "The Alcibiades subplot is finally too underdeveloped and fragmentary, too lacking in substance and power, to balance effectively the perspective of the Timon main plot" (p. 249).

Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective (1976), Larry S. Champion: "there is only a tenuous relationship between the actions of Timon and those of Alcibiades" (p. 216). "The principal difficulty in the use of Alcibiades as a device for transferring the emotion of the tragic catharsis is Shakespeare's failure to provide a vital relationship between the two plot strands. . . . At the same time the subplot fails to function convincingly in the establishment of a secondary character whose illumination or compassion could provide the rationale for tragedy" (p. 215).

Shakespeare and His Times (1817), Nathan Drake: "Timon and Apemantus are both misanthropes; but from very different causes, and with very different consequences, and yet they mutually illustrate each other" (Vol. 2, 447-48). Drake describes these differences:

> If the constitutional goodness of Timon is to be inferred from the conduct of his domestics, the errors which overshadowed it are most distinctly laid open by the unsparing invective of Apemantus. The misanthropy of this character is not based, like Timon's, on the wreck of the noblest feelings of our nature, on the milk of human kindness turned to gall, but springs from the vilest of our passions, from envy, hatred, and malice. He is a born beggar, and his pride is to continue such, while his sole occupation, his pleasure and his choice, is to drag vices, and calumniate the virtues of humanity.. . . The widely different fate of these two characters, is, likewise, decisive of the opposite origin and nature of their misanthropical conduct. Timon, that 'monument,/And wonder of good deeds evilly betow'd' dies broken-hearted, a martyr to self-delusion, and to the ingratitude of mankind; whilst Apemantus, wrapped up in constitutional apathy, travels on unscathed, a general and unfeeling railer on the frailty of his species. (Vol. 2, 450, 452)

Shakspere and Jonson, Dramatic, versus Wit-Combats. Auxiliary Forces:--Beaumont and Fletcher, Marston, Decker, Chapman, and Webster (1864), Robert Cartwright reads the play for topical allegory and finds that Apemantus is Jonson.

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight: "That the Apemantus of this scene [I.i] belongs wholly to Shakspere is not to our minds quite so certain. There is little of the wit in any part of this dialogue; and the pelting volley of abuse between the Cynic, the Poet, and the Painter, might have been produced by any writer who was not afraid of exhibiting the tu quoque style of repartee which distinguishes the angry rhetoric of fish-wives and school-boys" (Vol. 1, 334).

"On the Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1874), F.G. Fleay:

> after Timon has said, 'Let us in!' [I.i.254] one of the rest who entered with Alcibiades says, 'Come, shall we in? and taste L. Timon's bountie?' and after a little conversation, he and his friend, another of the rest, go in together. So I think Shakspere arranged it: his alterer empties the stage of all but Apemantus, who stays in order to 'depart after all discontentedly like himself' in the next scene: but as there was a bit of Shakspere to be used up. . . the alterer brings in two extra Lords to talk to Apemantus, so that, after all, Apemantus has no opportunity of leaving the stage like himself. (p. 130)

Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art (1881), Edward Dowden: "The misanthropy of Timon is contrasted with that of Apemantus. . . . Apemantus serves as an interpreter and apologist of Timon. He has erected his natural churlishness into a philosophy and a creed. He snarls at the heels of humanity with a currish fashion, to pick up the scraps that fall" (p. 346).

The Works of Shakespeare (1888-90), Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall: "Timon hates men, and is miserable in his hatred; Apemantus hates them too, and enjoys it. Always a cynic and a carper, he never had any faith in the fondness of the human heart, and cannot open his mouth except to give utterance to a sneer or a surly repartee" (Vol. 7, 13).

The old Arden Timon of Athens (1905), K. Deighton: "it is a mere assumption that the First and Second Lords are two of the rest who enter with Alcibiades; the words 'Come, shall we in, and taste Lord Timon's bounty' are bound up with the First Lord's remark about Apemantus, 'He's opposite to humanity'; it is nowhere said that the cynic left the stage 'discontentedly like himself,' but that at the beginning of the next scene he 'comes, dropping after all, discontentedly, like himself'; nor is this behaviour of his in any way necessarily dependent upon his being left on the stage after the others had gone out" (p. xvii).

"Shakespeare's Purpose in Timon of Athens" (1928), Dixon Wecter:

> One finds the original of Apemantus in Henry Cuffe, also in the retinue of Essex, whom Birch calls "a great philosopher." Bacon describes him as "a base fellow by birth, but a great scholar," with which we may compare Timon's contemptuous address to Apemantus--

> Thou are a slave, whom Fortune's tender are
> With favour never clasp'd but bred a dog (IV,iii,251).

And Wotton, pp. 31-32, describes him as

> a man of secret ambitious ends of his own, and of proportionate Counsells smothered under the habit of a Scholler, and slubbered over with a certain rude and clownish fashion, that had the semblance of integrity. (p. 719)

The Wheel of Fire (1930; rpt. 1967), G. Wilson Knight: "Timon is a universal lover, Apemantus a universal cynic. His mind functions in terms of the foul, bestial, and stupid attributes of man" (p. 212).

"Primitivism in Shakespeare and Spenser" (1940), Thomas P. Harrison, Jr.: "Imperfectly but clearly the poet brings to bear two distinct charges against Timon's cynicism and against his primitive mode of life. In contrast with the delusion of a soft primitivism one encounters the significant comments of Apemantus, the selfish cynic who has played a prophetic role from the beginning of the play, where (1.2.284) he had been reviled as 'opposite to humanity'" (p. 69).

"En Relisant Timon d'Athenes" (1942), Robert Kemp prefers Apemantus to Timon, whose reaction to ingratitude, he feels, is excessive, coming, as it does, from a man who has seen the Peloponnesian War and the fall of Pericles (p. 3).

An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948), Hardin Craig: "The play also affords another type of man-hater in Apemantus, described as a 'churlish philosopher.' He has known all his life that men are a sorry lot and has devoted himself on principle to hating them. Little use is made of him. He merely visits Timon in his prosperous days to tell Timon he is making a mistake and later returns to say, 'I told you so.' Even the theme of misanthropy is not fully worked out in Timon of Athens, although elements of it are present" (p. 247).

"Timon of Athens" (1948), J.C. Maxwell: "In the earlier scenes, Apemantus falls easily enough under the type of 'scurrulous and profane jester' first introduced by Jonson in Every Man out of his Humour in the person of Carlo Buffone" (p. 207). Maxwell also notes "Apemantus's essentially sentimental and self-indulgent cynicism" (p. 207).

Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies (1950), Willard Farnham:

> The beastliness of Apemantus in Timon is also backed by more than the Timon legend. Shakespeare's Apemantus is a cynic bearing some relation to the traditional Diogenes, whose reported sayings and doings were current among sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English writers and were often collected. Like Diogenes, Apemantus is called a dog, and like Diogenes he admits that he is a biting dog. And when he is called an "unpeaceable dog" by one of Timon's flatterers, his retort that he would

> "fly, like a dog, the heels of an ass" (I.i.283) is in the vein of Diogenes, who supposedly knew always how to discomfit those he disliked by witty reference to his title of dog. . . . The condemnation of flatterers as devouring beasts which is attributed to Diogenes. . . might have served as a model for Apemantus' bitter criticism of Timon's flatterers. (p. 73)

On Apemantus' asceticism: "The asceticism of the Diogenes of tradition seems to be Apemantus' rule of life. There was thought to be justification for saying that Diogenes 'ledde a bestly lyfe,' using the good things of the earth 'no more than bestes' and drinking water as beasts do. Apemantus at Timon's feast, eating root and drinking 'honest water' while 'rich men sin' is the same mixture of beastliness and moral fervor that Diogenes had the reputation of being" (p. 73). On Apemantus and Thersites: "unlike Thersites, he has consistent philosophy in him, in addition to mere scurrilousness, and he distinctly does not gloat over the existence of the evil and folly that he scourges" (p. 74).

The Elizabethan Malady: A Study of Melancholia in English Literature from 1580 to 1642 (1951), Lawrence Babb: "Apemantus is apparently a malcontent by nature, not by accident" (p. 95). "Apemantus, in spite of his eccentricities, is an intelligent, candid, and honest man" (p. 95).

"Timon of Athens" (1957), R.P. Draper: "The stage is set for

tragedy because Timon is under a grievous illusion about the nature of men, and the collapse of society seems imminent because it has become thoroughly degenerate. Apemantus is a commentator on all this, but like Thersites in Troilus he is not necessarily Shakespeare's own spokesman. As we learn later from Timon, in a very different mood, he is part of the general corruption that he dwells upon so avidly" (p. 195).

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme: "Apemantus. . . cannot live without this society: if it were gone he would have nothing on which to pour scorn. He is the inverted parasite, but as much conditioned and supported by the decaying world as any of the fawning courtiers" (pp. 113-14).

The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art (1960), Robert C. Elliott: "This cynic, this 'churlish philosopher,' is a perfect type of the railer-fool. He hates everyone, is 'ever angry,' as Timon says" (pp. 150-51). On Apemantus' function in the play:

> Apemantus' railing is, in one sense, a performance, a kind of game; various characters egg him on, feed him lines, to see the clown perform. . . but in another scene, his railing peels off layer after layer of fraudulence, as it cuts its way to the core of things. Outrageous as Apemantus is, bitter, cynical, snarling, his view of the reality at Timon's court is healthy by comparison with what prevails. (p. 151)

Apemantus is "like other malcontents who brood on degeneration, the moral bias of the idealist manqué" (p. 151). Finally, Elliott identifies "both Timon and Apemantus as satirists" (p. 165).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner: "He [Apemantus] reduces himself to the 'unaccommodated man' which Lear had seen in Poor Tom, and which now is symbolized in Apemantus" (p. 138). "Apemantus is used for several purposes. As man-hating cynic in the opening scenes of the play, he is man reduced to beast by his rejection of the humanity which is God's noblest creation. As such he is used to set off the opposite qualities of the magnanimous Timon. The cynicism of Apemantus is pride in the medieval theological sense; his scorn for humanity is a denial both of his brotherhood to man and of the fatherhood of God" (p. 142).

Shakespeare's Life and Art (1961), Peter Alexander: "Apemantus with his raillery is created to emphasize what these incidents [the incidents in the play] tell us. He is the needy hater of the world, who, owing to some deprivation, covers up with the vehemence of his contempt what is now known as an inferiority complex" (p. 185). On Timon and Apemantus' misanthropy:

> The misanthropy of Apemantus is only the world's self-love inside out. But Timon's hate is from no such malice; and his occupation is gone not because the citizens will not repay their borrowings, but because their refusal wakens him from his dream of restoring the golden age and all its charities in such a nest of vipers. Apemantus could see the world given over to

> beasts and remain a beast with them, but Timon will be a man or nothing; and his misanthropy comes on him, as it does on the other great misanthropes of the stage, because it seems impossible to remain a man among his friends. (p. 185)

Shakespeare: The Problem Plays (1961), Peter Ure: "Despite his own dislikeable nature, Apemantus helps to re-define those whom Timon so freely calls his friends as flatterers, and to bring home to the audience a moral point with which they would be extremely familiar (one, indeed, on which Plutarch had written at great length, namely, that it is very hard to discern the one from the other" (p. 47).

"Timon of Athens" (1963), David Cook: "Apemantus seems to be cast in the philosophical tradition of Diogenes; he serves as the relentless mentor in the play. He is neither taken in by the glitter of society, nor does he withdraw from it, but stays to warn and moralize. His view of his fellows, if sometimes almost as black as Timon's is at the last, remains philosophic rather than petulant or personal; and he is engaged throughout in moral and prophetic admonition, never in self-glorification or self-pity. . . . Apemantus is cast as the homilist: often his works become so impersonal that he seems to speak for the play rather than for himself" (p. 89).

"Dog Imagery in The Two Gentlemen of Verona, King Lear,

and Timon of Athens" (1964), Ralph M. Tutt: "Timon feels no kinship with Apemantus in cynicism and despair, because Apemantus has no justification for his attitude. He has never been flattered or betrayed, because he has never been actively involved in life, has never been generous" (p. 19).

Language as Symbolic Action (1966), Kenneth Burke:

> Apemantus serves to keep the play from falling simply into contrasted halves. For the presence of the scurrilous Apemantus from the start, even at the height of Timon's popularity, establishes thus early the style which will be stressed by Timon himself after his drastic change of heart which makes him into as sturdy a votary of vituperation as Apemantus. The nauseous presence of Apemantus in Act I, even while Timon was at the peak of his philanthropic expansiveness, is a dramatic way of saying that intrinsic to the very nature of such generosity as Timon's, there are always, in the offing, such nasty possibilities as Apemantus exemplifies. (p. 117)

Shakespeare the Craftsman (1969), M.C. Bradbrook: "Apemantus, whose name means 'feeling no pain', is tied to the City he despises--seeing the wild woods only as somewhere that is not Athens, Timon as no more than the Prodigal among husks" (p. 157).

"Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Dr. Faustus" (1970), Anne Lancashire: "Parallel to the Knowledge of Everyman is a 'mercy figure' in Timon who offers 'redemption' of a kind, through true knowledge of the world, to the protagonist. This

mercy figure is Apemantus, the cynical philosopher, who believes in 'plain dealing' (I.i.210) and attempts to give Timon a clear-sighted view of the nature of men and of the society they create. . . . Apemantus, as Knowledge, makes possible for Timon only a partial recovery from despair, because we are, in Timon, in a secular world, and full recovery from the evils of life is possible only to spiritual man. Everyman is offered spiritual as well as secular knowledge; Timon can be given only the latter" (p. 38).

"Shakespeare's Misanthrope" (1973), Harry Levin: "Apemantus performs a unifying function by prefiguring the second part during the first, eating roots while the others are banqueting, recognized by them as being 'opposite to humanity'" (pp. 92-93).

Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective (1976), Larry S. Champion: "The caustic objurations of Apemantus, who observes the situation without involvement and of whom it is said that he loves 'few things' better than to 'abhor himself' (I,i,59-60), provides the most extensive commentary on the evils both within and around Timon. In isolation his misanthropic diatribes would be dismissed as the utterances of a diseased mind. But flanked by the remarks of those characters who focus our attention on just such moral erosion, Apemantus' chilling attacks seem not only credible but strangely appropriate" (p. 207).

"Truth and Timon of Athens" (1979), Lesley W. Brill: "Apemantus is ever ready to serve as a commentator. He judges not only the jewel and the painting, but the company of Timon's flatterers, Athenians generally, the art of poetry, the venality of the Merchant, the quality of the feast and the masque, and Timon himself" (p. 24).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "his [Apemantus'] singling out Timon for attention is not mere altruism; Apemantus likes to be right, and his smug attitude after Timon's fall gives one the feeling that he has been looking forward to seeing the philosophy prove true" (p. 88). Soellner also examines the influences of Shakespeare's sources on his characterization of Apemantus:

> Apemantus, like Timon, was essentially Shakespeare's own creation. The little about him in the sources was useless for Shakespeare's purposes. Plutarch conceived him as the misanthrope's confidant: "This Timon would have Apemantus in his company because he was like to his nature and conditions and also followed him in manner of life." Cicero in De amicitia suggested Apemantus was Timon's misanthropic ally: "Nay, even if anyone were of a nature so savage and fierce as to loathe the society of men--such, for example, as tradition tells us a certain Timon of Athens once was--yet even such a man could not refrain from seeking some person before whom he might pour out the venom of his embittered soul." (p. 88)

On Apemantus and Thersites: "Apemantus is sometimes said to be in the pattern of that other railer against Greek society, Thersites in Troilus and Cressida. But the two share little more than a few tricks, and the scurrilous commentary and sarcastic repartee in which they both excel are used for different purposes. Thersites has no moral fervor; he is no cynic but an allowed fool, and if he lives in the gutter, he does not do so because of philosophical principles. . . . Apemantus's function resembles the fool's in Lear by uttering truths unpleasant to the tragic hero and criticizing his actions" (p. 89). On Apemantus' prose-verse speeches: "The very rhythm of his speech differs; . . . many of his lines have a status between prose and verse, tending toward twelve-feet doggerel. He hardly ever speaks more than two lines of blank verse before he falls into doggerel or prose. No other character talks in such a skipping manner--an idiosyncracy surly due to deliberate characterization rather than to the play's lack of finish" (p. 89). Soellner finds models for Apemantus in Lyly's Diogenes in Alexander and Campaspe (1584), Richard Barckley's Discourse (1603), Thomas Lodge's Catharos: Diogenes in His Singularity (1594), and Arthur Warren's The Poor Man's Passions and Poverty's Patience (1605) (pp. 89-90).

APEMANTUS (in IV.iii)

Shakespeare and His Times (1817), Nathan Drake: "the unhappy Timon proceeds, with admirable discrimination, to contrast himself and his persecutor; a description which, for strength and severity, as well as truth of censure, has never been exceeded. . . . In revenge for this correct, but tremendous picture of himself, Apemantus, shortly afterwards, presents Timon with a miniature of his own character, so faithfully condensed, that it comprises, in about a dozen words, the entire history of his life; the indiscriminate generosity of his early, and the extravagant misanthropy,of his later days: 'The middle of humanity thou never knewest, but the extremity of both ends'" (Vol. 2, 250-51).

The Dramatic Works of Shakspere (1826), Samuel Weller Singer: "They [Timon and Apemantus] have a sort of competition with each other in their trade of misanthropy: the cynic reproches the impoverished Timon with having been merely driven by necessity to take to the way of living which he had been long following of his free choice, and Timon cannot bear the thought of being merely an imitator of the cynic" (Vol. 8, 3).

The Wheel of Fire (1930; rpt. 1967), G. Wilson Knight:

> Apemantus comes to Timon, the philosopher of hate

> to the prophet of hate. The incident points the difference between them, and is important. Apemantus first advises Timon to return to mankind, to turn flatterer himself. He points out that this life of hardship serves no purpose of revenge, and that nature will be no less cruel than men. Will the bleak air, the trees, the creatures hardened in nature's battle with a cruel heaven, come to Timon's bidding, and flatter? Timon angrily bids him depart. Apemantus shows signs of desiring friendship. . . . Timon reveals him to himself as a flatterer like the rest: a man whom loathing is an enjoyment, not a terrible destiny. (p. 225)

Shakespeare's Tragedies (1951) G.B. Harrison:

> Apemantus is the next comer. He is annoyed that Timon's melancholy is not inborn. It comes merely from a change of fortune; he has no right to shame the woods by carping; he should rather turn flatterer and woo those who once wooed him. Apemantus' flow of bitter words is at first so much more powerful that for a while Timon is almost speechless, but at length he recovers the initiative and justifies his own better claim to melancholy. To contemporaries, especially those afflicted with a severe dose of the true melancholic humour, this argument would have given sardonic satisfaction, for it was a matter for grave debate whether one who was bred a dog and had never known prosperity had as great a right to the disease as one who, like Timon, "had the world as my confectionary" . . . . But the argument degenerates into mere muddy abuse until Timon drives Apemantus away with stones. (pp. 265-65)

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner:

> In the debate itself, the central dialectic of ideas

in the play, Apemantus does score some hits, or else it were not a good match; but there can be little doubt that Timon wins. Apemantus begins well by rubbing in Timon's subjection to flatterers and by asking him to try being a flatterer of Nature now. But Timon gives him his own medicine by accusing Apemantus of flattering misery (236). Then Timon asks Apemantus why he has come, and when the latter denies any altruistic motive by saying that his purpose is merely to vex Timon, the misanthrope calls this pursuit "always a villain's office, or a fool's." Timon then elicits from the cynic the concession that he is pleased with this role--it is evident now, if it was not before, that the poet was quite wrong when he said that Apemantus loves to abhor himself; he should have said that he loves to abhor others and man in general. Timon can easily turn Apemantus's admission of pleasure in his role of gadfly into a confession of knavery: "What, a knave too" (239-40). (p. 93).

POET and PAINTER (I.i)

"Lucian and Boiardo in Timon of Athens" (1931), R. Warwick Bond: "The Poet of Acts I and V is created from Gnathonides who offers his dithyambic ode in Lucian's c. 46" (p. 53).

"Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (1942), Una Ellis-Fermor: "The Jacobean drama offers us a series of notable inductions, and Shakespeare is here [in I.i], as usual, profoundly original in an age of virtuosos. This passage gives us, moreover, in the poet's allegory, the ironic fore-warning of Timon's fall, a warning which precedes the detailed presentation of his wealth and extravagance that occupies the first two acts" (pp. 271-72).

An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948), Hardin Craig refers to the Poet and Painter as two "puppets" who "talk about their art" (p. 250)

"In Defense of Timon's Poet" (1953), Kenneth Muir: "there is little to justify the assumption that" the Poet "is indulging in 'base poetic flattery.'. . . The Poet, in other words, presents the moral of Shakespeare's play. He may wish for reward, but he writes the truth as he sees it. His later conduct, if Shakespeare is responsible for it, may indicate that his conscience as a man was inferior to his artistic conscience. But if one considers how many poets followed up poems in praise of Cromwell with enthusiastic welcomes of the Restoration, one is

inclined to regard Timon's anonymous poet with charity" (p. 121).

"Timon and the Conceit of Art" (1955), W.M. Merchant:

> Recent critics have not been. . . forthright in their treatment of these two characters [the Poet and the Painter] but though the play has received a good deal of critical attention in contemporary writing, it has mainly been regarded as a social document, Shakespeare's treatise on 'the new anti-feudal forces of commercialism, money and self-interest.' . . . a closer view of their role shows a more organic relation between their opening scene of discussion and rivalry and the major themes of the play, to which the subject of 'money and self-interest' is strictly subordinate. (p. 249)

On the Poet's allegory: "the poetic allegory. . .serves as a prologue to the play and an epitome of it; it directs attention not so much to the pernicious nature of wealth as to the dual theme of the false appearance of friendship and the uncertainty of fortune" (p. 250).

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme: "poet and painter discuss their arts with an air of superior detachment amounting to dilettantism, full of conceits with no substantial purpose underneath" (pp. 109-10).

Shakespeare as Collaborator (1960), Kenneth Muir: "Nor is the moral character of the poets depicted in Shakespeare's acknowledged plays so lofty that we can assume that Lodowick's portrayal is beneath him. The time-serving poet in Timon of

Athens and the lynched poet in Julius Caesar are neither idealized" (p. 37).

Endeavors of Art: A Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama (1963), Madeleine Doran: "The discussion in the first few acts of Timon of Athens between the poet and the painter shows how a work of art might be considered both as accurately representational and as ideally true" (p. 72). On the Poet and Painter's debate: "It is a comparison in which three commonplaces of renaissance critical thought join hands: the similarity of poetry and painting, the idea of art as a vehicle of universal truth, and the idea of art as a teacher of mankind" (p. 74).

"Timon of Athens" (1963), David Cook: "True the painting carries a moral, the warning that pride goes before the fall, but significantly Timon does not consider this when he later receives the work" (p. 85).

"Timon of Athens and Morality Drama" (1967), David M. Bergeron: "the De casibus tragedy which follows is anticipated in the opening words of the play. The conversation between the Painter and Poet also points to the hypocritical reaction of Timon's friends; this hypocrisy is at the heart of the theme of the play" (p. 183).

"Timon of Athens and the Growth of Discrimination" (1967),

R. Swigg: "It is here, under the heading of 'art' (both deceptive skill and as straightforward, true 'being') that evil and good, appearance and reality, are drawn together in a new conjunction. Dishonesty is included within a scheme of 'honesty'. At the same time, the Poet and Painter, corrupt exponents of art, are dissociated from the intrinsic value of art itself. Just as Timon's behaviour with the new-found gold contrasted with that of the servants' indicted him as tainter, so now the Poet and the Painter are clearly perceived in isolation from their art as debasing, human practitioners in contrast with the soldier's 'art'" (p. 393).

"Timon: Shakespeare's Magnyfycence and an Embryonic Lear" (1978), Ruth Levitsky: "the picture of Timon and all his flatterers as minions of Fortune as typical of all Mankind is not merely implied: it is expressly stated by the poet" (p. 112).

"Truth and Timon of Athens" (1979), Lesley W. Brill: "Although they are among the most obvious and least appealing of Timon's flatterers, they nonetheless come closest of anyone to showing Timon the simple truth of his position. The Poet's initial narrative of a Timon-figure skidding down Fortune's hill may be a simplification of what follows, but it is in the main an accurate prophecy of the rest of the play. Similarly, the proposed satire which the Poet outlines in Act V stands as a

fair summary of the action to that point. How are we to account for the relative truth of these productions, productions of men who are fully as grasping, dishonest, and simple-minded as Timon's other flatterers?. . . One must. . . conclude either that the Poet does not understand what he writes or that he cannot control it, which may be saying the same thing" (pp. 34, 35).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner:

> The artistic prelude of Timon, in which a discussion of poetry and art exposes the commercial prostitution, turns on a triad of values whose places were often discussed in the Renaissance: Nature, Art, and Fortune. The two former were generally looked upon as forming a defensive alliance against the fickleness of the latter. One of Alciati's emblems, for instance, showed Art (Mercury) as the helper of Nature (ars naturam adjuvans) in rejecting the advances of Fortune (adversus vim fortunae est ars facta). Perversely, the poet subordinates himself to Fortune in her attack on Nature and thus violates the Renaissance triad, changing it from a harmonious relationship into a subversive hierarchy: Art above Nature, Fortune above Art. (p. 133)

On the paragone itself: "The quarrel is reflected in the painter's insistence that painting more vividly than poetry depicts the adversity of fortune. . . . Shakespeare evidently knew about the rivalry between poets and painters concerning which of their respective arts was superior in the imitation of reality, although the paragone seems not to have been waged in England--somehow he

knew about all major intellectual and artistic currents" (p. 134).

[See also the "Paragone" section in "Miscellaneous."]

POET and PAINTER (V.i)

Johnson on Shakespeare (1765; rpt. 1968), Samuel Johnson on the stage direction, "Enter Poet and Painter" (s.d. V.i.1):

> The Poet and Painter were within view when Apemantus parted from Timon, and might then have seen Timon, since Apemantus, standing by him, would see them: but the scenes of the "thieves" and the "steward" have pass'd before their arrival, and yet passed, as the drama is now conducted, within their view. It might be suspected that some scenes are transposed, for all these difficulties would be removed by introducing the Poet and Painter first, and the thieves in their place. Yet I am afraid the scenes must keep their present order; for the Painter alludes to the thieves, when he says, "he likewise enriched poor and straggling soldiers with great quantity." This impropriety is not heighten'd by placing the thieves in one act, and the Poet and Painter in another; but it must be remembered, that in the original edition this play is not divided into separate acts, so that the present distribution is arbitrary,and may be changed of any convenience can be gained, or impropriety obviated by alteration. (pp. 741-42)

Remarks Critical and Illustrative, on the Text and Notes of the Last Edition of Shakespeare (1783), Joseph Ritson: "If we allow the Poet and Painter to see Apemantus, it may be conjectured that they did not think his presence necessary at their interview with Timon, and had therefore returned back into the city" (pp. 153-54).

Comments on the Last Edition of Shakespaare's Plays (1785), John Monck Mason: "Johnson's remarks on the impropriety of this scene [V.i] are not well founded. The Poet and Painter were in view when Apemantus parted from Timon, and might then have seen

him; but we may suppose that they had no desire to converse with him, until after they had heard that he was possessed of money, and had enriched other people. The Painter's first speech seems to intimate that he had seen him before" (p. 303).

The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare (1790), Edmond Malone: "I perceive no difficulty. . . . Shakespeare was not very attentive to these minute particulars; and if he and the audience knew of the several persons who had partaken of Timon's wealth, he would not scruple to impart this knowledge to persons who perhaps had not an opportunity of acquiring it" (Vol. 10, 119).

"On the Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1869), F.G. Fleay:

> In v. 1, which is certainly a continuation of the same scene [IV.iii], the poet and painter have not only heard the rumour, but they know exactly all Timon's visitors: Alcibiades, the women, the "soldiers," and the steward who has just left the stage; they only know "'tis said," however, so they did not see him go. We avoid Scylla, certainly, by allowing the curtain to fall at the end of iv. 3. But Charybdis is then enevitable. The poet and painter must have been coming, and in sight, all through Sc. 3, from 1.356 to the end, and while the curtain is down. (p. 143)

"Timon and the Conceit of Art" (1955), W.M. Merchant: "Timon has now reached the utter rejection of the values by which he had lived, and with the entry of the poet and the painter the cycle is complete. The commendation of the painter's art in the first scene is recalled, the artist's revelation of the true

man beneath the exterior corrupted by the trafficking of dishonor. Now, in the fourth act [sic; read "fifth act"], both painting and poetry are rejected; they too are illusion, a deceitful appearance, like the false behavior of his friends and his own apparent generosity" (p. 256).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner: "The visit of the Poet and Painter emphasizes Timon's rejection of the former values by which he had lived, for his praise and support of the artists at the play's beginning is recalled. Art, the revelation of true reality, he now sees only as deceitful false appearance. With the banishment of the Poet and the Painter, the former Timon is gone forever" (p. 148).

"Timon of Athens and the Growth of Discrimination" (1967), R. Swigg: "Late in the play, the Painter argues that 'To promise is most courtly and fashionable; performance is a kind of will or testament which argues a great sickness in his judgment that makes it' (V.i.26-29). And Timon's career in Athens is virtually an embodiment of such an argument, being an example of a life of unreality created on the mere basis of words, the 'promise' divorced from the 'performance'" (p. 389).

"Theme in Timon of Athens" (1974), Michael Tinker: "Throughout his conversation with the Painter and the Poet he plays on the word 'honest,' and in so doing he curses himself.

It is the very word he used to describe Flavius, but, in his refusal to admit the failure of his own logic, he has ceased to be honest himself. When he comments to the two, 'Each man apart, all single and alone,/Yet an arch-villain keeps him company' (V.i.106-107), the remark applies equally to himself" (p. 86).

FLAVIUS

"On the Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1874), F.G. Fleay: "The steward also, or at any rate some one who talks very like the steward of the 2nd author's scenes, is here [in I.ii] called Flavius and here only. But in Act ii. Sc. 2, Flavius is given by Shakspere as the name of one of Timon's servants who is not the steward" (p. 131). This leads Fleay to believe that I.ii "has not a trace of Shakspere in it" (p. 131).

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (1886), Henry N. Hudson:

> Again: In I.2, which is all Anonymous, the Steward, or one who performs the office of the Steward, is called Flavius; but, in the latter part of ii.2, which is certainly Shakespeare, Flavius is given as the name of one of Timon's servants who is not the Steward. In the Shakespeare portions, in fact, the folio never designates the Steward by his proper name, but only by that of his office. (Vol.15, 188)

The old Arden Timon of Athens (1905), K. Deighton: "Regarding the steward there is a difficulty not easily to be accounted for" (p. xv). Deighton goes on to cite Fleay and Hudson (see above). He makes no additional suggestions.

"Is Shakespeare Aristocratic?" (1914), Albert H. Tolman: "there certainly are many examples in Shakespeare of devoted love

between servant and master. Call to mind the faithful steward of Timon of Athens" (p. 295).

The Wheel of Fire (1930; rpt. 1969), G. Wilson Knight:

> Flavius, Timon's steward, comes to remind us of the reality of faithfulness and love. Yet even here Timon loses not a jot of grandeur. At first he refuses to see, then to recognize, his faithful servant. Finally, he is forced to realize that in simple love his steward is again offering his service to the ruin of his old master. . . . The beauty of this incident is the beauty of a blade of grass beneath the architrave of a cathedral. The finite virtue of simple humanity is asserting its right to stand within the vaulted silences of the eternal which scorns all limit, all failure. Timon stays for a moment his outward passionate adventure, pauses to proclaim one honest man: though the edifice of his creed of hate be a mighty thing, the blade of grass, rooted in the strength of a mightier, splits one stone of the foundation. But Timon, with an afterthought, suspects Flavius of mean motives. Reassured, he shows him his gold, and gives him wealth with the terrible injunction that he, too, is to hate mankind. (pp. 227-28)

An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948), Hardin Craig: "The speeches of Flavius are unmarked in the Folio text, and his appearance here [IV.iii] may be an afterthought" (p. 253). Nevertheless, Flavius "introduces a positive element of redemption and consolation opposed to the bitterness of Timon" (p. 253).

Shakespeare's Tragedies (1951), G.B. Harrison: "Last of all,

old Flavius appears, lamenting over his fallen master. Timon at first refuses to recognize him until the old man proffers his life-time's savings, which he will share with his master--a gesture which Shakespeare had already used in As You Like It. . . . Timon at last is shaken. . . . And again the echo--'Think, we had mothers'. Troylus, maddened by Cressid's disloyalty, is inclined to square the general sex by Cressid's rule: to Timon, one loyal man seems almost a breach in nature" (P. 265).

"On Certain Proper Names in Shakespeare" (1951), Robert Adger Law: "Flavius, an historical tribune, makes the opening speech in Julius Caesar" (p. 61). Law goes on to note that North's Plutarch is the source of eighteen names in Timon. He concludes that these Plutarchian name origins "may have a slightly larger bearing on the problem of Shakespeare's authorship of one or two plays sometimes termed 'doubtful.' . . . To be specific, this means a bit more evidence for Shakespeare's authorship of. . . Timon of Athens" (p. 65).

The Slave of Life: A Study of Shakespeare and the Idea of Justice (1955), M.D.H. Parker: "Flavius indeed redeems himself; he is powerless to redeem Timon" (p. 144).

The Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957), J.C. Maxwell: "The audience can see, if Flavius--his heart stronger than his head--

cannot, that an attempt on the part of man to ape divine bounty, even spontaneously giving without receiving anything in return, is presumptuous and must inevitably be frustrated" (p. xxxiv).

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme: "Flavius [is] the only one. . . who can maintain a fairly balanced viewpoint" (p. 110).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "Timon's misanthropy, like everything else in Shakespeare's plays, is part of a dramatized situation and is in no sense a lyrical statement of the poet's own beliefs; and Timon's invective, for which the play has received most of such praise as has generally been given it, is all the more remarkable when one pauses to reflect that it states an attitude from which, through the presence of the Steward, Shakespeare has dissociated himself completely" (p. li).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner: "Timon is offered by his simple servant, Flavius, the possibility of redemption just as Lear was offered it by Cordelia, but unlike Lear, Timon rejects this offer and dies the beast he actually has become" (p. 138). "The most significant of Timon's visitors is his faithful steward, Flavius, for their meeting provides the crucial test in which a fallen Timon is offered the chance of re-

demption. When he rejects it, we know that his damnation is assured. . . . Flavius may be viewed as a Christ symbol offering salvation. Not only does Timon reject this offer but he would reduce the saviour himself to his own bestial level" (pp. 148, 149).

Shakespeare's Life and Art (1961), Peter Alexander: "There is at the core of the play, as in Timon's own heart, a rare humanity; and the sense of the nobility in simple service finds expression in these humbler figures. They reassure us of the humanity in Timon himself, and that it was indeed his goodness that undid him" (p. 187). Alexander also compares Flavius with Kent: "Flavius, the steward, is a companion worthy of the faithful Kent, and like Kent stands at the end unrecognized by his distracted master" (p. 187).

Shakespeare: The Problem Plays (1961), Peter Ure: "The method for resisting flatterers was to know thyself. Flavius, the faithful steward, is the witness that Timon does not know himself in respect of his most relevant property and emblem, his purse" (p. 47).

"Dog Imagery in Two Gemtlemen of Verona, King Lear and Timon of Athens" (1964), Ralph M. Tutt notes a dog image in Flavius' "speech to the servants of Timon's creditors (III. iv.47-56)" (p. 19).

Language as Symbolic Action (1966), Kenneth Burke:

> But the play finds ways whereby sheerly supernumerary characters, such as servants and strangers, can be manipulated in Timon's favor. The genuine, doglike loyalty of Flavius is a case in point. The image of the dog figures quite dyslogistically throughout the play, as Caroline Spurgeon has pointed out. It is almost as though Shakespeare were systematically developing variations on the etymology of the word "cynic," as the term which the ancient Greeks would have applied to the "beastly" attitudinizings of both Timon and Apemantus, and which they would apply to the currish nature of mankind generally. But besides the fawning dog of flattery, and the mad dog of backbiting, there is the doglike loyalty of service. And Flavius's loyalty to Timon speaks well for Timon, as does the judgment of other servants, who despise the ingratitude of their masters with regard to Timon, even though, like the Stranger in Act III, scene ii, they themselves give us grounds to believe that they wouldn't have done much better had they been in their masters' place. (p. 118)

"Timon of Athens and Morality Drama" (1967), David M. Bergeron:

> Along structural lines, I would suggest that the role of Flavius in Timon is comparable to that of Death in Everyman, only mutatis mutandis. Death visits Everyman early in the play and tells him that he must take a journey from which he shall not return. This marks the reversal or change in Everyman's career; the unexpected has happened. Similarly, it is the faithful servant, Flavius, who comes to tell Timon of the depleted treasure and thus signals the beginning of the change in Timon's life. (p. 183)

Shakespeare the Craftsman (1969), M.C. Bradbrook: "Good spirits were not conjur'd into a circle [see I.i.5-7); later the Fool defines this universal spirit as Lust; and Plutus, the chthonic god, is named as Timon's steward" (p. 148).

"Alchemy and Timon of Athens" (1970), David M. Bergeron: "A time of testing but makes the gold of Flavius' spirit shine brighter than usual. Almost he persuades Timon to view life differently" (p. 370).

"Theme in Timon of Athens" (1974), Michael Tinker:

> The appearance of Flavius after the Banditti leave seems to me to be the crux of the play. Flavius does not understand what has happened to Timon. He makes the same mistake that Apemantus made: "What an alteration of honor has desp'rate want made!" (IV.iii. 465). There is no "desp'rate want" although Flavius cannot know that. When Timon first sees Flavius he treats him as he treats all other men. . . . Flavius, like Alcibiades, is condemned for being a man. There is a notable difference, however, between this confrontation and the others. Flavius weeps, and Timon is moved. . . . Almost--but not quite. Timon very nearly accepts values beyond material ones. But he does not. And his refusal to do so is tragic. (p. 84).

Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective (1976), Larry S. Champion: "Timon's culpability is signaled also by the steward Flavius, whose asides and soliloquies in the opening acts clearly establish both that Timon's liberality is compulsive and flagrantly

immoderate and also that he has been repeatedly warned of the consequences of such actions" (p. 208).

"Timon of Athens: The Rage of Disillusion" (1979), Susan Handelman: "The idealized value of woman as mercy and selfless love becomes the bond between men, the surplus which allows man to unite with man. In Timon, this surplus of love is found in the faithful servant, who seeks Timon out despite his poverty and exile to serve him without a price" (p. 65).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "Flavius has a surprisingly large share of words; he is only slightly behind Apemantus, who, as a satirist and philosopher, is expected to trade in words, and he is considerably ahead of Alcibiades. The relative verbosity, I think, comes from an individualizing feature of his character that is generally overlooked: a fondness for sonorous phrases and noble commonplaces" (p. 87). On Flavius in IV.iii: "He [Timon] parodies Flavius in harping on 'honest.' When he proclaims him the 'one honest man,' he uses the jest he remembers from Apemantus" (pp. 44-45). On the name Flavius: "It is sometimes claimed that Shakespeare quickly forgot that he had named the steward Flavius since he used the name only once for him (1.2.153)

and later, by mistake, for another servant (2.2.189). But this latter error was presumably the compositor's rather than Shakespeare's, and the one mention of his name is certainly sufficient for identification" (p. 87).

AMAZONS

"The Amazons in Elizabethan Literature" (1940), Celeste Turner Wright: "Because of Their decorative costumes, Amazons figure in a pageant at the christening in 1594 of Prince Henry, the heir of James I; Shakespeare's Timon, for similar reasons, contrives a masque in which Amazons dance and sing. . . . Whatever Elizabeth herself may have thought, the majority of her subjects appear to have accepted unchanged the views of the Middle Ages: they regarded the Amazons as picturesque ornaments to a pageant or romance but their social system as a dangerous example of unwomanly conduct, a violation of that traditional order under which 'Wommen are born to thraldom and penance/ And to been under mannes governance'" (pp. 440, 456).

"Timon, Cupid, and the Amazons" (1976), Robert C. Fulton: "there is a strong bias in the Renaisance against Amazons. . . . Behind the barbarity of the type was an emblem of chaos, since the Amazon represented an inversion of male and female roles extending from the personal through the political sphere" (p. 288). Fulton also sees a relationship between the Amazons in the masque and the two whores at Alcibiades' side (IV.iii): "The masque of Act I, scene ii, has undergone a total metamorphosis. The bright shapes and sparkling figures of that first banquet have given way to images of chaos and destruction.

Cupid has become the presiding genius at a feast of death. The brave habits of dancing ladies have fallen away to reveal a pair of poxy Amazons" (p. 294). "In his [Apemantus'] observations, then, can be glimpsed the negative connotations associated with these dancing ladies--ferocity and cruelty and the disease which signals destructive lust" (p. 290).

[See also "First Banquet"]

BANDITTI

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner: "To the banditti who come to rob him he gives gold and urges them 'to Athens go,/Break open shops; nothing can you steal,/ But thieves do lose it' (IV.iii.449-51). This shows that Timon stands for the perversion of justice. All nature to him reflects a pattern of injustice with which human thievery may accord" (p. 147).

"Theme in Timon of Athens" (1974), Michael Tinker: "Apemantus leaves and the Banditti enter. Timon immediately condemns them for the same fault that he condemns all others for: 'You must eat men' (IV.iii.428). He soon launches into a long description of nature as a thief. . . . Timon has again refused to see the world as anything but evil" (pp. 83-84).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner:

> Their visit provides the occasion for one of Timon's most scathing speeches, that on universal thievery. Its awesomeness is attested by the reaction of one of the degenerates. . . . Open criminality, we might say, is more curable than villainous sophistication were it not that the satirical key of the scene undercuts the moral. If the first bandit has his way, amelioration of his softer brother-in-arms will not take place until a later, indefinite time: "Let us first see

> peace in Athens, There is no time so miserable but a man may be true" (459-60). (p. 44)

"Timon of Athens: The Iconography of False Friendship" (1980), Clifford Davidson: "'You must eat men,' he [Timon] will advise the banditti (IV.iii.428). Men indeed have feasted upon him; now he firmly believes that not friendship but hostility between man and man is the normal and only condition of life" (p. 190).

[See also "Timon's Orations"]

CUPID

Language as Symbolic Action (1966), Kenneth Burke: "Also, the role of Cupid in connection with the masque suggests to me the thought that, whereas the absence of children is accidental in some plays, it is essential to this one" (p. 118).

"Timon, Cupid, and the Amazons" (1976), Robert C. Fulton, III emphasizes a Renaissance distinction between "'good' and 'bad' cupids" (p. 287). "English poets as disparate as Spenser and Jonson are sensitive to the malevolent potential of the god of love" (p. 285). On the other hand, Cupid "remains for many merely a conventional ornament to embellish those courtly entertainments 'when love was free and Venus seized all men's eyes'" (p. 287). Apemantus' comments on the masque serve to underscore these negative aspects of the god: "His running commentary throughout this scene [I.ii] forms an effective contrast to the demonstration of love and harmony at which the banquet aims. . . . his acerb remarks help us remain aware of the darkness implicit from the beginning in the figure of blind Eros" (p. 287).

"Timon of Athens: The Iconography of False Friendship" (1980), Clifford Davidson: "Prodigality, as visualized by Casare Ripa, is 'hoodwink'd'--i.e., blindfolded, as in the game of blind-man's-bluff. Thus Timon is one of those who unseeingly 'spend and squander their Substance without Reason, to those who are unworthy, for the most part, observing neither Rule nor

Measure'" (p. 182). "When [Cupid] cries, 'Hail to thee, worthy Timon, and to all/that of his bounties taste' (I.ii.118-19), he is echoing the 'all hail' of Decius' greeting to Julius Caesar, the words of the betraying witches in Macbeth, and Judas' fatal salutation to Christ" (p. 193).

[See also "First Banquet"]

"Timon of Athens and the Conceit of Art" (1955), W.M. Merchant: "the poetic allegory [in I.i] goes further than the painter's analysis of 'magnificence'; its description of Timon's sycophantic adherents, loyal so long as his fortune holds, but with hurried withdrawal at his decline in fortune, serves as a prologue to the play and an epitome of it; it directs attention not so much to the pernicious nature of wealth as to the dual theme of the false appearance of friendship and the uncertainty of fortune" (p. 250).

Timon of Athens (1965), Maurice Charney: "The controlling element in the scene [I.i] is the Poet's allegory of Fortune, which serves as a central fable for the play" (p. xxiv).

"Fortune and Friendship in Timon of Athens" (1976-77), Lewis Walker: "Timon is influenced by certain concepts of Fortune familiar to Shakespeare and his contemporaries. . . . many of the play's pecularities result from Shakespeare's attempt to demonstrate the operations of the goddess through dramatic action, a procedure necessitating a mingling of allegorical and naturalistic elements which is disconcerting for the modern reader" (p. 577). On the allegory of Fortune in I.i: "The allegory introduces Timon. . . as a study in what it means to be loved by Fortune and

to trust in her favors" (p. 580). On II.ii: "The playwright has invented a bit of stage business that obliquely involves Timon with a whore. This is enough to suggest Timon's relationship without on the one hand resorting to pure allegory and on the other having to justify the scene in entirely naturalistic terms" (p. 582). On Phrynia and Timandra: "In the iconography of the Renaissance, Fortune could be pictured specifically as a soldier's whore, and this is surely one of the main reasons why Phrynia and Timandra accompany Alcibiades on his visit to Timon in the woods" (p. 582). On Timon's gift to Ventidius: "The point of this episode is that any generosity, no matter how noble, which is based on the gifts of Fortune, can have no lasting effect" (p. 588). On Timon and his friends: "Timon's relationship with his friends is not direct; Fortune acts as intermediary. No matter how Timon expresses his idea of friendship, Fortune always plays a major role as a sort of broker between friends" (p. 588). Timon seeks friends "as if they were gifts of Fortune, thereby making it inevitable that they will not be 'steadfast'" (p. 591). Finally, "There can be little doubt that in Timon of Athens Shakespeare is showing how Fortune affects relationships between human beings by presenting thorough perversion of the ideal of true friendship" (p. 598).

"Timon: Shakespeare's Magnyfycence and an Embryonic Lear" (1978), Ruth Levitsky:

> The play opens with a discourse on the fickleness of the goddess Fortuna: the audience is being reminded of the danger in being "the very bottom on her cap" (Ham. II. ii.225); for since this goddess gave and took away as a matter of mere caprice, only the person who disdained her favours was safe from the humiliation, disappointment, and grief attendant upon the loss of those favours. . . . Straight off, we are told that Timon is in the power of this goddess. (p. 112)

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner, in the chapter "Fortune and the Globe," attempts to re-create "the thematic patterns that arise from [the] interplay of literary and visual suggestiveness in the Fortuna allusions of Timon by drawing on emblems and processional symbols" (p. 145). In the chapter "The Turn of Fortune's Wheel," Soellner traces the paths of Timon and Alcibiades on the wheel of Fortune:

> If we look at the structure in the light of the fortune pointers, we see it as tripartite. The first movement focuses on Timon, the spender and giver, and occurs in Athens; Timon here feels on top, but we know that he is on his way down. The second movement begins when the world seeks to put him in the regnavi position in the woods and continues with the world changing its mind and vainly visiting and wooing him; it ends with Timon's announcement that his reign is over. At the point where Timon's friends write him off, Alcibiades seems forced into the non regno placement; instead he rises to make himself master of Athens. His ascent is the third movement. (p. 32)

"Timon of Athens: The Iconography of False Friendship"

(1980), Clifford Davidson:"The Poet. . . comes around to a prophecy of the tragic conclusion, and his prophecy is expressed in terms of. . . familiar iconography" (p. 194).

[See also Howard Rollin Patch's "The Tradition of the Goddess Fortuna in Roman Literature and in the Traditional Period" (1922).]

HOSTILIUS

"Hostilius: Timon of Athens, III.ii.70" (1952), Fitzroy Pyle notes that "Hostilius" is the name given to one of the three strangers in III.ii: "The name Hostilius is not again used of the Second Stranger, and otherwise all three strangers are quite anonymous. All editors think of them so; for none lists Hostilius among the dramatis personae. But if the name has no business to be in the text, how did it find its way into the First Folio? I believe it was through a misreading of a stage direction" (p. 48). Pyle then argues that the name "Hostilius" is a compositorial error, which should have been deleted from the text:

> My suggestion is that the printer's copy read like this:
>
> And he that's once deny'de, will hardly speede. Exit First Stranger. Do you obserue this Lucilius.
>
> Thus what I assume is that in the manuscript there was not enough room beside Exit to write Lucilius, and that consequently it was written underneath, sufficiently close to the First Stranger's speech for the compositor to mistake the word as part of that speech, and sufficiently illegibly for him to misread it as Hostilius. (p. 49)

LORDS

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme: "The function of the Lords is clear: they demonstrate the final decay of a civilization which defines itself in terms of luxury. From this point of view there is no real distinction between the three whom we see at fairly close hand; each represents a slightly different side of the same selfish meanness bred inevitably by the society on which Timon depends, on which he tells Apemantus not to rail, because he cannot accept its failure" (p. 113).

LUCILIUS

"On Certain Proper Names in Shakespeare" (1951), Robert Adger Law: Lucilius "will be remembered as the Roman soldier who tried to save Brutus' life by claiming to be Brutus on the battlefield of Philippi" (p. 61).

"Timon's Imitation of Chirst" (1966),Jarold W. Ramsey: "Now I do not see how this [Timon's dowery gift] can be taken in context as other than a noble and charitable deed. The names of its ideal motives are fidelity and caritas, none other. Timon serves the causes of romantic love and gratefulness by rewarding an honest and faithful retainer, Lucilius, with enough money to enable him to marry the daughter of a tight-fisted and snobbish old Athenian" (p. 164).

[See also "OLD ATHENIAN," and "TIMON'S GENEROSITY"]

MESSENGER, SOLDIER, and EPITAPHS

The Plays of William Shakespeare (1765), Samuel Johnson: "There is something elaborately unskilful in the contrivance of sending a soldier, who cannot read, to take the epitaph in wax, only that it may close the play by being read with more solemnity in the last scene" (Vol. 6, 271-72).

The Works of William Shakespeare (1865), William George Clark and William Aldis Wright: "the close of the play bears the marks of haste, or want of skill, and the clumsy device of the wax cannot have been invented and would scarcely be adopted by Shakespeare" (Vol. 7, 315, n. xvii).

"On the Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1874), F.G. Fleay: "Act V. Sc. 3, where the Soldier who can't read, reads an Epitaph which is not written, and gives us the most useless and superfluous information of his own afterwards" (p. 136).

Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society (1874), B. Nicholson:

> There are two incompatible epitaphs, but they occur in a Shakspere passage in the last scene. "Seek not my name" and the tone of these two lines are incompatible with, "Here lie I, Timon." Hence a second epitaph has been substituted as an improvement, while both have by an oversight, been retained. (p. 248, n. 1)

The Temple Shakespeare (1899-1902), Israel Gollancz: "The third scene [V.iii], however, is clearly not Shakespeare's; and the four-lined epitaph in the fourth scene [V.iv] combines two inconsistent couplets,--the combination evidently being un-Shakespearian, though both appear to have been in the rough unfinished Ms. The poet obviously had not made up his mind which of the two epitaphs to use,--whether Timon's own, or that which, as North's Plutarch says 'commonly rehearsed, was not his, but made by the poet Callimachus'" (Vol. 29, 211).

"The Sources of Timon of Athens" (1903-04), W.H. Clemons:

> the epitaphs by Timon and by Callimachus are inserted almost verbatim from North's Plutarch, forming a contradictory whole which was evidently intended merely as a temporary arrangement. The only verbal change between this passage in "Timon of Athens" and those in North is the substitution of "wicked caitiffs" for "wicked wretches"; and as the word "catife" occurs prominently in Painter it seems not too wild a conjecture to say that the "Palace of Pleasure" as well as North's translation was before the eyes of the playwright. (p. 216)

Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama (1924; rpt. 1966), H. Dugdale Sykes: "Nothing need be said of this final scene [V.iv], except that its style is Shakespearean. But the two inconsistent epitaphs (from Plutarch's Life of Antonius) I take to be a relic of the original rough draft, and the fact that Shakespeare

has allowed both to stand, as evidence of the hasty and perfunctory nature of his revision" (p. 48).

"The Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1940), Ralph A. Haug: "Act five has the surest evidence of hasty work found in the play. An illiterate soldier has taken a wax impression of the inscription on Timon's tomb, and presents it to Alcibiades to read." But this epitaph (V.iv.70-73) "is really two contrasting epitaphs, copied almost verbatim from North's Plutarch. What happened seems obvious. Shakspere noted both down, intending later to delete one. Shakspere never returned to Timon, hence both epitaphs remain. That a reviser would have gone to the trouble of seeking out another epitaph is impossible" (p. 241).

Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies (1950), Willard Farnham: "The tragedy is not properly called Plutarchan, despite the fact that two versions of Timon's epitaph found in North's translation of Plutarch are used in the play. The Timon who becomes a beast and finds a den for himself in the woods--the Timon who has most call upon Shakespeare's poetic power--is not in Plutarch at all. He is a creation of authors later than Plutarch" (p. 67).

"Timon of Athens" (1963), David Cook: "In order to strengthen the presentation of Timon's death, his epitaph is

introduced twice, not altogether successfully in dramatic terms" (p. 93).

Shakespeare's Occasional Plays: Their Origin and Transmission (1965), J.M. Nosworthy:"The final scenes in the Folio text are perplexing, but the redundant accounts of Timon's death and the preservation of two conflicting epitaphs, suggests conflation of alternative endings" (pp. 225-26).

"Timon of Athens and the Growth of Discrimination" (1967), R. Swigg:

> It is fitting, in this movement away from the 'general' imbroglio towards the 'particular' individual, from the inhuman rule towards the human exception, that the Messenger's friend should be the illiterate soldier who discovers Timon's epitaph--not a man of words at all, but, like Timon's servants, displaying a 'kindness' more enduring in its modest aims than Timon's eloquent sweeps of love and hate. The power of compassion, felt in one individual, places the generalizing Timon in perspective: Timon's message of hate is not the last word on life, for it is encircled, reduced, and mitigated by the soldier as he takes a 'soft impression' in wax (v.iv.68) of the bitter epitaph. Just as the materialistic ethic of Timon's Athens grasped and soiled verbally any sense of quality in life, and by encirclement, rendered it impotent--and all without the illiterate soldier's own excursion into verbal danger. (p. 392)

The Tragic Engagement: A Study of Shakespeare's Classical Tragedies (1968), Judah Stampfer: "the double epitaph (V.iii.3-4; V.iv.69-73), though a confusion, has an aesthetic propriety.

Timon cannot set down words enough, register his epitaph vehemently enough" (p. 215).

Shakespeare the Craftsman (1969), M.C. Bradbrook: "The oracular tomb bears an epitaph in secret characters which the not illiterate messanger cannot decipher but takes to Alcibiades for interpretation. It witholds, then yields the very name of Timon--two epitaphs conflated. Shakespeare had not made a choice, observe the critics intelligently" (p. 159).

The Riverside Shakespeare (1974), Frank Kermode: "Having two epitaphs for Timon before him in Plutarch, Shakespeare transcribed them both (IV.iv.70-73) and, since one contradicts the other, would have cancelled one in making a final revision" (p. 1442).

"Truth and Timon of Athens" (1979), Lesley W. Brill: "The inconsistencies among Timon's epitaphs have been regarded as evidence of the incomplete state of the drama as we have it, the assumption being that Shakespeare would have caneelled one or two of them when he gave a final polishing to the play. But their contradiction of each other has a broad consistency both with Timon's career and with the multiplicity of contradictory commentaries that accompany it. Through his epitaphs, Timon offers his final commentary and so concludes a life that con-

sisted of a series of formal gestures of uncertain import. He writes the poem of his death as he wrote the poem of his life" (p. 26).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner:

> Nor does the often-invoked duplication of Timon's epitaph in 5.4.70-73 prove that Shakespeare abandoned the play before fully revising it. In fact, the repetition could be used to argue the opposite. The customary explanation is that Shakespeare copied down both epitaphs as Plutarch quoted them, the one attributed to Timon himself and the other to the poet Callimachus, even though they contradict each other, and that he failed to expunge one of them later. But in similar scenes of duplication with variation, such as Love's Labor's Lost, 4.3.280-362, and Julius Caesar, 4.2.143-58, 166, 180-95, textual scholars have usually thought that the explanation lies in a revision of the original lines by Shakespeare; somehow, both the first version and the revision remained in the manuscript and were printed. The epitaph of Callimachus may have seemed to Shakespeare to express better what Alcibiades calls Timon's 'latter spirits' and he may have thought that evoking Timon's name at the end, as it does, was a good idea. Perhaps Shakespeare wrote Timon's own epitaph first, and then during a revision remembered the more fitting lines of Callimachus; he turned once more to Plutarch in order to paraphrase them, and somehow both epitaphs got into the printed text. (pp. 193-94)

OLD ATHENIAN

Shakespeare's Satire (1943), O.J. Campbell: "The similarity of his [Timon's] response to each one of these adulators [in I.i] in turn makes his generosity seem automatic and therefore ridiculous" (p. 187).

The Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957), J.C. Maxwell:

> there is a clear indication of genuine personal feeling in his [Timon's] generosity, and it is shown in contrast with a typical representative of the spirit of Athens, the 'old Athenian'. Timon as shown here is not adequately described by the more rigorous critics, such as . . . O.J. Campbell, 'The similarity of his response to each one of these adulators in turn makes his generosity seem automatic and therefore ridiculous'. This episode is an exception to that 'similarity', but at the same time it does show the subtle corruption exercised by the materialistic spirit of Athens. (pp. xxxi-xxxii)

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver:

> the Old Athenian. . . for purely mercenary reasons (the background of corrupt Athens is being filled in all the time) objects to the marriage of his daughter to Timon's servant Lucilius. Here the brevity of Timon's comments is most telling: "What of him?--Well; what further?--The man is honest--Does she love him?--Love you the maid?" and then the immediate decision to endow Lucilius with an equal fortune. There is certainly in this nothing "ridiculous"; there is nothing that is even open to criticism. (p. xliii)

"Timon of Athens and the Growth of Discrimination" (1967), R. Swigg:

> The materialistic code to which one old Athenian subscribes is typical: his daughter must go in marriage not to a poor lover like Timon's servant but to high bidders, for 'I have bred her at my dearest cost' (I. i.127). But so powerfully rife is the cash-ethic that Timon's benevolent solving of the marriage problem is as completely regulated by its rules as was the old Athenian's posing of the problem in the first place; for, though to Timon all that seem to decide the question are the simple response of feeling--'Does she love him?' 'Love you the maid?' (I.i.135, 137)--yet, in fact, wealth is the real abiter:
>
> > What you bestow, in him I'll counterpoise,
> > And make him weigh with her. (I.i.148)
>
> Here, explicitly by Timon's action and implicitly by his assaying metaphor, we can see the workings of computation, a sense of spiritual values manipulated, if unwittingly, by steady materialism. (p. 387)

"Timon of Athens: Tragedy or Satire?" (1969), Robert E. Morsberger: "there appears an old man who may be seen as a foil to Timon. This man will not allow his daughter to marry an impecunious servant; and he says that if his will is crossed, he will dispossess his daughter and choose his heir from the beggars of the world. But this is quite like Timon when he is spited; when his will is crossed, he rejects Athens, curses her, and gives his gold to thieves and drabs" (p. 65)

"Fortune and Friendship in Timon of Athens" (1976-77), Lewis Walker: "The point of this episode [Timon's marriage gift] is that any generosity, no matter how noble, which is based on the gifts of Fortune, can have no lasting effect" (p. 588).

"Timon in Shakespeare's Athens" (1980), Robert S. Minola:

> This man, the familiar senex iratus of comedy, angrily and self-righteously complains to Timon about his daughter, who has been so wayward and ungrateful as to fall in love with a poor servant. Instead of unceremoniously returning the curmudgeon to his home or his senses, Timon quickly appeases him with an offer of money, an offer which is clearly more of a bribe than a gift. Here Timon displays his tragic inability to distinguish between true and false needs, between the deserving and the undeserving. Such undiscriminating liberality was not likely to be construed in Shakespeare's time as generosity. (p. 24)

[See also "Timon's Generosity," "Timon and Money," and "Lucilius"]

The Plays of William Shakespeare (1765), Samuel Johnson: "I suspect some scene to be lost, in which the entrance of the fool, and the page that follows him, was prepared by some introductory dialogue, and the audience was informed that they were the fool and page of Phrynia, Timandra, or some other courtesan, upon the knowledge of which depends the greater part of the ensuing jocularity" (Vol. 6, 718).

The Pictorial Edition of Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight writes that the Fool, Page, Apemantus, and Servants in II.ii are not Shakespeare's creations: "The whole thing wants the spirit of Shakspere, and it wants also the play upon words which he almost invaribly employed upon such occasions. The Fool, the Page, the cynic, and the Servants, are simply abusive" (Vol. 1, 335).

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (1886), Henry N. Hudson: "In Act ii. there seems a want of due connection between the first and second scenes, since we have the Fool speaking of his mistress, and the Page out on her errands, while no hint has yet been given as to who or what their mistress is" (Vol. 15, 188-89). Hudson then cites Johnson (above), agreeing that some material is missing and noting the "long

vapid dialogue with Apemantus and somebody's Fool" (Vol. 15, 188).

The old Arden Timon of Athens (1905), K. Deighton disagrees with Johnson, writing that even the discovery of a missing scene would do nothing to clarify the Fool and Page's roles: "it helps us nothing to suppose, with Johnson that a whole scene is missing" (pp. xi-xii).

"The Usurer's Sin in Elizabethan Literature" (1938), Celeste Turner Wright: "the usurer is a whoremaster, who keeps a bawdy house for Lady Pecunia and lives upon the letchery of metals. . . . Sometimes the usurer is literally a bawd, like Security in Eastward Ho; Perfidious Oldcraft followed the trade in youth; and Bartervile draws revenue from the stews" (pp. 180, 181). Usurers are also classed with "theives, bawds, hucksters, or even playwrights and actors" (p. 185). Wright notes that according to Thomas Nashe (Christs Teares [1593], Works, ed. McKerrow, 2, 99), "The prodigal son. . . fed hogs--that is, usurers" (p. 193).

"The Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1940), Ralph A. Haug: "Two letters are brought in by a page, one to Timon and one to Alcibiades, from a whore; Shakespeare probably meant to do something with them, but forgot. The later association of Timon and Alcibiades is significant. The other errors are slight,

but that of the letters is important. A reviser or interpolator would have no possible point of introducing them, since he was not making the plot" (p. 235).

"Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (1942), Una Ellis-Fermor:

> But one thing disturbs us in this act, our first meeting with a conspicuous and inexplicable loose end in the character of the Fool. Although the passage in which he appears is well enough written, he is not built into the play. We do not know who he is or where he comes from. We hardly know to whom he belongs. And he disappears never to appear again. We are forced to one of two assumptions: either that he ceased to be part of Shakespeare's design by a change of intention after this scene, or that the scenes or passages in which his function and relation to the play would have appeared were never written or were lost. He is the first, but not the last disturbing element of this kind that we shall find in the play. (p. 276)

An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948), Hardin Craig: "One feels that the first act might have been and should have been a more sumptuous picture, and the same is true of the abbreviated second act, which is also rather confused with Senators, Apemantus, and an uncalled-for Fool" (p. 251).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H. J. Oliver: "In spite of the Othello parallel, however, the appearance of the Fool in Timon seems to be only a rough start on a possible comic subplot, for the development of which there was ample room,

since the play falls far short of the normal Elizabethan and Shakespearian length; and it is tempting to speculate how it could have been developed like the Pompey scenes in Measure for Measure which do so much to make the Vienna of that play a real city and build up the background of general corruption against which the main story is played out" (p. xxvii).

Wise Fools in Shakespeare (1963), Robert Hillis Goldsmith mentions Timon's Fool (p. 110).

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1969), Charlton Hinman: "The passage of approximately seventy lines devoted to the fool and the page (see I,ii,47-119) is dramatically unnecessary, has small intrinsic merit, and seems at best an infelicitous interruption of the serious business at hand" (p. 1137).

"Fortune and Friendship in Timon of Athens" (1976-77), Lewis Walker:

> The Fool, who is obviously a bawd serving the mistress of a brothel, has been bantering with Apemantus and others, when a Page belonging to the same establishment appears with letters for Timon and Alcibiades (11. 81-88). Since there is never again any mention of the letters, what is in them, or indeed whether they are delivered, this passage has been thought to be a "loose end." But if the traditional picture of Fortune as harlot is kept in mind, this scene can be read as an ingenious way of dramatizing the dependence of Timon and Alcibiades on her at a particular point in the play. Shakespeare is not concerned to show the logical progression from one point to another or to furnish motivation for the invitation to the brothel or for Timon's presumed interest in it. In fact, such specifics seem to be avoided on

> purpose, to give the scene a self-contained quality. The playwright has invented a bit of stage business that obliquely involves Timon with a whore. This is enough to suggest Timon's relationship with Fortune without on the one hand resorting to pure allegory and on the other having to justify the scene in entirely naturalistic terms. (p. 582)

"Timon of Athens and the Morality Tradition" (1977), Lewis Walker: "If. . . Shakespeare's reliance on morality conventions is kept in mind, this episode can be understood not as an anomaly or imperfection but as a significant part of the play's action. Folly is the scene's pervasive theme, as indicated by the presence of the Fool and heightened by the game of riddling initiated by Apemantus" (p. 173). On the letters:

> The idea of using letters from a corrupt source to indicate depravity in the recipient appears to be borrowed from the moralities. In Mundus et Infans, when the protagonist is at the height of his powers, the dramatist chooses to reveal his involvement with the Seven Deadly Sins by having him boast about the messages that seven "Kings" have sent him. Specifically, he says that "the King of Lechery lovely his letters hath me sent" (l. 276). If Shakespeare is using this convention, the letters from the brothel implicate Timon in the sin of lust. (pp. 168-69)

See also Vanna Gentili's La recita della follia. Funzioni dell'insania nel teatro dell'eta di Shakespeare (1978) which examines the sociological and ideological implications of the Fool in Timon.

PHRYNIA and TIMANDRA

"On the Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1869), F.G. Fleay: "Phrynia and Timandra are called Phrynice and Timandylo. This is one among several instances, tending to show that the second author worked on a badly-written MS. of Shakspere's portion" (p. 143).

"Timon of Athens: The Disruption of Feudal Morality" (1947), E.C. Pettet:

> we are ready for the appearance of a whore as a character amid Timon's denunciations of the new world of the cash-nexus, for plainly there exists in Shakespeare's mind a close parallel, even a connexion, between usury and prostitution. . . . In other words, prostitution is but one more relationship through which gold, the 'bright defiler Of Hymen's purest bed,' 'sets [men] into confounding odds, that beasts May have the world empire'; and that is why Timon when he is calling for the destruction of society bribes and urges Phrynia and Timandra to ply their trade with the utmost vigour. (p. 335)

"On Certain Proper Names in Shakespeare" (1951), Robert Adger Law notes that Timandra is among the eighteen names in Timon that Shakespeare could have borrowed from Plutarch. On Phrynia: "This name, I believe, Shakespeare invented, deriving it either from the land of Phrygia, spelled out in prominent capitals close to the name of Timandra in the 1579 edition of North, or from Phrynicus, a powerful enemy of Alcibiades, or

from a combination of the two names" (p. 62).

"Acts IV and V of Timon of Athens" (1959), Winifred M.T. Nowottny: "in Timon's imagination the prostitute is at once the symbol of the real baseness underlying the pretense of ordered society, an actual agent of its actual destruction" (p. 495). Like Pettet (1947) and Walker (1977), Nowottny notes Timon's "identification of gold and prostitution" (p. 495).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "the two women who visit Timon with Alcibiades and are given gold to destroy mankind are called in that scene (IV.iii) 'Phrynia' and 'Timandra'; but apparently they are also the 'Phrinica and Timandylo' who, we are told at V.i.5-6, 'had gold of him'" (p. xvi).

The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art (1960), Robert C. Elliott: "The most discreditable blot on Alcibiades, however, is that with no qualms he enjoys the company of two of Shakespeare's foulest women, the whores Phrynia and Timandra" (p. 155).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner: "Alcibiades in his visit to Timon's cave is accompanied by two whores, who provide symbols of love reduced to lust and who

offer scope for Timon's concern with animal sexuality" (p. 146).

"Timon of Athens" (1957), R.P. Draper: "The. . . scene with the mistresses of Alcibiades continues this preoccupation with the theme of degeneracy, in the fullest sense of the word. The imagery [of men loving 'disease for the sake of gold'] is brought to life in Phrynia and Timandra, to whom Timon gives gold in order to encourage them to the work of spreading disease" (p. 197).

Language as Symbolic Action (1966), Kenneth Burke:

> There was one other opportunity to introduce the theme of the girls; and it was used cunningly, when easygoing Alcibiades, who was equal to anything, passes by with two courtesans in his train. But though supernumeraries, they are made to function well indeed since they are woven so meaningfully into the play's constant references to gold (gold as filth and lucre). They are quite willing to accept with equanimity Timon's dirty comments on their trade, so long as his gestures of detestation include the act of showering them with treasure. "More counsel with more money, bounteous Timon," they call cheerfully, in the midst of his insults. They go well with Alcibiades. (p. 118)

The Base String: The Underground in Elizabethan Drama (1968), Normand Berlin:

> Alcibiades will bring peace and justice to Athens--the man who was accompanied by two rotten whores. In the last case especially, Shakespeare need not have presented Alcibiades in the company of whores. They could have served their symbolic function had

> they come upon Timon without Alcibiades, as did the Bandetti. Surely, the appearance of Alcibiades in the company of the two diseased wenches would tend to lower him in the audience's estimation. Surely, Shakespeare realized this. Yet, Shakespeare does present Alcibiades with the whores, which leads one to suspect that Alcibiades must know the whores in order to rule sucessfully. Is knowledge of the underworld through contact necessary for the proper understanding of the basic moral premises by which all men must live, and is not such knowledge necessary for those who wish to rule a state on principles of justice and love? Othello, Lear, and Timon seem to indicate this, as does Henry IV, where Hal studies his underworld companions. For Shakespeare the underworld seem [sic] to be the fruit on the forbidden tree; it must be chewed for the proper knowledge of good and evil. (p. 211)

"Timon, Cupid, and the Amazons" (1976), Robert C. Fulton: Alcibiades "envisions Phyrnia and Timandra as instrumental in the downfall of Athens. By making them a part of the military encounter he imagines will take place, he is in effect bestowing Amazonian qualities on them. Indeed, 'Amazon' appears to have been Elizabethan cant for prostitute" (p. 292). Fulton goes on to associate the Amazons in Timon's masque with the two whores:

> The sight of Alcibiades' troop seems to galvanize Timon's imagination. "Enter ALCIBIADES, with fife and drum, in warlike manner; PHRYNIA and TIMANDRA" (IV.i-i.47.s.d.). The masque of Act I, scene ii, has undergone a total metamorphosis. The bright shapes and sparkling figures of that first banquet have given way to images of chaos and destruction. Cupid has become the presiding genius at a feast of

> death. The brave habits of the dancing ladies have fallen away to reveal a pair of poxy Amazons. (p. 294)

"Timon of Athens and the Morality Tradition" (1977), Lewis Walker: "Timon, having fled Athens, discovers gold and calls it the 'common whore of mankind' (1.43). Instead of letting this statement stand as a metaphor, Shakespeare immediately literalizes it by bringing on Alcibiades, Phrynia, and Timandra to act it out. Timon then offers gold to the two women in return for their promise to spread loathsome diseases (11.135-51). For such compensation, they are willing to do whatever he wishes: 'Well, more gold. What then?/Beliv't that we'll do anything for gold' (11.151-52). Timon thus invests real whores with the power of the metaphorical whore of mankind." (p. 175).

"Fortune and Friendship in Timon of Athens" (1976-77), Lewis Walker: "In the iconography of the Renaissance, Fortune could be pictured specifically as a soldier's whore, and this is surely one of the main reasons why Phrynia and Timandra accompany Alcibiades on his visit to Timon in the woods" (p. 582).

SEMPRONIUS

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight: "It seems to us perfectly impossible that Shakspere could have produced thoughts so commonplace, and verse so unmusical, as we find in the speech of Sempronius" (Vol. 1, 366).

"On Certain Proper Names in Shakespeare" (1951), Robert Adger Law: "Sempronius was a fellow-consul with Scipio Africanus" (p. 62).

The State in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman Plays (1940), James Emerson Phillips, Jr.: "According to Alcibiades it is lust for gold, a disproportionate emphasis on material welfare, which has turned the Senate from its appointed vocation of government" (p. 130). On the Senators' final recognition of Timon's worth:

> The Senate itself, speaking for Athenian society, eventually admits that Timon's virtue and nobility have gone unrewarded. . . . The Senate even adopts the Renaissance attitude that those highest in virtue should be placed highest in authority and honor in the hierarchy of degrees in a commonwealth. . . . Such an offer is not merely an empty expression of an abstract principle of political theory; it is a real admission that leadership by a man of Timon's virtue and ability is essential to the welfare of a state. (pp. 140, 141)

"Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (1942), Una Ellis-Fermor: "the sudden incursion of the senators and their control of the final scenes is hardly related at all to the original design, and the matter here is not solid or potent enough to be the culmination of what has been so powerfully planned. Again, we are strongly tempted to assume some missing scenes grouped round and relating to III.v which might have connected that scene with these, and these, thereby, to the whole plan. . . . As we have reason to believe that the plot was firmly designed,

we can only assume that the design is not fairly represented by what remains" (p. 280).

"The Last Tragic Heroes" (1966), G.K. Hunter: "The censure that I see aimed at Timon's indiscriminateness seems to be paralleled by a similar censure aimed at the Senate. The Senate refuses to see any mitigating circumstances in the crime of Alcibiades's anonymous friend. With Angelo-like incapacity to discriminate law from justice, they rest on the assertion, 'We are for the law', and banish Alcibiades for questioning this" (p. 15).

"The Ending of Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1973), Richard D. Fly: "the sudden appearance of the Senators and their predominant part in the final action seems improperly motivated, insufficiently related to the body of the play, and, most importantly, inadequate to resolve the issues raised in the previous action" (p. 243).

"Timon in Shakespeare's Athens" (1980), Robert S. Miola: "The Senators' position is. . . paradoxical and ambiguous, for they are corrupt usurers who bleed the commonwealth for personal gain. In this scene [III.v] they appear as sanctimonious hypocrites whose public declarations are in sharp contrast with their personal practice" (p. 28).

[See also "Alcibiades, III.v," "End of Play," "Greeks and Athens," and "Cash Nexus."

"Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1946), A.S. Collins: "There are two master keys to the play--the Three Strangers in III.ii, and the great scene (III.v) of Alcibiades before the senate. The first lets us into the secret of the nature of the play, its Morality nature" (p. 98).

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme: "The absence of moral stamina which characterises this society is reflected even in the two strangers and the servants who represent, however briefly, the nearest we get to an acceptable standard of values" (p.114). On the first Stranger:

> He lacks. . . the force of character to do anything on his own account to help Timon; so too with the creditors' servants who claim to deplore the task they are performing but not sufficiently to prevent their pressing their masters' demands. Perhaps one can over-emphasise points like this, but they certainly accord with the general tone. (p. 115)

The Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957; rpt. 1968), J.C. Maxwell:

> Though Shakespeare has not gone as far as he sometimes does in presenting us with firmly placed subordinate characters from whom we can take our bearings with regard to the hero, he makes up for this by at least one undiluted piece of choric comment, the dialogue between the 'three strangers' at the end of

> 3.2. Timon's 'right noble mind, illustrious virtue and honourable carriage' elicit disinterested admiration, and the ingratitude with which he is treated appears as monstrous. . . . Shakespeare goes out of his way to give us also the impartial judgment of the three strangers. (p. xxv)

Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective (1976), Larry S. Champion: "As the extent of Timon's derangement becomes apparent, Shakespeare through additional pointer characters also intensifies the spectators' repugnance of those whose avarice and hypocrisy have helped to mold Timon's misanthropy. For example, in an aside Lucullus delights in the arrival of Flaminius because he anticipates a gift from Timon; yet, when he hears that his friend wishes to receive rather than give, he offers the servant a reward to say he was not to be found. Flaminius, in a soliloquy moments later, berates this 'disease of a friend' with 'such faint and milky heart' (III.i. 50, 51)" (p. 213).

"Truth and Timon of Athens" (1979), Lesley W. Brill:

> Searching for a moral arbiter within the play, J.C. Maxwell nominates the three Strangers who appear in III.ii. He notes that Timon elicits "disinterested admiration" from the Strangers, whose judgments he calls "impartial" (p. xxv). That they praise Timon for an honorable man and condemn those who denied him is beyond dispute. That their statements represent "choric comment" (Maxwell, p. xxv) is harder to maintain. To do so we must overlook the shape of the play generally and of the scene in

which the Strangers appear in particular. When the Strangers call Timon a good and kind man, they are simply speaking as everyone else does on all occasions except when Timon asks for money. The chief difference between the Strangers and most of the other noble characters in the play is simple: Timon never asks them for a loan. The structure of their scene strongly implies that, were the Strangers to be solicited, they would reply as the other professed admirers of Timon do. (p. 28)

VENTIDIUS

"On the Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1869), F.G. Fleay: "Ventidius in i.1, and ii.2, is spelled Ventidius or Ventiddius; in ii.1 and iii.3, Ventigius or Ventidgius" (p. 146). Fleay lists Ventidius among the play's "non-Shakespearean characters" (p. 150).

"Lucian and Boiardo in Timon of Athens" (1931), R. Warwick Bond: "The gifts to his servant and Ventidius have their origin in those to Philiades and Demeas (cc. 47, 49)" in Lucian's Timon sive Misanthropos (p. 53).

"On Certain Proper Names in Shakespeare" (1951), Robert Adger Law notes that Ventidius is among the eighteen names in Timon that Shakespeare probably found in Plutarch: "Ventidius was a general under Mark Antony who wisely refused to gain too many victories in Antony and Cleopatra" (p. 62).

Shakespeare's Military World (1956), Paul A. Jorgensen: "Above all, Shakespeare's frustrated purposes are shown in the mutilation of the Ventidius theme. Ventidius, whom Timon has specially befriended early in the play, was apparently meant to be the last and most striking of the series of ingrates who refuse Timon help. This theme had to be supressed because of a dangerous parallel with Bacon's treatment of his

noble benefactor" (p. 280).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver:

> the appearances of Ventidius in the play were perhaps most often cited as difficulties. In the opening scene, Timon generously redeems him from prison by paying the debt of five talents for which he has been imprisoned (and the name here is spelt "Ventidius"). It was then argued that Ventidius' refusal of help to Timon when Timon was in need of money would mark the climax of ingratitude, be the last straw. And Timon does indeed instruct the Steward to approach Ventidius for help (at II.ii. 224-35), where the name is spelt "Ventiddius"). We do see Lucius and Lucullus refuse assistance, but we only hear casually and indirectly, from Sempronius, of Ventidius' refusal (at III.iii.4-10, where the spelling becomes "Ventidgius"). But he does refuse; and therefore his earlier offer to repay the money to Timon at I.ii.1-8 is regarded as an inconsistency or false start (and the name there is "Ventigius"). Obviously, and to anticipate, the door was wide open for a theory of divided authorship, with one author spelling "Ventid(d)ius" and the other "Venti(d)gius". (pp. xiv-xv)

"Timon of Athens" (1963), David Cook: "He [Timon] is not. . . doing Ventidius any particular kindness, since we are to understand that Ventidius' father has left him an ample fortune" (p. 86).

"Timon's Imitation of Christ" (1966), Jarold W. Ramsey: "Timon moves gracefully through Act One at the head of a pageant of generosity: the formal ritual of his gift-giving

establishes a pattern that extends, with ironic variations, throughout the drama. His first gift of the day is to Ventidius, in prison for debts. . . . Now I do not see how this can be taken in context as other than a noble and charitable deed" (p. 164).

"Timon of Athens: The Rage of Disillusion" (1979), Susan Handelman: "His [Timon's] first act in the play is to 'free' a friend from 'debt.' . . . Timon's acts of beneficence bind other men to him, defend against separation, dissolve boundaries, as Marx showed it was the particular property of money to do" (p. 57).

[See also "Timon's Generosity," and Walker (1976-77) in "Fortune"]

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1967) Charles Knight: "Had [Timon] loved a single human being with that intensity which constitutes affection in the relation of the sexes, and friendship in the relation of man to man, he would have been exempt from that unjudging lavishness which was necessary to satisfy his morbid craving for human sympathy" (Vol. 1, 341).

The Works of Shakespeare (1888-90), Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall: Shakespeare "may have thought that the subject [of the play] was not one in which the female character could be displayed to any advantage" (Vol. 7, 13).

Shakespeare's Tragedies and Other Studies in Seventeenth Century Drama (1950), Clifford Leech:

> Timon is in one respect altogether exceptional among early seventeenth-century plays: that is, in its minimal use of women characters. Phrynia and Timandra, the camp-followers of Alcibiades, are the only named women in the play, though a troupe of women masquers appears at Timon's banquet in I.ii. Such women as there are here are treated with scanty courtesy, and thus the play stands in marked contrast to those that followed, which in Imogen and Perdita and Miranda have provided many an occasion for rhapsody. At this time most dramatists were giving increasing importance to their women's parts, as for example Webster and Fletcher did; Shakespeare had not long before created Cressida, Lady Macbeth, Desdemona, and the three daughters of King Lear, and Cleopatra. Perhaps it was the drawing of Cleopatra

> with such close analysis of her character that produced a reaction and helped to lead Shakespeare to the choice of a theme where women would for once be unnecessary. (p. 123)

Timon of Athens (1965), Maurice Charney: "the only women in the play are. . . Amazons and the prostitutes, Phrynia and Timandra; the world of Athens is distinctly a man's world" (p. xxv).

Language as Symbolic Action (1966), Kenneth Burke:

> We should mention another kind of supernumerary. Since the play is almost wholly concerned with relations among men (as though all the world were a kind of secular monastery devoted perversely to a universal god of gold), women figure only in a supernumerary capacity. . . . Fittingly, there are no mothers, sisters, or wives in this play. Timon is an almost brutally end-of-the-line character, his life coming to a close in rabid talk of total human rot. (p. 118)

"Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Doctor Faustus" (1970), Anne Lanchashire: "The morality nature of the play also accounts for the scarcity and unimportance of female characters (not a characteristic of the old Timon); Shakespeare is presenting to us, not a real (or mock) society, but a moral situation" (p. 43).

"Shakespeare's Misanthrope" (1973), Harry Levin: "Love between the sexes plays no part in either of his two worlds. In the first, though it is Cupid who presents the masque, the dancing ladies are Amazons quickly dismissed. In the second Alcibiades

introduces the only two feminine characters, courtesans ungallantly encouraged by Timon to infect mankind with their alleged diseases" (p. 91).

"Timon of Athens: The Rage of Disillusion" (1979), Susan Handelman:

> That the embodied principle of good is often an idealized woman in Shakespeare is significant. In Timon, there is neither good art nor good women. The play itself is in part about the cultural and individual disaster of execution of the female. A world without women is a world not only without art, but without order. In Lear, the good woman, the ideal of pure love was exiled, but not murdered until the end of the play. In Timon, she never existed; there is no feminine representative of goodness and constancy. When woman as nourisher is perceived as devourer, and relation with her as feared dependency; when the wish for a gratifying union with her is seen as threatening destruction only; when she is not only banished, but hated and murdered, then there can be neither manhood nor brotherhood, neither human being, nor society. That is the condition of the world in Timon of Athens. (p. 49)

On women and money: "In Timon, money has replaced the mediating power of idealized woman. . . but instead of providing a way for contraries to mutually exist, marry, mingle, and create, money destructively converts opposites into negations of each other and Timon becomes Misanthropos" (p. 52).

[See also "Phrynia and Timandra," and "Amazons."]

FIRST BANQUET (I.ii)

Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society (1874),

B. Nicholson:

> The banquet scene (I.ii) is said not to advance the action. True; but like the conversation between Macbeth and Lady Macbeth, and Macbeth's soliloquy, it developes character; and some such scene is essential. In a play, characters must not only be described, as in a poem or novel, but shown. Here it is required to develope, first, the character of Timon, who is to be shown as somewhat weakly falling into a violent and maddened misanthropy, because when rich he was weakly lavish, loved to be courted, and to flatter himself and all around him. Secondly, it is required to show the universal benefits received by "the States," (the Senate, as representing Athens), the lords, and Ventidius,and their adulation of Timon. Thirdly, to bring out at once the character of Apemantus, who, as a cynic by nature, and one who rails and lets the world go by, is intended to contrast with and bring out the different character of Timon and his misanthropy. Hence his frequent appearance in the earlier scenes, where also a biting jester was required; and I cannot but think I hear some at least of Shakspere's prose in the scene from the entrance of Apemantus to the entrance of Alcibiades. So I think the grace is by Shakspere. If so, it is most probable he had had a banquet scene before him; and even if he did not write the grace, still the dramatic necessity of some such scene renders it more probable that the scene was there. Of course it may be said that Shakspere may have left that for a future that never came, but we must beware of a supposition which refutes in advance all objection; and such an omission is not agreeable to what has been handed down of his working, or what we learn from a study of his plays. Moreover, we must then admit that the second writer was no such botcher as he is obliged to be represented elsewhere. The so-called 'germs' seem to me to mean that there are references to what is developed in other parts of the play, and to be equally applicable to both theories. If there was a banquet, it is a matter of necessity that there should be a reference to it as in I.i.290; and, as I said, on another point, he must have been a careful developer who added so necessary a scene, or developed it from

> what without a banquet-scene would have been so casual a phrase. (pp. 249-50)

"The Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1940), Ralph A. Haug: "The masque in this scene has been criticized. 'This is tragedy,' critics say. 'A masque has its place in A Midsummer Night's Dream or The Tempest, but not here in a tragedy of hate.' But. . . this early part of Timon's existence is filled with wealth, joy, luxury. . . . And in no way could this idea be better staged than by a masque" (pp. 232-33).

"The Amazons in Elizabethan Literature" (1940), Celeste Turner Wright: "Because of their decorative costumes, Amazons figured in a pageant at the christening in 1594 of Prince Henry, the heir of James I; Shakespeare's Timon, for similar reasons, contrives a masque in which Amazons dance and sing" (p. 440).

"Timon of Athens" (1957), R.P. Draper: "In the great feast of I.ii [Timon] comes very near to enunciating an ideal of benevolent communism in which money merely provides the opportunity for men to express charity towards one another" (p. 195).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann: "The masque of the ladies (I.ii), with whom the men dance, reminds us of the 'Dancing and Revelling with Gentlewomen' chronicled in Gesta Grayorum" (p. 22).

"The Banquet of Sense" (1961), Frank Kermode:

> Timon's honour and nobility, much insisted upon, are firmly associated with his bounty and his lavish entertainments. There are two banquets in the play. At the first, Timon says grace, and a masquer dressed as Cupid enters to announce the arrival of his fellow-masquers. . . . There seems no doubt that this little entertainment is intended as part of that acute unspoken criticism of Timon's misconception of Honour and Nobility. (pp. 80-81)

"Timon of Athens" (1963), David Cook: "The masque symbolically sets Timon again above mere mankind who have to war with the human condition" (p. 85).

"Timon's Imitation of Christ" (1966), Jarold W. Ramsey: "Timon's 'Masque of Cupid' (I.ii) is perverted by his friends into a masque of cupidity" (p. 163). "What is the banquet, in other words, but a monstrous parody of the Communion of the Last Supper, with every guest playing Judas Iscariot to Timon's Christ?" (p. 167).

"'These pretty devices': A Study of Masques in Plays" (1967), Igna-Stina Ewbank: Timon's masque "gathers into itself symbolically all the elements of Timon's earlier life: lavish expenditure, social grace, ceremony and ostentation" (p. 418).

Shakespeare the Craftsman (1969). M.C. Bradbrook: "the actual music for the masque (music was a tradition at Blackfriars) survives in manuscript at the British Museum, and adds

to the probability that the play was written in a hand that Dr Brett, of King's college, would date as between 1610 and 1620" (p. 164).

"Theme in Timon of Athens" (1974), Michael Tinker, although not commenting on the banquet itself, writes that "Food becomes a metaphor for material values" (p. 78).

"Genera mixta and Timon of Athens" (1977), William W.E. Slights:

> Timon, an apparently wealthy and highly regarded citizen in Athens, reaches the height of his fortunes with the mounting of a lavish spectacle, an Ovidian banquet of sense, culminating in a masque of Amazons. The masque marks the turning point in Timon's fortunes and hence in the action of the entire play. It has a different position and function from any other embedded masque in Shakespeare. Unlike those in the romantic comedies and the romances, which occur late and celebrate the action of reunion, this masque is prominently placed at the end of Act I to establish the precarious norm of civilized behavior which is soon lost in Athens. (p. 42)

The masque portrays art holding disruptive social forces in check: "Timon's purpose in mounting the masque is to delight his friends and to reassure them that the disruptive forces in his society, symbolized by the conquered Amazons, are being held in check by art and manners" (p. 43).

"Timon of Athens and the Morality Tradition" (1977), Lewis Walker: "It is hard to avoid the conclusion that this scene

[I.ii] is a direct descendent of the worldly feasts of Herod and Mankind, whose extravagance has been imported into Timon's hall and enhanced by the stage direction. Not only is there music but it is loud music; the banquet is specified to be a great banquet; those in attendance are described with particular care, to indicate that all sorts and conditions depend on Timon" (p. 163). Walker discusses Timon's masque with reference to the morality convention of the five senses:

> The masque is obviously a celebration of the five senses as they are promoted by Timon. . . . here, all the senses are presented formally, impersonated by ladies. In the context of the banquet, itself a sign of worldliness and riot, the masque presents further evidence that Timon is guilty of abuse of the senses. Cupid's salute includes both Timon and his guests, identifying the latter according to their capacity to consume the sensual delights dispensed by the former. Images of Timon's plentitude abound: the five senses come freely to gratulate his plenteous bosom; presently, Lucullus remarks, "You see my lord, how ample y'are belov'd" (1.126). The exquisite synesthesia Timon seems to stimulate (Alcibiades has been feeding hungerly on Timon's sight) is also apparent: the ladies come to feast Timon's eyes. One editor has suggested that line 122 be emended to read: "Th'ear, taste, touch, smell." But even without such ingenious assistance the passage makes its point: all the senses are cultivated by Timon. (p. 167).

On the question of Timon's authorship of the masque, Walker finds that the masquers act out Timon's personal emblem: Timon says that the masquers "have 'entertained me with mine own device'

(I.ii.146), which has been taken to mean that Timon suggested the masque or had a hand in its composition." But what Timon means "is that the ladies have entertained him by acting out his personal emblem" (p. 168). On the masque in general: "the masque is central to the meaning of Timon's character and actions . . . . The banquet, although it has allegorical overtones, is also a very real part of the play's action; the five senses, on the other hand, are presented in a masque that is a formal commentary on the banquet and on Timon" (p. 168).

"Truth and Timon of Athens" (1979), Lesley W. Brill: "the characters. . . serve as commentators upon the action of their play and as reformulators of each other's commentaries" (p. 24). In terms of the first banquet: "Virtually everyone at the feast offers an opinion, frequently with considerable pomp, on some facet of his surroundings. As in the opening exchanges, the comments are themselves immediately subjected to scrutiny and criticism, especially but not exclusively from Apemantus" (p. 24).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "As a celebration of friendship, it evokes the shadow of the Platonic banquets celebrated in the Renaissance; but even without Apemantus's cutting remarks, we would know how

very much this celebration lacks substance. In fact, the banquet resembles the opposite of Platonic ones, the banquets of sense with their dangerous allurement to the appetites, such as emblems and moral poems characterized them" (p. 70). On the masque:

> What Timon presumably intends with the device of Cupid and the Amazons is to present the reconciliation of opposites; what he produces is ominously discordant: when blind love leads warlike femininity, disaster is likely to result. The masque demonstrates Timon's sensual extravagance, an ingredient in the societal disorder satirized by Apemantus. At the same time, the banquet and masque, as much as they show Timon's shortcomings, betray also his simple, childlike desire for a good harmonious life--an urge aesthetically and morally far more pleasing than the realistic calculations of his ironhearted friends who live in the age of gold. (pp. 70-71)

"Timon of Athens: The Iconography of False Friendship" (1980), Clifford Davidson: "His [Timon's] feasting of his fellow Athenians is even, on one level, a kind of parody of Communion in which they partake of his body and blood. . . . And Apemantus in a sense voices our horror that 'so many dip their meat in one man's blood' (I.ii.41)" (p. 190).

"Timon in Shakespeare's Athens" (1980), Robert S. Miola: "One of the most immediately striking features of Athens as commonly conceived was its notorious indulgence in riotous feasting. . . . Shakespeare's use of Timon's banquet as the imaginative center of his Athens is hardly surprising. Through it he depicts all the lavish fare, sumptuous display, and exces-

sive appetite traditionally associated with the city" (p. 23).

On the banquet and democracy:

> As we can see, Timon's banquet is not merely a dramatized image of the familiar Athenian weakness for feasting. It is a strikingly appropriate and resonant symbol of Athenian immorality, depicting the source and center of the city's depravity--namely, its democratic government. Like Plato before him, Shakespeare uses the image of a disorderly, excessive banquet to illustrate the indulgence of appetite, the blithe conferral of equality upon all, and the abrogation of degree and order which, according to both classical and contemporary beliefs, characterized life in a democratic state. (p. 25)

[See also Marie Cornelia's The Function of the Masque in Jacobean Tragedy and Tragicomedy (1978), and "I.ii."]

SECOND BANQUET (III.vi)

"Shakespeare's Purpose in Timon of Athens" (1928), Dixon Wecter: "Upon Essex's first arraignment Bacon set out to unearth evidence against him of the sort most irritating to Elizabeth. Bacon's subsequent attempt to explain away this initial act of perfidy, in a letter to the Earl, recalls the lame excuses of the sycophants (recast from Shakespeare) when they are invited to the mock banquet. Also, the bitterness of Sir. Gilly Meyric, the steward of Essex, may be compared to the indignation of Timon's steward against the false friends" (p. 717).

Shakespeare: The Problem Plays (1961), Peter Ure:

> calculated balance may be observed in the relation of the second banquet scene (III.vi) to the first (I.ii). The elegant food that gratifies the four senses (I. ii.121) has become lukewarm water and stones, the friends are changed into beasts, the host's speech of welcome into a long commination (III.vi.88-104). Timon stage-manages the revelation of his his own nature has itself been transformed from sweetness and dreamy abundance into bitterness and withdrawal as though he were the regisseur of some desperate anti-masque, fitly opposite to the masque of Cupid performed at that earlier feast. He still gives and gives out, but what he gives are stones, projected from him in hurling movements of fury. (pp. 48-49)

"Dog Imagery in The Two Gentlemen of Verona, King Lear, and Timon of Athens" (1964), Ralph M. Tutt: "At the mock banquet,

just before he proclaims to his former friends his hatred of all humanity, Timon addresses them ironically as 'great benefactors' and 'present friends' (III,vi,78-94); abruptly he shifts his tone, 'Uncover, dogs, and lap' (95), and the dishes are revealed to be filled with water. At this point in the play, 'dog' becomes as prominant in Timon's vocabulary as it is earlier in that of Apemantus, a character who is himself consistently characterized in dog imagery" (p. 19).

"'Smoke and Luke-Warm Water': A Note in Timon of Athens" (1964), Malcolm Ware relates "smoke" (Timon, IV.iii.138-43, and King John, III.i.226-30) and"water" (Winter's Tale, I.ii.131-35, Trolius and Cressida, III.ii.198-203, and Othello, V.ii.134) with hypocrisy (pp. 342-44).

"Timon's Imitation of Christ" (1966), Jarold W. Ramsey calls Timon's throwing of water a "mock baptism": "instead of offering his guests a final mock-Communion of his own substance, he offers them a sort of mockery of the baptism ritual--splatters them with water, and in lieu of a blessing calls down 'the infinate malady of man and beast' on them all" (p. 168).

"Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Dr. Faustus" (1970), Anne Lancashire: "the greatest ceremonial spectacles of the play, the two contrasting banquet scenes, are a secular parallel to the religious 'banquet' of Holy Communion which is central to the moral teaching of a play such as Everyman (in which, however, the

banquet takes place offstage). Timon's refusal to feed his followers in the second banquet is an anti-ritual which emphasizes Timon's wrongheadedness in cutting himself off from the world--in denying mercy and forgiveness as essential principles of conduct for man in this imperfect existence; and it contains an implicit contrast with the Last Supper, at which Christ denied nourishment to no one, not even to the 'flatterer' Judas Iscariot" (p. 43).

"Shakespeare's Timon of Athens, III.vi" (1978), Henry D. Janzen: "The dramatic and thematic significances of the three words 'perfection,' 'smoke,' and 'water' have already been explicated by Malcolm Ware in his note "'Smoke and Luke-warm Water': A note in Timon of Athens" (Anglie [sic], 82 [1964], 342-44). But the critical question has not yet been answered: why lukewarm water?" (p. 4). Janzen quotes Revelation 3:15-16 "where we hear the Spirit of God saying to the Laodicean Church, a church in its final stage of apostasy: 'I knowe thye workes, that thou are nether colde not hote: I wolde thou werest colde or hote. Therefore, because thou art luke warme, and nether colde or hote, it wil come to passe, that I shal spewe thee out of my mouth' (Geneva Bible, 1560)." Janzen believes that "the association of lukewarmness with vice is naturally in Shakespeare's

mind when he has Timon scream out: 'Smoke and lukewarm water/ Is your perfection'" (p. 4).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner:

> The dance-of-death motif is highlighted by the banquets. At the first, art once more communicates a truth different from what it is designed for. Timon's masque ends in a dance, interpreted by Apemantus as symbolizing the quick changes brought about by fortune: "I should fear those that dance before me now/Would one day stamp upon me" (1.2.139-40). Timon, however, still spins his uphoric dream to the accompaniment of lutes and oboes. Not until the demands for repayment have reached a fortissimo does he perceive the disharmonies around him. The trumpet sound with which he has the second banquet opened signals his awakening to the harsh realities. He produces now his own Apemantian anti-masque when he knocks his guests and they fall over each other as they seek to recover their jewels, coats, and hats. Before the overturn of all order becomes Timon's constant theme, he glaringly exposes the disorder that reigns in Athens. (pp. 135-36)

On Fortune and the two banquets: "The two banquets bring out Timon's assuming. . . polar roles of Fortuna as rewarder and punisher; it is likely that Shakespeare conceived the contrast of the banquets, which has no equivalent in the sources, so to point up these roles" (p. 147).

"Timon of Athens: The Iconography of False Friendship" (1980), Clifford Davidson comments on "Uncover dogs" (III.vi. 82): "The words allude 'to the story of Actaeon devoured by his

own dogs.' Hence Timon becomes the victim of those whom he has fed, recognizes at last his position in relation to these false friends, and invites them with perfect appropriateness to partake of a banquet of warm water with the words 'Uncover, dogs, and lap' (III.xi [sic] 82)." p. 189). "Ingratitude, symbolized in Renaissance iconography by Actaeon's dogs, is indeed much worse than theft, for it is a barbaric devouring of a victim" (p. 190).

END OF PLAY

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner: "The play closes upon the note of ancient evil destroyed and of good reborn" (p. 153).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann: "The same sort of 'conclusion in which nothing is concluded' [See Ellis-Fermor (1942)] was devised for Troilus, against the chronology of the sources, against the familiar facts of 'history', for the sake of intellectual outrageousness: it may be that Shakespeare thought his audience (if any) would prefer disturbing questions in the place of the usual heavy-handed resolutions of tragedy. . . . Shakespeare found it rewarding to ask frightening questions and close them with perfunctory answers, fading out without the high moral seriousness and conviction of his greatest purging catastrophes" (pp. 16-17).

"King Lear and Timon of Athens" (1964-65), Ján Šimko: "here Shakespeare has provided the play (which is not a tragedy, although it presents the tragic fate of one person) with a positive and promising ending. It is the strong man that Shakespeare placed here his hope with a view that he would be strong enough to bring about a redress of all wrongs committed by the forces of evil" (p. 338).

"Timon of Athens and the Growth of Discrimination" (1967), R. Swigg: "Alcibiades is again before the Senate, but the roles have changed: he is now their judge, not they his. . . . In the figure of Alcibiades are joined the best of those two life-experiences--youthful compassion balanced with aged authority" (pp. 393, 394).

"Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Dr. Faustus" (1970), Anne Lancashire: "The play. . . ends almost as positively as Everyman, with the establishment of mercy; but because, in Timon, we are confined to this physical world, there can be no spiritual soaring beyond it into complete harmony and goodness, but, rather, only a complex and difficult reconciliation of contraries" (p. 41).

"The Ending of Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1973), Richard D. Fly: "From the perspective which terminates Timon's experience with society, life itself appears as only a joke, and this circumambient diabolic laughter echoes faintly through the reconciliation between Alcibiades and Athens as the play closes. . . . one can, therefore, take little comfort in the ostensibly optimistic conclusion of the play" (p. 252).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner:

> The final scene is, I think, complete, it is, at any rate, effective. True, it does not vie in spectacle with some of Shakespeare's greatest finales, such as those of Hamlet and Lear. There is no death, only the report of one, and we have heard it before; instead, there is a reconciliation, one that resembles not so much those of the tragedies as of the problem plays. There is a certain open-endedness here, a lack of total conviction characteristic of the endings of All's Well That Ends Well, Measure for Measure, and particularly Troilus and Cressida. But we have come to look upon open-endedness as rather a virtue, and in Timon it has intriguingly ironic implications. (p. 58)

"Timon of Athens: The Iconography of False Friendship" (1980), Clifford Davidson: "His [Timon's] despair about the human condition, like Gulliver's at the end of the Travels, so sets him off from other men that 'reconcilement' seems impossible. There appears to be at last absolutely no hope which might sustain him and give him some reason for continuing to live" (p. 199).

[See also, "V.iv," and "Alcibiades (V.iv)."]

TYPE OF PLAY--TIMON AS TRAGEDY

The Plays of William Shakespeare (1778), George Steevens: "Timon is a domestic tragedy, and therefore strongly fastens on the attention of the reader" (Vol. 8, 458).

"Shakespeare's Timon: A Study of Character" (1887), T. Gasquoine calls Timon a tragedy of character [see Haug, 1940] in which external action matters less than internal action (pp. 296-303).

"Timon of Athens" (1926), Ralph Roeder finds Timon a sympathetic character and calls his tragedy one of loneliness (pp. 453-60).

The Wheel of Fire (1930; rpt. 1967), G. Wilson Knight: "Timon is the archtype and norm of all tragedy" (p. 220).

"The Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1940), Ralph A. Haug: "Compared with the action of Lear, with which it is closest allied, Timon is rather static. . . .Timon dies a natural death. It is thus a tragedy of mood and character, not one of action" (p. 246).

"Shakespeare and the Tragic Pattern" (1958), Kenneth Muir extends Shakespeare's tragedies to include Richard II, Richard III, four Roman plays, and Timon of Athens (pp. 145-62).

The Hyacinth Room (1964), Cryus Hoy classifies Timon as a tragedy in which "reality violates the ideal to the point

of reducing it to virtual travesty" (p. 22).

"Shakespeare's Greeks" (1964), Clifford Leech: "one particularly strange tragedy (Timon)" (p. 4).

"Alcibiades' Revolt in Timon of Athens" (1967), Leonard Goldstein calls Timon a "bourgeois tragedy" (p. 277).

"Alchemy and Timon of Athens" (1970), David Bergeron: "Timon is, I would suggest, a 'green world' tragedy" (p. 372).

"Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Dr. Faustus" (1970), Anne Lancashire: "Timon of Athens might. . . be called a 'tragedy of unforgiveness'" (p. 43).

"The Ending of Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1973), Richard D. Fly: "Timon commands a centrifugal movement away from society towards total isolation and death--a movement suggesting tragedy and eliciting emotions associated with cartharsis. Alcibiades is less fully portrayed as the leader of a centripetal movement back into reunion with society--an action suggesting primarily history and eliciting communal emotions" (p. 246).

Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective (1976), Larry S. Champion: "Shakespeare does not attempt to depict in the protagonist a full tragic experience; no insight gained through suffering justifies the tragedy for the spectators, prompting them to perceive the best hope for mankind in his purgation of self

from the center of all decisions and evaluations" (p. 201).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner:

> My argument for Timon as a tragedy rests on a negative and positive demonstration. I shall first try to show that the claims for its being something else--a morality play, a satire, a domestic drama, or a pageant--stem from a partial or simplified reading. I shall then point out the essential elements Timon shares with plays that we have come to recognize as tragedies. Each of these is in some features different from the other, and we can therefore grant Timon some idiosyncracies if it meets many of the criteria that have been thought characteristic of the genre. No one play meets them all. (p. 16)

TYPE OF PLAY--TIMON MORALITY

Shakespeare (1939), Mark Van Doren: "Timon is not so much a man as a figure representing Munificence, an abstraction in whom madness may not matter" (pp. 289-90).

"Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1946), A.S. Collins: "Timon is his [Shakespeare's] true morality play in the straight sense. . . . There are two master keys to the play--the Three Strangers in III.ii, and the great scene (III. v) of Alcibiades before the senate. The first lets us into the secret of the nature of the play, its Morality nature" (p. 98).

An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948), Hardin Craig: "Timon of Athens is a sort of morality play" (p. 248).

Shakespeare's Tragedies (1951), G.B. Harrison: "These first scenes reveal the essential weakness of the play, which is more of a morality than a drama. All the characters are personification and none at any time becomes an individual. Timon is simply Reckless Prodigality; he has no human relations, no wife, child, parent, friend or even mistress" (p. 258).

The Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957; rpt. 1968), J.C. Maxwell:

> The abstract and schematic nature of the play has evoked comment of two contrasting kinds. Neither is

> entirely satisfactory by itself, but taken together they help to define its special quality. On the one side it has been suggested by A.S. Collins that Timon is Shakespeare's 'true morality play in the straight sense' [Collins, 1946]; the minor characters scarcely even pretend to be individuals; 'Apemantus is a fairly simple "humour" of Railing Envy, and Timon is Ideal Bounty and Friendship. Alcibiades alone is a man, a soldier, practical, sensual, yet a true friend, but barely individualized'. There is truth in this, but it scarcely answers all the questions the play raises for us. When, for instance, Mark Van Doren in a similar vein writes, 'Timon is not so much a man as a figure representing Munificence, an abstraction in whom madness may not matter', we are entitled to ask why it should not matter [Van Doren, 1939]. If the morality convention were as one-sided as this, it would be incapable of presenting real moral situations. Even a relatively crude work like Skelton's Magnificence does not absolve its central figure from criticism simply by giving him a name that is predominantly laudatory. There is, in fact, no need for such subterfuges in order to make sense of Timon. Timon is, if you like, a simplified, schematized figure; but Shakespeare makes it quite clear that his madness does 'matter', that his prodigality is to be judged by ordinary moral standards. (pp. xxviii-xxix)

Shakespeare: The Problem Plays (1961), Peter Ure: "The sense that Timon's experience illustrates a general truth, while it need not detract from the sharpness of his own lessoning, is precisely that quality which gives the play its character of a moral apologue. All the commentators have recognized that character even though they may not all wish to see it simply as a medieval morality Shakespearianized" (p. 49).

Timon of Athens (1965), Maurice Charney: "The structure of the play is that of a dramatic fable, divided into two sharply contrasted parts. By dramatic fable I mean what other critics have called a morality play or an allegory--that is, a structure that does not proceed rationally and causatively from point to point, but rather one that progresses by a series of unmotivated leaps from one imaginative state to another" (pp. xxii-xxiii).

"Timon of Athens and Morality Drama" (1967), David M. Bergeron: "I want to show the relationship of Timon to a specific morality play--Everyman. By viewing the thematic and structural similarities between these two plays we can come to a new understanding of how Timon owes at least a partial debt to medieval drama" (p. 182).

"Timon of Athens" (1969), L.C. Knights: "we seem to be dealing with. . . a play that, in some important ways, comes close to the Morality tradition" (p. 4).

"Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Dr. Faustus" (1971), Anne Lancashire:

> I suggest that in Timon of Athens Shakespeare, like Marlowe in Faustus, is writing his own secularized, anti-traditional morality play. Like Marlowe, Shakespeare chooses as subject matter a

> well-known story in which the hero is finally destroyed rather than saved--and through his own willful choice. Like Marlowe, Shakespeare draws upon the theme and structure of morality drama, working at once within, against, and beyond that framework. Where Marlowe uses the form and theme of the psychomachia drama, as exemplified in Mankind, Shakespeare uses the tradition of plays such as Everyman, in which the mankind hero is brought, by the experience of some material disaster, to a realization of the transitory nature of worldly goods, and accordingly turns to spiritual values. Where Marlowe employs morality devices such as the Good and Evil Angels, Shakespeare gives us, among other traditional features, Everyman's traditional appeal to and rejection by false friends. Where Marlowe reverses the stock morality play ending of spiritual salvation, Shakespeare too rejects the redemption of Everyman, and essentially shows Timon going to death "unredeemed", a self-exile from human society. (p. 35)

"Shakespeare's Misanthrope" (1973), Harry Levin: "The first three acts attempt to trace, so to speak, the etiology of Timon's malaise. The treatment is somewhat diagrammatic, as in a morality play. Instead of the psychological insight that revealed, step by step, how a Macbeth could become steeped in blood or an Othello corrupted by unworthy suspicions, we are confronted with the overt theatricalism of a Leontes overcome by jealousy in a single instantaneous seizure" (p. 91).

"Shakespeare's Timon of Athens and Elizabethan Prodigal-Son Plays" (1975), Michael Kevin Maher argues that Timon resembles Elizabethan morality plays and is a "moral" play rather than a tragedy. Timon, therefore, is not a tragic hero.

"Timon of Athens and the Morality Tradition" (1977), Lewis Walker: "This paper will treat Timon's prodigality and the vices of his compatriots in the light of a detailed examination of several morality conventions, and Shakespeare will be shown to have drawn more directly on the earlier dramatic tradition than has been hitherto suspected" (p. 159). For example, "Timon's seemingly unlimited wealth and his willingness to dispense it indiscriminately recall the handling of riches in the earlier plays" (p. 160).

"Timon: Shakespeare's Magnyfycence and an Embryonic Lear" (1978), Ruth Levitsky: "It may well be that Timon was never meant to be a tragedy--that it is a different genre, more akin to the moralities. I do not, however, see in it the Everyman pattern (reversed or otherwise) which Ann [sic] Lancashire [1971] finds there. It is more directly related to those moralities which embody conflict and debate themes than to those turning upon the coming-of-death motif. . . . Like Magnyfycence. . . it is secular in its concern with the dispensation of worldly goods. More importantly, both these plays, as well as King Lear, deal with the question of how a man ought to react to conditions of both prosperity and adversity" (p. 107).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979),

Rolf Soellner: "Of all the claims that Timon belongs to a genre different from tragedy, the one easiest to refute is that it is a 'morality.'. . . We do not have the feeling of a clear moral orientation to which Timon could and should adjust himself. . . . Nor does the action suggest that the characters have to make the kind of moral choices facing the characters of moralities. The play does not indicate a spiritual framework or prepare us to expect either salvation or damnation of its hero. It is therefore nonsense to say that a salvation ending is 'denied' and to call Timon an anti-morality. Timon heightens life; it does not organize it according to didactic principles. Its apparently simple pattern is made complex and ambiguous by ironies, and its presiding deity is the enigmatic and unpredictable Fortuna" (pp. 17-18).

TYPE OF PLAY--TIMON SATIRE

Shakespeare and His Times (1817), Nathan Drake: "Timon of Athens is an admirable satire on the folly of ingratitude of mankind; the former exemplified in the thoughtless profusion of Timon, the latter in the conduct of his pretended friends; it is, as Dr. Johnson observes, 'a very powerful warning against that ostentatious liberality, which scatters bounty, but confers no benefits, and buys flattery, but not friendship" (Vol. 2, 447),

Characters of Shakespear's Plays (1817), William Hazlitt: "It [Timon] is as much a satire as a play" (p. 210).

Shakespeare's Plays (1844-47), Gulian C. Verplanck cites Collier on Coleridge: "'He said that the whole piece was a bitter dramatic satire--a species of writing in which Shakespeare had shown, as in all other kinds, that he could reach the very highest point of excellence. Coleridge could not help suspecting that the subject might have been taken up under some temporary feeling of vexation and disappointment'" (Vol. 3, 5).

Timon of Athens (1890), William J. Rolfe: "Timon of Athens, of all the works of Shakespeare, possesses most the character of satire: a laughing satire in the picture of the parasites and flatterers, and Juvenalian in the bitterness of Timon's imprecations on the ingratitude of a false world" (p. 15).

The Temple Shakespeare (1899-1902), Israel Gollancz calls Timon "bitter satire" (Vol. 29, 214).

Shakespeare's Satire (1943), Oscar James Campbell: "Many of the satirical devices which Jonson perfected in Sejanus and Volpone Shakespeare adopted in constructing from the traditional story of Timon his first tragical satire" (p. 183). "I believe that Timon of Athens is not a tragedy wrecked in full career by the eruption of the author's personal despair too imperious to be restrained. On the contrary, most of its eccentricities will be softened or disappear altogether if we realize that Shakespeare designed his play as a satire to be written, after the new manner of Ben Jonson, in a tragic key" (p. 185). "So even those who realize that Timon of Athens is not a tragedy made chaotic by the insurrection of Shakespeare's emotions of despair and disgust will not give it their unqualified approval. . . . Just because it is tragical satire, it is not attuned to Shakespeare's nature or to the intensities of his genius. Even those informed by historical study of the author's purpose in composing Timon of Athens will not quite properly continue to assign it a low place in the canon of Shakespeare's works" (p. 197).

A History of English Literature (1950), Hardin Craig believes

that Timon "belongs to the region of satire and still more to the region of tirade" (p. 268).

Shakespeare's Prose (1951; rpt. 1963), Milton Crane: "Timon of Athens is a satirical play, whose prose is closely associated with its satire" (p. 167).

The Power of Satire: Magic Ritual, Art (1960), Robert C. Elliott: "Although Timon of Athens ends in a manner appropriate to tragedy, Professor Campbell's denomination of it as a tragical satire [Campbell, 1943] is just; the play is entangled in the most complicated ways with problems of satirical theory and practice. A Jacobean audience, for example, would have associated both Timon and Apemantus with satirists; or they would have recognized in the misanthropic utterances a tone that had become conventional for satirists of the period" (p. 162).

"Timon of Athens" (1969), L.C. Knights: Timon is "a direct satire on the power of money" (p. 8).

"Timon of Athens: Tragedy or Satire?" (1969), Robert E. Morsberger: "it [Timon] is inadequate as a tragedy and certainly does not qualify as a romance, comedy, or tragedy-comedy. The play seems to have a closer resemblance to satire--to some of the caustic satires of Marston and Donne or to the later dramatic satires of Wycherley and Moliere. What then is

the object of the satire? I suggest that it is twofold, directed both at society and more particularly at the misanthrope, personified by Timon" (p. 57). Nevertheless, the play fails even at this: "I think that Shakespeare deliberately made Timon. . . intending to satirize him rather than exhalt him as a tragic hero. However, Shakespeare's purpose is not wholly clear, and perhaps it was not so even to himself. The result is that the play is a hybrid, not wholly succeeding as either satire or tragedy" (p. 57).

"Genera mixta and Timon of Athens" (1977), William W.E. Slights: "characteristic of the stage satire of the early seventeenth century (the best evidence suggests a date for Timon around 1607-08) is a conscious distinction between the author and his satiric persona" (p. 41). "Shakespeare himself had experimented earlier with the same generic mixture, tragical satire, in Troilus and Cressida (1602). It seems reasonable to speculate that in doing so he was responding to the need of the times for new theatrical forms to deal with contemporary porblems of authority and to feed the appetites of audiences eager for the kind of sophisticated stage satire being written by Jonson and Marston" (p. 60).

TYPE OF PLAY--TIMON NOT SATIRE

Lives of the British Dramatists (1846), Thomas Campbell: "'a tragedy has no business to resemble a biting satire'" (Verplanck [1847], Vol, 3, 3).

The Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957; rpt. 1968), J.C. Maxwell: "Shakespeare has not gone as far as he sometimes does in presenting us with firmly placed subordinate characters from whom we can take our bearings with regard to the hero [but] he makes up for this by at least one undiluted piece of choric comment, the dialogue between the 'three strangers' at the end of 3.2. Timon's 'right noble mind, illustrious virtue and honourable carriage' elicit disinterested admiration, and the ingratitude with which he is treated appears monstrous. This in itself is enough to refute the view, developed in its most extreme form by O.J. Campbell [1943], that Timon is set before us merely for derision, and that the play is Shakespeare's attempt at a 'tragical satire' in the manner of Jonson's Sejanus" (p. xxv).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "Among Shakespeare's heroes, who are all extremists, he [Timon] is the most extreme; to call him a satirist is to put him into a frame from which he breaks" (p. 19).

"It seems to me. . . unwise to separate Timon from Shakespeare's tragedies by labeling it a 'satirical tragedy' or a 'tragical satire.' Certainly satire is one of its defining elements, but there are other components that equally claim attention" (p. 20).

TYPE OF PLAY--TIMON ACADEMIC PLAY

Shakespeare's Life and Art (1939), Peter Alexander: "When Troilus and Cressida was removed, in the course of printing, from among the Tragedies, Timon of Athens was inserted in its place. Apart from this accidental connection between the plays, there is a similarity in their construction. Troilus, as internal and external evidence suggests, was written for a special and no doubt an academic audience. In Timon the intellectual appeal is as slightly disguised" (p. 183).

"Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1946), A.S. Collins: "It is not a play. . . popular in appeal, or ever likely to be so. . . . it is a play that could well appeal to a select thinking audience, for it covers much of the ground of Baconian essays on Friendship, Traffic, True and False Misanthropy, Laws and Mercy, but, of course, with a most un-Baconian feeling" (p. 97).

On the Design of Shakespearian Tragedy (1957), Harold S. Wilson calls Timon an experimental play written to stimulate an intellectual audience (p. 145).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann: "The recognition that Timon may have been meant as something other than the regular tragedy has come slowly. I do not think that we should call it a 'tragical satire', yet we cannot hope to be fair to this unique and embarrassing drama by lazily lumping

it together with the grand tragedies. If a point of reference is required, the most useful would be Troilus, with which it has much more affinity than I have been able to demonstrate. A coterie audience, especially one made up of termers, would resolve many of its difficulties, both of value and technique" (p. 20).

"The Date and Production of 'Timon' Reconsidered" (1974), James C. Bulman, Jr.: "Scholars for years have been inclined, like Bradbrook, to believe that Shakespeare could have seen Timon [the manuscript play]. But if Timon [the manuscript play] was performed at the Inns of Court c. 1601-02, it is likely that Shakespeare did see it; for he had close associations with the Inns, and especially with the Middle Temple, where his own Twelfth Night, and perhaps Troilus and Cressida and Timon of Athens, were performed" (p. 127).

TYPE OF PLAY--TIMON EXPERIMENTAL PLAY

The Jacobean Drama: An Interpretation (1936), Una Ellis Fermor: "Timon, which is. . .revolutionary in form, spends a whole act presenting the initial situation and the characters before the action starts, and of this the first scene is partly occupied by a brief prophetic survey in semi-symbolic form that balances the situation rather than sets the mood" (p. 34).

"Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1946), A.S. Collins: "In fact, the unending variety of his [Shakespeare's] dramatic experiments is so obvious that it should be easy to see that, if Timon is the most striking of his experiments, it is by that all the more surely Shakespeare's, a bold departure typical of him and not of any other" (p. 97).

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1954), Harold Jenkins: "the plays acted by the King's men at this time reveal a drama capable of bold experiment" (p. xv). Charles Sisson in the same edition: "Its [Timon's] structure is loose and improvised" (p. 910).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "The play is indeed, as Miss Ellis-Fermor has herself implied [Ellis-Fermor, 1936], a most interesting experiment in dramatic technique; and the technique used is far in advance of its own

day and is very like that of certain modern novels, those of which Aldous Huxley's Point Counter Point is the prototype. With an absolutely minimum of chronological narrative, Shakspeare has set off against each other the reactions of one man to different situations, and the reactions of different men to the same situation" (p. xlviii).

TYPE OF PLAY--MISCELLANEOUS

Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Centuries (1880), Henry Hallam: "Their [Timon's friends'] thanklessness is anticipated, and springs from the very nature of their calling; it verges on the beaten road of comedy" (Vol. 3, 297).

The Works of Shakespeare (1888-90), Henry Irving and Frank Marshall: "Timon of Athens is a study of the disasterous effects of a reverse of fortune upon an unbalanced mind" (Vol. 7, 12).

The Problem of Timon of Athens (1923), Thomas Marc Parrott: "The theme, the ruin of a frank and generous soul by ingratitude, public and private, is no unfit subject for tragedy, the treatment of this theme in Timon presents some very effective scenes, yet as it stands it is a simply impossible play" (p. 3).

"The Theme of Timon of Athens" (1934), John W. Draper: "it is a sort of dramatic elegy on the ideals of chivalry that were succumbing in a capitalistic age" (p. 30).

"Timon of Athens: The Disruption of Feudal Morality" (1947), "Timon is a straightforward tract for the times" (p. 321).

"Patterns of Tempo in Shakespeare's Timon" (1948), John W. Draper calls Timon a "problem play" (p. 194).

Shakespeare's Tragedies (1951), G.B. Harrison: "It belongs rather to a new kind of drama for which enough specimens remain to justify a new catagory--Misanthropy" (p. 253).

The Slave of Life: A Study of Shakespeare and the Idea of Justice (1955), M.D.H. Parker: "Timon seems a play of echoes which Shakespeare never conceived as a dramatic whole" (p. 145).

On the Design of Shakespearean Tragedy (1957), Harold S. Wilson writes that Timon "is a great poem rather than a great Play" (p. 156).

Shakespeare: The Problem Plays (1961), Peter Ure considers Timon a "problem play" (pp. 44-53).

The Living World of Shakespeare (1964), John Wain finds Timon "at least partly a cautionary tale" (p. 143).

"King Lear and Timon of Athens" (1964-65), Ján Šimko writes that Timon "is not a tragedy, although it presents the tragic fate of one person" (p. 338).

A Natural Perspective (1965), Northrop Frye finds that Timon has "many features making for an idiotes comedy rather than a tragedy" (p. 98).

The Tragic Engagement: A Study of Shakespeare's Classical Tragedies (1968) Judah Stampfer: "This choreography, unfolding static example without dramatic engagement, the broad anonymity, the absence of a specific antagonist, all suggest a special mode of play, a closet drama. The writing of a closet drama by Shakespeare is odd; yet it may not have been intended from the start. A certain initial balletlike rhythm may have intrigued him, some nondramatic overtones, an intuition about anonymity. Then after the exhaustion of King Lear, such a project might have appealed to him. Even as a closet drama, it does not come to life with white-hot immediacy; yet its masterly choreography and its stark, vehement gallop into death make it fascinating" (p. 188).

Shakespeare the Craftsman (1969), M.C. Bradbrook: "Timon is a warning mirror, reflecting the plight of spend-thrift nobility" (p. 147).

"Genera mixta and Timon of Athens" (1977), W.E. Slights: "Shakespeare fused several existing dramatic kinds--masque, comic anti-masque, bitter satire, and tragedy--into a work of genera mixta" (p. 61).

The Complete Works of Shakespeare (1980), David Bevington: "Timon of Athens defies the conventional categories of tragedy,

comedy, and history. In terms of Northrop Frye's Anatomy of Criticism, the play stands chiefly between tragedy and satire. . . . The play is tragic in portraying a fall from greatness, satiric in exposing an unfeeling society. Satire is potentially comic as well, as we are invited to laugh sardonically at the hypocrisies of Timon's fair-weather friends. The play is also a history, drawn from historical sources, as its Folio title, The Life of Timon of Athens, suggests. We ought to see or read it with the expectations not simply of tragedy but also of satire and ironic history" (p. 1250). Bevington also calls the play a satiric morality:

> As a genre, in fact, the play most resembles those works which the Painter and the Poet wish to offer Timon himself: a "moral painting" and a "satire against the softness of prosperity" (I,i and V,i). Such a genre is deliberately old-fashioned, reminiscent of medieval morality plays and of the "hybrid" morality plays of the 1570's and '80's like Thomas Lupton's All for Money (c. 1577) or Thomas Lodge and Robert Greene's A Looking Glass for London and England (1587-1591), which inveigh against usury and the neglect of military heroes. John Marston's later quasi-morality, Histriomastix (c. 1599), proclaims the decline of civilization through worldly insolence. Ben Jonson's Volpone (1605-1606), though "comical" rather than "tragical" in its satire, similarly castigates human greed. The Parnassus trilogy (1598-1603) indulges in a massive venting of spleen against a Philistine culture. Timon of Athens follows this tradition of social satire, derived from both English and classical models. Like most satire of the 1600's, both dramatic and nondramatic, it is crabbed in style, features a railing protagonist, and denounces through

> exaggerated caricature an ugly array of types representing a broad social spectrum. Choice of the satiric morality play as a generic model accords well with the plays acerbic view of decadence and "softness." (p. 1250).

[George Steevens in The Plays of William Shakspeare (1778) writes that "The play of Timon is a domestic tragedy, and therefore strongly fastens on the attention of the reader" (Vol. 8, 1778). This designation is repeated in some later editions, but it is never commented upon.]

Shakespeare (1907), Sir Walter Raleigh: "The close likeness between Timon and King Lear has often been noticed, so that it is not unfair to say that in King Lear Shakespeare treated the very same theme of Timon, and treated it better, with all the added circumstances of likelihood" (p. 115).

The Problem of Timon of Athens (1923), Thomas Marc Parrott: "The theme, the ruin of a frank and generous soul by ingratitude, public and private, is no unfit subject for tragedy, the treatment of this theme in Timon presents some very effective scenes, yet as it stands it is a simply impossible play" (p. 3).

The Wheel of Fire (1930), G. Wilson Knight: "there is one symbol that persists throughout both parts of the play and this has important meaning: gold. Gold-symbolism is throughout recurrent, and impressions of gold and riches are woven close within the texture of thought and emotion. . . . The contrast is ever between gold and the heart's blood of passionate love of which it is a sacrament: the association, of the metaphoric value of gold and the value of love; or conversely, of hardness and the callousness of ingratitude. . . . Now the gold symbolism continued into the last two acts serves a double purpose. First, it draws men to him as of old, and

suggests the continued richness and nobility of his nature, the native aristocracy of his heart" (pp. 233-34).

"The Theme of Timon of Athens" (1934), John W. Draper: "Shakespeare. . . contrary to his established habit, not only much enlarged the plot of a popular story, but utterly changed its point of view and theme, so that it was not a picture of misanthropy but a lament for fallen greatness" (p. 22). Draper argues that the theme of Timon is usury--"the economic ruin of the nobility" (p. 28):

> The Elizabethan attitude towards usury is the key to Timon of Athens; it gives the purpose to the play, which former scholars could not find; it explains the change in Timon, links to the former acts the final episode of Alcibiades' revenge, and so gives unity to character and to plot; it gives a reason for Shakespeare's change in attitude toward the Timon of tradition; and, by showing that he meant the play to be a commentary on current life, it explains his utter disregard of classical authenticity. (p. 29)

Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us (1934), Caroline F.E. Spurgeon: "What do we find is the central image, the picture constantly before Shakespeare's eyes in this play? Dogs: dogs fawning and eating and lapping and licking, with 'gluttonous maws' devouring their lord's meat; hounds feasting on the blood of the animal they have killed; dogs being given food denied to men; dogs licking up remnants; dogs being stoned

and spurned and kicked; a mangy dog, a sleeping dog, an unpeaceable dog, a beggar's dog" (p. 198). On "gold" as an image: "gold is constantly spoken of and kept before our minds. . . but there is only one image from gold throughout the play [at I.i.275]" (pp. 344, 345).

The Jacobean Drama: An Interpretation (1936; rpt. 1961), Una Ellis-Fermor: "Timon defines the theme that Lear had touched, and loses little of its magnitude in definition. Lear's cry 'Off, off you lendings' is also Timon's first impulse: to strip away the horror of corruption that is civilization and fight back to the bare,essential, natural condition of man. It is the subversion of society only that he seeks at first, but he moves step by step through the gradually unfolding experience of destruction until the boundries of thought themselves dissolve and the mind itself, the very instrument of consciousness, is drawn out into chaos" (p. 264).

"A Note on Coriolanus" (1938), Enid Glen: "Its [Coriolanus'] theme is, however, one in which Shakespeare elsewhere shows himself to be particularly interested, and the scope of which extends far beyond politics; it has something in common with the tragedies of Othello, of Brutus and of Timon. It is the moving account of a man of simple and passionately held ideals who in the event is false to two of the strongest of them: he

loves his country more than his life, he loves loyalty and hates the breaking of promises. . . and his tragedy is that his nature drives him to become doubly a traitor, and to be killed for breaking his word" (p. 374).

Shakespeare (1939), Mark Van Doren: "There are three malcontents: Timon, Apemantus, Alcibiades. Three servants enter Timon's hall bearing gifts (I.ii). Three friends refuse money to Timon in three consecutive scenes (III,i, ii, iii), and the three strangers comment upon the triple outrage (III,ii). In his solitude Timon is visited by three significant individuals: Alcibiades, Apemantus, Flavius. This is obviously the work of a playwright who does not care how much his machinery shows, just as the poetry is the work of a man who does not mind announcing his themes: in the first half they are friendship, music, love, praise, and summer tears, in the second half they are hate, rage, roots, gold, bleak earth and sky, unvesseled sea, and winters too hard for weeping" (p. 252).

"Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (1942), Una Ellis-Fermor: "One detail that first becomes noticeable here is perhaps worth bearing in mind, the brief references to 'the gods,' that might be passed over as mere mechanical phrases, were it not that they recur as does an iterative image and

culminate in a passage of inescapable significance in a later act. The very presence of such a recurrent minor theme, the more indicative in that it is unobtrusive, suggests the continuing presence also of a presiding idea of which it is the momentary revelation" (p. 277). Ellis-Fermor also finds that the play's "central idea" is "the hollowness of society and its relations" (p. 272),

Shakespeare and the Nature of Man (1942), Theodore Spencer: "In a sense Timon may be regarded as the climax of Shakespeare's presentation of the evil reality in human nature under good appearance. We might say--with some danger of over-simplification--that his other tragedies had portrayed the situation in various personal relationships: Hamlet discovers the evil in his mother, Troilus in his mistress, Othello (as he thinks) in his wife, Lear in his daughters, Macbeth in the dusty fulfillment of his ambition--while Timon discovers evil in all mankind. And we might think, in consequence, that Timon should be more terrible than any of the other tragedies, since it presents evil in such universal terms" (p. 183).

"Excessive Goodness a Tragic Fault" (1944), Ruth L. Anderson: "The notion that goodness, when not linked with distrust, may prove one's undoing is the fundamental theme in Timon of Athens" (p. 93).

"Shakespeare's Use of the Idea of the Beast in Man" (1945), George Coffin Taylor:

> In Timon of Athens, as has been noticed, the beast in man idea swells to its greatest volume. But Spencer [1942, above] sees in this the death of the idea in Shakespeare, and is led thereby to a conclusion which, it will shortly be seen, is entirely untenable. The extraordinary ramifications of the idea in Timon are far more important as to revealing the infinite variety of concepts springing out of the once elemental conception than in revealing a Shakespeare in person shutting his mind thereafter to one-half of the truth as to the beast in man, as Spencer suggests. After Timon is disillusioned, his language is characterized by beast-in-man references. When one bears in mind the strength of friendship between man and man cult in Renaissance literature, it is little wonder that Timon should represent in that literature the high point of vituperative invective as to the nature of man. Shakespeare took Timon over readymade, the very essence of misanthropy, and through him therefore naturally he was almost obliged to develop in his diatribes on man the beast idea theory. The play teems with beast references, the last of which [is] the most elaborate use of the idea in Shakespeare. (p. 536)

"Timon of Athens" (1948), J.C. Maxwell considers the words "bounty" and "goodness" in I.ii (pp. 199-200); paradoxical uses of the word "free," and puns on "drug," and "drudge":"the pun is an extremely pregnant one, concentrating in a single word the reduction of men to a cash basis" (p. 203).

Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies (1950), Willard Farnham: "In the beast theme of

Timon one may perhaps find the essence of tragedy. Shakespeare obviously put much of himself into its development, whatever portion of it he took from the Timon legend. It is of some significance that in no other of Shakespeare's plays does the word "beast" occur so often as in Timon" (p. 68).

"Shakespeare's Dog-and-Sugar Imagery and the Friendship Tradition" (1950), James L. Jackson: "the fawning of spaniels is a commonplace of Elizabethan literature, and while one must agree that Miss Spurgeon's series of images is frequently recognizable in the plays, it is more likely to be a grouping of commonplaces on flattery than a reflection of Shakespeare's own experience. The image of the fawning spaniel is an obvious commonplace of Elizabethan proverbial matter and occurs in some other Shakespearean passages not mentioned by Miss Spurgeon" (p. 260) [See Spurgeon, 1935, above].

The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery (1951), W.H. Clemen notes that in Timon's last "two acts some central themes may be clearly distinguished" (p. 172). One is "Timon's will to destroy everything" (p. 172). Another is the "motif of disease" which "is by far the most powerful" (p. 172). The "'nature-imagery' plays the most important part in the last acts" (p. 173). "In Timon, gold is one such real element of

great symbolical force which for Timon himself is repeatedly the occasion of new chains of images (IV.iii.26; IV.iii.83; V.i.50)" (p. 174). The play's first three acts contain images of "sumptuousness, festivity and culture (jewelry, gold, costly vessels, presents)" (p. 175).

Poets on Fortune's Hill: Studies in Sidney, Shakespeare, Beaumont & Fletcher (1952), John F. Danby: "The theme of 'Nature' runs through the whole of Macbeth, King Lear and Timon" (p. 149).

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1954), Charles Jasper Sisson: "The themes of the play, prodigality and melancholy, were familiar to Elizabethan society" (p. 910).

"Timon and the Conceit of Art" (1955), W.M. Merchant: "two related themes have been established in the plot: deceitful appearance, introduced by the technical consideration of painting and poetry in their arts of imitation; and betrayal of trust and friendship, related to the scriptural theme of an ideal of charity and its denial" (p. 253).

"Timon of Athens" (1957), R.P. Draper: "Gold plays an immensely important part throughout the play" (p. 195).

The Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957; rpt. 1968), J.C. Maxwell: "To say that it is a study of a potentially noble but unbalanced and prodigal nature, corrupted by a usurious and materialistic society with its flattery, and thrown off

his balance and plunged into an equally extreme and indiscriminate misanthropy when the loss of his wealth discovers the falsehood of his friends--to say this is probably a less hopelessly inadequate account of 'what the play is about' than could be given for any other important play of Shakespeare" (pp. xli-xlii).

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme calls "flowing" "the dominant imagery of the play--or rather the imagery that might be expected to be dominant if it were convincingly carried out" (p. 111):

> In the first scene the poet's gentle flame 'Provokes itself, and like the current flies Each bound it chafes' (I.i.26). The crowd around Timon is a 'confluence', a flowing together. Wine of course flows abundantly, and so do tears, from Flavius and also from Timon, whose 'eyes cannot hold out water' to forget the faults of his friends (I.ii.101). Timon's estate ebbs, and his debts come as a 'great flow' (II.ii.142). References to plunging and drowning are frequent. In the second half of the play this sense of flow becomes concentrated in imagery more specifically of the sea, which culminates in Timon's grave 'upon the very hem o' th' Sea' (V.iv.66), with a final reference to tears from Alcibiades. I said that this imagery is not convincingly carried through: its function, that is, within the poem as a whole, is not defined with sufficient precision for the weight which it seems called upon to bear (the word 'flow' appears constantly and is replaced in the last two acts by 'surge'--one can hardly say anything more exact). One is reminded continually of its presence without being able to use it to secure a developing awareness of Shakespeare's meaning. (pp. 111-12)

"Gold and blood have become identified--a surface identification borne out by some curious images drawn from clothing" (p. 113). "It is significant that nowhere is Timon's nobility realized in any substantial image: on the contrary, the word 'noble' is used continually and indiscriminately by the Lords, by the Servants and by Alcibiades--it has become an adjective associated automatically with Timon, with an emptiness undiscovered only because it is never examined: the Lords obviously have no interest in doing so, the servants lack the opportunity and Alcibiades the wisdom and force that would be required" (p. 114).

"Acts IV and V of Timon of Athens" (1959), Winifred M.T. Nowottny: "gold as a symbol of Fortune is seen as confounding abstract categories of value and as transforming human attributes" (pp. 493-94). In IV.iii gold moves from "the symbol of the confusion of moral, physical and social distinctions (IV.iii.28-41) to a further symbolization of gold as the 'common whore' (IV.iii.42)" (p. 495). "[T]here has been substituted for the whole Elizabethan world-picture the twin myths of prostitution and thievery associated with the god of gold" (p. 497). Basically, Nowottny sees the play as "the climactic inversion. . . of values specifically Christian" (p. 497).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "little is added to the play as it stands by the mention of gods from time to time [cf. Ellis-Fermor, 1942, above]" (p. xxvi).

The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art (1960), Robert C. Elliott: "Throughout the first part of the play this grotesque metamorphosis operates consistently: nobility becomes the disgorgement of gold" (p. 150).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner: "in a neat parallel of four, stand Timon's faithful servants, Flavius, Flaminius, Lucilius and Servilius. Their loyalty is one of the play's major themes" (p. 140).

"Timon's Dog" (1961?), William Empson comments on the uses of the word "dog" in Timon (pp. 175-84).

The Story of Night (1961), John Holloway traces the "sun imagery" in the play (p. 133).

Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play (1962), Anne Righter, like Nowottny (1959, above), examines the play's uses of art and artificiality (p. 186).

"Dog Imagery in The Two Gentlemen of Verona, King Lear, and Timon of Athens" (1964), Ralph M. Tutt: "Recurrent analogies in each play present the dog as a callous brute, indifferent to

human kindness" (p. 15). Tutt summarizes the development of Shakespeare's dog imagery: "the relationship of Launce and Crab, clearly one in which dog rules man, should help us to understand Shakespeare's use of dog imagery in King Lear and Timon of Athens. 'When man's servant shall play the cur with him, look you,' says Launce, 'it goes hard.' And so it does in the lives of Launce, Lear, Kent, Gloucester, and Timon when, for various reasons, they find themselves suddenly denied 'natural' rights, at the mercy of their inferiors" (p. 22). Tutt also notes Flavius' dog image at III.iv.47-56; Timon's at III.vi.78-95; Timon calling Apemantus a dog at IV.iii.200-01; Timon to Flavius on dogs at IV.iii.534-37; and dog-man inversions throughout the play (pp. 19-20).

"'Smoke and Luke-Warm Water': A Note in Timon of Athens" (1964), Malcolm Ware comments on "Smoke and luke-warm water/ Is your perfection" (III.vi.82-83): "smoke" "is associated with deceit, hypocrisy, or with something it conceals. . . . The association of water and hypocrisy is, of course, proverbial; for in Genesis, xlix, 4 we find water takes every shape, having none of its own. Three times Shakespeare uses water to describe the hypocrite who can, like both water and smoke, assume any shape or role [The Winter's Tale, I.ii.131-35; Troilus and

Cressida (III.ii.198-203; and Othello (V.ii.134)] (p.343).

Timon of Athens (1965), Maurice Charney: "Act III, Scene v, is the first and only full scene of the subplot. It is well written and fully written. . . . Although the scene has no plot links with what precedes, it does have a strong thematic conncetion with it. The Athenian senators show the same ingratitude to a benefactor of their state as they did to Timon. This scene plays an important part in developing the tone and mood of Athens, so that when Timon's mock-banquet and revenge follow in the next scene, we are glad to see the tables turned on the greedy, usurious senators" (pp. xxvi-xxvii).

"Why the Sweets Melted: A Study in Shakespeare's Imagery" (1965), C.H. Hobday comments on Timon imagery in I.i.58-61, 210-11, 225-26, and 250-62 (p. 11).

Language as Symbolic Action (1966), Kenneth Burke: on "gold": "And though, according to our modern depth psychologists, the infant's original relation to the fecal is on the slope of 'love' rather than 'hate,' we early come to associate invective with the excrementitiously tabooed, hence the intensely pajorative nature of gold in this play" (p. 122). On food and eating:

> As for the cannibalistic food imagery in this play, one might at first question whether it fits the fecal theme. But as here used, it assuredly does. Man eats man, like dog eat dog. ("Destruction fang mankind!"). Here eating is in the same category with fighting. We are invited to think of eating, not as the pleasant gratifying of a peaceloving appetite (as in the early church Communion service) but as rending, tearing, biting, destroying, Eating here is the rabid use of claws and jaws, a species of hate (as in Act IV, scene iii, line 398: "Eat, Timon, and abhor them."). As so conceived, eating is but an incipient stage of excretion, in the same motivational bin with offal and invective. (p. 123)

Burke lists these themes:

> All told, then, what we have, put together with an almost oppressive consistency, despite the forced marriage of the Timon and Alcibiades themes are: (1) Choice of a character with a vile tongue, as likely material for a drama. (2) Absolute misanthropy, as a motive about which to organize his cantankerousness. (3) Disappointment to justify his misanthropy. (4) Prior, overgenerous, prosperous hospitality, to set the conditions for his disappointment. (5) Two closely related characters, each like-minded in a notably different way, and both shunned by him. One is a misanthrope like him, but differs in that he was from the start what the protagonist became, and was never wealthy; the other, like him, is an enemy of Athens, but not on general principles as a corrollary of misanthropy in general, and only so long as Athens effectively resists him. (6) Friends, guests, creditors, servants, and various other supernumeraries added, to meet incidental requirements of the plot; and they provide a spectrum of motivation that, though sparse for Shakespeare, far surpasses most dramas. (7) Since invective is motivationally fecal, gold provides a term that straddles both the theme of money and the theme of misanthropy. Also, its "radical" nature fits well with Timon's absolutist "digging." (8) Beastly imagery in general and dog imagery in particular serve as a variant source of misanthropic metaphors. (9) The closely related imagery of eating (in a pejorative sense) fits well, as connoting cor-

> responding kinds of appetition, either obsequious or rapacious. (pp. 123-24)

"Timon's Imitation of Christ" (1966), Jarold W. Ramsey: "two of the dominant images of the play" are "Water" and "Gold" (p. 163):

> Gold seems to have its traditional homiletic associations with greed,stupidity, falseness, and artifice--with the bad, "unnatural" elements of human nature it evokes. Water, on the other hand, is associated in Timon with benign Nature, with intrinsic values, with sincerity and transparency in human relationships, and (in Timon's mind, at least) with Nature's powers of cleansing and restoring corrupted human nature. (p. 164)

"Alcibiades' Revolt in Timon of Athens" (1967), Leonard Goldstein sees the play in terms of "two aspects: an interest in the strong man as benevolent ruler, and an apparent growing interest in the common people" (p. 257).

"Shakespeare and the Morality of Money" (1969), Allan Lewis:

> In Timon of Athens, Timon turns to hatred of all men in society when he sees the evil inherent in gold. The speech of Faulconbridge has its sequel, with greater detail, in the words of Timon, who, digging for roots, discovers gold. The bitter haunting lines begin. . . and ends [sic] with the same image of sexual depravity. Gold becomes the "common whore of mankind." (p. 387)

"Timon of Athens: Tragedy or Satire" (1969), Robert E. Morsberger comments on the play's gold (p. 59), sun (p. 60), beast-disease (p. 60), and venereal imagery (p. 62).

"Alchemy and Timon of Athens (1970), David M. Bergeron: "There is a word used several times in the play which I think has a relationship to alchemy, at least it can be interpreted in that way" (p. 366). The word is "base" and Bergeron traces its possible significances (pp. 366-67).

"Shakespeare's Misanthrope" (1973), Harry Levin: "It seems clear that he [Shakespeare] who empathized with such numerous and varied themes, found this ["antipathy"] an uncongenial one" (p. 94). Levin also considers "acquisition and dispossession as a timely theme" (p. 94).

"Theme in Timon of Athens" (1974), Michael Tinker: "The theme, simply stated, is 'Man shall not live by bread alone'. That theme is brought out by the imagery, the plot structure, and the inversion of the theme in the protagonist, that is, by the representation of a man who does live by bread alone" (p. 76).

"Timon of Athens and the Rhetoric of No" (1976), Marianna da Vinci Nicols: "Timon of Athens is about language. . . .

language functions[s] simultaneously as a mirror of character and as a subject or theme" (p. 30).

"Genera mixta and Timon of Athens" (1977), William W.E. Slights: "His [Shakesepare's] subject [is] an examination of the proper uses of authority in an established social order" (p. 41). "There are a great many analogous speeches on the gold topos in plays by Shakespeare's contemporaries" (p. 53). Slights then considers "the encomiastic address to gold that opens Volpone (1605)" and compares it with Timon's remarks on gold (p. 53).

"Timon of Athens and the Morality Tradition" (1977), Lewis Walker: "Timon's words promise abundant and various gratifications of the senses, a significant number of which will be provided by the banquet to which he bids Alcibiades. During the feast, Timon uses food imagery in speaking of his friend's profession (I.ii.75-79]" (p. 164).

"A dream of Friendship: Themes in Timon of Athens (1978), Gavin Bantock: The play is not only about misanthropy but also about the nature of friendship (pp. 167-206).

"Timon of Athens: The Rage of Disillusion" (1979), Susan Handelman: "The play is less about the experience of loss itself than a demonstration of the rage which refuses to accept loss" (p. 47).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "There is something prosaic about the imagery; the pictorial fancy is either subdued or, where it lights up, it does so disturbingly" (p. 98). On "gold": "it is surely a powerful symbol, the most powerful of the play. And if by 'image' we understand a visually conceived idea, many of the references to gold qualify since they invoke vivid impressions of gold" (p. 98). Soellner also examines the following images and words: "flowing," "flood," "tides," (pp. 99-101); images of disease and animality (pp. 194-95); sexual disease (p. 105); prostitution (p. 105); weighing images (p. 108); "use" and "usury" (p. 110); cynics and "use" (p. 111).

Soellner also replies to Empson's remarks on the play (Empson, 1961?, above): "Why Timon would want to imitate Apemantus's dog is hardly as baffling as Empson seems to think, and it is apt enough as an insult. . . .The insult mirrors Timon's dislike of having to imitate Apemantus; it does not refute the accusation that the misanthrope had adopted the cynic's idiom with his manners, which is really a quite justified accusation. But then, imitation was the Renaissance key to mastery of style" (p. 106).

Finally, Soellner returns to "gold" as a negative image in both Timon and Volpone (p. 109). He also considers "gold" and "use" (pp. 112-13).

"Timon of Athens: The Iconography of False Friendship" (1980), Clifford Davidson: "the emblematic nature of Shakespeare's art can very properly be studied through the iconography of false friendship in Timon of Athens" (p. 181). Davidson also notes the "obvious double meaning which would seem to connect Timon's 'spending' of gold with 'spending' in a sexual sense. Shakespeare seems content with the iconography of a man ecstatically scattering his worldly wealth" (p. 186).

Davidson notes an ambiguous dog emblem: "The most important emblem of the deceptive language of flattery is the dog, a creature to which Timon's friends are constantly being compared. Appropriately, a dog is an equivocal symbol in the Renaissance iconography, for this creature can appear in reference to loyal friendship as well as to flattery, or even ingratitude" (p. 189). Davidson cites two proverbs recorded by Tilly: "'The dog wags his tail not for love of you but for your bread;' 'Whores and dogs fawn on a man no longer than they are fed'" (p. 189). On "Uncover, dogs, and lap" (III.vi.82), Davidson cites the Hertel edition of Ripa: "'Nutri canes, ut Te endant'('Feed dogs, that they may eat you'). The works allude 'to the story of Actaeon devoured by his own dogs'" (p. 189).

MISC.--BEASTS

The State in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman Plays (1940), James Emerson Phillips: "The use of the term 'beasts' in Renaissance political and social writing . . . was the epithet commonly employed to describe men either in the chaos of the pre-social era or in a commonwealth which for one reason or another had disrupted the natural civil order. . . . The frequent appearance of the term in Timon is a further suggestion that Shakespeare was thinking of social disintegration much as his contemporaries thought of it. For as Apemantus says in describing the Athenian state, 'The commonwealth of Athens is become a forest of beasts'" (pp. 136-37).

"Primitivism in Shakespeare and Spenser" (1940), Thomas P. Harrison, Jr.: "In Timon this symbolic treatment of bestial degradation fades into the background as Timon seeks the bestial plane of life, which then becomes Shakespeare's theme; in Lear the comparison between man and beast remains symbolic, and there it is fairly confined to the wild ravings of the king. This significant difference makes Timon the more important of the two plays as a contribution to the subject of primitivism" (p. 66).

Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies (1950), Willard Farnham: "The true beast, even the

'unkind' beast, is thought of as better than the depraved man of this tragic world, but he is only a beast after all, a subject of admiration faute de mieux" (p. 70).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "Besides drawing on the elements and the celestial bodies, Timon's rhetoric of nature outdoes Apemantian pessimism in denying that animals are better than men and in seeing them as participating in the general corruption. The conventional misanthropic position has always been to disparage man in favor of the animals or at least some animals" (p. 140).

"Timon in Shakespeare's Athens" (1980), Robert S. Miola: "As the democratic dream of equality based on innate goodness turns into a nightmare of bestial passion, we are left with the chillingly ironic suggestion that men may perhaps be considered equals only in the universality of their base appetites and instincts. This, the darkest moment of the play. . . is strikingly reminiscent of the pessimism expressed in Troilus and Cressida and King Lear, where the lower half of man's nature overrules the higher and brighter principles of virtue, reason, and order" (p. 26).

WAS TIMON PERFORMED BEFORE 1623?

Shakespeare's Plays (1844-47), Gulian C. Verplanck: "we cannot find, from the lists of plays performed at court, the manuscripts of critical dramatists, like Dr. Forman, or the theatrical barrister, who fixed the date of Twelfth Night, that Timon was ever acted at all before it was printed; and the strong probability is that it was never what is called a stock-piece, for repeated representation" (Vol. 3, 5).

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Skakspere (1867), Charles Knight: "Timon of Athens was a play originally produced by an artist very inferior to Shakspere, and which probably retained possession of the stage for some time in its first form" (Vol. 1, 333). Knight does not say whether what he believes to be Shakespeare's revision of this play ever appeared on the stage.

Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society (1874), B. Nicholson:

> I now add a tolerably decisive proof that Timon as we have it was an acted play. In old plays the entrance directions are sometimes in advance of the real entrances, having been thus placed in the theatre copy that the performers or bringers-in of stage-properties might be warned to be in readiness to enter on their cue. In Act I. Sc. i. (folio) is

> Enter Apemantus opposite "Well mocked," though he is only seen as in the distance by Timon after the Merchant's next words, and does not enter till after "Hee'l spare none." So in the banquet (Sc. ii.mod.eds.) there is--Sound Tucket. Enter the Maskers [&c.] before Timon's--"What means thàt trump?"--and, Enter Cupid with the Maske of Ladies before Cupid's fore-running speech. There is doubtless a little confusion in having two directions, perhaps due to the Cupid fore-runner, and his speech being a Shakspere addition, but the argument remains the same, for both directions are in advance, as the Lady Masquers do not enter till after Timon's "They'r we[l]come all, let 'em haue kind admittance." (p. 252, n. 2)

The Works of Shakespeare (1888-90), Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall: "But before he [Shakespeare] had time to give the whole a final revision it was called for by the manager, and hurried upon the boards. These assumptions will account both for the general unity of plan as well as for the signs of incomplete revision observable here and there" (Vol. 7, 4). "[T]here is good reason for believing that the play as we have it in the Folio had been already acted" (Vol. 7, 6). As evidence, the editors cite Nicholson [1874, above].

Timon of Athens (1890), William J. Rolfe also believes that Timon was performed. Citing Nicholson [1874, above], Rolfe argues that the play's stage directions indicate that the Folio text was set from theater copy: "Our opinion is that Timon had been finished and put upon the stage some time before

the printing of the folio. It could never become popular as an acting play, and was probably soon withdrawn" (p. 11).

The old Arden Timon of Athens (1905), K. Deighton: "It may also be doubted whether the editors of the folio would have included in their volume a play never put before the public" (p. xxiii).

Shakespeare and Chapman (1917), J.M. Robertson: "there is no evidence that the play was ever performed" (p. 129).

Shakespeare's Life and Art (1939), Peter Alexander:

> When Troilus and Cressida was removed, in the course of printing, from among the Tragedies, Timon of Athens was inserted in its place. Apart from this accidental connection between the plays, there is a similarity in their construction. Troilus, as internal and external evidence suggests, was written for a special and no doubt an academic audience. In Timon the intellectual appeal is as slightly disguised. (p. 183)

"Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1946), A.S. Collins: "It is not a play therefore popular in appeal, or ever likely to be so. . . . it is a play that could well appeal to a select thinking audience, for it covers much of the ground of Baconian essays on Friendship, Traffic, True and False Misanthropy, Laws and Mercy, but, of course, with a most un-Baconian feeling" (p. 97).

"Shakespeare Learns the Value of Money: The Dramatist at Work in Timon of Athens" (1953), Terence Spencer: "parts of our text of Timon have never been reasonably completed, polished, or corrected for performance or perusal" (p. 75).

On the Design of Shakespearian Tragedy (1957), Harold S. Wilson calls Timon an experimental play written to stimulate an intellectual audience" (p. 145).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "There is no reason to think that the play was ever acted in Shakespeare's lifetime and there is no contemporary mention of it" (p. xl).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann: "If Timon too was produced at an Inn of Court this would be just the sort of company in which one would expect to find the pedantic author of the MS. Timon" (p. 14). "If intended for an evening performance at an Inn of Court, Timon's emphasis on food and drink would have special point. . . . The masque of the ladies (I.ii), with whom the men dance, reminds us of the 'Dancing and Revelling with Gentlewomen' chronicled in Gesta Grayorum" (p.22). "Timon's prodigality would be a sobering spectacle for the young law students, who were a byword for this sin. Alcibiades' pleading in III.v, as though in a court of law, would enthrall

such an audience, even if the accused does not appear. . . . a number of features of the play. . . would gain immensely in impact if viewed through the eyes of the special audience" (p. 18).

Shakespeare: The Problem Plays (1961), Peter Ure: "there is no evidence that [Timon] was ever performed in Shakespeare's time" (p. 44).

Shakespeare's Blackfriars Playhouse: Its History and Its Design (1964), Irwin Smith: "he [Shakespeare] seems to have written Timon with Blackfriars performance in mind" (p. 232).

Shakespeare's Occasional Plays: Their Origin and Transmission (1965), J.N. Nosworthy: "Sections of manifestly roughed-out material alternate with perfected scenes which, to all appearances, had been carefully prepared for production. The possibility that these scenes, with the masque as the central point of interest, were assembled to provide a short entertainment at Court or elsewhere cannot be ruled out, especially as the music for the Masque of the Amazons survives in B.M. Add. MS. 10444. More important, however, is the overall impression that Timon, with its generous provision for spectacle, was conceived, from the first, in terms of both Blackfriars (and possibly the Court) and the Globe. The Globe version, if such a thing had ever materialised, would certainly have dispensed with some of

the more elaborate devices and properties, and it is conceivable that an alternative ending would have been required. The final scenes in the Folio text are perplexing, but the redundant accounts of Timon's death and the presersation of two conflicting epitaphs, suggests conflation of alternative endings" (pp. 225-26).

"The Comedy of Timon: A Revealing Play of the Inner Temple" (1966), M.C. Bradbrook: "If Shakespeare's Timon had been given at Blackfriars (the nearest playhouse to the Inner Temple, just within the city walls), perhaps, as Honigmann [1961, above] conjectures, it had been originally designed for the Inns of Court; but if it was moved to Blackfriars later, the Epilogue may suggest the transfer of a private show to a public audience and mockingly predict that the comic Timon would be transferred as the tragic one had been" (p. 101).

The Tragic Engagement: A Study of Shakespeare's Classical Tragedies (1968), Judah Stampfer: "Timon of Athens was first printed in the 1623 folio, and may never have been acted in Shakespeare's lifetime" (p. 185).

Shakespeare the Craftsman (1969), M.C. Bradbrook: "I think it [Timon] essentially an indoor play as both décor, movement and nature of the chief role imply" (p. 163). "The

strongest evidence that Timon was acted lies in the farcical Comedy of Timon," which Bradbrook goes on to argue is a parody of Shakespeare's Timon (p. 165).

The Riverside Shakespeare (1974), Frank Kermode: "it remains a possibility that the corruption [in the play] was introduced during the transmission of the text, and that Shakespeare wrote a typical play for a special performance--say at an Inn of Court--which was somehow garbled later. But this hypothesis requires a great deal of proof" (p. 1441).

"The Date and Production of 'Timon' Reconsidered" (1975), James C. Bulman, Jr. believes that Timon, like Twelfth Night and Troilus and Cressida, was performed at Middle Temple (p. 125).

The Canon of Thomas Middleton's Plays: Internal Evidence of the Major Problem of Authorship (1975), David J. Lake: "Timon must be a rough draft: it is certainly in a theatrically unviable condition, bristling with loose ends" (p. 280). "Shakespeare and his fellows of the Kings' Men came to realise that no amount of patching could turn Timon of Athens into an attractive play for the Globe or Blackfriars, and hence it was never finished for production" (p. 286).

Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective (1976), Larry S. Champion: "possibly it [Timon] represents a consciously different

kind of play. . . an Elizabethan pageant or 'show' prepared for private stage performance and depending not on plot but on a series of contrasting scenes written on a central theme" (p. 203).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "Fortuna iconography in Timon raises the question of for what theater the play was written" (p. 149). Soellner argues at length that Timon was performed at the Globe (pp. 149-58). "The absence of any record of performance of Timon in Jacobean times should not be taken to indicate that the play was never performed. No records exist that Antony and Cleopatra and Coriolanus were performed, but who would doubt that they were? It is indeed possible that the lack of a performance record for all three of the last tragedies points to their being less popular than the preceding ones, but it is extremely unlikely that any one of the three was withheld from the stage" (pp. 195-96).

[See also, The Shakespeare First Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History (1955), W.W. Greg: "There is no record of the play's having been acted, and it is most unlikely that it ever was" (p. 411).]

TIMON'S VERSIFICATION

"Coriolanus"; "Antony and Cleopatra," Remarks on the Differences in Shakespeare's Versification in Different Periods of His Life and on the Like Points of Difference in Poetry Generally (1857), Charles Bathurst notes the difficulty of verse in Timon and compares it with that in Coriolanus.

The Works of William Shakespeare (1857-66), Richard Grant White: "The first folio is the only source of the text of Timon of Athens; and there it is found in a very corrupted state. Its versification in certain Scenes was probably never smooth, but in this regard it has doubtless suffered greatly in the printing office or transcription" (Vol. 10, 204).

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight: "There are various. . . modes of 'regulation,' which have been most extensively employed in the play before us; and the consequence was that some very important characteristics were utterly destroyed in the variorum editions--the record was obliterated. The task, however, which Steevens undertook, was in some cases too difficult a one to be carried through consistently; and he has been compelled, therefore, to leave several passages, that invited his ambition to 'regulate,' even as he found them. . . . No one we believe. . . will consider that Steevens has improved the poet by his 'regulation'" (Vol. I, 332)

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (1886), Henry N. Hudson: "It may be worth nothing also, that in the Shakespeare portions there is never any difficulty in distinguishing what was meant for verse and what for prose; while in the Anonymous portions the two are often hardly possible to be distinguished" (Vol. 15, 189).

"The Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1940), Ralph A. Haug: "It is hard to dogmatize about prose, although most of the critics do. But though Mr. Wright calls the scene from which the above lines (IV.iii.325-29) are taken 'vaudeville,' and Professor Parrott calls it a faux pas, I cannot see in them anything save Shakspere at a something less than his best" (p. 243).

Shakespeare's Prose (1951; rpt. 1963), Milton Crane: "The confusion of prose and verse may indicate that this is an unfinished or unrevised version. . . . A final version might have been entirely in verse. This suggestion cannot be offered too tentatively" (p. 170).

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme: "The verse has, fitfully, many qualities which stamp it as coming from Shakespeare's maturity" (p. 122). Nevertheless, "for all the local successes attained, Timon is certainly a failure; and on the whole it is not difficult to see why. There is little of the richness of meaning, given by the tactual and visual immediacy apparent in the language of the other plays of this time: the

imagery is not properly controlled and has no coherent development; the rhythm is sluggish, both in individual speeches and as a whole" (p. 123).

The Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver notes the play's irregular versification, specifically at I.ii.38-52, III.v.41-59, and IV.ii.30-51:

> Under the. . . . head, of versification, perhaps the most important features are the extremely free verse of many parts of the play, so free that it has not even the "ghost" of the iambic pentameter behind it as has most of the free verse of, say, T.S. Eliot; the large proportion and irregular occurrence of prose; and the high number of rhymes, often occurring at the most unexpected places. The general impression is perhaps even more important here than any single speech; but particular reference may be made to a speech by Apemantus (I.ii.38-52) which (so far as one can judge) begins as prose, has three lines of verse in the middle, returns to prose, and ends with a rhymed couplet (though that is also printed as prose in the Folio). Another instance of irregularity is the speech of Alcibiades to the Senate (III.v.41-59); and still another, perhaps the most frequently cited, is the soliloquy of the Steward at IV.ii.30-51 which Chambers described as an "alternation of jolting rhymed couplets with lines in which the metre seems suddenly to come to an abrupt stop" while Wright could only call it "little more than prose run mad in the inferior author's manner" (and therefore to be ascribed to a lesser dramatist than Shakespeare). (p. xvi)

Timon of Athens (1965), Maurice Charney: "Shakespeare seems to be completely in control of the style of Timon, which, if it has rough places that need to be revised, has also some

extraordinary felicities" (p. xxxii). Charney also notes the play's concision: "One other stylistic excellence in Timon is its epigramatic conciseness, the ability to pack a complex meaning into a brief phrase" (p. xxxii).

The Tragic Engagement: A Study of Shakespeare's Classical Tragedies (1968), Judah Stampfer aruges that verse irregularities are present because Timon is a "closet drama": "the clumsy, irregular speeches can be exaggerated in importance. This or that particular speech is less compelling than the strained artificiality of the entire play, its choked, impersonal language, its static posturing, stylized passions and metaphors, reversals of word order. . . . This is less a hasty, unrefined draft than a strained artificiality appropriate to the false nuances of society" (p. 189).

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1969), Charlton Hinman notes that the play's "imperfect verse", although partly the result of compositorial corruption, nevertheless also originates in an unrevised manuscript: "In fact it must have contained many passages which, though they represented something nearly complete, something more than rough sketches, could not yet be regarded by Shakespeare as in their final form" (p. 1138).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner comments on Apemantus' prose-verse speeches. He argues that Shakespeare mixes prose and verse lines as a means

of characterization: "many of his lines have a status between prose and verse, tending toward twelve-feet doggerel. He hardly ever speaks more than two lines of blank verse before he falls into doggerel or prose. No other character talks in such a skipping manner--an idiosyncracy surely due to deliberate characterization rather than to the play's lack of finish" (p. 89). Soellner also aruges that the the play's rough language is dramatically appropriate: "Something too much has been made of the roughness of the language. The unevenness in some of Apentus' speeches, as I have argued, is characteristic of his purposely rude and boorish manner of speaking. Similar reasons of dramatic propriety account for some metrical and syntactical irregularities in speeches by other characters, such as in Alcibiades' defense against the senators. . . . If we realize that it shows Alcibiades' anger rising when he is rudely interrupted by a senator, we shall find the slight irregularity of the lines emphasize his clipped accent, irritated questions, and the stinging axioms he throws at the senators" (p. 189).

"Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (1942), Una Ellis-Fermor: "the play of Timon does not endow its minor characters with the function of focusing, by their nature and actions, our thoughts and attention on the central figure" (p.282).

An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948), Hardin Craig: "He [Timon] has no human ties and no involvements of personality. There is this little individuality in the characterization. He is a moral voice answering humanity. And the other characters in this play are types. Apemantus is a cynic. Alcibiades is an unreflective doer" (p. 249).

"Patterns of Tempo in Shakespeare's Timon" (1948), John W. Draper: "most of the characters themselves are so much more social types that many of them, such as the several 'Senatores,' have not even individual names, but seem to be solely the personifications of economic or political tendencies" (p. 188). "Characters are mere types to illustrate certain social groups" (p. 194).

"Timon of Athens" (1948), J.C. Maxwell: "There are a number of firmly placed characters to give us our bearings, so that if we make a mistake about one, we can pull ourselves up by seeing that our reading does not fit into the general pattern. Timon

is not devoid of pointers of this kind, but they are less obtrusive and so error can propagate itself more easily" (p. 196). On Flavius at II.ii.38-41: "I think Shakespeare is here using his gnomic technique with a good deal of subtlety. We are meant to accept what Flavius says, but not to regard him as having adequate insight into Timon's nature, and the special connotations that the play has given to 'goodness' and 'bounty' enable us to achieve both these ends at once" (p. 201).

"The Paradoxical Encomium in Elizabethan Literature" (1949), Alexander H. Sackton notes Shakespeare's use of adoxiography (the rhetorical device of praising the unworthy or dispraising the worthy) (pp. 83-104).

Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies (1950), Willard Farnham:

> In putting Timon to dramatic use Shakespeare apparently chooses for the first time to present a deeply flawed hero such as we have found to be characteristic of his last tragic world. He chooses for his hero a man who in the Renaissance has generally had a bad reputation as a hater of mankind and has generally been thought unworthy of mankind's sympathy. He lets him have all the faults that have been credited to him by unsympathetic tellers of his story. He tries to make us see these faults in the light of sympathy, but does not try to minimize them. In conclusion he suggests that we should forgive them, as Nature herself seems to forgive them. (p. 77).

Shakespeare's Tragedies and Other Studies in Seventeenth Century (1950), Clifford Leech: "The characters in Timon and the romances lack complexity because of this: they proceed in a direction that is determined almost exclusively by their own natures. Shakespeare's latest vision of the world might indeed be described as peopled by saints and sinners, veering between the poles of salvation and damnation: no longer is it a world of interactions, where one man can save or betray another" (p. 117).

Shakespeare's Tragedies (1951), G.B. Harrison: "The first scenes reveal the essential weakness of the way which is more of a morality than a drama. All the characters are personifications and none at any time becomes an individial. Timon is simply Reckless Prodigality; he has no human relations, no wife, child, parent, friend or even mistress. He remains therefore a type for whom we may feel neither intimacy nor common interest" (p. 258).

The new Arden Timon (1959), H.J. Oliver: "With an absolute minimum of chronological narrative, Shakespeare has set off against each other the reactions of one man to different situations, and the reactions of different men to the same situation" (p. xlviii).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner: "In Timon. . . the secondary characters are divided clearly between good and evil, and the lightness with which they are sketched shows us that Shakespeare first conceived of them as

symbols of particular moral positions" (p. 140).

"Timon of Athens" (1961), E.A.J. Honigmann: "The secondary characters. . . do not stand in any sort of relationship to each other. . . . This sacrifice of one major source of conflict. . . seems no accident. As often elsewhere, Shakespeare mirrors the predicament of his hero in these subordinate figures" (p. 15). "The episodic nature of the action. . . may be not so much Shakespeare's slack planning as an intended effect. Many scenes are placed side by side rather than closely integrated with one another, a fact which goes hand in hand with the diminished individualization of the minor characters" (p. 16).

"King Lear and Timon of Athens" (1964-65), Jan Simko: "The main figures are not so much individualized as those in King Lear. They produce the impression of being rather representatives of certain human types or mouthpieces of certain ideas and conflicting forces" (p. 334).

"The Comedy of Timon: A Reveling Play of the Inner Temple" (1966), M.C. Bradbrook: "Beginning with a group of characters who are treated sometimes morally and sometimes satirically, developing through a series of tableaux, it [Timon] is finally dominated by the figure of the hero, who reaches cosmic and symbolic dimensions" (p. 84).

In the Tragic Engagement: A Study in Shakespeare's Classical Tragedies (1968), Judah Stampfer: "the loose names, the numbering of the senators who negotiate with Alcibiades, may not be simply sloppy writing. They would also suit a closet drama projecting faceless anonymity, the time-serving populace of a metropolis. A closet drama more readily allows such ambiguities without an antagonist to grapple with" (p. 189). "Timon of Athens has less characters than social types, playing their voices against one another, poet against painter, debtor against solicitor, ceremony against ritual feast, in arabesques of situations. The characters enjoy no growth, no self-discovery, no catharsis, no human truths. They rather shift and adjust to the wash of events, this way and that, a social sea, on which bland flecks flow by each other to their trivial fate" (p. 205-06).

"Timon of Athens" (1969), L.C. Knights: "it is worth remarking how sharply, in this play, Shakespeare serves to insist on the moral issue, even to the extent of morality plays. In the first part of the opening scene. . . Timon's situation is presented with a formal simplification that suggests a moral exemplum rather than any kind of naturalistic portrayal" (p. 4). Timon "comes close to the Morality tradition. There is no attempt at characterization; many of the figures are simply representative types" (p. 5).

"Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Dr. Faustus" (1970), Anne Lancashire: "Timon himself would lose his everyman quality if his individual personality were more fully brought out; it is essential that we see his character in broad, typical outlines alone: misguided, blind prodigal in I-III, in IV and I, selfdefeated cynic. . . . He is simply everyman, standing among moral attitudes, necessarily inactive in all fields except the one of moral choice" (P. 42). "It [Timon] is a moral ememplum, based on debate. Other necessary parts of Timon as moral exemplum are the episodic nature of the action, the fact that various minor characters are all connected to (and contrasted with) Timon but not each other" (p. 42). "The morality nature of the play also accounts for the scarcity and unimportance of female characters" (p. 43).

Shakespeare the Dark Comedies to the Last Plays: From Satire to Celebration (1971), R.A. Foakes: "The protagonists [of the late tragedies] are presented critically, and distanced from us in the discordances of a variety of perspectives upom them. . . it is in these plays that Shakespeare adapts to his own purposes the possibilities for satirical tragedy opened up by Marston and Jonson" (p. 87).

"The Ending of Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1973), Richard D. Fly: "Universal 'either/or' critical responses to

Shakespeare's plays are usually distorting and reductive, and this may be true also of the Alcibiades/Timon controversy. Critical debate on this level can quickly descend to appeal to moral biases and realiance on rhetorical flourishes. Perhaps a more rewarding approach is one which recognizes the presence of a double perspective that permits the audience to respond to the play's conclusion from two different and even contrasted viewpoints simultaneously" (p. 244).

"Shakespeare's Misanthrope" (1973), Harry Levin: "Shakespeare has individualized Alcibiades, along with Apemantus and Flavius, because they sustain a degree of affinity with Timon himself. All the other members of the cast are merely typified, as if to suggest that these are the sort of men to whom his cynical generalizations apply" (pp. 275-76).

Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective (1976), Larry S. Champion: examines the final tragedies and finds "Concerned with a vision of evil and its operation different from that of the middle tragedies, he utilizes the very devices by which heretofore he has depicted the private, inner struggle with close emotional rapport between the spectators and the protagonist. . . in order to place a greater emphasis on the forces of evil that operate on the protagonist from without" (p. 217). "Timon's character is too rigidly drawn. . . the result of Shakespeare's determination

to prevent the spectators' close emotional identification with the character" (p. 217). "Then too, the characters surrounding Timon are strangely impersonal, labeled only by profession or occupation" (p.217).

On Timon's character: "Timon's character is not flat; Shakespeare attempts to give it dramatic interest through development from prodigality, to naively idealistic rationalization, to self-pity, to a hatred that grows by degrees from his desire for immediate vengeance in kind, to his denunciation of false friends, his repudiation of his homeland and his few faithful companions, and finally his awesome execrations upon the entire race and his attempts to utilize his new-found wealth to provoke its destruction by war, rapine, and disease" (p. 202).

"Timon: Shakespeare's Magnyfycence and an Embryonic Lear" (1978), Ruth Levitsky: "If in constructing his Timon, he had in mind a kind of exemplum the device of using personified abstractions would have been ready-to-hand. . . . While Shakespeare does not label his characters as abstractions, Fortune is described in detail, and ingratitude, false friendship, despair, and the like are such obvious ingredients of the plot as to remind the reader of the earlier dramatic mode. Then, too, the vagueness of the characterizations, even of those who bear proper names (as opposed to types, such as 'Poet,' 'Painter,' 'Stranger'),

link this play with the Morality" (p. 108).

"Truth and Timon of Athens" (1979), Lesley W. Brill: "Timon begins with a prologue which in effect instructs its audience about what it is watching--a commentary upon, presumably, the facts of life--and how it is to respond--by working its own criticisms or reformulations of that commentary. As the play proceeds every action and circumstance becomes an occasion for comment and countercomment. The audience is never allowed to forget that the world is what one makes of it, and that what one makes of it is always subject to dispute and redefinition" (p. 23). Thus, "All utterances and all gestures in Timon are rendered equivocal by the variety of responses they evoke" (p. 25). "The simplicity of characterization in Timon, surprisingly, does not clarify this confusion, for although sympathetic and unsympathetic characters are strongly differentiated, they are not distinguished in terms of reliability" (p. 27). "The multiplicity of reality in Timon defeats the attempts of any character or group of characters to apprehend it fully" (p. 31).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "This lack of interaction of the secondary characters which has been criticized and attributed to the play's incompleteness, emphasizes the non-coherence of the society portrayed. The prevailing tragic pessimism is reflected even in the dramatic structure" (p. 27).

On the play's nameless characters and Shakespeare's characterization: "In the large degree of namelessness and in the frequent use of professional or class designations, Timon resembles Coriolanus with its first, second, and third senator, first and second soldier, and several numbered but unnamed citizens. In both plays, such non-individualized characters help to create a panorama of a society, and the picture is unpleasant. It is, however, more so in Timon; corruption and degradation permeate here all segments and strata: the worlds of art, commerce, trade, and the politics are all deeply corrupted. What need is there to give names. Change a name or a face, the total impression remains the same. No wonder that Brecht liked the play" (p. 85).

The Complete Works of Shakespeare (1980), David Bevington: "Appropriately for this satirical depiction of human greed, the characters are virtually all types or social abstractions in a generic portrayal of avarice. Several represent the crafts and professions, and are abstractly labeled as such. . . . Seldom in Shakespeare do we find so many characters without proper names. They are depersonalized, and we are distanced from them" (p. 1251).

ACT-SCENE DIVISION

The Works of William Shakespear (1709), Nicholas Rowe becomes the first editor to divide Timon into acts and scenes. The act-scene division is the same as in standard modern texts, with one exception: in modern editions the fifth act does not begin with the Steward's soliloquy (IV.iii in our text), as it does in Rowe, but rather with the visit of the Poet and the Painter (V.i in our text).

Mr. William Shakesperae Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies (1767-68), Edward Capell begins the fifth act, as most editors have done since, with the visit of the Poet and the Painter. This emendation has been accepted by editors of all major editions of the play. Aside from occasional suggestions that some scenes are missing from our present text [see "Missing Scenes"], Capell's division has not been disputed, until Soellner, below.

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner suggests an overhaul of the play's act-scene division: "We must not assume that the act division in modern editions, divisions that date back to Capell and other eighteenth-century editors, are in every way correct. In the case of Timon, I think, they have done some outright harm to the appreciation of the play's structure, and I shall suggest revisions dictated by dramatic logic" (p. 33). Soellner starts the fourth act after

IV.iii (the lament of the Servant) and includes all but one set of visitors (the Senators) in Act IV: "From the first to the last, these visits to Timon's cave are cohesive and have a way of commenting on one another; there should certainly be no act division between them" (pp. 41-42). Act V begins with the visit of the Senators. On the division of Acts IV and V:

> The most disturbing separation is that of the fourth and fifth acts; it has a way of jarring one's feeling for the continuity of the action and of obscuring the distinction between epitasis and catastrophe since it puts the separating line between the visit of the steward and that of the poet and painter to Timon's lair, followed by the senators. A quite notable break, after their failure to receive help from Timon and their reappearance in Athens, that is, between the present 5.1. and 5.2. One must assume that some time has elapsed between the senators' departure and their reappearance, whereas no such interval is evident at the point of the customary act division. The two later scenes are separated also by a shift in location--strikingly so after the long stretch of action at Timon's cave. Logic and common sense demand putting the act division at this point. (pp. 33-34).

Soellner goes on to suggest that Act III end at the conclusion of what is now IV.ii, and that Act IV start at what is now IV.iii:

> Besides the major realignment of acts four and five, I propose a somewhat less important change of the boundary between acts three and four. The third act, I think, should be extended through what is at present the second scene of the fourth, and the new act should begin with Timon's appearance in the woods. (p. 34)

TALENTS

The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare (1790), Edmond Malone, citing Steevens, finds no difficulty with the phrase, "so many talents" (III.ii.13), quoting from Julius Caesar, "'There is so much that thou wilt kill me straight'" (Vol. 8, 54).

The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare (1821), George Steevens: "the printer, who copied from the playhouse books, put down an indefinite sum for the definite sum, which remained unspecified" (Vol. 13, 318).

"On the Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1869), F.G. Fleay lists the pound value of all talents mentioned in the play (pp. 144-45). and then considers the talent references in III.ii, III. v, and III.vi:

> The "so many" talents of iii. 2 and the "fifty-five hundred" in the same scene, look like the work of a man who had some misgivings as to his previous amount of 50 talents; but was finally too hurried to remember to alter it. Note, in iii. 2, no amount is given.
>
> The thousand talents (more than a quarter of a million sterling) in ii. 2, is in any case absurd. I would read 1000 pieces, believing talents to have come in after the second writer had inserted ii. 2, 201, to make the amount demanded of the senators larger than that from a private lord. (p. 145)

Mr. William Shakespeare's Commedies Histories Tragedies and Poems (1883), Richard Grant White also comments on the phrase

"so many talents": "Possibly used (like "so and so") for an indefinite notion; but also probably the presence in the text of a mere memorandum left from the first draft. It would hardly be used twice in the course of a few speeches. The sum mentioned by Lucullus is so enormously great that it is quite surely the result of some error" (Vol. 5, 343).

The old Arden Timon of Athens (1905), K. Deighton: "as I do not believe that any definite value is attached to either talents or pieces, any more than to 'solidares,' the sums mentioned do not cause me any doubts" (p. xiii).

Shakespeare and Chapman (1917), J.M. Robertson: "But on any view we are left with. . . a first writer who knew what a talent stood for, and a second writer who was in doubt on the subject. And as the 'talent' never occurs elsewhere in Shakespeare's plays save by way of metaphor--and seldom at that--we are so far justified in counting Chapman the first writer and Shakespeare the second" (p. 134).

The Problem of Timon of Athens (1923), Thomas Marc Parrott:

> Timon sends to the Senate for what Robertson thinks the impossible sum of 1,000 talents, a figure which reveals, he holds, Shakespeare's ignorance of the value of the talent. I am not concerned to defend Shakespeare's classical knowledge, but I would point out that in North's Antony--which Shakespeare must have known almost

> by heart--there is such frequent reference to large sums of talents that Shakespeare may well have been misled by their value. . . . In view of these figures there seems nothing startling in Shakespeare's notion that the wealthy Timon had lent 1,000 talents to the State. . . . I do not see, then, that any argument against Shakespeare's priority can be based, as Robertson would have it, on his ignorance of the talent's value. (p. 12)

"The Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1940), Ralph A. Haug:

> In III,ii,29-41 we have an example of what must surely be hasty, incomplete writing. Timon's servant, Servillius asks Lord Lucius for "so many talents" (line 39) and Lucius retorts: "He cannot want fifty five hundred talents." . . . I believe that the amounts "50" and "500" were put down in Shakspere's manuscript, until one could be checked and crossed out. As the play was never finished, this was never done. (p. 236)

"Shakespeare Learns the Value of Money: The Dramatist at Work on Timon of Athens" (1953), Terence Spencer considers the number of talents in III.ii.11-15, 24-26, 39-41, and 42-43: "The author wrote 'so many talents' in these passages because he had not made up his mind what figures to put and intended to fill it in later. . . . A scene which is still in this state of incompleteness can only be regarded as. . . . an author's draft" (p. 77).

Shakespeare the Craftsman (1969), M.C. Bradbrook: "the muddle about the value of the Greek talent, which Spencer made so much of as evidence of revision, can be paralleled in the

Comedy of Errors, certainly written by a man who knew Greek" (p. 166).

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1969), Charlton Hinman: "Relatively small numbers of talents are mentioned in Lucian, much larger ones in Plutarch." Shakespeare "had set down two alternative sums and had never got around to striking out one or the other. For the repeated use of the manifestly unsatisfactory 'so many' in the preceding lines is hardly understandable except as an indication that the writer had become uncertain whether 'fifty' or 'five hundred' should eventually be used to specify a very large but yet not an altogether preposterous sum" (p. 1138).

The Riverside Shakespeare (1974), Frank Kermode: "Shakespeare had clearly not made up his mind about the value of the Athenian talent. He uses different values inconsistently, and in III.ii three times writes 'so many,' as if he intended to go back and fill on the appropriate number; however this muddle arose, it seems obvious that it would have been sorted out for an acting version" (p. 1442).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "There are problems with this explanation [Spencer's explanation that, according to Soellner, "Shakespeare did not know the value of talent when he started out, became confused about it, and therefore sought and obtained the correct infor-

mation" (p. 190)]. For one, the allegedly revised figures seem too high if the ancient talent is rated according to its comparable value in Shakespeare's time. . . .Another objection to the idea that the early figures are revised comes from their resembling those in Lucian and the Timon comedy. . . . There is no proof that Shakespeare ever learned or cared to learn the exact value of the talent. It is symptomatic that in a later occurrence of 'talents' in Cymbeline, 1.6.80, the word stands merely for an indefinite, large sum" (pp. 190, 191).

Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art (1881), Edward Dowden: "There is, at least, something baser than the misanthropy of Timon--complacent acquiescence in the life of greed, of selfishness, of unrighteousness in the cowardly and lascivious Athens" (p. 345).

Shakspere and His Predecessors (1896), F.S. Boas: "Though the scene is laid in Athens, Shakspere shows as little power of creating a Greek environment for his story as he had done years ago in A Midsummer Night's Dream. Except for a brief allusion to the 'great towers, trophies, and schools,' which Alcibiades is begged to spare, there is not a hint to show that the dramatist had any conception of the artistic and intellectual glories of Athens in its prime. He was evidently as unfamiliar with the conditions of Periclean Greece as of Homeric" (p. 496).

"The Theme of Timon of Athens" (1934), John Draper: "The Elizabethan attitude towards usury is the key to Timon of Athens: it gives the purpose to the play, which former scholars could not find; it explains the change in Timon, links to the former acts the final episode of Alcibiades' revenge, and so gives unity to character and to plot; it gives a reason for

Shakespeare's change in attitude toward the Timon of tradition; and, by showing that he meant the play to be a commentary on current life, it explains his utter disregard of classical authenticity" (p. 29).

The State in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman Plays (1940), James Emerson Phillips: "In Timon of Athens Shakespeare returns to the problem of a diseased society" (p. 126).

"Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1946), A.S. Collins: "Shakespeare. . . has essayed the morality play, but in order to show Timon, who is in one aspect Bounty, in his other Ideal Friendship, not universally, but in a degenerate state, a 'coward and lacivious town', whose rulers worship money and security" (p. 99).

"Timon of Athens: The Disruption of Feudal Morality" (1947), E.C. Pettet: "Stripped of its flimsy Athenian trappings, Timon is a straightforward tract for the times, and on this occasion no one can accuse Shakespeare of looking at his world through rose-coloured spectacles" (pp. 321-22).

"Patterns of Tempo in Shakespeare's Timon" (1948), John W. Draper: "Perhaps the most of all Shakespeare's dramas, Timon of Athens bears the marks of a problem-play: it has the generalized setting that the demonstration of the thesis re-

quires, an unhistoric Athens of here and everywhere" (p. 188).

The Classical Tradition: Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature (1949; rpt. 1970), Gilbert Highet: "The Greek plays are not like Greece" (p. 197).

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme: "In the end, the society, and Timon with it, appears too decadent, too unnatural for Shakespeare's purpose; and the only action which could develop out of the original situation proved a moral and artistic impasse" (p. 125).

The new Arden Timon of Athens" (1959), H.J. Oliver: "The play lent itself quite readily to modern dress, perhaps because it has so little of the 'local colour' of Athens in it" (p. 155).

"'Greeks' and 'Merrygreeks': A Background to Timon of Athens and Troilus and Cressida" (1962), T.J.B. Spencer comments on Roman anti-Greek attitudes: "Cicero, who brought so much Greek culture to Latin literature and philosophy, wrote disparagingly of the graeculus on many occasions, and the Romans of the Empire declared their contempt, dislike, or derision of the Greeks, often in highly vituperative terms, which made a deep impression upon the habits of thought of the men of the Renaissance" (p. 226). Spencer notes that Livy, Seneca,

and Quintilian are among the Roman writers who "sneered at the failings of the Greeks, their impudence, venality, mendacity, vanity, and servility. There were very few good Greeks; and they were all dead" (p. 226). Christian tradition carried on this anti-Greek bias. St. Paul, writing to Titus, "warns his friend that he is likely to run into difficulties, owing to the evil disposition of the Cretans. For, did not one of their own sages. . . declare that his countrymen were always liars, vile beasts, and idle gluttons?" (p. 226). It was "this Roman and scriptural point of view that, on the whole, dominated the writers of the Renaissance" (p. 226). In the Adagia, Erasmus "incorporated all these Roman prejudices; and so words and phrases such as pergraecari and fide graeca and Cretiza cum Cretensi. . . .Every schoolboy could learn to sneer at the Greeks" (p. 227).

During the English Renaissance, Spencer writes "the word Greek, generally preceded by an epithet like 'mad' or 'merry,' became an ordinary conversationl expression meaning a person of loose and lively habits, a boon companion, a fast liver" (p. 227). Greeks were known "for their persistent indulgence in drunkenness" (p. 228); and they were thought to be dishonest: "A 'Greek' meant what we should call a 'twister,' that is, a sharper, a cheat, a crook, any kind of confidence-trick-

ster; it meant, in fact, all that was implied in the proverb fide graeca" (p. 229). Greek women were whores: "It needs to be added that the women of Greece had a reputation that corresponded to the men's, the complement of rogue with whore having long been usual" (p. 231). Homosexuality was the "'Greek vice,'" which "was of course a byword, and Shakespeare deliberately introduces this Renaissance notion in relation to Achilles and Patroclus" (p. 231).

Spencer does not examine Timon in relation to these Renaissance attitudes toward Greeks, but he concludes that a knowledge of them is essential to understand the play: "As for Timon of Athens, we should certainly be thinking anachronistically if we were to regret that the chaste Doric beauties of the Parthenon and a Sophoclean or Socratic elevation of thought do not provide the background to Timon's life. . . . In fact, Timon and his circle 'live like Grecians'" (p. 233).

"Shakespeare's Greeks" (1964), Clifford Leech picks up where T.J.B. Spencer leaves off in "'Greeks'and 'Merrygreeks'" (1962). He provides this outline of the origins of Renaissance anti-Greek sentiment:

> Athens itself was remote and rarely visited. The Pope ruled in Rome, but it was the non-Christian Turk whose flag flew in south-eastern Europe. And

> while the Roman empire had become Christian through Constantine, the legend of Athens was uniformly a pagan thing. . . . In the time of the republic, Cicero could see Greek influences at work in Rome, and see them as a source of decadence. Greek literature provided, of course, models for the Romans to imitate, standards for emulation, and yet its subject-matter was dangerously questionable. Horace could say of The Iliad that 'in seditions, in trickery, in crime and lust and anger' it showed the commission of sin inside and outside the walls of Troy. Vergil's Aeneid had an anti-Greek bias, presenting Rome as the city willed by the gods to take the place of the Troy the Greeks had treacherously and savagely destroyed. A Roger Ascham might praise a host of Greek writers above all Romans but Cicero. . . . But Ascham knew Greek as common men, and nearly all poets and dramatists did not; and even he might have doubted the wisdom of making Greek literature totally available in his time. For the generality of Elizabethans. . . a 'Greek' was a boon companion, a twister, a sharper, a crook. The women of Hellas, from Helen, wife of Menelaus, to the hetairai of Periclean Athens, were notoriously of loose life. And the words of St. Paul were available to show his dissatisfaction with the men who constituted his first mission-field among the gentiles. Spencer assures us that we should not be surprised at the kind of men Shakespeare shows us in Triolus and Timon. They are 'merely "Greeks",' he says, as the Elizabethans imagined Greeks to be--dissolute, full of tricks, avid for luxury, prone to wrath and butchery. (pp. 7-8)

The Tragic Engagement: A Study of Shakespeare's Classical Tragedies (1968), Judah Stampfer: "the city of Athens is exceedingly stylized and abstracted, not a sink of depravity, like Vienna in Measure for Measure. There is no thievery, no fornication, no physical brutality" (p. 205). "[T]he city is an even, imperturbable, urban flow. As Alcibiades stands at

its gates with an avenging army, the senators mobilize no defenses, but blandly point out that revenge is beside the point in an impersonal metropolis" (p. 209).

Shakespeare the Craftsman (1969), M.C. Bradbrook: "Elizabethan Englishmen were not keen on Greeks. To the descendants of Pious Aeneas, inhabitants of Troynovant, they might almost have appeared as hereditary enemies. Greeks were thought of as convivial and dissipated because the Romans saw them that way; a 'Grecian' or 'Merrygreek' was Elizabethan slang for a roysterer. Greeks also being twisters, liars and cheats, Timon's friends were merely living up to the national character" (p. 148).

Timon of Athens and the Morality Tradition" (1977), Lewis Walker: "The portrayal of Athenian society in Timon. . . owes a great deal to the moralities. During the last quarter of the sixteenth century the moralities concentrated on the vice of greed and forms of corruption related to it. Increasingly, the playwrights dispensed with the generic Mankind figure, or rather fragmented him into representatives of various social classes and professions. The pervasiveness of greed could then be demonstrated by showing its effects on these representatives" (p. 172).

"The Ancient World in Shakespeare: Authenticity or Anachronism? A Retrospect" (1978), John W. Velz: "A. . . tightly reasoned book remains to be written on Shakespeare's response to Greek political philosophy; such a book ought to stress his sense of the polis as the core of civilization. One sees it best in Timon, where the failure of the polis to manifest its ontological essence, the reciprocities of human intercourse, leads to an atavistic collapse into barbarism conveyed by imagery of bestiality and cannibalism; only Alcibiades's eschatological purge of the city can restore the civility (both senses) of Athens" (p. 6).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "It may be finally noted that the very location of the play, supported, for Shakespeare and his audience, an emphasis on man's corruption and degeneracy. Ancient Greece, particularly post-Periclean Athens, furnished the Renaissance with spectacular examples of what happens to states when men become vicious and beastly. . . . The location of the play and some of Shakespeare's sources account at least partly for the somber view of man and society that permeates it" (p. 14)

"Timon in Shakespeare's Athens" (1980), Robert S. Miola: "I would like to suggest that Timon's setting is not merely

Grecian but Athenian as well. It exhibits many of the vices that Shakespeare's contemporaries, steeped in Athenian history and legend from earliest school days, associated with Athens, vices which were inextricably bound up with their conception of Athens as a democracy--a chaotic, vicious government by definition. . . . Derived from Aristotle as well as Plato, Plutarch, Demosthenes, Isocrates, Thucydides, Aelianus, Cicero, Seneca, Diogenes, Laertius, and many contemporary compendia, this conception of Athens as a city of license and disorder became proverbial" (p. 22).

PATRONAGE

"Timon of Athens: The Disruption of Feudal Morality" (1947), E.C. Petter:

> To appreciate the real significance of the play it is essential for us to understand something of the economic plight of those feudal lords who, with their heirs, relatives, dependents, were the most influential patrons of the Elizabethan stage. As a class these feudalists had been severely hit by the sharp rise in prices throughout the century, for while the bulk of their income was derived from the land, rents often remained at a relatively low, customary level. . . . The results of this were what we should expect: by the end of the sixteenth century many landowners, including some of the greatest noblemen in the country, were in debt to thousands of pounds, while a considerable amount of land had fallen, through mortgage, into the hands of City merchants, tradsmen, and lawyers" (p. 322)

"The Literature of Patronage, 1580-1630" (1952), Patricia Thomson: "The distinguishing feature. . .of the Elizabethan, as opposed to the medieval, system of literary patronage is that the new patron accommodates more poets, and the new poet seeks more patrons" (p. 271). "Shakespeare's Timon is an excessively bountiful though indiscriminating patron. His extravagant generosity renders him bankrupt" (p. 272). "Shakespeare, though fully alive to Timon's grave dificiencies, argues. . . a patron's case" (p. 272). In Timon also "the 'eternizing theme, provides yet another comment on the new poet/patron relationship

of the sixteenth century; for it involves a bargain. The emphasis of the New Economy tells in it; work must pay its way and only good value is rewarded" (pp. 273-74).

[See also the "Timon and Money" section.]

TIMON and JACOBEAN ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

"The Theme of Timon of Athens" (1934), John W. Draper: "The play, indeed, is Shakespeare's Gulliver, a fierce and sweeping indictment of the ideals and social ethics of the age, an indictment largely consonant with popular opinion of the time. In Lear, Shakespeare depicts the social chaos consequent upon the abdication of royal authority; in Timon of Athens, upon the economic ruin of the nobility" (p. 28).

"Timon of Athens: the Disruption of Feudal Morality: (1947), E.C. Pettet:

> To appreciate the real significance of the play it is essential for us to understand something of the economic plight of those feudal lords who, with their heirs, relatives, and dependents, were the most influential patrons of the Elizabethan stage. As a class these feudalists had been severely hit by the sharp rise in prices throughout the century, for while the bulk of their income was derived from the land, rents often remained at a relatively low, customary level. Some were shrewd enough to turn their attention to mining and industry; others attempted to reorganize their estates and screw up the level of rents. But these entrepeneurs and 'improving' landlords were the exceptions, and most of the nobility, lacking either the energy and initiative or the ruthlessness to adopt other measures, had recourse to the only other way out of the difficulty--the money lender. The results of this were what we should expect: by the end of the sixteenth century many landowners, including some of the greatest noblemen of the country, were in debt to thousands of pounds, while a considerable amount of land had fallen, through mortage, into the hands of City mercants, tradesmen, and lawyers. (p. 322)

On Timon as Feudal lord: "This concept [that of the bountious household] is feudalism, where religious and moral precept imposed upon all lords the obligation of 'bounty' or 'housekeeping'--a duty that included, along with a large house and a numerous retinue of servants, hospitality, charity, and patronage of all kinds" (p. 323).

"Patterns of Tempo in Shakespeare's Timon" (1948), John W. Draper: "The disasters that overtake him [Timon] represent the decay of the old feudal virtue of liberality--and feudalism, as seen in the Falstaff plays, was indeed decadent in Elizabethan times" (p. 188).

"Timon of Athens" (1969), L.C. Knights: "Timon of Athens, in so far as it is a direct satire on the power of money, can be seen as Shakespeare's response to certain prominent features in the economic and social life of his own day" (pp. 7-8)

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "Timon's fall is not altogether attributable to social pressures. He is not exactly a feudal lord ruined by his duty to keep a bountiful and hospitable house, as A.C. Pettet [1942] has it; nor is the play, à la J.W. Draper, an elegy on the ideals of chivalry that were succumbing to a capitalistic age [Draper, 1934, 1948, above]. None of the duties and reciprocal relation-

ships of the feudal age are assumed: Timon makes the point that he gave 'freely ever' (1.2.10). . . . Timon is not depicted as a victim of a system, nor are his friends merely doing what the system gives them a right to do. All are put in a situation that tests their capacities as human beings even more than as members of a particular society" (p. 122).

[See also "Timon and Money"]

ESSEX AND TIMON OF ATHENS

"Shakespeare's Purpose in Timon of Athens" (1928), Dixon Wecter:

> I do not maintain. . . that Timon is in every particular a faithful portrait of the Earl, but rather that in building up the character of the Athenian lord Shakspere wrote into the play the Southampton judgement on the crying unjustice of the Essex affair, particularly the part played by Francis Bacon; and so transparent was his intention that the play was mutilated shortly after its composition when a contemporary event, the trouble over Samuel Daniel's Philotas, demonstrated that a public vindication of Essex would still be politically offensive--not, probably, to the King himself, but to certain powerful noblemen. (p. 707)

Shakespeare's Military World (1956), Paul A. Jorgensen: "It is no mere coincidence that one of the ablest 'disintegration' explanations for the rough condition of Timon of Athens as a play is based upon a partial identification of Timon with Essex" (p. 279). Jorgensen then goes on to base much of his theory of the play on this idea, with specific reference to Wecter.

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "because the play was politically dangerous, it was. . . deliberately mutilated by another. Just why it should have been mutilated and not destroyed is far from obvious, nor is any parallel between Timon and Essex, let alone between Ventidius and Bacon, all that

clear. Nor is there evidence of sufficient interest in Essex in 1606 or later to make a revival of the play then at all probable" (p. xxiii).

MATERIAL MISSING FROM TIMON

The Plays of William Shakespeare (1765), Samuel Johnson: "I suspect some scene to be lost, in which the entrance of the fool, and the page that follows him, was prepared by some introductory dialogue, and the audience was informed that they were the fool and page of Phrynia, Timandra, or some other courtisan, upon the knowledge of which depends the greater part of the ensuing jocularity" (Vol. 6, 718).

"Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (1942), Una Ellis-Fermor: "Timon's speeches arise naturally out of what has gone before, but the sudden incursion of the senators and their control of the final scenes is hardly related at all to the original design, and the matter here is not solid or potent enough to be the culmination of what has been so powerfully planned. Again, we are strongly tempted to assume some missing scenes grouped round and relating to III.v which might have connected that scene with these, and these, thereby, to the whole plan. . . . As we have reason to believe that the plot was firmly designed, we can only assume that the design is not fairly represented by what remains" (p. 280).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner comments on Act V:

> The act. . . is too short, and it moves in a staccato fashion until the last and very effective scene. The first short scene (the second in the customary divisions), in which the senators return to Athens after their abortive mission to Timon, is abruptly followed by the short speech of the soldier on finding Timon's grave and epitaph. An intermediate scene may have been lost, and there may also have been some abridgement or rewriting of the soldier's speech, since it is slightly confusing. (p. 48)

"[T]he second most important character of the play, Alcibiades, has a surprisingly low share of words. . . . If a longer version of the play existed at one time, as I suspect, he may have had more than the few lines he speaks in the first two acts and been even more prominent in the ending than he is now" (p. 50). Finally, Soellner speculates on what may be missing from Act V:

> If I may indulge in a speculation about what is missing, a scene of desperate debate in Athens before Alcibiades' arrival at the gates and a crowd scene after his demand for surrender suggest themselves to me. Both or either of these scenes would have offered an opportunity for the one character to reappear whom I miss in the fifth act, the character who would be a keen critic of Alcibiades' words and actions: Apemantus. (p. 57)

TIMON A FAILURE

"On the Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1869), F.G. Fleay: "The play is, in its present state, unique among Shakspere's for its languid, wearisome want of action" (p. 147).

Introduction to the Literature of Europe (1880), Henry Hallan: "The fable, if fable it can be called, is so extraordinarily deficient in action, a fault of which Shakespeare is not guilty in any other instance, that we may wonder a little how he should have seen in the single delineation of Timon a counterbalance for the manifold objections to this subject" (Vol. 3, 298).

Shakspere and His Predecessors (1896), F.S. Boas: "Its main plot lacks sufficient action, and dwindles in its latter stages into mere passionate declamation" (p. 495).

The Temple Shakespeare (1899-1902), Israel Gollancz: "The doubtful authorship of a great part of the play accounts, in all probability, for the unsatisfactory state of the text" (Vol.29, 210).

Shakespeare (1907), Sir Walter Raleigh: "the play as a whole is unsatisfying, because the cause is inadequate to produce the effect. No one can read the play and believe that Shakespeare intended a satire on misanthropy" (p. 113).

The Problem of Timon of Athens (1923), Thomas Marc Parrott: "as it stands it is a simply impossible play" (p. 3). "There is not enough of the creative power of Shakespeare in the play to quicken the whole into dramatic life" (p. 4).

Life of Shakespeare (1925), J.Q. Adams finds the "material" "unsuited to a great drama" (p. 402).

Shakespeare (1939), Mark Van Doren: "If Aristotle was right when he called the plot the soul of tragedy, Timon of Athens has no soul" (p. 249).

Shakespeare and the Nature of Man (1942), Theodore Spencer: "If Coriolanus is a study in human behavior, Timon, by the very nature of the story, illustrates a thesis: the thesis that all men are bad; and though Shakespeare could describe men's badness with great vigor and force by reversing the traditional distinction between men and beasts, that reversal, no matter how strongly felt, is not in itself enough to produce tragedy. It produces only railing, and we feel toward Timon no particularly tragic emotion" (p. 183).

Shakespeare's Satire (1943), O.J. Campbell: "So even those who realize that Timon of Athens is not a tragedy made chaotic by the insurrection of Shakespeare's emotions of despair and disgust will not give it their unqualified approval. . . . Just

because it is tragical satire, it is not attuned to Shakespeare's nature or to the intensities of his genius. Even those informed by historical study of the author's purpose in composing Timon of Athens will quite properly continue to assign it a low place in the canon of Shakespeare's works" 9p. 197).

Shakespeare's Tragedies (1951), G.B. Harrison: "the play if full of imitations and echoes; it is second-hand work, Shakespeare repeating or paraphrasing himself, or borrowing ideas from others because his own inspiration is flat" (p. 267)

William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1954), Charles Jasper Sisson: "one can nevertheless conclude to a finished play, imperfect certainly, and negligent even, upon a theme and story which did not lend itself to perfection in form,but gave scope for much splendid writing" (p. 910).

"Timon of Athens" (1959), Andor Gomme: "Timon is certainly a failure; and on the whole it is not difficult to see why. There is little of the richness of meaning given by the factual and visual immediacy apparent in the language of the other plays of this time: imagery is not properly controlled. . . . the position of Alcibiades is hard to account for fully. . . . at times the play reads like a grotesque" (p. 123). "In the end, the society, and Timon with it, appears too decadent, too unnatural

for Shakespeare's purpose; and the only action which could develop out of the original situation proved a moral and artistic impasse" (p. 125).

The new Arden Timon of Athens (1959), H.J. Oliver: "Every artist knows the experience of the work which simply refuses to 'go well', and Timon, apparently, did not 'go well' for Shakespeare" (p. xxviii).

Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy (1960), Irving Ribner: "It is largely because the sub-plot was left so incomplete, with important details inadequately explained, that the play remains unsatisfying" (p. 138).

Shakespeare: The Problem Plays (1961), Peter Ure: "Shakespeare probably set out to create a tragic hero having something in common with Lear and Othello, and . . .he failed to do so partly because he had not chosen a story and theme capable of sustaining him" (p. 45).

Shakespearian Tragedy (1971), H.B. Charlton comments on Antony and Cleopatra, Coriolanus, and Timon: "they are the products of a Shakespeare whose hand has lost none of its cunning, but whose inward eye is dimming. His imagination ranges widely as ever over space and time; but it dwells more on the surfaces and no longer thrusts to the utter depths" (p. 15).

TIMON--ART and MUSIC

"Timon of Athens and the Morality Tradition" (1977), Lewis Walker: "The ceremony with which Timon's affairs are conducted, and particularly the music which is heard so frequently, is firmly rooted in the early drama. As far back as the cycle plays, music of various sorts had been utilized to suggest earthly power and ironically to undercut the power" (p. 161). Music, in short, is equated with worldliness: "The numerous ceremonious entrances in Timon, punctuated by music, evoke an atmosphere of worldliness similar to that which surrounds the courts of Herod and Mankind" (p. 162).

"Timon of Athens" The Rage of Disillusion" (1979), Susan Handelman: "In the Great Chain of Being, differences are dissolving, and all things are dangerously confusing their places . . . . Men and beasts are transformed into each other. Art itself cannot mirror life, correspond in a one-to-one relationship to a nature no longer based on a hierarchical set of correspondences" (p. 55).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner:

> In Shakespeare's time, even the simple term "art" carried the now obsolete meanings of craftiness, cunning, and deceit. Timon later makes these meanings explicit when he says to the poet, "Thou

> art even natural in thine art" (5.1.84), that is, he calls the poet a born as well as a practiced deceiver. The art that nature makes cannot be better than that nature itself. "Artificial," which is generally pejorative in critical terminology now, meant "of art" as well as "deceitful." Therefore, for Shakespeare's audience, the poet's praise of the painting had an intriguing semantic ambiguity: "It tutors nature; artifical strife/ Lives in these touches, livelier than life" (1.1.37-38). The painter may be striving to surpass nature by his art, but he is also engaged in a crafty enterprise--or so at least somebody alert to the two artist's duplicity would understand it. Even the painter's preceding remark, specious in its modesty, that the painting is a "pretty mocking of life" (35) is subject to an ironic reading: it presents a good likeness, yet it is a fraud of some sort. (p. 130)

On the Poet's remark on the Painter's painting ("It tutors nature; artifical strife/Lives in these touches, livelier than life" [I.i.37-38]), Soellner notes the danger of too closely imitating nature:

> If we may believe the poet, the portrait of Timon does indeed have (enargaia), since it conveys an impression of Timon's gracefulness and imaginative power. But there was still an old prejudice about imitating nature closely and, in the process, making art triumph over nature. . . . An art that "tutors" nature, as the poet says the painting does, could raise a moral problem. (p. 131)

In short, Soellner finds Shakespeare asking, "is art a varnishing or an essentializing endeavor?" (p. 132).

PARAGONE

"An Echo of the 'Paragone' in Shakespeare" (1938-39), "A.B." writes that the Poet's description of Fortune is the conventional Fortuna sedens, first described by the Greek painter Apelles of Colophon in the fourth century B.C. (pp. 260-62).

"Timon of Athens and the Conceit of Art" (1955), W.M. Merchant: "This controversy concerned the status of the painter in society and his refusal to accept a position lower in the scale than the poet's" (p. 251). "[If] Shakespeare was commenting in the opening scenes of Timon of Athens on the material of the Paragone argument which had become a commonplace of intellectual society, he explores there not its more obvious social elements, but its profounder implications, the competence with which painting and poetry render 'appearance' as a revelation of 'reality'" (p. 252).

"The Harmony of Disenchantment" (1964), W. Moelwyn Merchant: "the antipathy of the poet and painter. . . places the commonplace Jacobean moral problem of deceitful appearance within the wider aesthetic concern of the 'Paragone controversy' in which Leonardo da Vinci asserted the supremacy of the visual arts. It is not surprising that, opening with the preoccupation, the moral and spiritual problems of the play should be visualised in terms of a masque of the five senses, two feasts, the asserted presence of a gold horde and the final conjunction of exile in

a waste place washed by the 'salt sea'" (p. 114).

The Riverside Shakespeare (1974), Frank Kermode: "The dialogue between the Poet and the Painter with which the work opens is based on the paragone of Renaissance Italy" (p. 1442).

USURY

"The Usurer in Elizabethan Drama" (1946), Arthur Bivins Stone: "In fact, Timon of Athens is almost unique among the plays in which the usurer and the prodigal appear, in that Timon pays the just penalty of his foolish extravagance" (p. 196).

"The Theme of Timon of Athens" (1934), John W. Draper: "If usury then was responsible for. . . social disintegration and the misery it entailed, one can easily see why Antonio and even Timon were so sympathetic to an Elizabethan audience, which saw itself, like them, in the clutches of gripping creditors" (pp. 26-27). Usury, Draper continues, turns the idea of degree on its head: "The state was the one protection of property and life, and its stability the summum bonum of society; and this stability rested, as Ulysses says in Troilus, on the maintenance of 'degree,' that is the fixity of social rank; and usury, by raising the merchants above the nobles, was thus revolutionising society and endangering the state: like Timon, the Elizabethans felt that the world was upside down" (p. 27).

"The Usurer's Sin in Elizabethan Literature" (1938), Celest Turner Wright: "The playgoer and the casual reader doubtless had reason to detest the money-lender. For them, accordingly, he reamins a fixed type of monster" (p. 178).

Wright also notes that it is common to find the usurer depicted as a bawd: "the usurer is a whoremaster, who keeps a bawdy house for Lady Pecunia and lives upon the lechery of metals. . . . Sometimes the usurer is literally a bawd, like Security in Eastward Ho; Perfidious Oldcraft followed the trade in youth; and Bartervile draws revenue from stews" (pp. 180, 181). Moreover, usurers are also classed with "thieves, bawds, hucksters, or even playwrights and actors" (p. 185). Wright also notes that, according to Nashe (Christs Teares [1593] Works McKerrow , II, 99), "The prodigal son. . . fed hogs--that is, usurers" (p. 193).

"Timon of Athens" (1948), J.C. Maxwell: "We are soon to learn that Timon has been having recourse to usurers in the literal sense, but the implications of these lines are more profound: by his habit of lavish recompense Timon is turning even those who ostensibly give him free gifts into usurers, more successful usurers than the real ones" (p. 199).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner: "The use of money for its augmentation seemed rank abuse to the anti-usurers: money, they said, was not a commodity but only a means to obtain commodities. The Aristotelian objection was often quoted: to have money beget money was a perversion of its nature" (p. 117).

"Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (1942), Una Ellis-Fermor: "As a first act. . . this does its work. If the next four had been lost we should have no reason to suspect artistic confusion or collapse in what was to follow" (p. 273).

An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948), Hardin Craig: "The first two acts of Timon of Athens are somewhat broken, irregular, and imperfect. They show evidence of artistic planning rather than artistry. . . . One feels that the first act might have been and should have been a more sumptuous picture" (p. 251).

"Timon of Athens" (1969), L.C. Knights: "The first act's showiness serves the same purpose as similar elements in ballad or morality play: it tells us in straightforward visual terms that what we have before us is an example of vanity and pride of life decked out in tinsel. . . . What we seem to be dealing with, then, is a play that, in some important ways, comes close to the Morality tradition" (p. 5).

"Timon of Athens and the Morality Tradition" (1977), Lewis Walker: "The setting of the first act of Timon also seems to be heavily influenced by the morality tradition. As the play opens, we are in Timon's house, perhaps in an outer

hall, where the Poet, Painter, Jeweler, and Merchant enter 'at several doors' (s.d., begins I.i). From the remarks of these characters, we know that various Senators enter and probably go into an inner room to see Timon (ll. 39-41). The Poet takes note of 'this confluence, this great flood of visitors' (l. 42), and it is fair to infer that the scene is filled with activity, with comings and goings of important people. Timon's entry is heralded by a trumpet, and he is described as 'addressing himself courteously to every suitor' (s.d., l. 96). He receives Ventidius' messenger and other suitors, reinforcing the impression that he is a great man of affairs. In essence, Timon is holding court in his 'hende hale,' as the World does in Perserverance and as Mankind is encouraged to do once he has mounted the World's scaffold" (p. 161).

The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1867), Charles Knight: "The foreshadowing of the fate of Timon in the conclusion of this dialogue [between the Poet and the Painter] is part of the almost invariable system by which Shakspere very early infuses into his audience a dim notion of the catastrophe,--most frequently indeed in the shape of some presentiment" (Vol. I, 334).

Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society (1874), B. Nicholson:

> In Act i. sc. 1, it can hardly be supposed that Shakspere, who seldom blotted, left this trifling bit unfinished. If he did not, then in a most ceremonious and punctilious age (Shakspere's), two guests do not follow so great a one as Timon when he invites them with 'Let's in,' and they stand out merely for one to say to the other, 'Come, let's in;' after which, and after a few words that they are evidently and clumsily left on the stage to say, the other repeats the 'Shall we in?' Take the scene as it stands, all follow Timon, and the needy poet and painter having praised their patron, these lords enter as coming to the feast, dally a little with Apemantus, and then naturally, by contrast and sight of the house, tell us that the nobles equally praise Timon, Is not this less incongruous and more natural. and does it not tend to show that Shakspere overwrote an older play? Mr Fleay seems to think that what he would call additions, violate a stage direction; but that direction is, that Apemantus comes dropping after [to the banquet], not that he goes dropping out after all. (p. 249)

The Wheel of Fire: Interpretations of Shakespearian Tragedy (1930; rpt. 1960), G. Wilson Knight: "In no play of Shakespeare is the opening more significant. Art, wealth, trade are represented, things which stand for human intercourse, progress, civilization, worldly success and happiness" (p. 207).

William Shakespeare (1936), George Brandes: "Shakespeare has defined his purpose here as closely as did Daudet, some hundreds of years later, in the first chapter of his Sappho, in which the whole course of the story is symbolised in the ever-increasing difficulty with which the hero mounts the stairs, carrying the heroine to the highest story of the house in which he lives" (p. 562).

"'My Foot'" (1939), C. Wanklyn: "'My Foot'" (Clxxvi. 426) [See "'My Foot' in The Tempest, i.2.466" (1939)].--Timon of Athens (I.i.94) seems to throw some light on this:--'Yet you do well/To show Lord Timon that mean eyes have seen/The foot above the head'" (p. 34).

The Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957; rpt. 1968), J.C. Maxwell: "This first scene has foreshadowed the approaching fall, and has shown us in some measure how even the more genuinely fine sides of Timon's nature are corrupted by the spirit of his society, but on the whole we have so far seen him at his best" (p. xxxii).

The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art (1960), Robert C. Elliott: "No Jacobean audience could have missed the point: the deliberately trite hill of Fortune allegory of the Poet; the insistent emphasis on prodigality; the fawning and flattering and the reiterated hope that good fortune will last (the fortune-equals-money equation constantly present)--all this could presage nothing but disaster" (p. 150).

"Timon of Athens" (1969), L.C. Knights: "In the first part of the opening scene (in what I have called the Prologue) Timon's situation is presented with a formal simplification that suggests a moral exemplum rather than any kind of naturalistic portrayal" (p. 4). "All this obvious showiness serves the same purpose as similar elements in ballad or morality play: it tells us in straightforward visual terms that what we have before us is an example of vanity and pride of life decked out in tinsel. . . . What we seem to be dealing with, then, is a play that, in some important ways, comes close to the Morality tradition" (p. 5).

The Riverside Shakespeare (1974), Frank Kermode: "the opening scene of Timon of Athens survives in its finished state" (p. 1442).

"Timon of Athens: The Iconography of False Friendship" (1980), Clifford Davidson comments on "Plutus" in I.i.275-79: "According to Fraunce, 'Pluto was accompted the Lord of riches

and treasure: Pluto is the earth, whence al metals are digged. Plutos in Greeke, signifieth riches.'" (p. 192).

[In William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1969), Charlton Hinman notes on the play's first scene: "It is an admirable beginning. It is lively, colorful, full of both movement and matter. It has abundant variety, yet its numerous components are coherently interrelated and form a unified whole" (p. 1136).]

CRITICISM AND COMMENTARY (I.ii)

See "First Banquet."

CRITICISM AND COMMENTARY (ACT II)

"Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (1942), Una Ellis-Fermor: "The second act. . . shows as yet no signs of weakness. Where the first act had been extended and in parts almost leisurely, as fits the induction to an inner action of vast scope, this second act is correspondingly rapid" (p. 276).

"Two Notes on the Interpretation of Shakespeare's Text" (1959), Hilda M. Hulme on "It cannot hold, no reason/Can sound this state in safety" (II.i.12-13): "The primary meaning of the Senator's words would be 'No reasonable person can think it financially safe to try to bolster up Timon's credit. Anyone foolish enough to lend him money will lose it'. Sound may have also the secondary sense 'to plumb, go deep enough to'; state has no doubt the sense 'splendour, extravagance'. Johnson's emendation 'found' for sound has been retained by some present-day editors" (p. 355).

"On the Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1874), F.G. Fleay: "Act i. Sc. 2, on the other hand, has not a trace of Shakspere in it" (p. 131).

Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society (1874), B. Nicholson:

> In Act ii. sc. 2, Mr. Furnivall has argued for the retention of the prose bit, on the entrance of the servants. I add another consideration--the amount--its requirement of one sum--the words "to the States' best health"--the answer in a "joint and corporate voice"--the distinction between the senators and lords--and various passages in V. 1, where the senators address Timon, all show that the thousand talents had been lent to the State. A servant could not without a gross breach of decorum have been sent to the senate, but his steward, an Eleazar of Damascus--who had uncontrolled use of his signet--could go, and had gone. The text agrees with this; and as it also shows that the steward was sent to Ventidius, the servants are unused, unless you make Shakspere send them to lords Lucius and Lucullus. If the prose bit be not Shakspere's, how can it be an addition? (pp. 250-51)

Shakespeare: The Problem Plays (1961), Peter Ure: Act three shows "the commercial world of Athens--as bad a place as Volpone's Venice--that comes under the lash in the three brilliantly varried and horrid scenes. . . which show what happens when Timon's flatterers are asked to help him out" (p. 48).

"Timon of Athens, III.i, ii, iii" (1976), Hiasa Kazue writes that the discord of these three scenes is very dramatic (in Japanese, pp. 32-42).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner:

> when it suited Shakespeare's dramatic purpose, he characterized even minor figures sharply. He did so in the three scenes in which Timon's friends and exploiters--Lucullus, Lucius, and Sempronius--come to Timon's aid (3.1-3). These scenes invite comparison with the handling of a similar situation by Thomas Heywood in A Woman Killed with Kindness (pt. 1607), when Susan Mountford appeals to three relatives and friends to help her bankrupt brother and is turned down in quick succession. I venture to think that Shakespeare was induced by this scene of Heywood's (3.3) to demonstrate what he could make of such a simple situation; characterization by contiguous triplicity was not usually his method. (p. 86)

[See also "Lucius," Lucullus," and "Sempronius."]

CRITICISM AND COMMENTARY (III.i)

[See "Attribution, Act III."]

CRITICISM AND COMMENTARY (III.ii)

[See "Strangers."]

The Works of William Shakespeare (1842), J. Payne Collier notes what he believes to be a reference to Puritians in III. iii.32-33: "Coleridge said, in 1815, that he saw the same vigorous hand at work throughout, and gave no countenance the notion that any parts of a previously existing play had been retained in Timon of Athens, as it had come down to us. It was Shakespeare's throughout; and, as originally written, he apprehended that it was one of the author's most complete performances: the players, however, he felt convinced, had done the Poet much injustice; and he especially instanced (as indeed he did in 1818) the clumsy, 'clap-trap' blow at Puritians in act iii, scene 3 as interpolation by the actor of the part of Timon's servant" (Cited in Verplanck (1844-47), Vol. 3, 5).

William Shakespeare (1936), George Brandes: "This direct, unmistakable attack upon Puritianism [III.iii.32-33] has a remarkable effect coming from the lips of a Grecian servant, and we may gather from it some idea of the general aim of all these outbursts against hypocrisy" (p. 564).

The Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957; rpt. 1968), J.C. Maxwell: "Topical allusions seem to be almost entirely absent, but it is only fair to mention one which may tell against the

view I prefer, as favouring a date not earlier than 1606. In my note on 3.3.32-3, I have suggested that an allusion to the Jesuits may be intended, and this would perhaps be more apt after than before the Gunpowder Plot" (p. xiv). Maxwell's note reads as follows:

> 32-3. <u>those</u>. . . <u>fire</u> Various of the recent wars of religion (e.g. in France) may have been in Sh.'s mind. Perh. he was thinking specifically of the Jesuits (rather than, as Warb. thought, the Puritians), whom it was customary a little later to describe as incendiaries: cf. a pamphlet of 1623 quoted in R.C. Bald's ed. of Middleton, <u>A Game of Chesse</u> (1929), p. 149. (p. 133, n. 3.3.33-2)

CRITICISM AND COMMENTARY (III.iv)

"Farewell to'Vllorxa'" (1936), Samuel A. Tannenbaum: "Paleographically the substitution of 'Vllirxa' for 'all or ha' is one of the easiest and most likely misreadings. Both upper case and lower case a are often mistaken for u (v), and h is often indistinguishable from x" (p. 44).

"The Authorship of Timon of Athens" (1940), Ralph A. Haug writes that III.iv "is dramatically necessary, a development of the characters of Timon and the steward, and is not beneath the admiration of fair criticism. It is most surely not 'contemptible' and 'ragged'" (pp. 237-38).

Shakespeare: The Problem Plays (1961), Peter Ure: "The scene (III.iv) in which he is surrounded, like a baited animal, by a pack of howling creditors is a dreadful parodic counterpart of the earlier scenes in which he was surrounded by a crowd of mock-diffident beneficiaries" (p. 48).

"Desperate Debts'" (1967), J.C. Maxwell:

> In English Studies, xxxviii (1957), 198, Miss Hilda Hulme wrote: "Debts in Stratford (and locally elsewhere, NED: from 1551) were reckoned sperate or desperate, having some hope of being paid or else irrecoverable." The 1551 reference is to the entry sperate; the next one, involving desperate as well, is dated 1625. (The entry desperate, 3, has nothing before 1651, and then the application is to "debtor".) Miss Hulme goes on to cite Timon of Athens, III,iv.

103, which apparently counts as up to now the earliest example of desperate applied to debts; but she regards it as merely "possible that desperate in isolation carried for [Shakespeare] the sperate/desperate antithesis". There seems no reason for doubt about the independent currency of desperate; at any rate in a play roughly contemporary with Timon, Middleton's Michaelmas Term (c. 1606; published 1607) we have in close succession, "desperate debts"(ed. Bullen, III. iv.169-70) and "desperate debtor" (III.iv.175). (p. 141)

CRITICISM AND COMMENTARY (III.v)

[See "Alcibiades, III.v," "Attribution, III.v," and "Senators."]

CRITICISM AND COMMENTARY (III.vi)

"Shakespeare's Timon of Athens, III.vi" (1978), Henry D. Janzen points out the connection between Revelations 3: 15-16 and Timon's words at III.vi.84-89, where words and deeds blend in one theatrical moment (pp. 3-4).

"Timon of Athens: The Iconography of False Friendship" (1980), Clifford Davidson comments on III.vi.28-29: "these are birds [swallows] which are often regarded as emblematic of 'fair weather friends.' The Renaissance proverb says, 'Swallows, like false friends, fly upon the approach of winter'" (p. 195).

CRITICISM AND COMMENTARY (IV.i)

[See "Timon's Orations," and "Attribution, IV.i."]

Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society (1874), B. Nicholson: "Act iv, sc. 2, so far at least as to the parting of the servants, is not quite Shakspere's, but was certainly, I think, overwritten by him; there are lines wholly different from the rhythm of the second author, but having the rhythm and style of Shakspere" (p. 251).

"Timon: Shakespeare's Magnyfycence and an Embryonic Lear" (1978), Ruth Levitsky: "Act IV, scene ii becomes a debate between two examplars of cynicism, neither of whom at this point is even slightly admirable" (p. 118).

[See "Timon's Orations," and "Attribution, IV.ii."]

CRITICISM AND COMMENTARY (IV.iii)

"Shakespeare's 'Wappen'd Widow'" (1950), James N. Tidewell comments on "the wappen'd widow" (IV.iii.38): "Wappened would indicate one who had passively acquiesced in cohabiting. Not only would such an explanation conform to accepted linguistic pattern, but it would also give a better reading to Shakespeare's passage, in which Timon is trying to indicate the tremendous power of money by saying that gold will make similar the most contrasting things and make possible the most unlikely" (p. 139).

"Restoring Shakespeare: The Modern Editor's Task" (1952), Peter Alexander comments on IV.iii.12 ("It is the pasture lards the rother's sides"): "(where 'rother' means 'ox') and all is clear in sense and appropriate to the misanthrope's mood" (p. 2).

The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art (1960), Robert C. Elliott writes on IV.iii.354-75: "The form, the content, the tone of this are familiar. It is a conventional wit-combat in invective, much like that described by Horace in the 'Journey to Brundisius': the contest in scurility between Sarmentus and Messius at which Horace and Maecenas and Virgil laughed" (p. 159).

[See also "Apemantus," "Flavius," "Timon's Orations," and "Attribution, IV.iii."]

"Lucian and Boiardo in Timon of Athens" (1931), R. Warwick Bond: "the last two acts of Timon of Athens correspond to the action presented in Lucian and Boiardo" (p. 57).

"Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (1942), Una Ellis-Fermor: "The fifth act is again uneven. So erratic is the relating of its parts that we sometimes feel as if we are reading a mixture of two different plays. Yet all through it are the signs of mature writing which make us hesitate to say that it has not been touched by Shakespeare" (pp. 279-80).

"The Ending of Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration" (1973), Richard D. Fly: "the last Act of Timon moves on two levels, the ethical absolute and the historical, and. . . they remain mutually exclusive. When seen in this manner, Alcibiades and Timon are not to be compared to see which one makes the more reasonable response to Athenian ingratitude; rather they are to be understood as responding to two totally different human conditions, and in both cases their response is equally valid" (pp. 248-49).

[See also "End of Play."]

CRITICISM AND COMMENTARY (V.i)

[See "Poet and Painter."]

[See "Messenger, Soldier, Epitaphs," "Attribution," and "End of Play."]

CRITICISM AND COMMENTARY (V.iii)

[See "End of Play," "Attribution, V.iii," "Messenger, Soldier, Epitaphs."]

CRITICISM AND COMMENTARY (V.iv)

[See "End of Play," "Attribution, V.iv," "Alcibiades, V.iv," and "Senators."]

MISC.

The old Arden Timon of Athens (1905), K. Deighton provides a "Time-Analysis" of the play:

Day 1. Act I. sc. i. and ii.
" 2. Act II. sc. i. and ii., Act III. sc. i.-iii.
" 3. Act III. sc. iv.-vi., Act IV. sc. i. and ii.
Interval
" 4. Act IV. sc. iii.
" 5. Act V. sc. i. and ii.
" 6. Act V. sc. iii. and iv.

"Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (1942), Una Ellis-Fermor provides a list of references in which "gods" are invoked in the play (p. 277).

"Timon of Athens: The Disruption of Feudal Morality" (1947), E.C. Petter believes that the Senators' stand against dueling in III.v. is dramatically appropriate: "Whether the scene that presents this dispute is Shakespeare's work or not, the clash itself has a thoroughly convincing air of reality, for the class of men most likely to reject duelling and the principle of 'honour' that was used to justify it would be precisely the class that the dramatist puts into his Athenian Senate--usurers and men of business who 'love security'" (p. 336).

Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies (1950), Willard Farnham: "Boaistuau says that among representative philosophies which show perception of man's un-

happy state are those of three ancients: Heraclitus wept over, Democritus laughed at, and Timon had a particular hatred for man and all his works" (p. 58).

Shakespeare's Life and Art (1961), Peter Alexander comments on servants and service in Timon: "There is at the core of the play, as in Timon's own heart, a rare humanity; and the sense of the nobility in simple service finds expression in these humbler figures. They reassure us of the humanity in Timon himself, and that it was indeed his goodness that undid him" (p. 186).

"Timon of Athens and the Jacobean Duel" (1956), G.R. Waggoner notes the Alcibiades' plot: "The subplot is greatly concerned with duelling. . . this play offers an opportunity for the study of Shakespeare's attitude toward a public issue of his own time" (p. 303).

"Cumulative Parallel Episodes in Four Shakespearian Plays: Essays on Romeo and Juliet, Troilus and Cressida, Timon of Athens, and Coriolanus" (1971), David B. Olson discusses dramatic parallelism as the source of unity of the plays in order to see by what patterns the plays progress towards their culminations, and by what means Shakespeare controls the motion of the plays.

"Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare as Baroque Literature" (1973), William Samuel Levison considers Macbeth, Dryden's and Davenant's Tempest, Shadwell's Timon, Dryden's Troilus, Tate's

Lear, Gâldon's Measure for Measure.

"The Function of the Hero in Shakespeare's Last Tragedies" (1974), Timothy J. Gura writes on Timon, Antony and Cleopatra, and Coriolanus.

"Atheni Timon vagy as onpusztitas erkolese" (1974), Maria Zsamboki examines Timon and the ethics of self-destruction (pp. 758-66).

"Konflikt und Harmonie in Shakespeares Dramen" (1975), Georg Seehase: Conflict and harmony form the basis of a poetic principle in Shakespeare. Examples from Hamlet and Timon (pp. 39-45).

"Timon of Athens" (1977), W.H. Bizley: A letter in defense of the method of detecting sensibility in the texture of history (pp. 69-70).

"Marriage and the Family in Shakespeare: Some Problems and Some Themes" (1978), Charles Frey: Abstract of paper given at 1977 MLA. Family is variously defined; marriage is first viewed optimistically as a cure for dynastic strife, but later skeptically seen as insufficient. Mentions Timon.

"Ruskin, Apemantus, and His Father" (1979), Michael Simmons: Influence of Timon on Ruskin's "Traffic" (pp. 308-10).

Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy (1979), Rolf Soellner on servant morality: "Even the usurers' servants express unhappiness about the task for which they are used, and one, Hortensius, castigates his master's ingratitude (3.4.26-28).

There is no breakdown in servant morality of the kind that Malynes and other critics of society found in England and that Timon proclaims in his craze for total upheaval. . . . Yet one cannot take much satisfaction in this goodness from below" (p. 120).

On the idea of a punishing god: "He [Shakespeare] could not explicitly make Timon see nature's unkindness to man as the result of God's punishment; but again, he could hint at such a connection. The contemptus mundi described the elements as the executors of the wrath of God against sinful man, and analogously Timon appeals to their destructive power against wicked Athens" (p.138).

CONCLUSION

I. Problems of Attribution

Charles Knight in The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1838-43; rpt. 1867) first argued the theory of divided authorship. It is still debated today. Arguments for this theory are generally based on prose and verse style. According to Knight, for example, Shakespeare came across "a play originally produced by an artist very inferior to [him] and which probably retained possession of the stage for some time in its first form" (Vol. 5, 336, in 1838-43 ed.). Similarly, Frederick Gard Fleay in Shakespeare Manual (1878) finds that the "style" of the first few lines of Act IV "and especially the meter, is utterly unlike anything in the other plays of Shakspere. . . . This style was introduced by Webster, and followed by Tourneur, who are the chief masters therein" (p. 201). On this evidence alone, Fleay assigns Tourneur as Shakespeare's collaborator.

Influenced by Fleay, Ernest Hunter Wright in The Authorship of Timon of Athens (1910) also examines the play on the basis of the style of various passages and discovers the hand of an unnamed, inferior playwright (p. 57). Using the varying value of a talent throughout the play as proof of Timon's poor structure, J.M. Robertson in Shakespeare and Chapman (1917) argues for Chapman's collaboration (p. 134). In Shakespeare's

Plays (1847) Gulian C. Verplanck argues that Heywood is Shakespeare's collaborator.

Among other editors who propose an unnamed collaborator are: Norman Hudson in The Works of William Shakespeare (1851-56); Richard Grant White in The Works of William Shakespeare (1875); William George Clark and William Aldis Wright in The Works of William Shakespeare (The Globe ed., 1846); H.A. Evans in The Henry Irving Shakespeare (1888-90); William J. Rolfe in Timon of Athens (1895); and Isreal Gollancz in The Temple Shakespeare (1899-1902).

Turning to the twentieth century, critics of the play have also supported the view of divided authorship. Like J.M. Robertson, Thomas Marc Parrott in The Problem of Timon of Athens (1923) argues that Chapman is Shakespeare's collaborator (pp. 27-28). According to H. Dugdale Sykes in Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama (1924), however, Middleton and Day wrote an original draft of the play that Shakespeare later adapted (pp. 19-25) More recently, Tucker Brooke in A Literary History of England (1948, p. 539); Hardin Craig in A History of English Literature (1950, p. 268); and Winifred Nowottny in "Acts IV and V of Timon of Athens" (1959; pp. 493-97) has each supported the theory of divided authorship.

The question of the play's authorship is, in short, still one of critical debate.

II. Problems of Text

The romantic critic Hermann Ulrici was, I believe, first to suggest that Timon is an unfinished play. In Shakespeare's Dramatic Art (1846), basing his judgment on stylistic criteria--on numerous "heavy" "turns" which lack "the author's last finishing touch" (p. 238)--Ulrici concludes that Shakespeare had abandoned the play in an incomplete state.

The view that the play is incomplete, either because it was left so by Shakespeare or because of subsequent bibliographical corruption, is proposed by a number of critics and editors: J. Payne Collier in The Works of William Shakespeare (1842, Vol. 6, 574); H.N. Hudson in The Works of Shakespeare (1851-56, Vol. 8, 8); Wilhelm Wendlandt in "Shakespeare's Timon von Athens" (1888, pp. 107-92); E.K. Chambers in William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems (1930, Vol. 2, 482); M.R. Ridley in Timon of Athens (1934, p. 111); George Lyman Kittredge in The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (1936, p. 1045-46); W.W. Greg in The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare (1942, p. 149); Una Ellis-Fermor in "Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (1942,

pp. 270-83); J.C. Maxwell in The Life of Timon of Athens (1957, p. vii); F.P. Wilson in Elizabethan and Jacobean (1946, p. 117); C.J. Sisson in William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1954, p. 910); and H.J. Oliver in Timon of Athens (1959, p. xxviii).

On the other hand, Terence Spencer has argued more recently in "Shakespeare Learns the Value of Money: The Dramatist at Work" (1953) that because the play is incomplete, it provides a rare opportunity to witness various stages of Shakespeare's composition, an idea that Maxwell echoes in his introduction to the play (p. xxix). E.A.J. Honigmann in "Timon of Athens" (1961) argues that all textual difficulties are "post-Shakespearean in origin" (p. 19), implying that the play was set up from corrupt foul papers. Similarly, Oliver (1959), in what seems to be an attempt to save the play from the divided-authorship theory, argues a complicated theory of compositorial practice in order to account for what he believes is the play's unfinished state (Timon, pp. xvi-xxii).

In general, then, it seems that the idea of Timon as an unfinished play begins to gain ground when the theory of divided authorship,with its many contradictory accounts of revision, came under attack in Chamber's Facts and Problems (1930). The "irregularities" of text, verse, prose, and

dramatic form which the revisionists had accounted for as a lesser playwright's inferior work or a hasty Shakespearean revision, are now seen as the inherent defects of an abandoned Shakespearean draft. Nevertheless, evidence to support the unfinished theory of the play is, as it was for the revisionists, missing or based primarily on subjective criteria. Thus, the problem of Timon's text remains.

III. Problems of Sources

Turning to possible bases of the play, the question of sources may be divided into six categories. A seventh category includes possible contemporary contexts.

1) The play's primary source is taken directly from Lucian. Editors and critics who ascribe to this view include: Charles Gildon in "Remarks on the Plays of Shakespeare" (in The Works of Mr. William Shakespear, ed. Rowe, 1710, 7, 373); Alexander Pope in The Works of William Shakespear (1725, Vol. 5, 5); Sir Thomas Hanmer in The Works of William Shakespear (1744-46, Vol. 6, 155); H.N. Hudson in The Works of Shakespeare (1851-56, Vol. 8, 9); Richard Grant White in The Works of William Shakespeare (1875, Vol. 10, 198); and K. Deighton in the Arden Timon

of Athens. The view that Lucian is the play's primary source has not, to my knowledge, been argued since Deighton.

More recent critics of the play tend to argue that 2) Timon is based on an Italian or French translation of Lucian. Among critics arguing this view are: R.W. Bond in "Lucian and Boiardo in Timon of Athens" (1931, pp. 52-68); Georges Bonnard in "Note sur les Sources de Timon of Athens" (1954, pp. 59-69); and E.A.J. Honigmann in "Timon of Athens" (1961, pp. 8-11).

Other critics believe that 3) Shakespeare's Timon is based on the anonymous Timon manuscript play. Critics who argue that the anonymous Timon is earlier than Shakespeare's play and was used by him as a source include: Robert Hillis Goldsmith in "Did Shakespeare Use the Old Timon Comedy?" (1958, pp. 31-32); W.H. Clemons in "The Sources of Timon of Athens" (1903-04, p. 217); and James Bulman, Jr. in "The Date and Production of 'Timon'" (1976, p. 122). On the other hand, M.C. Bradbrook argues in "The Comedy of Timon: A Reveling Play of the Inner Temple" (1966) that the anonymous Timon follows Shakespeare's play (pp. 90-103).

Still other critics propose that 4) Timon is based on Plutarch, primarily on his "Life of Marc Antony." These

critics and editors include: Edmond Malone in The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare (1790, Vol. 1, 372); Tucker Brooke in A Literary History of England (1948, p. 538); Hardin Craig in A History of English Literature (1950, p. 268); Robert Adger Law in "On Certain Proper Names in Shakespeare" (1953, p. 352); and E.A.J. Honigmann in "Timon of Athens" (1961, pp. 8-11).

On the other hand, some critics argue that 5) Timon is based on a number of sources. Kittredge, for example, says in The Complete Works of Shakespeare (1936) that Shakespeare uses both Plutarch and Lucian (p. 1045), sources with which Sisson in William Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1954) agrees (p. 910). To Plutarch and Lucian, Maxwell in the Cambridge Timon of Athens (1957) adds the anonymous Timon (pp. xxi-xxii). In Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies (1950) Willard Farnham devotes thirty-two pages to the play and argues numerous influences, among which are Lucian and Plutarch; Painter's Palace of Pleasure (1566); Pedro Mexia's La Sliva de varia leccion (1540); and John Alday's Theatrum Mundi (1581) (pp. 39-72). In "Timon of Athens" (1961) E.A.J. Honigmann accepts Farnham's sources but also stresses Plutarch's influence and Lucian as obtained

from Filbert Bretin's Les Oeuvres de Lucian (1582) (p. 12). In "The Date and Production of 'Timon' Reconsidered" (1975) Bulman, in addition to considering the anonymous Timon as a source of Shakespeare's play, also argues at length for Jonsonian influences (pp. 119-27). Finally, in the new Arden Timon (1959) Oliver argues that Plutarch is Shakespeare's primary source, that Lucian and Painter's influences, although present, are slight, that the anonymous Timon is probably the source of most of Lucian in the play, and that there may be the influence of a lost Timon play (pp. xxxii-xl).

The notion of an ur-Timon play has not, to my knowledge, been argued in other modern criticism of the play. The idea was, however, popular during the nineteenth century when 6) a lost play was believed a source of Timon. Charles Knight, for example, in The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (1838-43) argues for a lost play (Vol. 5, 333), as does Gulian Verplanck in Shakespeare's Plays (1847, Vol. 3, 6). Bonnard in "Note sur les Sources de Timon of Athens" (1954) does consider the possibility of a lost play (p. 60); but Honigmann in "Timon of Athens" (1961) seems to sum up the critical consensus on the ur-Timon notion when he remarks that the "slenderness of the arguments" (p. 13) in its favor indicate its improbability.

Finally, 7) contexts of possible influence may also include contemporary treatises on social and economic conditions, as well as economic conditions themselves. In "Timon of Athens: The Disruption of Feudal Morality" (1947), for example, E.C. Pettet investigates such contemporary economic contexts as the effect of the rising cash-nexus on Feudal morality; the poverty of patrons; and the prodigality and consequent ruin of many of the aristocracy.

Pettet is primarily concerned, however, with showing that Timon is a generous Feudal lord suddenly confronted and overwhelmed by "the new cash-nexus world of Shylock" (p. 325). Although Pettet does not support his arguments with any of the economic treatises of the period, he nevertheless considers the moral contexts of contemporary economic conditions as possible influences of the play.

On the other hand, in a recent unpublished dissertation, "Shakespeare's Moral Economics and Timon of Athens" (1977), John Ruszkiewicz examines many didactic economic treatises of the period. His thesis is that these treatises inform much of the moral atmosphere of the play.

To conclude, however, my survey of source criticism indicates that Timon's sources are still disputed. A critical consensus on the extent of influence, indeed, even on the sources

themselves, is nowhere apparent. The problem of the play's sources remains one of Timon of Athen's major unresolved questions.

IV. Problems of Chronology

The preceding survey of chronology criticism may be divided into four categories: 1) critics who argue late or early dates; 2) the question of Essex and the date; 3) Antony and Cleopatra and the date of Timon; and 4) King Lear and the date of Timon.

1) The earliest proposed date of composition of Timon that I was able to discover is argued by Nathan Drake. In Shakespeare and His Times (1817) Drake argues for a strong Jonsonian influence and finds it necessary to date Timon 1602 (Vol. 2, 447).

On the other hand, Edmond Malone, arguing in The Plays of William Shakespeare (1790), feels that because Shakespeare would have consulted Plutarch's "Life of Marc Antony" before the composition of Timon, but not before the publication of Antony and Cleopatra (STC 1608), the play was probably written about 1610 (Vol. 1, 372-73). In the present century, M.C. Bradbrook argues that a bad play is always a parody of a better one on the same topic, and that the anonymous Timon therefore

follows Shakespeare's. She dates Shakespeare's Timon 1609 and the anonymous Timon 1611 (pp. 83-103). In "The Date and Production of 'Timon' Reconsidered" (1975), however, Bulman finds Bradbrook's "illogic" "little more than bardolatry" (p. 127), and dates the anonymous Timon 1602, stating only that Shakespeare saw the play and was influenced by it.

2) Arguments based on a possible Essex influence can be seen in "Shakespeare's Purpose in Timon of Athens" (1928), where Dixon Wecter argues resemblances between Essex and Timon and therefore dates the play shortly after the Earl's death (1601) (pp. 701-21). More recently, Paul A. Jorgensen in Shakespeare's Military World (1956) also notes similarities between Timon and Essex and assigns the play to the early 1600's (p. 267). According to James McManaway, however, who argues a moderate position in "Recent Studies in Shakespeare's Chronology" (1950), the date ought to be set between 1605 and 1608 (pp. 22-33).

3) Regarding efforts to date Timon in relation to other Shakespearean plays, many critics argue that the play is closer to Antony and Cleopatra than King Lear. Kittredge, for example, finds that the "subject of Timon may have impressed itself on Shakespeare's mind when he was reading Plutarch with a view to Antony and Cleopatra" (p. 1046). Sisson in William

Shakespeare: The Complete Works (1954), draws the same conclusion (p. 910).

4) On the other hand, much criticism on the date of the play is based on Timon's various relations to King Lear. Verplanck in Shakespeare's Plays (1847), for example, dates Timon about the time of Hamlet and Lear (p. 102). Although proposing no exact date, Una Ellis-Fermor in The Jacobean Drama (1936) also draws connections between Timon and Lear; but, writing that "Timon defines the theme that Lear had touched" implies that Timon is the later play (p. 246). Hardin Craig in An Interpretation of Shakespeare (1948) also thinks that Timon is later than King Lear (p. 256).

To summarize, then, the date of Timon of Athens is still a question of critical debate. None of the criticism I have surveyed provides any evidence which would allow assigning a date with any certainty. The dates proposed in the criticism on the subject vary greatly. The problem of Timon's chronology remains unanswered.

V. Problems of Interpretation

The divergence of interpretation of Timon of Athens is, I believe, evident in each of the above sections on the play's

commentary. A review of generic criticism in the "Type of Play" section may best illustrate the history and present state of Timon interpretation.

Timon has been called an "impossible play" (Parrott, 1923), an "elegy" (Draper, 1934), a "straightforward tract for the times" (Pettet, 1947), "a play of echoes" (Parker, 1955), "a great poem rather than a great play" (Wilson, 1957), a "problem play" (Ure, 1961), "a cautionary tale" (Wain, 1964), "a problem play" (Draper, 1948), an "unnatural fantasy" (Danby, 1949), "the doubtful harbinger of the romances" and "a tragedy manqué" (Leech, 1950), a "misanthropy" (Harrison, 1951), "an idiotes comedy" (Frye, 1965), "a closet drama" (Stampfer, 1968), "a warning mirror, reflecting the plight of spendthrift nobility" (Bradbrook, 1969), "comic and pathetic" (Fergusson, 1970), "masque, comic anti-masque, bitter satire, and tragedy" (Slights, 1977), "a problem play" (Fushimi, 1979), "tragedy" "satire" "ironic history" "social satire" "reminiscent of medieval morality plays" (Bevington, 1980).

Critics and editors who believe that Timon is a tragedy include: Samuel Johnson and George Steevens (1778), T. Gasquoine (1887), Ralph Roeder (1926), G. Wilson Knight (1930), Ralph A. Haug (1940), G.B. Harrison (1951), Cyrus Hoy (1964), Clifford Leech (1964), Leonard Goldstein (1967), David M. Bergeron (1970),

Anne Lancashire (1970), Richard D. Fly (1973), Larry S. Champion (1976), and Rolf Soellner (1979).

Critics and editors who call Timon a satire include: Nathan Drake (1817), William Hazlitt (1817), Gulian C. Verplanck (1844-47), Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall (1888-90), William J. Rolf (1890), Israel Gollancz (1899-1902), Oscar James Campbell (1943), Hardin Craig (1950), Milton Crane (1951), Robert C. Elliott (1960), L.C. Knights (1969), Robert E. Morsberger (1969), William W.E. Slights (1977). On the other hand, those who believe that the play is not a satire include: Thomas Campbell (1846), J.C. Maxwell (1957), and Rolf Soellner (1979).

Critics and editors who argue that Timon is a morality play include: Mark Van Doren (1939), Hardin Craig (1948), G.B. Harrison (1951), Peter Ure (1961), Maurice Charney (1965), David M. Bergeron (1967), L.C. Knights (1969), Anne Lancashire (1971), Harry Levin (1973), Michael Kevin Maher (1975), Lewis Walker (1977), and Ruth Levitsky (1978).

Critics who call Timon an academic play include: A.S. Collins (1946), Harold S. Wilson (1957), E.A.J. Honigmann (1961), and James C. Bulman, Jr. (1974).

Finally, critics who think that Timon is an experimental play include: Una Ellis-Fermor (1936), A.S. Collins (1946), Harold Jenkins (1954), and H.J. Oliver (1959).

This divergent and contradictory opinion on the nature of the play itself is also reflected in all other aspects of Timon interpretation.

To conclude, then, I hope to have shown in all the previous surveys that problems of attribution, text, sources, chronology, and interpretation still surround this puzzling play. Timon of Athens remains a critical enigma.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

EDITIONS

Alexander, Peter, ed. The Works of William Shakespeare. New York, 1952.

Bevington, David, ed. The Complete Works of William Shakespeare. Chicago, 1980.

Capell, Edward. Mr. William Shakespeare Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies. 10 vols. London, 1767-68.

Charney, Maurice, ed. Timon of Athens. New York, 1965.

Clark, William George and William Aldis Wright, eds. The Works of William Shakespeare. The Globe edition. London, 1864.

Collier, J. Payne, ed. The Works of William Shakespeare. 8 vols. London, 1842.

Deighton, K., ed. Timon of Athens. The Arden Shakespeare. London, 1905.

Dyce, Alexander, ed. The Works of Shakespeare. 6 vols. London, 1857.

Evans, Blackmore, et al., eds. The Riverside Shakespeare. Boston, 1974.

Evans, H.A., ed. The Henry Irving Shakespeare. Timon of Athens. New York, 1888-90.

Farmer, Richard, ed. The Plays of William Shakespeare. 12 vols. London, 1800.

Furnivall, F.J., ed. The Leopold Shakespeare. London, 1887.

Gollancz, Israel, ed. The Temple Shakespeare. 40 vols. London, 1899-1902.

Hanmer, Sir Thomas, ed. The Works of Shakespear. 6 vols. Oxford, 1744-46.

Harbage, Alfred, ed. William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. Baltimore, 1969.

Hudson, Henry N.,ed. The Works of Shakespeare. 11 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 1851-56.

_____. The Works of Shakespeare. 11 vols. Boston, 1872.

_____. The Complete Works of William Shakespeare. Harvard Edition. 20 vols. Boston, 1881.

Irving, Henry, and Frank A. Marshall, eds. The Works of Shakespeare. 8 vols. London, 1888-90.

Johnson, Samuel. ed. The Plays of William Shakespeare. 8 vols. London, 1765.

_____, George Steevens, and Isaac Reed, eds. The Plays of William Shakespeare. 10 vols. London, 1785.

_____. The Plays of William Shakespeare. 15 vols. London, 1793.

Kittredge, George Lyman, ed. The Complete Works of Shakespeare. New York, 1936.

Knight, Charles, ed. The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere. 8 vols. London, 1838-43; 2nd ed. 1867.

Malone, Edmond, ed. The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. 10 vols. London, 1790.

Malone, Edmond, ed. The Plays of William Shakespeare. Dublin, 1794.

_____, and James Boswell, eds. The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. 21 vols. London, 1821.

Maxwell, J.C., ed. The Life of Timon of Athens. Cambridge, 1957; rpt. 1968.

Oliver, H.J., ed. Timon of Athens. The Arden Shakespeare. London, 1959.

Pope, Alexander, ed. The Works of Shakespear. 6 vols. London, 1723-25.

Ridley, M.R., ed. Timon of Athens. The New Temple Shakespeare. London, 1934.

Rolfe, William J., ed. Timon of Athens. New York, 1895.

_____. Timon of Athens. New York, 1906.

Rowe, Nicholas, ed. The Works of Mr. William Shakespear. 6 vols. London, 1709-10.

Singer, Samuel Weller, ed. The Dramatic Works of William Shakspere. 19 vols. Cheswick, 1826.

Sisson, C.J., ed. William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. London, 1954.

Staunton, Howard, ed. The Plays of Shakespeare. 3 vols. London, 1858-60.

Steevens, George, ed. The Plays of William Shakespeare. 12 vols. London, 1778.

Theobald, Lewis. The Works of William Shakespeare. 7 vols. London, 1733.

Verplanck, Gulian C. ed. Shakespeare's Plays. 3 vols. New York, 1847.

Warburton, William, ed. The Works of William Shakespear. 8 vols. London, 1747.

White, Richard Grant. The Works of William Shakespeare. 12 vols. Boston, 1857-66.

_____. Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies Histories Tragedies and Poems. Riverside edition, 6 vols. Boston, 1883.

Williams, Stanley T., ed. The Life of Timon of Athens. The Yale Shakespeare. New Haven, 1919.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, J.Q. Life of Shakespeare. Boston and New York, 1923.

_____. "The Timon Plays." JEGP, 9 (1910), 506-24.

_____. "Timon of Athens and the Irregularities in the First Folio." JEGP, 7 (1908), 53-63.

Alexander, Peter. "Restoring Shakespeare: The Modern Editor's Task." Shakespeare Survey, 5 (1952), 1-9.

_____. Shakespeare's Life and Art. New York, 1939; rpt. 1961.

Anderson, Ruth L. "Excessive Goodness a Tragic Fault." Shakespeare Association Bulletin, 19 (1944), 85-96.

B., A. "An Echo of the 'Paragone' in Shakespeare." Journal of the Warburg Institute, 2 (1939), 260-62.

Babb, Lawrence. The Elizabethan Malady: A Study of Melancholia in English Literature from 1580 to 1642. East Lansing, 1951.

Baldwin, T.W. Small Latine and Lesse Greeke. 2 vols. Urbana, 1944.

Bantock, Gavin. "A Dream of Friendship: Themes in Timon of Athens." Reitaku Univ. Kiyo, 25 (1978), 167-206.

Bathurst, Charles. "Coriolanus"; "Antony and Cleopatra," Remarks on the Differences in Shakespeare's Versification in Different Periods of His Life and on the Like Points of Difference in Poetry Generally. London, 1857.

Battenhouse, Roy W. Shakespearean Tragedy. Bloomington, 1962.

Baugh, Albert C., ed. A Literary History of England. New York, 1948.

Bennet, Robert B. "The Figure of the Malcontent in Shakespeare." DAI, 31, 6045A (Stratford) (1971).

Bentley, Gerald Eades. "John Cotgrave's English Treasury of Wit and Language and the Elizabethan Drama." Studies in Philology, 40 (1943), 186-203.

Bergeron, David. "Alchemy and Timon of Athens." CLAJ, 13 (1970), 346-73.

_____. "Timon of Athens and Morality Drama." CLAJ, 10 (1967), 181-88.

Berlin, Normand. The Base String: The Underworld in Elizabethan Drama. Rutherford, 1968.

Bertram, Franz. Die Timonlegende: Eine Entwicklungsgeschichte des Misanthropentypus in der antiken Literatur. Greifswald, 1906.

Binder, Wilhelm. Ueber Timon den Misanthropen. Ulm, 1856.

Blake, Harriet Manning. Classic Myth in the Poetic Drama of the Age of Elizabeth. Lancaster, Pa., 1912.

Boas, F.S. Shakspere and His Predecessors. London, 1896.

Bond, Warwick. "Lucian and Boiardo in Timon of Athens." MLR, 26 (1931), 52-68.

Bonnard, Georges. "Note sur les Sources de Timon of Athens." Etudes Anglaises, 7 (1954), 59-69.

Bradbrook, M.C. "The Comedy of 'Timon of Athens': A Reveling Play of the Inner Temple." Renaissance Drama, 9 (1966), 83-103.

Bradbrook, M.C. Shakespeare the Craftsman. London, 1969.

Bradley, A.C. Shakespearean Tragedy. London, 1904.

Brandes, George. William Shakespeare. New York, 1898; rpt. 1936.

Brizley, W.H. "Timon of Athens." Theoria, 48 (1977), 69-70.

_____. "Language and Currency in Timon of Athens." Theoria 44 (1975), 21-42.

Brooke, Tucker. The Tudor Drama: A History of English National Drama to the Retirement of Shakespeare. Boston and New York, 1911.

_____. "The Renaissance (1500-1660)." In A Literary History of England. Ed. Albert C. Bough. New York, 1948.

Bulman, James C. "The Date and Production of 'Timon' Reconsidered." Shakespeare Survey, 27 (1974), 111-27.

Byrne, Muriel St. Clare. "The Shakespeare Season at the Old Vic and Stratford-Upon-Avon." Shakespeare Quarterly, 8 (1957), 466-67.

Campbell, John Libby. "Timon of Athens: An Existential and Psychological Approach." DAI, 87, 1560A-61A (N.Y.U) (1976).

Campbell, Oscar James. Shakespeare's Satires. New York, 1943.

Campbell, Thomas. "Remarks on the Life and Writings of William Shakespeare." In Lives of the British Dramatists. Eds. Thomas Campbell, et al., Philadelphia, 1846.

Cartwright, Robert. Shakspere and Jonson. Dramatic, versus Wit-Combats. Auxiliary Forces:--Beaumont and Fletcher, Marston, Dekker, Chapman, and Webster. London, 1864.

Cazamian, Louis. L'Humour de Shakespeare. Paris, 1945.

Chambers, E.K. Shakespeare: A Survey. London, 1925.

_____. William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems. 2 vols. Oxford, 1930.

Champion, Larry S. Shakespeare's Tragic Perspective. Athens, Georgia, 1976.

Charlton, H.B. Shakespearian Tragedy, Cambridge, 1971.

Clemens, Wolfgang. The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery. New York, 1961 (Based on Shakespeare's Bilder, Bonn, 1936).

Clemons, W.H. "The Sources of Timon of Athens." Princeton Univ. Bulletin, 14-15 (1902-04), 208-23.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. Lectures and Notes on Shakespeare and Other Dramatists. Oxford, 1931.

Collins, A.S. "Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration." RES, 22 (1946), 96-108.

Conrad, Hermann. "Shakespeare's Timon: Urheberschaft, Abfassungszeit und Entstehung." Zeitschrift fur Vergleichende Literaturgeschichte, 17 (1909), 337-84.

Cook, David. "Timon of Athens." Shakespeare Survey, 16 (1963), 83-94.

Cornelia, Maria. The Function of the Masque in Jacobean Tragedy and Tragicomedy. (Jacobean Drama Studies, 77), Salzburg: Institute für Englische Sprache und Literatur, Univ. Salzburg, 1978.

Craig, Hardin. A History of English Literature. New York, 1950.

_____. An Interpretation of Shakespeare. New York, 1948.

Crane, Milton. Shakespeare's Prose. Chicago, 1951.

Danby, John F. Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature. London, 1961.

_____. Poets on Fortune's Hill: Studies in Sidney, Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher. London, 1952.

Davidson, Clifford. "Timon of Athens: The Iconography of False Friendship." The Huntington Library Quarterly, 43 (1980), 181-200.

Delius, Nicholaus. "Uber Shakespeares Timon." Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, 2 (1867), 335-61.

Doran, Madeleine. Endeavors of Art: A Study in Form in Elizabethan Drama. Madison, 1954.

Dowden, Edward. Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art. New York and London, 1881.

Drake, Nathan. Shakespeare and His Times. 2 vols. London, 1817.

Draper, John W. "The Psychology of Shakespeare's Timon." MLR, 35 (1940), 521-25.

_____. "Patterns of Tempo in Shakespeare's Timon." Shakespeare Association Bulletin, 23 (1948), 188-94.

_____. "The Theme of Timon of Athens." MLR, 29 (1934), 20-31.

Draper, R.P. "Timon of Athens." Shakespeare Quarterly, 8 (1957), 195-200.

Edmunds, John. "Shadwell and the Anonymous Timon." Notes and Queries, n.s., 14 (1967), 218-21.

Elliott, Robert C. The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art. Princeton, 1960.

Ellis-Fermor, Una. The Jacobean Drama: An Interpretation. London, 1936; rpt. 1961.

_____. "Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play." Review of English Studies, 18 (1942), 270-83.

Elze, Karl. Notes on Elizabethan Dramatists with Conjectural Emendations of the Text. 3rd ser., Halle, 1886.

_____. William Shakespeare: A Literary Biography. Trans. L. Dora Schmitz, 1888. (Rpt. New York, AMS, 1973. 1st German ed. 1876).

Empson, William. "Timon's Dog." In The Structure of Complex Words. London, 1951 (?).

Ewbank, Inga-Stina. "'These pretty devices': A Study of Masques in Plays." In A Book of Masques in Honour of Allardyce Nicoll. Cambridge, 1967.

Farnham, Willard. Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1950.

Fleay, F.G. "On the Authorship of Timon of Athens." Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society, 1874.

Fly, Richard. "The Ending of Timon of Athens: A Reconsideration." Criticism, 15 (1973), 242-52.

Foakes, R.A. Shakespeare: The Dark Comedies to the Last Plays: From Satire to Celebration. Charlottesville, 1971.

Foard, James T. "Shakespeare's Classical Plays." Manchester Quarterly, 12 (1893), 333-71.

Frey, Charles. "Marriage and the Family in Shakespeare: Some Problems and Some Themes." Shakespeare Newsletter, 28 (1978), 19.

Frye, Northrop. A Natural Perspective. New York, 1965.

Frye, Roland Mushat. Shakespeare and Christian Doctrine. Princeton, 1963.

Fulton, Robert C., III. "Timon, Cupid, and the Amazons." Shakespeare Studies, 9 (1976), 283-99.

Fushimi, Toshinori. "A Note on Timon of Athens." Kyoyobu Kiyo (Tohoku Univ.), 30 (1979), 135-50. (In Jap.)

Gasquoine, T. "Shakespeare's Timon: A Study of Character." The Christine Reformer (May, 1887), pp. 296-307.

Gentili, Vanna. La recita della follia Funzioni dell'insania nel teatro dell'età di Shakespeare. Torino: Einaudi, 1978.

Gildon, Charles. "Remarks on the Plays of Shakespear." In The Works of Mr. William Shakespear. Ed. Nicholas Rowe, vol. 7, London, 1710, 372-76.

Goddard, Harold C. The Meaning of Shakespeare. Chicago, 1951; rpt. 2 vols. 1960.

Golding, S.R. "Timon of Athens." Notes and Queries, 150 (1926), 273-75.

Goldsmith, Robert Hillis. Wise Fools in Shakespeare. Michigan, 1955.

_____. "Did Shakespeare Use the Old Timon Comedy?" Shakespeare Quarterly, 9 (1958), 31-38.

Goldstein, Leonard. "Alcibiades' Revolt in Timon of Athens." Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, 15 (1967), 250-78.

Gomme, Andor. "Timon of Athens." Essays in Criticism, 9 (1959), 107-25.

Greg, W.W. The Shakespeare First Folio. Oxford, 1955.

Greg, W.W. The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare. Oxford, 1942.

Gura, Timothy J. "The Function of the Hero in Shakespeare's Last Tragedies." DIA, 35 3681A (Northwestern) (1974).

Hallam, Henry. Introduction to the Literature of Europe. 4 vols., London, 1837.

Handelman, Susan. "Timon of Athens: The Rage of Disillusion." American Imago, 36 (1979), 45-68.

Hankins, John E. "Misanthropy in Shakespeare." In The Character of Hamlet and Other Essays. North Carolina UP, 1941, pp. 115-30.

Harrison, G.B. Shakespeare's Tragedies. New York, 1952.

Harrison, Thomas P., Jr. "Aspects of Primitivism in Shakespeare and Spenser." Tulane Studies in English, 20 (1940), 39-71.

Haug, Ralph A. "The Authorship of Timon of Athens." Shakespeare Association Bulletin, 15 (1940), 227-48.

Harder, Helga Irene Kutz. "Right Self-love as the Fulcrum of Balance in Shakespeare's Plays." DAI, 38, 804A (Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill) (1977).

Hazlitt, William. The Complete Works of William Hazlitt Ed. P.P. Howe, 21 vols. London, 1930-34.

_____. Characters in Shakespeare's Plays. London, 1817.

Hewitt, Joseph William. "Some Aspects of the Treatment of Ingratitude in Greek and English Literature." TAPA, 48 (1917), 37-48.

Hiasa, Kazue. "Timon of Athens, III.i,ii,iii." Silphe (Neiji Gakuin Univ.), 16 (1976), 32-42.

Hinman, Charlton. "The Prentice Hand in the Tragedies of the Shakespeare First Folio: Compositor E." Studies in Bibliography, 9 (1957), 15-20.

Hobday, C.H. "Why the Sweets Melted: A Study in Shakespeare's Imagery." Shakespeare Quarterly, 16 (1965), 3-17.

Hogan, C.B. Shakespeare in the Theatre. 2 vols. Oxford, 1952-57.

Holloway, John. The Story of Night. Lincoln, 1961.

Honigmann, E.A.J. "Timon of Athens." Shakespeare Quarterly, 12 (1961), 3-20.

Hoy, Cyrus. "Jacobean Tragedy and the Mannerist Style." Shakespeare Survey, 26 (1973), 49-67.

Hulme, Hilda M. "Two Notes on the Interpretation of Shakespeare's Text." Notes and Queries, n.s., 6 (1959), 345-55.

Hunter, G.K. "The Last Tragic Heroes." In Later Shakespeare, Stratford-Upon-Avon Studies 8, London (1966), pp. 11-28.

Hyde, Elizabeth. "A Note on King Lear and Timon of Athens." Notes and Queries, n.s., 7 (1960), 19-20.

Ikawa, Fuku. "The Roles of the Poet and the Painter in Timon of Athens." Doshisha Studies in English. (Doshisha Univ., Japan), 11 (1975), 84-112. (In Jap.)

Jackson, James L. "Shakespeare's Dog-and-Sugar Imagery and the Friendship Tradition." Shakespeare Quarterly, 1 (1950), 260-63.

Jackson, MacDonald P. Studies in Attribution: Middleton and Shakespeare. (JDS 79), Salzburg; Institute für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, Univ Salzburg, 1979.

Janzen, Henry D. "Shakespeare's Timon of Athens, III.vi." Explicator, 36 (1978), 3-4.

Jewkes, Wilfred T. Act Division in Elizabethan and Jacobean Plays, 1583-1616. Hamden, Conn., 1958.

Jones-Davies, Maria-Térèse. "L'Or sur la scène élisabéthaine: Une aventure sociale." In Hommage à Emile Gasquet (1920-1977). (Annales de la Fac. des lett. et Sciences Humanines de Nice 34), Paris, 1978, pp. 31-42.

Jorgensen, Paul, A. Shakespeare's Military World. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1956.

Keller, Wolfgang. "Shakespeare als Überarbeiter Fremder Dramen." Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, 58 (1922), 68-82.

Kemp, Robert. "En Relisant Timon d'Athenes." Le Temps, 4-5 avril (1942), 3.

Kermode, Frank. "The Banquet of Sense." The Bulletin of the Frank Rylands Library, 44 (1961), 68-99.

Knight, G.W. The Wheel of Fire: Interpretations of Shakespearian Tragedy. London, 1930.

_____. "Timon of Athens." RES, 22 (1946), 325.

_____. "Timon of Athens and Its Dramatic Descendants." Review of English Literature. II, 4 (1961), 9-18.

_____. "Timon of Athens and Buddhism." Essays in Criticism, 30 (1980), 105-23.

Knights, L.C. "Timon of Athens." In The Morality of Art, ed. D.W. Jefferson, London, 1969, pp. 1-17.

Kocher, Paul H. "Timon of Athens, Act V, Scene 3." Shakespeare Association Bulletin, 14 (1939), 239-42.

Kullman, G. "Shakespeares Antheil an dem unter seinem Namen veröffentlichten Trauerspiele Timon." Archiv für Litteraturgeschichte, 2 (1882), 196-245.

Lake, David J. The Canon of Thomas Middleton's Plays: Internal Evidence for the Major Problem of Authorship. London, 1975.

Lancashire, Anne. "Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Doctor Faustus." Shakespeare Quarterly, 21 (1970), 35-44.

Law, Robert Adger. "On Certain Proper Names in Shakespeare." University of Texas Studies in English, 30 (1951), 61-65.

Lawrence, William Witherle. Shakespeare's Problem Comedies. New York, 1931, rpt. 1960.

Lee, Sidney. A Life of William Shakespeare. London, 1898; rpt. 1904.

Leech, Clifford. Shakespeare's Tragedies and Other Studies in Seventeenth Century Drama. London, 1950.

_____. "Ephesus, Troy, Athens:Shakespeare's Use of Locality." Stratford Papers on Shakespeare, no 47 (1964), pp. 151-69.

_____. "Shakespeare's Greeks." Stratford Papers on Shakespeare, no. 47 (1964), pp. 1-20.

Levin, Harry. "Shakespeare's Misanthrope." Shakespeare Survey, 26 (1973), 89-94.

Levison, William Samuel. "Restoration Adaptions of Shakespeare as Baroque Literature." DAI, 34, 730A (Urbana Champaign) (1973).

Levitsky, Ruth. "Timon: Shakespeare's Magnyfycence and an Embryonic Lear." Shakespeare Studies, 11 (1978), 107-21.

Lewis, Allen. "Shakespeare and the Morality of Money." Social Research, 36 (1969), 373-88.

Lisk, Maryann Ruth. "'Hate-Man Timon': A Study of Misanthropy in Shakespeare's Plays." DAI, 38, 4142A (McMaster) (1978).

Lord, Louis E. "Aristophanes' Influence on English Writers." In Aristophanes: His Plays and His Influence, Our Debt. London [?], 1925, pp. 155-73.

Lütkehaus, Ludger. "'Verdamml Metall, Gemeine Hure Du. . .': Shakespeares Timon von Athen und Marx' okonomisch Geldtheorie." Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift, 60 (1969), 282-95.

Maginn, William. "Timon of Athens." Shakespeare Papers, London, 1859, pp. 187-231.

Maher, Michael Kevin. "Shakespeare's Timon of Athens and Elizabethan Prodigal-Son Plays." DAI, 35, 5353A (Georgia) (1975).

Mantey, Karl Georg. Shakespeare's Letzter Tragischer Held: Eine Vertiefung in Timon von Athen mit einer deutschen Nachbildung der Tragödie in Blankversen. Berlin-Wannsee, 1963.

Mason, John Monck. Comments on the Last Edition of Shakespeare's Plays. Dublin, 1785.

Maxwell, J.C. "Timon of Athens." Scrutiny, 15 (1948), 195-208.

_____. "'Desperate Debts.'" Notes and Queries, n.s., 14 (1967), 141.

McManaway, James G. "Recent Studies in Shakespeare's Chronology." Shakespeare Survey, 3 (1950), 22-23.

Merchant, W.M. "Timon of Athens and the Conceit of Art." Shakespeare Quarterly, 6 (1955), 249-57.

_____. "The Harmony of Disenchantment." Stratford Papers on Shakespeare, no. 47 (1964), pp. 110-25.

Miola, Robert S. "Timon in Shakespeare's Athens." Shakespeare Quarterly, 31 (1980), 21-30.

Morsberger, Robert E. "Timon of Athens: Tragedy or Satire?" In Shakespeare in the Southwest: Some New Directions. Texas Western Press of the University of Texas, 1969, pp. 56-70.

Morton, Richard. "'Silver at the Bottom of the Melting Pot': Dryden's Troilus and Shadwell's Timon." Stratford Papers on Shakespeare, no. 47 (1964), pp. 126-50.

Muir, Kenneth. "Timon of Athens and the Cash Nexus." Modern Quarterly Miscellany, 1 (1946), 57-76.

_____. "In Defense of Timon's Poet." Essays in Criticism, 3 (1953), 120-21.

_____. "Shakespeare and the Tragic Pattern." Proceedings of the British Academy, 44 (1958), 145-62.

_____. Shakespeare as Collaborator. London, 1960.

Muller, A. "Über die Quellen aus denen Shakespeare den Timon von Athen entnommen hat." Unpubl. Diss. Jena, 1873.

Neiditz, Minerva. "Primary Process Mentation and the Structure of Timon of Athens." University of Hartford Studies in Literature: A Journal of Interdisciplinary Criticism, 11 (1979), 24-35.

Nichols, Marianna da Vinci. "Timon of Athens and the Rhetoric of No." Cahiers E., 9 (1976), 29-40.

Nicholson, B. Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society (1847).

Nosworthy, J.M. Shakespeare's Occasional Plays: Their Origin and Transmission. New York, 1965.

Nowottny, Winifred M.T. "Acts IV and V of Timon of Athens." Shakespeare Quarterly, 19 (1959), 493-97.

Patch, Howard Rollin. "The Tradition of the Goddess Fortuna in Roman Literature and in the Traditional Period." Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, 3, no. 3 (April, 1922), 3, no. 4 (June, 1922).

Pauls, Peter. "Shakespeare's Timon of Athens: An Examination of the Misanthrope Tradition and Shakespeare's Handling of the Sources." DA, 30, 1146A-1147A (Univ. of Wisconsin) (1969).

Pyle, Fitzroy. "Hostilius: Timon of Athens, III.ii.70." Notes and Queries, 197 (1952), 48-49.

Odell, G.C.D. Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving. 2 vols. New York, 1920.

Olson, David B. "Cumulative Parallel Episodes in Four Shakespearian Plays: Essays on Romeo and Juliet, Troilus and Cressida, Timon of Athens, and Coriolanus." DAI, 32, 1483A (Univ. of Washington) (1971).

Parker, M.D.H. The Slave of Life: A Study of Shakespeare and the Idea of Justice. London, 1955.

Parrott, Thomas Marc. The Problem of Timon of Athens. Shakespeare Association Papers, no. 10, London, 1923.

Pettet, E.C. "Timon of Athens: The Disruption of Feudal Morality." RES, 23 (1947), 321-36.

Phillips, James Emerson, Jr. The State in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman Plays. New York, 1940.

Preston, Thomas R. Not in Timon's Manner: Feeling, Misanthropy, and Satire in Eighteenth-Century England. (Studies in the Humanities, 9), Atlanta, 1975.

Raleigh, Walter. Shakespeare. New York, 1907.

Ramsey, Jarold W. "Timon's Imitation of Christ." Shakespeare Studies, II (1966), 162-73.

Reid, Stephen A. "'I am Misanthropos'--A Psychoanalytic Reading of Shakespeare's Timon of Athens." Psychological Review, 56 (1969), 442-52.

Ribner, Irving. Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy. New York, 1960.

Richardson, William. "On the Dramatic Character of Timon of Athens." In Essays on Shakespeare's Dramatic Characters, 2nd ed. London, 1785.

Righter, Anne. Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play. London, 1962.

Ritson, Joseph. Remarks Critical and Illustrative, on the Text and Notes of the Last Edition of Shakespeare. London, 1783.

Robertson, J.M. Shakespeare and Chapman. London, 1917.

Roeder, Ralph. "Timon of Athens." Theatre Arts Monthly. 10 (1926), 453-60.

Ruskiewicz, John Joseph. "Shakespeare's Moral Economics and Timon of Athens." DIA, 38, 2818A (Ohio State) (1977).

Saagpakk, Paul F. "A Survey of Psychopathology in British Literature From Shakespeare to Hardy." Literature and Psychology, 18 (1966), 135-65.

Sackton, Alexander H. "The Paradoxical Encomium in Elizabethan Literature."Tulane Studies in English, 28 (1949), 83-104.

Schanzer, Ernest. "Plot Echoes in Shakespeare's Plays." Shakespeare-Jahrbuch (Heidelberg), 1969, pp. 103-21.

Schlegel, A.W. Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature. trans. John Black. London, 1846.

Seehase, Georg. "Konflikt und Harmonie in Shakespeares Dramen." Shakespeare-Jahrbuch (Weimar), 3 (1975), 39-45.

Seward, T.C. and M.D. Faber. "A Note on Stephen Reid's Essay, "'I am misanthropos'--A Psycholanalytic Reading of Shakespeare's Timon of Athens." Psychological Review, 58 (1971), 617-23.

Siegel, Paul N. Shakespeare in His Time and Ours. Notra Dame, 1968.

_____. "Shakespeare and the Neo-Chivalric Cult of Honor." Centenial Review, 8 (1964), 39-70.

_____. Shakespearean Tragedy and the Elizabethan Compromise. New York, 1957.

Šimko, Ján. "King Lear and Timon of Athens." Philologica Pragensia, 8 (1965), 320-42.

Simmons, Michael. "Ruskin, Apemantus, and His Father." Notes and Queries, 26 (1979), 308-10.

Slater, Eliot. "Word Links Between Timon of Athens and King Lear." Notes and Queries, 25 (1978), 147-49.

Slights, William W.E. "Genera mixta and Timon of Athens." Studies in Philology, 74 (1977), 39-62.

Smith, G.C. Moore. "Notes on Some University Plays." MLR, 3 (1907-08), 141-56.

Smith, Irwin. Shakespeare's Blackfriars Playhouse: Its History and Its Design. New York, 1964.

Soellner, Rolf. Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy. Columbus, 1979.

Spencer, Hazelton. The Art and Life of William Shakespeare. New York, 1940.

_____. Shakespeare Improved. Cambridge, Mass., 1927.

Spencer, Terence. "Shakespeare Learns the Value of Money: The Dramatist at Work." Shakespeare Survey, 6 (1953), 75-78.

Spencer, Theodore. "The Elizabethan Malcontent." In J.Q. Adams Memorial Studies, ed. James F. McManaway, and Giles Dawson, Washington, D.C., 1948.

_____. "The Isolation of the Shakespearean Hero." Sewanee Review, 52 (1944), 313-31.

_____. Shakespeare and the Nature of Man. New York, 1942.

Spurgeon, Caroline, F.E. Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us. Cambridge, 1935.

Squire, John. Shakespeare as a Dramatist. London, 1935.

Stampfer, Judah. The Tragic Engagement: A Study of Shakespeare's Classical Tragedies. New York, 1968.

Stapfer, Paul. Shakespeare et l'Antiquite. 2 vols. Paris, 1879.

Stedman, John M. "Iconography and Methodology in Renaissance Dramatic Study: Some Caveats." Shakespearean Research Opportunities, 7-8 (1972-74/75), 39-52.

Stoll, Elmer Edgar. Shakespeare and Other Masters. Cambridge, Mass., 1940.

Swigg, R. "Timon of Athens and the Growth of Discrimination." MLR, 62 (1967), 387-94.

Swinburne, Charles Algernon. A Study of Shakespeare. New York, 1880.

Sykes, H. Dugdale. Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama: A Series of Studies Dealing with the Authorship of Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Plays. Oxford, 1924.

Tannenbaum, Samuel A. "Farewell to 'Vllorxa.'" Shakespeare Association Bulletin, 11 (1936), 41-45.

Taylor, George Coffin. "Shakespeare's Use of the Idea of the Beast in Man." Studies in Philology, 42 (1945), 530-43.

Terwin, J.C. Shakespeare on the English Stage, 1900-1964. London, 1964.

Thompson, Patricia. "The Literature of Patronage, 1580-1630." Essays in Criticism, 2 (1952), 267-84.

Tidewell, James N. "Shakespeare's 'Wappen'd Widow.'" Notes and Queries, 195 (1950), 139-40.

Tinker, Michael. "Theme in Timon of Athens." In Shakespeare's Last Plays: Essays in Honor of Charles Crow. Athens, Ohio, 1974, pp. 76-88.

Tolman, Albert H. "Is Shakespeare Aristocratic?" PMLA, 29 (1914), 277-98.

Traversi, D.A. An Approach to Shakespeare. New York, 1938.

Tschischwitz, B. "Timon: Ein Kritischer Versuch." Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, 4 (1869), 160-97.

Tutt, Ralph M. "Dog Imagery in Two Gentlemen of Verona, King Lear, and Timon of Athens." Serif (Kent State Univ. Library), Oct. 1964, pp. 15-22.

Ulrici, Hermann. Shakespeare's Dramatic Art. Trans. from the 3rd ed. of the German by L. Dora Schmitz. 2 vols. 1876 (1st German ed., 1839; 2nd ed., 2pts., 1847, 3rd ed., 3 pts., 1868-69).

Ungerer, Gustav. A Spaniard in Elizabethan England: The Correspondence of Antonio Pérez's Exile. 2 vols. London, 1975-76.

Ure, Peter. Shakespeare: The Problem Plays. London, 1961.

Van Doren, Mark. Shakespeare. New York, 1939.

Velz, John W. "The Ancient World in Shakespeare: Authenticity or Anacronism? A Retrospect." Shakespeare Survey, 31 (1978), 1-12.

Waggoner, G.R. "Timon of Athens and the Jacobean Duel." Shakespeare Quarterly, 16 (1965), 302-11.

Wain, John. The Living World of Shakespeare. New York, 1964.

Walker, Alice. Textual Problems of the First Folio: Richard III, King Lear, Troilus and Cressida, 2 Henry IV, Hamlet, Othello. Cambridge, 1953.

Walker, Lewis. "Timon of Athens and the Morality Tradition." Shakespeare Studies, 12 (1979), 159-77.

_____. "Fortune and Friendship in Timon of Athens." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 18 (1977), 577-600.

Walker, Roy. "'Unto Caesar': A Review of Recent Productions." Shakespeare Survey, 11 (1958), 128-35.

Wanklyn, C. "'My Foot.'" Notes and Queries, 176 (1939), 34.

Wecter, Dixon. "Shakespeare's Purpose in Timon of Athens." PMLA, 43 (1928), 701-21.

Wells, William. "Timon of Athens." Notes and Queries, 6 (1920), 266-69.

Wendlandt, Wilhelm. "Shakespeares Timon von Athen." Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, 23 (1888), 107-92.

Williams, Gary Jay. "Stage History, 1816-1978." In Rolf Soellner, Timon of Athens: Shakespeare's Pessimistic Tragedy. Columbus, 1979, pp. 161-85.

Williams, Philip, Jr. "New Approaches to Textual Problems in Shakespeare." Studies in Bibliography, 8 (1956), 8-14.

Williams, Stanley T. "Some Versions of Timon of Athens on the Stage." Modern Philology, 18 (1920), 101-17.

Wilson, F.P. Elizabethan and Jacobean. Oxford, 1946.

Wilson, F.P. "Shakespeare and the Diction of Common Life." Proceedings of the British Academy, 27 (1944), 167-97.

Wilson, Harold S. On the Design of Shakespearian Tragedy. Toronto, 1957.

Winter, William. Shakespeare on the Stage, 3 vols. New York, 1911-16.

Wright, Celeste Turner. "Some Conventions Regarding the Usurer in Elizabethan Literature." Studies in Philology, 31 (1934), 176-97.

_____. "The Amazons in Elizabethan Literature." Studies in Philology, 37 (1940), 449-94.

_____. "The Usurer's Sin in Elizabethan Literature." Studies in Philology, 35 (1938), 178-94.

Wright, Ernest Hunter. The Authorship of Timon of Athens. New York, 1910.

Yamazaki, Chiaki. "Timon of Athens: 'Appearance' and 'Reality.'" Fujimi (Fujimi Donjinkai), 1 (1979), 59-69. (In Jap.)

Young, C.B. "The Stage-History of Timon of Athens." In Timon of Athens. ed. J.C. Maxwell. Cambridge, 1957.

Zsámboki, Mária. "Athéni Timon vagy az önpusztitás erkölcse [Timon or the Ethics of Self Destruction]." Valóság, 15 (1974), 758-66.