SHAKESPEARE'S ANNUS MIRABILIS

SHAKESPEARE'S *ANNUS MIRABILIS*: SOME STRUCTURAL ASPECTS OF *CORIOLANUS*, *TIMON OF ATHENS* AND *PERICLES*

By

BARBARA JANE PANKHURST, B.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

September 1979

MASTER OF ARTS (1979) McMASTER UNIVERSITY
(English) Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Shakespeare's *Annus Mirabilis*: Some Structural Aspects of *Coriolanus*, *Timon of Athens* and *Pericles*

AUTHOR: Barbara Jane Pankhurst, B.A. (Cantab.)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. A.D. Hammond

NUMBER OF PAGES: vi, 108.

ABSTRACT

An investigation of seven aspects of the structure of Shakespeare's Coriolanus, Timon of Athens and Pericles, as a means to understanding the dramatic unity and coherence of the plays. The study is essentially the prolegomena to a more detailed discussion both of those three plays and of those which followed them, and whose structure developed out of theirs. Coriolanus, Timon of Athens and Pericles are seen as the products of an eighteen-month period circa 1607-8, possessed in each case of an effective, integral dramatic structure. The topics selected for consideration to prove that thesis are as follows:

1. The relationship between the hero and fortune, with particular attention to the patterning of events within the play. This central topic forms the bulk of the first half of the study.
2. The hero's language: rhetoric and a public mode of address.
3. The soliloquy of self-delusion.
4. The use of "sets" of characters, or actions seemingly distinct from the main action.
5. Narrator and observer figures.
6. Formal movement (a): pageants, masques, feasts and songs.

7. Formal movement (b): speeches which give moments of stasis within scenes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I acknowledge with gratitude and respect my indebtedness to the wisdom of my Supervisor, Dr. A.D. Hammond.

Nil desperandum Teucro duce, et auspice Teucro.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I

INTRODUCTION

Between the broad groups of Shakespeare's tragedies and romances lie three plays which are among the least popular of his works: Coriolanus, Timon of Athens and Pericles. With two of them at least, such was not always the case. Ben Jonson was disgruntled by the popularity of Pericles, that "mouldy tale";[1] and in the title role of Coriolanus Kemble made his reputation, and Kean extended his. In modern times Timon and Pericles, however, have been unduly neglected; a neglect which is owing in part to the controversies surrounding both the dating and the authorship[2] of the plays. The accepted date for the completion of Coriolanus and Pericles is the period 1607-8, but supporters of a rather earlier date (perhaps as early as 1605) for Timon of Athens can be found, who base their arguments largely upon some verbal echoes of King Lear which they find in Timon - or vice versa - and upon a similarity of theme.[3] However, the differences between the plays are such that to talk of Timon as a failed Lear, or an incomplete re-working of the same theme, is seriously to misrepresent it. Timon of Athens belongs to that group of plays which present a new view of man, and of which Antony and Cleopatra is the first.

A second reason for the neglect of Coriolanus, Timon and Pericles can be found in the changed nature of the relationship which they allow between the audience and the central figures. The hero alone no longer claims our principal loyalties and involvement while struggling in an impossible situation with two mutually exclusive, equally disastrous choices. Where, for the heroes of the tragedies, that situation was largely brought about by the actions of others in the flux of time,[4] the hero now seems to initiate the problems or changes himself, within a world previously stable. His lack of self-knowledge and concomitant extreme reactions to the discovery that he is not at the centre of his world after all, contribute to the audience's perception of him as unapproachable and distinctly less likeable than many have found Othello or Hamlet or Antony or Prospero to be. The result is that Coriolanus, Timon and Pericles do not elicit the same engaged response from the audience as the tragic heroes produce. Engagement is still present, but it is balanced by a sense of detachment.

Yet the detachment does not result wholly from the effects of disagreeable character traits, for each of these heroes is granted a noble stature. The generous impulses of a large soul; valour and fortitude; a splendidly reckless disregard for consequences; the admiration of his peers (whether grudging or not) for his achievements: all these are contributing factors to our recognition of his nobility. There are,

nevertheless, several more important reasons than this to explain ambivalent responses to the heroes, and these are to be found in the structure of the plays. Of these I shall enumerate seven, of which the most important is the stress laid upon time and the operations of fortune, or mutability, in the succession of events. The hero's errors about causal connection, and his mistaken emphasis upon time past rather than time future are complemented by the patterning of events throughout the play. In the case of Coriolanus and Timon this is of course intrinsically connected to their lack of self-knowledge, and the relationship between Timon's mistakes and the play's patterning makes the play a pivot of development. For that reason the central part of this study comprises a discussion of fortune and time, with particular emphasis upon Timon of Athens.

That analysis leads necessarily to the second and third factors, which have to do with language. The second is a particular use of rhetoric or a public mode of address by the eponymous hero. The third element, which accentuates the distancing effect of the former, is the paucity of soliloquies and scenes of sympathetic understanding between the hero and a confident. Those soliloquies which do occur are far from being the speeches of self-examination found in the tragedies.

Fourth is the use of separate "sets" of characters, and actions seemingly quite distinct from the main action around the central figure. Their inter-relationship may best be understood if it is contrasted with that between the misfortunes of Lear and Gloucester. In the latter case, the relationship

between the main plot and the sub-plot is understood instantly, as the event occurs, both "intellectually" and "emotionally". In the case of the former plays, the inter-relationship of matter and mood is understood in a more detached way, by assessing it after the event.

The fifth factor to be investigated is the recurring presence of an "observer" figure or figures, designed to comment upon words and deeds - but not simply in order that the audience may agree with the comments. Very complicated responses of engagement and detachment are elicited by these characters.

The sixth structural device is the use of songs, fanfares and pageant-like moments of formal movement, including processions, dances and feasts. Finally comes another sort of moment of formal movement, but one which is again connected with language: the moments of stasis which occur in certain scenes, stemming from long speeches by various characters, and around which the scenes seem to be built. Proportionately less space is devoted to a discussion of these two factors, although the second in particular should be investigated much more fully in an extension of the study into the romances.

These, then, are the topics to be considered; for it is the contention of this study that by understanding more fully the precise, coherent dramatic structure which lies behind Coriolanus, Timon of Athens and Pericles the nature of the last plays may be better understood.

II

THE HERO AND FORTUNE

This supernatural soliciting
Cannot be ill; cannot be good.
Macbeth I.iii.130-1

After King Lear, probably written for performance in 1605,[5] two important changes are apparent in Shakespeare's work. The first is that he ceased to create a part for a villain, opposed to his hero. Macbeth, the following year, locates the evil directly in the man with whom we, the audience, are to sympathise. In Antony and Cleopatra neither Rome nor Egypt is seen as exclusively 'right'. We can see, as does Antony, admirable qualities in the life of each; we can also understand to a formidable degree the separation which can take place between heart and head. Thus, evil can be found in the protagonist, as well as in his antagonist; and in his surroundings. We are no longer confronted by a figure of evil, pursuing power for its own ends, but by numerous close linkings of good and evil, as the very source of power. This change was foreshadowed as early as 1599, in Julius Caesar; and it is not a mere coincidence that that play also shows the initial movements towards the second of our two changes, namely, a new sort of resignation to the workings-out of events.

Julius Caesar is of course the first of the plays in

which Shakespeare used as a sourcebook Plutarch's Lives of the Noble Greeks and Romans, as it appeared in North's translation; and the movement back to Plutarch in Antony and Cleopatra, Coriolanus and Timon of Athens brings before us again those particular virtues of character which we are wont to call "Roman", and which were encompassed in the Latin concept of "virtus". A high sense of personal honour and integrity; bravery, fortitude, the power of endurance: all that is excellent in the physical and moral nature of man was included in that word. And in Plutarch, the first biographer of note, and certainly the first to understand the importance of that literary genre, Shakespeare found particularly subtle treatments of motives, of human weaknesses and the pressure put upon them by a train of events as well as by the temptations of others: in fact, of the relationship between a man's self and his times. The Chronicles, such as those of Hall, Holinshed, and Stow, present vastly oversimplified accounts of men and actions in comparison, and are far more guilty of partiality or politically-motivated writing. Shakespeare's response to the Chronicles and his dramatic insight go far beyond them, it hardly needs to be said: but there is very little about the histories which is positively un-Tudor, or even un-Elizabethan. In the "classical" plays, although toga-clad Romans may doff their hats, and rude mechanicals have grievances as well as articles of clothing in common with Elizabethan citizens, the society which surrounds them has important

differences from Shakespeare's own.

In the first place, there is no monarch, and the idea of kingship, when pursued by a Caesar, is not supported as something of divine origin. The fact that Cleopatra is a queen is not stressed overmuch in comparison to her femininity. As kingship is far from being a divine concept, absolute power does not appear as a divine gift either; and the struggle to obtain it, together with the moment of victory, do not confer divinely-favoured rights upon the possessor. The basis of power is seen to lie somewhere else; and although in Antony's case that somewhere might seem to be personal greatness, yet he is no more averse than Octavius to using the moment, and other people's weaknesses, to obtain what he wants. Act II scene ii of Antony and Cleopatra shows the verbal jousters at work, and Act II scene vii enforces the lesson with the general contempt for Lepidus, and the need of Pompey to preserve appearances:

Menas: These three world-sharers, these competitors,
Are in thy vessel. Let me cut the cable,
And when we are put off, fall to their throats:
All there is thine.

Pompey: Ah, this thou shouldst have done,
And not have spoke on't! In me 'tis villainy,
In thee, 't had been good service. Thou must know,
'Tis not my profit that does lead mine honour;
Mine honour, it. Repent that e'er thy tongue
Hath so betray'd thine act. Being done unknown,
I should have found it afterwards well done,
But must condemn it now. Desist, and drink.

Menas: [Aside] For this,
I'll never follow thy pall'd fortunes more.
Who seeks and will not take, when once 'tis offer'd,
Shall never find it more.

Ant. II. vii. 69-83

The splendidly amusing balance here between good and evil, honour and dissembling, word and deed, although dealing with fundamentally the same subject as the final scene of Richard II, shows a significant development from it. The sources of power and a man's right to command, far from being reserved for the final scene, are at the heart of the play. Caesar, like Henry, can adapt to the times, where Antony, in this respect something of a splendidly gilded dinosaur, cannot; and splendid though he be, he must fall. Yet Antony can command throughout the play a remarkable loyalty from his army and servants. Despite the gulf, both in Rome and in Egypt, between those who command and those who obey, his followers can share his view of the world and of himself - a self-portrait of some magnificence. With Coriolanus, we move to the hero out of his depth in his society and basing his concept of the natural leader upon premises which are faulty in every respect. The fine line between good and evil, and the source of power, become yet more complex issues in this play, where again the gods are mere names, and a man's ability to use the moment as it passes determines his fate.

In Coriolanus then there are no deities, whether classical or Christian, and no divine rights. The balance to be sought in this play is between the individual and the state, wherein is contained the only idea of "fate", which thus takes the form of a conflict between the proverbial immovable object and irresistible force; rather than (as in the tragedies)

between the individual and inscrutable fates, directed from "above" in some way, with "the State" existing only incidentally as the status quo. It is particularly interesting that in this play, where the gods play no part in the action, whether through oracles, elemental forces or direct intervention, they should be so often named. There are some thirty instances in which various characters mention them, invariably collectively, in wishes, oaths, curses, praises and exclamations. In fact, they are very much a part of what might be called the period setting. Far more significant uses of their names come, however, when their classical attributes are transferred to Coriolanus. The man seems to become a god for most of the citizens, in that his deeds of battle are remarkable, and he comes to hold the fate of Rome in his hand. But "superhuman", rather than "divine", would be the best adjective to describe him, for although his exploits tower above his fellows', and he refuses to be drawn into the peacetime world of petty rules and regulations and jockeying for position: yet the pairing of him with Tullus Aufidius, and the important uses of humour in the structure of the play, prevent our ever mistaking him for anything but mortal. Indeed, the phrases which Volumnia, Cominius, and Menenius especially, heap upon him have the effect of simultaneously increasing his noble and wrath-filled stature and confirming his human fallibility.

Coriolanus' merits both moral and physical are stressed in these comparisons. Aufidius, the ancient enemy, says to him:

> If Jupiter
> Should from yond cloud speak divine things
> And say ''Tis true', I'd not believe them more
> Than thee, all-noble Martius.
> Cor. IV. v. 104-7

and he addresses him as 'Thou Mars' (ibid. 119). Cominius reinforces that appellation when he answers Menenius' query,

> Pray, your news?
> If Martius should be join'd wi'th' Volscians --
> Cominius: If!
> He is their god. He leads them like a thing
> Made by some other deity than nature,
> That shapes man better; and they follow him
> Against us brats, with no less confidence
> Than boys pursuing summer butterflies,
> Or butchers killing flies. IV. vi. 89-96

Volumnia, come to beg for the salvation of Rome, tells her son:

> Thou hast affected the fine strains of honour,
> To imitate the graces of the gods,
> To tear with thunder the wide cheeks o'th'air,
> And yet to charge thy sulphur with a bolt
> That should but rive an oak. V. iii. 149-53

but she remembers that she gave him birth, and that he should have the human graces of pity, mercy, justice and forgiveness, even if in divine quantities:

> Why dost not speak?
> Think'st thou it honourable for a noble man
> Still to remember wrongs? ibid. 153-5

For the spurned Menenius, trying to regain his self-esteem and venting his sorrow and anger upon the now crest-fallen tribune Sicinius, Coriolanus, once out of his reach, must be of Jove-like proportions:

> This Martius is grown from man to dragon: he has wings: he's more than a creeping thing .... The tartness of his face sours ripe grapes. When he walks, he moves like an engine and the ground shrinks before his treading. He is able to pierce a corslet

> with his eye, talks like a knell, and his hum is a battery. He sits in his state as a thing made for Alexander. What he bids be done is finished with his bidding. He wants nothing of a god but eternity, and a heaven to throne in.... in such a case the gods will not be good unto us. When we banished him, we respected not them; and, he returning to break our necks, they respect not us.
> V. iv. 12-14, 17-25, 32-5

The tribunes, newly-appointed, had been quick to recognise the threat to their power which Coriolanus posed. Brutus accuses him as follows:

> You speak o'th'people
> As if you were a god to punish, not
> A man of their infirmity. III. i. 79-81

In private, however, the tribunes tacitly admit to one another that Coriolanus has a more than human stature:

> Such a pother,
> As if that whatsoever god who leads him
> Were slily crept into his human powers,
> And gave him graceful posture. II. i. 216-9

and this is generally acknowledged in Rome, on one hand by a mere messenger, to whom the natural term of comparison is:

> the nobles bended
> As to Jove's statue, and the commons made
> A shower and thunder with their caps and shouts:
> I never saw the like. ibid. 263-5

and on the other hand by Cominius, in his tribute to Coriolanus' deeds for Rome, in Act II scene ii.

It is clear that for the citizens of Rome, Coriolanus, if not actually Jove or Mars, certainly embodies their will, and is an instrument of fortune -- indeed, he is their fortune, both good and bad. But as for Coriolanus himself, the contempt which he feels for the commons and their tribunes does not mean

that he thinks of himself as god-like, or even superhuman, or as an instrument of fate. Coriolanus sees fate as something that happens to him as much as to others, and although, like Achilles, he feels that he has cause for a noble and righteous wrath, in no way does he see himself as the chosen one of the gods. In Act I scene ix there is an important instance of this attitude, foreshadowing his response to his mother's appeal in the final Act.

Having single-handedly taken Corioles, and received the surname Coriolanus, Caius Martius finds that he does after all have a boon to beg of Cominius: he wants to spare a Volsce who had previously given him shelter, and is now a prisoner, and he phrases his request thus:

> The gods begin to mock me: I that now
> Refus'd most princely gifts, am bound to beg
> Of my lord general. I. ix. 77-9

On being asked the man's name, he replies: "By Jupiter, forgot!" Later, when in the position of one who can grant requests, and being importuned by his mother in speeches of great power, Coriolanus is for once held in silence by the moment. Then he responds:

> O mother, mother!
> What have you done? Behold, the heavens do ope,
> The gods look down,and this unnatural scene
> They laugh at. O my mother, mother! O!
> You have won a happy victory to Rome;
> But for your son, believe it, O, believe it,
> Most dangerously you have with him prevail'd,
> If not most mortal to him. V. iii. 183-90

Coriolanus alone sees his life as subject to the whims of the gods, just as those of others are. But this speech shows a

second important characteristic of Coriolanus' self-view, which is intimately connected to the first.

It is a commonplace that in Julius Caesar a rhetorical mode of speech, both to others and about oneself, is frequently used, particularly by Caesar, Brutus and Cassius, and also by Mark Antony:[6] these four being the men engaged in the power struggle of the play, and each having a particular vision of his own future, of the nature of power, and of his own relationship to it. It is extremely significant that at this crucial moment, when his honour is being pulled in two directions at once, Coriolanus should also employ the third person when speaking of himself. It must be noted that Coriolanus is far from generalising about his position, as is so often the case in the history plays, when monarchs think of their public and their private selves, but is at his most tender and personal: and yet he chooses to express himself in an impersonal form. The fact that he thinks in this way of himself at such moments is indicative of his general failure to think about himself at all.

This is not to say that Coriolanus has no sense of himself. On the contrary, his personal honour and duty are important to him, as is shown in his replies to his mother and Menenius, who endeavour to induce him to apologise for his contempt of the people:

> Why did you wish me milder? Would you have me
> False to my nature? Rather say I play
> The man I am.
> .....

> For them? I cannot do it to the gods,
> Must I then do't to them?
> Volumnia: You are too absolute,
> Though therein you can never be too noble,
> But when extremities speak. I have heard you say,
> Honour and policy, like unsever'd friends,
> I'th'war do grow together: grant that, and tell me,
> In peace what each of them by th'other lose
> That they combine not there.
> .....
> Coriolanus: Must I go show them my unbarb'd sconce?
> Must I
> With my base tongue give to my noble heart
> A lie that it must bear? Well, I will do't:
> Yet were there but this single plot to lose,
> This mould of Martius, they to dust should grind it
> And throw't against the wind. To th'market-place!
> You have put me now to such a part which never
> I shall discharge to th'life.
> Menenius: Come, come, we'll prompt you.
> .....
> Coriolanus: I will not do't,
> Lest I surcease to honour mine own truth,
> And by my bodies action teach my mind
> A most inherent baseness.
> III. ii. 14-16, 38-45, 99-106, 120-123.

Of course, ultimately he gives in:

> Pray be content.
> Mother, I am going to the market-place:
> Chide me no more. ibid. 130-2

and again, the form of address which he uses is significant. Again the word "mother", as much as the suddenness of the reversal of his decision, shows how powerful is his sense of filial duty. He perceives his sense of personal honour in relation to that, and to his military profession: but not in relation to himself as an amalgam of those two, and as something else, which is private, besides. Coriolanus, despite all these apparent ideas of himself, which must be weighed, has in fact no real idea of in what that self really consists. His lack of self-knowledge and self-examination is striking,

and because of it he, more than any other character, sees the operations of the gods in his life, rather than understanding a causal connection between his actions or words, and those events which follow (in our view) as a consequence.

Caught between his sense of honour and his failure to understand himself (and others), Coriolanus displays a noble Stoicism -- when he is not made too angry to think at all, by the taunts of others. It is a curious sort of resignation to events; and of course resignation,by its very nature, tends to prevent self-questioning. The audience, too, is caught between his honour and that resignation. We have a sense of his noble stature, dependent upon the things said about him, his deeds and his own absolutism, as described above; and because others see him as the instrument of fortune, where he sees himself as fortune's plaything, we are confronted by a dichotomy which leads us to view events as a part of a larger pattern of inevitability. What we face may be characterised as a detachment of the hero from his surroundings, owing to other characters' views of him, and an engagement between him and those surroundings, owing to his own beliefs.

With a conspicuous lack of self-knowledge, however, and the conflict of his own beliefs about his fortune with those of his society, Coriolanus cannot learn through suffering. In this we see the huge difference between this play and King Lear (and also Macbeth, although there the hero's view of things is different again). There are, in the audience's

perception of the play, no gods in Coriolanus making plagues of pleasant vices; consequent upon that, each human being is not equally insignificant in the face of eternity, but needs to assess himself or herself and to understand his or her value to the State, which is not automatically decided; and thirdly, the separation which takes place between heart and head in the hero's behaviour still allows us to sympathise with his inclination towards each of his mutually exclusive choices.

This change, I have said, comes first with Antony and Cleopatra, although in certain respects it is foreshadowed by Julius Caesar. The separation between heart and head, which I have used to characterise the hero's divided public and private loyalties, is first seen in Brutus, who can convince himself that he can murder a man on the possibility of his behaving in a certain way in the future, and that by doing so he will be removing a threat and allowing the desirable status quo to continue, rather than affecting the whole balance of things around him and stirring up other, powerful emotions. This separation of his function and duty from his personal feelings in the matter is in part mirrored by Caesar's vision of his public and private selves: his roles as head of state and as affectionate husband and friend. But Caesar's is a less thoughtful separation. Brutus, although more an idealist than a realist, remains a thoughtful man, aware of other, less praiseworthy motives, but hoping to lead other men to leave

them behind by setting what is, in his view, the best and noblest before them. His awareness and thoughtfulness mean that, as Reuben Brower puts it:

> Brutus is from the start too well educated to know the full agony of a 'mind diseased' or to learn through intense suffering.... But Shakespeare has seen what Plutarch barely recognised, that a person of such gentleness and such abstract purity of intention could not act the part of conspirator and political murderer without pain. 7

Brutus, in other words, will never live in a world of total chaos because his resilient and intelligent mind will always be able to come to terms with events, even if he makes mistakes in so doing. This is illustrated in the incident of the duplicated report of Portia's death,[8] which I do not believe to be a scribal/compositorial/reporter's error, any more than I think it was an oversight on Shakespeare's part. To receive the second report calmly and yet as if it were new information shows how seriously Brutus takes his responsibility to continue to separate his personal feelings from his political position, now that he has made the mistake of doing so for the first time. Professor Brower's choice of metaphor, "act the part", perhaps the most frequently used of all both in the Elizabethan theatre and in modern discussions of it, is highly apposite here.

When we talk of role-playing in conjunction with King Lear, then the role which he assumes at first (of kindly father, much beloved) is for a single, planned, public occasion. His role of "slave,/A poor, infirm, weak, and despis'd old man", is founded in anger and self-pity without self-knowledge. Both

Edmund and Edgar deliberately choose to seem the thing they are not. The role-playing in Julius Caesar, while it involves a certain amount of dissembling at Caesar's assassination, both by the conspirators and by Mark Antony, is due rather to the separation between public and private personae which the principal characters make, in the face of the struggle for power. In Coriolanus, I have argued, Caius Martius' divided honour and loyalties stem from this same conflict, and the same is true of the hero and heroine in Antony and Cleopatra, where two worlds are to be balanced. The roles which are assumed in that play, as in Coriolanus, Timon of Athens and Pericles, may be taken knowingly or in ignorance, but they are taken because in each case the society around the hero forces them upon him.

Both Antony and Coriolanus think of themselves as natural leaders. Their bravery and strength of character qualify them for this role, but it is worth pausing for a moment upon Plutarch's definition of such a man to see what else might be needed. Plutarch is talking of Lycurgus:

> But as for Lycurgus, they thought of him thus: that he was a man borne to rule, to commaund, and to geve order, as having in him a certain naturall grace and power to drawe men willingly to obeye him. 9

It is clear that Coriolanus does not possess all these characteristics. He was "borne to rule" only in the sense that he has Volumnia for a mother, who has educated him to believe that of himself; and his abilities to "commaund and to geve order"

depend upon that self-confidence and upon his extreme bravery. Probably no one could have less "naturall grace and power to drawe men willingly to obeye him." Coriolanus' technique is mainly to insult and bully his soldiers into following him, and those who praise him as a person, rather than rejoicing in the victory which he brings, are not those subordinate to him.

Antony, on the other hand, has "naturall grace"; his nobility encompasses magnanimity and a considerable ability as an orator, characteristics which speak for him just as loudly as do his deeds. The problem with Antony is that he was born too late.[10] The Roman world with which he has to deal is no longer willing to regard him, while alive, as a superior being, even if it ever was -- about which there is some room for doubt. But Antony, like Coriolanus and like Timon, is contentedly convinced that some things are his right, not because he feels that the gods have bestowed them upon him, but rather because the behaviour of others has led him to believe that they think that to be the case. Antony, Coriolanus and Timon are all trapped by the expectations which others have of them, without the assurance of a divine approval which the monarch-heroes of the histories and tragedies believe themselves to have. But whereas Antony has considerable political acumen, even though he does not always avail himself of it, Coriolanus and Timon, for all their friends and supporters, real and supposed, are essentially alone because they cannot

find the balance between the individual and his society. Neither of these heroes has a strong enough sense of himself apart from his society to enable him to counteract, or even come to terms with, the pressures which are put upon him; and that is equally true of Pericles.

Timon's acquaintance are generally agreed that he is a man on whom fortune smiles, a fact which has enhanced his position in society almost to that of a hero. Only a hint is given of his heroic military prowess, although it comes from Alcibiades, the best qualified to assess valour:

> I have heard and griev'd
> How cursed Athens, mindless of thy worth,
> Forgetting thy great deeds, when neighbour states,
> But for thy sword and fortune, trod upon them --
> Tim. IV. iii. 93-6

But even here, Timon's deeds of prowess are inseparably linked with his wealth: his principal deeds are the giving of gifts. As long as he remains a man of deeds, before circumstances force him, like Coriolanus, to use only words, he is the cause of power struggles. These are not the struggles of political factions, but they are motivated by the same self-interest, and the man at the centre of them is similarly unable to understand fully what is going on until a crisis has shown him how easily he can be dispensed with.

In talking of Timon's "fortune" it is for a long time impossible to separate the two meanings of the word: first, his monetary wealth and second, the circumstances which have

brought it to him. As long as his money lasts, Timon tends to think that he himself is the source and provider of it; and his "reasoning" is clear. A lack of self-knowledge, an inability to discern motives and therefore the flattery of his supposed friends, have convinced him that he holds the place at the centre of his world. In that world money is god, beloved and doer of deeds. As the aim of Timon's acquaintance is almost without exception the acquisition of goods -- a word whose double meaning is highly apposite, for material possessions are, to them, the highest good -- Timon, as the provider of them, governs their power. And Timon, let it be said, likes power. He can do things for individuals which they thought previously were impossible, such as free Ventidius from prison, and enable a servant to marry the girl of his choice. He is therefore seen, and sees himself, as one able to change the course of events, and he rejoices in the fact:

> Methinks I could deal kingdoms to my friends,
> And ne'er be weary. I. ii. 219-20[11]

There is, as J.C. Maxwell has noted,[12] a certain presumption in Timon's arrogating this god-like role to himself. The steward, Flavius, comments:

> Poor honest lord, brought low by his own heart,
> Undone by goodness; strange, unusual blood,
> When man's worst sin is he does too much good!
> Who then dares to be half so kind again?
> For bounty, that makes gods, do still mar men.
> IV. ii. 37-41

However, Flavius' real concern is at the ingratitude of the "slaves and peasants" and at Timon's exploited generosity,

rather than at any fault or lack of wisdom in that generosity itself:

> Who is not Timon's?
> What heart, head, sword, force, means, but is
> Lord Timon's,
> Great Timon, noble, worthy, royal Timon?
> Ah, when the means are gone that buy this praise,
> The breath is gone whereof this praise is made.
> Feast-won, fast-lost; one cloud of winter show'rs,
> These flies are couch'd.

Timon, still unconvinced, replies:

> If I would broach the vessels of my love,
> And try the arguments of hearts by borrowing,
> Men and men's fortunes could I frankly use
> As I can bid thee speak.
> Steward: Assurance bless your thoughts.
> Timon: And in some sort these wants of mine are
> crown'd,
> That I account them blessings; for by these
> Shall I try friends. You shall perceive how you
> Mistake my fortunes; I am wealthy in my friends.
> II. ii. 169-76, 181-8

Timon's imperceptiveness is doubly illustrated here. He both fails to understand the sad bitterness with which the Steward repeats the lavish terms of praise that have been showered upon him, and he fails to understand the intimate connection between money, position and regard, which his use of the word "fortunes" (lines 183 and 188) to mean both "wealth" and "future state" should have shown him. Even more blatant is his failure to realise the connection between being poor and having few friends (whose obvious converse is having many friends because one is rich) when he sends a servant to ask Ventidius for a loan:

> When he was poor,
> Imprison'd, and in scarcity of friends,
> I clear'd him with five talents.
> II. ii. 228-30

The very first use of the word "fortune" in the play shows how well all those around Timon understand that connection. The Poet, who has just been obliged to admire the Painter's latest production, is eager to return the compliment by describing his new work to an unwilling listener; and the subject matter is similarly Timon:

> his large fortune,
> Upon his good and gracious nature hanging,
> Subdues and properties to his love and tendance
> All sorts of hearts; yea, from the glass-fac'd flatterer
> To Apemantus, that few things loves better
> Than to abhor himself - even he drops down
> The knee before him, and returns in peace
> Most rich in Timon's nod.
> I. i. 56-63

As the Poet and the Painter are themselves glass-fac'd flatterers, their commendations of Timon as good and gracious, like the Merchant's praise, "A most incomparable man, breath'd, as it were,/To an untirable and continuate goodness", are perhaps of questionable moral worth. However, it is clear that for these hangers-on, like the various lords and senators, Timon's only fault is that which also benefits them: a lavish use of his money; and that is a fault not because it may harm him, nor because it requires them to be subservient (as J.C. Maxwell has suggested)[13] but because it will, in time, exhaust his supply of gifts to them, through his bounty to others. Throughout the play the vocabulary used by the Athenians is imbued with this self-seeking concern, often in an unconsciously ironic manner. The Poet, as befits his profession, is the most conscious in his coupling of fortune and love (as in

lines 56-8 above), and deliberately puns on the "rich" rewards which Timon actually bestows, as opposed to the moral enrichment of their lives which the flatterers claim to receive (line 63). His use of the verb "properties" is arguably not so conscious, however, and is resoundingly echoed by the promises of the beleaguered senators, who know no other way of getting love and help than by buying it:

> a recompense more fruitful
> Than their offence can weigh down by the dram --
> Ay, even such heaps and sums of love and wealth
> As shall to thee blot out what wrongs were theirs,
> And write in thee the figures of their love,
> Ever to read them thine. V. i. 149-54

Led by their greed and encouraged by Timon's imperceptiveness, his suitors are more than willing to humble themselves without thinking of their subordinate position as an oppressive demand of Timon's. Nor are they resentful of his position, for although they may indeed envy his present wealth (as it still appears to exist in the first Act), yet they are scornful of his foolishness in lavishing rather than hoarding it - except in so far as traders like the Jeweller and Merchant profit twice over from his gifts. It is therefore less a matter of the flatterers' being oppressed by generosity, than of Timon's being so, and the dual meaning of the word "free" (both "generous" and "unrestrained"), which Maxwell rightly points out, should be seen in conjunction with Timon's new, constraining poverty rather than with his effects on his supposed friends, while wealthy, as Maxwell argues.

For Timon is no more guilty than his suitors of a

failure to "grasp the notion of the necessary reciprocity of creation."[14] The difference is that (at first) Timon wishes only to give, whereas the flatterers want only to take. After he has first-hand experience of the latter, Timon sees the operations of nature as directed by the same greed and thievery.[15] Before that, however, although he may not wish to be beholden to anyone, yet he recognises that it is a part of friendship to give and take:

> O no doubt my good friends, but the gods themselves have provided that I shall have much help from you: how had you been my friends else?
> I. ii. 86-8

The difficulty is, of course, that Timon's use of tenses brings his reasoning tumbling down. His 'friends' have qualified for that name in the past by virtue of actions which they have not yet undertaken, and which belong to an indefinite future; and while an idealist might find the sentiment praiseworthy, a realist will only have his suspicions confirmed, to find that the speech continues:

> Why have you that charitable title from thousands, did not you chiefly belong to my heart? I have told more of you to myself than you can with modesty speak in your own behalf; and thus far I confirm you. O you gods, think I, what need we have any friends, if we should ne'er have need of 'em? They were the most needless creatures living should we ne'er have use for 'em, and would most resemble sweet instruments hung up in cases, that keeps their sounds to themselves. Why, I have often wish'd myself poorer that I might come nearer to you. We are born to do benefits; and what better or properer can we call our own than the riches of our friends? O what a precious comfort 'tis to have so many like brothers commanding one another's fortunes. O joy's e'en made away ere't can be born! Mine eyes cannot hold out water, methinks. To forget their faults, I drink to you. ibid. 88-95

A great deal is revealed in this speech about the relationship between the hero and fortune, and I shall comment on it in some detail.

The opening sentence shows a strange attitude to the gods. It is as if Timon is only sure that some need will arise for him to receive his friends' favours because otherwise he will not have the pleasure of proving their worth: as if fate will arrange these things for his convenience. For undoubtedly Timon has an idea that his friends must be very superior people -- necessarily, for they have been hand-picked and hand-praised. It was noted earlier that Timon likes power, and this speech is an excellent example of a companion craving for attention. As a wealthy patron he has gatherings of suitors for banquets, entertainments and simply as a matter-of-course during the day; but here Timon makes a public declaration whose subject matter -- his trust in his friends and his consciousness of their worth -- might be thought more appropriate to a series of private interviews. Such mass praise, of a similar lavishness to his gifts, is also similar to them in its unreflecting extravagance, both of which make intimate friendship an impossibility for Timon. The speech becomes more and more of a public gesture at least in part as a response to Apemantus' dour grace, which has preceded it, and whose simple style, as much as its stark sentiments, makes Timon's protestations seem all the more extravagant.[16] The colloquial expostulation with which he calls upon the deities (in the sentence beginning "O you gods") has little to do with his earlier idea that they

direct the fates. Nor is it the product of what Timon thinks to be his relationship with his friends: instead it is coloured by his actual relationship with them. The play on words in his half-jest, "What need we have any friends, if we should ne'er have need of 'em? They were the most needless creatures living..." is less clever than thoughtless. It is the line of a man who has never known a real need -- or at least, has never known that he had one. Again, unconscious irony is apparent in the simile of "sweet instruments", whose principal characteristic is that they can be readily tuned to the desired pitch. Timon's friends, like Coriolanus' plebians, are little more than voices.

Most is revealed about Timon's lack of understanding in his wish to "come nearer" to his suitors, wherein unwittingly he makes apparent the gulf that he sees between them. Still less consciously does he admit that it is his wealth that keeps them apart. Yet immediately he goes on to say that they are all equals, "brothers commanding one another's fortunes". Once again the word "fortunes" appears in a context where both its meanings immediately come to mind; but for Timon, the meaning "fate" or "circumstances" is only present in that his money is able to change other people's situations. To add to the picture of an unreflecting man now comes the characteristic of his having strong emotions; the two complement one another nicely in his overpowering generosity (undoubtedly spontaneous, to him, yet expected by his friends). Later, in his abhorrence

for mankind and for creation in general, he will give cause for Apemantus to say, "The middle of humanity thou never knewest, but the extremity of both ends." (IV. iii. 301-2).

Yet Apemantus' summing-up, in context, refers superficially to having too much and too little respect for worldly things, through too much and then too little trust in human nature. Apemantus, like the Steward,has always warned Timon against flatterers and extravagance, but neither of them has ever criticised Timon's understanding of the two aspects of his "fortune". Furthermore, Apemantus' main criticism of Timon's later behaviour comes from an opinion that he should not spend his time railing against his former friends, but rather should exploit them as he was exploited. In Timon's Athens the prevailing philosophy is one of personal gain, meaning that each man endeavours to organise the world around his desires, and importunes the gods to that end. Any rewards which he obtains are just, on the one hand because of his cleverness in out-witting or out-manoeuvering a rival, and on the other because he believes, in his solipsistic universe, that good fortune -- which means economic good fortune -- is his right: for, as there are no moral imperatives other than self-interest, there can never be any moral debts (only financial ones, owing to him at considerable interest). Shakespeare makes pointed use of the two areas of meaning of such words as these, as can be seen from this example:

> Steward [Aside] What will this come to?
> He commands us to provide, and give great gifts,
> And all out of an empty coffer;
> Nor will he know his purse, or yield me this,
> To show him what a beggar his heart is,
> Being of no power to make his wishes good.
> His promises fly so beyond his state
> That what speaks is all in debt; he owes for ev'ry word:
> He is so kind that he now pays interest for't.
> I. ii. 189-197

The Steward's question is one of reckoning up addition sums as well as one concerned with consequences. The synonymity of money and power is stressed again, and the double meaning of "good" -- that Timon's beneficent wishes should come to pass, as well as be financially viable -- is of particular importance in conjunction with the terms "wishes", "promises" and "word", all of which remind us that Timon intends to suit the action to the word, in contrast to his glass-fac'd flatterers.

Characters' intentions, together with the ubiquitous irony, are extremely important means whereby the audience may experience the mood informing the matter of this play. The structural means through which we come to terms with the matter will be dealt with in the following chapter. Here it is proposed to discuss intention and irony as they contribute to the feeling of inevitability which underlies the fate of Timon of Athens.

The simplest irony is to be found in the title. Although Athens was not, in Shakespeare's day, endowed with an almost symbolic role as a centre of learning and of civilization --

that would have to wait for the Neo-classicists -- yet its achievements had been affirmed by the Renaissance, and it was undoubtedly a city whose inhabitants were thought of in a favourable light. However, the play does not invite commendations of a single one of its citizens, whose values have been sufficiently commented upon above. Only the servants, particularly Timon's servants and steward, and the three strangers display a less-egocentric philosophy (see pp. 39-42 below). The Steward's speech, quoted in part above, is the first of the few examples of fellow-feeling which the play offers, and its unusual sentiment is made the more striking by the simplicity of rhythm and expression of the final line, following what sounds at first like the conventional rhyming couplet which ends a set-piece:

> Happier is he that has no friend to feed
> Than such that do e'en enemies exceed.
> I bleed inwardly for my lord. I. ii. 200-2

The Steward, as has been noted, makes conscious use of irony as he tries to convince Timon of his suitors' nature. Once Timon has turned his back on the city, Flavius' tone loses that edge, which is more than replaced by Timon's own remonstrances. Finally convinced of his Steward's integrity, Timon turns ironically to address the gods:

> Forgive my general and exceptless rashness,
> You perpetual-sober gods! I do proclaim
> One honest man. Mistake me not, but one.
> No more, I pray -- and he's a steward.
> How fain would I have hated all mankind,
> And thou redeem'st thyself. But all, save thee,
> I fell with curses. IV. iii. 499-505

Timon sufficiently perceives the irony of the "one honest man" being one whose livelihood is guarding his master's money. It is an especially important moment for that realisation to come. It might be expected that at this point Timon, an outcast from his society like Lear and Gloucester and Edgar from theirs, would, like them, rail against fate, or see the human race "as flies to wanton boys" in its relationship to the gods. Timon, however, does not see his situation as one offering divine sport. Like Coriolanus, having been rejected by his society he rejects it in his turn, by asserting his superiority to it. That superiority is manifest, he believes, in his ability to bring vengeance down upon it, not because he is a helpless tool of amused, uncaring deities, but rather because in making his rejection he has confirmed his greater, independent stature, and is able to be the means whereby the tools which the gods have provided -- gold, human greed and duplicity, pride and fear -- may be used. Timon's prayers and curses show the uneasy hovering between this attitude and a more hubristic one which his strong emotions cause. Thus, his use of "redeem'st" and "fell with curses" (lines 504-5) show him almost arrogating divine attributes to himself, and at the very least, a belief that he is now a chosen instrument of the gods.

That belief is not one upon which Timon acts continuously. Again like Coriolanus, his belief in the justness of the revenge which will come through him is mostly actuated by

the consciousness of the shameful treatment which he has received from other humans, and he sees himself in relation to them far more than to the gods. His first exclamations and curses after hearing of his abandonment by his friends seem conventional enough:

> Steward: After distasteful looks, and these hard fractions,
> With certain half-caps, and cold-moving nods,
> They force me into silence.
> Timon You gods reward them!
> II. ii. 215-7
> Tear me, take me, and the gods fall upon you!
> III. iv. 98
> The gods confound -- hear me, you good gods all --
> Th'Athenians both within and out that wall.
> IV. i. 37-8

When he finds the buried gold, he cries out:

> Gold? Yellow, glittering, precious gold?
> No gods, I am no idle votarist.
> Roots, you clear heavens! .....
> .....
> Ha, you gods! Why this? What this, you gods?
> IV. iii. 26-7, 31

It is worth noting the direct manner of these addresses. While his curses may imply the subjunctive, yet we hear them as imperatives to the gods; and his exclamations over the gold show a colloquial style, at first demanding to be taken seriously, and then reasoning that that has in fact happened, and that he is to fashion his own revenge. The same colloquial style may be heard in his grace (Act III scene vi), which sounds ominious to his expectant guests; and the same certainty of the gods' interest, in the following speeches to Phrynia and Timandra, to Flavius, and to the senators of Athens:

> You are not oathable,
> Although I know you'll swear, terribly swear
> Into strong shudders and to heavenly agues
> Th'immortal gods that hear you.
> IV. iii. 137-40

> Thou singly honest man,
> Here, take: the gods out of my misery
> Has sent thee treasure. Go, live rich and happy
> But thus condition'd: thou shalt build from men;
> Hate all, curse all, show charity to none,
> But let the famish'd flesh slide from the bone
> Ere thou relieve the beggar: give to dogs
> What thou deniest to men....
> IV. iii. 527-34

> So I leave you
> To the protection of the prosperous gods,
> As thieves to keepers.
> V. i. 181-3

Timon's conditions to his steward, like the words with which he gives gold to Alcibiades,[17] show him now convinced that he is the means of revenge; perhaps also convinced that it is with the gods' blessing, but more likely having ceased to consider that idea any longer, in his consuming hatred. Thus, while Timon never consciously denies the gods and their power, it is clear that his earlier belief, that fate will arrange things for his convenience, is one that does not leave him. He does not blame the gods for human failings, but rejoices that heaven allows him to exploit them for his own ends: that justice lies in his hands, and the gods will continue to confine to earth the guilty human race, while he rightly escapes to a grave on the sea-shore, and ends any remaining links with humanity.

In the central scene of Timon's exile, Act IV scene iii, in which so many of these curses and prayers occur, there is,

however, one passage whose content is strikingly different: the conversation with Apemantus. It is remarkable that amongst all the truth-telling and invective, the gods are named only once, and that at the beginning of Timon's catalogue of animal attributes (line 328), when their presence makes the required third in the order of sentient life. The dialogue is essentially a debate, where a certain amount of sophistry accompanies reasoned argument. Both sophistry and invective have entered the play before, but in each case the characters using them have seemed simple rather than complex, their place in the structure abundantly clear, and the irony of their reception by Timon even more transparent. The sophists are of course the one-time friends, finding reasons to deny Timon's requests; all the invective comes from Apemantus, until Timon's disillusionment.[18] However, when Apemantus enters in the fourth Act, after being absent since Act II scene ii, he no longer seems one who is "opposite to humanity" simply because he speaks the truth while the other Athenians lie to themselves and each other. Flavius' honesty and Alcibiades' plea to the Senate for mercy for a friend have made integrity and justice into more complex issues, and Apemantus' version of the truth, which was clear-sighted at the banquet and muddied with invective against the usurers' men in Act II, is now inadequate.

In part this is owing to the development of Apemantus' character, which begins essentially with the introduction of the Fool, who holds by ancient tradition the prerogative of

speaking the truth and mocking men's manners which has so far belonged to Apemantus. Explanations of Apemantus as a lone truthteller, as he saw himself at the banquet,[19] become too simple, and we are forced to consider Timon's accusations, that the cynic behaves in that way only because he is "a slave, whom Fortune's tender arm/With favour never clasp'd, but bred a dog." (IV. iii. 252-3) In seeing Apemantus as less "moral" than he appears at first, it is to be remembered that the meaning of his name is "suffering no pain". In that characteristic, Timon thinks, can be found the essential difference between them: Apemantus preaches from a stony heart that has never known favour or suffering. If allowance is made for a degree of self-pity in Timon's claim, and for his wilful blindness to the truth which Apemantus tried several times to make him see at the banquet, then there is still a certain truth to his accusation; and it begins to be seen that a quantity of posturing is behind Apemantus' cynicism, which is his means of playing an independent role. Thus we may understand his rebuke, "Do not assume my likeness." (IV. iii. 220).

Apemantus in his role as cynic may be compared with Diogenes in John Lyly's Alexander and Campaspe of 1579-80. It was the first of Lyly's surviving plays, and shows many of the characteristics which were to take his works to the very threshold of self-conscious, fully developed dramatic art in England; and as R.W. Bond comments in his edition,[20] Lyly's importance as a model for Shakespearian comedy is great. Alexander goes to Diogenes as a conqueror intrigued by the

man who refuses to come to him when summoned. As the prince whose education is being furthered in the play, Alexander becomes, briefly, Diogenes' stooge:

> Alexander: Why then dost thou owe no reverence to Kings?
> Diogenes: No.
> A. : Why so?
> D. : Because they be no Gods.
> A. : They be Gods of the earth.
> D. : Yea, Gods of earth.
> A. : Plato is not of thy mind.
> D. : I am glad of it.
> A. : Why?
> D. : Because I would have none of Diogenes mind but Diogenes.
> .....
> A. : How should one learn to be content?
> D. : Unlearn to covet.
> A. : Hephestion, were I not Alexander, I would wish to be Diogenes.
> II. ii. 123-45

(The beautiful irony of the final, familiar speech is too complete to need comment!) The difference between Diogenes and Apemantus will be clearly seen from Hephestion's description of the former:

> He is dogged, but discrete; I cannot tel how sharpe
> With a kind of sweetnes; ful of wit, yet too too weyward. ibid. II. ii. 150-1.

Hephestion is describing a courtier's wit unrestrained by the ideal moderation. Into this pleasant comedy, which dutifully mixes profit with pleasure on Horace's instructions, Diogenes' rebukes are a source both of comedy and of moralising upon the need to keep to that golden mean. Apemantus, on the other hand, although well able to turn a witty phrase, offers a serious, alternative way of life, first to the Athenians' greed, second to Timon's unthinkingness, and third to what he sees

as Timon's state of self-pity. H.J. Oliver has written of their final encounter:

> The cynic's last interview with the misanthrope ought to be played with a certain half-amused tolerance: in the attitude of the philosopher (whose view that men cannot be trusted is at least based on a lifetime's disinterested observation) to the misanthrope (who is cursing all mankind simply because his own limited experience has found some men false) there is something of the contempt of the professional for the amateur. 21

"Half-amused tolerance" is not an adequate description of Apemantus' responses throughout the dialogue, but the self-assurance that produces it in the first place is certainly characteristic of him. Apemantus, as has been noted, makes no reference to anything of divine origin in the exchange; his concern is strictly how human beings live together in society, and his attitude is one of independent survival. Timon's rejection of his reasoning and his confidence that his independent observation has supplied him with the answers is supported by our conclusion that his attitude, his half-jesting, half-serious advice to exploit in one's turn, and his interrupted sermon on the indifference of nature to Timon's supposed posturing, are principally "intellectual" rather than "felt" responses to the latter's fall. In addition, dramatic irony works against Apemantus here. His principal accusation is that, given gold, Timon would quickly return to his former life -- which we know not to be the case. Second, the philosopher believes that Timon still wants flatterers, and has not rejected Athens from anything other than injured vanity: whereas the

exchange with Alcibiades and his whores has shown him fully aware of others' deceits and lusts, and using them openly, with curses, and with the flatterer's knowledge (though without their belief). Further, Timon, it has been argued, already sees himself as the means by which the gods will call down vengeance upon the Athenians (see pp. 29-30 above); thus, Apemantus' advice to exploit them, whether spoken mainly in jest or not, becomes an irrelevant response.

However, in excluding mention of the gods from the dialogue (with the single exception noted) Shakespeare forces our attention upon Apemantus' arguments, as those of the one dispassionate, reasoning being. When those arguments, initially intended to be a rational exchange, degenerate into insult, we find that not merely the value of living a luxurious life in the city is questioned, but also the value of life itself. Again the monetary metaphor is apposite: spurning the "sugar'd game", Timon demands

> Why shouldst thou hate men?
> They never flatter'd thee. What hast thou given?
> .....
> Apemantus: Art thou proud yet?
> Timon: Ay, that I am not thee.
> Apemantus: I that I was
> No prodigal.
> Timon: I that I am one now.
> Were all the wealth I have shut up in thee,
> I'ld give thee leave to hang it. Get thee gone.
> That the whole life of Athens were in this!
> Thus would I eat it.
> IV. iii. 271-2, 279-84

Timon's particular detestation of Apemantus is not simply hatred of one whose advice was right. Apemantus may be practical in

terms of self-interest, but "practical" does not mean "right", and Timon's question,"What hast thou given?" is in the nature of an accusation about the past as well as the present. Timon's reversed pride in prodigality -- which may encompass being able to give corrupting gold in abundance, finding independence in powerful hatred, and being able to make an extreme gesture (as he does in his words before eating a root) to which there is no rational counter-argument -- because it is informed by our knowledge of Apemantus' essentially sterile approach to life, and by the dramatic irony which has helped to highlight that, has an air of greatness rather than of the ridiculous.

That sense is confirmed, and Apemantus is linked more firmly with the solidly, fallibly human, when Timon, thinking himself alone, turns to address his new-found gold:

> I am sick of this false world, and will love nought
> But even the mere necessities upon't.
> Then, Timon, presently prepare thy grave;
> Lie where the light foam of the sea may beat
> Thy grave-stone daily: make thine epitaph,
> That death in me at others' lives may laugh.
> O thou sweet king-killer, and dear divorce
> 'Twixt natural son and sire, thou bright defiler
> Of Hymen's purest bed, thou valiant Mars,
> Thou ever young, fresh, loved and delicate wooer,
> Whose blush doth thaw the consecrated snow
> That lies on Dian's lap ! Thou visible god,
> That sold'rest close impossibilities,
> And mak'st them kiss; that speak'st with every tongue,
> To every purpose! O thou touch of hearts
> Think thy slave Man rebels, and by thy virtue
> Set them into confounding odds, that beasts
> May have the world in empire!
> Apemantus: Would 'twere so!
> But not till I am dead, I'll say th'hast gold.
> Thou wilt be throng'd to shortly.
> IV. iii. 378-97

Death and gold are grammatically linked: only gesture would make apparent, at line 383, that Timon is now addressing the latter, and that confusion is paralleled in Timon's use of the first and second person as he meditates what to do. Life and death have become inextricably entwined around the idea of gold, which is murderer and adulterer, soldier and lover, speaker of falsehoods and touchstone of truth. In this speech Timon no longer envisions himself as the means who will use the god-given tool, corrupting wealth, but now sees gold as possessed of a power and potency quite independent of what he will do.[22] This is a necessary change for him, for life, after his conversation with Apemantus, seems still more worthless. Yet the vigour of his curse must survive and, aided by the absence from Apemantus' vocabulary of the ambiguous word "fortunes" (whose place is taken by "future" and "wealth", without any accompanying idea of an inevitability more profound than the law of the jungle which prevails in Athens), Timon addresses gold directly, for the first time, and as the god which other men so fervently worship.[23]

Apemantus' exit lines reaffirm the desirability of life, as does the arrival of the Banditti, by their humour as much as by the characters' attitudes to survival. Earlier in the play can be found some rather more chilling attitudes, however, which also contribute to the mood in which the matter of Timon of Athens is to be assessed. It was noted above that the servants, particularly Timon's, and the three strangers, are

the characters in the play with a less egocentric philosophy. The usurers' and lords' servants express their dislike of their masters' immoral behaviour[24] — but they still carry out their instructions. Their loyalty is to something fundamentally corrupt, and their importuning causes Timon to exclaim, "Give me breath" (II. ii. 38), which is sufficiently reminiscent of their masters, who through Timon "drink the free air" (I. i. 85), to make the point about money's stranglehold still clearer. Their obsequiousness is also made more apparent by their familiarity with Apemantus immediately afterwards.

Flaminius, Lucilius and Servilius and the rest of Timon's servants (their names are not always given), like the Steward, Flavius, are incorruptible. Their concern for their master's well-being is manifest repeatedly[25] and, interestingly, they have a sense of themselves as a group with a common cause, which is expressed by the familiar "ship of state" metaphor:

> 3rd. Servant: Yet do our hearts wear Timon's livery,
> That see I by our faces; we are fellows still,
> Serving alike in sorrow. Leak'd is our bark,
> And we, poor mates, stand on the dying deck,
> Hearing the surges threat; we must all part
> Into this sea of air. IV. ii. 17-22

A "sea of air" seems a frightening thing, and there is a sense of loss when this band embraces and parts, having shared the Steward's remaining money. But by that very action the inescapable link of wealth with good fortune in human life is stressed, and we notice how each goes off to make his own way, only the Steward thinking of giving aid to Timon: and indeed, he will only be able to do that for as long as it is practical

(although that should not be taken as a slur on his honesty):

> I'll follow and enquire him out.
> I'll ever serve his mind, with my best will;
> Whilst I have gold I'll be his steward still.
> IV. ii. 29-51

In the three strangers a different problem is to be faced.

J.C. Maxwell writes:

> 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. 26

The structural implications of this will be dealt with in the following chapter (see pp. 84-5 below). Here, the strangers' characters are to be assessed a little more stringently. It is significant that it is they, rather than Lucius, who begin the gossip about Timon's fallen estates, and that Hostilius' reason for mentioning Lucullus' refusal of a loan is equally to show how real Timon's ruin must be,as to offer a rebuke for Lucullus' ingratitude. All such protestations come from the two-faced Lucius. While Timon's servant listens to Lucius' excuses, the strangers listen too; nor do they remonstrate with him when the servant leaves. After Lucius departs in his turn, the strangers talk over the irreligious ingratitude which they have witnessed:

> And yet -- O see the monstrousness of man,
> When he looks out in an ungrateful shape! -
> He does deny him, in respect of his,
> What charitable men afford to beggars.

The First Stranger, affirming that he has never had any favours from Timon, protests:

> Had his necessity made use of me,
> I would have put my wealth into donation,
> And the best half should have return'd to him,
> So much I love his heart. But I perceive
> Men must learn now with pity to dispense,
> For policy sits above conscience.
> III. ii. 74-7, 84-9

The man's charitable intentions are touching -- until we remember (from line 77) that a charitable man should give to any who are in need. The Strangers hide their selfish reluctance under a cloak of polite forms and politic utterance: the ingratitude which they seemed to find "monstrous" is a close relative of their politic meanness.

From this lengthy analysis it is now clear how much irony underlies this play, and how much more complex it is than many critics have been prepared to allow. The Athenians' guiding principle, self-interest, rules their understanding of the concept of fortune, from the Poet and the Painter, whose "mean eyes have seen/The foot above the head" (I. i. 95-6), to the Stranger, who observes that the times dictate that pity must be forgotten. In Timon of Athens "time" means future and present time, rather than time past. As in Coriolanus, past deeds are conveniently forgotten, and the hero himself is not able to see how the insistence upon the future will militate against him. But Timon differs from Coriolanus in

the absence of any family of love and of a new generation. Rome will go through another cycle when Volumnia has finished educating the young Marcius, and the balance of power may shift. In Athens, Alcibiades promises to overhaul the legal and financial systems; but we feel that with the death of Timon there are no great souls left. Alcibiades' efficiency, like Octavius' when set against the character of Antony, is a pallid, soulless affair; and his soldiership is rooted upon corrupting wealth, just as Aufidius' moment of triumph is rooted upon corrupting envy. However, both Coriolanus and Timon, once exiled from their society, lose themselves, not as Antony did, to an alternative life, but to a destructive nothingness in which all sense of their individual value depends upon spurning everything in relation to which they previously saw themselves, thus destroying their own view of their value.

In comparison with the possibilities of engagement and detachment offered by Coriolanus (see pp. 14-15 above), Timon of Athens at first seems rather barren. The idea of Fortune's wheel is well-worn, and the interest to be aroused by seeing the exact nature of Timon's fall seems likely to be dulled by its repetitive inevitability, rather than accentuated by a momentum of "felt" inevitability: but the inappropriateness of such an expectation is quickly shown. The irony underlying the Athenians' vocabulary, as well as Timon's, helps to elicit from the audience a far more complex awareness of the meaning of inevitability in the play: a complexity which is

compounded by the amount of conscious and unconscious role-playing of the characters. It is paradoxical that in a play so concerned with material things, where the services of poet and painter are bought and art plays so little attention to truth: that in the midst of all this, so much artistry should be employed by the Athenians in dealing with daily life. For the most part, as might be expected in drama, that artistry is principally apparent in the use of words. High-sounding compliments and all the forms of politesse are scrupulously observed, and the preservation of those forms as a means of disguising the rather sordid intentions behind them is a very important consideration for the suitors. We quickly come to understand that Timon is trapped by ritual expectations of a vastly more expensive return for every gift made to him. The fact that no one has set out to construct such a trap, but that it has grown as the result of a series of consequences, helps to make it seem to us all the more hopeless for those involved; and without blaming it upon malignant deities, it comes to represent for us a far stronger, and fatal mechanism. Thus, from what seemed at first a format offering only a detached view of events for the spectator, we move to an entirely opposite, engaged stance. The importance of humour and of the various "staged scenes" in Timon of Athens in preserving that balance will be discussed in the following chapter. Here it is appropriate to notice two other contributing factors deriving from the hero's character.

The first is connected to the paradox noted above about the descriptions of Coriolanus (see pp. 9-11 as above), which simultaneously increase his noble stature while confirming his fallibility. The politesse which surrounds Timon, with its continual use of the adjectives "good", "noble", "honoured", etcetera, shows us how he is being used; but at the same time we become aware that his suitors do not see that there is really a certain nobility about his magnanimity and generosity, foolhardy though it may be.

The second factor is similarly paradoxical. Viewing Timon's character dispassionately, we conclude that both his extreme trust and his extreme hate are wrong. Yet, given the nature of the Athenians, and our awareness of the duality of good and evil as the source of power, there is a certain rightness about them also. It becomes urgently necessary, in the midst of so much duplicity, that there should be a man of faith: that is a dramatic as well as a moral imperative. Dramatically, a moral centre, as it were, is needed. Similarly, as the immorality of the Athenians increases, a rebellion against it becomes dramatically necessary. Their web-like manipulation seems to enclose Timon on every side, and a huge burst of energy is needed to break it, which is expressed as a strong emotional reaction. Timon's lack of self-knowledge means that the satisfaction of these dramatic needs is not merely adequate, but excessive in such a way that further dramatic momentum is gained. Thus, two factors in the play

which might seem guaranteed to preserve a detached viewpoint for the spectator actually produce a strong sense of engagement.

Against the refusal of Coriolanus to change with changing times, except in the matter of changing sides, and Timon's deliberate change against the times, the relationship of Pericles to fortune must now be set. Like Timon, Pericles changes against rather than with the current of the times. However, that is only made apparent by the actions of the gods. Pericles' seclusion after the supposed death of Marina might be thought to be, like Timon's, a voluntary exile appropriate in the face of a corrupt society now without value to him; but in this play the gods take an active part, and their presence causes a shift in the relationship between the hero and fortune.

Once again it is to be noted how often the gods are called upon, collectively, in wishes, curses, oaths and the like. However, in Pericles they also have specific functions -- the functions of classical mythology -- and the various characters have to deal with the matter of pleasing them. In Timon of Athens it was noted how Timon gains a greater-than-human stature because he has a great soul despite his mistakes: he is not calculating, like the other lords; and everybody hangs upon his deeds. In Pericles the hero's "superhuman" stature results from the fact that he is on a quest; moving from place to place, he thus becomes a focus for us. Of course

his is not a quest comparable to that of Malory's or Spenser's knights; its specific purpose is not to achieve great things, but to avoid bad ones. Exiled from his society, he has to struggle to retain his sense of himself while nameless. But in Pericles a further complication must be faced: the qualitative change made by the presence of a narrator.

There are narrator and observer figures in the other plays under discussion also, and some part of their roles has been touched upon already in the analysis of the relationship between the hero and fortune. However, none of them steps out of the frame of the play to address the spectators in the manner of Gower. Both Gower and the dumb-shows cause a deliberate break in mood. As with the unpromising introductory metaphor of Fortune's wheel in Timon, so Shakespeare seems to have set himself what to a lesser playwright would be severe problems of construction -- and triumphed over them. Each unit of scenes between narrative material has a considerable power of engaging the audience; but with each shift to narration, detachment is the result. John Arthos calls it "that identification without sympathy, that detachment without irony" which contribute to a response by the audience as to something archetypal.[27] Annette Flower, in an article stimulated in part by that of Arthos, stresses the importance both of tale-telling and of dreaming: "The story is therefore not only framed as Gower's tale, but dependent upon being 'told' by its own characters", who recount their adventures to one another.[28]

However, if this were all then one would be talking of nothing more than a fairy tale. Pericles has indeed many elements of fairytale in it but, complex as those folk stories may be, it is more than that. The fairy or folk tale motifs are obvious: riddles, the unknown knight, the foul fair lady, identification by a ring, the wicked "stepmother", the inheritance of another kingdom, the trial of chastity, the lost child - all these are very familiar ideas to the reader of folktales, or to one steeped in the oral tradition of Shakespeare's day. The important difference in Pericles is that here the reader or spectator is not confronted by one or two of those motifs, set in a story whose ending can be predicted; nor is he or she dealing with a haphazard collection of useful story-telling devices: instead Shakespeare presents an integrated whole, where the elements complement one another in a structure which includes calculated interruptions.

The second important difference from the genre of the plays having Plutarch as a source is the reintroduction of kingship, with the changes which that makes in the relationship between the hero and his society. In Antioch, Tyre and Pentapolis, and also in Tharsus and Mytilene, although they are not kingdoms, a distinct hierarchy exists with the ruler as its head, which all accept as the natural order of things. Pericles' metaphor for it is a tall tree with spreading roots which are shaded by the beneficent upper branches. Furthermore, although neither Pericles nor any other character ever describes

him as having a god-like role, he talks of his father in such a manner:

> Yon King's to me like to my father's picture,
> Which tells me in that glory once he was;
> Had princes sit like stars about his throne,
> And he the sun, for them to reverence.
> None that behold him but, like lesser lights,
> Did vail their crowns to his supremacy.
> II. iii. 37-42

Simonides,who inspired this comparison, tells his daughter:

> Princes, in this, should live like gods above,
> Who freely give to every one that come to honour them;
> And princes not doing so are like to gnats
> Which make a sound, but kill'd are wonder'd at.
> ibid. 60-3

There is of course no questioning of the idea of inherited rank here. Simonides, both in this conversation and in an earlier one, is talking of the honour of a prince, which makes him worthy of respect and dutiful to the gods who gave him his place:

> princes are
> A model which heaven makes like to itself:
> As jewels lose their glory if neglected,
> So princes their renowns if not respected.
> II. ii. 10-13

The importance of princely integrity is also stressed, in a bitter way, by Pericles.

> Kings are earth's gods; in vice their law's their will;
> And if Jove stray, who dares say Jove doth ill.
> I. i. 104-5[29]

However, the duties of a monarch, even the conflict between his public and private selves, are not the real subject matter of Pericles. The fact that so many of the characters are rulers means only that they have considerable power over the lives

of others, so that the operations of fortune do not seem to be exclusively in the hands of the gods, even though ultimately they control fate.

Prayers and thanks to the gods are always for good luck. Bad luck is blamed on fortune, caused variously by Fortuna personified, or by human failings, or by the raging of the elements usually without the specific command of Neptune or Jove. There is a considerable amount of moralising upon the lessons that can be learned from certain events, particularly by Pericles, who has, after all, most cause. Both the moralising and the attitudes to good and bad luck are connected to the play's concern with the riddle or mystery of life. Thus, while Pericles may say with some stoicism:

> We cannot but obey
> The powers above us. Could I rage and roar
> As doth the sea she lies in, yet the end
> Must be as 'tis. III. iii. 9-12

yet our feeling while watching the play is one of sympathy for Marina's incomprehension of the methods chosen by those powers:

> Ay me! poor maid,
> Born in a tempest, when my mother died,
> This world to me is as a lasting storm,
> Whirring me from my friends.
> IV. i. 17-20

The storm and sea-tempest are images which contribute a great deal to the play's power; on the simplest level because of the strong linking pattern which they provide; beyond that because of the power, the unpredictability and yet the changelessness of the sea itself, and the physical connection which it provides between the scattered communities of the play.

The nature of each community gives some clue as to the type of fortune to be expected at their hands. In Antioch and Tharsus, where Pericles meets deceivers, no loyal train is apparent, no hierarchy of order. The rulers impose their will upon their subjects without receiving in return any tributes of loyalty; and consequently there is no bond of honour between them. In contrast to the presence of attendants in Antioch and Tharsus just for show, in Simonides' court at Pentapolis the jousting, the ceremonial, the banquet and dances,and the pledges, made by the other knights, of loyalty and respect, like the ceremonial of Cerimon's household at Ephesus, are clues that here a proper order will be maintained. In Mytilene, as on the shores of Pentapolis, we meet the ordinary citizens and their order. The fishermen make their livelihood from the element which proves treacherous to Pericles, showing that it is possible to live in harmony with nature. At the Bawd's house, exploitation of vices and general corruption, physical and moral, show the reverse side of such harmony; but the humour of the episode does not allow it to seem repugnant. The final community is Pericles' own court at Tyre, where loyalty and respect both for him and for the idea of a wise ruler are shown, and the existence of failings in Pericles himself can be discussed openly by his counsellor.

Linking all these places and their concomitant fortunes is the figure of Gower, and he brings with him to the discussion of fortune, the question of the importance of time in a way

that has not previously occurred. There are two main areas to be considered: the patterning of events undergone by Pericles and Marina, separated by a gap of fourteen years; and the special ironies produced in the play by having a story-teller who is as omniscient as the gods, who comes back from the dead to tell the tale, and yet who is continually apologising for the story, blaming it on an earlier writer, and thus denying his ability as a teller of the tale to change the course of events.

It is to be noted first of all of Gower's narrative that he does not announce every change of scene and is not necessarily used always to announce a shift in time. Gower is in fact much more than a character doing what programme notes would do for a modern playwright: it is from him that much of the dramatic impulse comes. This is clear from the opening chorus and scene. The audience knows the title of the play, but Gower's speech makes no mention of the eponymous hero; Antiochus' name is the only one he gives, and that follows a short prologue praising the play, and is accompanied by a reference to "mine authors", so common to literature of Gower's own day. In terms of time periods, we have an author from the past assuring an audience of the present that the story (of past events) which they are about to hear used to be thought well of, and that their superior wits will appreciate it even more. Gower then begins to tell the tale in the simple past tense, appropriate to story-telling, and then suddenly the rest

of that past history comes alive in the present, its events belonging to the audience's future experience.

Gower also ensures in this speech that the answer to the riddle will seem apparent to the audience. (The answer is not, of course, the word "incest" which is ringing in our ears, but the name of the unknown princess.[30]) The principal dramatic impulse, however, comes from dramatic irony. The first scene between Pericles and Antiochus contains in itself no characterisation of the latter -- until, that is, his words and seeming are compared with what has been revealed by Gower. Immediately the scene is full of dramatic possibilities. Pericles' danger is intensified, for he will probably die not merely if he fails to guess the answer to the riddle, but if he succeeds as well.

The role of Gower may therefore be compared with the Verfremdungseffekt described by Bertolt Brecht. By drawing attention to the old devices, to the existence of the play qua play, Gower takes the audience through and past initial reactions into the heart of the matter. Earlier uses of the technique by Shakespeare may be found. In The Taming of the Shrew, Christopher Sly's confusion and delusion at the hands of a nobleman and his page slily introduce one theme (of men and women using one another unashamedly) and parody another (the difficulty of seeing through deception when blinded by self-interest). Finally, his enthusiasm for applying Petruchio's solution to his own termigant wife underlines by contrast what

the power of love has achieved in Katherina, and helps to put in perspective Petruchio's somewhat thoughtless treatment of her. A different sort of framing device is found in The Comedy of Errors, where Egeon's narrative, unlikely as it seems, makes the eventual discoveries of the play believable, removing the improbabilities in such a way that the audience is free to attend to the peculiar situation of Antipholus of Syracuse and the misunderstanding of his brother and sister-in-law. The experience gained from both these plays was doubtless of service to Shakespeare in working out the delicately linked frames of A Midsummer Night's Dream, and the ironic possibilities of discrepancy were explored in Henry V. These discrepancies do not merely derive from the Chorus' patriotic fervour when contrasted with the lack of enthusiasm of Harry's army generally, but also from the forced reminders that a play is going on, that an unlocalised scene is shifting, and that chunks of history are being scattered with gay abandon. It is sufficient to consider the Chorus and opening scene of Act II for examples, of which the most obvious are the contrast between a high-flown style and a low-life reality, and the schoolmaster's wagging finger in the last lines of the Chorus:

> The King is set from London, and the scene
> Is now transported, gentles, to Southampton;
> There is the playhouse now, there must you sit,
> And thence to France shall we convey you safe,
> And bring you back, charming the Narrow Seas
> To give you gentle pass; for if we may,
> We'll not offend one stomach with our play.
> But till the King come forth, and not till then,
> Unto Southampton do we shift our scene.
>
> Henry V II. i. Ch. 34-42

For a discrepancy between description and action, the Chorus' encomium of Harry before Act IV and the actual effect of the King upon his soldiers could not be bettered as an example; and for the deliberate introduction of anachronism, lines 29-34 of the Chorus to Act V may be cited.

That the genesis of the Chorus in Henry V is to be found in the aforementioned plays, rather than in the traditional use of a prologue or epilogue, can be seen by comparing the dramatic function of this chorus with that of Rumour in 2 Henry IV, or of the chorus before Acts I and II of Romeo and Juliet. Those two figures, although contributing to the mood of those segments in which they appear, are indeed primarily speaking programmes: Rumour, flitting across the stage as if escaped from a morality play, is intended to rekindle the excitement aroused by 1 Henry IV by launching the audience immediately into the thick of events; the Chorus in Romeo and Juliet intones two stately sonnets to set the serious but sweet mood around necessary pieces of information. Turning to Troilus and Cressida reveals again a Chorus who is not merely a figure but a character, with the speech rhythms of a personal voice, giving a critical slant to our appreciation of the play which is to follow, rather than setting a tone with which we will contentedly acquiesce until events in the play itself arouse in us some other reaction.

But the character of Gower adds another layer of complexity to the role of the Chorus: for Gower is not an

abstraction, but an historical figure, a deceased author himself appealing to dead authors for their authority. He seems at first to be a helpful story-teller, but he does not supply all the needed links between scenes: Gower lulls us into accepting him as what he claims to be, rather than as a dramatic construct.

The chorus which opens the second Act seems initially to be providing a summary of "the story so far" for any of the audience who were otherwise engaged during the first Act: but again, a closer examination shows that something rather more complex is achieved by it. Even the four lines of story-telling which open the chorus have another function as well. The adjectives used by Gower are the key to this: Antiochus is "mighty" and misuses his power; Pericles is "benign" but will "prove awful", showing that he will command respect where Antiochus has to use fear. In spite of his goodness, he will suffer; the audience is informed of this, so that it becomes inevitable, as do the rewards which he will receive at the end: and the inevitability is associated with Gower, as a manipulator comparable to Fortuna, by his use of the word "benison", with its quasi-religious overtones. In the knowledge that Pericles, good but also human, and therefore flawed, will suffer, the audience is alerted to suspect hubris when told not only that his statue is being built by the grateful inhabitants "to make him glorious", but also that they think "all is writ he spoken can".[31] "Writ" I take to mean, with

Malone, Holy writ rather than, figuratively, gospel truth (as Hoeniger suggests). The specific use of the word implies that quasi-divine stature is attributed to Pericles -- the exact opposite of the stature suggested by Gower, looking down and blessing him. Thus it becomes inevitable on two counts that Pericles will suffer fortune's blows: first because Gower has said so, authoritatively; second because consciously or unconsciously he seems to be verging on hubris, upon which the Olympian deities have no mercy.

However, it would be wrong to give the impression that hubris is in some way Pericles' tragic flaw. Hamartia is never, in any case, an adequate explanation for the fall of a Shakespearian hero; but if Pericles is guilty of a specific failing, then it is the typically Renaissance one of indulging in melancholia. It is never Gower's part to accuse him of that fault, but undoubtedly without Gower's presence we would not perceive it as we do. Helicanus' rebukes in Act I scene ii, of which it is possible that we have only a corrupt version,[32] would point out the tendency, which would then be remembered vaguely. Gower's verse makes our perception vivid, for there is a gently ironic tone about it at times, for which the deliberately archaic form is largely responsible, and which is strikingly absent from Pericles' often inflated language: and it is Pericles who opens the first, second and third Acts, and the third scene of Act V, with set-pieces which sound all the more formal by comparison. Thus the audience must face again the paradox of the same event or piece of information

simultaneously increasing the hero's stature and stressing his fallibility. Just as Pericles' goodness makes him a strong figure to join battle with fortune, and his human failings make it both right and inevitable that he should contend with fortune; so the praises and descriptions of him stress his goodness while the ways in which they are given subtly undercut any superhuman stature which the audience might accord him. This paradox contributes a great deal to that mystery which the play ravels about life.

To turn now to the relationship between Gower and time, and the pattern of events undergone by Pericles and Marina. The simplest connection has not proved to be, for critics generally, the most obvious. In spite of the fact that Gower is the narrator of the whole story, supposedly from the accounts of other authors, and that the story is about a type of quest which takes place over a considerable period of time, he never informs the audience of how much time has elapsed. Of course there are, in performance, visual clues. Pericles must remain at Simonides' court at least eight months; and Marina will be seen to be of a particular age, so that the length of Pericles' stay in Tyre will be known. But as Gower tells the story all the characters, and the audience, are caught in a flux of time whose precise measurement is not a concern of the play. In part this is of course the result of the non-localised drama of the tradition in which Shakespeare was writing. It should also be related, however, to the six

appearances of Gower in the play and to the dramatic movement between engagement and detachment of which he is a focal point, allowing the audience to understand the thematic links, which will now be discussed.

Act and scene divisions are even less relevant to Pericles than to Shakespearian drama as a whole; in the Quarto there is not even an Actus Primus to grace the first page. Instead there are the six groups of scenes introduced by Gower, three of the choruses including a dumb show, the last introducing a pageantlike scene in the temple at Ephesus. The six groups divide in half, Marina taking Pericles' place in the second half as the homeless figure, and each half has a definite structure. From Gower's first revelation about Antiochus onwards, the hero is faced with a series of deceptions. After Antiochus' and his daughter's concealed evil comes Simonides' seeming wrath and his daughter's seeming indifference; then Dionyza's murderous intentions lead her to give Pericles a final, although false, blow, at the same time starting Marina's troubles. Marina finds the Bawd to be only disguised as a woman; Lysimachus turns out to be far from the lecher he seemed; and Boult too proves to have a good heart. She then finds her father beneath a stranger's exterior, and the two of them discover Thaisa, a loving wife and mother, in the habit of a priestess to the goddess of chastity.

For the audience, however, there are still more disguises in the play. The role which Gower takes on has been

mentioned; Pericles and Marina play roles also, and the audience is able to appreciate how they seem to their interlocutors. Thus, Pericles seems to Helicanus to lose his true nature in melancholy; and Pericles deliberately pretends to be angered to test his counsellor. To the starving Cleon and Dionyza, Pericles seems bound on a war-like mission, and the audience is no more aware than they of what his intentions are until he states them. On the other hand, the audience has privileged information, from the asides of Simonides, Thaisa and Pericles, as to their real feelings about one another, and about Simonides' trick on the other knights. Pericles, like Marina, chooses to retain his anonymity after his adventure at sea, deliberately disguising his identity: and Thaisa also chooses to bury her real self in another role after being received by Cerimon.

Cerimon is a particularly interesting character in this respect. Our trust in him is based, I have argued, on an understanding of the meaning of the ceremonial and mutual respect which we see in his household, as in Simonides'. After the sailors, Lychorida and Pericles have cast Thaisa overboard, believing her dead, Cerimon is seen, saying categorically that nothing can save a certain sick man. His equal certainty that Thaisa is still alive is therefore the more to be trusted; and it is fitting that the first half of the play should end with his powers of discrimination, Thaisa's trust in him, and his aid to her to serve the goddess Diana. Cerimon, like Pericles until the supposed death of Marina, accepts whatever fortune

sends him. Unlike Pericles who, as a knight, must also go out to seek or make his fortune, Cerimon allows nature to work through him, thus understanding, as well as accepting, what occurs:

> I hold it ever,
> Virtue and cunning were endowments greater
> Than nobleness and riches; careless heirs
> May the two latter darken and expend,
> But immortality attends the former,
> Making a man a god. 'Tis known I ever
> Have studied physic, through which secret art,
> By turning o'er authorities, I have,
> Together with my practice, made familiar
> To me and to my aid the blest infusions
> That dwells in vegetives, in metals, stones;
> And can speak of the disturbances that
> Nature works, and of her cures; which doth give me
> A more content in course of true delight
> Than to be thirsty after tottering honour,
> Or tie my treasure up in silken bags,
> To please the fool and death.
> III. ii. 26-42

The influence of the active versus the contemplative tradition is obvious here. Cerimon can choose the latter because he is not obliged, like knightly prince Pericles, to give an account of himself in the former. Thus he speaks of the benefits of earth and the elements (which are "blest") which have seemed so far in the play largely to take from mankind. (The exception is the suit of rusty armour and the fish which Pilch, Patch-breech and their master draw up in their nets: again, they are close to the elements and work with them.)

There is also about Cerimon a strange sense of dual time. It was noted that he endeavours to save lives, but recognises death's claim: in other words, he faces the fact of mortality. Thus, his saying (lines 30-1) that a man can

get immortality through his good works -- an idea that, differently expressed, is part of Christian tradition -- is not hubris, but a recognition that memory lives on after the death of the individual, and that his name and achievements can never be sullied by the actions of others, especially his heirs. Cerimon has a respect for time in the largest sense, and understands that Nature provides a cure for each "disturbance" that she works; and the audience's appreciation of that is accentuated by the part which music plays in the recovery of Thaisa, and by the talk of heavenly odours. Both these bring an air of mystery to the event, highlighted further by its contrast with the irony of Cerimon's previous, humorous comment to his gentlemen, about Thaisa's coffin:

> What e'er it be,
> 'Tis wondrous heavy. Wrench it open straight.
> If the sea's stomach be o'ercharged with gold,
> 'Tis a good constraint of fortune
> It belches upon us. ibid. 52-6

His function at the end of the first half is therefore an echo of Gower's. The difference between his character and those seen so far, and his abilities as, in some sense, a magician foreshadowing Propero, bring with them a sense of detachment from the main action, but at the same time intensify our understanding and therefore our involvement in it.

In Marina can be found the unification of Pericles' and Cerimon's best abilities. She has the purity and fortitude of her father, coupled with the healing skills of the physician: but in Marina those are not skills which have been acquired

by study and contemplation. Their natural occurrence is a manifestation of a deeper purity, and confirms the truth of Cerimon's words, that Nature heals each wound which she causes. Thus Marina, who is unmarked by time and protected by the aura of fervent chastity, comes to stand for timelessness by fulfilling the demands of fortune in the larger pattern which became hidden from Pericles and Thaisa. After she has completed that pattern, Gower becomes again the simple story-teller which the audience once thought him, neatly tying up all the loose ends: although it should be noted that the gods cause the principal loose end, Dionyza's evil intention and Cleon's complicity, to be punished by a spontaneous rising of their people, which is another example of fortune's pattern being executed by human agents.

It is clear that fortune's pattern is something perceived more readily by the audience than by the characters involved. Cerimon sees it as a balance between disruptive and healing forces, but the rest of the characters only experience it in one-sided events, whose other side (and therefore the gods' benevolence) they must take on trust. In Coriolanus and Timon of Athens it is the character's attitudes which distance as well as involve the audience. In Pericles, on the other hand, it is the presence of Gower which produces the dual movement, allowing the audience to see more clearly the links and echoes, for comparison and contrast, between the various episodes, and thus showing the errors in Pericles' understanding of fortune. Both the demands of the story -- its

fairytale motifs, etcetera -- and what might be called the divine plot make the audience aware of an inevitability whose workings are a mystery to the characters.

The fact that there is felt to be a divine plot affects the place of good and evil as a source of power in the play. A rather more simple presentation is found of what was in Coriolanus and Timon a complex issue; but beneath the surface simplicity of a character's being either good or bad, the important issue of seeing beneath appearances still lurks. The disguises and roles assumed are most obvious to the audience, but they are not mere conventions. The structure of the play requires that the audience perceive the connections in order to understand the relationship between the hero and fortune.

The analysis of that relationship in Coriolanus, Timon of Athens and Pericles has inevitably touched upon others of the seven factors singled out as a means of understanding the connections between the plays, and it is now appropriate to turn to them in more detail, first in order to examine Pericles more closely, in itself, and second in order to trace their development through the three plays and into the "romances".

III

THE STAGED SCENE

The six topics which remain to be considered are primarily matters of structure, although inevitably they also play their part in elucidating character and theme. They divide into three pairs, concerned with language, the dramatic relationship between groups of characters, and stage spectacle, but all contribute to that new piece of dramatic structure which has been called the "staged scene." It is perhaps the distinguishing mark of the late plays, reaching an apotheosis of one kind in the final scene of Henry VIII, and of another in The Two Noble Kinsmen, and its development may be traced in all the plays following Antony and Cleopatra. The term "staged scene" refers here to a rather different dramatic element than is meant by its use with reference to such plays as Hamlet, Othello, Love's Labours Lost or As You Like It, although in each case affinities can be found, as is inevitable, given Shakespeare's continual development as a playwright. In Love's Labours Lost characters repeatedly arrange shows or displays for one another, from the lords' righteous indignation at each other's breaking of their vows, to the episode of the Russian dancers, to the Pageant of Worthies. Hamlet takes that idea and puts it to a more serious use,

Hamlet competing with Claudius for the role of stage-manager, as it were. In Othello, Iago's machinations are dependent upon his ability in that very role, but the play is a further development of the device, in that Othello never quite sees reality. In moving back to consider As You Like It, it might seem that the staged scene of the plays of 1606 onwards is present there in a more than embryonic state: where, in addition to the wrestling, the philosophizing and the flyting, there are also to be found Rosalind's management of Orlando, and Hymen's direction of satisfyingly symmetrical nuptials, the latter seemingly also satisfying the extra requirement of the post-1606 plays, that the staged scene be brought about by the structure as much as by the characters, and moreover that the structural inevitability be the result of the actions of the presiding deity or deities of the play as well as of the exigencies of the story. However, it must not be forgotten that such feelings of inevitability in the later plays are coloured by the relationship between the hero and fortune, and that the fortunes of Rosalind and Orlando are in no sense comparable to those in Coriolanus, Timon of Athens and Pericles. Not until The Winter's Tale did Shakespeare sufficiently perfect the new structures with which and within which he was working to allow the reintroduction of youthful lovers (whose love could be seen as an actuality), now within the operations of time and fortune as he posited them.

In part we feel those operations to be relentless because the playwright chooses to impose certain scenes on his

characters. The challenge of the opening scenes of Pericles and the apparently uninspiring dialogue on Fortune in Timon have been noted. In Coriolanus too the opening scene threatens to grind to a halt through the accumulated mass of words: for who can pretend that Menenius' fable of the belly is gripping, dramatic theatre? There is Menenius, occupying centre-stage, settling down for a long monologue; and there are the plebians, gathered around him waiting for the story. The audience knows that corn-riots are in the process of occurring, and there may well be those who wish that the story they are about to hear would be a continuance of the promising violence and conflict of rebellion, in rather more visual terms. But in fact that story is present, and is told in visual terms more than verbal ones. This precursor of Gower tells a fable which assigns roles, and the plebians deliberately adopt roles vis-à-vis the patrician in listening to him, just as later they will say whatever Coriolanus expects of them, or whatever their Tribunes expect of them, so long as they are given their moment in which to do it. Indeed, in Coriolanus the order of society consists largely in giving to each in turn his due moment to play a role -- hence the devastation of Menenius when Coriolanus refuses to allow him his moment as wise counsellor and father-figure.

Clearly this tendency in Coriolanus developed out of Antony and Cleopatra, the play in which, more than any other, characters describe and define themselves, and others, and their mutual relationships and situations. In Antony and

Cleopatra the discrepancies give rise to a remarkable dramatic tension, dependent upon the exclusiveness of the terms "Rome" and "Egypt" which yet, in the play, seem so inclusive. But these are not the only names which are made to stand for more than themselves: Antony and Octavius talk of their own position and mention their names (Octavius choosing "Caesar") as if the two things were synonymous; their lieutenants do the same thing, converting their generals' names into rallying-cries for their causes; and that tendency in its turn is taken up by the generals. The following examples, among many, may stand for the progression:

> Philo: Sir, sometimes, when he is not Antony,
> He comes too short of that great property
> Which still should go with Antony.
> . . . . Ant. I. i. 57-9

> Ventidius: I'll humbly signify what in his name,
> That magical word of war, we have effected.
> III. i. 30-1

> Agrippa: O Antony, O thou Arabian bird!
> Enobarbus: Would you praise Caesar, say 'Caesar',
> go no further. III. ii. 12-13

(It is to be noted that these lines are spoken in mockery of Lepidus' flattery, but have the dual function of mocking and extending the meaning of the general's names.)

> Caesar: Plant those that have revolted in the vant,
> That Antony may seem to spend his fury
> Upon himself. IV. vi. 10-12

Against the stress on proper names and titles may be set such descriptions of Cleopatra as "a lass unparallel'd", of her hopping "forty paces through the public street", and the scene of Caesar's arrival in her presence, when her lack

of regal attire prevents his recognising her. Occupying a place between the two types of description come the direct appeals to fortune in this play: the playing with words of the Egyptians while they are finding entertainment in consulting a Soothsayer; and the deadly earnest of Antony's question to the latter, "Whose fortunes shall rise higher, Caesar's,or mine?" and of his reply, "Caesar's." (II. iii. 15-16). The play continually represents an individual's position as inseparable both from his name (and thus his function) and from his spirit; and it conflates the two in the mixed grandeur and impossibility of, on the one hand, the Soothsayer's explanation of his prediction to Antony, and on the other, Cleopatra's description of her "most sovereign creature" (words which contain the essence of irony with regard to the hero and fortune). These descriptions and the many others of the play show characters attempting to define and contain in words their understanding of individuals: definitions which, while hopelessly inadequate to the task as the audience perceives it, can yet extend the possibilities of definition by the tensions set up between them and the action, and by the reverberations of particular words in patterns of imagery or association.

From these characters who attempt to describe and fix roles, more or less stepping back and assessing their subjects, come the narrator and observer figures like Menenius, the Tribunes and Volumnia (in a certain sense), Apemantus, the Poet and the Painter, and Gower, who takes the role itself from all

the other characters in Pericles, allowing them only isolated moments to make their comments. The spectators' roles which these characters take on would be hopelessly unsubtle, however, were it not for the different emphasis given to the soliloquy post-1606. Used so formidably in the great tragedies, it almost disappears in these plays; and where it is found, the soliliquy of self-examination has given way to the soliloquy of self-delusion. Furthermore, the hero now uses a rhetorical or public mode of address to express thoughts formerly voiced only to himself. Instead of the added bond of familiarity and involvement, which the soliloquy helps to create by admitting the audience to a character's inner doubts, now a declamatory voice frequently sweeps over them as it sweeps over other characters. This is not to deny the presence of the arts of language in any of the plays written pre-1606 -- that would be nonsense -- but is to draw attention to the shift in tone, to the distance put between a main character and the audience by the new style.

The opening scene of Pericles furnishes some excellent illustrations. Immediately after the identities of Pericles and Antiochus have been established, music plays to usher in the unnamed princess who is the object of Pericles' quest. Antiochus pronounces formal praises of her, dwelling upon her fortunate birth; Pericles responds with a paean on her appearance. His reply to Antiochus' warning about the death penalty for failure is just as expansive and impersonal as the paean,

and the audience is likely to remain detached from his claimed love (although engaged in the plot by their tri-partite awareness of dramatic irony, the meaning of the riddle, and suspense). John Danby attacks this scene, together with the rest of Acts I and II, for the "self-consciousness" manifest in them, and for being a derivation "insensitive" to the better parts of the Sidneian universe (a term which he is using in its widest sense, although launching it from an examination of the Arcadia). For Danby, the Acts have "no inclusive consciousness" -- "a consciousness centred either in a single character, made capable of investing all the parts with significance, or a consciousness centred in the writer of the acts and made persuasively present through the verse or the general moral sensitivity" -- and he finds them lacking in "the pressure of resolution or patience that is resistant to Fortune, the pressure of passion that combines with her irrationals generally, the room for growth and for disastrous collapse."[33] Danby's criticisms take no account of the presence of Gower, the concomitant dramatic irony resulting from his story-telling, and the fact that, as the subject is Shakespeare's rather than Twine's[34] or Wilkins'[35] (or even Gower's[36]) Pericles, the audience is made to perceive connections, and a "consciousness" filters through the directions of thought suggested by Gower's role until it is persuasively present.

In Pericles' words about the "celestial tree",

> See, where she comes apparell'd like the spring,
> Graces her subjects, and her thoughts the king
> Of every virtue gives renown to men!
> Her face the book of praises, where is read
> Nothing but curious pleasures, as from thence
> Sorrow were ever raz'd, and testy wrath
> Could never be her mild companion.
> Per. I. i. 13-19

the irony with which they are redolent sets up a far more complex pattern of association than the superficial one of being deceived by appearances. The virgin garments and season of the sonneteers are literally garments, put on at will;and the Graces are subjected to the princess' accomplished outer show. A double meaning which may be seen in the succeeding attribute -- that thoughts of evil do indeed conquer those of virtue in mankind -- links up with Pericles' melancholy after the supposed death of Marina: Marina herself being the perfect third in a triad of maidens of whom Thaisa is the second, and her face being indeed "read" by Pericles for its similarities to her mother's. Sorrow is razed from the world, as Pericles sees it later, by its lack of morality and justice. Both Pericles and Marina will be spoken of in metaphors drawn from trees: and the utterance of her mother's name, different from her own, will confirm Marina's pure identity, where Antiochus' daughter's name is lost in her mingling of two functions in incest. Thus, in the larger pattern of the play, the rhetorical mode of the hero is in no way restrictive of the thought. If, however, the speech is assessed purely in terms of what is known thus far in the play, then Pericles' formal behaviour on a formal occasion is seen to be impeccable; but the scene

that he thinks is merely being staged for him has also been rigged; and the incongruity of talking about the freshness of spring against a background of "grim looks" brings in some grim humour, a mood which is sustained by Antiochus' breaking through Pericles' oration (only to be interrupted in his turn), to advise him of the "martyrs slain in Cupid's wars" who speak silently of "death's net, whom none resist". The result is that the formal roles, for which formal language seems to prepare both characters and audience, are discarded as the trappings of the moment, and through the rather black humour the audience is made aware of the serious intent of the play because the moralising has been undercut, to reveal a morality or, as Danby would put it, a "general moral sensitivity". If "self-consciousness" in art is to be taken to mean the skilful direction of the audience's responses by the structure of a work, then Pericles is indeed self-conscious: but that is hardly a fault.

Danby's charge about Pericles that "the version of the Sidneian world presented in the first two acts is comparatively crude" is also based upon a misinterpretation of the dramatic structure: comparing apples and oranges, he necessarily praises the fruit most agreeable to his palate. Pericles is not just the world of Sidneian romance transposed, but a development from and transformation of the plays which preceded it, with cross-fertilization from the oral and popular traditions as well as contemporaneous work in other literary modes. In a different way, J.M. Nosworthy also sees Pericles (and Cymbeline)

as the play of the book, as it were. He is an apologist for the defects of structure and style of those two plays on the grounds that Shakespeare was for the first time without a dramatic model, and had to struggle over what he calls his "pioneer colonizing efforts":

> The sustaining of a satisfactory tragi-comic balance is one of the problems implicit in romance material and the achievement of a perfectly happy ending is another. The portrayal of idealized characters in unreal situations must have represented, to the Shakespeare who for some eight or ten years had been occupied almost exclusively with individual relationships, psychological probability and the terrible logic of human destiny, a change so fundamental as to be perplexing and, at first, detrimental.

He continues:

> Above all, perhaps, there is the structural challenge implied in the romance's demand for alienation and subsequent reconciliation. 'Once upon a time...', 'Far away and long ago...', formulas so simple and so current in fairy-tale, impose problems of space and time which sorely tax ingenuity when they are transferred to the stage. 37

The problems of structure outlined by Nosworthy are valid (unlike the earlier remarks quoted) and it is regrettable that neither of these critics mentions the irony of Shakespeare's using a story-teller in Pericles, who virtually begins "Once upon a time...", as part of his solution to them. Once again Gower's role illuminates our consideration of the hero, in a later scene cited by Danby for faults of language and resultant lack of intensity. The scene is Pericles' first shipwreck, of which Danby says:

> The moral and verbal sensitivity is simply lacking. We are left with the lowest common factors in each case: verbal formulae instead of poetic statement, the cliché of resignation instead of the vast moment of spiritual forces that turns on 'patience'. In the hands of the writer of the first two acts the romance-world degenerates into one in which nothing can really happen. We are given no sense of the creaturely, of the essential, of being at the centre of organic change. We are left, that is, with no sense of people as people. 38

and the speech which he has particularly in mind is the following:

> Yet cease your ire, you angry stars of heaven!
> Wind, rain, and thunder, remember, earthly man
> Is but a substance that must yield to you;
> And I, as fits my nature, do obey you.
> Alas, the seas hath cast me on the rocks,
> Wash'd me from shore to shore, and left me breath
> Nothing to think on but ensuing death.
> Let it suffice the greatness of your powers
> To have bereft a prince of all his fortunes;
> And having thrown him from your wat'ry grave,
> Here to have death in peace is all he'll crave.
> II. i. 1-11

The extra formality which is given to this speech, by contrast with the preceding one of Gower's, has already been noted (see p. 61 above). What must also be noted is the dumb-show which cuts through that speech, announcing Thaliard's murderous intentions and initiating Pericles' hasty departure from Tharsus. The event is a simple one: the delivery of a letter amidst a train of nobles, the knighting of the Messenger, and a general exeunt; and its dramatic economy is best appreciated after comparing it with the relevant passages in Gower[39] and Twine,[40] which introduce Hellican and Elinatus, respectively, to convey the news in person and in secrecy. In each case the romance theme of a faithful servant aiding secretly his

wandering lord, and in the nick of time at that, is replaced by Shakespeare with a scene which reiterates Pericles' bearing and dignity while suggesting, by the suddenness with which this bolt from fortune comes, that they will not be adequate for the troubles ahead. The moral overtone here is undercut by Gower's story-telling disclaimer: Pericles suffers in the tempest

> Till fortune, tir'd with doing bad,
> Threw him ashore, to give him glad:
> And here he comes. What shall be next,
> Pardon old Gower, -- this 'longs the text.
> II. i. Ch. 37-40

What "'longs the text" is not merely the arrival of the fishermen and their ensuing comic scene, but the spectacle of Pericles, "wet", and such a spectacle might verge on the ludicrous. That it does not is the result of the audience's attention having been drawn to the potential; but the risible is not to be excluded entirely from the audience's response, for it is part of Shakespeare's weaponry to keep the possibilities for many different reactions open simultaneously, thus tempering any purely detached, "intellectual" response to the ideas voiced by Pericles. At the beginning of this scene there is no great feeling of engagement at his circumstances. There is too great a disparity between his claimed obedience to the elements and his tone, which is almost one of superiority; between his pessimism and Gower's jaunty tone; and between the finality which he sees in his present condition, bereft of his "fortunes" -- which he uses to mean "future" --, and the

fact that he has not been buried in a watery grave.

It is important that the audience should appreciate this tendency to melancholy, for which Helicanus has rebuked his prince, especially when the surrounding circumstances do not seem to them to warrant it. In this way a feeling will be built up that to give way to melancholy is to fail to address oneself properly to the whole business of inevitability -- a feeling which the dramatic structure intensifies, particularly by depriving us of intimate expressions of the hero's grief at the final blow, the "death" of Marina. Critics have seen the play as stressing the need for patience: but patience is a very cold and abstract concept for an audience to sympathize with if the circumstances in which it is supposed to operate are such as to promote detachment rather than engagement. Substituting for "the need for patience", "the need to combat melancholy" makes far better sense of the play, replacing a passive endurance by an active one, in which the importance of humour is immediately apparent. The long wait for an ultimate end and purpose to be revealed is complemented by the discovery of smaller patterns of sense: the unknowable remains unknowable, but lesser things are comprehensible. Thus Pericles' words,

> yet thou dost look
> Like Patience gazing on kings' graves, and smiling
> Extremity out of act. V. i. 137-9

should not be taken as the key to the play's meaning, but as a part of the rhetorical language belonging to the prince in

his normal state of mind, which is now gradually returning to him.

The language characteristic of Coriolanus and Timon has already been commented upon and the brooding soliloquies which open the Acts of their exile have been noted. They are soliloquies of hatred, their speakers in mean apparel, and are preceded by scenes of disguised betrayal (namely, the double deception of Timon's second banquet, and the meeting of a Volscian spy and a Roman traitor). Like those two speeches, the other soliloquies of the protagonists are self involved in so bitter a way that they produce detachment rather than engagement in the audience. Despite the harshness of each situation and our understanding of the connection between the event and the consistent character with which we are presented, any feelings of sympathy are restrained.

In Pericles soliloquy and aside are indistinguishable: both are forms of address to the gods, to the elements or to other characters, and are concerned with events rather than problems. The development from Coriolanus' and Timon's failure to think about problems and their verbally violent response to events is obvious. The "priestly farewell" which is promised to Thaisa is made to take place not merely off-stage but in "no time" also; Pericles is therefore deprived of the beneficial intimacy of a soliloquy over the corpse, and the softer rhythm and elusively complex imagery of the blank verse, amidst the sailors' prose practicalities and those of Lychorida, only seem to allow him a personal moment which is, paradoxically, again one of high formality.

Dramatic balance is given to the distancing effect of the hero's public mode of address by a number of narrator or observer figures. As Northrop Frye puts it, by means of the shifts of perspective provided by isolated individuals, "something external to us is suddenly internalised, so that we are forced to participate in what we have been conditioned to think of as removed from us and our sympathies."[41] The observer figures do not necessarily bestow impartial insight, but by a number of means, including partiality and dispassionateness, cause us to re-examine our perceptions of the hero or his situation and to find that we have more, rather than less, sympathy for him. Thus the spiritual poverty of the Tribunes, as much as the pragmatism of Aufidius, changes our response to Coriolanus, as does every new piece of information about Volumnia and her attitudes to life, the state and the individual. Nothing more need be said about the friends of Timon, and the function of the Poet, the Painter and the Steward has also been discussed (see pp. 33, 46 above). Apemantus and Alcibiades require further comment, however, for there are strong affinities between their roles and the frame and "episodic" structure of Pericles.

It is not proposed to add to the analysis already made of Apemantus' role in Act IV scene iii, but rather to examine Act I and Act II scene ii. From the moment of his initial entry Apemantus undermines the faith which the audience has built on the Poet and Painter as observers: for, egocentric

though they may be, they are sufficiently worldly cynics to seem impartial because allowance can be made for their partiality; and in addition they unfold the story, which inclines us to think them reliable because of the convention of opening scenes. Apemantus, however, does more than redefine the word "cynic" by his arrival. He leaves the stage at the end of Act I scene i only so that his re-entry in scene ii may reinforce the impression of him as a lone truth-teller. That he is a lone truth-teller here by virtue of his dramatic role rather than his character has been argued above (see p.38 ff); that he is a precursor of Gower, looking on scenes whose outcome he can predict, but cannot change, is equally clear. His replacing the Poet and Painter as commentator, as much as his more vitriolic remarks, means that his reliability in that role is also questioned.

Again, therefore, the paradox of simultaneous engagement and detachment arises. The Athenians try to remain amusedly detached from Apemantus' barbs, but cannot; they are stung into abandoning their politesse for insults, the elaborate game of wit falling to the ground when Apemantus refuses to abide by their rules. That there are unspoken rules of language, and that Timon enjoys living by them, thinking himself impervious to their flattery, is clear from the following exchange:

> Jeweller: My lord, 'tis rated
> As those which sell would give; but you well know,
> Things of like value, differing in the owners,

> Are priced by their masters. Believe it, dear lord,
> You mend the jewel by the wearing it.
> Timon: Well mock'd.
> Merchant: No, my good lord; he speaks the common tongue,
> Which all men speak with him.
> Timon: Look who comes here: will you be chid?
> Tim. I. i. 171-8

Timon's brief commendation of the Jeweller's wit, and his sudden interruption of what promises to be a rival encomium when he notices Apemantus approaching suggest that the ritual of praises, like the ritual of giving gifts, has a well-defined role for him which he in no way shirks. His suggestion that Apemantus should be engaged in repartee has the air of a new form of entertainment about it, from which he imagines he can remain equally remote.

Timon's attitude colours that of the audience. Apemantus' brusque prose is not, it seems, simply in meaningful contrast to the formal measures up to this point, but also provides humour varying from the sardonic to the earthy. However, the very fact that Apemantus bests a succession of flatterers means that his attractiveness begins to pall. The arrival of Alcibiades and his suite provides a welcome new momentum, and Apemantus' final flyting with two unnamed Lords leaves an impression favourable to Timon and slightly hostile to the disagreeableness with which Apemantus spoils all occasions. It is with this impression in mind that we see his re-entry, "dropping after all", "discontentedly, like himself." How skilfully, then, is his role transformed into one for which the audience has every sympathy! His honesty is quickly

felt to be refreshing rather than in bad taste, as he sits apart from the ceremony of Timon's banquet, like the audience, and voices to the general air -- simultaneously to himself, perhaps wonderingly; to Timon, in warning; to the suitors, with contempt; and to the audience, both confidingly and rhetorically -- his opinions of the immorality taking place before them. It is as if two dialogues evolve for the scene: that of Apemantus, commenting on what he hears and sees, and that of the other guests and the host, studiously ignoring aural and visual truth, and substituting for it new appearances, in the form of healths and courtesies, and a masque (of which Timon disclaims all knowledge -- improbably, as none of the guests claims authorship). (For further discussion of these, and of Apemantus' grace, see pp. 28-30 above.)

One further point remains to be noticed about the first Act: how, after the masque, Apemantus becomes a silent spectator, watching the giving of more gifts, while Flavius, the steward, is given three asides (which give the facts of Timon's situation); and Apemantus only speaks again when all the guests and servants have left. On the suddenly emptied stage, it is as if Timon is left with a reflection to talk to, whom he wants to fit into the well-known pattern ("Now Apemantus, if thou wert not sullen,/I would be good to thee." I. ii. 238-9). Apemantus, however, is only prepared to offer reflections of an entirely different kind:

> No, I'll nothing; for if I should be brib'd too there would be none left to rail upon thee, and then thou wouldst sin the faster. Thou giv'st so long, Timon, I fear me thou wilt give away thyself in paper shortly. What needs these feasts, pomps, and vain-glories?
> Timon: Nay, and you begin to rail on society once, I am sworn not to give regard to you. Farewell, and come with better music. I. ii. 240-7

In this case one observer figure has complemented, indeed, has added to, another's stature. The Steward's revelations have made plain that Apemantus' predictions are very far from hollow; in fact, they are so substantial as to be inevitably true, and alone on the stage with him, Timon is facing his destiny. Immediately, however, Apemantus' stature is undercut by his sardonic rejoinder and especially by the word "heaven", which brings his own failings before us; and it is that very fallible Apemantus who is seen in Act II scene ii with the Fool, who takes over the role of truth-teller as an hereditary right.

In Apemantus, then, can be seen the outsider who increases our awareness of the relationships between characters, both by his dramatic function and by his cynical philosophy, simply as another character, in his relationship with others. In Timon of Athens it is ideal that the dual role should belong to a philospher, who supposedly demolishes appearances with argument. In Pericles the hero does his own moralising, as it were, and the dual role passes to a story-teller, who makes alternative constructs to the hero's perception of the order of things both by his function and by the gently humorous character with which he is endowed.

In turning to consider Alcibiades, the argument moves to the fourth of the sixth factors, namely the existence of different sets of characters, seemingly offering different dramatic actions. Following the antitheses of Rome and Egypt, Romans and Volsces, in Timon of Athens a more severely bi-partite structure is produced by "belonging" and "exile". Clearly Alcibiades provides a contrast with the self-exiled Timon and the solitary Apemantus in his choice of deeds over words (whether of scorn, cynicism or resignation). But within that general outline there can be found an episodic structure which foreshadows its deliberate adoption in Pericles. When Alcibiades is first introduced he seems to be another in a succession of friends and acquaintances coming to pay court to Timon and enjoy his feast. Rather more ceremony is accorded him than the other lords, but the man of action, like the usurers, is scrupulous in his attentions to Timon. During Timon's exile he arrives once more with ceremony, and offers practical help, which is undercut by the presence of the two whores who accompany him, suggesting yet more services which can be bought, and thus further suggesting that Alcibiades' quarrel with Athens is not as pure as it might seem. His stress upon his need to pay his soldiers, and the curses with which Timon gives him gold, strengthen that impression of a co-operation between good and evil forces in pursuit of power: and his response to Timon's curses echoes Timon's own response to Apemantus' advice:

> Hast thou gold yet? I'll take the gold thou
> givest me,
> Not all thy counsel. IV. iii. 131-2

This again is parodied in the whores' replies to Timon's counsel:

> Well, more gold. What then?
> Believe't that we'll do anything for gold.
> ibid. 151-2

> More counsel with more money, bounteous Timon.
> ibid. 169

Here, as in Alcibiades' confrontation with the Senate, themes and links are implied but not stated. The confrontation itself is a scene which makes dramatically possible Timon's virtually continuous presence on the stage from Act IV to the beginning of Act V scene ii. In it a verbal battle is fought for justice, in a cause where that is not felt to be the result of a strict interpretation of the law, thus giving a rational statement to the arguments which allow the Athenians to deny obligations whose legal weight comes from a wider morality than that of the statute-book. The scene economically introduces the relationship of power to justice: power to hide behind the authority of law, and physical power to overturn an order impervious to argument. Neither side is blameless, but neither side is without a certain right. The links between this scene and Timon's domination of the stage are clear: Alcibiades' conflict prepares the audience for the later exchanges by crystallizing the positions of the interlocutors within the prevailing morality of Athens and within the larger morality which the characters, in their various ways, attempt

to deny. In addition, his decision to avenge injustice by deeds, not words, accentuates our perception of Timon's bitter misanthropy as futile; whereas the contrast between his avowed deeds and his inability to make them a reality without gold reduces deeds to words, and words to tainted boasts, in such a way as to strengthen and validate Timon's curses. His retreat from the world becomes, if not commendable, at least more than understandable: the alternative courses of action being even more morally suspect. It is by now clear how much I disagree with Una Ellis-Fermor when she says of Timon of Athens that, unlike Lear and Hamlet, it "does not endow its minor characters with the function of focusing, by their nature and actions, our thought and attention on its central figure."[42] "Function" is the very thing with which the minor characters -- indeed, all other characters -- are endowed. Their dramatic function is to suggest connections between and modifications of ideas and themes implicit in Timon's story. Timon of Athens does not use choric comment as J.C. Maxwell suggests:[43] its points are made in far more subtle ways than his remark implies.

But of course choric comment does not need to be blatant, or a believable, trustworthy piece of information. In Shakespeare's hands Gower's version of Pericles (both literally and figuratively) makes of the voice of the narrator a complex instrument. It is not, however, the sole provider of choric comment, for in Pericles, as in Coriolanus and Timon, structural means like songs, pageants of various kinds, and moments of

stasis coming from long speeches or passages of debate are also used to that end. In Coriolanus the pageants are processional in nature: the arrival of the army, of the senate, of the women pleading for mercy. They bring with them a sense of order and structure lying behind the hero in his society; but more than that, of the order in motion, its weight of progress inevitably overwhelming the hero's protestations. Against that order his individuality stands out as both unique (and great) and foolhardy.

That movement is beautifully counterpointed by Coriolanus' ordeal in the gown of humility. The audience has two visual signals here, as well as hearing his verbal distaste at the proceedings, to suggest the inevitable future conflict: first, the fact that his martial uniform is hidden beneath something which he fears will make him "surcease to honour mine own truth"; second, the fact that he must be still, and wait for events to happen to him, people to come to him, whereas previously he has been a source of action, if not the source. The scene makes it obvious that Coriolanus is already partly exiled: the plebians play out their roles around him

> (Coriolanus:...your voices!/Indeed I would be consul.
> Sixth Citizen: He has done nobly, and cannot go without any honest man's voice. Cor.II. iii. 129-32)

but Coriolanus disallows the roles and the movement of the times which has brought them into being. He cannot comprehend his society, and, unlike Volumnia, will not allow himself to use to his advantage the rituals which he despises. Yet

visually he dominates the stage for so long throughout this scene that his presence is still felt when the Tribunes plan their next move; just as his name dominates their speech and that of the Citizens, although it is not uttered once. The very fact of seeing Coriolanus still, means to the audience that he will soon be seen in action, and the manner in which he was held motionless means that his action will be against his society's manifest order.

When in Act V scenes ii and iii the positions are apparently reversed, and the Romans are suitors to Coriolanus who holds power over them, the visual metaphor shows a conflict parallel to that surrounding the elections. The super-added factor of Tullus Aufidius' presence as a spectator makes the grip of an order opposed to Coriolanus' individuality seem all the tighter, and a conflict, resulting in his fall, the inevitable consequence. Aufidius' role is strengthened by the powerful impression of what individuality can achieve, obtained by the audience from Coriolanus; his ability to bend to circumstance and use deception, combined with his place as Coriolanus' opposite number in the Volscian society, means that to his personal strength can be added that of the weight of society behind him. It is of course the force of visual metaphor which is Coriolanus' downfall. He is, after all, a part of Roman society, even if a rebellious part, and the sight of order being violated, when Volumnia stage-manages the ritual supplication, produces a need to re-establish that

order, which must inevitably be done by him because it is he who has usurped the power which organises it. The climax of his understanding of and response to that broken order comes not in a violent outburst, but in a moment of stillness, of absolute stasis on stage, which will turn upon, we imagine, his next word: but it does not. Gesture, not words, reveals the truth, and makes a tableau whose resolution and whose rightness are apprehended instantly, in all their complexity, as words could never have achieved. In the same way, Coriolanus' appearing with the Commoners around him in Act V scene vi makes inevitable Aufidius' response, which is not simply one of provoking Coriolanus to fight, but of trampling upon his corpse. That picture of triumph is so appalling that it must quickly be covered by words, the words which he mouths of repentance.

The development of this dramatic need for words to cover an image in Timon of Athens has been touched on in the discussion of Apemantus' function at the banquet, and Alcibiades' function when he meets Timon in the woods. It can also be found in a slightly different form in the Steward's three asides at the banquet, whose suddenness after the masque of Amazons is startling, as is its style. A completely different rhythm is used from that which has been heard earlier in the scene, which drives home the point that he is speaking of factual matters, not speculating upon the turning of Fortune's wheel.

The masque itself is a very interesting construct to occur at this point. Show and ritual have accompanied Timon's entrances to this point. The stage directions are explicit. Before his entry in Act I scene i is found the following: "Trumpets sound. Enter Lord Timon, addressing himself courteously to every suitor"; and at the beginning of the second scene:

> Hautboys playing loud music. A great banquet serv'd in; and then enter Lord Timon, Athenian Lords and Senators; Ventidius which Timon redeem'd from prison; Lucullus and Alcibiades. Steward and others in attendance. Then comes, dropping after all, Apemantus, discontentedly, like himself.

To underline the point, if it has not yet been grasped, comes Timon's speech, early in the scene:

> Nay, my lords, ceremony was but devis'd at first
> To set a gloss on faint deeds, hollow welcomes,
> Recanting goodness, sorry ere 'tis shown.
> But where there is true friendship, there needs none.
> Tim. I. ii. 15-18

We may therefore be rightly suspicious of the masque itself, its Amazonian masquers having lutes instead of bows and arrows, and Timon (like Apemantus) refraining from joining in dancing which is seemingly a metaphor for order and harmony. The seeming harmony of present- and compliment-giving which succeeds this is another fair covering for something rotten within. The promptitude with which three servants arrive with gifts, hot upon one another's heels, makes the atmosphere increasingly oppressive, and Apemantus' down-to-earth comment is doubly welcome in the midst of so much deception of self and others.

The music and dancing of Timon are thus far from the beneficent influences which they are commonly called in Shakespeare. There is no music of the spheres, only a jarring of planets and a potential planetary plague in a gilded Alcibiades. In Pericles the importance of disguising and the interpretation of appearances has already been noted, and naturally this carries over into the use of music and other forms of ceremony. However, the connections between the various sorts of disguising in the play are firmly established, and by the arrival of Marina to aid Pericles, the importance of music as a means of communication is understood. As with the revival of Thaisa, so Marina's choosing to play her instrument before she speaks to Pericles brings with it the air of a moment outside time, and an influence more than human. The natural culmination of this is the heavenly music which Pericles hears before his vision, which is inaudible to the other speakers (and as Marina does not reply to her father's question about it, she may be associated with it without its becoming in any way a fact to be commented upon, rather than a feeling). The dances of the knights and the ladies at Simonides' court, Pericles' music and Simonides' ruse of employing him as a music teacher are earlier mirrors of one another for assisting our understanding of the place of music, which may be traced back ultimately to Pericles' opinion of Antiochus' daughter, after learning the truth about her:

> You are a fair viol, and your sense the strings,
> Who, finger'd to make man his lawful music,
> Would draw heaven down and all the gods to hearken;
> But being play'd upon before your time,
> Hell only danceth at so harsh a chime.
> I. i. 82-6

This speech is another moment of stasis within a scene, when an interpretation is made of the situation of order, or apparent order, before the protagonist's eyes (and of which Cerimon's speeches on the power of nature and on Thaisa's appearance are further examples). All these moments are occasions which, by producing a sense of detachment from the action in the audience, will re-engage them in its progress, more aware of the mutual reflections of parallel incidents or images. Pericles is of course doubly complicated by having parallel incidents for the hero before further parallels appear in the events surrounding his daughter. Both Cymbeline and The Winter's Tale eliminate the first set of parallels (although the plethora of verbal echoes in the latter should be noted[44]). The Winter's Tale is thus enabled to stress the movement of time in a larger pattern; but in Pericles the songs and pageants of the first part allow sufficient distancing for that to take place also.

"Patterning", therefore, is the key word in a discussion of Coriolanus, Timon of Athens and Pericles. A series of mirrors and reflections can be found in the structure of the plays which continually direct and redirect the audience's attention and sympathies. From the obvious devices of parallel events and verbal echoes, to the far more subtle and complex ones of the narrator or observer whose comments are not to be taken at face value, and the scene controlled visually and temporally by formal movement of various kinds, it is clear that just as these colour our assessment of the hero's attitude to fortune, so they manipulate our own sense of time and inevitability. The evolution of the use of these devices may be traced throughout Shakespeare's works, but their particular development in the plays under discussion shows how crucial these works are to an understanding of the relationship between the tragedies and the romances. As the manipulation of the audience's responses of engagement and detachment becomes apparently more obvious, so its part in the dramatic structure becomes more involved, more fascinating and more discreet. The "unlovable" hero is in fact a character who forces our engagement, and of the most intense kind, in his troubles, as his moments of crisis extend through time into a timelessness which is also, as it were, a spatial dimension. Their extent is both experienced and seen in the visual metaphors which these plays employ, examples of which can be found in the three scenes of rejection -- of the Roman embassy; of the

Athenians; of Marina -- which have been examined. The use of roles and of definitions lead us past appearances to visual and aural truth.

It is beyond the scope of this study to trace in detail the development of the concept of time and the other devices discussed through the romances, although that is the obvious next step. By analysing in detail their use in Coriolanus, Timon of Athens and Pericles -- an analysis of what is essentially a series of overlapping circles -- these three plays, which have seemed inhospitable to many readers, can be seen to be works of great complexity. Far from being haphazard or formless, their structure is both coherent and subtle, requiring an audience alert to the implied directions which their patterning represents. Frank Kermode has written of the period which begins with Coriolanus:

> It is not surprising that The Tempest has sent people whoring after strange gods of allegory, any more than it is surprising that Coriolanus and Timon of Athens are the least loved of the mature plays. They represent a maturity of conception, a control of the medium, both linguistic and dramatic, which we scarcely know how to begin to understand. We may prefer the rich thematic mixture of Lear, or the haze which still gives the edges of Twelfth Night a romantic glow, but in its uncompromising victory over the means to truth, its control over vision and expression, and its refusal to be seduced by any temptation to betray the principles of architectonicé, the last period represents the summit of Shakespeare's achievement. 45

To this admirable summary it remains only to add a note on the importance of humour within what Kermode calls the architectonicé. Humour has, in these plays, an ironic edge.

In no sense does Shakespeare use wit, dramatic irony, satire, incongruity or bawdy to produce simply an unthinking guffaw. Humour, like the narrator or observer figure, is used to manipulate in the audience the feelings of engagement and detachment which produce an intense awareness of themes, character and inevitability. The pleasure which it produces is not that of charm, or even of fun; humour is deadly in its pointedness, and in the instantaneous recognition which it brings of conflict: and in conflict, explicit and implicit, lies dramatic action.

NOTES

1. Ben Jonson, 'Ode to Himselfe', added to The New Inne, in The Complete Works Vol. VI. Edited by C.H. Herford and P. Simpson, (Oxford, 1945).

2. On the question of divided authorship: both Timon and Pericles are cited as plays in which Shakespeare collaborated, or reworked an old play, or someone else's first draft, or abandoned the work as unsatisfactory in some way. Charles Knight was the first to suggest a second hand in Timon in his Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere (8 vols. London, 1838-43):

> Shakspere was satisfied to take the frame-work, as he found it, [of] 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. (pp. 333, 336)

This went from theory to fact to theory in succeeding nineteenth century editions, and in the twentieth century the disintegrationists' suggestions for ascription of Acts and scenes have become progressively more complicated. Francelia Butler in her book, The Strange Critical Fortunes of Shakespeare's 'Timon of Athens' (Iowa, 1966), gives in tabular form the findings of Knight, Hudson, White, Fleay, Rolfe, Gollancz, Wright, Parrott and Sykes. (pp. 39-41). The first proponent of Timon as an unfinished play was Hermann Ulrici, in Shakespeare's Dramatic Art, trans. Alexander J.W. Morrison (London, 1846). This view was restated by E.K. Chambers in William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems (2 vols. Oxford, 1930) and enlarged by Una Ellis-Fermor in her article entitled "Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play" (Review of English Studies, XVIII, July 1942, 270-83). Miss Ellis-Fermor's views have received a great deal of support from subsequent editors of the play, which Ms. Butler summarises in her second chapter.

The argument of this study is that Timon, like Pericles, is structurally sound as we have it. Arguments to the contrary concerning Pericles may be found in the editions of J.C. Maxwell, (New Cambridge Shakespeare, 1956, xii-xxix) and F.D. Hoeniger (New Arden Shakespeare, 1963, liii-lxiii).

It is of course possible that the names of two authors should appear on the title-page of any play commonly called Shakespeare's. However, there is no proof of dual authorship except in the case of The Two Noble Kinsmen,

where the planning of who-should-write-what was clearly made at an early stage, and with considerable critical acumen. Thus, as all judgements are strictly subjective and the only incontrovertible fact is that there are no facts, it is preferable to refer to the author of all thirty-seven plays as Shakespeare.

3. The strongest verbal similarities between Timon and Lear are to be found in the heroes' curses upon procreation. Timon's is a general curse, a blight laid upon the whole earth:

> Ensear thy fertile and conceptious womb;
> Let it no more bring out ingrateful man.
> Go great with tigers, dragons, wolves and bears;
> Teem with new monsters, whom thy upward face
> Hath to the marbled mansion all above
> Never presented. O, a root; dear thanks!
> Dry up thy marrows, vines and plough-torn leas,
> Whereof ingrateful man, with liquorish draughts
> And morsels unctuous, greases his pure mind,
> That from it all consideration slips --
> Tim. IV. iii. 189-98

Lear's curses are many and various. The relevant passages are as follows:

> Hear, Nature, hear! dear Goddess hear!
> Suspend thy purpose, if thou didst intend
> To make this creature fruitful!
> Into her womb convey sterility!
> Dry up in her the organs of increase,
> And from her derogate body never spring
> A babe to honour her! If she must teem,
> Create her child of spleen, that it may live
> And be a thwart disnatur'd torment to her!
> Lear I. iv. 273-81

> You sulph'rous and thought-executing fires,
> Vaunt-carriers of oak-cleaving thunderbolts,
> Singe my white head! And thou, all-shaking thunder,
> Strike flat the thick rotundity o'th'world!
> Crack Nature's moulds, all germens spill at once
> That makes ingrateful man!
> III. ii. 4-9

One of Apemantus' speeches also has verbal similarities to one of Lear's:

> Call the creatures
> Whose naked natures live in all the spite
> Of wreakful heaven, whose bare unhoused trunks,
> To the conflicting elements expos'd,
> Answer mere nature; bid them flatter thee.
> Tim. IV. iii. 229-33

> Poor naked wretches, whereso'er you are,
> That bide the pelting of this pitiless storm,
> How shall your houseless heads and unfed sides,
> Your loop'd and window'd raggedness, defend you
> From seasons such as these? O! I have ta'en
> Too little care of this. Take physic, Pomp;
> Expose thyself to feel what wretches feel,
> That thou mayst shake the superflux to them
> And show the Heavens more just.
>
> Lear III. iv. 28-36

The situations of Timon and Lear are similar only in that each has turned his back upon his society and is raging, under the elements, against man's ingratitude. Each has a loyal follower (the Steward and Kent) and each put a mistaken, unquestioning trust in extravagant protestations of love. There is of course no absolute proof that Timon was not written in 1605-6; yet the verbal "evidence" cited by supporters of that date is seen to rest upon the repetition of a few words -- "womb", "mother", "teem", "ingrateful", "dry up", "expose" -- and of a few ideas -- man's pride and extravagance; monstrous births; false friendship; the ragged and starving poor as a living book wherein the more fortunate should read -- none of which is in itself extraordinary and whose presence as a group, if it is not logically explicable merely on the grounds of interconnection of ideas, could be owing to Shakespeare's memory, which we know to have been extraordinarily retentive, or even to a recent performance or reading of King Lear.

J.C. Maxwell provides a useful summary of critical opinions in his edition (ed. cit. xi-xiv). Noting that A.C. Bradley's metrical tests suggested a date "between King Lear and Macbeth", and that Sir Walter Raleigh thought Timon "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", Maxwell finds himself in agreement with J.D. Wilson, Peter Alexander and Willard Farnham, among others, on an early date. Sir Edmund Chambers' reasoning for placing Timon between Coriolanus and the last plays unfortunately suffers from being in proximity to his Shakespearian sorrows suggestion, but was accepted by Clifford Leech, who concludes that Timon is a play "containing the germ of the romances" and that it represents "a stage in Shakespeare's development that is logically if not chronologically subsequent to" that of Antony and Cleopatra and Coriolanus. C.J. Sisson finds the use of Plutarch as a source-book for those plays a strong pre-supposition in favour of a date around 1607: and this is the one point which Maxwell is willing to concede. The references as cited by Maxwell are as follows:

Bradley, Shakespearean Tragedy (1904), note S.
Raleigh, Shakespeare (1907), p. 115.
Dover Wilson, The Essential Shakespeare (1932), p. 131.
Alexander, Shakespeare's Life and Art (1935), p. 187.
Farnham, Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier (1950), p. 7.
Chambers, William Shakespeare (1930), I, 483.
Leech, Shakespeare's Tragedies and Other Studies in Seventeenth Century Drama (1950), pp. 113-4.
Sisson, ed. Shakespeare's Works. (1954), p. 910.

N.B. All quotations from Shakespeare's works both here and in the body of the text are from the New Arden edition. Bibliographical information for the relevant volumes is as follows, in alphabetical order:

Antony and Cleopatra ed. M.R. Ridley (1954)
Coriolanus ed. Philip Brockbank (1576)
Cymbeline ed. James Nosworthy (1955)
Julius Caesar ed. T.S. Dorsch (1955)
King Lear ed. Kenneth Muir (1952, repr. with corrections 1972)
Pericles ed. F.D. Hoeniger (1963)
The Tempest ed. Frank Kermode (1954)
Timon of Athens ed. H.J. Oliver (1959, repr. with corrections 1963)
The Winter's Tale ed. J.H.P. Pafford (1963)

4. King Lear is obviously the least straightforward of the tragedies in this respect.

5. A discussion of the chronology of the canon may be found in James G. McManaway, "Recent Studies in Shakespeare's Chronology", Shakespeare Survey, III (1950), 22-33.

6. Examples: Caesar: II. ii. 10-12, 27-30, 41-8, 65-8
Brutus: I. ii. 46-7, 172-5; II. i. passim.
Cassius: I. ii. 54-62, 115-17, 135-61
Antony: III. i. 183-211; and of course the orations of III. ii. 74-107, 118-37, 169-96, 210-30.

7. Reuben Brower, Hero and Saint: Shakespeare and the Greek and Roman Heroic Tradition (Oxford, 1971), p. 236.

8. Julius Caesar IV. iii. 147-59, 181-95. Note especially Cassius' comment, ll. 194-5, "I have as much of this in art as you,/But yet my nature could not bear it so", further evidence that Brutus' claimed ignorance is acted.

9. North's Plutarch, "The Life of Lycurgus", I. 123, quoted by Brower, op. cit., p. 211n.

10. Cf his remark III. xi. 3-4, "I am so lated in the world that I/Have lost my way for ever", which acknowledges his benightedness in the face of political drift.

11. Cf the Steward's remonstrance, II. ii. 156-8,
> O my good lord, the world is but a word:
> Were it all yours, to give it in a breath,
> How quickly were it gone!

12. J.C. Maxwell, ed, Timon of Athens, New Cambridge edition (Cambridge, 1957), pp. xxxiii-xxxv.

13. Maxwell, ed. cit., p. xxxv for "the implication that Timon's 'freeness' is oppressive to its recipients." I do not, however, dispute the importance which Maxwell finds in the word "free", in both its meanings (i.e. generous and unconstrained). For this see pp. 23-4 below. See also Maxwell's article, "Timon of Athens" in Scrutiny, XV, 3 (Summer 1948), 195-208, especially p. 202.

14. Maxwell, ed. cit., p. xxxiv, says this of Timon.

15. Tim. IV. iii. 438-45.

16. Tim. I. ii. 62-71.

17. Tim. IV. iii. 109-30.

18. See Tim. III. i. 15-45; III. ii. 1-58; III. iii. 9-36; and cf I. i. 180-272; I. ii. passim.; II. ii. 51-122.

19. Tim. I. ii. 238-51.

20. R.W. Bond, ed. The Works of John Lyly (3 vols., Oxford 1902).

21. H.J. Oliver, ed. cit., p. 1.

22. Cf Timon's aside at V. i. 46-52.

23. It is conceivable that in writing this speech Shakespeare had in mind the opening scene of Jonson's Volpone (1607), which uses abundant antitheses to describe "the world's soul", and refers to its importance as an alternative spring equinox ("the celestial Ram") just as Timon says:
> She whom the spital-house and ulcerous sores
> Would cast the gorge at, this embalms and spices
> To th'April day again. Tim. IV. iii. 40-2

24. See Tim. III. iv. 1-28 and cf ll. 41-101.

25. See Tim. III. i., III. ii, III. iii, and IV. ii. passim.

26. J.C. Maxwell, ed. cit., p. xxv.

27. John Arthos, "Pericles, Prince of Tyre: A Study in the Dramatic Use of Romantic Narrative" in Shakespeare Quarterly IV, Summer 1953, 257-70.

28. Annette C. Flower, "Disguise and Identity in Pericles" in Shakespeare Quarterly XXVI, Winter 1975, 30-41.

29. The favourable comparison of princes to gods is of course a Renaissance commonplace. See, for example, the Countess of Pembroke's version of Psalm 82 verse 1: "Who gods (as God's vice regents) ar".

30. A point made by P. Goolden, "Antiochus' Riddle in Gower and Shakespeare" in the Review of English Studies, n.s. 6, 1955, 245-57, cited by Phyllis Gorfain, "Puzzle and Artifice: The Ridde as Metapoetry in Pericles" in Shakespeare Survey 29, 1976, p. 13n.

31. See Per. II. i. Ch. 10-14.

32. See F.D. Hoeniger, ed. cit., pp. 180-2, Appendix C, A. While agreeing with Hoeniger that I.ii. 35-57 seems, at first sight, a little bald, and that it is possible that a passage of text is missing, yet I would argue that in dramatic terms, the scene works admirably as it stands. The flattery of which Helicanus accuses Pericles' courtiers is the humouring of a dangerous melancholy, as Helicanus sees it, which is depriving the people of the prince's wonted care. Dismissing the lords twice is a symptom of this; Pericles is removing himself from the proper order of Tyre. Hoeniger's "reconstruction" is clever, but improbable. Surely Helicanus would not address his sovereign, "Peace, peace, and give experience tongue." Even Kent tries a more circumspect approach twice before being "unmannerly" (see Lear I. i. 119-153).

33. J.F. Danby, Elizabethan and Jacobean Poets (London 1952), p. 91 ff.

34. Lawrence Twine, The Patterne of Painefull Adventures, n.d. (1594?), repr. in J. P. Collier, Shakespeare's Library (2nd. edn., 1875), vol. IV.

35. George Wilkins, The Painfull Adventures of Pericles Prince of Tyre (1608) repr. Kenneth Muir, ed. Liverpool Reprints, No. 8, 1953.

36. John Gower, Confessio Amantis VIII.

37. Nosworthy, ed. cit., p. xxxi.

38. Danby, op. cit., p. 92.

39. Gower, op. cit., ll. 579-92.

40. Twine, op. cit., Ch. III.

41. Northrop Frye, A Natural Perspective: The Development of Shakespearean Comedy and Romance (Columbia 1963), p. 101.

42. Una Ellis-Fermor, op. cit., p. 282.

43. See p. 42 above.

44. For an investigation of verbal echoes see Richard Proudfoot, "Verbal Reminiscence and the Two-part Structure of The Winter's Tale" in Shakespeare Survey 29, 1976, 67-78.

45. Frank Kermode, ed. cit., p. lxxx.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Texts and Concordances

Brockbank, Philip. (ed.) Coriolanus. (New Arden) London: Methuen, 1976.

Dorsch, T.S. (ed.) Julius Caesar. (New Arden) London: Methuen, 1955.

Evans, G.B. et al. (eds.) The Riverside Shakespeare. Boston and London: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.

Farmer, John S. (ed.) Mucedorus. (1598) (Tudor Facsimile Texts) Edinburgh and London, 1910. Reproduced New York: A.M.S. Press, 1975.

Greg, W.W. (ed.) Clyomon and Clamydes. (1599) (Malone Society Reprints) Oxford: University Press, 1913.

--------. (ed.) Pericles: Shakespeare Quartos No. 5 (1609) Oxford: Clarendon, 1940.

--------. (ed.) The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune. (n.d.) (Malone Society Reprints) Oxford: University Press, 1930.

Hinman, Charlton, (ed.) The Norton Facsimile: The First Folio of Shakespeare. New York and London: Norton, 1968.

Hoeniger, F.D. (ed.) Pericles. (New Arden) London: Methuen, 1963.

Kermode, Frank. (ed.) The Tempest. (New Arden) London: Methuen, 1954.

Maxwell, J.C. and J.D. Wilson. (eds.) Pericles Prince of Tyre. (New Cambridge) Cambridge: University Press, 1956.

--------. (eds.) The Life of Timon of Athens. (New Cambridge) Cambridge: University Press, 1957.

Muir, Kenneth. (ed.) King Lear. (New Arden) London: Methuen, 1952, reprinted with corrections 1972.

Nosworthy, J.M. (ed.) Cymbeline. (New Arden) London: Methuen, 1955.

Oliver, H.J. (ed.) Timon of Athens. (New Arden) London: Methuen, 1959, reprinted with corrections 1963.

Oxford Shakespeare Concordances. Antony and Cleopatra: A Concordance to the Text of the First Folio. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.

--------. Pericles: A Concordance to the Text of the First Quarto of 1609. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.

--------. Timon of Athens: A Concordance to the Text of the First Folio. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

Pafford, J.H.P. (ed.) The Winter's Tale. (New Arden) London: Methuen, 1963.

Ridley, M.R. (ed.) Antony and Cleopatra. (New Arden) London: Methuen, 1954.

Selected Secondary Sources

Abbott, E.A. A Shakespearian Grammar: An Attempt to Illustrate Some of the Differences between Elizabethan and Modern English. 3rd. revised edition London, 1870, reprinted New York: Dover, 1966.

Arthos, John. "Pericles Prince of Tyre: A Study in the Dramatic Use of Romantic Narrative", Shakespeare Quarterly, IV (Summer 1953), 257-70.

Brockbank, J.P. "Pericles and the Dream of Immortality", Shakespeare Survey, XXIV (1971), 105-16.

Brockman, B.A. (ed.) Shakespeare: "Coriolanus": A Casebook. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1977.

Brower, Reuben. Hero and Saint: Shakespeare and the Greek and Roman Heroic Tradition. Oxford: University Press, 1971.

Bullough, Geoffrey. Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare. 8 vols. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957-75.

Butler, Francelia. The Strange Critical Fortunes of Shakespeare's "Timon of Athens". Iowa: University Press, 1966.

Calderwood, James. "Coriolanus: Wordless Meanings and Meaningless Words", Studies in English Literature 1500-1900, VI (1968), 211-24.

Chambers, E.K. William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems. 2 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1930.

Charney, Maurice (ed.) Shakespeare's Roman Plays. Boston: Heath, 1964.

Danby, John F. Elizabethan and Jacobean Poets: Studies in Sidney, Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher. London: Faber, 1964.

Doran, Madeleine. Endeavours of Art: A Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama. Wisconsin: Madison, 1954.

Edwards, Philip. "Shakespeare's Romances: 1900-57", Shakespeare Survey, XI (1958), 1-18.

Ellis-Fermor, Una. "Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play", Review of English Studies, XVIII (July 1942), 270-83.

--------. Shakespeare the Dramatist. Edited by Kenneth Muir. New York and London: Barnes and Noble, 1961.

Flower, Annette C. "Disguise and Identity in Pericles" Shakespeare Quarterly, XXVI (Winter 1975), 30-41.

Frye, Northrop. A Natural Perspective: The Development of Shakespearean Comedy and Romance. New York: Columbia, 1965.

Goolden, P. "Antiochus' Riddle in Gower and Shakespeare", Review of English Studies, n.s. 6 (1955), 245-51.

Gorfain, Phyllis. "Puzzle and Artifice: The Riddle as Metapoetry in Pericles", Shakespeare Survey, XXIX (1976), 11-20.

Hart, Alfred. "Shakespeare and the Vocabulary of The Two Noble Kinsmen", in his Shakespeare and the Homilies. Melbourne: University Press, 1934. In association with Oxford University Press.

--------. "Vocabularies of Shakespeare's Plays", Review of English Studies, XIX (April 1943), 128-40.

Hoeniger, F.D. "Shakespeare's Romances since 1958: A Retrospect", Shakespeare Survey, XXIX (1976), 1-10.

Jonson, Ben. The Complete Works. Edited by C.H. Herford and Percy Simpson. 11 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1925-52. Volume 6, (1945).

Knight, Charles. Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere. 8 vols. London: 1838-43.

Knight, G. Wilson. The Wheel of Fire. 4th ed. London: Methuen, 1960.

Kozlenko, William.(ed.) Disputed Plays of William Shakespeare. New York: Hawthorn, 1974.

Leavis, F.R. "The Criticism of Shakespeare's Latest Plays: A Caveat", Scrutiny, X, 4 (1942), 339-45.

Leech, Clifford. Shakespeare's Tragedies and Other Studies in Seventeenth Century Drama. London: Chatto and Windus, 1961.

MacCallum. M.W. Shakespeare's Roman Plays and Their Background. London and Melbourne: University Press, 1910. In association with Oxford University Press.

McManaway, James G. "Recent Studies in Shakespeare's Chronology", Shakespeare Survey, III (1950), 22-33.

Maxwell, J.C. "Timon of Athens", Scrutiny, XV, 3 (Summer 1948), 195-208.

Mehl, Dieter. The Elizabethan Dumbshow: The History of a Dramatic Convention. Translation of his "Die Pantomime im Drama der Shakespearezeit", Heidelberg, 1964. New York: Harvard, 1965.

Palmer, D.J. (ed.) Shakespeare's Later Comedies: An Anthology of Modern Criticism. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969.

Proudfoot, Richard. "Verbal Reminiscence and the Two-part Structure of The Winter's Tale", Shakespeare Survey, XXIX (1976), 67-78.

Smith, Hallett. Shakespeare's Romances: A Study of Some Ways of the Imagination. San Marino, California: Huntington 1972.

Spencer, T.J.B. "Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Romans". Lecture delivered to the Shakespeare Conference at Stratford-upon-Avon, 6 September, 1955; reprinted in Shakespeare Survey, X (1957), 27-38.

Spencer, T.J. B. "Shakespeare Learns the Value of Money: The Dramatist at Work on Timon of Athens", Shakespeare Survey, VI (1953), 75-8.

--------. (ed.) Shakespeare's Plutarch. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964.

Stratford-upon-Avon Studies 8. Later Shakespeare. Edited by J.R. Brown and B. Harris. London: Arnold 1966.

Ulrici, Hermann. Shakespeare's Dramatic Art. Translated by Alexander J.W. Morrison. London: 1846.

Weidhorn, M. "The Relation of Title and Name to Identity in Shakespearean Tragedy", Studies in English Literature 1500-1900, IX (1969), 303-19.