

THE ARDEN SHAKESPEARE

TIMON OF ATHENS

EDITED BY H. J. OLIVER



THE ARDEN EDITION OF THE
WORKS OF WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE

TIMON OF ATHENS

Edited by
H. J. OLIVER

ARDEN SHAKESPEARE PAPERBACKS

METHUEN & CO LTD

11 NEW FETTER LANE LONDON EC4

The general editors of the Arden Shakespeare have been
W. J. Craig (1899-1906), succeeded by R. H. Case (1909-1944)
and Una Ellis-Fermor (1946-1958)

Present general editors: Harold F. Brooks, Harold Jenkins
and Brian Morris

Timon of Athens was first published in the Arden Shakespeare in 1905
edited by K. Deighton

Third edition (H. J. Oliver), revised and reset, 1959
Reprinted with minor corrections 1963

First published as a University Paperback 1969
Reprinted 1977

Editorial matter © 1959 Methuen & Co Ltd

ISBN (hardbound) 0 416 47250 8
ISBN (paperback) 0 416 27860 4

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
Richard Clay (The Chaucer Press), Ltd
Bungay, Suffolk

This title is available in both hardbound and paperback
editions. The paperback edition is sold subject to the condition
that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, resold,
hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior
consent in any form of binding or cover other than that in
which it is published and without a similar condition including
this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

Distributed in the U.S.A. by
HARPER & ROW PUBLISHERS, INC.
BARNES & NOBLE IMPORT DIVISION

THE ARDEN SHAKESPEARE
GENERAL EDITORS: HAROLD F. BROOKS
AND HAROLD JENKINS

TIMON OF ATHENS

PREFACE

THE present edition is not a revision of, or dependent on, K. Deighton's "old" Arden edition of *Timon of Athens*. Deighton's notes have been read with respect and are sometimes quoted, as are those of other commentators, in both agreement and disagreement; but his text was not used as the basis of mine.

In preparing this edition, I have been greatly helped by many scholars, and in particular by the General Editors of the "new" Arden series. It is a privilege to record my indebtedness to the late Professor Una Ellis-Fermor for numerous characteristic acts of kindness and for much good advice, especially on the arrangement of the material in the Introduction; she was able to read that part of my edition in typescript and generously expressed her approval of it. Dr Harold Brooks also has answered questions put to him from time to time and, without imposing opinions in any way, has contributed much that is valuable, particularly to the Explanatory Notes.

Mr J. C. Maxwell, who has collaborated with Professor J. Dover Wilson on the edition of this play for the New Shakespeare series (C.U.P.), generously sent me page-proofs of his work; and although these did not reach me until my edition was in the press, I am glad to have been able to insert mention of his interpretation of i. i. 33-4, iii. iii. 34-5, and iv. iii. 451, 457. (Other references to Mr Maxwell's opinions are to his earlier article on the play, listed in my bibliography.)

Dr James G. McManaway and Dr Charlton Hinman, of the Folger Shakespeare Library, were most generous in arranging to send me microfilms of Folio texts of *Timon*; and Dr Hinman added to that kindness by sending me in advance a copy of an address on problems of Folio texts which he was preparing for delivery at the Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association in Washington, D.C., in December 1956. Dr F. D. Hoeniger, of Victoria College, Toronto (editor of the Arden *Pericles*), was equally generous in drawing my attention to, and copying out for me, Edward Dowden's marginalia in his copy of Deighton's edition of *Timon*, now in the Folger; and Professor Fredson Bowers, of the University of

Virginia, spent valuable time looking through the papers of the late Philip Williams for me, in search of collected evidence on the question of the "copy" for the First Folio text of *Timon*.

I am particularly grateful to them all, and also to Mr John Metcalfe, Principal Librarian of the Public Library of N.S.W., and his Deputy, Mr G. D. Richardson, who arranged for me to have special access to the Library's copy of the First Folio and the fine collection of texts and critical works in its Shakespeare Room.

I also desire to express my thanks to the Oxford University Press for permission to print, as Appendix C of this edition, extensive selections from H. W. Fowler's translation of Lucian's *Timon the Misanthrope*, originally published at the Clarendon Press in 1905.

H. J. OLIVER

Sydney, 1958

NOTE TO 1963 REPRINT

I HAVE taken the opportunity of correcting a few minor errors and misprints; of distinguishing between the first three editions of Rowe and between the various editions of Steevens and Reed, where those editors are mentioned in collations or notes; and of revising or adding to the explanatory notes, at II. ii. 237; III. vi. 114; IV. iii. 2-3, 123, 163; and V. i. 34.

I have tried to profit from the comments of reviewers and other readers of the first edition and am particularly grateful to Professor G. Blakemore Evans (*J.E.G.P.* 59, 1960), Mr J. C. Maxwell, and Mr E. J. Dennis for helpful suggestions.

Since this revised edition was prepared, Professor Charlton Hinman, in *The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare* (Oxford 1963), has revealed that in different copies of the First Folio *Timon* there are variant states of pages Gg1^v and hh5 (as well as of gg2^v); these variants, however, are insignificant and do not alter the text. (For gg2^v, see pp. xxxi-xxxii of my Introduction; see also p. 26.)

H. J. O.

University of N.S.W., 1963

ABBREVIATIONS AND REFERENCES

The following abbreviations are used for the principal editions cited in the Collations and Explanatory Notes:

Rowe	<i>The Works</i> , ed. N. Rowe, 1709 (2 editions), 1714.
Pope	<i>The Works</i> , ed. Alexander Pope, 1723-5.
Theobald	<i>The Works</i> , ed. L. Theobald, 1733, 1740.
Hanmer	<i>The Works</i> , ed. Sir T. Hanmer, 1744.
Warburton	<i>The Works</i> , ed. with Notes by Pope and William Warburton, 1747.
Johnson	<i>The Plays</i> , ed. Samuel Johnson, 1765.
Capell	<i>The Comedies, Histories and Tragedies</i> , ed. Edward Capell, 1768.
Steevens	<i>The Plays</i> , ed. with Notes by Johnson and George Steevens, 1773, 1778, 1793.
Malone	<i>The Plays and Poems</i> , ed. E. Malone, 1790.
Reed	<i>The Plays</i> , ed. Johnson and Steevens, revised and augmented by Isaac Reed, 1785, 1803, 1813.
Singer	<i>The Dramatic Works</i> , ed. S. W. Singer, 1826.
Knight	<i>The Comedies, Histories, Tragedies and Poems</i> , ed. Charles Knight, 1838-43 (<i>The Pictorial Shakespeare</i>).
Collier	<i>The Works</i> , ed. J. Payne Collier, 1842-4, 1853, 1858.
Verplanck	<i>The Plays</i> , ed. G. C. Verplanck, 1847 (<i>The Illustrated Shakespeare</i>).
Delius	<i>Shakespeares Werke</i> , ed. N. Delius, 1854.
Hudson	<i>The Complete Works</i> , ed. H. N. Hudson, 1851-6 (<i>The Harvard Shakespeare</i>).
Dyce	<i>The Works</i> , ed. Alexander Dyce, 1857, 1864-7.
Grant White	<i>The Works</i> , ed. R. Grant White, 1857-66.
Staunton	<i>The Works</i> , ed. Howard Staunton, 1858-60.
Camb. Edd.	<i>The Works</i> , ed. W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright, 1863-6, 1891-3 (<i>The Cambridge Shakespeare</i>).
Keightley	<i>The Plays</i> , ed. Thomas Keightley, 1864.
Globe	<i>The Works</i> , ed. W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright, 1864 (<i>The Globe Edition</i>).
Rolfe	<i>The Works</i> , ed. W. J. Rolfe, 1871-96.
Evans	<i>Timon of Athens</i> , Intro. and Notes by H. A. Evans, [1890] (<i>The Henry Irving Shakespeare</i>).
Deighton	<i>Timon of Athens</i> , ed. K. Deighton, 1905, 1929 (<i>The Arden Shakespeare</i>).

Fletcher	<i>Timon of Athens</i> , ed. R. H. Fletcher, 1913 (<i>The Tudor Shakespeare</i>).
Williams	<i>Timon of Athens</i> , ed. Stanley T. Williams, 1919 (<i>The Yale Shakespeare</i>).
Ridley	<i>Timon of Athens</i> , ed. M. R. Ridley, 1934 (<i>The New Temple Shakespeare</i>).
Kittredge	<i>The Complete Works</i> , ed. G. L. Kittredge, 1936.
Alexander	<i>The Complete Works</i> , ed. Peter Alexander, 1951.
Sisson	<i>The Complete Works</i> , ed. C. J. Sisson, [1954].

The conjectures of Dowden are those recorded in his manuscript notes in a copy of the Arden edition of *Timon of Athens* now in the Folger Shakespeare Library; those of Becket, Daniel, Heath, Jackson, Mason, Mitford, and Rann are cited from the collations of the Cambridge editors.

Titles of works mentioned in the Introduction and Appendices are cited in full; the following abbreviations are used in the Explanatory Notes or in footnotes:

Abbott	E. A. Abbott, <i>A Shakespearian Grammar</i> (3rd edition, London 1873).
Armstrong	E. A. Armstrong, <i>Shakespeare's Imagination</i> (London 1946).
Joseph	Sister Miriam Joseph, <i>Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language</i> (Columbia U.P., N.Y. 1947).
Kennedy	M. B. Kennedy, <i>The Oration in Shakespeare</i> (Univ. of North Carolina 1942).
Kökeritz	Helge Kökeritz, <i>Shakespeare's Pronunciation</i> (Yale 1953).
M.L.R.	<i>The Modern Language Review</i> (C.U.P.).
M.P.	<i>Modern Philology</i> (Univ. of Chicago).
Maxwell	J. C. Maxwell, 'Timon of Athens', <i>Scrutiny</i> , xv, 3 (Summer 1948), 195-208.
N. & Q.	<i>Notes and Queries</i> .
Noble	R. Noble, <i>Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge</i> (London 1935).
North's Plutarch	<i>The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes, compared together by that grave learned philosopher and historiographer, Plutarke of Chaeronea: Translated out of Greeke into French by James Amiot . . . and out of French into English, by Thomas North</i> (4th edition 1676).
O.E.D.	<i>The Oxford English Dictionary, being a corrected re-issue of A New English Dictionary upon Historical Principles</i> (1933).
P.M.L.A.	<i>Publications of the Modern Language Association</i> (of America).
Painter	William Painter, <i>The Palace of Pleasure</i> , 1566.
Partridge	Eric Partridge, <i>Shakespeare's Bawdy</i> (London 1947).
Pettet	E. C. Pettet, 'Timon of Athens: The Disruption of Feudal Morality', <i>R.E.S.</i> , xxiii (1947), 321-36.
Phillips	J. E. Phillips, <i>The State in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman Plays</i> (Columbia U.P., N.Y. 1940).
R.E.S.	<i>The Review of English Studies</i> (O.U.P.).
S.B.	<i>Studies in Bibliography</i> (Bibliographical Society, Univ. of Virginia).
S.Q.	<i>Shakespeare Quarterly</i> (Shakespeare Association of America, N.Y.).

Schmidt	Alexander Schmidt, <i>Shakespeare-Lexicon</i> (2nd edition, Berlin 1886).
Shadwell	<i>The History of Timon of Athens the Man-Hater</i> (1678; ed. Willis Vickery, The Bankside-Restoration Shakespeare, N.Y. 1907).
Sisson	C. J. Sisson, <i>New Readings in Shakespeare</i> (C.U.P. 1956).
Spurgeon	Caroline Spurgeon, <i>Shakespeare's Imagery and What it Tells Us</i> (C.U.P. 1935).
Tilley	M. P. Tilley, <i>A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries</i> (Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor 1950).
Wright	Joseph Wright, <i>The English Dialect Dictionary</i> , 1900.

Abbreviations used for the titles of Shakespeare's other plays are those of C. T. Onions, *A Shakespeare Glossary* (2nd edition, Oxford 1919), p. x; and the line-numbers cited for these plays are those of the Globe Edition.

INTRODUCTION

I. THE TEXT

A. THE FOLIO

Timon of Athens is one of the eighteen plays now regularly thought of as Shakespeare's which, not having appeared separately in Quarto during his lifetime, were first printed, after his death, in the First Folio of 1623; and before publication it was therefore entered in the Stationers' Register by Isaac Jaggard and Edward Blount, on 8 November 1623, among the "Copies as are not formerly entred to other men".

For this play, then, the Folio is the only text. But *Timon* differs in many important respects from other "Folio plays" and sometimes presents an editor with problems that are unique.

It is known¹ that *Timon* was not originally intended for the position it now has in the Folio, after *Romeo and Juliet* and before *Julius Cæsar*. There survives in some copies of the Folio a leaf (gg3) with the last page of *Romeo and Juliet* (p. 77) on the recto and the first page of *Troilus and Cressida* (p. 78) on the verso. But there were difficulties over the text of *Troilus and Cressida*, which was therefore withdrawn, and printing was resumed with *Julius Cæsar*. At a later stage (not, as was thought until recently, in October or November 1623 after the printing of *Cymbeline*, the last play in the Folio, but, as J. W. Schroeder has shown, at an earlier date "during an interval in the printing of portions of *Hamlet*, *Lear* and *Othello*"²), *Timon* was printed to fill the gap left between *Romeo and Juliet* and *Julius Cæsar*. The original leaf gg3 was cancelled and a new quire signed gg begun³; the last page of *Romeo and Juliet* was reprinted on

1. The pioneer conclusions of E. E. Willoughby in *The Printing of the First Folio of Shakespeare* (Bibliographical Society, Oxford, 1932) have now been modified by, particularly, Giles E. Dawson, 'A Bibliographical Problem in the First Folio of Shakespeare', *The Library*, 4th ser., xxii (1942), 25-33; W. W. Greg, *The Shakespeare First Folio* (Oxford, 1955); John W. Schroeder, *The Great Folio of 1623* (1956); and the conclusions of Charlton Hinman from his collations of the First Folios in the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C., including those stated in his paper 'Bibliographical Oddities in the Shakespeare First Folio' read to the Modern Language Association in Washington in December 1956.

2. *Op. cit.*, p. 87. 3. The actual signatures are Gg, gg², gg³.

the recto of the new gg1 and *Timon* begun on the verso. (And since the reprinted page was wrongly numbered 79 instead of 77, there were now no pages numbered 77 and 78 in *Romeo and Juliet* and the first three pages of *Timon* were wrongly numbered also as 80-2; the correct pagination did not begin again until 81 was repeated on the new gg3^r.) *Timon* proved to be a much shorter play than *Troilus and Cressida*, for which the remainder of the original quire gg and the whole of quires hh and ii had been allowed; *Timon* ended on hh5^v (p. 98). Accordingly an unusual (and inaccurate) list of dramatis personae, headed "The Actors Names", was printed to fill up hh6^r; the verso, exceptionally, was left blank; and since *Julius Caesar* began on quire kk, on p. 109, there are no quire ii and no pages numbered 99-108 in this section of the Folio.

The conclusion that *Timon* would not have appeared at all in the First Folio if there had been no difficulties over *Troilus and Cressida* can nevertheless not be drawn with full confidence, since there is nothing to show that *Timon* was not originally intended for a later place in the volume. But there are many other curious features of the text which lend some weight to the conjecture.

B. "INCONSISTENCIES AND LOOSE ENDS"

Even before the days of modern bibliography, editors and readers of *Timon* were puzzled by what seemed to be loose ends in the play or even false starts, by certain inconsistencies in the naming of the characters or the spelling of their names, and by the exceptional irregularity of the versification, which more often than in any other play by Shakespeare refused to scan according to the regular iambic pentameter pattern.

Under the first head, the appearances of Ventidius in the play were perhaps most often cited as difficulties. In the opening scene,¹ Timon generously redeems him from prison by paying the debt of five talents for which he has been imprisoned (and the name here is spelt "Ventidius"). It was then argued that Ventidius' refusal of help to Timon when Timon was in need of money would mark the climax of ingratitude, be the last straw. And Timon does indeed instruct the Steward to approach Ventidius for help (at ii. ii. 224-35, where the name is spelt "Ventiddius"). We do see Lucius and Lucullus refuse assistance, but we only hear casually and indirectly, from Sempronius, of Ventidius' refusal (at iii. iii. 4-10, where the spelling becomes "Ventidgius"). But he does refuse; and therefore his earlier offer to repay the money to Timon at i. ii. 1-8 is regarded

1. Here and throughout the Introduction, by "act" and "scene" I refer to the usual modern divisions of the play (found, for example, in the "Globe" edition): in the Folio text there are no act and scene divisions at all in *Timon*.

as an inconsistency or false start (and the name there is "Ventigius"). Obviously, and to anticipate, the door was wide open for a theory of divided authorship, with one author spelling "Venti(d)d(ius)" and the other "Venti(d)d(i)gius".

Alcibiades was also regarded as a character whose proper place in the play had not been determined. The scene of his banishment from Athens—because he insists on pleading before an ungrateful Senate for the life of a friend who is neither named nor mentioned anywhere else in the play—was a particular puzzle; and E. H. Wright, for one, proclaimed that it "has not the slightest reference to Timon or the remotest relation to anything whatsoever that takes place in the half of the play preceding".¹ The same critic was worried by the effect of the appearance of Alcibiades at the end of the play as "a kind of Fortinbras in the drama, fighting out the wrongs at which Timon can only curse"²; Hardin Craig spoke of "the rather inconsistent Alcibiades" who "appears as a restorer of normal social life—a sort of Richmond or Octavius"³; and E. K. Chambers could not make up his mind whether Alcibiades was intended to contrast with Timon or was "merely Timon over again, in a weaker and less clearly motivated version of the disillusioned child of fortune".⁴

Chambers, again, found the very presence of the faithful steward in the play a further difficulty. "What", he asked, "is the precise dramatic purpose served by the good steward . . . and his sentimentalities, which seem to give the lie to Timon's wholesale condemnation of humanity, without any appreciable effect upon its direction or its force?"⁵

Finally, Timon himself seemed an unsatisfactory character. J. W. Draper could not reconcile the Steward's praise of Timon with what seemed to him a lack of common sense in the Timon of the first two acts: "Clearly", he wrote, "Shakespeare intended his audience to admire Timon's very prodigality",⁶ but Draper found that he could not admire it himself. More recently, Una Ellis-Fermor has complained that Timon simply does not exist as a person. For a tragic hero he is, in her eyes, curiously "colourless and neutral"⁷; and this, at least, is a serious charge against the play.

Under the second head, inconsistency in the naming of characters, there was also no lack of material. The Ventidius-Ventigius—

1. *The Authorship of "Timon of Athens"* (N.Y., 1910), p. 44. 2. *Ibid.*, p. 17.

3. *An Interpretation of Shakespeare* (N.Y., 1948), p. 253.

4. *Shakespeare: A Survey* (London, 1925), p. 269. 5. *Ibid.*, p. 269.

6. 'The Theme of *Timon of Athens*', *M.L.R.*, xxix (1934), 21.

7. '*Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play*', *R.E.S.*, xviii (1942), 283.

Ventidius–Ventidgius sequence has already been noted; and it may be added that the spellings “Apemantus” and “Apermantus” are both found from time to time in the Folio text, though not necessarily in separate scenes as are the various spellings of Ventidius. Worse, the two women who visit Timon with Alcibiades and are given gold to destroy mankind are called in that scene (iv. iii) “Phrynia” and “Timandra”; but apparently they are also the “Phrinica and Timandylo” who, we are told at v. i. 5–6, “had gold of him”. Worst of all, the character who is elsewhere in the play consistently called only “Steward” is apparently the one who in i. ii. 153–202 is temporarily named “Flavius”; but later, at ii. ii. 189, while the Steward is on stage, Timon, calling for two servants, names one of them “Flavius”, and that one seems to be identical with the “Flaminius” who goes to Lucullus to ask aid for Timon in iii. i.

Under the third head, of versification, perhaps the most important features are the extremely free verse of many parts of the play, so free that it has not even the “ghost” of the iambic pentameter behind it as has most of the free verse of, say, T. S. Eliot; the large proportion and irregular occurrence of prose; and the high number of rhymes, often occurring at the most unexpected places. The general impression is perhaps even more important here than any single speech; but particular reference may be made to a speech by Apemantus (i. ii. 38–52) which (so far as one can judge) begins as prose, has three lines of verse in the middle, returns to prose, and ends with a rhymed couplet (though that is also printed as prose in the Folio). Another instance of irregularity is the speech of Alcibiades to the Senate (iii. v. 41–59); and still another, perhaps the most frequently cited, is the soliloquy of the Steward at iv. ii. 30–51 which Chambers described as an “alternation of jolting rhymed couplets with lines in which the metre seems suddenly to come to an abrupt stop”¹ while Wright could only call it “little more than prose run mad in the inferior author’s manner”² (and therefore to be ascribed to a lesser dramatist than Shakespeare).

C. THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS

Before proceeding to any such theory of collaboration, the modern reader will want to know whether bibliography can throw any light on the problem and in particular whether any of the peculiarities of the text can be explained as the fault of the compositor (or compositors) who set the play in type or as the result of any abnormality in the “copy” provided. It is not a question to

1. *Shakespeare: A Survey*, p. 271. 2. *Op. cit.*, p. 46.

which as yet any final answer can be given, but the following is a tentative analysis of the evidence.

The usual spelling tests¹ suggest that *Timon of Athens* (except, possibly, one or two pages) was set up in type by the more inaccurate of the two main compositors of the First Folio, the so-called "Compositor B". His characteristic spellings "yong", "heere", "deere", "greefe", "do", "go", "divell" and "bin", for example, are far more in evidence than the alternative spellings favoured by his principal colleague, "A"; one also finds his rather exceptional use of apostrophes and, as Hinman has recently pointed out, a preference for one long dash over two short ones to indicate the breaking-off of a speech.² Hinman has also added the information that, except possibly for one page, *Timon* is set throughout from the same type cases—and this happens in the Tragedies only when a play is set by one man.

Already, then, one is faced by a likelihood of some textual corruption, for Compositor B has been proved careless. He is likely to omit words and make other errors through trying to carry too many words in his head; and he will sometimes set prose as verse or verse as prose, either to make the layout of the page look more attractive or simply to fit a predetermined number of words into a given space.

The further complication is that alongside the characteristic spellings of Compositor B, there are others, not compositorial, which are probably a "show-through" from the copy he was setting up in type. At this stage, the evidence becomes very difficult to interpret, and bibliography is in danger of completing the vicious circle if it argues that the presence of some spellings suggests a certain compositor and then that the absence of them or the presence of others suggests a characteristic of the copy (rather than a different compositor). But used with care (and particular care when B is involved, since he was more likely to alter spellings in his copy than were his colleagues), the evidence of unusual spellings in a printed play can give presumptive evidence of the nature of the copy from which the compositor worked.

1. See, for example, Willoughby, *The Printing of the First Folio*; Hinman, 'Principles Governing the Use of Various Spellings as Evidence of Alternate Setting by Two Compositors', *The Library*, 4th ser., xxi (1941), 78-94; Alice Walker, *Textual Problems of the First Folio* (Camb., 1953); Greg, *The Shakespeare First Folio*; Williams, 'New Approaches to Textual Problems in Shakespeare', *S.B.*, viii (1956), 3-14.

2. 'Bibliographical Oddities in the First Folio'. Compositor "E" was not concerned with *Timon*—possibly because he "was not regarded as competent to deal with manuscript copy" (Hinman, 'The Prentice Hand in the Tragedies of the Shakespeare First Folio: Compositor E', *S.B.*, ix (1957), 3-20).

It is certain that the copy for *Timon* was not prompt-copy or any kind of manuscript that had been used in a theatre. The very first stage-direction, for example, says "Enter Poet, Painter, Jeweller, Merchant, and Mercer" although as far as one can determine there is no Mercer in the play. (There are speech-prefixes "*Mer.*" but they apparently stand for the Merchant; and the Poet and Painter discuss the other *two* people on stage, not three.) Such a "ghost-character" would certainly be struck out in a prompt-book but is characteristic of author's "foul papers" (or a transcript of them): the author writes down a list of characters he may require but forgets one of them or changes his mind.¹ The error is all the more likely to remain, of course, if the author has in fact never read through his manuscript but has left it unrevised.²

The "false exit" such as one finds at iv. iii. 377-95 is also not likely to stand in a prompt-book. Here, after Timon and Apemantus have indulged in a valedictory exchange of insults, Timon begins what reads like a soliloquy: "Then, Timon, presently prepare thy grave . . ."; yet when he has finished speaking, one is astonished to find Apemantus still on stage. The explanation is not that the lines are misplaced; Apemantus replies to Timon's last words. One can only conclude that the author changed his mind while writing and did not go back to alter.

The stage-directions also are of the kind characteristic of foul papers rather than of prompt-copy. "Ventigius which Timon redeem'd from prison", when the character is re-introduced, reads like an author's reminder to himself; and "Then comes dropping after all Apemantus discontentedly like himself" is at the best an indication of what the *author* would like to see on the stage. These fall within the class that Greg has called "descriptive stage-directions"; others, such as "Enter divers Friends at severall doores" (iii. vi. 1), are "permissive" and make no attempt to decide the exact number of characters who are to be on the stage.³ The calling of servants by their masters' names (e.g. "Varro" and "Isidore" in ii. ii)—a kind of author's shorthand—and the decision *during* the scene to call the Second Stranger of iii. ii "Hostilius" are then further indication that the copy had not been used for theatrical performance. In fact, most of these features and the inconsistency with some of the speech-prefixes provide an exceptionally good parallel to the part of the play of *Sir Thomas More* which is now generally

1. See Greg's interesting examples, *The Shakespeare First Folio*, pp. 111-12.

2. This whole discussion of the "copy" of *Timon* should be related to what is said in Sections 3 and 7 of this Introduction on *Timon* as an unfinished play.

3. See also the directions at i. i. 245, iii. i. 1, iii. iii. 1, iv. ii. 1, v. i. 29 and v. i. 129, and notes on some of them.

believed to have been written by Shakespeare: as Alice Walker has remarked, if Hand D of that manuscript was his, then "it is plain that he left a trail of ambiguities and loose ends in the speech pre-fices of minor characters to be solved at a reviser's discretion".¹

None of the characteristics already mentioned, however, is inconsistent with the copy's having been a transcript of the foul papers. The late Philip Williams, shortly before his death in 1955, announced his belief that *Timon* "was set from a fair transcript made by the same scribe who prepared the manuscript from which the folio text of *Coriolanus* was set", his evidence being apparently largely spellings which he found in both texts and considered not typical of the Folio compositors.² I myself think it probable that part of the copy was Shakespeare's own foul papers but that another part was a transcript—and that it was a transcript made by Ralph Crane, the scribe who prepared many dramatic scripts in the early 1620s and whose transcripts are thought to have been the copy for at least five of the other plays in the First Folio.³ Again the evidence is not easy to interpret,⁴ and Crane's habits as a scribe did not remain constant; but his characteristic "ha's" for both "he has" and "has" and "'em" for "them", his curious use of apostrophes in phrases like "I'am" and "ye'have", and his fondness for hyphens, colons and parentheses are all found in the text of *Timon*. Using such cumulative evidence as this, I would suggest that at least the following sections of the copy of *Timon* were transcripts in Crane's hand of those parts of Shakespeare's foul papers which were too "foul" for a compositor easily to read:

- I. i. 176–end
- I. ii
- III. ii, iii, iv and v
- IV. iii parts, including 461–end
- V. i–end

This hypothesis is based on a study of all the spellings in the play

1. *Op. cit.*, p. 97.

2. See his paper 'New Approaches to Textual Problems in Shakespeare', posthumously published in *S.B.*, VIII (1956). Professor Fredson Bowers was kind enough to look through Williams's papers for me but could find nothing further on the problem.

3. For Crane's characteristics as a scribe see, for example, F. P. Wilson, 'Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players', *The Library*, 4th ser., VII (1927), 194–215; R. C. Bald's edition of Middleton's *A Game at Chesse* (Camb., 1929); and the Malone Society editions of *Demetrius and Enanthe* (1951) and *The Witch* (1950).

4. For example, Crane's favourite spelling "ha's" is also found in the work of Compositor "B" setting from printed copy in *Troilus and Cressida*; and forms like "I'am" are common enough at a slightly later date.

and not on the occurrence of any one in a particular scene. But once having formed from all the available evidence his theory of the copy, the editor must print in his text nothing that is inconsistent with that theory. In practice, it is only rarely that I wish to emend the Folio text of *Timon*; but, to take one example, I do believe that Sempronius' "Has much disgrac'd me in 't" at III. iii. 15 is not, as William Wells argued,¹ an instance of Middleton's alleged dropping of the personal pronoun in the nominative case but an example of the compositor's failure to set up correctly Crane's characteristic "ha's" or "h'as" (meaning "he has").²

If indeed the copy was in two hands, in some such division as that very tentatively suggested above, then it may be that there is also a bibliographical explanation of the two spellings of "Ventidius" and "Apermantus": I suggest that Crane wrote "Venti(d)-gius" and "Apermantus" where Shakespeare wrote "Ventid(d)ius" and "Apermantus". It does seem interesting, for example, that before the entrance of "Apermantus" in I. i, there are spellings which are not like Crane's (such as "vouchsafe") and spellings which are almost certainly Shakespeare's (particularly "saciety" i.e. "satiety"); immediately after his entrance are found the Crane-like "toong" ("tongue") and "whether" ("whither"). Whether this is so or not, it is clear that we shall not understand the occurrence of these various spellings of proper names until we remember that the pages were set up by the compositor not in their present order but by formes; in any set of twelve pages the normal order of setting would be 6, 7; 5, 8; 4, 9; 3, 10; 2, 11; 1, 12.³ A reader of the Folio text finds on gg2, seven lines from the bottom, "*Enter Apermantus*"; he sees "Gentle Apermantus" and the catch-

1. '*Timon of Athens*', *N. & Q.*, N.S., VI (1920), 266-9.

2. If v. i was in transcript, it may also have been the scribe who failed to notice that one of the two epitaphs on Timon had been, or had to be, deleted; he copied both and the compositor could only follow.

3. Charlton Hinman, 'Cast-off Copy for the First Folio of Shakespeare', *S. Q.*, VI. 3 (Summer 1955), 259-73. Briefly, Folio is quired in sixes: i.e., each gathering consists of three folio sheets placed one inside another, so that sheet 3 forms the third and fourth leaves of the gathering (3^r, 3^v, 4^r, 4^v: pp. 5, 6, 7, 8); sheet 2 forms the second and fifth leaves (2^r, 2^v, 5^r, 5^v: pp. 3, 4, 9, 10); and sheet 1 forms the first and sixth leaves (1^r, 1^v, 6^r, 6^v: pp. 1, 2, 11, 12). Printing proceeds with the sheets unfolded, and of course one side of the sheet (two pages) is printed at a time—either the two pages from the "outer forme" of type or the two from the "inner forme" (sheet 1^o=pp. 1, 12; sheet 1ⁱ=pp. 2, 11; sheet 2^o=pp. 3, 10; sheet 2ⁱ=pp. 4, 9; sheet 3^o=pp. 5, 8; sheet 3ⁱ=pp. 6, 7). What Hinman has shown is that not only did the printing proceed by formes, but also the pages were set up by formes and not in the order in which they appear in the printed volume; the compositor normally began with the inner forme of sheet 3. This was possible because the copy was "cast off": i.e., an estimate was made of the amount of copy that would be needed for each page.