The Naked Nature of *King Lear* and *Timon of Athens*

Miyuki Yamamoto

In respect of plots, ideas, or characters, *King Lear* has much in common with Shakespeare's other plays. For instance, *Troilus and Cressida* gives us a good clue towards understanding the idea of natural order described in *Lear*, and in Richard *II* we find the same feature of the protagonist's identity crisis in Richard as in Lear. Also, in relation to the plot features of the pastoral narrative—the banishment from society, a period of sojourn in a natural world, and an eventual return to society—*Lear* has a curious kinship with *As You Like It.*[1] However, the natural world in *Lear* is not one of green woods or forest, but the wilderness, naked and rough nature. David Young says, "The pleasant and fanciful settings of Arden are gone, and into their place rushes a natural world that is inscrutable, unpleasant, and intensely realized."[2] In this respect, *Timon of Athens* makes a good comparison with *Lear*. In fact, *Timon* has a lot in common with *Lear*. *Timon*'s theme of 'ingratitude' is comparable with *Lear*'s. After experiencing people's ingratitude, Timon, like Lear, realizes good appearance and false reality of the world. He too becomes sick of corrupt civilization and becomes anarchic. His reductive approach to life is similar to Lear's, and Timon's words

reflect Lear's: "I am sick of this false world, and will love naught / But even the mere necessities upon't" (*Tim.*, 4. 3. 378 – 79).[3] Disappointed with human ingratitude, both Lear and Timon try to live on minimum requirements. They come to think that the natural condition of human beings should be plain and simple.

However, there are difficulties in making a case about *Timon of Athens*. First, the date of the play is uncertain. Some scholars say *Timon* should be dated near 1605, a view that is supported by the play's similarities with *King Lear*. The Oxford editors and Robert H. Goldsmith agree with this theory. Others say it should be dated 1607 – 08, as would be reflecting in its connections with the Plutarchan tragedies, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*. H. J. Oliver and E. K. Chambers support this view.[4] Besides, there is a question over Shakespeare's single authorship, and as Mark Dominik says, today *Timon* is generally regarded as "some form of Middleton-Shakespeare joint work."[5] According to the Oxford editors,

> Developing a conjecture by Wells (1920) and Sykes (1924), Lake (1975), Jackson (1979), and Holdsworth have provided extensive, independent, and compelling evidence that approximately a third of the play was written by Thomas Middleton.[6]

To make matters worse, the text is incomplete and *Timon* is normally agreed to be an unfinished play, as Una Ellis-Fermor and others have declared.[7] Regardless of all these divided arguments, I would like to follow the Oxford editors' and David Farley-Hills' views that *Timon* precedes *Lear* and that Thomas Middleton is Shakespeare's collaborator.[8] Farley-Hills thinks that Plutarch is probably not a major direct source for *Timon* and that an old Timon comedy is a

common source to *Timon* and *Lear*.[9] He says,

> It seems to me much more likely that Shakespeare abandoned the completion of *Timon* at the last moment with the realization that he could achieve a much more satisfactory working of its main theme in a new play, than that having achieved his greatest play he would want to go over similar ground again, only to find he'd made a mess of it.[10]

What I intend to do in this essay is to stand on the premise that *Timon of Athens* is *King Lear*'s precursor, and discuss how in the different plays Shakespeare developed a similar theme concerning appearance and reality.

Timon of Athens and *King Lear* share the same theme of good appearance and false reality. In the first act of *Timon*, there are tremendous manifestaions of good appearance around Timon, with flatterers, gold, jewels, and feasting. In such a sumptuous world, Timon is incredibly generous and bounteous.[11] For example, he redeems Ventidius from prison and gives one of his servants considerable money to match with a girl whom he wants to marry. Because he is himself so openhanded, he has unreasonable expectations that others will treat him as he does them. In Timon we find the same kind of self-satisfactory expectations that Lear has towards his daughters. Like Lear who believes in the filial affection of his daughters, Timon believes in true friendship: "I am wealthy in my friends" (*Tim.*, 2. 2. 181). He never imagines being deceived by those he calls his friends and we call flatterers. He is once overjoyed and weeps, saying to one of them,

... the gods
themselves have provided that I shall have much help
from you. How had you been my friends else ? ...
'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, ... ' ....
Why, I have often wished 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.

(*Tim.*, 1. 2. 85 – 87, 91 – 95, 97 – 104)

Nevertheless, after three acts, the false reality is revealed : Timon goes bankrupt and flatterers turn out to be his cruel creditors. Timon is bitterly disillusioned with friendship. There is a crucial scene which makes him completely give up friendship. In act 3, scene 4, servants of Timon's creditors rush to him with bills and try to collect money from him.

TITUS' SERVANT My lord, here is my bill.
LUCIUS' SERVANT Here's mine.
[HORTENSIUS' SERVANT] And mine, my lord.
VARRO'S [FIRST *and*] SECOND SERVANTS

And ours, my lord.

PHILOTUS' SERVANT All our bills.

TIMON Knock me down with 'em, cleave me to the girdle.

(*Tim.*, 3. 4. 85 – 88)

This scene reminds me of the scene in *King Lear* where Gonerill and Regan torment Lear by reducing the number of his hundred knights to none: "What need you five and twenty? ten? or five?" (*Lr.*, Gonerill: 2. 4. 254), "What need one?" (*Lr.*, Regan: 2. 4. 256).[12] Here the theme of ingratitude is evident. As Lear is disillusioned by his own daughters, Timon finally realizes he is betrayed by his friends. Like Lear, Timon understands that his friends admire not what he is but what he has. Timon curses them, calling them, "Most smiling, smooth, detested parasites, / Courteous destroyers, affable wolves, meek bears, / You fools of fortune, trencher-friends, time's flies, / Cap-and-knee slaves, vapours, and minute-jacks!" (*Tim.*, 3. 7. 93 – 96). His rage is huge because his expectation has been immense. As a result of their ingratitude, he becomes anarchic and pursues the naked truth by disrobing his clothes. The following soliloquy demonstrates Timon's determination to leave the Athenian society:

Piety and fear,
Religion to the gods, peace, justice, truth,
Domestic awe, night rest, and neighbourhood,
Instruction, manners, mysteries, and trades,
Degrees, observances, customs, and laws,
Decline to your confounding contraries,
And let confusion live! . . .

[*He tears off his clothes*]

> Nothing I'll bear from thee
> But nakedness, thou detestable town ; . . .
> Timon will to the woods, where he shall find
> Th'unkindest beast more kinder than mankind.
>
> (*Tim.*, 4. 1. 15 – 21, 32 – 33, 35 – 36)

Timon's "let confusion live!" sounds like an echo of Lear's "Let copulation thrive" (*Lr.*, 4. 5. 110). Timon comes to detest the Athenian society and wants its ruin. He regards clothes as a symbol polluted in the corrupt civilization and gets rid of them in a quest for naked truth. Not only his anger at ingratitude but also his disclothing behaviour and, of course, his journey to the wilderness parallel Lear's.

In spite of all the similarities, however, there are differences between Timon and Lear. In both plays, good appearance and false reality, hence, the 'covered' and 'naked' conditions of the protagonists, are contrasted. Since both Timon and Lear go from one extreme end to the other, Apemantus' words to Timon can be true of Lear : "The middle of humanity thou never knewest, but the extremity of both ends" (*Tim.*, 4. 3. 302 – 03). Nevertheless, unlike Timon, Lear has a good natured daughter, Cordelia, who demonstrates the "middle of humanity" and comes to terms with naked nature. Cordelia shows that our natural condition is different from that of animals : we human beings need coverings for protection and dignity. On the other hand, for Timon, there is no one who plays such a part as Cordelia. Strangely, there are no references to Timon's family ties. At the beginning of the play, Timon is a fool who mistakes flatterers for his true friends and gives them all. Then, after his bankruptcy, he intensifies his dehumanization. Timon's loyal servant Flavius tries to

succour Timon from despair, saying, "O let me stay / And comfort you, my master" (*Tim.*, 4.3.534 – 35). At first Timon admires Flavius' loyalty, saying, "Had I a steward / So true, so just, and now so comfortable ? / It almost turns my dangerous nature mild" (*Tim.*, 4.3. 491 – 93). He emphasizes the rarity of Flavius' sincerity with such words like "I do proclaim / One honest man—mistake me not, but one, / No more, I pray—and he's a steward .... all save thee / I fell with curses" (*Tim.*, 4.3.497 – 99, 501 – 02), "Thou singly honest man" (*Tim.*, 4.3.524). However, he cannot accept Flavius and keeps him away from himself. Flavius to Timon cannot be Cordelia to Lear. After all, Flavius is not Timon's own flesh and blood. He is more like Kent or Gloucester, whose labours are not so much admired by their master, and Timon treats him similarly. Apemantus takes a similar role to the Fool in *Lear*, but he behaves in more sardonic way towards Timon. Since the beginning Apemantus has assailed corrupt Athenian society and Timon's stupidity, but Timon has not really listened to him. As a result of his disillusionment with the ingratitude of the Athenian people, Timon hates all mankind, with no exceptions. He drastically changes himself from a silly extragavant to an obstinate misanthrope. It seems that these extremities of Timon make it harder for us to sympathize with his misfortune. Hence, there are opinions such as Maurice Charney's: "[*Timon of Athens*] is so overwhelmingly satirical, so incomplete in its conception of its tragic protagonist. Timon is so neatly divided between excessive love and excessive hatred of mankind that he doesn't seem tragic at all." [13]

Surely Timon is not satisfactory as tragedy, but it is effective as satiric. Until Timon finally goes bankrupt he has maintained superficial relationships with his flatterers. For undeserved people he

has blindly spent more money than he can afford. He is evidently unwise. The more such foolishness and optimism of Timon are suggested, the more satiric and the less tragical he seems to be. I do not entirely disagree with G. Wilson Knight's opinion that Timon is a noble figure whose generosity is abused by a vicious and ignoble world. Knight maintains, "Timon himself is the flower of human aspiration. His generosity lacks wisdom, but is itself noble; his riches reflect the inborn aristocracy of his heart." [14] However, Knight's praise for Timon is generally too much. In the first place, seen as a tragic protagonist, Timon's characterization is incomplete: not only his familial relationship but his social status is unclear. He is only hinted to be a militarily influential person in Athens [ALCIBIADES "...neighbour states / But for thy [Timon's] sword and fortune trod upon them [the Athenians]" (*Tim.*, 4.3.95–96)]. We do not know how important Timon is to Athens, and vice versa. In contrast, Lear has a sufficient condition for a tragic hero in terms of his social position and his familial relationship. He is innately fated to be involved in a scramble for political power. The two elder daughters intrigue against him, and his only happiness, Cordelia, is killed as a victim in a political power game. Unlike Timon's retributive misfortune, Lear's misfortune is very fatalistic.

Moreover, the depiction of society makes a crucial difference between Lear's and Timon's characterization. On the one hand, *Timon*'s society is very much based on grotesque capitalism. Lewis Walker, who studies Shakespeare's attempt to demonstrate the operations of the goddess through dramatic action in *Timon*, maintains that

> [Timon's friends] are not friends or equals, but rivals.... If one is chosen to receive Fortune's favor, the others regard him as momentarily ahead in the competition. Timon is described as having been elevated not only above his peers but also above some who were formerly his betters.[15]

There is considerable emphasis on the corruption of society, too. Athenian society is far from the brotherly communion Timon has idealized. It is a cannibalistic mutual devouring and materialistic society where money, the "visible god" (*Tim.*, 4. 3. 389), is valued more than anything else. As Gail K. Paster states, "The mentality of Athens is so narrowly materialistic that the bonding agent in this social fabric is not love, as it is in *Lear*, but rather money."[16] In such a materialistic world, Timon seems to be an ignorant agent in practicing such egalitarian charity as Lear and Gloucester idealize after their misfortunes:

> LEAR Take physic, pomp,
> Expose thyself to feel what wretches feel,
> That thou mayst shake the superflux to them
> And show the heavens more just. (*Lr.*, 3. 4. 33 – 36)

> GLOUCESTER ... distribution should undo excess,
> And each man have enough. (*Lr.*, 4. 1. 65 – 66)

After his disillusionment, Timon, like Lear, tries to destroy Athenian social order by an act of will, creating an imagery of universal upheaval with his verbal power:

Piety and fear,
Religion to the gods, peace, justice, truth,
Domestic awe, night rest, and neighbourhood,
Instruction, manners, mysteries, and trades,
Degrees, observances, customs, and laws,
Decline to your confounding contraries,
And let confusion live!

(*Tim.*, 4. 1. 15 – 21)

However, ironically from the beginning of the play, we cannot sense any social order ruled over Athenian society. What we perceive is that an individual reductive approach to life does not affect the society, for his misfortune never causes any fluctuation of society as a whole. Therefore, Timon's abuse on the Athenian society shows only how he is estranged from the materialism widely that is spread all over society. This is not tragic but satiric.

Blindly, Timon behaves like a king in giving charity in the capitalistic and materialistic world, and his words confirm this fact. After his fall Timon expresses his sorrow at the disintegration of his identity. Bitterly hurt by his friends' ingratitude, he says to Apemantus,

. . . myself,
Who had the world as my confectionary,
The mouths, the tongues, the eyes and hearts of men
At duty, more than I could frame employment,
That numberless upon me stuck, as leaves
Do on the oak, have with one winter's brush
Fell from their boughs, and left me open, bare

For every storm that blows—I to bear this,

That never knew but better, is some burden.

(*Tim.,* 4. 3. 260 – 68)

This speech of Timon recalls Lear's: "They flattered me like a dog and told me I had the white hairs in my beard ere the black ones were there. To say 'ay' and 'no' to everything that I said 'ay' and 'no' to was no good divinity" (*Lr.,* 4. 5. 94 – 97). Nevertheless, although if Lear made this speech of Timon it might sound sympathetic, in Timon's case it sounds rather pathetic. Timon is not a king in a feudal world like Lear. Apemantus, who sees Timon's firm resolution to retreat from the society and to return to nature as if it were the only safe place, appears to be ridiculing Timon's stupidity of having mistaken himself for a kingly figure:

What, think'st

That the bleak air, thy boisterous chamberlain,

Will put thy shirt on warm? Will these mossed trees

That have outlived the eagle page thy heels

And skip when thou point'st out? Will the cold brook,

Candied with ice, caudle thy morning taste

To cure thy o'ernight's surfeit? Call the creatures

Whose naked natures live in all the spite

Of wreakful heaven, whose bare unhousèd trunks

To the conflicting elements exposed

Answer mere nature; bid them flatter thee.

O, thou shalt find—

(*Tim.,* 4. 3. 222 – 33)

In contrast with Timon's materialistic and capitalistic society, Lear's society is based on solid feudalism. Therefore, Lear's fall is not confined to his private misfortune like Timon's. So things actually happen, whereas Timon can only vainly invoke them in his words. In *Lear,* the imagery of unnaturalness, disorder, and corruption is widely created. Gloucester illustrates how all human relationships fail in such a world: "Love cools, friendship falls off, brothers divide. In cities, mutinies; in countries, discord; in palaces, treason; and the bond cracked 'twixt son and father" (*Lr.,* 1. 2. 94 – 96). The disordered parent-child relationship, not only in Lear's family but also in Gloucester's family, exemplifies this universal upheaval. Thus, in *King Lear* Shakespeare demonstrates how Lear's misfortune confuses every degree in the Great Chain of Being.[17] Unlike in *Timon* whose world seems to function closer to that of the modern capitalism, in *Lear* there are correspondences between Lear and society and between society and universe. In such a situation, Lear's misfortune expands its meaning. Also, in such a situation, Lear experiences afflictions which Timon does not go through. Although Lear's anger starts with Gonerill's and Regan's ingratitude, Lear does not cling to it for long. Reconciliation with Cordelia kills his rage at ingratitude, and he ceases to curse his monstrous daughters. Moreover, even before the reconciliation, Lear gradually loses his interest in the issue of ingratitude. His mind comes to be occupied with other, more complicated problems.

In my opinion, there are two kinds of conflict in Lear with which are not treated in Timon: the first one is disillusionment with kingship and the second is disillusionment with divine justice. As an earthly God, Lear has believed in a king's privileged relationship with

God for a long time, but in his adversity he discovers his kingship has no appeal to God. Though Lear asks for God's help, God does not answer him. Lear has to admit the fact that the King is not something special to God, but is treated just like ordinary men. The anguish of such an inner conflict disintegrates Lear's sense of identity and drives him mad. His despair at the disillusionment is well expressed in his words: "When the rain came to wet me once and the wind to make me chatter, when the thunder would not peace at my bidding, there I found 'em, there I smelt 'em out" (*Lr.,* 4. 5. 97 – 100). However, the time comes when Lear dissolves the conflict. The reconciliation with Cordelia kills Lear's rage at ingratitude and pulls himself together. His words, "I am a very foolish, fond old man, / Fourscore and upward, / Not an hour more nor less" (*Lr.,* 4. 6. 57 – 59) will be his declaration that at last he has given up kingship and accepted himself as he is. Thus, thanks to Cordelia, Lear overcomes his despondency and succeeds in reconstituting himself.

Nevertheless, that is not the end of his suffering. There is another conflict which grows to agonize Lear—disillusionment with divine justice. At some point in the play Lear begins to doubt God's justice, and the death of Cordelia in the final scene completely disillusions his belief that God stands by the good and right. Until Cordelia's death, Lear has taken it for granted that gods and Nature should punish evil to keep things in order. Also, since Lear thinks that divine existence should have some intention and purpose to make things happen, he again and again appeals to supernatural powers to punish Gonerill and Regan. He believes his own absolute innocence. However, the death of the most innocent Cordelia refutes his belief. His faith shaken, Lear is at a loss. His cry at the death of Cordelia, "Why

should a dog, a horse, a rat have life, / And thou no breath at all? " (*Lr.*, 5.3.280–81), is his ultimate question of divine dispensation. Seeking a relationship with superhuman existence in his adversity, Lear is disillusioned by first, his idea of kingship, and next, his idea of God's justice. It is really hard for the eighty–year–old man to give up long-term beliefs and reconstitute himself. Thus, Lear's disillusionment with his kingship and supernatural existence are serious, all the more because he has been largely dependent on them.

In conclusion, it is uncertain whether Shakespeare started working on *King Lear* realizing he could achieve more than what he had done with Middleton in *Timon of Athens*, but it is plausible. But I have observed, despite the two plays' similar starting points, *Lear* grows forward into areas of experience that are closed off in *Timon*.

Notes

1) Maynard Mack points out *Lear*'s structure as "the shape of pastoral romance" (63). He says that *Lear* alludes to patterns of As *You Like It* and turns them upside down [*'King Lear' in Our Time* (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1966) 63–66].
2) David Young, *The Heart's Forest: A Study of Shakespeare's Pastoral Plays* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1972) 82.
3) Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor, John Jowett, and William Montgomery, ed., *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988). All subsequent citations to *Timon of Athens* are from this edition.
4) Wells and Taylor with Jowett and Montgomery, *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987) 127–28, 501–02. Robert Hillis Goldsmith, "Did Shakespeare Use the Old Timon Comedy?" *SQ* 9 (1958): 31–38.
H.J. Oliver, ed., *Timon of Athens*, The Arden Shakespeare (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1959) xli. E.K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930) 483.
Associating *Timon* with *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*, based on the same source of North's translation of *Plutarch*, some scholars conjecture

the date of *Timon* as 1607 – 08. However, Shakespeare had already used *Plutarch* largely for *Julius Caesar*. Also, in opposition to those who regard *Plutarch* as the principle source of *Timon*, James C. Bulman, Jr claims *Plutarch* as "only incidental to the body of the play" (104), but the MS *Timon* comedy as a significant source. Bulman maintains that on the account of Timon's prosperity, bankruptcy, and exile, we must turn to Lucian's *Misanthropos* and that "It is possible that if Shakespeare saw the comedy [*Timon*] acted at the Inns of Court, or read the MS, his knowledge of Lucian came largely, if not exclusively, through it.... [T]he material which Shakespeare is thought to have borrowed from the *Misanthropos* may in fact have been borrowed from the comedy instead" (104 – 05) ["Shakespeare's Use of the 'Timon' Comedy," *SSu* 29 (1976): 103 – 16]. As to the date of the MS comedy, Bulman, in another article, has argued beyond reasonable doubt that the MS comedy, "riddled as it is with Jonsonian allusion, was performed at the Inns of Court no later than 1602" ["The Date and Production of 'Timon' Reconsidered," *SSu* 27 (1974): 127]. In the Introduction of the Malone Society's *Timon*, Bulman and J. M. Nosworthy summarize these arguments [(Oxford: Oxford UP, 1978)]. Moreover, Goldsmith claims, "Shakespeare did draw upon the anonymous play as a source—not only for *Timon of Athens* but for elements in *King Lear* as well" [*SQ* 9 : 32].

5) Mark Dominik, *Shakespeare—Middleton Collaborations* (Beaverton: Alioth Press, 1988) 16.

6) Wells and Taylor with Jowett and Montgomery, *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion*, 128. William Wells, "Timon of Athens," *Notes and Queries* 12 (1920): 266 – 69. H. Dugdale Sykes, *Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama: A Series of Studies Dealing with the Authorship of Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Plays* (London: Oxford UP, 1924) 19 – 48. David J. Lake, *The Canon of Thomas Middleton's Plays: Internal Evidence for the Major Problem of Authorship* (London: Cambridge UP, 1975) 279 – 86. Macd. P. Jackson, "Studies in Attribution: Middleton and Shakespeare," ed. James Hogg, *Jacobean Drama Studies* (Salzburg: Institut Für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, 1979) 54 – 66. R. V. Holdsworth, *Middleton and Shakespeare: The Case for Middleton's Hand in 'Timon of Athens,'* Manchester, Eng., PhD, 1982. The Oxford editors say, "Specifically, Middleton's presence in *Timon* is indicated by the distribution of (*a*) linguistic forms, (*b*) characteristic oaths and exclamations, (*c*) function words, (*d*) rare vocabulary, (*e*) characteristic stage directions, (*f*) verbal parallels, (*g*) spellings, (*h*) inconsistencies of plotting, (*i*) rhyme" (128). As to the brief summery of the detailed Middleton's attribution to *Timon*, see the Oxford Edition's *Textual Companion*, p. 501.

7) Una Ellis-Fermor, "*Timon of Athens*: An Unfinished Play," *The Review of English Studies* 18 (1942): 270 – 83.

8) David Farley-Hills, *Shakespeare and the Rival Playwrights* 1600 – 1606 (London: Routledge, 1990). There are critics who assign *Timon*'s date to around 1608.

9) Goldsmith studies similarities between the old Timon comedy, and *Lear* and *Timon*, and suggests that *Lear* and *Timon* were based on the old Timon comedy [*SQ* 9].

10) Farley-Hills, *Shakespeare and the Rival Playwrights* 1600 – 1606, 168.

11) A topical issue is hinted in both *Timon* and *Lear*. Coppélia Kahn discusses parallels between Timon's prodigality and James I's notorious prodigality ["'Magic of Bounty': *Timon of Athens*, Jacobean Patronage, and Maternal Power," *SQ* 38 (1987): 43 – 50. Also, Richard Halpern sees in Lear's division of the kingdom a parallel with James' practice of creating knighthoods. Halpern states, "James's profligacy was widely regarded as a foolish waste of national and royal resources. Lear carves up his patrimony in one bold if misguided stroke, whereas James fritters his away through conspicuous consumption and the inflation of honors" [*The Poetics of Primitive Accumulation: English Renaissance Culture and the Genealogy of Capital* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991) 231].

12) Jay L. Halio, ed., *The Tragedy of King Lear*, New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992). All subsequent citations to *King Lear* are from this edition.

13) Maurice Charney, *All of Shakespeare* (New York: Columbia UP, 1993) 318. For Farley-Hills, Timon's "function falls somewhere between tragic hero and satiric scourge, and fails to convince as either" [Farley-Hills, *Shakespeare and the Rival Playwrights* 1600 – 1606, 176]. The reason is, Farley-Hills says, "the two voices [of Shakespeare and Middleton] have not been fully integrated" (176).

14) G. Wilson Knight, *The Wheel of Fire: Interpretations of Shakespearian Tragedy with Three New Essays* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd, 1930) 210.

15) Lewis Walker, "Fortune and Friendship in *Timon of Athens*," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 18 (1976): 578 – 79.

16) Gail Kern Paster, *The Idea of the City in the Age of Shakespeare* (Athens: The U of Georgia P, 1985) 99. As to the discussion of Shakespeare's Greek settings, see T. J. B. Spencer, "'Greeks' and 'Merrygreeks': A Background to *Timon of Athens* and *Troilus and Cressida*," *Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama in Honor of Hardin Craig*, ed. Richard Hosley (Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1962) 223 – 33. Also, as to the discussion of Shakespeare's Athenian settings, see Robert S. Miola, "Timon in Shakespeare's Athens," *SQ* 31 (1980): 21 – 30.

17) According to Elizabethan orthodoxy, the created world, nature, should have a hierarchial order, as Thomas Elyot says, "in everything is order, and without order may be nothing stable or permanent. And it may not be called order except it do contain in it degrees, high and base, according to the merit or estimation of the thing that is ordered" [*The Boke Named the Gouernour*, 1531. Cited by E. M. W. Tillyard, *The Elizabethan World Picture* (London: Penguin Books, 1943) 20]. Tillyard explains that the metaphor of the Chain of Being served to express "the unimaginable plenitude of God's creation, its unfaltering order, and its ultimate unity. The chain stretched from the foot of God's throne to the meanest of inanimate objects" [*The Elizabethan World Picture*, 33]. Although Tillyard oversimplified the idea, traces of this propaganda exist in Shakespeare's plays.