

TIMON OF ATHENS.

NOTES AND INTRODUCTION BY
H. A. EVANS.

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-00149-6 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 7
 William Shakespeare
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

DRAMATIS PERSONÆ

TIMON, of Athens.

LUCIUS,
 LUCULLUS, } flattering lords.
 SEMPRONIUS, }

VENTIDIUS, one of Timon's false friends.

ALCIBIADES, an Athenian captain.

APEMANTUS, a churlish philosopher.

FLAVIUS, steward to Timon.

Poet, Painter, Jeweller, and Merchant.

An old Athenian.

FLAMINIUS,
 LUCILIUS, } servants to Timon.
 SERVILIUS, }

CAPHIS,
 PHILLOTUS,
 TITUS,
 HORTENSIUS, } servants to Timon's creditors.
 And others, }

A Page. A Fool. Three Strangers.

PHRYNIA, } mistresses to Alcibiades.
 TIMANDRA, }

Cupid and Amazons in the mask.

Other Lords, Senators, Officers, Soldiers, Banditti, and Attendants.

SCENE—Athens and the woods not far from it.

HISTORIC PERIOD: The fourth century B.C.

TIME OF ACTION (according to Daniel).

Six days, with one considerable interval.

Day 1: Act I. Scenes 1 and 2.

Day 2: Act II. Scenes 1 and 2; Act III. Scenes 1-3.

Day 3: Act III. Scenes 4 and 5; Act IV. Scenes 1
 and 2.—Interval.

Day 4: Act IV. Scene 3.

Day 5: Act V. Scenes 1 and 2.

Day 6: Act V. Scenes 3 and 4.

TIMON OF ATHENS.

INTRODUCTION.

LITERARY HISTORY.

Timon of Athens was first printed in the Folio of 1623, where it is entitled "The Life of Tymon of Athens," and no scrap of evidence as to the existence of the play earlier than this is to be found. The text is frequently corrupt, and its history is remarkably obscure. No one now maintains that the whole play is the work of Shakespeare; that about half is his, and that the other half is the composition of an inferior writer, has been accepted as an established fact by all modern critics. Nor has there been any wide divergence of opinion as to what parts are Shakespeare's and what not; the question in dispute has been how the play came to assume the shape in which we find it in the Folio. Did Shakespeare revise an older play, or was his work left unfinished and filled out into a five-act play by someone else?

Before attempting to answer this question it will be well to glance at the sources from which the story is taken. These are three: a passage in Plutarch's *Life of Marcus Antonius*; Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*, novel 28; and Lucian's *Dialogue, Timon*. Timon is twice mentioned in *Aristophanes*;¹ but the earliest account of him as a historical character occurs in Plutarch's *Antonius*,² which Shakespeare was probably reading about 1606 for his *Antony and Cleopatra*. Here he would find a brief account of Timon's misanthropical ways, one or two of his smart sayings, and his epitaph. Plutarch—whom Painter merely reproduces—says nothing of Timon's life before he turned man-hater, and gives us but the merest hint of the causes which gave rise to

his loathing for his fellow-creatures: "Antonius, he forsooke the citie and companie of his friends, and built him a house in the sea by the Ile of Pharos, vpon certain forced mounts which he caused to be cast into the sea, and dwelt there as a man that banished himself from all mens companie: saying that he would leade Timons life, because he had the like wrong offered him, that was before offered vnto Timon: and that for the vnthankfulnesse of those he had done good vnto, and whom he tooke to be his friends, he was angrie with all men and would trust no man" (*North's Plutarch, M. Antonius, c. 38*). For further details we must go to Lucian's *Dialogue, Timon or Misanthropos*,³ and here we find a picture of Timon which has evidently furnished the framework of the play. The outline of the *Dialogue*, so far as it concerns our present purpose, is as follows:—Timon is a wealthy open-handed citizen of Athens, who had kept up great state and had raised many of his friends to affluence through his liberality. His unstinted generosity at last reduces him to poverty, but it is in vain for him to appeal to their compassion; they one and all turn their backs upon him. Accordingly he takes up a spade and goes out into the country, where he endeavours to earn a few pence by hiring himself out as a labourer. One day when he is digging he comes upon a treasure of gold coins. So he resolves to purchase the estate on which he has made his discovery and build a tower for himself and his money, where he will live the life of a misanthrope, and be known for his moroseness, harshness, boorishness, ill-temper, and inhumanity. But the news of his good fortune is not long in reaching Athens, and his former acquaintances come flocking

¹ See note 1 at the end of the play.

² Plutarch has another mention of Timon in his *life of Alcibiades* (c. 4), where the anecdote told of him looks like a fuller version of the one told in the *life of Antonius*.

³ A versified paraphrase of this *Dialogue* will be found in *T. Heywood's Pleasant Dialogues and Drama's*, 1637 (*Works*, 1874, vol. vi. pp. 155-197).

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00149-6 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 7

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

TIMON OF ATHENS.

forth to congratulate him, and get what they can to take home again. One of them, Thrasicles, the philosopher, is the prototype of Apemantus. He pretends that he has not come like the rest to see what he can get from Timon by smooth words; he is a man of simple tastes; his food is barley-bread, an onion, a few cresses, with a little salt besides on a feast-day, his drink pure water from the spring, his dress a simple cloak, while for money he cares no more than for the pebbles on the seashore. With an evident eye to his own interest he tries to persuade Timon to abandon his wealth; but Timon sends him about his business, as he has already sent the others, with a broken head.

Now here are at least three things not mentioned by Plutarch: first, Timon's lavish generosity, and subsequent desertion by his friends in his hour of need (this is at most hinted at in Plutarch); secondly, his discovery of a treasure and the reappearance of his friends in consequence; and thirdly, the character of Thrasicles. But these points have not been introduced into the non-Shakespearian parts of the play alone, they appear in the Shakespearian portion as well; and therefore Shakespeare must have been acquainted with Lucian's story in some shape or other. No translation of the Dialogue either in English or French existed in his day, but we need not suppose him to have ever read the Dialogue itself; an adaptation of the story would be all that would be necessary; and this he would find ready to hand, if there already existed a play on the subject of Timon founded upon Lucian and actually in possession of the stage. The existence of some such play was first assumed by Knight, whose theory has been accepted by Staunton, the Cambridge editors, and Delius, and offers a satisfactory explanation of the relationship of our play to Lucian.¹ It is just this which the theory

¹ A play called *Timon*, assigned by Steevens to the year 1600 or thereabouts, and evidently intended for representation before an academical audience, was printed by Dyce for the (old) Shakespeare Society in 1842, and is reprinted in Hazlitt's edition of Collier's Shakespeare Library. The writer of this play seems also to have been indebted to Lucian, for Timon takes to the woods and digs up treasure; but there are only two points which give us any reason to suppose it has any connection with our play—

advocated by Fleay and others leaves unexplained. These critics, while assigning parts of the story undeniably drawn from Lucian—such as Timon's munificence, his discovery of gold, and his treatment of his visitors in the woods—to Shakespeare, do not explain how he became acquainted with them. The other theory presents no difficulty on this point. We assume that during his reading of Plutarch Shakespeare's attention was arrested by the story of Timon; that it struck him that the character of Timon might be made effective for the stage, and that not having time or inclination to work up a complete plot into a regular five-act play he availed himself of a "*Timon*" which was in the hands of his theatre at the time. This play had perhaps been a failure in its existing shape, and the company were therefore glad to embrace Shakespeare's offer to remodel it. Accordingly he rewrote about half of it, and hastily revised the rest, leaving this for the most part untouched, but inserting or altering a few lines or phrases here and there. But before he had had time to give the whole a final revision it was called for by the manager, and hurried upon the boards. These assumptions will account both for the general unity of plan as well as for the signs of incomplete revision observable here and there.²

We must now briefly notice Mr. Fleay's theory, which, together with the discussion upon it, will be found in the *New Shakspeare Society's Transactions*, 1874 (part I. pp. 130-194 and 242-252). He holds that the play

a banquet scene in which Timon sets before his guests stones painted like artichokes (see note 126, on act iii. 6. 111), and the story of the faithful steward, here called Laches, who follows his master to the woods and tries to comfort him. There is, however, no reason for thinking that it was ever acted in London, or that Shakespeare ever saw it. It is possible that it may have been known to the writer of the old *Timon* which Shakespeare rewrote, or that both these plays may have drawn upon a common original now lost. It may be noted in this connection that the expression "*a Timonist*" occurs in Dekker, *Satiromastix* (1602), *Dramatic Works*, vol. i. p. 258, ed. 1873:

I did it to retyre me from the world;
And turne my *Muse* into a *Timonist*,
Loathing the general Leprozie of Sinne,
Which like a plague runs through the soules of men.

² For instance, the approach of the poet and the painter (iv. 3. 356) nearly 200 lines before their entrance on the stage, and the double epitaph at the end of the play.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00149-6 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 7

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION.

was left unfinished by Shakespeare and afterwards completed for publication by an inferior hand.¹ We shall not differ widely from Mr. Fleay in his selection of the non-Shakespearian portions of the play, but his theory requires him to assume that these are at best but patches on the original work, and do not contribute to the advancement of the plot. Here he fails to make out his case. Thus he says that the whole of act i. scene 2 "leaves the story unadvanced;" but surely it serves the purpose of setting before us Timon's magnificent style of living in the days of his prosperity, together with his princely bounty. Without it we jump at once from the introductory scene (act i. scene 1) to one in which we find Timon in difficulties with the duns at his gates (act ii.). Again, of act iii. he says: "these scenes by author the second add nothing to the progress of the play;" but scenes 1-4, besides being highly dramatic, are wanted to show us the ingratitude of Timon's friends; otherwise, as Dr. Furnivall points out, the tremendous change in Timon's character would be due to the refusal of help from one friend alone, Ventidius, —a refusal, too, which, whether by accident or design, is not represented on the stage, but only incidentally mentioned; while scene 5 gives the origin of the quarrel between Alcibiades and the senate, and connects itself with the concluding scene of the play. To take one more instance, Mr. Fleay thinks act iv. scene 3. 292-362 is an insertion because it interferes with the sense; Apemantus's remark (line 363) "Thou art the cap of all the fools alive," being a reply to Timon's "here it (gold) sleeps, and does no hired harm" (line 291). To this Dr. Nicholson replies that as Apemantus does not care for gold, he would not call Timon a fool for saying that gold was best placed where it was out of the way, and that the connection between lines 291 and 292 is natural, for Timon's use of the word "sleeps" suggests to Apemantus to ask, as he does in line 292, "Where ly'st o' nights, Timon?" while "Thou art the cap of all the fools alive" is an appropriate answer to Timon's assertion that he would rather be a beggar's dog than Ape-

¹ Rolfe thinks the play was completed for the stage some time before the printing of the Folio.

mantus (line 361), and means "thou never knew'st what was good for thee; in this thou capp'st all."

The following are the non-Shakespearian portions according to Fleay, with remarks by the present editor:—

1. Act i. scene 1, lines 186-248, 266-283.—These prose bits, says Mr. Fleay, are "bald and cut up," and their effect is certainly something quite different from the rest of the scene; but it is possible that Shakespeare may have chosen this abrupt, snappy style of talk as something specially suitable to Apemantus.

2. Act i. scene 2.—The halting verse cannot be Shakespeare's, but there is no reason why he may not have written Apemantus's grace, and particularly Timon's prose speech beginning "O, no doubt, my good friends," lines 91-112.

3. Act ii. scene 2, lines 46-131.—As the Page and the Fool are not introduced elsewhere, this may be a bit of the old play; but purposely left here by Shakespeare, in order to spare the audience the details of the wearisome accounts which Timon and his steward discuss off the stage. (See the remarks of Dr. Nicholson, *ut supra*, p. 250.)

4. Act ii. scene 2, lines 195-204.—Mr. Fleay condemns these lines in order to square with his theory that Lucius, Lucullus, and Sempronius are characters introduced by the expander of the play.

5. Act iii. the whole, except scene 6, lines 95-115.—The whole of scene 6 may be Shakespeare's; but of course every reader must judge for himself.

6. Act iv. scene 2, lines 30-50.—Connected with iv. 3. 464-543.

7. Act iv. scene 3, lines 292-362.—Possibly Shakespeare's for the reason given under 1; see also what has been said above on "Where ly'st o' nights?"

8. Act iv. scene 3, lines 399-412, 454-463.

9. Act iv. scene 3, lines 464-543.—Mr. Fleay thinks that Timon's relenting to the steward, and rewarding him, is "aesthetically contrary to the whole drift of the play. Had Timon been convinced that there was one 'just and comfortable man,' he would have ceased to be *misanthropos*, and would not have concluded his interview with

Ne'er see thou man, and let me ne'er see thee."

But is this so inappropriate after all? No doubt Timon is inconsistent, yet a character may be inconsistent and still true to nature, and it was not without good reason that Shakespeare left this episode where it was when, as our theory assumes, he revised the play. It is thus that Timon is redeemed from utter inhumanity, and thus that he once again appeals to our sympathy; indeed after listening to his tremendous invectives against the whole human race, vigorous as they are, we might begin to feel that he

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00149-6 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 7

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

TIMON OF ATHENS.

was something too far beyond the range of our experience did not this dialogue with his steward remind us that he is still a man. The speech of Timon beginning "Look thee, 'tis so!" line 529, is nervous enough to be from Shakespeare's own pen.

10. Act v. scene 1, lines 1-57.—Some lines in this read very like Shakespeare's work.

11. Act v. scene 3.—The close of the play bears the marks of hurried revision.

As to the date at which Shakespeare revised the play we have nothing but internal evidence to go upon. This would assign it to the same period as Lear, Antony and Cleopatra, and Coriolanus, and, as Professor Dowden puts it, 1607 is a date which cannot be far astray.

But we have not quite exhausted the peculiar features of this play. In the Folio it comes between Romeo and Juliet and Julius Cæsar, and is paged 80 and 81 (a mistake for 78 and 79), then 82, 81 (mistake for 80, 81), then 82 to 98, then a leaf unpagged with the actors' names printed on one side, and then comes the first page of Julius Cæsar, numbered 109, so that four leaves appear to have been cancelled. Fleay points out that this space, pp. 78-108 (now occupied by Timon), would *exactly* have held Troilus and Cressida, which is actually paged 79 and 80 in its second and third pages, but is otherwise unpagged. He concludes, therefore, that it was originally intended to stand where Timon does now. "But as this play was originally called *The History of Troilus and Cressida* (so in the Quarto Edition), and as there is really nothing tragical in the main bulk of it, it was doubted if it could be put with the Tragedies, so the editors of the Folio compromised the matter by putting it between the Histories and Tragedies, and not putting it at all in the Catalogue, though they still retained their first title for it as *the tragedie of Troilus and Cressida*.

But if, as I conjecture, all the following plays, from Julius Cæsar to Cymbeline, were already in type and had been printed off, there was nothing to fall back upon but Pericles and the unfinished Timon" (Fleay, *ut supra*, p. 137). It is perhaps unsafe to infer that more than Julius Cæsar was already printed, but nevertheless this is a very happy explanation of the eccentricities of the pagination in the Folio,

and explains why a whole leaf is given up to the actors' names, with a liberality which does not occur elsewhere in the book.¹ The suggestion which follows, that the editors of the Folio "took the incomplete Timon, put it into a playwright's hands, and told him to make it up to thirty pages," seems much less probable,² for there is good reason for believing that the play as we have it in the Folio had been already acted. "In old plays the entrance directions are sometimes in advance of the real entrances, having been thus placed in the theatre copy that the performers or bringers-in of stage properties might be warned to be in readiness to enter on their cue. In act i. sc. 1 (Folio) is *Enter Apemantus* opposite 'Well mocked,' though he is only seen as in the distance by Timon after the Merchant's next words, and does not enter till after 'Hee'l spare none.' So in the banquet (sc. ii. mod. eds.) there is—*Sound Tucket. Enter the Maskers, &c.*, before Timon's—'What means that trumpet?'—and *Enter Cupid with the Maske of Ladies* before Cupid's fore-running speech" (Dr. Nicholson, *Transactions, &c.*, p. 252).

STAGE HISTORY.

In dealing with Timon of Athens darkness is, at the outset, illumined only by conjecture. Mr. Fleay, whose theories as to Shakespeare's share in the authorship are fully disclosed in his paper on the Authorship of Timon of Athens, read before the fourth meeting of the New Shakspeare Society, 8th May, 1874, and included in the first volume of its *Transactions*, assigns it to 1606-7 (see *Life of Shakespeare passim*), and supposes it to belong to the same period as "that part of Cymbeline which is founded on so-called British history" (ib. 156). Malone attributes it to 1610. Its date of composition was, we may fairly assume, near that of production, since in Shakespeare's case no cause for delay can easily have arisen.

¹ And also why whole passages of prose are split up into impossible verse.

² The Cambridge editors themselves say, "It may be that the MS. of Timon was imperfect, and that the printing was stayed till it could be completed by some playwright engaged for the purpose. But it is difficult to conceive how the printer came to miscalculate so widely the space to be left."

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-00149-6 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 7
 William Shakespeare
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION.

Nothing, however, is known, and we have no record of a performance of the play as Shakespeare left it earlier than the present century.

Shadwell is responsible for the first adaptation of *Timon* that saw the light after the period of Puritan sway. "The History of *Timon of Athens the Man Hater Made into a play*" was printed in 4to in 1678, and was acted at the Dorset Garden Theatre probably in the same year. The following cast is printed with the tragedy:—

Timon of Athens	= Mr. Betterton.
Alcibiades, an Athenian captain	= Mr. Smith.
Apemantus, a rigid philosopher	= Mr. Harris.
Demetrius, Timon's steward	= Mr. Medburne.
Nicias	= Mr. Standford
Phæax	(should be Sandford).
Ælius	= Mr. Underhill.
Cleon	= Mr. Leigh.
Isander	= Mr. Norris.
Isidore	= Mr. Percival.
Thrasillus	= Mr. Gillo.
Diphilus, Servant to Timon	= (no name).
Old Man	= Mr. Bowman.
Poet	= Mr. Richards.
Painter	= Mr. Jevon.
Jeweller	
Musician	
Merchant	
Evandra	= Mrs. Betterton.
Melissa	= Mrs. Shadwell.
Chloe	= Mrs. Gibbs.
Thais	} Mistresses to Alcibiades.
Phrinias	
	= Mrs. Le-Grand.

Servants, Messengers, several Masqueraders, Soldiers.

It is dedicated to George Duke of Buckingham, the author of *The Rehearsal*. With customary affectation of homage to Shakespeare Shadwell says in the dedication: "I am now to present your Grace with this History of *Timon*, which you were pleased to tell me you liked; and it is the more worthy of you, since it has the inimitable hand of Shakespeare in it, which never made more masterly strokes than in this." Then with arrogance no less customary he continues: "Yet I can truly say, I have made it into a play." The Prologue addressed to the Wits who sate in judgment on new plays contains an allusion to Shakespeare in which Shadwell contrives once more to puff himself:

In th' art of judging you as wise are grown,
 As, in their choice, some ladies of the town:
 Your neat-shap'd Barbary Wits you will despise,
 And none but lusty sinewy writers prize:
 Old English Shakespear-stomachs, you have still
 And judge, as our fore-fathers writ, with skill.

In the epilogue also Shadwell shelters himself behind Shakespeare:

If there were hope that ancient solid wit
 Might please within our new fantastick pit;
 The play might then support the criticks' shock,
 This scien (*sic*) grafted upon Shakespear's stock.

From a glance at the cast it will be seen what liberties have been taken with Shakespeare's story. The names of the characters and the characters themselves have been altered. In the Stuart period a piece with no love interest might well be regarded as outside conception. Shadwell has accordingly presented *Timon* as faithless to his mistress, Evandra, who loves him passionately and is constant to the end; and enamoured of Melissa, a mercenary creature who oscillates between him and Alcibiades accordingly as their fortunes rise or fall. Apart from the fact that his lines are cacophonous and contemptible, Shadwell's theories are fatal to the play. Constancy such as Evandra shows is enough to have reconciled *Timon* to the world, since devotion so exemplary in woman might compensate for any amount of masculine shortcoming. The dignity and pathos of the death are lost when the messenger of Alcibiades returns at the close of the fifth act to say:

My noble lord, I went as you commanded
 And found Lord Timon dead and his Evandra
 Stab'd and just by him lying in his tomb, &c.

It is needless to dwell upon an atrocity which ranks with the happy termination to *Lear* and other perversions of the same epoch. Not more defensible is the treatment of Flavius, rechristened Demetrius, and of Apemantus.

Downes speaks of this play as a success. His words are: "*Timon of Athens* alter'd by Mr. Shadwell; 't was very well acted, and the music in 't well perform'd; it wonderfully pleas'd the Court and City; being an excellent moral" (*Roscius Anglicanus*, p. 37). A different impression is conveyed in the epilogue to

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00149-6 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 7

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

TIMON OF ATHENS.

The Jew of Venice of George Granville, Lord Lansdowne, produced twenty-three years later. In this, after complaining of the bad taste of audiences, the writer continues:

How was the scene forlorn, and how despis'd
When Timon, without music, moraliz'd!
Shakespeare's sublime, in vain entic'd the throng,
Without the charm of Purcell's syren song.
—Works, ed. 1752, p. 184.

This wretched version held the stage for near a century. Concerning the performance we know nothing. Evandra is a sort of die-away character in which Mary Betterton would be seen to advantage, Betterton would presumably be suited to Timon, and Harris, an excellent actor, would do justice to Apemantus. Sandford was a noted stage-villain. Ann Shadwell, the wife of the adapter, was not much of an actress, but Melissa is not much of a part.

On the 27th June, 1707, Shadwell's Timon was revived by the summer company at the Haymarket. Mills was Timon, Verbruggen Apemantus, Booth Alcibiades, Norris the Poet, Bullock Phæax, Johnson Elius, Mrs. Porter Evandra, and Mrs. Bradshaw Melissa.

Drury Lane witnessed its production on 8th Dec. 1720, when Booth was Timon, Mills Apemantus, Walker Alcibiades, Pinkethman the Poet, Mrs. Thurmond Evandra, and Mrs. Horton Melissa; and Covent Garden on 1st May, 1733, with Milward as Timon, Quin as Apemantus, Walker as Alcibiades, Mrs. Hallam as Evandra, and Mrs. Buchanan as Melissa. Milward revived it for his benefit at Drury Lane 20th March, 1740, repeating his performance of Timon. Quin was once more Apemantus, Mills was Alcibiades, Woodward the Poet, Mrs. Butler Evandra, and Mrs. Pritchard Melissa. It was played for the last recorded time for Hales's benefit at Covent Garden 20th April, 1745. Quin was still Apemantus, Hippius Phæax, Theophilus Cibber the Poet, Woodward Isander, Mrs. Pritchard Evandra, and Miss Hippius Chloe. The other characters are not given. Hales, since all sorts of rash experiments were permitted at benefits, was assumably Timon.

At Dublin Shadwell's play was given about 1715 at Smock Alley Theatre. The cast of the performance, a rare thing in early Dublin

annals, is preserved, and as it included many names subsequently to become famous it may be given as it is supplied in Hitchcock's Historical View of the Irish Stage, i. 27, 28. The notes are our own:

Timon	=	Mr. Th. Elrington. ¹
Alcibiades	=	Mr. Evans.
Apemantus	=	Mr. Ashbury. ²
Nicias	=	Mr. Fra. Elrington. ¹
Phæax	=	Mr. Thurmond. ³
Oelius (<i>sic</i>)	=	Mr. Trefusis.
Cleon	=	Mr. Quin. ⁴
Isidore	=	Mr. Hall.
Thrasillus	=	Mr. Dougherty.
Demetrius	=	Mr. Leigh. ⁵
Poet	=	Mr. Griffith. ⁶
Painter	=	Mr. Oates.
Jeweller	=	Mr. Bowman.
Musician	=	Mr. Hallam.
Evandre (<i>sic</i>)	=	Mrs. Thurmond.
Melissa	=	Mrs. Wilkins.
Chloe	=	Mrs. Haywood. ⁷
Thais	=	Miss Wilson.
Phrynia (<i>sic</i>)	=	Miss Schooling.

An adaptation from Shakespeare and Shadwell by James Dance, better known by his acting name of Love, was published in 1768, and was produced near the same time by its author at the theatre erected by him and his brother in Richmond. Like Dance's other dramas, it is a poor compilation. Love played Apemantus, Aikin was Timon; Fawcett, Lucullus; Cautherley, Alcibiades; and Mrs. Stephens, Evandra. Richard Cumberland was the next adapter of Timon. His version was produced 4th December, 1771, at Drury Lane under Garrick's management, with Barry as Timon, Bannister as Apemantus, Packer as Flavius, Palmer as Lucius, Hurst as Lucullus, Baddeley as the soldier, and Crofts (his first appearance on the stage) as Alcibiades. Mrs. Barry was Evanthe. Cumberland

¹ The Elringtons were a family of clever actors. Thomas Elrington was at that time manager of the theatre.

² A son, assumably, of the late manager of Smock Alley, whose daughter Thomas Elrington married.

³ A well-known actor at Drury Lane, the husband of an actress even better known, who played Evandra.

⁴ The famous Quin, then a youth of twenty-two.

⁵ Actor, song-writer, and dramatist.

⁶ A good actor and a pleasing poet.

⁷ Subsequently known as Mrs. Elizabeth Haywood, a voluminous writer introduced by Pope into the Dunciad, book ii.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00149-6 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 7

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION.

has the grace, in his advertisement to the printed version (8vo, 1771), to express his wish that he could have brought the play upon the stage with less violence to its author, and to hope that his own errors may be overlooked or forgiven in the contemplation of the "many passages of the first merit" which are still retained. He adds, "as the entire part of Evanthe and with very few exceptions the whole of Alcibiades are new, the author of the alteration has much to answer for" (Memoir, i. 384). His affectation of modesty is sufficiently transparent. On the plea that the play is now out of print, he burdens his memoirs with a long extract which may figure among any future illustrations of bathos. Cumberland chronicles that "public approbation seemed to sanction the attempt at the first production of the play" (ib. i. 385); but owns that it was subsequently passed over with neglect. It was indeed conspicuously unsuccessful, as appear to have been most alterations of Timon. Francis Gentleman, in his *Dramatic Censor*, does not include Timon among the plays on which he comments, and we are accordingly without the light which his criticisms cast upon the representations of other Shakespearean works. Genest gives a full description of the changes made by Cumberland, and is lenient in his verdict, speaking of some of the shortening as judicious, and declaring that in the respect of making in the scenes from Shakespeare few alterations except omissions Cumberland is much superior to Shadwell. Genest admits that the additions of both coalesce badly with the original, but holds that both have improved that part of the play which concerns Alcibiades" (Account of the English Stage, v. 319). To make, as does Cumberland, Evanthe the heroine, the daughter of Timon, and present her as beloved by Lucius and Alcibiades, and favouring the latter, is, as has been observed, injudicious. The reckless extravagance of Timon in spending his money on sycophants becomes unpardonable when his wealth, or a portion at least of it, should belong to his daughter.

Fifteen years later, at Covent Garden, 13th May, 1786, yet one more alteration was tried with insuccess. Timon of Athens, altered

from Shakespeare and Shadwell, is attributed in the *Biographia Dramatica* to Thomas Hull, a well-known actor and dramatist, for whose benefit it was given. From the same authority we learn that it was coldly received. This version has never been printed. The following is the cast: Timon = Holman, Apemantus = Wroughton, Alcibiades = Farren, Flavius = Hull, Lucullus = Quick, Lucius = Wewitzer, Evandra = a young lady, her first appearance, Melissa = Mrs. Inchbald. With the exception of the representative of Evandra, the foregoing actors constitute a strong cast. The young lady, according to the *Theatrical Journal* for May, 1786, "is said to be a sister of Mrs. Kemble, formerly Miss Satchell." Miss Satchell, afterwards Mrs. Stephen Kemble, was the daughter of a musical-instrument maker. The *débutante* is praised for her figure, manner, and deportment, and declared to have been "natural and affecting." Hull's alteration, it is said, "ought to be consigned to oblivion," a fate which soon attended it. Genest fails to chronicle who was the young lady playing Evandra. He says, however, that Flavius was quite in Hull's line, that Wroughton was a very good Apemantus, and that Quick and Wewitzer played well and did not make their parts too comic (Account of the English Stage, vi. 402).

A long interval elapses before Timon of Athens is again heard of, and it is then (28th October, 1816), for the first time, announced as in Shakespeare's version. Even now, however, some modification was found necessary. This was accomplished by the Honourable George Lamb. In the advertisement to the play the adapter says: "The present attempt has been to restore Shakespeare to the stage, with no other omissions than such as the refinement of manners has rendered necessary—the short interpolation in the last scene has been chiefly compiled from Cumberland's alteration." Genest, who gives an analysis of the play, praises it highly, saying that it "does Lamb considerable credit, and adding, with a certain amount of hyperbole, that "it is not only infinitely better than any of the former alterations, but it may serve as a model of the manner in which Shakespeare's plays should be adapted to the modern

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-00149-6 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 7
 William Shakespeare
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

TIMON OF ATHENS.

Stage" (Account of the English Stage, viii. 585, 586).

In this revival Kean made his appearance as Timon, the cast including Bengough as Apemantus, Wallack as Alcibiades, Holland as Flavius, Harley as Lucius, S. Penley as Lucullus, and Bernard as Sempronius. It was not a great success, and was acted seven times. Hazlitt's precious series of criticisms upon Kean's performances in Shakespeare does not include Timon, and the ordinary organs of theatrical criticism pass over the representation without notice. Procter (Barry Cornwall) apologizes for Kean, declares the play unadapted for representation, and says that Kean, by dint of his own single strength, was unable to make it popular. He continues: "In fact, although one of the finest, it is at the same time one of the least dramatic works of Shakespeare. It is more of a monodrame than a play" (Life of Kean, ii. 163). The dialogue was given by Kean with prodigious effect," his retorts upon Apemantus, and his curses on ungrateful Athens—

Let me look back upon thee. O thou wall
 That girdest in those wolves, &c.—

were made as fierce as voice and expression could render them. But he did not exhibit the whole character. We beheld in him the bitter sceptic, but not the easy, lordly, and magnificent Timon" (ib. ii. 163, 164). Mr. Hawkins, in his Life of Kean, i. 398, quotes from an unpublished letter of Mr. Harry Stoe Van Dyk, that Kean breathed the very soul of melancholy and tenderness in those impressive words:—

But 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.

—Act iv. sc. iii. 259-266.

He quotes also the opinion of Leigh Hunt, that the finest scene was that with Alcibiades. "We never remember the force of contrast to have been more truly pathetic. Timon, digging in the woods with his spade, hears the

approach of military music; he starts, waits its approach silently, and at last in comes the gallant Alcibiades with a train of splendid soldiery. Never was scene more effectively managed. First you heard a sprightly quick march playing in the distance. Kean started, listened, and leaned in a fixed and angry manner on his spade, with frowning eyes and lips full of the truest feeling, compressed, but not too much so; he seemed as if resolved not to be deceived, even by the charm of a thing inanimate; the audience were silent; the march threw forth its gallant notes nearer and nearer, the Athenian standards appear, then the soldiers come treading on the scene with that air of confident progress which is produced by the accompaniment of music; and at last, while the squalid misanthrope still maintains his posture and keeps his back to the strangers, in steps the young and splendid Alcibiades, in the flush of victorious expectation. It is the encounter of hope with despair" (ib. 398, 399).

Another long interval passed before Timon was again revived. Genest, indeed, chronicles no other performance.

Warned by previous experience, Macready left the character of Timon unattempted, and his example was followed by Charles Kean. Not, indeed, until it was revived by Phelps is Timon traceable on the stage.

On the 15th September, 1851, with more than usual attention to the *mise en scène*, Phelps produced Timon at Sadler's Wells. On this occasion the performance triumphed over the defects, real or imaginary, of the play. Between its first production and the following Christmas it was played some forty times. In the Life of Phelps by W. May Phelps and John Forbes-Robertson, the bill of this interesting performance is given (p. 273). Though respectable in their day, the actors of the subordinate parts are now wholly forgotten. It is not necessary accordingly to give more than the principal characters which were thus cast:—

Timon	=	Mr. Phelps.
Lucius	=	Mr. F. Robinson.
Lucullus	=	Mr. Hoskins.
Sempronius	=	Mr. H. Mellon.