

“Meat,” “Root,” and “Man’s Unkindness” in *Timon of Athens*

Marie HONDA

Introduction

Timon of Athens is considered as William Shakespeare and Thomas Middleton’s most unpopular tragedy. Compared to Shakespeare’s other plays, it has hardly been staged nor discussed by critics, though Timon was known as a legendary Athenian misanthrope among his contemporary writers, such as William Painter and Robert Burton, as will be discussed below. The plot of the play is simple: Timon, a wealthy and generous Athenian gentleman, enjoyed sharing his wealth with artists and friends. However, after he went bankrupt, all his friends refused to help him. Timon then leaves town and chooses to live naked in a cave in the forest, where he eats “root/s” (1.2.71; 1.2.134; 4.3.23; 4.3.28; 4.3.185; 4.3.191; 4.3.412; 5.1.72) and calls himself “beast” (4.3.50) and “Misanthropos” (4.3.54).¹ He commits suicide by the end of the play.

The play is problematic in various ways; there is no record of it being performed in Shakespeare’s days, and it was not published in quarto. While the play was published in the First Folio in 1623, the date when it was written remains unclear. John Jowett, editor of the Oxford Shakespeare, suggests in his edition that it was written in early 1606, which is followed by Hugh Grady (Jowett, Intro, 3-9; Grady, *Shakespeare* 90). John W. Draper remarks that the authorship of the play has been the central issue in its critical history; hence, its theme has been relatively overlooked (20). Many

critics have discussed the problems of the play, especially its “inconsistencies and loose ends,” as E.A.J. Honigmann describes it (18). Some critics, therefore, have suggested the possibility of a collaboration.² In 1849, Charles Knight first proposed Shakespeare wrote *Timon of Athens* in collaboration with an unknown contributor. William Wells and H. Dugdale Sykes identified Middleton as a co-author (Wells 266-69; Sykes 19-48). E. K. Chambers, however, suggested that Shakespeare wrote the play solely and left it unfinished (482). This theory was influential and followed by Una Ellis-Fermor, Ralph A. Haug, and many other critics until the 1970s. Yet, at the beginning of 1980, in his unpublished doctoral dissertation, through a detailed stylistic analysis, R. V. Holdsworth suggested that Shakespeare wrote two thirds of the play, while Thomas Middleton wrote Act 1, Scene 2 and Act 3, Scenes 3-6. Jowett and Grady agree with this idea (Jowett, *William Shakespeare* 501; Grady, *Shakespeare* 98). Jowett, and Anthony B. Dawson and Gretchen E. Minton, editors of Arden’s Third Series, all include Middleton’s name as Shakespeare’s co-author in their editions.

Apart from the authorship, many critics have discussed socio-economic themes of the play, as the terms “gold” and “rich” are used throughout.³ In his edition, Jowett indeed suggests that the play shares the theme of gold with *Volpone*. However, he also notes that “the beast fable of *Volpone* and the bounty-hunters named after raptors and corvines relate to the widespread theme of bestiality and to the specific animal fable at 14.328-45 [Scene 14, Lines 328-45 in his edition] in *Timon of Athens*” (Intro, 7). Jowett speculates *Timon of Athens* and *Volpone* were written around the same period, and therefore, share such thematic similarities. As Jowett points out, animal is the theme of *Timon of Athens* as well as gold, and in addition to his comment, words related to food and animals such as “meat,” “root,” and “beast” recurrently appear in the play.

Through its use of food and animal metaphors, *Timon of Athens* seems to question animal-human relationships. For example, Apemantus appears to criticize the consumption of animal flesh when he says to Timon, “I scorn thy meat” (1.2.38). Todd A. Borlik states that “meat” appears “eleven times in

this play; sometimes it refers to any food in general, but often it specifically designates animal flesh" (194). Thus, Borlik interprets Apemantus's "meat" as "animal flesh." Moreover, in his grace, Apemantus says, probably as an aside, "Rich men sin and I eat root" (1.2.71). While Timon and his guests satisfy their gluttonous desires by consuming animal flesh and drinking wine, Apemantus eats roots and drinks water. Furthermore, observing Timon's hospitality toward his guests, Apemantus, conjuring a cannibalistic image, laments: "O you gods, what a number of men eats Timon and he sees 'em not" (1.2.39-40).

With the growth of food studies and ecocriticism, Joan Fitzpatrick, Borlik, and Simon C. Estok have only recently paid attention to Apemantus's and Timon's obsession with "roots" and vegetarianism in the play (Fitzpatrick 130-19; 57-80; Borlik 194-95; Estok 94-98). While those food and ecocritical studies are innovative and thought-provoking, they only focus on diets and food metaphors but overlooks animal metaphors and animal-human relationships in *Timon of Athens*.

Andreas Hofële and Jowett points out that a misanthrope was considered a beast at that time (Hofële, "Man" 232; Jowett, Intro 17; 22; 29-30). Based on Aristotle's idea, Hofële quotes, "Whosoever is delighted in solitude is either a wild beast or a god," which is mentioned in Francis Bacon's "Of Friendship" in his *Essays*. Hofële sees Timon as "the perfect illustration of Aristotle's famous dictum" ("Man" 232) and claims that the "Elizabethan version of Timon's story" follows such image, quoting the title of Painter's twenty-eighth novella in his *Palace of Pleasure* (1566): "Of the straunge and beastlie nature of Timon of Athens, enemie to mankinde" ("Man" 232).⁴ Jowett mentions not only these two works, but also Sir John Beaumont's reference to Timon as "that odious beast" and Robert Burton's idea that solitary people "become beasts, monsters, inhuman, ugly to behold, *misanthropi* . . . as so many Timons" (Intro, 29-30).

Thus, animal metaphors abound in the play but have only been discussed by a few critics—William Empson, Willard Farnham, and Hofële. Empson only discusses the dog metaphor used to criticize flattering and

fawning characters (177). Farnham briefly discusses the animal metaphors and states that “[t]he beastliness of pictured in *Timon* is worse than that of beasts, for it walks in shape of man,” and that “[t]he beastlike men in *Timon* are often ravening devourers of each other,” highlighting the play’s cannibalistic metaphors (70-71). Hofèle pays attention to the absence of female characters excluding the gropes of the Amazon dancers and whores. He indicates that Timon is described as an Other, namely “man’s opposites in terms of gender and species—woman and beast” (228). In other words, Timon becomes both beastlike and effeminate in his male society. This study shares Farnham and Hofèle’s interest in cannibalistic metaphors, but none of their studies discuss human “kindness” as a distinguishing characteristic between animals and humans, nor link the play with ancient Greek philosopher Pythagoras’s and Renaissance humanist Michel de Montaigne’s ideas.⁵

In early modern England, reason was believed to be a human trait that distinguished humans from animals. However, there is a thin line separating the two. People were afraid of becoming animals during that period and *Timon of Athens* seems to reflect such worry, describing “kindness” instead of “reason” as a human feature that sets humans apart from animals. Pythagoras was the father of vegetarianism and the first to show his sympathy for animals. Following Pythagoras, Montaigne was also an advocate for animals, as will be further discussed below. Nevertheless, Pythagoras’s and Montaigne’s views were not mainstream during the Jacobean period when most people believed in the Great Chain of Being, which ranks all creatures beginning with God and the angels, then descends through humans, animals, plants, rocks, then minerals (Egan 57-60). The belief that humans are superior to animals was widespread, leading to people’s enjoyment in blood sports such as hunting, bear-baiting, and cock-fighting. Renaissance humanists Desiderius Erasmus and Motaigne, and Puritans, however, were part of the minority who criticized hunting and bear-baiting as cruelty and animal abuse. *Timon of Athens* seems to share such ideas with the minority and challenges Jacobean anthropocentric ideas

by showing skepticism about eating animal flesh and underlining human cruelty.

Referencing Pythagoras’s and Montaigne’s ideas, this study aims to investigate animal–human relationships by focusing on the food and animal metaphors in *Timon of Athens*. The play neither directly condemns carnivorism nor advocates animals. Yet, it seems to criticize anthropocentric ideas that were mainstream during the Jacobean period, as reflected in Timon’s frequent attacks on “man’s unkindness” (4.3.175), or human cruelty (e.g. “[t]h’unkindest beast more kinder than mankind” (4.1.36)). The play also addresses Timon’s preference for eating “root” than “meat,” that is, animal flesh, in its latter half.

This study mainly discusses two scenes: the feast scene in Act 1, Scene 2 and the forest scene in Act 4, Scene 3. According to Jowett and Gray, the feast scene was entirely or partly written by Middleton, whereas the forest scene was wholly written by Shakespeare.⁶ The study first looks at the consumption of animal flesh and cannibalism, focusing on Apemantus’s and Timon’s discourses and comparing them with Pythagoras’s doctrine of transmigration. Second, it explores Timon’s vegetarianism with reference to Pythagoras’s promotion of vegetarianism. Finally, it discusses Jacobean people’s anxiety of becoming animals and Timon’s criticism against human “unkindness,” and shows Pythagoras’s and Montaigne’s ideas on cruelty in the context of the animal–human relationships.

1 “Meat”: Carnivorism and Cannibalism

Timon of Athens has two feast scenes, but this study only focuses on the first. At the first feast (1.2), Apemantus, a philosopher, criticizes the consumption of animal flesh and points out that Timon enjoys eating and drinking with his “false” friends but is unaware that he is the one being “eaten.” It is after this feast that Timon realizes he is bankrupt. He asks for a loan from his so-called friends, but all of them refuse to help him. Timon decides to exact revenge against them, inviting them to another feast. At

the second feast (3.7), Timon serves them stones and water, throws the water in their faces, and drives them out of his house by hurling the stones at them. Timon immediately leaves Athens after that, cursing all the people in the town.

At the first feast, Apemantus’s abstinence is portrayed in contrast with Timon and his friends’ gluttony. As many critics have pointed out, Apemantus resembles Diogenes the Cynic in both behavior and mind.⁷ Diogenes was an ancient Greek philosopher and one of the founders of Cynic philosophy. He lived like a dog in a barrel and preferred a simple lifestyle, but it is unclear whether he was a vegetarian. In *Timon of Athens*, Apemantus is always present at Timon’s feasts but they are not friends. As a Cynic philosopher, Apemantus always gives cynical comments, which is probably why Timon often calls him a dog.

As quoted in the introduction, Borlik states that the term “meat” sometimes “refers to any food in general, but often it specifically designates animal flesh” (194). However, “meat” seems to only refer to “animal flesh” in the play, given its use in contrast with “root” (“Rich men sin and I eat root” (1.2.71); “O, a root, dear thanks . . . ungrateful man, with liquorish draughts / And morsels unctuous greases his pure mind” (4.3.191-94)) and the recurrent image of cannibalism (“O you gods, what a number of men eats Timon” (1.2.39); “I never tasted Timon in my life” (3.3.80); “This slave, / Unto his hour, has my lord’s meat in him” (3.1.54-55)) in the text. Therefore, Timon’s “meat” grotesquely connotes his own “flesh” as well as animal flesh.

Apemantus repeatedly refers to “meat.” He is asked by the Second Lord if he is “going to Lord Timon’s feast,” to which he answers, “Ay, to see meat fill knaves and wine heat fools” (1.2.268-69). At the banquet, Apemantus keeps doubting Timon’s words, “you are welcome” (1.2.23) and annoying Timon. As a result, Timon asks him, “prithee let my meat make the silent” (1.2.38). Apemantus responds, “I scorn thy meat, ’twould choke me ’fore I should e’er flatter thee” (1.2.38-39). According to Keith Thomas, meat, particularly beef, was the most frequently consumed in Britain in early

modern Europe, but it was expensive. Indeed, Thomas notes that "[i]n lowhere in Europe was this dependence upon animals greater than in England . . . The early modern period in England saw a striking expansion in the use of horse for draught, thus gradually releasing oxen to be used for human food" (26). However, he goes on to say, "Of course, meat was relatively luxury," quoting a theologian's words in 1609, "Our poor country-people . . . feed for the most part upon hard cheese, milk and roots" (26). Thus, the two different sorts of food, "meat" and "root" at Timon's feast suggest differences in social class and wealth between Timon and Apemantus. Apemantus, therefore, bitterly criticizes Timon's vanity and flattery.

"Meat" is mentioned by Apemantus in a religious as well as a social and economic tone. In his grace, Apemantus observes, probably as an aside, "Rich men sin and I eat root" (1.2.71), that is, rich people eat sinful food while he eats roots. "Rich men sin and I eat root" (1.2.71) alludes to the Bible: "It is better not to eat meat or drink wine or do anything that will cause your brother to sin" (Romans 14: 21). However, the allusion to the Bible is anachronistic in Timon's pagan world. Timon and his guests satisfy their gluttony—one of seven deadly sins—by eating animal flesh and drinking wine, whereas Apemantus eats roots and drinks water—the drink that is served to Timon's guests at his second feast.

Such religious image is connected with cannibalistic metaphors when Apemantus portrays the relationships between Timon and his friends. Apemantus says to Timon, "I scorn thy meat, 'twould choke me 'fore I should e'er flatter thee" (1.2.38-39). Then, Apemantus laments, probably as an aside, "O you gods, what a number of men eats Timon and he sees 'em not! It grieves to see so many dip their meat in one man's blood, and all the madness is, he cheers them up too" (1.2.39-42). In his edition, Jowett comments that this line is "[p]arodically reminiscent of Christ's Last Supper, 'He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, he shall betray me'" (Mathew 26: 23) (2.41n.). By "I scorn thy meat," Apemantus means that he despises the animal flesh Timon serves at the feast. However, when he says, "so many dip their meat in one man's blood," he means that many guests eat Timon's

own flesh. In short, Timon's "meat" ("thy meat") grotesquely and ironically shifts to his own flesh ("their meat"). Unlike Timon's false friends, Apemantus never eats Timon's "meat."

The metaphor of Timon as "meat" is also represented in later scenes. After Lucullus, Timon's false friend, refuses to lend him money, Flaminius, Timon's loyal servant, notes in his monologue, "This slave, / Unto his hour, has my lord's meat in him" (3.1.54-55). Similarly, Flavius, Timon's another loyal steward, makes a complaint to Titus, a servant to one of Timon's creditors, "Why then preferred you not your sums and bills / When your false masters ate of my lord's meat?" (3.4.47-48). These loyal servants attack the ingratitude of Timon's false friends who have enjoyed his "meat," that is, food, money, or gifts. Moreover, Timon's bountifulness is famous even among three Strangers, and the rumor of his downfall has reached their ears. The First Stranger criticizes Timon's false friends for their ingratitude and notes that "I never tasted Timon in my life, / Nor came any of his bounties over me / To mark me for his friend" (3.2.80-82), but that if asked, he will help Timon "[f]or his right noble mind, illustrious virtue / And honourable carriage" (3.3.83-84). Thus, not only Apemantus, but also Timon's loyal servants and even the Strangers, recognize that Timon is figuratively being eaten by his false friends.

Timon and Alcibiades, an Athenian captain, employ cannibalistic metaphors to describe the relationship between Alcibiades and his enemies. At the feast, Timon believes Alcibiades wants to go to the battlefield; he says, "You had rather be at a breakfast of enemies than a / dinner of friends" (1.2.75-76). Alcibiades extends Timon's grotesque metaphor: "So they were bleeding-new, my lord, there's no meat / like 'em; I could wish my best friend at such a feast" (1.2.77-79). These quotations clearly indicate that Alcibiades wants to eat his enemies as "breakfast." The First Senator sees Alcibiades acting "like a boar too savage" (5.2.50), but his remark suggests that he is actually crueller than the animal. In a later scene, the First Senator suggests to Alcibiades, "By decimation and a tithed death, / If thy revenges hunger for that food / Which nature loathes, take thou the destined tenth"

“Meat,” “Root,” and “Man’s Unkindness” in *Timon of Athens*

(5.5.31–33). This line implies that Alcibiades wants to eat his enemies as a form of revenge.

Similarly, after being betrayed by his false friends and becoming a misanthrope, Timon vengefully wishes that he had eaten all the people of Athens. When he is about to eat the root that he had just found, he makes the following wish, in Apemantus’s presence: “That the whole life of Athens were in this! / Thus would I eat it” (4.3.282). Moreover, when three thieves approach, Apemantus says: “More things like men. Eat, Timon, and abhor them” (4.3.393). In that line, the thieves are probably the objects of “eat.” Seeming to remember Timon’s desire to eat the Athenians, Apemantus makes fun of him.

Shakespeare’s idea of cannibalism may have originated from Pythagoras’s doctrine of transmigration. Pythagoras’s works do not exist, but his oration is included in Book 15 of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, which Shakespeare was familiar with. In fact, Boy refers to “Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*” (4.1.42) in *Titus Andronicus*. Although an English translation by Arthur Golding was published in 1567, Shakespeare certainly read it in Latin because it was used as a textbook at grammar school (Briggs 155). Many of Shakespeare’s plays, including *Titus Andronicus* and *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, draw on Ovid.

In Book 15 of *Metamorphoses*, Pythagoras, recalling the Golden Age when both animals and humans ate nuts and grasses, condemns killing animals for food because they may carry the soul of one’s family member or friend. In the volume, Pythagoras refers to cannibalism when he explains the taboo of eating animals based on reincarnation:

Let liue in saufty honestly with slaughter vndefyld,
The bodyes which perchaunce may haue the sprits of our brothers,
Our sisters, or our parents, or the spirits of sum others
Alyed too vs eyther by sum fréendshippe or sum kin,
Or at the least the soules of men abyding them within.
And let vs not Thyësteslyke thus furnish vp our boordes

“Meat,” “Root,” and “Man’s Unkindness” in *Timon of Athens*

With bloodye bowells. (2D1-1v)

Pythagoras advises against killing and eating animals because they could be carrying the soul of the prospective meat-eater’s family member or friend, just like in the case of Thyestes, who unwittingly ate his two sons. Jacobean playwrights, including Shakespeare, did not believe in reincarnation, but the idea of human to animal transformation and vice versa should have appealed to them. In fact, Jonson mentions Pythagoras’s doctrine of transmigration in *Volpone*, when Nano relates that the soul of Pythagoras is in the body of Androgyny (1.2.23–24). This episode derives from Lucian’s *The Dream*, where a cock suddenly tells his master cobbler that he is a reincarnation of Pythagoras. Erasmus echoes this tale comically in *The Praise of Folly*, which Jonson and Shakespeare certainly read, as many critics point out, and the book was probably widely known at the time.

Shakespeare’s idea may also come from Montaigne. Montaigne’s *Essays* was translated into English by John Florio in 1602. The book had great influence on Shakespeare, and many critics have discussed its relation to *Hamlet*, *The Tempest*, and other plays. In “Of Cannibals” in the first volume of Montaigne’s *Essays*, which is known for its parallelisms with Gonzalo’s speech in *The Tempest*, Montaigne describes Brazilian customs of cannibalism. His servant who had lived there for over ten years told him about such customs. Early modern Westerners generally thought of cannibals as savage and brutal. However, according to Montaigne, the French are more cruel than Brazilian cannibals because the former tortures their captives slowly in various ways, while the latter only eats their captives’ bodies after killing them:

I thinke there is more barbarisme in eating men alive, then to feed vpon them being dead; to mangle by tortures and torments a body full of lively sense, to roast him in peeces, to make dogges and swine to gnawe and teare him in mammoeces (as we have not onely read, but seene very lately, yea and in our owne memorie, not amongst

ancient enemies, but our neighbours and fellow-citizens; and which is worse, vnder pretence of piety and religion) then to roast and teare him after he is dead. (1: 104)

“Eating men alive” means torturing them by mangling or roasting them, or allowing dogs and swine to gnaw at and tear their bodies. This sounds very cruel, but such is the case with Timon, who is both the victim and the eater. Timon is eaten alive, which entails being cut to pieces with “knives” (1.2.44) by his friends and flatterers. In other words, Timon’s friends and flatterers exploit his generosity in the name of friendship, and Timon is gradually tortured by his debts. Timon himself does not realize it, but his steward, Flavius, knows that Timon is sinking into destitute. As a result, Timon ruins his estate and himself, and becomes a misanthrope. Consequently, Timon wishes to eat all the Athenians alive as revenge.

Whether the objects are animals or humans, “eating” ultimately means the eater’s display of power. In short, the human consumption of animal flesh connotates their power balance. Thomas states that “[i]n drawing a firm line between man and beast, the main purpose of early modern theorists was to justify hunting, domestication, meat-eating” and other things (41). Similarly, Erica Fudge observes that consuming animal flesh is symbolic of both “death (human mortality)” and “power (human dominion)” (75). This is also true of human flesh. Those who “eat Timon” feel that they are superior to him. Because they do not see him as their friend unlike Timon’s naïve expectation, no one helps him when he is destitute. In contrast, Timon and Alcibiades want to eat those who have betrayed them as revenge to reassert their superiority and reclaim their power (“That the whole life of Athens were in this! / Thus would I eat it” (4.3.282); “If thy revenges hunger for that food, / Which nature loathes, take thou the destined tenth” (5.5.32-33)). Thus, in this play, these cannibalistic metaphors are used to express human conflicts over power.

2 "Root": Vegetarianism

Timon leaves Athens and goes to the forest where he becomes a misanthropic vegetarian. Timon digs the earth for roots to eat. He curses humans and finds gold while searching for roots: "Destruction fang mankind! / Earth, yield me roots" (4.3.23). The term "yields" suggests the productivity of the earth. To put it another way, here Timon sees the earth as "Mother Earth." He criticizes the evils of money and continues to dig, talking to the earth: "Roots, you clear heavens!" (4.3.28); "Come, damned earth, / Thou common whore of mankind that puts odds / Among the rout of nations, I will make thee / Do thy right nature" (4.3.42-45). "Do thy right nature" translates to "give me roots." After giving the gold to Alcibiades's two prostitutes, Timon resumes digging for roots because he is "hungry" (4.3.176), despite "being sick of man's unkindness" (4.3.175). He talks to Mother Earth again: "Common mother . . . Yield him who all the human sons do hate / From forth they plenteous bosom one poor root . . . Ensear thy fertile and conceptious womb, / Let it no more bring out ungrateful man. / Go great with tigers, dragons, wolves, and bears, / Teem with new monsters" (4.3.176-89). The image of "Mother Earth" is repeated here. When he finally finds roots, he cries, "O, a root, dear thanks!" (4.3.191).

In these passages (4.3.23-45; 4.3.176-91), Timon repeats "root/s" four times (4.3.23; 4.3.28; 4.3.185; 4.3.191). Soon after finding roots, Apemantus visits Timon and complains that people are saying that Timon is imitating him, which Timon denies. At a glance, Timon may look so. However, Timon is not imitating Apemantus, but rather surpasses him. Like Apemantus, Timon is obsessed with roots and water, but he also levels bitter criticism against eating animal flesh. He criticizes the act of eating animals and advocates vegetarianism in the following two examples in the same scene.

The first example is seen in the dialogue between Timon and Apemantus. When Timon asks Apemantus, "What wouldst thou do with the world, / Apemantus, if it lay in thy power?" (4.3.320-21), Apemantus answers,

“Give it the beasts, to be rid of the men” (4.3.322). Then, Timon sarcastically asks if he wants to live as a beast with other beasts: “Wouldst thou have thyself fall in the confusion of men, and remain a beast with the beasts?” (4.3.323-24). Furthermore, Timon points out the brutality of the animal world, exemplifying the food chain concludes that each animal is subjected to another animal as prey: “If thou wert the lion, the fox would beguile thee; if thou wert the lamb, the fox would eat thee; if thou wert the fox, the lion would suspect thee when peradventure thou wert accused by the ass; if thou wert the ass, thy dullness would torment thee, and still thou lived’st but as a breakfast to the wolf . . .” (4.3.327-32). At the end of this speech, Timon says to Apemantus concludingly, “What beast couldst thou be, that were not subject to a beast? And what a beast art thou already that seest not thy loss in transformation!” (4.3.341-44).

Timon’s passage regarding the food chain (4.3.327-42) describes the strict law that governs the animal world, where the fox eats the lamb, while the wolf eats the ass. After “the wolf,” Timon mentions the “unicorn” (4.3.335), “bear” (4.3.337), “horse” (4.3.337; 4.3.338), “leopard” (4.3.338; 4.3.339), and again “lion” (4.3.339), though they are omitted above. Such food chain is also seen in Athens where the winner eats the loser, though figuratively. With the use of such metaphor, Timon seems to criticize human violence and conflicts over power as well as eating animal flesh. As quoted in the introduction, Jowett associates this passage with “the beast fable of *Volpone* and the bounty-hunters” (Intro, 7). Yet, Jowett does not show how the animal fable in *Volpone* relates to this passage; hence, these lines more closely resemble Pythagoras’s idea, especially that regarding the food chain.

In Book 15 of *Metamorphoses*, Pythagoras praises the peaceful life between animals and humans in the Golden Age, which is also described in Book 1. All of them eat nuts, fruits, and roots. Pythagoras criticizes savage beasts such as tigers, bears, and wolves for killing other animals even when Mother Earth offers plenty of alternative food:

The beastes doo breake theyr fast with flesh.....

The nature of the beast that dooth delygth in bloody foode,
Is cruell and vnmercifull. As Lyons féerce of moode,
Armenian Tigers, Beares, and Woolues. Oh what a wickednesse
It is too cram the mawe with mawe, and frank vp flesh with flesh,
And for one liuing thing too liue by killing of another:
As whoo should say, that of so great abundance our moother
The earth dooth yéeld most bountuously, none other myght delygth
Thy cruell téethe too chawe vppon, than grisly woundes that myght
Expresse the Cyclops guyse? (2C3v)

The phrase "breake theyr fast" recalls the wolf's "breakfast" (4.3.332) in Timon's words, and the lion, the bear, and the wolf are mentioned by Timon as well.⁸ Moreover, the idea reflected in "one liuing thing too liue by killing of another" is similar to Timon's "What beast couldst thou be, that were not subject to a beast?" (4.3.341-42). Furthermore, the bounteousness of "our moother / The earth" is recurrent in Pythagoras's discourse, as seen in Timon's passages (4.3.23-45; 4.3.176-91). Timon's obsession with roots seems to share Pythagoras's idea that eating animal flesh is cruel while eating vegetables can bring a peaceful life for every creature.

The second example of Timon's criticism of eating meat and his praise of Mother Earth occurs in his dialogue with the three thieves. While they call themselves "soldiers," the thieves ask Timon for food when they are hungry: "We are not thieves, but men that much do want" (4.3.410). Timon comments:

Your greatest want is you want much of meat.
Why should you want? Behold, the earth hath roots,
Within this mile break forth a hundred springs,
The oaks bear mast, the briars scarlet hips,
The bounteous housewife Nature on each bush
Lays her full mess before you. Want? Why want? (4.3.411-16)

Timon suggests eating “roots” and other plants and drinking water, praising the bountiful products of “the earth” or “Nature”—a recurrent image both in the play and in Pythagoras’ words.

Here, Pythagoras admires natural products:

Yée mortall men forbear too frank your flesh with wicked foode.
Yée haue both corne & frutes of trées and grapes & herbes right good.
And though that sum bée harsh and hard.....
.....
.....The lauas earth dooth yéeld you plentiously
Most gentle foode, and riches too content bothe mynd and eye. (2C3v)

However, the First Thief argues, “We cannot live on grass, on berries, water, / As beasts and birds and fishes” (4.3.417-18), to which Timon gives a shocking response: “Nor on the beasts themselves, the birds and fishes—You must eat men” (4.3.419). In other words, human beings, including the thieves, can no longer satisfy their hunger with animal flesh because they now feed on human flesh. “You must eat men” suggests the extremity of Timon’s misanthropy and cynicism against human cruelty and ingratitude. Thus, Timon criticizes eating both animal and human flesh in these two examples.

3 “Man’s Unkindness” and Pythagoras’s and Montaigne’s Ideas on Cruelty

Following the notion of the Great Chain of Being, most people believed that humans were superior to animals in the Jacobean time. Language, reason, and religion were the main factors that distinguished humans from animals, as well as courtesy and cleanliness. Nakedness is closely linked to bestiality; hence, naked Timon calls himself “[a] beast” (4.3.50). Those who did not have these features were seen as animals; accordingly, African, American, and Irish indigenous and English women, children, and poor

people were considered as animals. However, interestingly, according to Thomas, the boundary between humans and animals was vague and fragile at the time: "Wherever we look in early modern England, we find anxiety, latent or explicit, about any form of behaviour which threatened to transgress the fragile boundaries between man and the animal creation" (38). Consequently, people were nervous and worried about becoming bestialized.

Timon of Athens seems to mirror such "anxiety" and challenge the prevailing anthropocentric views through its frequent use of animal metaphors. After realizing his friends' true identity, Timon starts comparing people to animals. He sees his flatterers as "dogs" (3.7.84), the Athenians as "wolves" (4.1.2), Alcibiades's prostitutes as "beagles" (4.3.174), Alcibiades as "[a] beast" (4.3.50), and Apemantus as "a beast" (4.3.324). In short, as Apemantus says, "the commonwealth of Athens is become a forest of beasts" (4.3.346-47). By contrast, outside Athens Timon becomes a naked misanthrope and beastlike. The Second Senator refers to him as "Transformed Timon" (5.5.19) while Apemantus calls him a "[b]east" (4.3.370) and a "[t]oad" (4.3.370). Even Timon, himself, calls himself "[a] beast" (4.3.50).

As mentioned in the introduction, Farnham claims that "[t]he beastliness of pictured in *Timon* is worse than that of beasts," and that "[t]he beastlike men in *Timon* are often ravening devourers of each other" (70-71). Indeed, "[t]he beastlike men" are described as being worse than beasts through Timon's voice, as Farnham points out; Timon sees himself as such, which may be why he commits suicide. One of the distinctions between animals and humans is "reason," as Thomas observes (32). Hamlet often refers to "reason" when he compared animals and humans in his soliloquies. However, Timon never mentions "reason," but instead considers "unkindness" as the border between "beastlike" Athenians and beasts.

Timon criticizes human "unkindness" when comparing them with animals. For example, on leaving Athens, Timon believes that he will find "[t]h'unkindest beast more kinder than mankind" (4.1.36) in the woods. Dawson and Minton comments on this phrase: "The word-play on *unkindest*, *kinder*, and *mankind* associates kindness with kindred . . . Although there is

no reason that beasts should be kind (=gentle) with humans, in Timon’s world the beasts are *kinder* to humans than humans are to their own kindred” (4.1.36n.). Another example occurs when, “being sick of man’s unkindness” (4.3.175), Timon digs the earth to find roots to eat because he is hungry. The word “unkindness” seems to indicate “cruelty,” given Timon’s personification of his house and his association of “mankind” with “an iron heart” in his speech, “The place which I have feasted, does it now, / Like all mankind, show me an iron heart?” (3.4.80-81). The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines “unkindness, n. (1. a)” as follows: “Behaviour or character not in accordance with natural feelings or moral standards, esp. in regard to familial relationships; absence of natural or normal affection, loyalty, or respect for other people.” The term has vague and broad senses in this definition, but as Jowett sees “unkind” in the First Senator’s line, “We were not all unkind” (5.5.20) as “unnaturally cruel” (17.21n.), Timon seems to mean cruelty by the word “unkindness.”

Other characters recognize their unkind treatment of Timon, though they do not seem to truly feel sorry for him. At Timon’s second feast, the First Lord says, “I hope it remains not unkindly with your lordship / that I returned you an empty messenger” (3.7.35-36). Similarly, in the final act, when Alcibiades is about to attack Athens, the Second Senator tells his colleagues he has asked Timon to return to the town and protect them: “So did we woo Transformed Timon to our city’s love / By humble message and by promised means. / We were not all unkind, nor all deserve / The common stroke of war” (5.4.18-22). As the Senators have rejected Alcibiades’s petition that they exempt his friend (a nameless character) from the death penalty despite the friend’s and Alcibiades’s military honor and sacrifice for Athens, so they have refused Timon’s help, when he asked, despite his contribution to the state. According to Alcibiades, “cursed Athens / mindless of thy [Timon’s] worth, / Forgetting thy great deeds when neighbour states / But for thy sword and fortune trod upon them” (4.3.93-95). Dowson and Minton comments on these lines: “Apparently, he [Timon] was involved in a war, where by wielding both his *sword* and

fortune (i.e. his money) he was able to protect from its neighbours” (4.3.94-95n.). Moreover, Timon, in a destitute state, recognizes his “great deeds” (4.3.94) for “the state’s best health” (2.2.197) and believes that it deserves “[a] thousand talents” (2.2.199). He dispatches his servant to the senators to borrow a certain amount of money, but his servant returns without it. Furious Timon denounces, “These old fellows / Have their ingratitude in them hereditary. / Their blood is caked, ’tis cold, it seldom flows, / ’Tis lack of kindly warmth they are not kind” (2.2.214-17). Notably, the terms “unkindness” and “ingratitude” are used interchangeably in the play. In fact, just before the Second Senator speaks the quoted lines (“So did . . . war”), the First Senator says to Alcibiades, “We sent to thee to give thy rages balm, / To wipe out our ingratitude with loves / Above their quantity” (5.4.16-18). Thus, the concepts of “ingratitude” and “unkindness” are closely related to each other in *Timon of Athens*.

Moreover, the idea of “ingratitude” is frequently compared to monsters in this tragedy: “O, see the monstrousness of man / When he looks out in an ungrateful shape” (3.2.75-76); “this ungrateful seat / Of monstrous friends” (4.2.45-46); “The monstrous bulk of this ingratitude” (5.1.63). Karen Edwards notes that “[t]he profoundly misanthropic Timon assumes that human beings, in their hypocrisy, greed and ingratitude, are the most monstrous creatures” (298). Monsters were seen as a kind of animal in those days; hence, it is natural that animal and monstrous metaphors coexist in the play. For example, Edward Topsell mentions the “Satyrs,” “Agopithecus” (the ape-like goat), Sphinx, “Arctopithecus” (the ape-like bear), and others in the genre of “monsters” in *The History of Four-Footed Beasts* (1607) (15-20). As Hofële points out, these monsters “are all hybrids; mostly hybrids not of two different kinds of animals but of animals and humans” (“Of Hybrids” 2). Following Topsell’s category, Shakespeare describes Caliban and Bottom as both animals (a fish and an ass) and monsters (hybrids of animals and humans) in *The Tempest* and *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*.

Timon of Athens seems to question humans’ superiority to animals by describing cruel and corrupted humans as animals, including monsters. The

play claims that humans are actually more brutal than animals by underlining human “unkindness.” As Thomas notes, the firm line between animals and humans was emphasized to justify eating animal flesh. René Descartes, for example, did not feel guilty about killing animals because he believed them to be machines that felt no pain (46). Pythagoras and Montaigne, however, attacked human cruelty and showed sympathy to animals. Pythagoras claims that every creature once lived peacefully when humans used to feed only on plants without killing and eating animals. This was until human “lust” drove people to eat animal flesh:

All things were voyd of guylefulness: no treason was in trust:
But all was fréndshippe loue and peace. But after that the lust
Of one (what God so ere he was) disdeyning former fare,
Too cram that cruell croppe of his with fleshmeate did not spare,
He made a way for wickednesse. And first of all the knyfe
Was staynd with blood of sauage beastes in ridding them of lyfe. (2C4)

Montaigne points to human cruelty in “Of Cruelty” in the second volume of his *Essay*:

I could hardly be perswaded . . . that the world could have afforded so marble-hearted and savage-minded men, that for the onely pleasure of murther would commit-it; then cut, mangle, and hacke other members in pieces . . . that is the extreamest point whereunto the crueltie of man may attaine. (2: 249)

Montaigne, on the contrary, claims that he does not have such cruelty and shows sympathy to animals, referring to Pythagoras: “I seldom take any beast alive, but I give him his libertie. *Pythagoras* was wont to buy fishes of fishers, and birds of fowlers to set them free againe,” Montaigne actually quotes Pythagoras’s words that were quoted above, “And first of all the knyfe / Was staynd with blood of sauage beastes in ridding them of lyfe”

(2C4), though this sentence from *Metamorphoses* is a bit differently translated by Florio in his translation of the *Essays*, “And first our blades in blood embrude I deeme / with slaughter of poore beasts reeking seeme.” Montaigne goes on to say:

Such as by nature shew themselves bloodie-minded towards harmles beasts, witnes a naturall propension vnto crueltie. After the ancient Romanes had once enured themselves without horror to beholde the slaughter of wilde beasts in their showes, they came to the murder of men and Gladiators. (2: 250)

These ideas seem to be epitomized in Timon’s line “[t]h’unkindest beast more kinder than mankind” (4.1.36). A similar but slightly different view is seen in *The Winter’s Tale*. When Antigonus is ordered to abandon Perdita, he wishes for her safety: “Wolves and bears, they say, / Casting their savageness aside, have done / Like offices of pity” (2.3.184-86). Antigonus demonstrates savage wolves’ and bears’ kindness and generosity, alluding to Romulus and Remus, the twins who were raised by a she-wolf; at the same time, he implies that Leontes is crueler than such savage animals.

“Kindness” as a human trait suggested by Ariel is the key element that drives Prospero to abandon his anger and revenge and is closely related to Timon’s use of the word. Timon sees “kindness” as the trait that distinguishes humans from animals, and criticizes his ungrateful friends and the senators as “beasts.” Meanwhile, Prospero believes that humans should show pity to their enemies when they are suffering. He regains his “reason” and abandons his “fury” by Ariel’s words. At the opening of Act 5 in *The Tempest*, Ariel reports that he has charmed Alonso, Sebastian, and Antonio into immobility, following Prospero’s order, and that “all three distracted” (5.1.12). Ariel tells Prospero that he should see them suffering, saying “good old lord Gonzalo / His tears run down his beard like winter’s drops / From eave of reeds. Your charm so strongly works ’em / That, if you now beheld them, your affections / Would become tender” (5.1.15-19). Ariel alludes to

Gonzalo’s “tears,” or pity for the sinful three and expects that Prospero’s anger will subside if he sees their condition. When Prospero asks, “Dost thou think so, spirit?” (5.1.19), Ariel responds with: “Mine would, sir, were I human” (5.1.20). Most importantly, Ariel suggests that if he were a human, he would pity them like Gonzalo. Accordingly, Ariel encourages his master to pity and forgive them because he is human. In other words, pity is portrayed as a human trait. Prospero responds to him as follows:

PROSPERO. And mine shall.
Hast thou, which art but air, a touch, a feeling
Of their afflictions, and shall not myself
(One of their kind, that relish all as sharply,
Passion as they) be kindlier moved than thou art?
Though with their high wrongs I am struck to th’quick,
Yet with my nobler reason ’gainst my fury
Do I take part. (5.1.20-27)

Prospero has been obsessed with anger and revenge, but then comes to his senses by Ariel’s word “human” (5.1.20). In other words, he regains his human nature—kindness and reason—and decides to abandon his revenge. Prospero’s “kind” (5.1.23) suggests a “[human] race,” while “kindlier moved” has two meanings, “more compassionately affected, but also more in accord with humankind,” according to Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan’s commentaries in their edition of the Arden Third Series (5.1.23n.; 5.1.24n.). Prospero’s word-play of “kind” recalls Timon’s “[t]h’unkindest beast more kinder than mankind” (4.1.36). Yet, if Timon had his “reason” and accepted the apologies of the senators while appeasing Alcibiades like Ariel did, Timon’s Athens would become peaceful without his death. Timon never speaks the term “reason” and sees himself as “[a] beast” (4.3.50) while seeing the others as beasts. Therefore, unlike Prospero, Timon had already lacked reason from the beginning of the play, and that is true of other characters except for Flavius and other minor characters. If Flavius were a wiser and

stronger figure, he could change Timon’s mind like Ariel did, but he is described as being mentally weak as a woman, as Timon says, “What, dost thou weep? Come nearer then. I love thee / Because thou art woman and disclaim’st / Flinty mankind” (4.3.477-48). After all, unlike Prospero, Timon cannot but die as a furious and vengeful misanthrope.

Conclusion

This study, referencing the influence of Pythagoras and Montaigne on *Timon of Athens*, has discussed animal-human relationships and human “unkindness” by analyzing the food and animal metaphors used in the play. It can be inferred that *Timon of Athens* mirrors people’s anxiety of becoming animals. It questions the prevailing anthropocentric views through the recurrent animal metaphors for humans, Apemantus’s and Timon’s preference of vegetarianism over animal flesh, and the description of “man’s unkindness,” or human cruelty, the opposite of human kindness that distinguishes them from animals.

As many critics have pointed out, *Timon of Athens* is an unfinished and imperfect play. The final scene, which was written by Shakespeare according to Jowett, and Dowson and Minton, ends with a reconciliation between Alcibiades and Athens, as suggested in Alcibiades’s final words, “Bring me into your city, / And I will use the olive with my sword, / Make war breed peace, make peace stint war, make each / Prescribe to others, as each other’s leech. / Let our drums strike” (5.5.79-83).⁹ However, his intention is ambiguous, and his medicinal metaphors sounds bloody and uncanny. Here, Alcibiades symbolically uses “olive” for peace and “sword” for war and claims that he will stop attacking the city. Instead, he tries to remedy war and peace as a “leech” or a physician. According to Dawson and Minton, “leech” suggests “physician (but also the animal that sucks blood)” (5.5.82n.). This play thus begins with the food metaphor of Timon’s blood and ends with the medical metaphor of Athenian people’s blood. What this ending signifies is unclear, but the overall play obviously suggests that human

cruelty, which is worse than that of animals, is strongly condemned and associated with murder and blood, as shown in Pythagoras and Montaigne’s texts, while kindness is described as a human characteristic.

Notes

* This research was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 21K00376. An earlier version of this study first appeared as a seminar paper for the ESRA (European Shakespeare Research Association) Virtual Conference 2021 (Seminar 15: “An art that nature makes?”: Nature and Shakespeare’s Greece). I would like to thank Prof. Alison Findlay and Prof. Vassiliki Markidou, the seminar convenors, Emeritus Prof. John Drakakis, the commentator, and Prof. Lisa Hopkins and other panelists for giving helpful questions and suggestions.

- 1 All quotations from *Timon of Athens* are from the Third Series of the Arden Shakespeare, edited by Anthony B. Dawson and Gretchen E. Minton.
- 2 For details of authorship of the play, see Vickers 244-90; also, Kane 217-20.
- 3 For recent discussions of *Timon of Athens* that focus on usury, credit, and debt, see Jowett, “Middleton” 219-37; Grady, “*Timon of Athens*” 430-51; Bailey 430-51; Kolb 399-419; Magarik 28-64.
- 4 According to Geoffrey Bullough and Jowett, Plutarch’s *Lives* and Lucian’s *The Dialogue of Timon* are two main sources of *Timon of Athens*, and *Palace of Pleasure* is its minor source (Bullough 225-26; Jowett, Intro, 17-19).
- 5 See Farnham 71-72; Hofële, “Man” 230-31.
- 6 Apemantus’s bloody and grotesque cannibalistic imagery in Act 1, Scene 2 seems to indicate Middleton’s taste rather than Shakespeare’s.
- 7 For the details of Apemantus’s figure, see Intro, 74-79 in Jowett’s edition; also, Intro, 54-61 in Dawson and Minton’s edition.
- 8 The term “breakfast” is reminiscent of Timon’s another speech: “You had rather be at a breakfast of enemies than a / dinner of friends” (1.2.75-76). As the lamb is eaten by the wolf, so are Alcibiades’s enemies eaten by Alcibiades.
- 9 See Jowett, Intro, 2; also see Dawson and Minton, Intro, 8.

Works Cited

- Bailey, Amanda. “*Timon of Athens*, Forms of Payback, and the Genre of Debt,” *English Literary Renaissance*, vol. 41, no. 2, 2011, pp. 375-400.
- Borlik, Todd A. *Ecocriticism and Early Modern English Literature: Green Pasture*. Routledge, 2011.
- Bullough, Geoffrey, editor. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*. Vol. 6, Routledge, 1966.
- Briggs, Julia. *This Stage-Play World: Texts and Contexts, 1580-1625*. 2nd ed, Oxford UP, 1997.

"Meat," "Root," and "Man's Unkindness" in *Timon of Athens*

- Chambers, E.K. *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems*. Vol. 1, Clarendon, 1930.
- Descartes, René. *A Discourse on the Method of Correctly Conducting One's Reason and Seeking Truth in the Sciences*. Translated by Ian MacLean, Oxford UP, 2006.
- Draper, John W. "The Theme of 'Timon of Athens,'" *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 29, no. 1, 1934, pp. 20-31.
- Egan, Gabriel. "Gaia and the Great Chain of Being." *Ecocritical Shakespeare*, edited by Lynne Bruckner and Dan Brayton, Routledge, 2011, pp. 57-69.
- Ellis-Fermor, Una. "Timon of Athens. An Unfinished Play," *The Review of English Studies*, vol. 18, no. 71, 1942, pp. 270-83.
- Empson, William. *Seven Types of Ambiguity*. 3rd ed., Chatto and Windus, 1953.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Praise of Folly*. Translated by Sir Thomas Chaloner. 1549. Early English Books Online, search.proquest.com/eebo/docview/2248550418/99837493/3D6C21CC40314B68PQ/4?accountid=163371. Accessed 30 October 2023.
- Estok, Simon. "Queerly Green: From Meaty and Meatless Days and Nights in *Timon of Athens*." *Ecological Approaches to Early Modern English Texts: Afield Guide to Reading and Teaching*, edited by Jennifer Munroe et al., Routledge, 2015, pp. 91-98.
- Farnham, Willard. *Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies*. U of California P, 1950.
- Fitzpatrick, Joan. *Food in Shakespeare: Early Modern Dietaries and the Plays*. Ashgate, 2007.
- Fudge, Erica. "Saying Nothing Concerning the Same: On Dominion, Purity, and Meat in Early Modern England." *Renaissance Beasts: Of Animals, Humans, and Other Wonderful Creatures*, edited by Erica Fudge, U of Illinois P, 2004, pp. 70-85.
- Grady, Hugh. "Timon of Athens: The Dialectic of Usury, Nihilism, and Art." *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works*, edited by Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard, vol. 1, Blackwell, 2006, pp. 430-51.
- _____. *Shakespeare and Impure Aesthetics*. Cambridge UP, 2009.
- Haug, Ralph A. "The Authorship of 'Timon of Athens,'" *The Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 227-48.
- Hofele, Andreas. "Man, Woman, and Beast in *Timon's Athens*," *Shakespeare Survey*, vol. 56, 2003, pp. 227-35.
- _____. "Of Hybrid and Hydras: Early Modern Political Zoology - and Shakespeare's *Coriolanus*," *Actes des Congrès de la Société Française Shakespeare*, vol. 38, 2020, pp. 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.4000/shakespeare.5235>. Accessed 1 November 2023.
- Holdsworth, R.V. "Middleton and Shakespeare: The Case for Middleton's Hand in *Timon of Athens*," Diss, U of Manchester, 1982.
- Honigmann, E. A. J. "Timon of Athens," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 12, no. 1, 1961, pp. 3-20.

“Meat,” “Root,” and “Man’s Unkindness” in *Timon of Athens*

- Jonson, Ben. *Volpone, or The Fox*. Edited by Robert N. Watson, Rev. ed., Methuen, 2019.
- Jowett, John. “Middleton and Debt in *Timon of Athens*.” *Money and the Age of Shakespeare: Essays in New Economic Criticism*, edited by Linda Woodbridge, Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, pp. 219-37.
- _____. “*Timon of Athens*.” *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion*, edited by Stanley Wells et al., Oxford, Clarendon, 1987, pp. 501-08.
- Kane, Eilidh. “Shakespeare and Middleton’s Co-Authorship of *Timon of Athens*,” *Journal of Early Modern Studies*, no. 5, 2016, pp. 217-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.13128/JEMS-2279-7149-18090>. Accessed 20 November 2023.
- Knight, Charles. *Studies of Shakespeare*. George Routledge, 1894.
- Kolb, Laura. “Debt’s Poetry in *Timon of Athens*,” *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, vol. 58, no. 2, 2018, pp. 399-419.
- Lucian. *The Dialogue of Timon. Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, edited by Geoffrey Bullough, vol. 6, Routledge, 1966, pp. 263-77.
- Magarik, Raphael. “Dependent Contractors: *Timon of Athens*, Collaborative Writing, and Theatrical Capitalism,” *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, vol. 19, no. 1, 2019, pp. 28-64.
- Montaigne, Michel de. *The Essays*. Translated by John Florio. Vol. 2. 1603. Early English Books Online, search.proquest.com/eebo/docview/2240953828/13D69FC7937347F0PQ/1?accountid=163371&imgSeq=1. Accessed 30 October 2023.
- Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Translated by Arthur Golding. 1567. Early English Books Online, search.proquest.com/eebo/docview/2240861651/99845834/10CE0DC5F61A45D EPQ/9?accountid=163371. Accessed 30 October 2023.
- Plutarch. *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes. Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, edited by Geoffrey Bullough, vol. 6, Routledge, 1966, pp. 251- 63.
- Raber, Karen, and Karen Edwards, editors. *Shakespeare and Animals: A Dictionary*. Bloomsbury, 2022.
- Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. Edited by Juliet Dusinberre, Bloomsbury, 2006.
- _____. *The Merchant of Venice*. Edited by John Drakakis, Methuen, 2010.
- _____. *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. Edited by Sukanta Chaudhuri, Bloomsbury, 2017.
- _____. *The Tempest*. Edited by Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan, Thomson Learning, 1999.
- _____. *Titus Andronicus*. Edited by Jonathan Bate. Routledge, 1995.
- _____. *Twelfth Night, or What You Will*. Edited by Keir Elam, Bloomsbury, Bloomsbury, 1995.
- _____. *The Winter’s Tale*. Edited by John Pitcher, Bloomsbury, 2010.
- Shakespeare, William and Thomas Middleton. *Timon of Athens*. Edited by Anthony B. Dawson and Gretchen E. Minton, Methuen, 2008.
- _____. *Timon of Athens*. Edited by John Jowett, Oxford UP, 2004.
- Sykes, H. Dugdale “The Problem of *Timon of Athens*.” *Sidelights on Elizabethan*

“Meat,” “Root,” and “Man’s Unkindness” in *Timon of Athens*

Drama: A Series of Studies Dealing with the Authorship of Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Plays, Oxford UP, 1924, pp. 1-48.

Thomas, Keith. *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800*. Penguin Books, 1983.

Topsell, Edward. *The History of Four-Footed Beasts*. 1607. Early English Books Online. [proquest.com/eebo/docview/2240889773/99857428/681D7EB589A04616PQ/6?accountid=163371](https://www.proquest.com/eebo/docview/2240889773/99857428/681D7EB589A04616PQ/6?accountid=163371). Accessed 11 November 2023.

“Unkindness, n. 1.a.” Oxford English Dictionary Online, Oxford UP, 2023, www.oed.com/dictionary/unkindness_n?tab=meaning_and_use#16704739. Accessed 11 November 2023.

Vickers, Brian. *Shakespeare, Co-Author: A Historical Study of Five Collaborative Plays*. Oxford UP, 2002.

Wells, William. “*Timon of Athens*,” *Notes and Queries*, 12th ser., vol. 6, 1920, pp. 266-69.