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In writing his sequence of Ages plays – The Golden Age (1611), The Silver Age (1613), The Brazen Age (1613), The Iron Age (1632) and The Second Part of the Iron Age (1632) – as well as his long narrative poem Troia Britanica (1609), Thomas Heywood clearly used as his fundamental source The Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye (ca. 1475), a work that epitomizes the medieval version of Greek mythology, including the Trojan War. However, he modified Caxton’s narrative under the influence of a number of classical writers, notably Virgil, Homer, and above all Ovid. The changes Heywood makes to Caxton illustrate how the view of the classics and of literature in general changed in the 16th century, a change in which Ovid, as the most studied classical writer, played a key part.

The Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye is a translation by William Caxton of a work by Raoul Lefèvre whose text on is based several earlier writers; for convenience and following custom I will refer to its author as Caxton. It is fundamentally an attempt to transform many stories from classical literature into a medieval romance. A series of heroes – Jupiter, Perseus, Hercules, Hector – are portrayed as knights who engage in adventures, often accompanied by their trusty squires – Ganymede, Danus, Philotes – in which they fight villains, monsters, and enemy armies. Much of the text is devoted to the depictions of fights, interspersed with intense dialogues between the heroes and the beautiful “damoyssel” with whom they fall in love. In order to achieve this transformation, Caxton wove together the many strands of Greek myth (mostly as the Romans depicted it) into a more or less coherent story. He also had to white-wash the heroes’ characters as much as possible, since Jupiter and Hercules in particular were hardly models of chivalry and their affairs were not conducted according to the rules of courtly love. He also had to cope with the paganism of the stories and their lack of a Christian moral framework. Finally, he had to deal with the fantastic elements in the stories; while dragons, sorcerers, giants, were common in romance stories, the much wilder imaginary beings, and especially the interventions of the pagan gods, in works such as the Metamorphoses, were clearly a problem for Caxton. Often there was no coherent way to translate a story from Ovid (who was certainly one of Caxton’s main sources) into a medieval romance framework, and so the narrative is at times quite incoherent, but this did not seem to bother its readers; Caxton’s Recuyell continued to be read into the 18th century.

Much of the material in the Recuyell derived from sections of classical material that were already suited to narrative treatment, such as the lives of Perseus and Hercules and the Trojan War as portrayed in late classical sources. But to include other myths, notably a number from the Metamorphoses, Caxton had to join together various strands with results that are surprising to those familiar with them in their original context. The story of Saturn and Jupiter uses motifs from the violent and primitive story of the battle between the Titans and Olympians to create a domestic tragedy of sibling rivalry and children raised in secret. To tell the story of Hercules’ visit to Hades, Caxton weaves together several myths, including Pluto’s abduction of Proserpine, the visit to Hell of Pirithous and Theseus, and (by making Orpheus Proserpine’s husband) Orpheus’ failed attempt to rescue his wife.
Coping with the pagan origins of the stories was a particular problem for Caxton, as it was for Christian authors since the early medieval period who sought to justify the reading of classical literature that clearly contravened their religious values. He is careful at the beginning of his text to explain that “the Enemy of man” created “the cursed sect of Goddis” (9). He says of the oracle at Delphi:

In this temple was a grete ymage composed and made alle of fyn golde In the worhippe of God Appolyne / and how well that the ymage was deef and dombe / yet allwaye ydolatrye regned in such wyse that tyme in the world. That the devyll put hym in the ymage and gaf answers to the paynems of that thingis that they demanded of hym And this dide the devyll for to abuse the foolish peple / that at that tyme belevyd that this ymage was verray god &c. (549)

Caxton does portray the world of his text as a heathen one, and his characters often pray to the pagan gods, but he is (generally) careful not to show that these prayers are effective and there are no interventions of the gods into human affairs, interventions that are so common in classical literature.

Caxton also make use of the traditional techniques used by medieval thinkers to justify the study of the classics: euhemerism and allegorization. Euhemerism was the doctrine that the Greek myths were distortions of true history; the Greek gods were kings and queens in the distant past whose acts were distorted and exaggerated by later poets into the fantastic stories of the myths. Thus Caxton says of Saturn:

In thys tyme hyt was so that whatsomever man practyquyed or fond ony thynges prouffytable for the comyn welche was recomanded solemnply and called and named a god after theyr folyssh and derke custome. Saturne was named a god ffor in hys yought by hys cunnnyng he was the first ffyndar to gyve instruction of eeryng and labouring the erthe and of sowing and repyng the cornes. (10)

Throughout the Recuyell, Caxton frequently intervenes to explain how some element in a myth was the result of “the poets” distorting what really happened. Other medieval thinkers portrayed the myths as allegories in which the pagan stories were seen as embodying edifying moral truths and hence were worthy of study despite their paganism; this approach is exemplified by the 14th century French Ovide Moralisé. Thus Jupiter’s appearance to Danae as a shower of gold was interpreted by some medieval thinkers as a fable about how virtue may be corrupted by gold. This becomes in Caxton an elaborate story of how Jupiter disguises himself as a pedlar to bribe his way into Danae’s tower, a story that Heywood dramatizes in The Golden Age. An extreme example of Caxton’s literalizing of an allegorical interpretation is his treatment of Hercules’ confrontation with the many-headed Hydra. According to the myth, when Hercules cut off one of the heads of this monster, it sprouted two in its place. According to the allegorical interpretation found for example in Boccaccio’s Genealogie Deorum Gentilium, the many heads of the Hydra represent the arguments of sophistic philosophers; when one fallacy is exposed, they produce seven more. And so Caxton presents the Hydra as a fierce half-man, half-dragon who confronts Hercules and poses sophistic questions to him; as soon as he replies to one,
the Hydra proposes seven more. Eventually, however, they fall to fighting and Hercules kills him.

Related to his concern not to validate the paganism of his characters is Caxton’s desire to limit the fantastic elements in the Greek myths. Medieval romance allowed a certain amount of fantasy – dragons, giants, and the sorcery practised by characters like Merlin – but its role was limited. Sorcery was primarily deception. Jupiter uses sorcery to disguise himself as Amphitrion in order to seduce Alcmena, and Juno similarly disguises herself “in diverse likenes and figures of bestes or of women” in Diana’s temple while Alcmena is attempting to give birth; she also uses witchcraft to prevent the delivery from happening. But the wilder flights of fantasy in Greek myth are tamed by Caxton. The three-headed dog Cerberus is portrayed as a giant with certain dog-like characteristics. The Centaurs are also giants; they are such good horsemen that they seem to be at one with their horses. The Pegasus is merely a very fast boat. Often Caxton uses a form of euhemerism to explain away the fantastic. The poets said Cerberus had three heads to signify his three singular vices of pride, avarice and lechery. Medusa stunned viewers with her beauty and riches, and the poets said she turned them to stone. When Atlas saw the head of Medusa in the hands of Perseus he fled into the mountains; the poets said he was turned into a mountain. But shortly afterwards Medusa’s head actually does turn men into stone; Caxton cannot tell the story of Perseus without this happening. This kind of incoherence is frequent in the text.

When he was creating the Ages plays, Heywood found many aspects of the Recuyell useful. Its story-line gave him a way of structuring his sequence. The humanization of the gods and the use of medieval romance motifs meant that the action could easily be portrayed on stage and was accessible to audiences, since Elizabethan drama, especially in its earlier phases, made use of many of the same medieval conventions (in plays such as Clyomon and Clamydes and Mucedorus). The avoidance of the fantastic also facilitated staging (although the Ages famously push Elizabethan “special effects” to their limit). There are long stretches of these plays that are simply dramatizations of Caxton.

But what is striking about the Ages is the extent that they deviate from Caxton, primarily as the result of Heywood’s returning the classical sources of the Recuyell. The second act of The Silver Age clearly derives directly from Plautus’ Amphitryon, not from the tame retelling of it in the Recuyell. The scenes of Hector’s challenge and the fight with Ajax in 1 Iron Age are closely based on Book 7 of The Iliad (in Chapman’s translation). And the story of the fall of Troy in the first three acts of 2 Iron Age closely follows Book 2 of the Aeneid and is very different from the portrayal of these events in Caxton. But it is above all Ovid’s Metamorphoses and Heroides that drive the various diversions from Heywood’s basic source for the plays.

Ovid was undoubtedly the most important influence on Heywood in his early years as a writer. Like other educated men of his generation, he was extensively exposed to Ovid at school and at university; according to Jonathan Bate, “Extensive reading and memorizing of the Metamorphoses was almost universally required in sixteenth-century grammar schools” (21). But it was Shakespeare’s strongly Ovidian Venus and Adonis, appearing in
1593 at the very beginning of Heywood’s writing career, that was the strongest catalyst to make Ovid central to his work and that of many of his contemporaries. Heywood wrote an obvious imitation of that poem, Oenone and Paris, published in 1594, which is based on Heroides 5. He translated two other of the Heroides, Paris to Helen and Helen to Paris, which were later published as part of his long narrative poem, Troia Britanica (1609). And he translated two of Ovid’s other works, the Ars Amatoria and the Remedia Amoris, which eventually found their way into print.

In order to use much of the material from classical sources Heywood had turn Jupiter and the others who were humanized in Caxton back into gods. He does this formally at the end of The Golden Age, when the Fates “deify” Jupiter, Neptune and Pluto. In the Silver and Brazen Ages the gods are portrayed as in classical Roman literature, with the same powers to intervene in human affairs. However, in his portrayal of the Trojan War in the Iron Age he reverts to the practice of Caxton (and late classical authors such as Dares and Dictys) and essentially omits the gods, who play such a central role in the Iliad.

The influence of Ovid is seen throughout the Ages. The concept of the Ages sequence derives from Book 1 of the Metamorphoses, in which Ovid describes the decline of human civilization in terms of a diminution from gold to iron. Although the Recuyell provides the basic structure of the series and is the default source to which Heywood constantly returns, Heywood usually prefers Ovid’s versions of the myths when they are available, and even when he is following Caxton the influence of Ovid is frequently felt, as the following examples illustrate.

Caxton’s version of the story of Callisto clearly derives from Book 2 of the Metamorphoses. But as usual in the Recuyell it is embedded into a coherent narrative. Jupiter meets Callisto while he is ransacking the palace of her father Lycaon, and, though he lusts after her, agrees to let her become one of Diana’s nuns. Jupiter subsequently disguises himself as a novice in the order to seduce her. Caxton portrays Diana is a sort of mother superior of a “cloister,” incongruously preoccupied with hunting. Heywood turns her back into a goddess, but he follows Caxton faithfully up to the point when the seduction begins. At this point Caxton gives Jupiter a long courtly speech to Callisto in which he reveals his passion (55-56). Heywood instead takes inspiration from Ovid, who has the disguised Jupiter begin by kissing her “not modestly, nor as a maiden kisses” (2.431). Heywood develops this into one of the most overtly erotic scenes of the period (34-35). The racy aspect of the scene that Caxton circumvents becomes its dominant element.

One of the more extreme examples of Caxton’s euhemerism is his treatment of the fight between Hercules and Achelous for the hand of Deianira. In Book 9 of the Metamorphoses Achelous is a river god who can change his shape; he wrestles with Hercules and successively changes his shape into a snake, and then into a bull, whom Hercules finally defeats by pulling off one of his horns. Caxton makes Achelous the king of a neighbouring kingdom to that of Deianira’s father Oeneus; when Oeneus chooses Hercules as his son-in-law Achelous leads an army against him, which Hercules defeats. As Caxton explains:
The poetes escryue & write this conquest that Hercules made upon achelous / ssaynyng that Achelous fought first in guyse of a man . and that than he was vaynqysshyd / After he chaungyd him self in guyse of a serpent / this is to vunderstande in subtyllesse and in malyce as he dide in assaillying hercules by night finnably he fought in the guyse of a booll / And that hercules brake his oon horne / That is to vunderstand that at the laste Achelous was fiers as a booll / ffor he deyde well nyhe for pryde and sorowe that he was taken / And that hercules brake hys horne / that is to vunderstande that he brak his royame and destroyed hit. (384)

In *The Brazen Age*, Heywood returns to Ovid’s version of the story, with added spectacle; Hercules wrestles with Achelous who turns successively into a serpent, a fury “all fire-worke” and a bull, one of whose horns Hercules removes (175-76).

Heywood follows the basic elements of Caxton’s portrayal of Hercules’ visit to hell, mixing Hercules’ assigned labour of bringing back Cerberus in chains with the Proserpine story and the story of Theseus and Pirithous’s visit to hell. He does not however follow Caxton in making Orpheus Proserpine’s husband, and indeed in *The Silver Age* omits Orpheus altogether. For Caxton Hell is simply “a lowe and basse Cite that was callid helle for as moch as this yle . Kynge pluto and his complices dide so much harme and euyll . that they were compared and likened unto deuyles and their Cite was named Helle” (313). For Heywood Hell is the classical Hades. He also very much changes the ending of this episode. In Caxton, Hercules simply binds Cerberus, beats Pluto, trounces his hellish crew, and brings back Proserpine to her mother. Heywood instead follows Ovid in Book 5 of the *Metamorphoses*. Jupiter is brought in to judge Proserpine’s fate, as he does in Ovid. His reply to Ceres contains verbal echoes of his speech in the *Metamorphoses*; his disturbing statement there that “this is no harm that has been done, but only love” (5.525-26) becomes in Heywood “The rape that you call force, we title love” (163). Because Proserpine has partaken of the pomegranate seeds she is forced to remain in hell. In Ovid, Jupiter decrees that she can spend half the year with Ceres and half with Pluto, thus making her an embodiment of the seasons. In *The Silver Age*, curiously, he decrees that she can spend half of each month on earth and the rest in hell, evoking the phases of the moon. As far as I can tell, Heywood invented this modification of the Proserpine story.

The scenes of Hercules’ bondage to Omphale in *The Brazen Age* are clearly derived from *Heroides* 9, and have no equivalent in Caxton. In Ovid’s poem Deianira complains about two women in Hercules’ life, Omphale, the Lydian queen whom he serves dressed as a woman, and Iole, the daughter of Eurytus, king of Oechalia, who was conquered by Hercules. Ovid’s poem is presumably the source of confusion among later commentators about the identities of Omphale and Iole, since it is easy to read the text as using both names to refer to the same woman. Caxton does not mention Omphale and tells only the story of Iole; Heywood uses both names to refer to Omphale, whose enslavement of Hercules is given very effective dramatic treatment. Presumably Caxton avoided the Omphale story as too degrading to a noble knight like Hercules.

Caxton’s version of the death of Hercules is clearly closely based on Ovid’s version, and so there is little occasion for Heywood to vary it. Of course Caxton omits the
intervention of Jupiter and the final apotheosis of Hercules, which Heywood includes in what is surely one of the most ambitious pieces of staging in early modern drama: “Jupiter above strikes him with a thunder-bolt, his body sinks, and from the heavens descends a hand in a cloud, that from the place where Hercules was burnt, brings up a starre and fixith it in the firmament” (254). Hercules’ killing of Lychas occurs as in Caxton, but when he says in The Brazen Age: “Euboean Sea receive him, for he’s thine” (252) he evokes the passage in Ovid (9.226-29) in which Lychas becomes rocks in the Euboean Sea, a miraculous metamorphosis not mentioned in Caxton. There are other signs that Heywood is following Ovid directly; when Hercules lists his many exploits (253-54) he does so in almost exactly the same order that he does in Ovid (9.182 ff.).

Incidentally, Heywood’s Hercules also mentions in his final boast “the monster Cacus,” who does not figure in Ovid’s list. He does however figure in the same position in Golding’s translation of this passage of the Metamorphoses; at least, I assume that is whom Golding means by “the monstrous Giant Cake by Tyber” (Golding 9.243). This is clear evidence that Heywood is consulting Golding’s translation. There are signs of this also in Medea’s incantation speech in The Brazen Age, which clearly echoes Golding’s translation of the same passage; for example, in Golding Medea says: “Ye Elves of Hilles, of Brookes, of Woods alone / Of standing Lakes, and of the Night approach ye everychone” (7.265-66); Heywood’s Medea says: “Godesse of witchcraft and darke ceremony / To whom the elves of Hils, of Brookes, of Groves / Of standing lakes, and caverns vaulted deepe / Are ministers” (215). Of course, Shakespeare also echoed this passage in The Tempest. These borrowings only seem to show up occasionally in the Ages, however; it certainly does not seem that Heywood got all his Metamorphoses from Golding. For example, Medea’s soliloquy in The Brazen Age (212) is quite close to Medea’s speech in Book 7 of the Metamorphoses (7.11 ff.), but there is no evidence here of Golding’s wording.

One of the sections in which Heywood most emphatically rejects Caxton’s version is that of Paris’s abduction of Helen. Heywood does follow Caxton in having Priam deliberately send Paris to abduct Helen, in revenge for the fact that the Greeks under Hercules sacked Troy and Telamon was given Priam’s sister, Hesione, as a concubine. But Caxton shows Paris encountering Helen in the temple of Venus on the island of Cythera. Although they are shown as strongly attracted to each other, Paris and his crew in fact take Helen, and much plunder from the temple, away by force. Heywood replaces this in the first act of 1 Iron Age with the situation as portrayed in Heroïdes 16 and 17; Paris arrives in Sparta as a guest of Menelaus, there is a growing mutual attraction between Helen and Paris which becomes an affair while Menelaus is away, and Helen consensually leaves with Paris, although there is a pretence that it is an abduction. As already mentioned, Heywood included translations of these Heroïdes in Troia Britanica (cantos 9 and 10), and many actual lines in this act (and in the scene of Helen’s arrival at Troy in act 2) are from this translation.

Of course, there is a great deal more Ovidian material in the Ages, such as in the Meleager episode, the story of the affair between Mars and Venus, and the story of Jupiter and Semele. But these scenes (and the Medea scenes) have no equivalent in the Recuyell. Caxton does not include the Meleager episode, presumably because it is too dependent on
the supernatural, while the central role of the gods probably ruled out the Semele and Venus-Mars stories. It is also unlikely that Caxton would sanction the eroticism of the former or the cuckold humour of the latter. The Medea story was no doubt omitted because Lefèvre/Caxton devoted a separate book to it (The History of Jason, 1477).

The changes Heywood makes to Caxton’s narrative indicate a number of changes in the literary landscape during the 16th century. Heywood shows almost no concern about the pagan nature of his material. There is a hint of it still in Homer’s prologue to The Golden Age, in which he stresses that it was he who gave divinity to the gods of ancient Greece; in other words, they are creations of poets, a last hint of the euhemerist argument (5). The same point is made in the epilogue, in which Homer describes “how these (first borne mortall), Gods were made / By virtue of divinest poesie” (78). After The Golden Age Heywood is quite happy to portray the gods as they are in Ovid, a validation of paganism Caxton tries hard to avoid. They are shown as having the power of gods, to know everything there is to know in the world, to transform themselves into any shape they please, and to get revenge on those who offend them, as Juno does on Semele. This difference from Caxton is most strikingly seen in the scene of Hercules death, where Heywood makes much of Hercules’ deification by Jupiter, which is totally absent in Caxton.

This scene also shows Heywood’s willingness to embrace the fantastic elements in the myths that Caxton seeks to minimize. Heywood’s centaurs are centaurs, not giants who are good horsemen, and Cerberus is indeed a three-headed dog. As just noted, not only does Heywood reject Caxton’s euhemerising of Achelous’s shape changing, but he adds a “fury all fireworks” to it. How these scenes were staged in Heywood’s theatre is hard to imagine, but it is clear that for him the supernatural and the fantastic were a key part of Ovid’s appeal.

There is little sign in Heywood of discomfort with Ovid’s morality or of a desire to find moral meaning in the myths. In contrast to Caxton, the Callisto scene is exploited for its full erotic potential, as is the affair between Paris and Helen. Heywood includes the Semele episode, in which much is made of her panting anticipation of sex with Jupiter in his full godhood, and the Venus-Mars scene, with its cynical moral that husbands are better off ignoring the adulteries of their wives. Ovid’s indifference to poetic justice must have been very noticeable to 16th century readers. Most fictional writings of the period, especially of the more popular sort, have a providential structure; that is to say, they end with the good rewarded and the evil punished, or at least with an affirmation that God’s will has been done. This was true in the theatre even after the era of the morality play; all the plays definitely known to have been performed the Queen’s Men, the leading touring company of the 1580s, have this structure.9 Heywood’s Ages do not seek to mitigate the non-providential world view of the Romans, with their worship of capricious and often cruel gods and their stoic recognition of the arbitrariness of fate. To audiences in the 1590s this non-Christian outlook, apparent also in other works of the period such as Marlowe’s Tamburlaine, must have seemed new and somewhat shocking.

An important factor in Heywood’s rejection of many of Caxton’s changes to Ovid is his recognition that many in the audience would be familiar with parts of the
Heywood says in the prologue to *The Silver Age* that he hopes “The learn’d will grace, the ruder not despise” his play (85); he clearly expects some in the audience to be “learn’d” in Ovid, and these would no doubt find it absurd to see Orpheus portrayed as Proserpine’s husband or Hercules to die without his apotheosis.

It might be imagined that the difference between Caxton and Heywood simply reflects a decline in the influence of religion on English society. While this may be partly true, it is far from the whole story. The Elizabethans took their religion very seriously and certainly were often as severe as earlier periods in their moral judgements. What has fundamentally changed is their attitude to literature. Caxton, like earlier medieval writers, clearly felt that stories could only be justified if they were in some sense true. Either they reflected true history, seen through the distorting lens of poetry, or they taught moral truths. The pagan gods did not exist and should not be portrayed as doing so. The same went for three-headed dogs and centaurs. What seems to have happened during the Elizabethan era is that readers and audience members learned to indulge in the imaginary for its own sake. Heywood does not believe in the pagan gods any more than Caxton did, but he was not afraid to imagine they existed. He revels in the fantastic and is even not afraid to put aside his everyday moral principles and be carried into realms where right and wrong are less rigidly defined. In effect, the Elizabethans had learned to enter an imaginary world when experiencing literature, while most earlier writers and readers did not allow themselves to leave the real world, with its indubitably true Christian framework.

Ovid above all exemplifies the poet who appeals to the imagination. He constantly invites us to imagine the impossible, and his underlying playfulness, even when describing tragic or particularly violent events, can only be enjoyed if one gives up the common sense and moral seriousness of everyday life. To the modern reader it seems astonishing that these texts were the backbone of education in 16th century England. Clearly they only held that position because the moralizing and euhemerising of Ovid’s texts were taken for granted. But also clearly many schoolboys, like the young Heywood or Shakespeare, ignored this heavy-handed masking of the texts, and enjoyed them for what they were. They also no doubt read some of the Ovid that was not in the curriculum, including the *Amores* and *Ars Amatoria*. The seed for what is in effect the modern understanding of literature was in the hands of every beginning scholar; all they had to do was to read Ovid’s texts in the way they were intended, in the way that they in fact invite the reader to enjoy them. The burst of interest in Ovid in the 1590s primarily reflected the fact that this way of reading him was finally coming out of the closet, and it is not by accident that it came at the beginning of the great flowering of English literature, literature that demands that we enter an imaginary world just as Ovid’s poetry does. Heywood’s *Ages* were only a minor component of that flowering, but in their modifications of Caxton’s *Recuyell* they present a particularly graphic demonstration of the nature of the change.
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Notes

1 I have written two essays in which I propose a rather complicated history for these texts. Parts of them were initially written in 1595-96 and later revised by Heywood into the Ages series. I also show that when he wrote the Hercules sections of the Silver and Brazen Ages he had not yet read the Recuyell, but knew of Caxton’s rewriting of Greek mythology only through an abbreviated version of it in William Warner’s popular long poem, Albion’s England. None of this really matters for the content of this essay, though it is useful to keep in mind that I believe a substantial part of the Ages was written in the mid-1590s.
2 Lefèvre based the first parts of the work, concerning Jupiter and Hercules, on Boccaccio’s *Genealogie Deorum Gentilium* and late classical sources including Ovid, significantly supplemented by his own imagination. The third part, concerning the Trojan War, was a translation of Guido delle Colonne’s *Historia destructionis Troiae*, which was in turn based on the *Roman de Troie* of Benoît de Sainte-Maure. This part was not actually written by LeFevre, who died after completing the second part. See Le Corfec, 1-2.

3 M. L. Stapleton has reprinted Heywood’s *Art of Love* and has made a strong case that *The First and Second Part of the Remedy of Love*, published in 1620 as the work of Sir Thomas Overbury, is in fact by Heywood. See Stapleton 2000 and 2001.

4 There is no sign of any influence from the version of the story in the April section of the *Fasti*.

5 In *Oenone and Paris* and *Troia Britanica* she is Iole, in *The Brazen Age* she is Omphale.


7 See Burrow, 311-12.

8 See Tatlock, 715-16.

9 See Arrell 2012, 92 n.1.