



Heavey, K. (2021) Intertextuality and Thomas Heywood's Early Ovid: Oenone and Paris. In: Demetriou, T. and Valls-Russell, J. (eds.) *Thomas Heywood and the Classical Tradition*. Manchester University Press. ISBN 9781526140234.

This is the Author Accepted Manuscript.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/211576/>

Deposited on: 06 March 2020

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow  
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

## Chapter 2

### Intertextuality and Thomas Heywood's early Ovid: *Oenone and Paris*

*Katherine Heavey*

On 17 May 1594, an anonymous poem entitled *Oenone and Paris* was entered into the Stationer's Register. The poem, bearing a preface signed by T. H., has long been attributed to Thomas Heywood. Joseph Quincy Adams cites various evidence in support of the 'fair probability' that T. H. is Heywood, including the obvious classical learning of the two authors, their common admiration for Ovid and Lucian as well as Shakespeare, their interest in the Troy story in particular, and the various echoes of *Oenone and Paris* in Heywood's later works.<sup>1</sup> An epyllion set after the Trojan prince Paris' first meeting with Helen, *Oenone and Paris* recounts his invented return to Ida, and the hopeless attempts of the nymph Oenone, Paris' first love, to re-attract his interest, before he leaves to be reunited with Helen. Damned in the eyes of many critics for what Adams has termed its 'unblushing plagiarism' of Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* (1593),<sup>2</sup> but owing just as much to classical poetry, T. H.'s epyllion inventively reshapes its Ovidian and Shakespearean source material, incorporating further details from Lucian, Colluthus and earlier Elizabethan Troy-stories along the way. In this chapter, I will show that *Oenone and Paris* merits new attention, not only because it appears to be one of Heywood's earliest experimentations with an Ovidian source text, but also because it moves beyond this source in a variety of intriguing ways, demonstrating the complex and inventive intertextuality, and the interest in readers and reception, which would come to characterise Heywood's more ambitious later classicism.

In his choice of protagonists, T. H. attempts to write himself into a well-established mythic tradition, while also venturing in new directions with his treatment of his characters.

Early modern authors and readers would have been most familiar with Paris as a key player in the famous story of the Trojan War. Oenone, meanwhile, was best known as one of the despairing letter-writers of Ovid's *Heroides*, and *Oenone and Paris* is unarguably reflective of what Daniel Moss has usefully termed the 'Ovidian vogue' of the 1590s, in its reimagining of one of Ovid's writing women.<sup>3</sup> However, the poem is also remarkable as an adaptive project, one that demonstrates what Moss terms the 'medieval and early modern impulse to inscribe multiple new identities on the legendary figures of the classical world'.<sup>4</sup> T. H. is keenly aware that by choosing Oenone and Paris as his subjects, he is not just responding to Ovid, but is also activating his readers' memories of the story of the Trojan War, and offering a revision of that iconic tale. As this would suggest, the poem calls on its readers to be particularly mythically engaged, as they situate this invented episode in relation to the characters and details they already know from Ovid, Virgil, Homer and early modern sources.

Set before the outbreak of the war, and taking full advantage of what Tania Demetriou has termed 'the prequel's literary resource of being automatically read in relation to the known',<sup>5</sup> *Oenone and Paris* provides a new angle on a well-known story, not least by allowing a familiar but traditionally marginalised figure a new kind of power. T. H. permits Oenone to speak (rather than write) back to the man who has abandoned her, and the poem has been noted by critics for its sensitive treatment of its heroine,<sup>6</sup> and for retelling a familiar story 'from an unexpected, domestic and feminine, perspective'.<sup>7</sup> Oenone's voice is at the heart of the poem, with William Weaver pointing out that she is granted many more lines of dialogue than Paris, and that her speech is more rhetorically elaborate.<sup>8</sup> Refusing to submit unquestioningly to Paris' rejection, she is endowed with the complexified voice that Wendy Wall sees as characteristic of the female personae of Renaissance complaint poetry.<sup>9</sup> At certain moments, as she appeals to Paris, Oenone even enjoys some of the 'elevation and prestige' that Leah Whittington has argued can (paradoxically) be enjoyed by a supplicating

figure.<sup>10</sup> As Michael L. Stapleton and Janice Valls-Russell trace in chapters 3 and 5, later mythical works of Heywood's are equally remarkable for their emphasis on the voices and the ill-fated private relationships of classical women, and, like *Oenone and Paris*, these works might extend the stories of these women beyond their traditional classical boundaries. For example, in *The Iron Age* (printed 1632), Heywood brings the classical, Ovidian Helen to life onstage. He recycles his own work in the process, for much of her dialogue with Paris is borrowed from Heywood's earlier translations of *Heroides* XVI and XVII, which he had interpolated into his 1609 poem *Troia Britanica*. However, he also departs from Ovid, and from his own earlier work with the poet, and refashions Helen for an early modern audience eager for new addenda to a well-known and scandalous story. For instance, in one unclassical scene, Helen is forced to make an onstage choice between her husband and her lover, in front of an audience composed of Greeks, Trojans and Jacobean theatre-goers. T. H.'s focus on the private life of Paris and Oenone, and particularly on Oenone as a character, is a suggestive foreshadowing of Heywood's later, almost voyeuristic interest in Helen's psychology, and (more largely) his interest in what happened (or could have happened) before, around and after the familiar classical stories his educated audiences would already have known.<sup>11</sup>

Mark Bayer has argued that Heywood's mythic works demonstrate a sophisticated appreciation of the diverse audiences for whom he was writing, and the expectations and interests of these recipients: for example, the audience of a play like *The Iron Age* might differ appreciably from the readership of his poem *Troia Britanica*, and Heywood cuts his mythic cloth accordingly.<sup>12</sup> T. H. has also thought carefully about his readership, and their reception of his work, and in the preface to *Oenone and Paris*, he addresses the 'Gentlemen' he imagines as constituting this readership. He claims, somewhat defensively, that he presents his creation, 'the Maiden head of my Pen' to the judicious critical view of these readers (sig. A2r), so that their assessments may improve his future writing.<sup>13</sup> If T. H. is

sincere in his quest for constructive critique, then writing *Oenone and Paris* might be a good way to achieve this, because the growing popularity of such short mythic poems meant that by 1594, mythologically inclined readers could compare his efforts to those of other poets, including Shakespeare and Thomas Lodge (*Scilla's Metamorphosis*, 1589). The adaptation of Ovidian material (the *Heroides*) into a pseudo-Ovidian genre (the Elizabethan epyllion) also held other, more practical attractions for an author conscious of what his readership was already consuming, for as Moss puts it, '[q]uite simply, Ovidian poetry sold'.<sup>14</sup> Moreover, an ambitious but inexperienced author might be especially drawn to the emerging and evolving form of the epyllion, having seen the success of his predecessors: Götz Schmitz points out that after the publication of *Venus and Adonis* in 1593, 'the writing of an epyllion had become something of an obligatory apprentice work for aspiring poets'.<sup>15</sup> As Schmitz's phrasing suggests, there is perhaps a comfortingly formulaic quality to the epyllion, both for the writer and the reader. Sandra Clark notes that typically, such a poem

combines disparate elements from several genres, is classicising (packed with self-consciously classical references and allusions) and erotic in manner, and devotes itself to an Ovidian-style story of love.<sup>16</sup>

*Oenone and Paris* clearly incorporates such elements, and in so doing reflects the essentially 'disparate' nature of this form of poetry.<sup>17</sup> T. H.'s poem gestures to the Elizabethan interest in direct translations of Ovid (and particularly to George Turberville's successful *Heroides* of 1567), and to another popular contemporary form of poetry, that of male-authored female complaint, as well as to the period's broader interest in representations of supplication and appeal.<sup>18</sup> In *Oenone and Paris*, then, T. H. is able to marry familiarity with fluidity, to blend multiple fashionable Elizabethan forms and tropes with specific classical and early modern

intertexts, and to refigure these on his own terms. In its subject matter, its style and its address to the reader, the poem demonstrates an aspiring author thinking carefully about both his readership and his own approach to mythic writing, and reworking known material of various kinds to meet both the expectations of his imagined audience, and his own intellectual and commercial agendas.

T. H.'s poem is, inescapably, a reworking of one popular early modern intertext in particular, for as critics have noticed with disapproval, *Oenone and Paris* bears an obvious resemblance to *Venus and Adonis*, and its relationship to the earlier poem is signalled in the clear parallels between characters and in similarities of language.<sup>19</sup> The poem opens with Paris, like Adonis, hunting at daybreak; the reader learns that he has already returned from Greece with Helen, for he has left the bed of his 'new-stolne bryde' (8) to wander in the woods of Ida. He is soon accosted by Oenone, who has learned of Paris' betrayal (perhaps, as she describes in *Heroides* V, by seeing Paris and Helen together aboard his ship), and the narrator describes her grief, 'Her face al swoolne with still distilling teares' (38). She approaches Paris 'As once the goddesse Citherea came, / To finde Adonis following of his game' (53–4). Here T. H. not only likens Paris to Adonis, but also introduces the strange combination of powerlessness and agency that characterises Venus and Oenone, both of whom are compelled by fierce desire and pride, both of whom mount an attack (Venus' amatory, Oenone's admonitory) as soon as they meet their beloveds, and both of whom end their poems disconsolate, after their dire warnings of impending disaster have been ignored.

Descriptions of physical appearance allow T. H. both to imitate Shakespeare and (perhaps secondarily) to flesh out his characters. Adonis and Paris are both described as red and white in hue, but while in Adonis' case this demonstrates his desirability, since he is, as Venus tells him, 'more white, and red, than doves or roses are' (10),<sup>20</sup> in Paris the colour combination betokens his guilt: Oenone tells him 'Thy Crimson rose the Lilly doeth out-

chase, / Thy favour doeth thy fatall faultes discover!' (63–4), and before Paris' first speech the narrator observes 'His crimson colour tells his late abuses' (160).<sup>21</sup> Katherine Duncan-Jones finds the poem's imitation of Shakespeare's red and white 'rather unsubtle',<sup>22</sup> and she furnishes examples that do suggest the poet has inserted the colours somewhat at random, in opportunistic imitation of Shakespeare. For example, Paris notices Oenone and: 'when hee knewe she was his quondam wife / The white and redde were in his face at strife' (155–6). Here, the poet provides the implausible detail that perhaps Paris did not recognise Oenone at once, and in fact intends to reprimand her for daring, as a mere nymph, to approach him.<sup>23</sup> The rapid realisation of her identity is hard to take seriously,<sup>24</sup> and is likely to make Paris appear somewhat ridiculous, while also conveniently allowing the poet to import the Shakespearean imagery of red and white.<sup>25</sup>

Appearances remain a focal point, as the reader of the epyllion would expect, and they can be as revealing as Paris' blushes, though not always in the same way. Clark notes the typical description of the male youth in the Elizabethan epyllion: 'he is inexperienced and very young ... he is irresistibly beautiful with long hair and a smooth pale body'.<sup>26</sup> T. H. (and Oenone) are certainly aware of this tradition: Oenone praises Paris' 'faire hand' that is, she says, 'more soft and smooth then mine' (135),<sup>27</sup> and later his 'milke-white skinne' (459). As smooth as Paris' hand may be, though, he does not fit the model of sexual inexperience that that writers of the epyllion prized, that was indicated by an androgynous appearance, and epitomised by Shakespeare's 'tender boy' (32) or Christopher Marlowe's Leander, 'beautiful and young' (51).<sup>28</sup> Describing Paris in such conventional and eroticised terms, Oenone is perhaps trying to rewrite him into the innocent shepherd she once knew, closer to Adonis or Leander than to the seducing prince of Troy, who is so changed that he can no longer even recognise her. T. H. employs imagery that is typical of the epyllion, and of *Venus and Adonis*

in particular, in order to heighten the knowing reader's pity for Oenone, who cannot successfully use epyllic language to refashion Paris into the boy she remembers.

Elsewhere, too, the characters' relations to their Shakespearean antecedents are fascinatingly (and deliberately) unstable. When Paris cruelly tells her that he would never have married her, if he had known that he was Trojan royalty, the damage his words do to Oenone is compared to the physical pain of a hunted creature:

Like to a gosling in a puttockes clawes,  
Or silly dove, on whome the hauke hath seized,  
Or to a young lambe in a Lyons pawes,  
Whose wrathfull furor can not be appeazed,  
Even so lyes poore Oenone on the playne,  
That living, dyed, yet dead, reviv'th againe.

(319–24)

These lines echo Adonis' helpless submission to Venus' physical strength:

Even as an empty eagle, sharp by fast,  
Tires with her beak on feathers, flesh, and bone,  
Shaking her wings, devouring all in haste,  
Till either gorge be stuff'd, or prey be gone:  
Even so she kiss'd his brow, his cheek, his chin,  
And where she ends, she doth anew begin.

(55–60)



Oenone is literally floored by her lover's cruelty, helpless to resist Paris' figurative attack, as Adonis must endure Venus' literal assault. There is a circularity to T. H.'s final couplet that recalls Shakespeare's lines 59–60, and Adams notes that the same lines also echo Shakespeare's lines 473–4, 'For on the grass she lies as she were slain, / Till his breath breatheth life in her again'.<sup>29</sup> However, while there is still a superficial resemblance here between the collapsing figures of Oenone and Venus, a comparison of the context undercuts the likeness. The circularity in Shakespeare's lines 59–60 relates to Venus' endless embracing of Adonis; Oenone is instead trapped in a hopeless cycle of fainting and reviving, which underscores her unhappy status as a tragic suppliant.<sup>30</sup> Moreover, when Venus is described swooning at lines 473–4, Adonis falls to his knees and frantically tries to revive her, while Paris watches impassively until Oenone recovers, and does not speak to her for almost 300 lines. If T. H. activates his readers' recent memories of *Venus and Adonis* via such echoes, he does so in the hope that they will perceive difference as well as similarity in his creation.

Later, too, Oenone is only permitted to be superficially akin to Venus, and the reader is encouraged to draw on memories of their previous reading, both of Shakespeare's poem and of other Trojan stories. Fearing Paris may suffer at the hands of the Greeks, Oenone urges him to channel his energies into the figurative battle of sexual conquest instead, telling him

I am thy foe, doe what thou canst to force me!  
Tilt, fayre, but fayrely, least thy stroakes rebound.  
Sit fast and close, or else I will unhorse thee,  
Yet fall the first, to save thee from the ground.

(439–42)

This is all highly and deliberately reminiscent of *Venus and Adonis*' militaristic language, as well as recalling the epyllion's fascination with 'the reversal of accepted gender-roles', which becomes '[a] basic source of eroticism in the poems'.<sup>31</sup> Again, though, there is a crucial sense of difference: Venus, with her greater size and strength, is able to engage Adonis in a tussle, while in the later poem this is all hypothetical, and Oenone merely hopes that Paris will take charge, and will play both her 'foe' and lover.

Here and later, when she tries to tempt Paris into a fountain with the ludicrous offer 'Be Phaoes Boateman, I will be thy barke' (457), [perhaps referring the reader to \*Heroides XV \(Sappho's letter to Phao\)\*](#), Oenone is a figure of fun, because of her absurd exaggeration of seductive and/or supplicating postures.<sup>32</sup> However, while he smiles at her excesses (thereby endorsing a similar response in the reader), Paris is also the butt of an authorial joke. The attentive reader might notice that even in their imaginary and eroticised joust, it is Oenone who is imagined to unhorse Paris, and the episode demonstrates T. H. playing with the previous classical incarnations of his protagonists, in a way that Shakespeare does not. This is because the knowing reader would appreciate that the classical Paris was often scorned as a reluctant fighter and even a dishonourable coward, and so T. H.'s importing of the martial metaphor from *Venus and Adonis* is deliberately jarring. In Arthur Golding's translation of the *Metamorphoses*, for example, Neptune urges Apollo to kill Achilles, which he does by using Paris:

And in a clowd he downe among the host of Troy did slyde,  
Where Paris dribbling out his shaftes among the Gréekees hée spyde:  
And telling him what God he was, sayd wherfore doost thou waast  
Thyne arrowes on the simple sort? If any care thou haste

Of those that are thy fréendes, go turne ageinst Achilles head,  
And like a man revendge on him thy brothers that are dead.  
In saying this, he brought him where Achilles with his brond  
Was beating downe the Troiane folk, and leveld so his hond  
As that Achilles tumbled downe starke dead upon the lond. (sigs Xiiiiv–Xvr)<sup>33</sup>

Paris is a figure of ridicule here, at what should be his moment of greatest triumph. Unable even to identify important Grecian foes in the battle, he stands ‘dribbling out his shaftes’, a particularly vivid translation of the Latin ‘rara...spargentem...tela’ (XII, 600–1) ‘taking infrequent shots’.<sup>34</sup> Apollo urges Paris to act ‘like a man’ in seeking revenge on Achilles, but even when he has killed the Grecian (with the god guiding his hand), he is dismissed by the narrator as a ‘coward carpet knyght’ (sig. Xvr). In *Heroides XVII* (here translated by George Turberville), long before the outbreak of war Helen already knows enough of Paris flirtatiously to dismiss his strength in arms:

For Venus fitter thou  
than Mars dost seeme to bee;  
Love Paris, and let men of force  
go fight in fielde for thee.  
Let Hector, whome thou so  
dost vaunt, in armour broyle:  
Another kinde of warrefare is  
Farre better for thy toyle.

(sig. Oiiir)<sup>35</sup>

Of course, Ovid is also capitalising on an already established reputation; in Book III of the *Iliad* Paris challenges the Greeks to a duel, but when Menelaus eagerly accepts, the Trojan beats a rapid retreat. Hector is disgusted by his brother's reticence, condemning his apparent bravery as all for show: 'Unhappie Paris, bearing shew as doughtie as the best, / Yet in effect but feminate, with luxure to detest' (sig. Giiir).<sup>36</sup> Original early modern works, as well as translations of classical poems, inherited this perception of Paris; to take an example from Heywood's work, in *1 The Iron Age* Hector scorns him during the Trojan council as 'effeminate boy ... fitter for young *Oenons* company / Then for a bench of souldiers' (sig. B2r).<sup>37</sup> Even when he has killed Achilles (by ambushing him in Apollo's temple) Ajax declares Paris 'a milke-sop' (sig. Kr), and in Part 2, Pyrrhus echoes Hector by terming him a 'coward and effeminate Troian boy' (sig. B4r).<sup>38</sup>

Thus, when T. H. adopts a key set-piece of *Venus and Adonis* (the amorous wrestling match) he is recalling Shakespeare's poem, but he is also inviting the sufficiently well-read auditor to remember the Trojan's famous reluctance to take the field, and smile at the incongruity of Oenone's optimistically militaristic invitation. The Ovidian Helen notes archly that Paris is manifestly unsuited for battle (as the Trojan War will prove) and Oenone's metaphoric call to arms is altogether too forceful. Her employment of the Shakespearean metaphor suggests that however well she once knew Paris, by the time of his return to Ida she utterly misunderstands him, and she is rendered pitiable by her attempts to mimic the flirtatiousness of Venus or Helen. Such moments, in which T. H. imports echoes of the Shakespearean poem, but recasts them subtly to differentiate his characters from Shakespeare's, in the light of their individual classical reputations, argue for the poem as a sophisticated experiment in intertextuality. Might early readers of *Oenone and Paris* have read the poem alongside *Venus and Adonis*? If so, they might have been struck not only by the similarities of language and plot that have so exasperated generations of critics, but also

by the subtler differences, the ways in which T. H. recalls his Shakespearean model, while setting his creation somehow at an angle to it.

Ika Willis has pointed out that ‘All texts necessarily situate themselves within a literary system both by referring to an earlier model, suggesting a relationship of sameness or repetition, and comparing themselves to that model, suggesting difference’.<sup>39</sup> If the reader of *Oenone and Paris* might notice obvious similarities and subtler differences with regard to *Venus and Adonis*, the same is true of the poem’s ancient sources, as I shall now show. T. H. does not want his readers to simply discern and admire echoes of Greek and Latin poems. Rather, he wants them to recognise and interrogate his models, just as they might think of his characters as more than mere echoes of Shakespeare’s. His complex and rewarding intertextual work with classical poems recalls the process of conscious refashioning and reshaping that Moss has argued lay at the heart of the period’s Ovidianism, and which Demetriou also sees in deliberately truncated and altered versions of the Trojan myth, both ancient and early modern.<sup>40</sup>

If the most important early modern intertext for *Oenone and Paris* is *Venus and Adonis*, its most significant classical forebear is not the *Metamorphoses* (by which many of the Elizabethan epyllia were inspired) but Ovid’s *Heroides*, which, as Wall notes, was one model for complaint poetry.<sup>41</sup> T. H. juggles classical and early modern precedent in his incorporation of Ovidian material: sometimes, particularly when Oenone speaks, he translates Ovid faithfully (Weaver argues that while he closely imitates *Heroides* V, Oenone’s letter, in her speeches, by contrast, he searches his memory for *Heroides* XVI, Paris’ letter to Helen).<sup>42</sup> However, even when he is at his closest to Ovid’s Latin, he departs in some essential way from the spirit of the original, in his tireless quest to do something new with his known characters. Most obviously, rather than have her write, he has Oenone ventriloquise the words of her Ovidian epistle as she speaks to Paris, and use different parts of her own letter as

speeches, to respond to his defences and explanations. T. H.'s approach to the classical letters is perhaps deliberately unclear. In Ovid, Oenone writes her letter after Paris has returned with Helen (she recalls seeing the couple on board his approaching ship) but there is no suggestion that she has met him. Here, Paris encounters Oenone after he has returned with Helen: when she echoes the mixed recriminations, laments and boasts of her own classical missive, is she repeating a letter that she has already sent him, or is the speech assumed to be a substitute for the letter? And how does she know the content of Paris' letter to Helen, which she echoes in her recollection of Cassandra's warnings to Paris?<sup>43</sup> T. H.'s deconstructing and reframing of Ovidian epistles demonstrates one way in which the classical poet's heroines were 'collected, glossed and represented in a series of new and ever-changing textual permutations' in the period.<sup>44</sup> The poet disassembles and refigures *Heroides* V for an Elizabethan audience, turning the written word into heartfelt speeches, and, in the figure of Paris, embodying the faithless auditor that the Oenone of the *Heroides* had only imagined receiving and reading her words.<sup>45</sup>

T. H.'s Oenone echoes *Heroides* V as she curses Helen, 'that forreine hecfar of the Greekes' (67), as she urges Paris to consider the violent consequences of his new desire, as she recalls their swearing vows to one another, and as she proudly insists that she is as worthy as Helen of the love of a Trojan prince. T. H. was probably using Turberville's popular translation alongside a version of the Latin; when his Oenone describes the 'shaggy Satyres' and fauns searching for her (559–64), her specifying that the fauns are wounded is not in Ovid, but seems inspired by Turberville (in Turberville's translation the satyrs suffer 'great and grieffull paine', sig. Dvir). However, in this passage T. H. also includes a detail that is in Ovid but not in Turberville (that she 'hidde me close and never come among them').<sup>46</sup> When Oenone describes herself and Paris carving their pledge on a tree, she follows Ovid (but not Turberville) in identifying this tree as a poplar (though this detail is also to be found in

George Peele's 1584 pastoral *The Araynement of Paris*). The narrator might also expand on Ovid, building on classical material to satisfy the demands of his mixed genre. When Oenone recalls their oaths of fidelity, she adds references to the 'mylchie goate' of Ida and 'silver swanne' of the Po (341–2) that are nowhere in Ovid or Turberville (or *Venus and Adonis*) but that contribute to the sense of a tranquil, pastoral ideal that Paris destroys with his faithlessness.<sup>47</sup> When the Ovidian Oenone describes sighting Paris' ship, she recalls 'illuc has lacrimas in mea saxa tuli' (V, 74) 'yonder to the rocks I love I bore my tears' (Turberville's Oenone speaks more prosaically of taking her tears home to 'my Cotte', sig. Dvr). In *Oenone and Paris*, as the poem approaches its conclusion, Oenone asks natural features to mimic her grief: 'Howle & lament, you cliffes, rocks, cloudy mou[n]tains, / Clear-chrystal streams, wels, brooks, & lovely fou[n]tains!' (767–8). Schmitz has shown how descriptions of the natural world are one way in which epyllion and complaint are distinguished: 'the idyllic scenery in which the love-talk of the epyllion is often set ... can be contrasted with the historic or waste-land settings of the Complaint'.<sup>48</sup> Here, T. H. takes a tiny detail from *Heroides* V, and expands it to show how the idyll of epyllion – boasting goats, swans, 'The primrose, cow-slippe, and the daffadillie, / The pinke, the daysie, violet, and lillie' (17–18) – gives way to an inhospitable landscape of complaint as Oenone perceives Paris slipping from her, the scenery at the poem's conclusion composed of 'ragged cliffes' (763) and 'desarts' (785), amongst which the Elizabethan Oenone is left to wander. The poem's ending has been termed 'lame and impotent',<sup>49</sup> and it is true that T. H.'s choice of myth means that he has little choice but to let his poem peter out, for Oenone has no chance of convincing Paris to return. However, Schmitz sees the changing treatment of the natural world, and Oenone's increasing isolation, as signalling T. H.'s calculated move from epyllion to complaint, his awareness of the related but subtly different requirements of the genres: 'It is as if the author would make us feel the dividing line between the gregariousness of the epyllion and the

loneliness of the Complaint'.<sup>50</sup> T. H. understands the potential for interplay between both his chosen genres, and between his Latin and English versions of Ovid's letters, and he reworks an Ovidian moment in order to conclude with a bleakness and a lack of resolution that is both authentically complaining, and recognisably Heroidean.

If T. H. relied heavily on some version of *Heroides V* for Oenone's arguments and for her final, unresolved sense of despair, this may be in part because he had scant other literary sources for her voice. Denied an entry of her own in Natale Conti's compendium *Mythologia* (1567),<sup>51</sup> she is described in Thomas Cooper's *Thesaurus* (1578) under the entry 'Oenone' as 'the concubine of Paris, before that he ravished Helene'.<sup>52</sup> Other early modern accounts stress her victimhood: for instance, she is mentioned as an example of an overly credulous lover in the 'Admonition by the Auctor, to all yong Gentilwomen' (1567), a poem that may be by Isabella Whitney.<sup>53</sup> In *Fennes Frutes* (1590) Thomas Fenne includes her in his account of the Trojans in order to condemn Paris, who 'violated most shamefully his vow made to *Oenone*' (sig. Aa3r). George Peele's *Tale of Troy* (1589, rev. 1604) mentions her fleetingly to regret that she was deceived by the Trojan's beauty.<sup>54</sup> His pastoral *The Araygnement of Paris* (1584) also explores Oenone's potential as a character, rather than simply as a suffering foil to Paris, and the play may have furnished T. H. with the idea of using this pair, and moreover expanding Oenone's voice by a further blending of classical and vernacular sources; tracing links between *The Araygnement*, *Heroides V*, and Edmund Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar* (1579), Lindsay Ann Reid describes Peele's Oenone as 'an author of implicit intertextual renown'.<sup>55</sup> Peele's couple swear their love and witness it with an inscription on the poplar tree (as they do in *Heroides V*), before Paris presides over the judgment of the goddesses. They do not meet again; Oenone's next and final appearance sees her lamenting his faithlessness, and deciding 'I will goe sit and pyne under the Poplar tree, / And write my answer to his vow, that everie eie may see'.<sup>56</sup> She is given the opportunity to discuss Paris'



betrayal, but with Mercury rather than with Paris himself. In the following scene, Peele's Venus asks Paris if he has ever been in love, and he replies 'Lady, a little once' (678), a damning erasure of Oenone that might paradoxically prompt the reader to wonder what would happen, if they were ever to meet again. T. H. takes up this loose end, and the model provided to him by Peele's 'conspicuously writerly' heroine,<sup>57</sup> who is so clearly linked with her Heroidean predecessor. However, he reworks his models to give Oenone a more direct and final engagement with Paris. In so doing, he fashions a far more developed and complex voice for his heroine, while respecting and retaining the sense of hopelessness he would have found in earlier versions, both classical and early modern.

If, when he writes Oenone, T. H. adapts her Ovidian letter to Paris, with inspiration from previous Elizabethan texts and poetic forms along the way, he does something rather stranger with his Paris. When he has Paris respond to Oenone, T. H. uses material from *Heroides* XVI, which is of course not a letter to Oenone at all, but Paris' flirtatious missive to Helen, written when all thoughts of the nymph have been driven from his mind. As well as directing Paris' words to a different addressee, T. H. also alters events as he would have found them described in the Ovidian letter. For example, when Paris describes the judgment of the goddesses to Oenone, his account of this pivotal event is markedly different from the description he gives in *Heroides* XVI. Such differences may appear because, as Weaver theorises, T. H. simply did not have any version of this epistle before him, and so was attempting a paraphrase.<sup>58</sup> However, if we assume that T. H. was likely to be using complete editions of the poems (for example, the 1502 Aldine edition of the Latin, and Turberville's English translation), then the strayings from *Heroides* XVI are more probably intentional. They are 'a test of the poet's skill in *enargeia*',<sup>59</sup> as Weaver goes on to suggest, but are also, and specifically, informed by the fact that it is Oenone hearing these words. As well as recognising his use of rhetorical techniques such as *enargeia* (the embroidering paraphrase

recommended by Erasmus and Quintilian),<sup>60</sup> T. H.'s imagined readers would immediately notice that Paris is recycling an address to Helen. Here, as when he had Oenone suggest so enthusiastically that Paris might fight with her, T. H. is enjoying a joke with such readers, who would relish the incongruity of Paris attempting to appease Oenone with words he usually writes (perhaps, in this poem, has already written) to that 'forreine hecfar' (67) Helen of Troy.<sup>61</sup> The repurposing of the letter is a literary in-joke at the expense of the hapless Oenone, but it also diminishes the Trojan prince, the redirection of his words capitalising on his well-known reputation for duplicity and faithlessness, as T. H. had previously nodded to his propensity for cowardice. Likewise, the careful altering of the content of his Ovidian original also permits T. H. to poke fun at his characters, and to embellish one of the most famous parts of *Heroides* XVI, the judgment of the goddesses, for the eager Elizabethan reader.

Paris' judgment of Venus, Pallas and Juno, and his choice of Venus as the fairest goddess, was one of the most well-known aspects of his myth, and T. H.'s classically educated readers would have known both the judgment, and the disapproving way in which Paris' awarding of the prize to Venus is usually glossed.<sup>62</sup> Heywood's translation of Lucian's version of the judgment, included in his miscellany collection *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's* (1637), which Camilla Temple discusses in chapter 1, explains it as representing the folly of youth, which will choose the 'fraile gifts' offered by Venus over the more sensible and long-lasting rewards offered by Pallas and Juno.<sup>63</sup> Conti's *Mythologia* is more forthright, suggesting 'By setting Paris's disgraceful conduct before us, the ancients gave us the opportunity to condemn our own stupidity'.<sup>64</sup> Weaver argues that the Ovidian version of the judgment, as recounted by Paris, is 'the focal point of a set piece in self-praise',<sup>65</sup> but in recalling his famous task, Paris also aims to convince Helen of his sincere interest in her. Accordingly, in the Ovidian epistle he tells her that he was almost immediately swayed

towards Venus, regretting that two goddesses must lose out, but quickly realising that ‘one among the reast / surmounted other so’ (sig. Lvir) before he has even heard what they have to offer, and later telling Helen that Venus had ‘A face resembling thine’ (sig. Lviiir) when he judged her the victor.<sup>66</sup> Conscious of his audience, T. H.’s Paris describes things very differently. He comforts Oenone by terming her ‘fayrer then the dames of Troy’ (163), and depicts himself as far more conflicted than the Ovidian Paris, who emphasises that he quickly chose Venus (and thus, by proxy, Helen). T. H.’s Paris tells Oenone

Fayre was the first, the second was as fayre,  
The third no whit inferiour to the twaine:  
All would be victors, (and they worthie are),  
But one alone the victorie must gaine.  
That such should winne, I joyed much, beleeeve me,  
That such shuld lose, this was the thing did grieve me.

(241–6)

Here Paris, who has already expressed a similar regret that he is forced to disappoint Oenone, is keen that she should understand the difficulty of his choice, and be mollified as a result. Writing to Helen in Canto IX of *Troia Britanica*, Heywood’s 1609 version of Paris betrays a similar tendency to dither, telling Helen that when he beheld the goddesses

Methinks all three are worthy to o’ercome;  
To injure two such beauties, what tongue dare,  
Or prefer one where they be all so fair?  
Now this seems fairest, now again that other;

Now would I speak, and now my thoughts I smother...<sup>67</sup>

However, aware that he is addressing Oenone rather than Helen, T. H.'s Paris must go further in his explanation. Having prefaced his account with a compliment to Oenone (line 163), he gestures imploringly towards her ('beleeve me'), and describes being forced to study the goddesses with great care, 'Looking a-squint (as I doe nowe at you)' (249), as he makes his near-impossible decision.

Other elements of the judgment, though, are geared less towards sparing Oenone's feelings, and suggest that while Paris may be thinking of the nymph, the poet is thinking of his real-life readers. T. H. adds in the detail of the 'golden ball' (229) for which the goddesses are competing (which Paris does not mention in *Heroides* XVI, though Heywood includes it in *Troia*, at IX, 242). Here, Weaver asks, was the poet 'consciously modifying the story as told by Ovid, or (more likely) was he unconsciously importing the most famous *visual* element into his imaginative reconstruction of the story?'.<sup>68</sup> Unlike Weaver, I suggest that in incorporating one of the story's most famous set-pieces, and one which an Elizabethan reader would expect, despite its absence from the *Heroides*,<sup>69</sup> T. H. was deliberately and consciously departing from the Ovidian poem, as he had already done elsewhere in this work. He might have had Peele's play in mind when he mentioned the prize, but as part of this conscious, reader-oriented refashioning, he also splices his use of Paris' letter with other classical sources, this time Greek rather than Latin. In Lucian's 'Judgment of the Gods', one of his *Dialogues of the Gods*, T. H. would have found the golden ball, along with a much greater emphasis on Paris' indecision. He would also have found a crowd-pleasing bawdiness that is nowhere in Ovid's or Peele's accounts. Lucian's Paris tells Mercury that he is finding it impossible to judge a winner, and proposes a solution, here translated by Heywood in *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's*:

PAR. Yet one thing, Hermes, I with leave would know,  
Is it enough to judge by th' outward shew,  
Perusing them thus habited and clad?  
Or wert not fit a nearer course were had?  
To have them all stript naked, that myne eye  
May view them with more curiositie?  
MERC. A question that from sound discretion growes,  
And being judge, they are at thy dispose.  
PAR. At my dispose? Then I will have all three  
Stript to their skinnes. (sig. L2r)

Another possible ancient source for Venus' nakedness is Colluthus' irreverent and titillating short Greek poem *The Rape of Helen*, in which the goddess strips off in a successful effort to impress Paris.<sup>70</sup> Demetriou has shown that in the Elizabethan period, though it was known to be post-Homeric, this text 'was often printed in Homeric editions, and mentioned in paratexts as a prequel to the *Iliad*'. She points out that such editions of Homer 'circulated in England and put Colluthus on the literary map for anyone exploring Homer's epics', and that moreover, the poem was translated into Latin by Michael Neander, and subsequently paraphrased by the admired English poet Thomas Watson.<sup>71</sup> As I have argued, T. H. works with the Homeric Paris' reputation for cowardice, and if he read Homer in the kind of edition to which Demetriou refers, the poet could well have encountered Colluthus, and been drawn to the Greek poem for details that allow him to titillate his readers, and further undercut his hero.<sup>72</sup> Nobody is naked in *Heroides* XVI, and this kind of additional reporting is unlikely to impress Oenone, but in the epyllion, a misty-eyed Paris nevertheless recalls his new-found

bravery: ‘I feared no more – for who is afraid of fairnesse / Or wanton ladies appearing in their barenesse?’ (227–8). Such embroidering can only be included for the benefit of T. H.’s readers, whether it is intended to make sport of the perennially pleasure-seeking Paris, to hint at the poet’s command of Greek as well as Latin forms, or simply to increase the voyeuristic eroticism that was intrinsic to the epyllion. The extended description of the judgment allows for a further comic subtlety, as the reader knows that Oenone has heard this story before: she tells him as much in *Heroides* V, and also in lines 103–4 of T. H.’s poem. However, the complexity of the poem is such that Paris’ enthusiastic emphasis on the nakedness of the goddesses here also creates a moment of tragicomic poignancy later, at line 446, when Oenone offers to ‘strippe’ herself, to win back the attentions of her erstwhile lover. Paris’ attempt to excuse himself via (another) description of the judgment, salaciously drawn from a combination of Ovid, Colluthus and Lucian, is a treat for the knowing and expectant reader, both a damning indictment of his own monumental self-involvement, and a meandering but memorable interlude that is typical of the epyllion’s digressive nature.<sup>73</sup>

There is one final significant intertext for *Oenone and Paris*, and one that allows T. H. to focus pity on Oenone, in counterbalance to his lampooning of Paris. This is Paris’ epistle to Oenone, one of the so called ‘Sabinus’ epistles, poems first printed in the fifteenth century that were thought to be of ancient origin, and that saw some of the addressees of the original letters replying to their lovers. Paris’ Latin letter was included in the 1502 Aldine printing of the *Heroides*, which M. L. Stapleton notes was ‘the standard for English readers’ in the sixteenth century, and it was translated by Turberville alongside the other epistles in his edition of 1567.<sup>74</sup> Paris’ reply is much briefer than either his epistle to Helen, or Oenone’s letter to him, for there is little he can say to comfort her. As Raphael Lyne points out, the Paris of this letter immediately acknowledges that Oenone has fair grounds to complain, and so the letter ‘undoes its rhetorical platform from the beginning by confessing to the justness

of the charges it has to answer'.<sup>75</sup> T. H. imports this early admission of wrongdoing into his poem, though it will not sway Paris' mind: he tells Oenone 'Thy just complaint might urge a just remorse, / Had not the winged Lad bewicht my senses' (181–2).<sup>76</sup> In Paris' epistle, T. H. would have found this marked emphasis on Cupid's culpability: Paris tells Oenone 'For mee whome thou dost blame, / Cupido to his raigne / Hath forst to yeelde' (sig. Uvir).<sup>77</sup> In the epistle, Jupiter and Hercules are held up as examples of how even gods and demi-gods are victims of love, as they are in *Oenone and Paris* (649–90).<sup>78</sup> Here, T. H. apparently imports an error from Turberville's translation of his pseudo-classical source, which describes Hercules 'Ysat at distaffe' and 'in Ioles garment clad' (sig. Uviiiv); *Oenone and Paris* also confuses Iole with Omphale, describing Hercules in 'a womans frocke, / Spinning as much as Iole would aske' (681–2), but the Latin letter does not name her.<sup>79</sup> Like the reply he makes to the nymph in *Oenone and Paris*, Paris' letter stresses his own pain at hurting her: in the epistle he tells her 'I feele my guilt so gret ... My conscience me condempnes' (sig. Uvir) and in the epyllion 'thy passions unto mee are painfull. / My eares do glow to heere thy sad Discourses' (601–2). However, importantly, T. H. does not use everything from the epistle. Paris' letter, like *Heroides* V, hints at far greater, quasi-magical abilities than anything Oenone possesses in the epyllion, and even, at its close, suggests that she has the power of life and death over him: she must elect either to 'quench thy flames, or cleane put out / My brande that blazeth still' (sig. Xir).<sup>80</sup> T. H.'s Oenone has described the fauns searching for her so that she can cure them (line 562), but she has no such hold over Paris. The poet's clear knowledge of some version of the Sabinus epistle, which gestures towards a more empowered Oenone, means that his decision to leave her wandering in despair at the poem's close seems more calculated than accidental, deliberately reducing Oenone in comparison to her classical or pseudo-classical incarnations, and making her a figure to be pitied rather than feared.

In an essay on early modern intertextuality, Sarah Carter reminds us that key to intertextual practice is ‘the importance of writers being readers, reading, interpreting, imitating, and emulating’.<sup>81</sup> T. H. was clearly an engaged and enthusiastic reader, and as a result *Oenone and Paris* is a knowing and allusive intertextual patchwork of classical and early modern sources, which in its choice of protagonists, and status as both prequel and sequel to more famous events, provides a new perspective on the Troy story, as well as furnishing the eager Elizabethan public with another epyllion to shelve alongside Shakespeare. Brown has noted that the epyllion ‘brings to the fore the things that tend to be marginalized by epic including ... the bit players of grander epic narratives’,<sup>82</sup> and T. H. brings forward one such ‘bit player’ in Oenone, absorbing and deliberately reshaping a range of classical and early modern antecedents as he retells her story. If the poem is Heywood’s, as indeed it seems to be, he does not explicitly claim it as such in his extant writing. However, it is worth noting in conclusion that Heywood’s Trojan mythology is particularly self-reflexive and self-allusive (for example, as I have mentioned above, he recycles parts of Paris’ and Helen’s letters, which originally appeared in *Troia Britannica*, transforming them into dialogue in *I The Iron Age*). This is significant because his seventeenth-century version of Oenone’s story, which also appears in *I The Iron Age*, bears some striking resemblances to *Oenone and Paris*, and so may be a further example of the same recycling tendency.<sup>83</sup> This (very brief) episode constitutes another face-to-face meeting between the pair, taking place after Paris has resolved to abandon Oenone (albeit before his voyage).<sup>84</sup> Paris initially fails to recognise the nymph, and Oenone piteously appeals for him to reconsider his decision, and attempts physically to hold him back; all these details appear in the earlier poem. Moss has pointed out that one way in which an early modern author might make use of Ovid was to revise and rewrite his own approaches to the poet throughout his career, to define and redefine himself as a writer over time.<sup>85</sup> Heywood certainly regarded his own treatments of



the Trojan story as ripe for this kind of recycling and revising; his reuse of material from *Troia Britanica* in *The Iron Age* is proof of that. However, Oenone's reappearance in the play suggests that he was also keenly aware of what his fellow authors were producing for a mythologically inclined public. Reid points out that the lament of Peele's Oenone was excerpted from his play, and inserted into the printed miscellany *Englands Helicon* (1600), more than fifteen years after its appearance in the *Araynement*.<sup>86</sup> Perhaps, having registered her continuing interest for English readers at the turn of the century, Heywood granted Oenone a nostalgic reappearance in *The Iron Age* (and one that deliberately evoked his own 1594 incarnation of her). Having done so, he then chose to refocus his attention (and the attention of his audience) onto the more major players of this grandest of epic narratives, as befits a maturing writer and classicist.

---

<sup>1</sup> Joseph Quincy Adams (ed.), *Oenone and Paris*, by T.H. Reprinted from the Unique Copy in the Folger Shakespeare Library (Washington D. C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1943), pp. xxviii–xliv, xxviii. Quotations from the poem are taken from this edition unless otherwise indicated. In his footnotes and introduction, Adams records the many instances in which the language or syntax of the poem seems to be repeated in Heywood's later works, including in *The Brazen Age* (pp. xxxvi–vii), and *I The Iron Age* (pp. xxxvi, xxxvii–iii).

<sup>2</sup> Adams (ed.), *Oenone and Paris*, p. xiii.

<sup>3</sup> See Daniel D. Moss, *The Ovidian Vogue: Literary Fashion and Imitative Practice in Late Elizabethan England* (London: University of Toronto Press, 2014).

<sup>4</sup> Moss, *The Ovidian Vogue*, p. 181.

<sup>5</sup> Tania Demetriou, 'The non-Ovidian Elizabethan epyllion: Thomas Watson, Christopher Marlowe, Richard Barnfield', in Janice Valls-Russell, Agnès Lafont and Charlotte Coffin

---

(eds), *Interweaving Myths in Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017), pp. 41–64 (p. 54).

<sup>6</sup> For example by Götz Schmitz, *The Fall of Women in Early English Narrative Verse* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 68.

<sup>7</sup> Georgia Brown, *Redefining Elizabethan Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 103.

<sup>8</sup> William P. Weaver, *Untutored Lines: The Making of the English Epyllion* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012). p. 112.

<sup>9</sup> Wendy Wall, *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), pp. 251–2.

<sup>10</sup> Leah Whittington, *Renaissance Suppliants: Poetry, Antiquity, Reconciliation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 5.

<sup>11</sup> Although constraints of space prevent any extensive comment on *Troia* in comparison to *Oenone and Paris*, it can be observed that the lengthy, expository and alternating speeches of Paris and Oenone recall the long letters exchanged by the Heroidean Paris and Helen, and so anticipate the translations that were interpolated into *Troia*. Adams (*Oenone and Paris*, pp. xxxiv–vi), highlights various similarities of language in T. H.’s poem and *Troia*. The letters in *Troia* are in heroic couplets rather than *ottava rima* like the rest of the epic, and Adams speculates that this means they are very early examples of Heywood’s work, which were incorporated into *Troia*; thereby hinting at the tantalizing possibility that Heywood was translating the words of Paris and Helen at around the same time as he gave Oenone her chance to speak in the epyllion. However, Weaver, who deems Canto IX of *Troia* ‘more graceful’ than the paraphrase of Paris’ letter in T. H.’s poem, notes an alternative possibility, that the altered metre is intended to draw the reader’s attention to the letters (*Untutored Lines*, p. 117).

---

<sup>12</sup> Mark Bayer, 'Popular classical drama: the case of Heywood's *Ages*', in Sean Keilen and Nick Moschovakis (eds), *The Routledge Research Companion to Shakespeare and Classical Literature* (Abingdon, Routledge, 2017), pp. 227–35 (pp. 228–9).

<sup>13</sup> T. H., *Oenone and Paris* (London: R. Jones, 1594).

<sup>14</sup> Moss, *The Ovidian Vogue*, p. 181.

<sup>15</sup> Schmitz, *The Fall of Women*, pp. 66–7.

<sup>16</sup> Sandra Clark (ed.), *Amorous Rites: Elizabethan Erotic Verse* (London: Everyman, 1994), p. xxvii.

<sup>17</sup> In an account of comparable contemporary English poems, inspired by Greek rather than Latin sources, Tania Demetriou sounds a note of caution about the modern critical use of 'epyllion', suggesting that in the 1590s, the form was not necessarily as clearly defined as such a term might imply. Demetriou, 'The non-Ovidian Elizabethan epyllion', p. 48. See also Clark (ed.), *Amorous Rites*, p. xxviii.

<sup>18</sup> On male-authored female complaint, see John Kerrigan (ed.), *Motives of Woe: Shakespeare and 'Female Complaint': A Critical Anthology* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991). On supplication, see Whittington, *Renaissance Suppliants*.

<sup>19</sup> For a list of Heywood's many borrowings from *Venus and Adonis* across his works, see Adams (ed.), *Oenone and Paris*, pp. x–xiii, xxxix–xlii.

<sup>20</sup> William Shakespeare, *Venus and Adonis*, in Clark (ed.), *Amorous Rites*.

<sup>21</sup> Elsewhere in Shakespeare's poem, Adonis' complexion changes "'Twixt crimson shame and anger ashy pale' (l. 76), which only increases Venus' desire.

<sup>22</sup> Katherine Duncan-Jones, 'Much ado with red and white: the earliest readers of Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* (1593)', *The Review of English Studies*, 44 (1993), 479–501 (p. 495).

---

<sup>23</sup> Though Adams notes that ‘knewe’ here might also mean ‘acknowledge’ or ‘admit the claims of’. Adams (ed.), *Oenone and Paris*, p. 13.

<sup>24</sup> See also Weaver, *Untutored Lines*, p. 115, for the suggestion that ‘quondam wife’ is meant to be tongue-in-cheek.

<sup>25</sup> Adams notes the specific echo, of lines 345–6 of *Venus and Adonis*. Adams (ed.), *Oenone and Paris*, p. 13.

<sup>26</sup> Clark (ed.), *Amorous Rites*, p. xxxi.

<sup>27</sup> Adams notes the echo of *Venus and Adonis* line 116. Adams (ed.), *Oenone and Paris*, p. 12.

<sup>28</sup> Christopher Marlowe, *Hero and Leander*, in Clark (ed.), *Amorous Rites*.

<sup>29</sup> Adams (ed.), *Oenone and Paris*, p. 22.

<sup>30</sup> Whittington notes the importance of the suppliant’s physical posture – ‘crouching, kneeling, bending, prostrating’ – in inscribing difference between parties during the act of supplication. Whittington, *Renaissance Suppliants*, p. 16.

<sup>31</sup> Clark (ed.), *Amorous Rites*, p. xxxi.

<sup>32</sup> On the erotic potential of the suppliant figure, see Whittington, *Renaissance Suppliants*, pp. 38, 41–2.

<sup>33</sup> Arthur Golding, *XV books of Ovids Metamorphoses* (London: Willyam Seres, 1567).

<sup>34</sup> Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, trans. Frank Justus Miller, rev. G. P. Goold, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, rev. 1984 [1916]).

<sup>35</sup> George Turberville, *The Heroycall Epistles of the Learned Poet Publius Ovidius Naso*, trans. George Turberville (London: Henrie Denham, 1567).

<sup>36</sup> I quote the English translation (via French) of Arthur Hall, *Ten Bookes of Homers Iliades, Translated Out of French* (London: [Henry Bynneman] for Ralphe Newberie, 1581).

---

<sup>37</sup> In the 1632 printing these lines appear to be directed at Troilus, who has most recently addressed Hector, but Paris is also present, and seems a more likely addressee, given Hector's reference to Oenone, and to his brother's 'Sheepe-hooke' (sig. B2r). If *Oenone and Paris* is Heywood's, then this clear distinction between 'Oenons company' and 'a bench of souldiers' in the later play demonstrates Heywood consciously or unconsciously recalling his earlier work, and retrospectively undermining Oenone's militaristic invitation even further.

<sup>38</sup> Thomas Heywood, *The Iron Age* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1632).

<sup>39</sup> Ika Willis, *Reception* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018), p. 41.

<sup>40</sup> See Moss, *The Ovidian Vogue*, and Demetriou, 'The non-Ovidian Elizabethan epyllion'.

<sup>41</sup> Wall, *The Imprint of Gender*, pp. 251–2.

<sup>42</sup> See Weaver, *Untutored Lines*, pp. 101–2.

<sup>43</sup> In *Heroides* V, 113–20, Oenone recalls Cassandra warning her of Helen's approach, and the unhappy consequences it will have for her; in *Heroides* XVI, 121–4, Paris remembers his sister prophesying that he would bring back the fire that would burn Troy, and in XVII, 239–40, Helen also mentions the predicted burning of the city. T. H.'s Oenone recalls these more specific warnings when she tells him to leave Helen, 'Else wilt thou proove that burning fire-brand / Whereof the fayre Cassandra prophecied' (91–2).

<sup>44</sup> Lindsay Ann Reid, *Ovidian Bibliofictions and the Tudor Book: Metamorphosing Classical Heroines in Late Medieval and Renaissance England* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2014), p. 40.

<sup>45</sup> Ovid's Oenone has the reader of her letter firmly in mind: she opens with a command, and a mocking acknowledgement that Paris may be fearing a letter from Menelaus: 'perlegis? an coniunx prohibet nova? perlege – non est / ista Mycenaea littera facta manu!' (V, 1–2) 'Will you read my letter through? Or does your new wife forbid? Read – this is no letter writ by a Mycenae hand!'. Ovid, *Heroides. Amores*, trans. Grant Showerman, rev. G. P. Goold (London: Heinemann, 1914, rev. 1977). Quotations from the Loeb *Heroides* have been cross-

---

checked with the Aldine edition of 1502, Ovid, *Publii Ovidii Nasonis heroidum epistolae* (Venice, 1502), accessed via Early European Books Online.

<sup>46</sup> Compare Turberville, sig. Dvir and Ovid, *Heroides*, V, 135.

<sup>47</sup> [Joseph M. Ortiz reads \*Oenone and Paris\* as a ‘debate over the comparative merits of different classical genres, particularly pastoral and epic’: ‘Epic Oenone, pastoral Paris: Undoing the Virgilian \*rota\* in Thomas Heywood’s \*Oenone and Paris\*’, in Lynn Enterline \(ed.\), \*Elizabethan Narrative Poems\* \(London: Bloomsbury, 2019\), pp. 71–94 \(p. 72\).](#)

<sup>48</sup> Schmitz, *The Fall of Women*, p. 66.

<sup>49</sup> Duncan-Jones, ‘Much ado with red and white’, p. 496.

<sup>50</sup> Schmitz, *The Fall of Women*, p. 68.

<sup>51</sup> Conti does incorporate a snippet of *Heroides* V into an entry on fauns. See John Mulryan (ed.), *Natale Conti’s Mythologiae*, trans. Mulryan and Steven Brown, 2 vols (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2006), Vol. I, p. 385. Henceforth *Mythologia*.

<sup>52</sup> Thomas Cooper, *Thesaurus Linguae Romanae et Britannicae* (London: Henry Denham, 1578).

<sup>53</sup> ? Isabella Whitney, *The Copy of a Letter, Lately Written in Meeter, by a Yonge Gentilwoman, to her Unconstant Lover* (London: Richard Jones, 1567), sig. A7r.

<sup>54</sup> Thomas Fenne, *Fennes Frutes* (London: [T. Orwin] for Richard Oliffe, 1590), George Peele, *A Farewell, Entituled to the Famous and Fortunate Generalls of our English Forces. Whereunto is Annexed A Tale of Troy* (London: J[ohn] C[harlewood], 1589), sig. Br–v.

<sup>55</sup> Lindsay Ann Reid, ‘Oenone and Colin Clout’, *Translation and Literature*, 25 (2016), 298–314 (p. 306).

---

<sup>56</sup> George Peele, *The Araygnement of Paris*, ed. R. Mark Benbow, in Charles Tyler Prouty (ed.), *The Life and Works of George Peele* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1970), Vol. III, lines 666–7. For a full account of this poem, see Benbow’s introduction, pp. 7–60.

<sup>57</sup> Reid, ‘Oenone’, p. 314.

<sup>58</sup> See Weaver, *Untutored Lines*, pp. 101–2. He posits that in general, with regard to Paris’ speeches, Heywood (whom he takes as the poem’s author) ‘ambles along pretty closely in the neighbourhood of the Ovidian text’ (p. 100), but enumerates various small omissions and alterations in the description of the judgment, in particular, which suggest that Heywood might have been recalling Ovid ‘without book’ (p. 102). As Weaver acknowledges, and as I argue here, it is also possible to regard his departures from *Heroides XVI* as a deliberate strategy.

<sup>59</sup> Weaver, *Untutored Lines*, p. 104.

<sup>60</sup> In his rich and illuminating account of the poem, Weaver suggests that T. H.’s dedication to such humanist techniques renders Paris ‘as much Elizabethan schoolboy as Trojan Prince’ (*Untutored Lines*, p. 110).

<sup>61</sup> See Weaver, *Untutored Lines*, p. 100. He argues that the ‘gentlemen’ of Heywood’s readership, particularly, would have derived ‘no small pleasure’ from recognising the resetting of the Ovidian poem, and identifying the moments where it has been ‘diplomatically cleaned up in a couple of embarrassing particulars’.

<sup>62</sup> On the judgment motif, see Margaret J. Ehrhart, *The Judgment of the Trojan Prince Paris in Medieval Literature* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987) and John D. Reeves, ‘The Judgment of Paris as a device of Tudor flattery’, *Notes and Queries*, 199 (1954), 7–11.

<sup>63</sup> Thomas Heywood, *Pleasant Dialogues and Drammas, Selected out of Lucian, Erasmus, Textor, Ovid, &c.* (London: R. O[ulton] for R. H[earne], 1637), sig. K6v.

---

<sup>64</sup> Conti, *Mythologia*, Vol. II, p. 561.

<sup>65</sup> Weaver, *Untutored Lines*, p. 99.

<sup>66</sup> The translations from the *Heroides* are Turberville's. In the 1567 edition quoted, Paris' epistle is numbered XV, and Helen's XVI, with Sappho's to Phaon as XVII.

<sup>67</sup> Thomas Heywood, *Troia Britanica* (London: William Jaggard, 1609). References are to Yves Peyré (gen. ed.), *Troia Britanica* (2009–19), canto IX, lines 128–32, [www.shakmyth.org](http://www.shakmyth.org).

<sup>68</sup> Weaver, *Untutored Lines*, p. 103.

<sup>69</sup> The examples collected by Reeves, 'The Judgment of Paris', pp. 7–11, very frequently mention the prize.

<sup>70</sup> I am grateful to Tania Demetriou for drawing this intertext to my attention.

<sup>71</sup> Demetriou, 'The non-Ovidian Elizabethan epyllion', pp. 50, 44–6.

<sup>72</sup> For Heywood's knowledge of the *Iliad*, in George Chapman's translation but also in Greek, see Charlotte Coffin, 'Heywood's *Ages* and Chapman's Homer – nothing in common?', *Classical Receptions Journal*, 9:1 (2017), 55–78. On Heywood and Greek, see also the introduction and Chapter 1 (Camilla Temple).

<sup>73</sup> On digression in the epyllion, see Clark (ed.), *Amorous Rites*, p. xxix.

<sup>74</sup> M. L. Stapleton, 'Edmund Spenser, George Turberville, and Isabella Whitney read Ovid's "Heroides"', *Studies in Philology*, 105 (2008), 487–519 (p. 494). On the printing and provenance of the Sabine epistles, see Raphael Lyne, 'Writing back to Ovid in the 1560s and 1570s', *Translation and Literature*, 13 (2004), 143–64 (pp. 145–9). For the Latin letter, see *Publius Ovidius Naso heroidum epistolae* (Venice, 1502), fols kkiiv–kkivr.

<sup>75</sup> Lyne, 'Writing back to Ovid', p. 148.

<sup>76</sup> Lynn Enterline argues that Paris 'portrays himself not as a lover, but as a lawyer pleading a case in court'. Enterline, 'Elizabethan Minor Epic', in Patrick Cheney and Philip Hardie



---

(eds), *The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature, Volume 2: 1558–1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 253–71 (p. 256).

<sup>77</sup> Quotations from this epistle are Turberville's.

<sup>78</sup> Another possible source for this particular defence is Mark Alexander Boyd's Latin version of Paris' reply to Oenone, published in 1590 as part of the collection *Epistulae quindecim*. See Paul White, *Renaissance Postscripts: Responding to Ovid's 'Heroides' in Sixteenth-Century France* (Columbus, OH: Ohio State Press, 2009), pp. 236–41. However, if T. H. was using the 1502 Aldine edition of the Latin, and Turberville's English translation, he would have had easy access to both the Sabinus epistle and its translation, making one or both of these versions his more probable source for Paris' address to Oenone.

<sup>79</sup> Adams (ed.), *Oenone and Paris*, p. 40, notes the same error in Heywood's *Silver Age*, though Richard Rowland shows that in the *Brazen Age*, Heywood correctly identifies the cross-dressing with Omphale. Rowland, *Killing Hercules: Deianira and the Politics of Domestic Violence, from Sophocles to the War on Terror* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017), pp. 135–6. Boyd's Paris (see note 78 above) also avoids this mistake, another detail that suggests T. H.'s use of Turberville's translation of the Sabinus epistle, rather than Boyd's poem.

<sup>80</sup> Here and elsewhere, Paris' epistle refers obliquely to a separate Greek but post-Homeric tradition, in which he is mortally wounded during the Trojan War, and unsuccessfully appeals to Oenone to save him with her medical knowledge. See Quintus Smyrnaeus, *The Fall of Troy*, trans. Arthur S. Way (London: Heinemann, 1913), X, 253–489.

<sup>81</sup> Sarah Carter, 'Early modern intertextuality: post structuralism, narrative systems, and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*', *Literature Compass*, 13:2 (2016), 47–57 (p. 55).

<sup>82</sup> Brown, *Redefining Elizabethan Literature*, p. 103.

<sup>83</sup> Speaking of the episode in *The Iron Age*, Adams sees its similarity to *Oenone and Paris* as a further hint at Heywood's authorship of both works: 'so closely in plot and general spirit

---

does it resemble that poem, that one is inclined to suspect some significant relationship between the two'. Adams (ed.), *Oenone and Paris*, pp. xxxviii–ix.

<sup>84</sup> See *The Iron Age*, sig. B4r–v.

<sup>85</sup> See Moss, *The Ovidian Vogue*, Chapter 4 and pp. 181–2.

<sup>86</sup> Reid, 'Oenone', pp. 300–1.