EARLY MODERN LITERARY STUDIES

Heywood, Shakespeare, and the Mystery of *Troye*

Douglas Arrell
University of Winnipeg
d.arrell@uwinnipeg.ca

1. *Troye*

On June 22, 1596 a play called *Troye* received its first performance at the Rose playhouse in London. It appears that audience expectations were high. Philip Henslowe recorded in his *Diary* that his share of the receipts was £3 9s. While first nights normally meant high receipts for the company, this figure was exceptional; since Easter the company had been doing generally poor business, and the other new plays that debuted during this period averaged only about £2 10s at their premieres. It must have been an expensive production; presumably the 'great horse with his leages' listed in the properties inventory of the company in 1598 was the Trojan horse in this production and must have required a significant outlay.[1] Unfortunately, hopes for a smash hit were not to be realized. The play received only three subsequent performances and averaged only about 25 shillings per performance. In the context of the Admiral's company's receipts during this period these takings were not bad, but a successful opening night would certainly have generated more performances and larger audiences than were achieved.[2]

This information is all that can be deduced about *Troye* from Henslowe's *Diary*. However, in 1891 the theatre historian F. G. Fleay speculated that *Troye* might have been

---

[1] R. A., Foakes (ed.), *Henslowe's Diary*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 320.

[2] The company's London season ended two days after the fourth showing of *Troye*, which otherwise might well have achieved a few more performances, but the abrupt drop in revenue and the fact that the play was not revived when the company returned in the autumn certainly suggest that the play's audience appeal was limited. Compare it to a successful play such as *1 Hercules*, which achieved £3 13s, £3 9s, £3 and £3 1s at its first four performances, was revived after a summer break taking in £3 4s at its first autumn performance and had a total of 11 performances recorded in the *Diary*.

the same as *The Iron Age*, which with *The Second Part of the Iron Age* formed a sequence about the Trojan War by Thomas Heywood published in 1632; these were the last in a series of plays that included *The Golden Age* (1611), *The Silver Age* (1613) and *The Brazen Age* (1613). In 1908, W. W. Greg modified this suggestion somewhat, proposing that *Troye* was a shorter version of the combined two-part *Iron Age* plays, a theory that E. K. Chambers in 1923 called 'more plausible.'[3] However, Chambers noted that the prefaces to the *Golden* and *Silver Ages* seem to imply that the *Iron Age* plays were not yet in existence at the time these plays were published. In the former, Heywood says: 'This is the *Golden Age*, the eldest brother of three Ages, that have adventured the Stage,' implying that the *Iron Age* plays, which would be the fourth and fifth plays in the sequence, had not yet been performed and possibly were not yet written.[4] In the preface to *The Silver Age* he states: 'Though wee begunne with *Gold*, follow with *Silver*, proceede with *Brasse* and purpose by Gods grace, to end with *Iron*',[5] again suggesting that the creation of the *Iron Age* plays was in the future. Chambers does not deny that they might have been 'based on earlier work'[6] but seems to take these references to mean that the extant *1* and *2 Iron Age* were so much altered that they must be considered entirely new plays, which he dates to c. 1613. Commentators on Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* have followed Chambers in downplaying, if not denying, the connection between *Troye* and the *Iron Age* plays. David Bevington, in the most recent Arden edition of that play, expresses what is now the scholarly consensus on the subject: 'Heywood's *The Iron Age*, once tentatively identified with the *Troy* produced by Henslowe in 1596, was probably not written until 1609-10, at least in the version performed in 1612-13, so that it cannot be shown to have influenced Shakespeare.'[7] Although a possible connection with *Troye* is not denied, there appears to be an increasing belief that very little of the earlier play survives in the *Iron Age* plays. But did Heywood write *Troye*, and if so, how was *Troye* altered to create *1* and *2 Iron Age*?

In a recent article I presented what I believe are strong reasons for concluding that *1* and *2 Hercules*, shown in Henslowe's *Diary* to have been presented by the Admiral's

---

[3] Frederick Gard Fleay, A *Biographical Chronicle of English Drama* 1559-1642, 2 vols. (1891; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1973), I, p. 285; *Henslowe's Diary,* ed. by Walter W. Greg, 2 vols. (1904-08; rpt. New York: Norwood Editions, 1977), II, p. 180; E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage,* 4 vols. (1923; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951), III, p. 345.

[4] Thomas Heywood, *The Golden Age* (London: William Barrenger, 1611), sig. A2r.

[5] Thomas Heywood, *The Silver Age* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1613), sig. A2r.

[6] E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1930), I, p. 449.

[7] William Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida*, ed. David Bevington, The Arden Shakespeare 3rd series (London: Thomas Nelson, 1998), p. 394. References in parentheses refer to this edition.

company in 1595-96, were written by Heywood and were revised by him into the *Silver* and *Brazen Ages*.[8] If this conclusion is correct, it strongly suggests that Heywood wrote *Troye* and that it was later revised by him into the *Iron Age* plays. In the medieval version of Greek mythology, exemplified by Caxton's *The Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*, the Trojan War follows closely on the death of Hercules, as portrayed at the end of *The Brazen Age* and no doubt in *2 Hercules*. Hercules' sack of Troy, his killing of Priam's father, King Laomedon, and his giving of Priam's sister Hesione to Telamon, are the real causes of the war; it is in revenge for these atrocities, and the fact that Telamon is keeping Hesione as a concubine not a queen, that Priam agrees to send Paris to steal Helen. The Hercules plays were successful; *1 Hercules* was a major money-spinner for the company, and while *2 Hercules* had only an eight performance run, it brought in a disproportionately large income.[9] It seems very likely that Heywood would go on to write the next play in the sequence. It also seems likely that, fifteen years later, having adapted the Hercules plays for the *Ages* series, he would do the same for *Troye*.

One problem with connecting *Troye* with Heywood's *Iron Age* plays is the fact that, as Robert K. Presson points out, Chapman's translation of seven books from Homer's *Iliad* was not published until 1598.[10] I shall argue shortly that material from Chapman's version of Book 7 of the *Iliad* appears in *1 Iron Age* and was part of the original *Troye* of 1596. How is this possible? I suggest that although Chapman's translation was published in 1598 it may have been written earlier, and it is quite possible that Heywood could have read at least Book 7 while it was still in manuscript. Heywood and Chapman were both (probably) former university men who began writing for the Admiral's company in the mid-1590s. They shared an interest in the classics and translation; while Chapman worked on his Homer Heywood was translating several works of Ovid.[11] They each published an erotic Ovidian poem in the wake of *Venus and Adonis*.[12] They surely knew each other. We know that manuscripts were sometimes shared in Heywood's circle; in his preface to *The Brazen Age* he reveals that he lent his unpublished versions of Ovid's *De Arte Amandi*

---

[8] Douglas Arrell, 'Heywood, Henslowe, and Hercules: Tracking *1* and *2 Hercules* in Heywood's *Silver* and *Brazen Ages*', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, 17.1 (2014), https://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/journal/index.php/emls/article/view/100 (date accessed 4 April 2015), 1-21.

[9] See Arrell, p. 15n.

[10] Robert K. Presson*, Shakespeare's 'Troilus and Cressida' and the Legends of Troy* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1953), p. 19n.

[11] See M. L. Stapleton (ed.), *Thomas Heywood's Art of Love: The First Complete Translation of Ovid's Ars Amatoria* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000), pp. 16-17.

[12] *Oenone and Paris* by 'T.H.' appeared in 1594; Joseph Quincy Adams, in his edition of the poem (Washington: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1943), makes a very convincing case that Heywood is the author, and this attribution has been generally accepted. Chapman published *Ovid's Banquet of Sense* in 1595.

and *De Remedio Amoris* to one Austin, who subsequently claimed them as his own work.[13] Heywood would have been eager to see Chapman's translation, especially after he decided to write a play on the Trojan War. Admittedly, it is speculation that he borrowed Chapman's manuscript, but if there are other reasons to believe that this part of *1 Iron Age* was written in 1596, the date of publication of the first instalment of Chapman's Homer is not an insurmountable problem.

Another apparent difficulty lies in the date of republication of Caxton's *Recuyell*. This was Heywood's main source for the *Iron Age* plays. It was originally published in 1475-76 and when I conjecture he was writing *Troye* it had not been reissued since 1553. In my article on *1* and *2 Hercules*, I demonstrate that when Heywood wrote these plays in 1594-95 he had not yet read the *Recuyell*, which would later be such an important source for his work. Instead he relied on a much abbreviated version of Caxton's work in William Warner's long poem *Albion's England*, first published in 1586.[14] Caxton's *Recuyell* was republished in a somewhat modernized edition in two separate volumes by different publishers in 1596-97; the second volume, which deals with the Trojan War, appeared in 1597. How could Heywood have used it in writing a play performed in 1596? The answer comes in an article by Yves Peyré on the sources of Heywood's long narrative poem, *Troia Britanica*. In it he demonstrates that in this 1609 work Heywood uses the *1553* edition of Caxton, not the 1597 one.[15] This fact suggests the following plausible scenario. After the success of the Hercules plays, Heywood decided to continue the story with a play on the Trojan War. But this part of Caxton's narrative is skimmed over very briefly in *Albion's England*, which would no longer be adequate for Heywood's purpose. And so he was driven to obtain a copy of the 1553 edition of the *Recuyell*, which he continued to use in his later writings. The fact that he did not use the soon-to-be-easily-available 1597 text thus actually supports the idea that he wrote his first version of the Trojan War story in 1596, before the up-dated version was published.

If it is granted that Heywood wrote *Troye*, and that it was revised into the *Iron Age* plays, what can be said about the nature of the revision? Was the material completely reconceived, or does most of *Troye* survive in the extant works? The references in the prefaces cited by Chambers do not answer this question. In publishing even lightly-revised versions of fifteen-year-old plays under new titles, it does not seem surprising that

---

[13] Heywood, *The Brazen Age, (*London: Nicholas Okes*, 1613)*, sig. A2r.

[14] Arrell, pp. 16-18.

[15] Yves Peyré, 'Early Modern Mythological Texts: Troia Britanica, Library', *A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Classical Mythology*, http://www.shakmyth.org/page/Early+Modern+Mythological+Texts%3A+Troia+Britanica,+Library (date accessed 14 July 2015), n.p.

Heywood would present them as new plays; he certainly would not want to advertise them as recycled old ones.[16] Clearly there were significant changes, since one play has apparently become two. But would Heywood, the consummate professional, writing a new play on the same subject as an old one, throw away everything he had done and completely recast the material? In my article on *1* and *2 Hercules* I suggested that the main change was to eliminate a number of episodes from each play and replace them with other material. I suggested that the rest of the plays remained more or less unaltered, citing the only surviving example of Heywood's practice in revision, *The Escapes of Jupiter*, an adaptation of the Jupiter seduction scenes from the *Ages* that survives in a manuscript of the 1620s.[17] In this work, while there is some updating and tinkering with the language, the scenes Heywood wrote in some cases twenty-five years earlier were left essentially unchanged. In effect, *The Escapes of Jupiter*, as well as (I argue) the *Silver* and *Brazen Ages*, were created by cutting and pasting of old and new materials, not radical rewriting.

There is evidence, I think, of cutting and pasting in the *Iron Age* plays. If *1* and *2 Iron Age* are adaptations of a single play, *Troye*, it is clear that they contain a great deal of material that was added to make up the two-part play. No reader of *1 Iron Age* can fail to notice that the last act, showing the debate between Ajax and Ulysses over who should win the armour of Achilles and Ajax's subsequent madness and suicide, is a diversion from the main story and a very unusual kind of last act for an early modern English play. This material must replace the original last act of *Troye*, which showed the end of the war after the deaths of Hector and Achilles; it seems likely that the Trojan horse came into it, since the 'great horse' was included in the 1598 inventory of properties. The first three acts of *2 Iron Age* cover the last part of the war; they include the appearance of the horse, which is dramatically 'discovered' in the first scene of the second act. The last two acts of this play, dealing with the murder of Agamemnon and Orestes' killing of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus, all orchestrated as a grand revenge by Cethus, constitute a completely different action. Act 3 of *2 Iron Age* comes to a definitive conclusion that feels strongly like the ending of a play. The inevitable scene of mass slaughter of Priam and his family

---

[16] I think that the preface to *The Silver Age* refers to the *publication* of the *Ages* plays, not to their being written or produced, as Chambers assumes. The revision of *Troye* into the *Iron Age* plays could thus have taken place any time after 1611, when the *Golden Age* preface was written. I do not know where Bevington gets his dates of 1609-10 for the writing of the *1* and *2 Iron Age*, and 1612-13 for their being produced (p. 394). Bevington gives as his source Harold N. Hillebrand in *Troilus and Cressida*, New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1953), p. 462. In fact, Hillebrand merely cites Chambers' argument that the plays were written after the publication of *The Silver Age* in 1613.

[17] See Thomas Heywood, *The Escapes of Jupiter*, ed. by Henry D. Janzen, Malone Society Reprints (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).

is followed by one in which the Greek leaders engage in a kind of retrospective summary of the war; it ends with lines spoken by the dominant surviving figure, Pyrrhus:

> And now *Troyes* warres are ended, we in peace
> With glorious conquest to sayle back to *Greece*.
> Their Nation's vanish'd like their Citties smoake,
> Our enemies are all ashes : worlds to come
> Shall Cronicle our pitilesse revenge
> In Bookes of Brasse and leaves of Adamant.
> Towards *Greece* victorious Leaders, our toyle's past ;
> *Troye* and *Troyes* people we have burn't in flames,
> And of them both left nothing but their names.[18]

This highly formal and conclusive speech is very typical of the last speech of a tragedy, and not at all typical of the end of a third act, where there would normally be some reference to future action. Thus, in general terms we could guess that *Troye* originally had for its last act material from the first three acts of *2 Iron Age*.

One approach to identifying this material is to look at *Troia Britanica*, Heywood's 1609 poem that covers the same story as the *Iron Age* plays. The two works for the most part run closely in parallel; however, there are some scenes and speeches in the plays that are not in the poem. I suggest that when Heywood wrote *Troia Britanica* he followed the same sequence of events he had used in *Troye*; the poem thus preserves the Trojan War story as he originally wrote it. When he expanded *Troye* into the two part *Iron Age*, he added a significant amount of new material, which is easily identifiable since it is not in *Troia Britanica*. By eliminating this material from the *Iron Age* plays, we can approximate the content of the original *Troye*. The debate between Ajax and Ulysses and Ajax's suicide are not in the poem, for example, and this fact supports the contention that Act 5 of *1 Iron Age* was a later addition. At the end of the Trojan War section of *Troia Britanica*, Heywood lists the Ulysses-Ajax debate as among the events he has *not* dealt with in the poem, along with the fates of Agamemnon and the other Greek leaders at the end of the war;[19] this fact supports the theory that acts 4 and 5 of *2 Iron Age* are also part of the material added sometime after 1611. In particular, there is no trace in *Troia Britanica* of the revenge perpetrated by Cethus that forms the central plot line of this part

---

[18] *The Iron Age* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1632), pt. 2, sig. F4r.

[19] Thomas Heywood, *Troia Britanica: or Great Britaines Troy* (London: W. Jaggard, 1609), canto 15, stanza 98. Although the publisher attempted a modern style of page numbering in this work, there are many irregularities and so it is preferable to make reference to the poem by canto and stanza.

of the play. A notable difference between the poem and the play is the character of Synon. In the poem, and also in the *Aeneid*, he is a 'youth' whose role is limited to pretending to be an escapee from the Greeks, winning the confidence of the Trojans and persuading them to bring the giant horse into the city. He also uses the key to open the secret door on the horse and lights a beacon to signal to the Greek army that the plot has been successful. In *2 Iron Age* he has become a major character, an arch-villain who is a kind of twin of the famously ugly Thersites and who masterminds the whole plot. He is involved in two long scenes that are not in *Troia Britanica*. In one of these, he seduces Cressida while Diomedes looks on.[20] That this scene is a later addition is suggested by the fact that, as Arlene W. Weiner notes, it clearly borrows from the scene in which Troilus watches Diomedes seduce Cressida in *Troilus and Cressida*, which was probably written about five years after *Troye*;[21] while it is true that this kind of overhearing scene is common in the drama of the period, the obvious irony in the fact that it is now Diomedes watching Cressida's unfaithfulness strongly suggests a relationship to Shakespeare's play.[22] The fact that this scene is not in *Troia Britanica* supports the notion that Heywood only became familiar with *Troilus and Cressida* after 1609. The other Synon scene not in *Troia Britanica* is the one in which the Trojan horse plot is hatched.[23] He also has several long soliloquies and dialogues with Thersites that could be additions. The first twenty-eight lines in the scene in which he pretends to have escaped from the Greeks have no equivalent in *Troia Britanica*, where the appeal to the Trojans begins immediately with the story of Synon's anger at Palamides' execution; the over-the-top histrionics of these lines seem part of the new characterization of Synon.[24] Another scene not in *Troia Britanica* and clearly extraneous is one in which Helen and Cressida, who has now become a leper, meet and in which Helen is reconciled with Menelaus.[25] If one omits this scene and all the unnecessary Synon material the play still makes complete sense and the total of approximately 1268 lines in acts 1-3 of *2 Iron Age* would be reduced to 745.[26]

---

[20] *The Iron Age*, pt. 2, sig. C1r-C2r.

[21] Arlene W. Weiner, *Thomas Heywood's 'The Iron Age'* (New York: Garland, 1979), p. xxxiii.

[22] Note that there is no equivalent of this scene in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, which according to most scholars is Shakespeare's main source for the love plot. It seems unlikely Heywood could have found it anywhere except in Shakespeare's play.

[23] *The Iron Age*, pt. 2, sig. C3r-C4v.

[24] Ibid, sig. D1v-D2r.

[25] Ibid, sig. E3r-E4v.

[26] Here is an indication of the lines of *2 Iron Age* that I propose should be cut to reconstruct *Troye*; for convenience I have used the version of the play in vol. 3 of *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Heywood*, ed. R. H. Shepherd (6 vols; London: John Pearson 1874; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1964): p. 357, 15 ll.; p. 358, 36 ll.; p.359, 7 ll.; p362, 19 ll.; p. 363, 35 ll.; p. 364, 36 ll.; p. 365, 33 ll.; p. 366, 30 ll.; p. 367, 25 ll.; p. 368, 25 ll.; p. 369, 39 ll.; p. 370, 37 ll.; p. 371, 14 ll.; p. 374, 28 ll.; p. 377, 10 ll.; p. 378, 15 ll.; p. 379, 19 ll.; p. 386, 27 ll.; p.387, 36 ll. ; p. 388, 36 ll.; p. 389, 1 l.

While this would make a very long act, it is not much longer than the first act of *1 Iron Age* which has 736 lines. There could also have been some other less obvious material added to *Troye* to create the two *Iron Age* plays, but it seems likely the original play was very long, since Heywood decided to divide it into two plays; the fifth act of the new *1 Iron Age* has 370 lines, just half the number there may have been in the last act of *Troye*. I suggested in my discussion of *1* and *2 Hercules* that the revision of those plays was in part intended to deal with the problem of repetitiveness in the Hercules story, which largely consists of a series of fights that Hercules invariably wins. In this case it seems likely the revision was intended to deal with the original play's excessive length, which may have contributed to its failure. Although Heywood has a remarkable ability to compress a great deal of plot into a single scene or act, even he could not cram the entire Trojan War into one play of reasonable length.

For convenience, I shall use '*Troye*' to refer to acts 1-4 of *1 Iron Age* and the shortened version of Acts 1-3 of *2 Iron Age* hypothesized above. The ease with which this division can be achieved suggests that this material does indeed approximate the content of the *Troye* in Henslowe's *Diary*. I am not suggesting that Heywood did not make other changes when he revised his old text; but on the example of *The Escapes of Jupiter* I shall assume they were limited to relatively minor tinkering.

One feature that suggests a 1590s date for *Troye* is the strongly Ovidian atmosphere of its first act. In telling the story of Paris' seduction of Helen, Heywood ignores the treatment of it in Caxton and instead goes to Ovid's *Heroides* for his inspiration. In fact these scenes contain a number of direct quotations from Heywood's translations of numbers 16 and 17 of the *Heroides*, which later appeared in full in *Troia Britanica*. John S. P. Tatlock, who points these out, is surely correct in thinking that these translations were early work of Heywood, written when he was translating others of Ovid's works.[27] This was in the mid-1590s, when Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* had made Ovidian eroticism fashionable. Another Ovidian touch in Act 1 is the scene in which Oenone attempts to persuade Paris not to leave. This short scene, largely in rhyme, is clearly derived from Heywood's 1594 poem *Oenone and Paris*, which in turn was derived from another of the *Heroides* and was a close imitation of *Venus and Adonis*. Surely this scene was written in the mid-1590s, when Heywood was immersed in the topic and in Ovid, not fifteen years later. The theme of the handsome but indifferent youth resisting the pleadings of a lovely goddess was clearly a favourite in this decade and Heywood was exploiting its popularity, just as he had done when he included the story of Venus and

---

[27] John S. P. Tatlock, 'The Siege of Troy in Elizabethan Literature, Especially in Shakespeare and Heywood', *PMLA* 30 (1915), 673-770 (pp. 715-16).

Adonis in *1 Hercules*.[28] It is in fact surprising that the Oenone scene survived into the post-1611 play, but Heywood's concern in his revision was to add to a play that was to be divided in two, not to cut anything from it.

Another clear influence on *Troye* is Greene's *Euphues his Censure to Philautus* (1587), as shown by Tatlock;[29] it seems more likely Heywood would be using this source in 1596 than in 1611, when Greene's humanistic dialogue was no doubt largely forgotten. There are no signs of Heywood using any sources for this play later than 1596; on the other hand, the parts that I hypothesize were added to the play after 1611 to create *2 Iron Age* show clear signs of being influenced by the Jacobean revenge tragedy. Robert Grant Martin, in an essay of 1918, points out the affinity to this genre of the last two acts of the play. Because he takes Tatlock to have dated this material to 1595-96 he is forced to imagine that Heywood was much more advanced than he was, since the genre had hardly taken shape in 1596, and he has to attribute the obvious echoes of *Hamlet* to the ur-*Hamlet*.[30] Martin's essay in fact provides further evidence that acts 4 and 5 are part of the material added after 1611, material that was not part of the original *Troye*.

The evidence that *1* and *2 Hercules* and *Troye* were adapted by Heywood into the *Silver, Brazen* and *Iron Ages* is strong. But how strong is the evidence that the early plays were actually written by Heywood? Might they not have been written by someone else and adapted by Heywood, as Shakespeare adapted *The Troublesome Reign of King John* and *King Leir* by earlier anonymous writers? One could argue on stylistic grounds that the parts of the *Ages* plays I suggest derive from the 1590s seem in line with Heywood's usual playwriting manner. Their use of material from his 1594 *Oenone and Paris* connects them with Heywood at that period. A further indication that Heywood wrote *Troye* is that, as just mentioned, he used in this 1596 work (as it survives in *1 Iron Age*) lines from his translations of the *Heroides* that were not published until 1609 in *Troia Britanica*. Even this evidence does not prove the matter, since the supposed real author of the earlier plays could have read these poems in manuscript, or Heywood could have interpolated these passages (Tatlock lists at least fourteen of them) into the old text. In fact I do not think it can be proved definitively that *Troye* and the Hercules play were written by Heywood. However, it seems to me likely that they were, and the matter will have to stand there

---

[28] I argue in the article cited above that the Venus and Adonis episode was attached to the Erymanthian boar hunt, which I suggest must have been shown in *1 Hercules*; in the revision of the Hercules plays, it is attached to the Caledonian boar hunt in *The Brazen Age*.

[29] Tatlock, p. 725.

[30] Robert Grant Martin, 'A New Specimen of the Revenge Play', *Modern Philology* 16. 1 (1918), 1-10.

until someone suggests an alternative candidate and provides stylistic or other evidence in support of their proposal.

2. Heywood and Homer

Most of the story of the Trojan War as portrayed in *Troye* comes from Caxton's *Recuyell*.[31] This popular work, which epitomized the medieval understanding of Greek mythology, turned the heroes of Homer into knights and squires and minimized the fantastic elements in the stories as much as possible. It also combined and rearranged mythological tales from a wide range of sources, and imposed the logic of medieval story-telling on this material. In Caxton's version, the Trojan War began with Hercules' destruction of Troy and the giving of Hesione to Telamon. Paris had a dream of judging the beauty contest between the three goddesses, and was rewarded by Venus with a vision of Helen; he persuades the Trojans to send him to Sparta deliberately to steal the wife of a Greek leader in revenge for the treatment of Hesione. Both the Greeks and Trojans send to the oracle of Delphi to find out who will win, and the Trojan priest Calchas joins the Greeks when he learns that the Greeks will eventually be victorious. Hector is portrayed as the ideal knight; he is eventually treacherously killed by Achilles. After his death, Troilus becomes the great Trojan hero until he also is killed by Achilles. Achilles refuses to fight after he falls in love with the Trojan princess Polyxena. He is lured by Hecuba with a promise of marriage to her daughter to the temple of Apollo in Troy, where he is ambushed and killed by Paris. These and many other very un-Homeric features Heywood took from the *Recuyell*.

This was not his only source however. He modified Caxton in a number of places, usually under the influence of Ovid or Virgil. He adds the story that Hecuba had a dream that she gave birth to a burning brand, which led her to expose the newly-born Paris on Mount Ida, where he survived and became a shepherd.[32] The story of how he seduced Helen while a guest of Menelaus follows Ovid in *Heroides* 16 and 17 closely, and is very unlike Caxton's version, in which Paris meets Helen in the temple of Venus on Cythera and takes her away along with much loot from the temple by force.[33] The story that Achilles' heel was his only vulnerable spot, because his mother Thetis held him by the heel when

---

[31] *The Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye* is in fact a translation by William Caxton of a work by Raoul Lefèvre, who was in turn adapting a work by Guido delle Colonne; for convenience and following custom, I shall refer to its author as Caxton. I have used the edition of H. Oskar Sommer, 2 vols. (London: David Nutt, 1894).

[32] *The Iron Age,* pt. 1, sig, B3v.

[33] Caxton, II, p. 529.

dipping him in the sea (or the River Styx), and that this is where he was shot with an arrow by Paris, is found in many late classical sources but not in Caxton.[34] Heywood replaces Caxton's version of the final fall of Troy, in which Aeneas and Antenor are shown as traitors, with that in Book 2 of the *Aeneid,* which he follows closely.

Heywood also used what may be called the 'received knowledge' of Homer. While translations of the *Iliad* into Latin and French were available, and Arthur Hall's verse rendering of a French version of the first ten books was published in 1581, Chapman's translations, beginning with the *Seven Bookes of the Iliades of Homere* (Books 1-2 and 7-11) published in 1598, seem to have been the first occasion when most Elizabethan readers encountered Homer's actual words.[35] But there were many secondary sources, such as Thomas Cooper's *Thesaurus linguae Romanae et Britannicae*, widely used by Elizabethan writers including Heywood, [36] from which the basic facts of the Homeric version of the Trojan war could be discovered, and some of these were making their way into the Caxton-based versions of the story. Heywood diverges from Caxton in making Hector's killing of Patroclus an important motivation for Achilles' rejoining the battle and ultimately killing Hector; in Caxton Patroclus dies early in the war, and Achilles does not 'keep his tent' until after the death of Hector, when he has fallen in love with Priam's daughter Polyxena. Heywood did not have to discover this obvious improvement on Caxton's plot from reading the *Iliad*. He merely had to look up 'Patroclus' in Cooper's *Thesaurus,* where he would learn that:

> wherefore at the warre of Troy (when Achilles did keepe his tent, and woulde not fight, in displeasure that Agamemnon had taken Lady Bryseis from him) This Patroclus, the more to feare the Trojans, borrowed the armour of Achilles, whome he knew they dradde full sore, and in the same fighting in the fielde, was slayne of Hector, for sorrow whereof Achilles (that before could by no meanes be perswaded) to revenge his friendes death as a fierce tyger came agayne into the fielde, and there meeting with Hector, after long flight, chased him on foote rounde about the walles of Troye, and at the last slew him, and in the sight of his wretched father Priamus, drue him by an horse tayle, about the wals, and after

---

[34] For sources of these features of the Achilles myth see Jonathan Burgess, 'Achilles' heel: The Death of Achilles in Ancient Myth', *Classical Antiquity*. 14. 2 (1995), 217-244.

[35] Hall's translation seems to have had little impact; it probably was unknown to Chapman. See H.C. Fay, 'George Chapman's Translation of Homer's *Iliad*', *Greece & Rome* 21. 63 (1952), 104-11 (p. 104n).

[36] See Peyré, *op. cit.*, and DeWitt T. Starnes and Ernest William Talbert, *Classical Myth and Legend in Renaissance Dictionaries* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1955), pp. 213-25.

twelve dayes space scantly with a great summe of money could be perswaded to suffer him to be buried.[37]

Nor was Heywood the first to add this element of Homer into the traditional Caxton story. In George Peele's poem *A Tale of Troy* (1589), which generally follows Caxton, Achilles is drawn into the battle by the killing of Patroclus and kills Hector while the latter is attempting to strip Patroclus' body of its armour.[38] And one doubts that Peele in this school-boy poem was the first to make this addition. In Caxton it is the body of Troilus that is dragged behind Achilles' horse. Again, Heywood could have learned from sources like Cooper that in Homer it is Hector's body that is so treated.

Another Homeric addition to the *Iron Age* plays is the character of Thersites, who does not appear in Caxton. In the *Iliad* he makes a brief appearance in Book 2 as a rank and file soldier who criticizes the Greek leadership at an assembly, and who is notably deformed. Heywood did not have to find him there, as he was widely known in the Renaissance as a figure of ugliness and discord.[39] The fact that Heywood makes him one of the Greek leaders rather than a common soldier may reflect the fact that he got him from a source other than the *Iliad*; in Cooper he is described as 'A prince that came wyth the Greekes to the siege of Troy, which in person and conditions was of all other most deformed.'[40] This description fits Heywood's Thersites better than the one he might have found in Homer.

One part of *Troye* is, however, definitely taken from the *Iliad*. The scene in Act 2 in which Hector challenges the Greeks to single combat, and the subsequent fight between Hector and Ajax, follows the Homeric version closely. This challenge and fight are not found in Caxton and are not part of the usual telling of the Trojan War story in the Renaissance, although they were known through brief mentions in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and no doubt elsewhere.[41] Heywood's version is very close to Homer. Hector steps between the warring

---

[37] Thomas Cooper, *Thesaurus Linguae Romanae et Britannicae* (London: Nicholas Bestney, 1587), sig. 7N2v.

[38] 'A Tale of Troy', *The Life and Works of George Peele*, ed. by Charles Tyler Prouty (3 vols.), vol. I, *The Life and Minor Works of George Peele*, ed. by David H. Horne (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952), ll. 305-15.

[39] The best known Renaissance description of Thersites is by Erasmus in his *Apophthegemes.* For this and other references, see Jeffery R. Wilson, *Stigma in Shakespeare: Thersites in Renaissance Literature*, http://wilson.fas.harvard.edu/stigma-in-shakespeare/thersites-in-renaissance-literature (date accessed December 1, 2015).

[40] Cooper, sig. 7P4r.

[41] Ovid, *Metamorphoses.* trans. Frank Justus Miller, Loeb Classical Library, 2 vols. (London: Heinemann, 1921), bk.13, ll. 87-90, 275-79.

sides and proposes a two-man battle to the death; the victor will win the armour of the loser, to be hung up as a memorial in a temple, while the loser's body will be returned to his side to be burnt on a funeral pyre. He proposes that if he wins the Greek's body will be given a monument near the sea, where passing ships will remember Hector's heroic victory. These authentic Homeric details stand out against the Caxton-based medievalism of the rest of the play. The Greek response, including Menelaus' attempt to accept the challenge, the lottery to find which Greek would fight, and the fight itself, all follow Homer closely. The similarity between Heywood's and Chapman's language suggests that it was specifically his translation that Heywood was using.[42] Heywood's great addition to the scene is to bring in the fact – from Caxton not from Homer – that Ajax, the winner of the lottery, is the son of Hesione and Telamon, and therefore that he and Hector are cousins; Hector has a speech in which he says he wishes he could kill the Greek side of Ajax while preserving the Trojan. This familial relationship adds poignancy to the entirely Homeric end of the duel, in which the heroes exchange the same gifts that are described in the *Iliad*.

Given that Heywood definitely had read Book 7 of the *Iliad*, almost certainly in Chapman's translation, we might expect to find signs of influence from the rest of the *Seven Books*. Tatlock lists a number of references to Homer in *1* and *2 Iron Age*; apart from those to Book 7, they are relatively minor. Some of them clearly refer to other parts of the *Iliad* and I presume came from sources like Cooper.[43] One possibly genuine Homeric touch in *Troye* is the fact that when the Greek leaders arrive to try to persuade Achilles to join the battle he is playing on the lute. In Book 9 of the *Iliad* (included in the

---

[42] Some examples of Heywood's use of Chapman's choice of words are the following. Chapman: 'But let my bodie be returnd, that *Troys* two-sixt descent / May waste it in the funerall Pyle'; Heywood: 'my mangled body / Send backe to *Troy*, to a red funerall pile' (compare the Loeb Library translation:
'but my body let him give back to my home, that the Trojans and the Trojan wives may give me my due meed of fire in my death'). Chapman: 'And beare his armes to *Ilion*, where in *Apollos* shryne / Ile hang them as my trophies due'; Heywood: 'the armour which hee weares / I'le lodge as Trophies on *Apolloes* shrine' (Loeb Library: 'I will spoil him of his armour, and bear it to sacred Ilios and hang it upon the temple of Apollo'). Chapman: 'If *Hectors* honorable proofe be entertaind by none'; Heywood: 'shall this proud challenge / Bee Intertain'd by none?' (Loeb Library: 'if no man of the Danaans shall now go to meet Hector'). Chapman: 'the right side brasse, and seaven Oxe hydes within it quilted hard'; Heywood: 'behold my warlicke Target / Of pondrous brasse, quilted with seaven Oxe hides' (Loeb Library: 'had made him his flashing shield of seven hides of sturdy bulls, and thereover had wrought an eighth layer of bronze'). The Chapman lines are from Geoffrey Bullough (ed.), *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, vol. 6 (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966), pp. 124-127. The Heywood excerpts are from *The Iron Age*, pt.1, sig. E3v-F1r. The Loeb library excerpts are from A. T. Murray, trans., *Homer: The Iliad*, 2 vols. (London: Heinemann, 1924), I, pp. 307-319.
[43] Tatlock p. 723. Perhaps the most distinctive of these references, that to Diomedes' wounding of Venus as portrayed in Book 5 of the *Iliad*, is indeed to be found in Cooper's entry on 'Diomedes' (sig. 7I1v.).

Seven Books) when Ajax and Ulysses approach Achilles to persuade him to rejoin the fight, he is playing on the lyre (called a 'harp' by Chapman). I am not aware of this detail from the *Iliad* being widely known in the Renaissance. But such a small point could easily have been part of some secondary source, and so in the absence of other evidence one hesitates to see it as proof that Heywood read this part of Chapman's translation. All one can say is that he definitely read Book 7.

When Heywood rewrote the scenes of the challenge and fight in *Troia Britanica* in 1608-09, he removed some of the Homeric authenticity. The most notable change is in the prize to be won by the victor. Instead of merely winning the other's armour, the winner now will win the war: Helen will be returned and reparations made if the Greek warrior wins, and the Greeks will leave if Hector wins. In addition there is a great deal of elaboration; Hector's challenge, which was 25 lines in *Troye*, becomes 88 lines in *Troia Britanica*, and eight stanzas are devoted to describing Ajax's amour.[44] There seems no doubt that the *Troia Britanica* version was written after the *Troye* one. Surely Heywood would not revert to the bare Homeric version after having developed it so extensively in *Troia Britanica*, especially since making the prize the winning of the war would be very much in line with his usual no-holds-barred dramatic technique. It seems likely that Heywood wrote the scenes in *Troye* in 1596, shortly after first reading the parallel passages in Chapman's translation, and elaborated on them when he wrote *Troia Britanica* a dozen years later.

3. Heywood and Shakespeare

Another important indication that *1 Iron Age* was substantially written, apart from its last act, in 1596 is that Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida,* probably written about four years later, contains features that I suggest were borrowed from Heywood's play. Scholars have long recognized that there is a connection between *1 Iron Age* and *Troilus and Cressida*. Both portray a version of Hector's challenge and fight with Ajax based on Book 7 of the *Iliad*. As already mentioned, this episode is not in Caxton and does not seem to have been part of the conventional version of the Trojan War accepted in the Renaissance. Moreover, both make the same non-Homeric addition to the scene by portraying the two men as cousins; both contain a speech in which Hector says he would like to kill the Greek side of Ajax and preserve the Trojan.[45] In addition, both plays contain Thersites as a

---

[44] *Troia Britanica*, canto 12, stanzas 66-76 and 85-92.

[45] The two speeches are very similar; note particularly the parallel of 'by Olympicke Jove' and 'by Jove multipotent':

running quasi-comic character. Finally, both plays transpose the method by which Troilus is killed in the *Recuyell* to Hector: he is ambushed and surrounded by Achilles' Myrmidons. These very specific peculiarities surely leave no doubt that one of these authors has seen or read the other's play.

Primarily because of Chambers' dating of the *Iron Age* plays, and also probably because of the reluctance of many Shakespearian scholars to see Heywood's play as the originator of any features of Shakespeare's work, the consensus has been that Heywood must have borrowed from Shakespeare. But not everyone has agreed with this. Notably, Tatlock clearly viewed Shakespeare as the borrower; however, his reluctance to accept this conclusion led to his suggestion, taken up by some later scholars, that both authors were imitating an entirely hypothetical third play.[46] Arlene Weiner, in her edition of the play, also suggests that *1 Iron Age* was the original and *Troilus* the copy.[47] What evidence is there for this minority view?

Tatlock suggests that Heywood's play must be the original because it is the more 'primitive'. By this I take him to mean that it has evolved less from its sources, most notably *The Iliad*. Heywood's version of the challenge and fight are, as I have suggested, almost startlingly close to Homer, as if he had freshly read the episode and immediately incorporated it in his play. Shakespeare's version is much further removed, really a kind of sophisticated variation on the Homeric story. In *Troilus* the challenge is delivered by Aeneas, not Hector, to the Greek leaders, not the whole army. What is proposed is a kind of Elizabethan jousting match, in which each participant will support his claim that his

I would there ran none of our Troian blood	Were thy commixtion Greek and Trojan so
In all thy veines, or that it were divided	That thou could say, "This hand is Grecian all,
From that which thou receivest from *Telamon* :	And this is Trojan; the sinews of this leg
Were I assured our blood possest one side,	All Greek and this all Troy; my mother's blood
And that the other ; by Olympicke *Jove,*	Runs on the dexter cheek, and this sinister
I'd thrill my Javelin at the *Grecian* moisture,	Bounds in my father's", by Jove multipotent,
And spare the Troian blood.	Thou shouldst not bear from me a Greekish member
(*Iron Age*, pt. 1, sig. F1r)	Wherein my sword had not impressure made
	Of our rank feud. (*Troilus and Cressida* 4.5.125-33)

[46] Tatlock, 753-59. William Witherle Lawrence, in *Shakespeare's Problem Comedies* (New York: Macmillan, 1931), suggests that 'Shakespeare imitated Heywood, or, more probably, both used a common source, now lost' (p. 156). Hyder Edward Rollins implies that it is impossible to make a definite choice between these two possibilities; see 'The Troilus-Cressida Story from Chaucer to Shakespeare', *PMLA* 32 (1917), 383-429 (p. 422).

[47] Weiner, p. xxiv-xxvii. Harold S. Wilson also believed that Shakespeare borrowed from Heywood. See *On the Design of Shakespearian Tragedy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957), pp. 119-20.

mistress is superior to that of his rival. The lottery to choose the Greek champion is fixed by Ulysses to ensure that Ajax wins, in an attempt to goad Achilles into action. The fight is conducted as a sporting duel like that in *Hamlet*, with representatives from each side (Aeneas and Diomedes) ensuring fairness, time called, and no sense that lives are at stake. It is easy enough to imagine Shakespeare's seeing Heywood's version and deciding to write a variation on it in his usual creative way. It is impossible to imagine Heywood getting his version from Shakespeare's play; most of it came directly from Homer, and there is not a hint that it was influenced by Shakespeare's wildly different treatment of the material. It thus seems likely that Shakespeare is borrowing from Heywood here, although he makes a point of giving the material a very different spin.

Both authors deviate from Homer in making Achilles a participant in the lottery. In the *Iliad*, Achilles does not participate because he is keeping his tent after his quarrel with Agamemnon. In *Troye*, Achilles has not yet fallen in love with Priam's daughter Polyxena and so is still fighting for the Greeks; his participation is appropriate. In Shakespeare, he is already in love with Polyxena (though we do not discover this until later [3.3.194-95]) and is refusing to fight in order to win favour with her parents; his participation in the lottery thus seems an example of Shakespeare's occasionally incoherent plotting. It could be argued Shakespeare is making a telling psychological point, showing that Achilles cannot resist a chance to demonstrate his prowess even though he has supposedly withdrawn from the fighting; however, I suggest that a more likely explanation of Achilles' illogical behaviour is that Shakespeare has borrowed this feature from *Troye* without noticing that it does not quite fit the situation in his play.

Heywood's version of Thersites may be said to be closer to the original in that it is closer to the conventional Renaissance conception of Thersites as one of the princes of Greece who was notably ugly and famous for his railing. In Shakespeare he has become a clown (albeit a very bitter one), a 'privileged' fool (2.3.55) rather like Feste (and probably also originally played by Robert Armin);[48] it seems that he at first serves Ajax and then Achilles, and as well as amusing his masters he is given servile tasks, such as being sent to find out information (2.1.88) or to deliver a letter (3.3.306). This portrayal is certainly further from either the Renaissance or the Homeric version than Heywood's is, and rather like Shakespeare's portrayal of the challenge and duel seems a deliberate variation on Thersites as conventionally understood. Again this would seem to make it more likely that Heywood's Thersites is the original, and that Shakespeare adapted Heywood's version for his own purposes. In both plays, Thersites appears on the battlefield, is confronted by a Trojan warrior, and has his life spared, apparently because he is too

---

[48] See Bart van Es, *Shakespeare in Company* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 178

contemptible to be killed. Heywood's Thersites has some reason to be in the battle as one of the Greek leaders, while Shakespeare's professional fool seems particularly out of place there. Again, the fact that Shakespeare's version is less logical may suggest that Heywood's came first, since a motif that is borrowed is less likely to be a perfect fit than the same motif in its original context.

Another important indication of Heywood's priority lies in the manner of Hector's death. In Caxton, Hector is stabbed 'pryvely' by Achilles, with no opportunity to put up a fight. Moreover, he is killed when he has let down his guard because he is pursuing a Greek warrior in order to gain his valuable armour.[49] Medieval authors like John Lydgate and Christine de Pisan make much of this rather ignoble behaviour on Hector's part, using it as an opportunity for moralizing on the evil consequences of greed.[50] It is clear that Heywood could not accept this manner of Hector's death. He passionately admired the Trojan hero. This is most clearly seen in *Troia Britanica*, where Heywood's palpable grief as he approaches having to tell the story of Hector's end is obvious. He admits that he 'dotes' on Hector and says that the thought of Achilles dragging Hector's corpse behind his horse around Troy 'makes my soft eye with Springs of Sorrow flow.'[51] Clearly Heywood would insist that Hector's defeat must be shown to be as difficult and unfair as possible, and that he must die a blameless heroic death.

The death Caxton gives to Troilus has just the qualities that Heywood would require. Caxton shows Achilles arranging with his special guard of Myrmidons, some two thousands of them, to surround Troilus, who goes on bravely fighting, killing many of them, as they first slay his horse, then force off his helmet, then his armour, and then Achilles moves in and cuts off his head.[52] Heywood adapted this for Hector's death in *Troye*, giving Hector a chance to reproach Achilles for his dishonourable behaviour and shout defiance as he heroically kills many Myrmidons before finally being killed by them, with Achilles stabbing him after he has fallen. And of course Heywood does not show Hector distracted by greedily seeking armour. He repeats this portrayal of Hector's death in *Troia Britanica*, with even greater emphasis on Hector's heroism.

Shakespeare presents a much less idealized picture of Hector. He does portray him as pursuing the armour when he is killed, and although he uses the Myrmidon ambush he

---

[49] Caxton, II, p. 613.

[50] See John Lydgate, *Troy Book*, ed. by Henry Bergen, Early English Text Society (London: Kegan Paul, 1906), bk. 3, ll. 5354-72, and [Christine de Pisan], *C. Hystoryes of Troye*, trans. R. W. (London: Robert Wyer, c.1540), sig. T3v-T4v.

[51] *Troia Britanica*, canto 12, stanza 1 and canto 13, stanza 111.

[52] Caxton, II, pp. 638-39.

shows Hector being cut down without a struggle and with no display of heroism. In other words, his portrayal of Hector's death does not differ significantly in its effect from that of Hector's sudden death as portrayed in the *Recuyell*. Heywood, on the other hand, uses the Myrmidon ambush to make a dramatically different effect in his portrayal of Hector's death. It seems likely, therefore, that it was Heywood who initiated the transposition of Troilus' death to Hector, since he exploits this change from Caxton while Shakespeare does not. We can conclude then that Shakespeare was borrowing from Heywood here; Heywood gave his beloved Hector the heroic death that Caxton allots to Troilus, and Shakespeare adopted it from him merely as an effective piece of stage business.

A few further points might be mentioned. The scene in *Troilus* in which Priam and his sons discuss whether to accept Nestor's offer for the Greeks to leave if Helen is returned (2.2) is clearly based on the scene in the *Recuyell* in which the Trojans discuss whether to send Paris to seduce Helen;[53] a comparable scene occurs in *Troye*, but the interchange between Troilus and Helenus, which is similar in Shakespeare and Caxton, does not occur in Heywood's play.[54] Clearly in this part of the scene Shakespeare was consulting Caxton directly. However, the intervention of Cassandra 'with her hair about her ears' that occurs in all three texts contains something that is found in both Shakespeare and Heywood but not in Caxton: when Shakespeare's Cassandra says that 'Our firebrand brother Paris burns us all' (2.2.110), she obscurely alludes to the story of Hecuba's dream of a firebrand, one that Cassandra fully explains in Heywood's play.[55] Caxton nowhere mentions this story. The occurrence of this idea in the same context in both *Troilus* and *Troye* could be a coincidence, but given the other signs of influence is more likely to be a borrowing, and here the priority of Heywood is suggested by the clarity and extended nature of the reference in *Troye* compared to the cryptic allusion in *Troilus*. It is easy when one is borrowing to lose track of the sense of the material one is taking; Shakespeare clearly wanted to keep Cassandra's intervention short, and he seems to have pared the burning brand reference down to the point that it would be incomprehensible to most audience members. Although it is obviously not impossible that the influence was the other way around, the fact that Shakespeare's version is obscure and Heywood's is clear seems again point to Shakespeare as the more likely borrower.

Perhaps the most striking sign that Heywood did not know *Troilus and Cressida* when he wrote *Troye* is the absence of any borrowing in the latter from the love plot in Shakespeare's play. Heywood's version of the Troilus and Cressida story is essentially as

---

[53] Caxton, II, pp. 515-27.

[54] *The Iron Age*, pt. 1, sig. B1r-B3r.

[55] *The Iron Age*, pt. 1, sig. B3v.

it is in Caxton, where it is given a somewhat minimal treatment; his most notable change is to have Cressida persuaded by her father Calchas to join the Greeks, rather than have her exchanged for Antenor as in Caxton and Shakespeare. This minimal treatment is also found in *Troia Britanica*. Here he makes the addition of having Diomedes fall in love with Cressida at the very first mission he makes with Ulysses to Priam's court (whereas Shakespeare does not show Diomedes meeting Cressida until he comes to take her from Troy in the exchange).[56] Heywood seems not to have come to know Shakespeare's play until after it was published in quarto in 1609. As already noted, he then did borrow from it in the material he added to *2 Iron Age* in his portrayal of the scene in which Synon seduces Cressida.[57] Those who believe Heywood was influenced by *Troilus and Cressida* in writing *1 Iron Age* must argue that he borrowed many features from the Trojan War component of that play but nothing at all from the love story, which is so much more effectively told by Shakespeare than by Caxton. Harold N. Hillebrand suggests that Heywood took 'pains . . . to avoid duplication' of Shakespeare's play.[58] Not only is this restrained behaviour unlikely in the context of the theatre of Heywood's time, where shameless borrowing from other playwrights was common, but Hillebrand does not explain why the same scrupulous avoidance of duplication did not apply to the rest of the play. It is extremely likely that if he knew Shakespeare's version of the love story Heywood would have taken at least some features from it in his portrayal of the Troilus and Cressida relationship in his own play and in *Troia Britanica*. The absence of even a hint of such borrowing is near proof that *Troye* influenced Shakespeare rather than the other way around.

4. Shakespeare and Homer

It is very clear that Shakespeare did not rely on Heywood for the material taken from Caxton. There are a number of places in which he uses details from Caxton that are not in Heywood's play. These include: the fact that Hector was trying to get armour when

---

[56] *Troia Britanica,* canto 11, stanzas 40-41.

[57] Other possible borrowings from *Troilus* in the material added to *Troye* include the scene in which all the Greek leaders pass by Ajax while ignoring him (pt. 1, sig. L2r), which resembles the scene in *Troilus* in which the Greek leaders pass by Achilles (3.3), and the scene in which Ajax makes a series of requests to Thersites – 'What's Agamemnon?', 'What's Menelaus?' and so on (pt. 1, sig. L1v-L2r) – which resembles the scene in which Achilles and Patroclus makes similar requests to Thersites in *Troilus* (2.3.40 ff.). That the latter is a borrowing by Heywood is suggested by the fact that questioning a fool in the expectation of a witty answer is a familiar motif in early modern English drama, whereas it seems a Greek leader such as Heywood's Thersites would be less likely to be involved in such an activity.

[58] Hillebrand, p. 462.

attacked by Achilles; the names of the gates of Troy; the number of kings that came to Troy from Greece (sixty-nine); the fact that Cressida was exchanged for Antenor; and the interchange between Troilus and Helenus. These in some cases very specific details suggest that Shakespeare had Caxton (apparently also the 1553 edition) in front of him when he wrote the play.[59]

It is less clear that Shakespeare had first-hand knowledge of the *Iliad*. Although this notion is widely believed, there is a minority of critics who have questioned whether he read either Chapman's *Seven Books* or the complete epic in Latin or French.[60] The most notable among these is E. M. W. Tillyard. Tillyard suggests that Shakespeare did not require Chapman's translation to find out 'the small residue' of the material in the Trojan War part of the play that he did not take from Caxton; most of it he thinks was common knowledge. Like other sceptical critics he points to the fact that, although there are various details that ultimately derive from Homer, Shakespeare's play retains the essentially medieval view of the Trojan War of Caxton and his predecessors. Chapman's Homer was a revelation to many who knew only the *Recuyell* version, and one might have expected that Shakespeare's reading of a substantial part of this momentous work would have shown up much more clearly and extensively in *Troilus and Cressida*. The most significant borrowings from Homer that most scholars point to are Hector's challenge and the fight with Ajax; although much changed from Book 7 of the *Iliad*, these nevertheless show detailed knowledge of material that is not in the *Recuyell* and not part of the standard Renaissance understanding of the Trojan War. Even Tillyard is forced to admit that Shakespeare '*may* have got some of the non-medieval details of the duel from Chapman's *Iliad*.'[61] The recognition that he got these details from Heywood thus solves a problem for Tillyard and others who question the standard view. At the very least, full awareness of Heywood's influence demands a rethinking of assumptions about Shakespeare's debt to Homer in the play.

A detailed discussion of this issue is beyond the scope of this essay. I hope, however, that I have made a convincing argument that, whatever Shakespeare's other sources were, the

---

[59] For these and other borrowings from Caxton see Bevington, pp. 387-88. The fact that in writing *Troilus* Shakespeare used an almost fifty-year old edition of the *Recuyell* when a new one was easily available might give one pause. Consider also that Shakespeare's use of *Troye* seems more extensive than he could have picked up from watching a performance of the play, one of only four presented four or five years prior to his writing of *Troilus*. It seems more likely that he worked from a written copy. Perhaps Heywood lent him the manuscript of his failed play. And perhaps at the same time he lent his 1553 copy of the *Recuyell*.

[60] In addition to E.M.W. Tillyard, Presson (p. 8n) identifies Sidney Lee, E. E. Stoll and Thomas M. Parrott as critics who are sceptical of the direct Homeric influence on *Troilus*.

[61] E.M.W. Tillyard, *Shakespeare's Problem Plays* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1949), pp. 36-38.

influence of Heywood's *Troye* on *Troilus and Cressida* cannot be ignored. Heywood has not had a good press from students of that play. Hillebrand says of *1 Iron Age* and *Troilus*: 'In intellect, artistry, and purpose the two plays are about as much alike as a naïve child and a mature man.'[62] Presson quotes what seem to me to be perfectly acceptable lines from Hector's scene with Andromache in *Troye*, and implies that they are so bad that he questions whether the *Iron Age* plays can really have been as popular as Heywood says they were.[63] As I have already hinted, these negative assessments have played a role in the scholarly consensus that Shakespeare could not possibly be borrowing from Heywood in his play. I hope I have made a convincing case that the *Iron Age* plays are not just 'based on earlier work' but are essentially an expanded version of the *Troye* of 1596, and that the features they have in common with *Troilus and Cressida* are features that Shakespeare took from *Troye* when he wrote his own version of the Trojan story several years later. Shakespeare's play is essentially conservative, retaining the standard Caxtonian view of the Trojan War; by turning Hector's challenge into a chivalric affair he even gives a medieval twist to the most authentically Homeric section of *Troye*. Heywood's 1596 play may be the first piece of English literature to be influenced by the real Homer as translated by Chapman; whatever its faults, the play breaks new ground. While Shakespeare was a transcendent genius and Heywood merely a highly professional working playwright, Heywood does not deserve the contempt he has received from some of Shakespeare's devotees. This unduly low opinion of Heywood has distorted how many scholars have seen the relationship between *1 Iron Age* and *Troilus and Cressida* and given rise to a highly questionable narrative about the sources of Shakespeare's play.

5. Summary

This essay has attempted to use a number of approaches to demonstrate that the play *Troye* mentioned in Henslowe's *Diary* in 1596 was by Thomas Heywood and was later adapted by him into the *Iron Age* plays. It is a sequel to an earlier article in which I argue that *1* and *2 Hercules*, first presented by the Admiral's company in 1595, were also by Heywood and were adapted by him into the *Silver* and *Brazen Ages*. In the medieval version of Greek mythology the Trojan War follows closely on the death of Hercules, and it seems likely that Heywood would go on to write, and the Admiral's Men to produce, a play on that subject following on the success of the Hercules plays. Heywood's long poem of 1609, *Troia Britanica,* covers the same material as do the *Age*s plays; however, there are a number of scenes and passages in *1* and *2 Iron Age* that have no equivalent in

---

[62] Hillebrand, p. 463.

[63] Presson, p. 59.

this work. These include the events in the last act of *1 Iron Age* and a substantial part of *2 Iron Age*; they also contain features such as references to *Hamlet* and elements of the Jacobean revenge tragedy that are consistent with a post-1611 date. If these scenes and passages are omitted, the story remains coherent and is reduced to a single lengthy play, one that includes the 'great horse' listed in the 1598 list of properties owned by the Admiral's company; it seems plausible that these parts of the *Iron Age* approximate the original *Troye*. This reconstructed play includes in its first act extensive material from Ovid that seems likely to date from the mid-1590s, and shows no sign of influence from later sources. Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* and what I have posited as *Troye* have a number of peculiarities in common that prove that one influenced the other. Several factors strongly suggest that Heywood influenced Shakespeare, and that consequently *Troye* was written before 1601, the approximate date of the composition of *Troilus*. Heywood's closeness to Book 7 of the *Iliad* clearly indicates that he took Hector's challenge and duel with Ajax directly from that source; Shakespeare could have adapted Heywood's version of this scene, but Heywood could not have got his version from Shakespeare, whose treatment of the material varies widely from Homer. A number of other features of *Troye* are either closer to their source than Shakespeare's version of them or make more sense in Heywood's version than in Shakespeare's, suggesting that Heywood was the original. Shakespeare and Heywood both make a significant change from Caxton's *Recuyell* in having Hector killed by Achilles' Myrmidons rather than being stabbed in the back; the reason for this change seems likely to be to give Hector a more heroic death, and Heywood, who idolised Hector, had a stronger motive to do so than Shakespeare, who presents a less idealized Hector and makes nothing of the heroic possibilities of the scene. The fact that there is no sign of the influence of the *Troilus* love plot on *Troye* strongly suggests that Heywood was unfamiliar with Shakespeare's play when he wrote it. Finally, a number of critics, notably E. M. W. Tillyard, have suspected that Shakespeare did not use Homer as a direct source for *Troilus*. The fact that he could have got the scenes from book 7 of the *Iliad* and other Homeric touches from Heywood adds to this theory. It also supports the argument of this essay that the elements of *1* and *2 Iron Age* that constitute what I have called *Troye* were originally written before Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* and in their present form approximate the play presented by the Admiral's Men in 1596.