S K E N È

Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies

7:2 2021

"Well-Staged Syllables": From Classical to Early Modern English Metres in Drama

Edited by Silvia Bigliazzi

SKENÈ Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies

Founded by Guido Avezzù, Silvia Bigliazzi, and Alessandro Serpieri

Published in December 2021
ISSN 2421-4353

SKENÈ Theatre and Drama Studies
https://skenejournal.skeneproject.it
info@skeneproject.it

Dir. Resp. (aut. Trib. di Verona): Guido Avezzù
P.O. Box 149 c/o Mail Boxes Etc. (MBE150) – Viale Col. Galliano, 51, 37138, Verona (I)

Contents

"Well-Staged Syllables": From Classical to Early Modern English Metres in Drama

Edited by Silvia Bigliazzi

Miscellany

Special Section

Silvia Bigliazzi*

Versifying the Senecan Chorus: Notes on Jasper Heywood's Emulative Approach to *Troas*[1]

Abstract

Jasper Heywood's 1559 translation of Seneca's *Troades* is the first Senecan tragedy to be printed in England and is well-known for its free and inventive approach. Alterations include the addition of a whole speech and above all the radical transformation of the choral odes. It has been suggested that the addition of a new Chorus and the gradual effacement of the female collective at the level of drama respond to a poetic project establishing Heywood as a tragic poet in the *speculum* tradition. This article delves deeper into this question. Considering versification as a formal apparatus characterising the dramatic and perspectival functions of this new Chorus, it explores Heywood's response to the original metres of Seneca. It then discusses their apparent inconsistency in view of a poetic design grounded in Heywood's peculiar interpretation of this tragedy. A brief discussion of the textual transmission of Seneca's play elucidates how Heywood may have come to reconfigure the tragic female Chorus as an anonymous framing voice sharing in authorial knowledge.

Keywords: *Troas*; Seneca; Jasper Heywood; rhyme royal

In his 1691 *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets*, Gerard Langbaine notices that, in his translation of Seneca's *Hercules Furens* (1561), Heywood "endeavours to keep to Seneca's Sence; and likewise to imitate his Verse, changing his Measure as often as the Author", as "the Reader may observe by comparing the *English* Copy with the *Latin* Original" (1691, 251). Differently from his translations of *Troas* (1559) and *Thyestes* (1560), *Hercules Furens* is presented in the two languages and in both "the *Chorus* of each Act [is] different from the Act it self [sic]" (ibid.). Interestingly, Langbaine calls this translation an imitation and a copy in accord with the textual accuracy and faithfulness to the original advertised in the title-page: ". . . newly perusde and of all faultes whereof it did before abound diligently corrected, and

[1] This article is part of a broader research I carried out within the 2017 PRIN *Classical Receptions in Early Modern English Drama* research project (Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, University of Verona).

* University of Verona - silvia.bigliazzi@univr.it

so for the profit of young schollers so faithfully translated into English metre, that ye may se verse for verse tourned as farre as the phrase of the english permitteth". As a matter of fact, this parallel octavo edition placing the "original" and "the copy" face to face displays a clearly pedagogical intent (Ker and Winston 2012, 40). But the case of *Troas* is different and it is Heywood himself who suggests how in the paratextual material appended to his translation.

In his address "To the Readers" in *Troas* Heywood apologises to the "good reader" if "in any place" he has "swerved from the true sense, or not kept the royal speech meet for a tragedy" (28-9).[2] He claims to have "endeavoured to keep touch with the Latin, not word for word or verse for verse as to expounde it, but neglecting the placing of the words observed their sense" (51-3). He never mentions metres and verse, as he does in the "Preface" to *Hercules Furens*, where he repeats that he has followed the line-for-line method announced in the title-page. In the "Preface" to *Thyestes* he also alludes to his use of verse within the fictional frame of a dream vision, in the tradition of the *oraculum* (Pincombe 2012, 533), where he claims that Seneca himself invited him to rewrite his tragedies in the "metre of thy mother tongue" (54) in view of allowing men to see them "in English verse that never could Latin understand" (55-6) – a common idea at the time to justify the vernacularisation of Latin works. In these lines Heywood refers twice to English verse, suggesting a special attention to native measures. Indeed, what the reader finds in the play is a regular alternation of couplets of fourteeners for dialogues (a line "sounding harsh to the Ears of those that are used to Heroick Poetry", Langbaine would remark; 1691, 251) and pentameters with alternate rhymes, two verses Heywood was also to employ in *Hercules Furens* shortly afterwards. Thus, when Langbaine uses the word 'imitate' with regard to Seneca's verse in this last translation what he possibly means is the basic alternation of two measures for non-choric and choric parts, underlining a neat partition into separate dramatic portions requiring different metres. Clearly, the change from the fourteen-syllable line to the ten-syllable one is enough for Langbaine to mark a recognisable pattern in the English tradition, roughly corresponding to Seneca's basic variation between standard dialogue and lyric metres. The use of rhyme, which constitutes a massive innovation over the original – one harshly criticised by Ascham, among others (Attridge 1974, 93ff.) – is instead entirely ignored. Interestingly, the more varied metrical experiments Heywood displays in *Troas* go unmentioned – Langbaine only notices that "this Tragedy runs in Verses of fourteen Syllables, and for the most part his *Chorus* is writ in Verse

[2] All references to *Troas* and *Thyestes* are from Ker and Winston 2012. Numbers indicate lines.

of ten Syllables, which we call Heroick Verse" (1691, 253). What catches his attention in *Troas*, on the contrary, is Heywood's generally freer approach to the translation, including his treatment of the choral odes, which he re-elaborates through additions, substitutions and revisions:

> First, as to his Additions; he has at the end of the *Chorus* after the first Act, added threescore Verses of his own Invention. In the beginning of the second Act, he has added a whole Scene, where he Introduces the Spectre of *Achilles* rising from Hell, to require the Sacrifice of *Polyxena*. To the Chorus of this Act, he has added three *Stanzas*. Secondly, as to his Alterations; Instead of translating the *Chorus* of the third Act, (which is wholly taken up with the Names of Forreign Countries, the Translation of which without Notes, he thought would be tiresome to the *English* Reader;) he has substituted in its stead, another *Chorus* of his own Invention. (1691, 253-4)

Heywood's apparent disregard for the authority of the Latin writer in *Troas* has been interpreted as evidence of his "hesitant but nonetheless ambitious attempt to garner recognition as a tragic poet" (Ker and Winston 2012, 22). Suggestively, Ker and Winston have read into his "Preface to the Tragedy" his desire to align himself with Chaucer:

> He invokes a similar muse to Chaucer, who [in *Troilus and Criseyde*] appeals to 'Thesiphone', one of the three avenging furies, to help him to write 'woful vers,' which makes him 'wepen' as he writes. Using similar language of weeping and woefulness, Heywood asks a 'fury fell' [50] to 'guide' his 'hand and pen' [52-3] to write 'in weeping verse of sobs and sighs' [56]. Chaucer may be wryly hyperbolic, but Heywood is serious. Seneca is the original author, but Heywood presents himself as a solemn, tragic poet in his own right. (2012, 20)

Along similar lines, Pincombe has pointed out Heywood's allusion to Chaucer also in his "Preface" to *Thyestes*, where in his invocation of Megaera to imbue him with poetic fury he follows the medieval poet even to the point of repeating "the rhyme 'endite'/'write' as if to make the allusion obvious" (2012, 537).[3] A sense of emulation beyond ordinary imitation is strong, as Pincombe argues, and the addition of a final scene with Thyestes' soliloquy that "acts as an extraordinary reversal of the final scene of Seneca's original"

[3] "Inspire my pen with pensiveness this tragedy t'indite, / And as so dreadful thing beseems with doleful style to write" (335-6). As Pincombe comments, "it was not unusual for tragic poets in the Middle Ages to call upon one of the Furies to inspire them; and Heywood is here only following Geoffrey Chaucer in the opening invocation to *Troilus and Criseyde*: Thesiphone, thow help me for t'endite / This woful vers, that wepen as I write. / To the clepe I, thow goddess torment, / Thow cruwel Furie, sorwynge evere in peyne" (2012, 536). The words "write"/"endite" also occur at the end of lines in Heywood's "Preface" to *Troas* at 29, 53, 86, 89.

(539), seems to confirm it. Pincombe's remark is especially relevant here because in this particular translation Heywood's creative interventions coexist with a concern for Seneca's authority in ways that cannot be found in his address "To the Readers" in *Troas*, a play where his approach is much freer. In this address, Heywood complains about Seneca's text "being in many places very hard and doubtful" and "much corrupt by the default of evil printed books" (22-3). Lack of an authoritative edition of Seneca is the implied justification for manipulating the text to a much greater extent than he will do with *Thyestes*, where he claims to have 'received' a reliable manuscript from Seneca himself. But his critique of printers is not confined to his address in *Troas*. Bourne has rightly recalled that in the "Preface" to *Thyestes* Heywood protests "that Tottel had printed 'scant a sentence trewe,' even after Heywood had himself 'perusde their prooues'", and points out that when Tottel produced a new edition of the play later the same year, he corrected a few errors but did not touch typographic features. Thus, not surprisingly his translation of *Thyestes* was published by a different printer, possibly Richard Payne, who added "a large fleuron before each Chorus heading" with the effect of "a clean, visual distinction between dialogue and chorus" (2020, 60). And yet, from a typographical standpoint, except for this ornamental detail, those parts are equally cast in blackletter. But Heywood's preoccupation with printers does not end here. In the same "Preface" to Thyestes, Seneca too launches into a lament on the corrupt editions of his own tragedies. His offer to Heywood of a "gilded book" (189) containing the correct Latin manuscript is the answer able to contrast their unreliable transmission: "Now Gryphius, Colineus now, and now and then among, / He Aldus blamed with all the rest that in his works do miss / Of sense or verse; and still my book I did correct by his" (308-10).[4] Heywood is clearly aware of textual problems, in spite of the hazy references to the books he seems to have consulted, and his acrimony against printers is further proof of his considering *Troas* a play of his own. This becomes particularly obvious in his treatment of the Chorus.

In their commendable edition of this translation (2012), Ker and Winston have argued that while Heywood translated the initial *kommos* between Hecuba and the women into "a lyric metre" (the iambic pentameter with crossed rhymes) he did not perceive it as a "genuine choral ode" and therefore created a second "more anonymous" and detached 'Chorus' (31). More recently, they have further argued that Heywood's ignorance of "whether

[4] According to de Vocht, reference is here to "Simon de Colines (Colineus) printer in Paris, [who] edited in 1534 Seneca's works after Erasmus' emendations" (1913, 339, note on line 705). See also Daalder (1982, 86) and Ker and Winston (2012, 280). However, the publication de Vocht mentions, *Flores*, is an anthology of Senecan prose.

[the text was] left so of the author or part of it lost as time devoureth all things ('Preface' 72)" may have prompted him "to supply the wanting chorus, warning kings and princes of the unpredictability of fortune and shortness of life" (Winston and Ker 2013, 567). An awareness of the defective textual transmission together with a possible misunderstanding of the initial dirge as a full choral ode may lie behind the addition of a more impersonal choral ode (henceforth 1 Cho.). The detached voice of this new Chorus replaces the original passionate perspective of the Trojan women, who in 3 Cho. "speculate on the places to which they will be taken" (31), with more general considerations on the mutability of fortune. From this perspective, Heywood's main attempt would have been to "approximate Seneca's drama" (26) in order to obtain the same effect (Daalder 1982, lxiii) in various ways: for instance, by gesturing at a Senecan style in passages he freely re-elaborates by incorporating "sentences (and sententiae) . . . in order to produce scenes that fit the manner and matter of a Senecan tragedy" (Winston and Ker 2013, 566); but also by making it manifest in his approach to metre. It has been argued that his choice of specific verse forms and rhyming schemes typical of the English tradition, while having "no direct correlate in Latin poetry or in Seneca's given phrasing" (Ker and Winston 2012, 27), achieve "comparable, but not identical, English forms" (ibid.). Heywood did not experiment with quantitative verse,[5] and the comparability Ker and Winston identify seems to echo Langbaine's comment on verse imitation with regard to shifting dramatic parts. However, looking more closely into how Heywood versified his odes induces different considerations about metrical comparability and equivalent effects.

In the following pages I will explore this question starting from the premise that, as Tarlinskaja pinpoints, the "form of verse is not just a symbol of poetry", but it "adds to what is expressed in the texts" (2014, 1) and therefore cannot be extrapolated from the dramatic parts it belongs to. I will argue that in *Troas* Heywood shows a distinctive creative impetus when he deals with the choral odes and that this amounts, in Pincombe's terms, to an emulative, rather than an imitative fury, that goes hand in hand with the new dramatic function and versification he assigns to the Chorus. I will try to show that this explains the apparent lack of metrical consistency in the choice of metres for each choral ode, thus unveiling recurrent patterns whose

[5] As Attridge recalls, "Watson's lines written in the 1540s and quoted by Ascham in the *Scholemaster* and Ascham's own quantitative translations in *Toxophilus* (1545) were the earliest of the English attempts, but they had no immediate successors. James Sandford published some quantitative verse in various languages, including English, in his *Houres of recreation* (1576), but the movement did not really get under way until Sidney started writing quantitative poems for the *Arcadia*, probably between 1577 and 1580, and discussing the subject with Drant, Dyer and Spenser" (1974, 129-30).

sequence is not equivalent to that of the Latin original. I will also contend that through metric choices Heywood disseminates implicit authorial traces establishing his work within the English poetic tradition of epic and tragic poetry. To this end, I will first present a brief discussion of why the Chorus of Trojan women, who constitute "the most individualized chorus of any Senecan play" (Boyle 1994, 33), may have been interpreted by Heywood as alterable and, consequently, why he decided to add an entirely new Chorus with wholly new functions. Finally, I will discuss the peculiar versification of this strange Chorus in the light of its main dramatic functions and signifying potential. My contention is that Heywood resignified the play entirely, turning a tragedy of collective female suffering into a *de casibus* one. He did this, moreover, not only by manifestly referring to the fall of the princes and the *speculum* tradition in some of the choral odes especially, as justly contended by Winston (2016), but also by dissolving the dramatic function of the female Chorus as the bearers of the tragic fate of the community of the Trojan female survivors. Form, content, and verse converge in Heywood's translation towards one and the same emulative effort, effacing Seneca's peculiar Aristotelian-like Chorus of Trojan women to foreground a wholly new non-Senecan framing figure, that articulates a different conception of the tragic.

2. "The autor the Chorus must defende": Towards a New Chorus

At ll. 193-5 of his *Ars Poetica*, Horace writes that "actoris partis chorus officiumque virile / defendat, neu quid medios intercinat actus, / quod non proposito conducat et haereat apte" ("The Chorus [should] sustain the part and strenuous duty of an actor, and sing nothing between acts which does not advance and fitly blend into the plot", Horace 1999, trans. Fairclough). Modern editors generally interpret the word "defendat" as 'take the part of', 'perform',[6] and explain it in the light of Aristotle's teaching that the Chorus was an actor among actors (*Poetica* 1456a25-27). However, this is not how it

[6] See *defendo* 2.A.α in Lewis and Short (1956); 'sustain', *defendo* 3 in Gaffiot (2001 s): "'play the part', in line with Aristotle's *Poetics* 1456a25-7 [καὶ τὸν χορὸν δὲ ἕνα δεῖ ὑπολαμβάνειν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, 'the chorus should be treated as one of the actors', Halliwell in Aristotle 1995], as assumed by the context". See also Horace *Sat.* 1.10, 12: "defendente vicem modo rhetoris atque poetae" ("in keeping with the rôle, now of orator or poet", 1999), rather than synonym of *commendare* ('commend', 'endorse') as proposed by *TLL* 5.1.298.5. Niall Rudd (Horace 1989) comments that "the chorus should staunchly perform the role of an actor and the duty of a man". However, "officium virile" clearly refers to the duty, or role, of a single man (*vir* = single, from which the derivative *viritim* = singularly, individually). Therefore, Horace means 'to play the part of an actor, performing the function of a single character', as in Aristotle.

could be read in the first English translation published by Thomas Drant in 1567:

> The autor the Chorus must defende
> or else some other one
> Whose innocensie, or manhode
> deserveth prayse alone.
> Let them not singe twix acte, and acte
> that squayreth from the rest.
> Such let their songs be, as will tune
> unto the purpose best. (1567, 6*v*)

Drant did not follow Aristotle's *Poetics*, a text which had been circulating widely in Europe since Francesco Robortello's and Pier Vettori's editions (1548 and 1560, respectively), and instead turned the Chorus into the authorial mouthpiece and commentator it would soon become on the British stage. He misread the verb "defendat" as 'take sides with', 'defend', and probably found the variant 'autoris/auctoris' for the original "actoris", suggesting that the Chorus was to be the defender of the author or of a character whose moral integrity was to be praised. As a matter of fact, the phrase "actoris partis" (part of the actor) was the reading of most of the authoritative manuscripts of Horace's *Ars Poetica*, and had normally been adopted in the early editions since the end of the fifteenth century. This was for instance the case of the Venetian 1490-1491 edition with Pseudo-Acron's commentary on Horace. But in the sixteenth century, the variant 'autoris' was also occasionally chosen, as in the case of the Basle edition of 1520 (with no commentary) printed by Andreas Cratander. The two variants were acknowledged by prestigious commentaries, such as Maggi's, contained as an appendix in the Maggi and Lombardi 1550 edition of Aristotle's *Poetics* ("nam Auctoris aliqui, Actoris alii habent", "some have 'Auctoris', others Actoris'", 350). Typically, Maggi claimed his preference for 'Auctoris', which he adopted. Thus, he did not consider the Chorus to be an actor, but either a counselor of the actors or a spokesman for the author. A similar position was that of Robortello (1548), Minturno (1559), Julius Caesar Scaliger (1561), and even Denis Lambin in his 1566 commentary to Aldus' edition of Horace (1555), which correctly adopted "actoris", acknowledged both readings. To find a correct interpretation of that passage in English one had to wait until 1640, when in his translation Ben Jonson eventually restored the original actor's part to the Chorus: "An Actors part, and office too, the quire / Must manly keep, and not be heard to sing / Between the Acts a quite cleane other thing / Than to the purpose leads and fitly agrees" (Horace 1640, 12).[7]

[7] For a history of the reception of Horace's *Ars Poetica* see Hardison 1995.

Thus, when in Heywood's address "To the Readers" in *Troas* we find the claim that "the Chorus is no part of the substance of the matter" as a justification for his massive alteration of the choral odes we are not entirely surprised. What is unexpected, though, is that the comment is about this particular play, where the Chorus of women can hardly be considered marginal, an "interpretive packaging" surrounding the action, as Ker and Winston call it rephrasing Heywood (2012, 31). They participate in the *kommos* and are certainly present on stage in Acts 2, 3 and 4. Also, as Davis has convincingly argued, in Act 5 "the messenger's words make more dramatic sense if addressed to a relatively large group of women and not simply Hecuba and Andromache" (1993, 21), suggesting that the women of Troy should also be present on stage.[8] As Boyle has remarked, in Senecan tragedies Choruses may identify themselves, or be identified by other characters. But *Troas* is unique in showing in the initial choral ode a preoccupation for the past that "individualizes this chorus to an uncommon degree" (1994, 144). This unusual feature is part of the construction of a tragic experience revolving around the sense of a female communality that significantly climaxes in the final ode with the prospective dissolution of that female bond (220). In fact, the women participate emotionally in the action from the very beginning with their initial responsive lament for the experience of loss of the male patriarch, as the bearers of "'pathetic agency' . . . impotent on stage, but strong in catalysing the emotion of the audience" (Bigliazzi 2020, 72). Modifying this peculiar Chorus, whose strongly performative features, including dance and singing, were taken as a brilliant example of the so-called mobile Chorus on the continent (Giraldi 1554, 229), was neither a neutral choice nor an easily explicable one.

Troas contains four choral odes and the first two have been often commented on for their apparent inconsistency in supporting and denying the soul's survival after death, respectively.[9] The third one has an exotic quality in referring to the many possible destinations of the women once their community is broken, and the final one is about their grief following the group's abandonment of Troy and final dispersion. The play is also peculiar for its dual focus on two separate deaths, Polyxena's and Astyanax's, which are discussed and prepared for in different Acts (2 and 4; 2 and 3), before being narrated separately in Act 5. As already noticed, Heywood treated the text with a heavy hand. Doubtless, bringing Achilles' ghost on stage before

[8] See also Davis (1993, 20-1) and Fantham (1982, 39), who assumes that in Act 5 they exit with Andromache and Helen only at 1178-9: "repetite celeri maria, captiuae, gradu. / iam uela puppis laxat et classis mouet" ("Once more head quickly to the sea, prisoners. / Now sails unfurl on the ships and the fleet moves").

[9] See Fantham (1982, 78-92) and Boyle (1994, 172).

Thaltybius' narrative of his appearance in Act 2 meant making the scene more dramatic, while preparing for the herald's report. But it also patently belied the second choral ode on the denial of the soul's survival after death in a stronger way than Thaltybius' narrative of Achilles' appearance could ever do. Yet in gesturing towards the Senecan model of 'the return of the ghost', famous in the Prologues of *Thyestes* and *Agamemnon*, Heywood was imitating Seneca in ways not to be found in the choral odes, except when he incorporated material from other Senecan plays. The new Chorus Heywood creates does not alternate or interact with the female group, but substitutes it altogether. On the one hand, it acquires what Ker and Winston have called a metaspectatorial position when "they allude to the function of the play as a mirror displaying the capriciousness of fortune (1.Cho.55), and the stanzas added to the end of Act 2 address 'Good Ladies' (2.Cho.64-70) – ostensibly the Trojan women, but an open-ended reference – and prepare them for further grief as they watch the following act" (2012, 31). On the other, this position also allows for an entirely new didactic tone in the *speculum principis* tradition especially manifest in the allusion to Hecuba as a mirror for kings in the first ode (1 Cho. 52-4). Differently from the group of women, this new Chorus is not only anonymous but probably singular, as in the new parts of the odes it invariably uses the first person or refers to itself as an individual speaker, as in the last three stanzas of the second ode, where the Chorus says "mine iyes" before addressing the "good Ladies" with an invitation to cry over Hecuba. Singularity does not necessarily entail that the Chorus be one person, but it does suggest individual vocalisation in ways that are not those of the group of women in the lament with Hecuba, where they regularly use 'our'. What diversifies the four odes conceptually is the sententious and gnomic register adopted when treating the topic of the unpredictability of Chance in odes 1 and 3, and a more varied approach in dealing with that of death (physical and spiritual in ode 2, and communal in ode 4). This is accompanied by a markedly narrative stance with a clearly framing function – in 2 and 4 entrusted to the narrative potential of the rhyme royal stanza. Odes 2 and 3, especially the genuinely new parts contributed by Heywood, have a clearly connective and presentational function enhancing the framing role of this Chorus, that shares in authorial knowledge and fills in the gaps at the level of drama or anticipates the action to come.

2. Cho.50-70

These three staves following are added by the translator

O dreadful day, alas, the sorry time,
I come of all the mother's ruthful wo:
Astyanax, alas, thy fatal line
Of life is worn – to death straight shalt thou go.
The Sisters have decreed it should be so.
There many no force, alas, escape their hand.
The mighty Jove their will may not withstand.

To see the mother her tender child forsake,
What gentle heart that may from tears refrain,
Or who so fierce that would not pity take,
To see alas the guiltless infant slain.
For sorry heart the tears mine eyes do stain,
To think what sorrow shall her heart oppress
Her little child to leese remediless.

The double cares of Hector's wife to wail,
Good Ladies have your tears in readiness,
And you with whom should pity most prevail
Rue on her grief, bewail her heaviness,
With sobbing heart lament her deep distress,
When she with tears shall take leave of her son,
And now, Good Ladies, hear what shall be done.

3. Cho. 21-32

O perfit proof of her frailty,
The princely towers of Troy beat down,
The flower of Asia here you see,
With turn of hand quite overthrown.
The ruthful end of Hector's son,
Whom to his death the Greeks have led,
His fatal hour is come and gone,
And by this time the child is dead.
Yet still alas more cares increase,
O Trojans' doleful destiny,
Fast doth approach the maid's decease,
And now Polyxena shall die.

The repeated address to "the Good Ladies" to "hear . . . what shall be done" in 2 Cho. inscribes within drama the sense of the vision of an action about to take place whose imaginary quality is strictly connected with the pathetic words of the speaker, prefiguring Andromache's painful abandonment of her child to a horrendous fate of death (2 Cho. 57-63). Although the events are bound to remain imaginary insofar as the play was originally intended to be read,[10] the address enhances its self-reflexive focus on the story and its dialogue with the audience/reader between the Acts. In this way it replaces the traditional lyric dimension of the ancient choral song as underlined by continental writings on tragedies and commentaries on Horace and Aristotle. This Chorus is unequivocally a focaliser external to the action, an authorial voice in the Horatian tradition recalled above, that encourages emotional empathy. In this respect, it approximates Heywood's own voice in the "Preface to the Tragedy" (especially at ll. 43-9; "How Greeks them slew alas, here shall ye see", 46), which not coincidentally is also written

[10] As Pincombe rightly recalls, "Heywood wrote his verses to be read quietly in the study, not spoken out loud upon the stage" (2012, 532).

in rhyme royal. If in this passage the Ladies are primarily the women of Troy, as Ker and Winston suggest (2012, 31), this second Chorus is clearly separated by an invisible screen impeding communication on the stage. The women do not hear the Chorus, and the action continues in the following Act with Andromache's monody. This separateness underlines that the play communicates at different levels, and that this Chorus is situated in a liminal position as a fictional frame surrounding the drama proper. This suggests an entirely new conception of the Chorus clearly endowed with functions foreign to the Senecan one and increasingly turned into an authorial "interpretive packaging" emancipated from the original.

The fourth and last ode is of particular interest in that Heywood's subtle intervention on a few apparently minor details defines once and for all the position of this Chorus vis-à-vis the silent company of women. It also offers hints about Heywood's compositional process and autonomous choice in developing a new Chorus from the information he found in the editions he probably consulted. In this respect, it should be recalled that all modern editions of Seneca's play since Gronovius' (1661) have only one Chorus, as shown by the manuscript tradition on which they are based (the so-called 'Etruscus' or 'E' manuscript). However, that tradition was unknown in the Renaissance until 1661, which means that the editions printed before that date followed a plurality of different manuscripts, all belonging to a different branch called 'A'. They too had only one Chorus, but this was not entirely unequivocal. The early modern editions included G.B. Marmitta (1492), J. Badius Ascensius (1514), Aldus Manutius' printing press (1517), Henricus Petri (1529), Sebastian Gryphius (1541). Among these, according to de Vocht (1913), there must have been the printed text (or texts) possibly used by Heywood. More recent scholarship tends to regard the 1541 Gryphius edition as the only text Heywood saw.[11] If this is correct, he did not encounter more than one collective character, which was dubbed Chorus of women ("mulierum"), abbreviated as Chorus during the play. But had

[11] "Heywood raises the choice of an appropriate source text in the preface to Thyestes (lines 308-09), where he complains about the many errors found in the editions by Gryphius (1541), 'Aldus' (i.e. the 1517 Aldine edition by Jerome Avantius), and 'Colineus' (reference uncertain). Heywood there claims to have solved this problem by resorting to a manuscript of Seneca – something he could in theory have done, perhaps using manuscripts possessed by some Oxford colleges – but it appears that in practice he, and Studley too, followed Gryphius's text in almost every instance. Robinson's London edition of the Latin in 1589 (the first such edition in England) was based on Gryphius. Although Gryphius incorporated many of the conjectures and emendations made in the editions by Ascensius (1514) and Avantius (1517), all of these editions, as noted above, were equally dominated by the A manuscripts" (Ker and Winston 2012, 280)s. See also Daalder 1982.

he chanced to see the Marmitta edition, at line 814 he would have found a speech heading suggesting a masculine Chorus ("troianorum") hinting at a second composite character. This corresponds to the first line of the third choral ode, which Heywood rewrote from scratch, but where he also found the following line, marking the speakers as feminine: "Quae vocat sedes habitanda captas?" ("What home awaits us prisoners?").[12] The contradiction could not be ignored and it must have been puzzling for anyone who read the text. On the other hand, Badius pinpointed the feminine connotation at l. 67, that is, at the beginning of the *kommos*, when in the comment he added "Chorus Troadum", in addition to the stage direction already specifying "Chorus mulierum". This means that only if Heywood had seen the Marmitta edition could he have found a clue for considering the presence of a second masculine Chorus.

If we now turn to the fourth ode, which, like the second ode as well as the authorial "Preface" to the tragedy is cast in rhyme royal, we encounter interesting details about the genetic line of Heywood's new Chorus and its overall conception. The ode follows Polyxena's preparation as a bride for her wedding with Achilles and Helen's announcement that the company of women will soon break and they will be assigned to different Greek heroes: Hecuba to Ulysses, Andromache to Pyrrhus, and Cassandra to Agamemnon. But Heywood rephrases the ode in such a way that the voice we hear is not that of the women about to be dispersed, but of the new Chorus. The passionate expression of their grief and sense of mourning, which Seneca stylistically conveys through emphatic repetitions ("dulce maerenti populus dolentum / dulce lamentis resonare gentes", "It's sweet to grieve when nations grieve / Sweet when a people rings with cries", 1009-10), imperatives and run-on lines ("tollite felices. remouete multo / diuites auro", "Erase the happy. Remove men / crusted with gold", 119-20), are lost in English. They are replaced by gnomic impersonal statements suggesting the presence of an impassioned onlooker: "A comfort is to man's calamity, / A doleful flock of fellows in distress, / And sweet to him that mourns in misery / To hear them wail whom sorrows like oppress" (1-4). This opening stanza has alternate rhymes in the first four lines that seem to mimic sound patterns of the original, but the analogy is soon lost:

> dulce *maerenti* populus *dolentium*,
> dulce *lamentis* resonare *gentes*;
> *le*nius *lu*ctus *la*crimaeque *mordent*,
> turba quas *fl*etu simi*lis fre*qu*ent*at. (1009-12; emphasis mine)

The rhyming scheme of Heywood's royal stanza takes over the articulation

[12] All quotations and translations from Seneca's *Troades* are from Boyle 1994.

of both content and form, driving the voice of the new Chorus miles away from that of the Senecan women, whose run-on lines are numerous and especially scattered in the narrative portions, as in the following passage on the comfort derived from shared suffering:[13]

> *aequior*[1] casum *tulit*[1] et procellas
> *mille*[1] *qui*[2] ponto pariter *carinas*[3]
> *obruí*[2] *uidit*[2] *tabulaque*[4] *litus*[5]
> *naufraga*[4] *spargí*[5], *mare*[6] *cum coactis*[7]
> *fluctibus*[7] Corus prohibet *reuerti*[6]. (1029-33; emphasis mine)[14]
>
> [Chance and tempests cause less distress / To one who sees a thousand ships / Engulfed in the same sea and shores / Strewn with wrecks, as the breakers heave / And Corus bars the sea's return].

Heywood freely elaborates on the 'shipwreck with a spectator' motif, yet without achieving Seneca's "hyper-epicizing" through sounds, syntax and overrunning lines (Baertschi 2015, 186). In his hands the *exemplum*, confined within regular end-stopped lines, loses the passionate voice of the Senecan speakers, whose emotion continuously overflows the measure:

> A thousand sail who see'th to drench in seas,
> With better will the storm hath overpassed,
> His heavy hap doth him the less displease,
> When broken boards abroad be many cast,
> And shipwracked ships to shore they flit full fast,
> With double waves when stoppèd is the flood,
> With heap of them that there have lost their good. (Cho. 4, 29-35)

The ode is textually very interesting. In its last lines the new Chorus acquires a fully narrative and presentational stance with the sense of a final vision of the women about to be dispersed. Its words provide a doleful epilogue on their fate:

[13] As Baertschi notices, Seneca's use of enjambment is often the bearer of emotional excitement, as in the description of the storm in *Agamemnon* 497-506, where it "mirrors the foundering of the ships as well as the general confusion and destruction caused by the turmoil of the winds" (2015, 186).

[14] Other examples may be found at 1035-7: "uillo / aureo fratrem simul ac sororem / sustulist tergo medioque iactum / fecit in ponto"; 1044-6: "cum . . . / prenderint"; 1047ff.: "ubi omnis / terra decrescet"; 1051-2: "Troia qua iaceat regione monstrans, / dicet"; 1053-4: "alte / serpit".

Seneca (1042-55; emphasis mine)	Heywood (50-63; emphasis mine)
Soluet hunc *questum* [coetum] *lacrimasque nostras*	Anon *these plaints and Trojans' tears* shall quail,
sparget huc illuc agitata classis,	And here and there the ship *them* toss by seas,
cum tuba iussi dare uela *nautae*	When trumpets sound shall warn *the hoise up sail*,
et simul uentis properante remo	And through the waves with wind to seek their ways.
prenderint altum *fugientque* [fugietque] *litus*.	*Then shall these captives go to end their days,*
quis status mentis *miseris*, ubi omnis	*In land unknown* when once with hasty oar,
terra decrescet pelagusque crescet,	The drenching deep *they take and shun the shore.*
celsa cum longe latitabit Ide?	What state of mind shall then *in wretches* be,
tum puer matri genetrixque nato,	When shore shall sink from sight and seas arise,
Troia qua iaceat regione monstrans,	When Idey hill to lurke aloofe *they see*?
dicet et longe digito notabit:	Then point with hand from far where Troia lies,
"Ilium est illic, ubi fumus alte	Shall child and mother, talking in this wise:
serpit in caelum nebulaeque turpes."	"Lo yonder Troy, where smoke it fumeth high."
Troes hoc signo patriam uidebunt.	By this the Trojans shall their county spy.

Typically, Heywood replaces the Senecan women's collective lament ("questum lacrimasque nostras", 1042) with a description of their tears and future exile. In two extra lines of Heywood's own making, the speaker imagines "these captives [to] go to end their days / In land unknown", and then, on leaving the shore, that they will see the "Idey hill to lurke aloof" (54-5). This is the entirely external point of view of a spectator who does not include himself imaginatively in the scene of the women's departure. Seneca's extraordinary perspectival mobility, suddenly shifting the focus from the mariners ("nautae", 1044) and the oar ("properante remo", 1045) to the women who see the receding shore ("fugietque litus", 1046) is lost in Heywood. And this is the point where the question of textual transmission becomes interesting. Four out of the five editions available at the time (Manutius, Badius, Petrus, Gryphius) have "fugientque" at 1046, suggesting that it is not the "litus" (shore) that recedes from view, but the mariners ("nautae") who abandon it. Badius, however, at 1042 has "coetum" (company) in place of "questum" (lament), a variant that makes this edition foreign to Heywood's text, and instead a possible candidate for Dolce's contemporary translation of the same play which reproduces these two variants verbatim ("Disfarà questa nostra / Compagnia" and "E i marinai alhora, / . . . / E fuggiranno i liti"; 1560, 183*v*). Marmitta has not only "coetum" (company) but also the correct "fugietque litus". This suggests that Heywood either did not see the Marmitta edition, or chose not to follow it. But if he did not see it at all, he could not possibly have been influenced by its incongruous

mention of "chorus troianorum" at l. 814 in creating a separate Chorus (see Appendix), which therefore must have been his own choice entirely. He replaced the mariners with the impersonal image of the hoisted sails ("When trumpets sound shall warn the hoise up sail", 53), and introduced a reference to the women of Troy as "these captives" in a new line ("Then shall these captives go to end their days", 54), preparing the audience/readers for their appearance as the object of his narrative in the following mention of the wretched women (in Latin evoked by the dative "miseris", 1047) shunning the shore. In brief, the Latin presentation of the mariners leaving the shore (and the shore receding from view in the correct Marmitta edition), which could only be offered if the speakers were the women, is substituted by Heywood with the Chorus' focalisation on the wretched Trojan group as the object of the Chorus' narrative as the spectator to an imaginary scene.

Thus, the detail this ode definitely clarifies is that for no reason could the Senecan original Heywood read have influenced him in duplicating the Chorus, which in this particular scene is not only metaspectatorial, presentational, liminal in a new way in respect to the previous three odes, but is also creatively narrative. Its narrative stance is cast in rhyme royal and harps back to the translator's own voice in the "Preface", tacitly taking sides with Heywood as the "write[r]", "recite[r]" and "indite[r]" of the story (86, 88, 89). Even more than a mediator between stage/page and audience/reader between the Acts, the speaker is here the creator of this tragic vision and, like a Horatian Chorus, it stands by the author's side, in truth being one with his narrative voice.

Going back to questions of transmission, a last detail is needed before moving to the versification of the odes. All editions based on the 'A' manuscript tradition, as the one or ones Heywood saw, bear the title *Troas*. This is no secondary feature as it emphasises the tragedy of a city and, by extension, of its Queen, downplaying the role of the female collective. Heywood dedicated his "private exercise" (as he called it in his "Preface to the Tragedy", 11) to Queen Elizabeth. Possibly following the example of the *Mirror for Magistrates*, which he might have seen in an earlier form than the printed one dating from the same year (Ker and Winston 2012, 24), and which is also mentioned in the "Preface" to *Thyestes* (96), his new lines in 1 Cho. contain direct addresses to kings about the frailty of their own power. This didactic concern suggests a poetic project behind Heywood's translation of a different type from the one supporting the parallel edition of *Hercules Furens*. Combined with a reconfiguration of the tragic conception of the play highlighted in the variant title, this project also affects Heywood's choice of metres for the odes, suggesting why they are more elaborate in respect to those in his other Senecan translations. But first let us go back to Seneca and the question of metrical comparability we started from.

3. Competing with Seneca

As Boyle remarks (1994, 235), Seneca's standard metre for dialogue is the "iambic trimeter or (more loosely) senarius", that is, "a six-foot line based on the iambus (U_) for which several equivalents are allowed, primarily the spondee (_ _), tribrach (UUU), dactyl (_UU) and anapaest (UU_)". It is used for all non-choral parts as well as for Andromache's monody at 705-35 (3.2 in Heywood's translation). Seneca's preferred measure for the lyric parts is instead the anapaestic dimeter, which was also "typical of the entrances and exits of the Chorus in Greek tragedy", while his "favourite combinations . . . were dactyl-spondee (_ UU _ _) and spondee-anapaest (_ _UU_)".[15] In *Troades*, Seneca adopts all these metres, which Heywood renders in three main forms, differently from his later translations, which have only the iambic pentameter with crossed rhyme:

	Choral odes	Latin metre	English metre
Spoken parts		Iambic trimeters	Couplets of fourteeners
	Chorus mulierum. Hecuba (*Kommos*)	Anapaestici versus	Iambic pentameters with alternate rhyme
	1. Added Choral ode		Iambic pentameters with alternate rhyme
	The Spright of Achilles added to the tragedy (2.1)		Rhyme royal
	2. (+ three staves added by the translator)	Choriambici asclepiad.	Rhyme royal
Andromache's monody (3.2)		Anapaestici	Iambic pentameters with alternate rhyme
	3. (altered by the translator)	Sapphici	Iambic tetrameters with alternate rhymes
	4.	Sapphici	Rhyme royal

Like Hardison (1989, 156-7), Ker and Winston have pointed out that "Heywood approximates Seneca's use of iambic trimeters (usually twelve syllables) in his choice of the fourteener for dialogue, and also follows Seneca in using other, varied metres for choral passages or lyric passages uttered by main characters (Hecuba, 1.2 [*kommos*]; Andromache, 3.2)" (2012,

[15] For a more extensive discussion see Fantham 1982, 104-15.

26). As Mary Axton has noticed, by the 1590s "fourteeners [were] mocked as the fustian of 'King Cambises's vein'", but in the 1560s they were still fashionable in the interludes for high style (28n55). They can be found in plays of classical topics such as *Thersites* (1537), *Jack Jugeler* (1562), and *Horestes* (1567). But once set out in lines of eight and six syllables (four and three beats), as in the two 1559 and 1562 octavo editions of *Troas*, they visibly resemble the ballad metre or the common measure of hymnody (Attridge 2019, 203). Even without considering the rhyming couplets, which emphasise the sweetness of the line, as Giraldi put it,[16] this metre suggests a level of lyricism one would not expect as an equivalent for the speech-oriented trimeter. However, as Hardison has remarked, before 1559 anything that approximated serious plays, that is, morality plays, presented for dialogues a variety of different forms, including "cantilevered verse, ballad eight, three-beat couplets, rhyme royal stanzas using Alexandrines, seven-line stanzas of four-beat lines in monorhyme, and six-line stanzas with two-beat lines" (Hardison 1989, 156). Thus, in some way Heywood's consistent use of the fourteener for dialogue and of various measures for the choral odes, shows a new attitude inaugurating a more regular approach to serious drama, possibly inspired by the Latin model. And yet, if, as Hardison further remarks, the "fourteener also preserves a vital relation to speech through its association with a popular form, the ballad", while being "more formal than the irregular verse of the Tudor interlude and midcentury comedy" (1989, 157), it also retains the sense of the ballad lyric line alien to the Latin iambic trimeter. For dignified speech another measure had just been devised and this was blank verse. Although considered "straunge", as we read in the title-page of Surrey's 1554 translation of Book 4 of the *Aeneid*, blank verse was advertised as dignified by the same publisher William Owen who recommended it as "worthy to be embraced" (title-page).[17] Not coincidentally only a couple of years after Heywood's *Troas*, Norton and Sackville would employ it in *Gorboduc*.

Thus, while Heywood evidently grasped the difference between dialogues and choral odes in the Latin original, his translative choices appear consistent only in regard to their formal partition according to regular/varied metres, yet with no clear sense of the contrast between speech and song retained by

[16] Giraldi also carefully distinguished between different uses of rhyme, suggesting that it was appropriate especially to Choruses (1154, 229). See Introduction to the present issue, 12.

[17] For further discussion see Hardison (1986, 243-4) and Attridge (1974, 108-11). In passing, it may be recalled that in 1557 Books 2 and 4 were to be published by Tottel "just fifteen days after the first edition of *Songes and Sonnetes*" (Warner 2016, 116), testifying to the strong and immediate appeal of Surrey's translation.

Seneca.[18] Rhyming couplets of a long iambic verse as opposed to the shorter iambic pentameter with alternate rhyme – a measure that allowed for more freedom and could also be found in the recently published songs and sonnets of Tottel's miscellany (1557) – marked a thin divide. After all, as Attridge notices, the pentameter is the "obvious choice for a poet wishing to avoid the song-oriented four-beat forms" and its advantage is "a less dominant underlying rhythm . . . easier run-ons, and longer stretches of language before the chiming rhyme" (2019, 243). When we come to the rhyme royal stanza, Attridge also points out that it was "performed during the many varieties of English pageantry – and later, the masque", and with regard to its performance it fell "somewhere between poetry proper and drama". It was "usually pronounced by an actor impersonating a particular mythical or historical character, or an abstract quality, but as a formal, isolated performance of verse it [had] some of the features of a poetry recital" (2019, 251). This verse was first and foremost reminiscent of the native tradition of Chaucer and Lydgate, of which the contemporary *Mirror for Magistrates* was a continuation also with regard to the verse form. Interestingly, though, rhyme royal was not only perceived as serving best for grave discourse, as these references suggest, because it was also used with great flexibility "for the lighthearted, the joyous, and the broadly comic" even by Chaucer (Stevens 1979, 67). Besides, this stanza was considered appropriate for Prologues and Epilogues, as in the case of *Jack Jugeler*, as well as for the entrances of Thersites in the homonymous interlude, and of the Vice in *Horestes*. Typically, in this last interlude while songs are "syllabic, matching known tunes" (Axton 1982, 28n54), the rhyme royal stanza enhances the Vice's "dramatic style and isolation as a partly invisible figure . . . till the end of the play (when Truth and Duty conclude the interlude in rhyme royal)" (28). Usable for almost any circumstances, this stanza seems only to lack the lyric, 'singable' quality one would expect for a choral ode. Thus, when we find it in place of the original choriambic asclepiads and sapphic lines we feel a friction that can only be explained if we postulate a broader creative design. The only ode which approximates a song measure is the third one which Heywood rewrites entirely in iambic tetrameters with alternate rhymes.

Thus, while Heywood's different versifications for different parts of the drama reflect the basic dialogue/ode variation in the original, the criteria for equivalence are neither immediately manifest nor they render the text more Senecan-like. The sapphic line is once translated into iambic tetrameters

[18] Although it remains unclear whether Seneca's plays were for declamation only, at the time ancient Choruses were normally interpreted as being sung. Not surprisingly, Giraldi refers to the *kommos* in Seneca's *Troades* as an example of the singing and dancing Chorus (1554, 229-30).

with crossed rhymes (3 Cho.) and once into rhyme royal stanzas (4 Cho.), while the latter are employed for the choriambic asclepiads (2 Cho.) and Achilles' speech; also, the iambic pentameter is used for both the *kommos* and the added choral ode (1 Cho.), as well as for Andromache's monody in 3.2. If Ker and Winston are correct in suggesting that the kommos was not perceived as a genuine choral ode, why use the same verse for the new ode? If the aim was to re-establish the lyric role of the Chorus, employing the same metre might have looked reasonable only if the ode's lyric quality was not entrusted to verse.

The impression is that, in this particular case, the iambic pentameter of the dirge might in fact have affected the versification of the following new choral ode. As already observed, 1. Cho situates the play in the *speculum* tradition, so that Priam, whose death has just been lamented by the Queen and the women, is taken as an example for kings to consider themselves like dust (52), while Hecuba, "that waileth now in care" (53), is displayed as the living emblem of monarchs' "wavering wealth" (56). This speaker has clearly watched and heard the *kommos*, as it gestures back to it, and introduces the play thematically as a Prologue. But the actual prologue-like new passage in the Senecan style is the added speech of the ghost of Achilles. It "provides a starker metaphysical apparatus for *Troas*, dramatizing the themes of revenge more explicitly in a play where revenge would otherwise play a peripheral role" (Ker and Winston 2012, 31). Not coincidentally, therefore, after the *kommos* and 1 Cho., both in iambic pentameters with alternate rhymes, the more sustained rhyme royal stanza serves the purpose of isolating his entrance, while matching the grave discourse of revenge as the engine of drama.

Thus, a design bringing together this speech and odes 2 and 4, as opposed to odes 1 and 3, both featuring an alternate rhyme scheme, gradually begins to emerge. While the alternate rhyme pattern appears in passages dealing with the topic of blind Chance, including addresses to the audience/reader, rhyme royal is reserved for considerations on the soul's death along that of the body (2 Cho.), and for a speech on the women and children's final abandonment of Troy (4 Cho.). Both odes deal with grave discourses in ways that are not comparable with the gnomic sententiousness of odes 1 and 3 about Chance and the alternate fortunes of princes. They sceptically deny the consoling prospect of the survival of the soul, broaching a philosophical question clearly at odds with the *kommos* envisaging Priam's happy afterlife, as well as with the appearance of the ghost, and then narrate the imminent fate of the women's abandonment of Troy with no sense of the exemplarity of the event typical of the didactic tone of odes 1 and 3. Above all, rhyme royal marks these two odes out as related to a particular aspect of the tragic story reworked by Heywood. Although formally it recalls the *speculum* model

to which Lydgate's *Fall* belongs, the stanza is used for a wholly different topic, which constitutes the core of Seneca's tragedy: an interrogation of the meaning of death, both as an individual concern (2. Cho) and as a collective and social preoccupation (4. Cho).

Thus, Heywood's use of metres at the same time underscores variety following Seneca's metric variations (including Andromache's lyric passage), and defies equivalence in ways that challenge the idea itself of comparability. Heywood's metric choices draw two major thematic lines across the play and its paratexts: on the one hand, the medieval *speculum* topic corresponds to the alternate rhyme scheme with a variable sense of song being especially inscribed in the tetrameter format; on the other, the authorially revised Senecan tragic reflection on death and the dissolution of female communal bonds is cast in the medieval rhyme royal stanza with a pronounced narrative quality. In either case, Heywood was experimenting with how to inscribe his own poetic voice into the play, at the same time rooting it into the native tradition of tragic narratives. The rhyme royal stanza was possibly the best opportunity to conflate a sustained narrative with a markedly presentational and framing stance, as could also be suggested by its use for the Vice or Prologues and Epilogues in classical interludes. The only quality this verse lacked was of being song-like.

Heywood's verses in *Troas* can therefore hardly be considered as performance indicators distinguishing song from speech, however they are confined to a silent or imaginary performance by the reader. And yet a sense of their variation must have been perceived if Thomas Marsh used different typefaces for this play in Newton's 1581 *Tenne Tragedies*. In fact, this edition invariably uses blackletter for fourteeners even when assigned to the Chorus, as in *Hippolytus*' second choral ode, in all *Oedipus*' odes, and in the third choral ode of *Medea*, *Agamemnon* and *Hercules Oeteus*. In all other cases, the odes are in Roman, although on one occasion also the iambic tetrameter is cast in blackletter but is meant to signal variation within the ode: it occurs at the end of the third choral ode of *Hercules Furens* when Heywood introduces a metric change from iambic pentameters, which are in Roman type (1581, 14*r*), marking an equivalent change in the original from sapphic hendecasyllables to choriambic asclepiads. Interestingly, in the octavo parallel edition of this play printed by Henry Sutton in 1561, Heywood not only indicates the metre as in current Latin editions of Seneca, but he also casts the Latin original in Roman and his own translation in blackletter underlining its Englishness visually. The 1559 and 1560 octavo editions of *Troas* and *Thyestes* print all in blackletter. Once collected within Newton's *Tenne Tragedies*, *Troas* looked like all the other tragedies: speech is in blackletter and the odes in Roman typeface, including the initial *kommos*, the new choral ode and the new staves of the original second ode. To be

sure, this was not enough to establish a solid rule for marking the Chorus from the rest of the play, since both Achilles' speech, indicating a speaking part (Heywood 1559, Aiii*r*; Newton 1581, 95*v*), and Andromache's monody in 3.2 were cast in Roman type, which meant flouting all expectations of regularity in terms of speech and 'song'. But in fact it visualised another type of regularity, suggesting that a ratio after all could be found elsewhere in this tragedy: in the conceptual, functional and thematic dimensions of these portions of drama Heywood wrote in metres different from the fourteener; and this was enough to make the hand of the translator-as-poet visually recognisable.

4. Conclusion

Surprising though it may be, Heywood could not have perceived the *kommos* as a genuine choral ode, as Ker and Winston have argued. One wonders whether what prevented him from treating it as one was its dialogue. However, it did not puzzle Giraldi, for one, nor impeded him to recognise it as a truly choral performance. If we consider more closely the title Heywood found, *Troas* instead of *Troades*, and read his translation in this light, though, the whole picture begins to become clearer. As we noticed, Seneca's play is a wholly female tragedy concerning the dissolution of a community of women in the ancient world, following the Greek conquest of Troy and the defeat of its male heroes. But changing the title means changing the sense of this tragedy. The focus is suddenly shifted from the women to the ancient city, and by extension to its Queen, Hecuba, and her daughter-in-law, Andromache, both mothers of children who will be murdered for revenge and in order to interrupt the Trojan dynasty. Not surprisingly, Heywood's attention is laid on one woman, Hecuba, not the women of Troy in general, whose voice is heard only in the initial *kommos* and is mentioned occasionally by the new Chorus.[19] The last stanza of Heywood's "Preface to the Tragedy" clearly states where the tragic core lies, and it is not with them:

> First how the queen laments the fall of Troy,
> As hath mine author done, I shall it write;
> Next how from Hector's wife they led the boy
> To die, and her complaints I shall recite;
> The maiden's death then must I last indite.

[19] The cultural and political implications of this shift, in line with Heywood's dedication to the Queen, have been suggested by Ker and Winston (2012) in relation to the "mirror" motif in 1 Cho. On Hecuba's impact on audiences in early modern England see also Pollard 2017 (a brief reference to Heywood is on 8).

> Now who that list the Queen's complaint to hear,
> In following verse it shall forthwith appear. (85-91)

Getting rid of the third choral ode was part of this design of turning the play into the tragedy of one woman and her kingdom. It meant doing away with the sense of geographic entropy inscribed in the long list of towns and places contained in this ode, a list endowed with the tragic sense of dissolution of the female community as the focus of the play. For Heywood the unknown names of those countries "should have no grace in the English tongue, but be a strange and unpleasant thing to the readers" (45-6), and he replaced them with a new piece on the power of Chance. He could not understand why those strange names were important, because he did not grasp that the tragic dimension of this play resided in female collective suffering beyond the fate of individual subjects. "Quae uocat sedes habitanda captas? (814; "What homes awaits us prisoners?"): this is the crucial initial question in ode 3 Heywood omits to ask. Not surprisingly, in ode 4 there is no community of women foresuffering their tragic fate, but only the framing voice of the new Chorus mentioning the dissolution of the women's lament ("questum"), not of their community ("coetum") – a reference he could not read in the edition he probably consulted. By shifting the focus on to their plaintive action this reading weakens the sense that what is actually at stake here is the loss of their communal identity.

Tarlinskaja pinpoints the fact that verse "helps us to understand and interpret *dramatis personae*" (2014, 1); but as Stevens remarks, it also contributes "to the characterization of the teller" (1979, 68). In this case, the teller is an anonymous, individual Chorus who shares in the voice of the tragic poet as a medieval advisor to the prince. It also embodies Heywood's competitive stance with Seneca in re-narrating the tragic story of the women of Troy. Heywood does quote Seneca and occasionally gestures to his works by incorporating passages from other plays or following his dramatic model. But the overall vision and dramatic function is new and when he moves to metrics, we no longer sense ordinary imitation. The new Chorus speaks its lines in a voice metrically rooted in the English tradition of tragic narratives, and from a reliable, authorial position, metatextually framing the action, it fashions itself as a credible voice. Heywood's new Chorus is a persona with no characterisation, apart from being a sententious narrator. Its versification shows no actual equivalence to Seneca's metres, and precisely by failing to do so it contributes to making Heywood's emulative project autonomous: a design recognisable at the crossroads of different English narrative and dramatic traditions.

Appendix: Speech Headings and Speech Prefixes

	Marmitta 1492	Aldina 1517	Badius 1514	Petrus 1529	Gryphius 1541 (1548)
–	Incipit sextra (!) tragoedia quae Troas vocatatur / Actus primus. Hecuba loquitur.	TRAGOEDIA SEXTA, QUAE / INSCRIBITUR / TROAS. / ACTUS PRIMUS. / Iambic trimeters. / HECUBA. /	Tragoediae interlocutores. / Hecuba Pyrrhus / Chorus mulierum. Andromacha / Talthybius. Senex / Agamemnon Ulysses / Calchas. Astianax / Helena. Nuntius / Primus actus. / Trimentri Iambici	TRAGOEDIA SEXTA, / QUAE INSCRIB- / ITUR TROAS. / ACTUS PRIMUS. / Iambic trimeters. / HECUBA. /	Interlocu-/tores. / Hecuba Pyrrhus / Chorus mulierum. Andromacha / Talthybius. Senex / Agamemnon Ulysses / Calchas. Astianax / Helena. Nuntius //
67	Chorus mulierum Hecuba. Chorus loquitur	ANAPAESTICI VERSUS. / CHORUS MULIERUM • HECUBA. /	= Aldina / The commentary says "Chorus Troadum"	CHORUS MULIERUM. HECUBA. / Anapaesticiversus	CHORUS MULIERUM. HECUBA. / Anapaesticiversus
67		no heading (space for initial letter)	Idem	Idem	Idem
83		From now on H• and C• are in the left margin			
83	He.	H			
99	Cho.	C			
102b	Idem He.	(Complete) H			
117	Cho.	C			
130	He.	H			
132	Cho.	C			
142	Hecu.	H			
156	Idem Cho	(Felix Priamus / dicimus omnes) Ch (!)			
164	Actus secundus Taltibius Chorus. / Taltabius (!) loquitur	ACTUS SECUNDUS. / Iambic trimeters. / TALTHYBIUS. CHORUS. /			

166	Cho.	C	Idem	Idem	Idem
164		no heading (space for initial letter)			
203		Iambic trimeters. / PYRRHUS. AGAMEMNON. CALCHAS. /			
203		space for initial letter			
371	Chorus	Asclepiadean choriambs. / CHORUS. /			
409	Idem	ACTUS TERTIUS. / Iambic trimeters. / ANDROMACHA. SENEX. ULYSSES. /			
705	No indication of meter	Anapaests. / ANDROMACHA. /			
736		Iambic trimeters. / ULYSSES. ANDROMACHA. / ASTYANAX. /			
814	Chorus troianorum	Sapphici. / CHORUS. /			
861		ACTUS QUARTUS / Iambic trimeters. / HELENA. ANDROMACHA. HECUBA. /			
1009	Chorus	Sapphici. / CHORUS. /			
1056		ACTUS QUINTUS. / Iambic trimeters. / NUNTIUS. ANDROMACHA. HECUBA. /			

Works Cited

Aristotle. 1995. *Poetics*, edited and translated by Stephen Halliwell. Cambridge, Ma., and London: Harvard University Press.

Attridge, Derek. 2019. *The Experience of Poetry. From Homer's Listeners to Shakespeare's Readers.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

– 1974. *Well-Weighed Syllables.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Axton, Mary, ed. 1982. *Three Tudor Classical Interludes.* Cambridge: D.S. Brewer – Rowan & Littlefield.

Baertschi, Annette M. 2015. "Epic Elements in Senecan Tragedy". In *Brill's Companion to Roman Tragedy*, edited by George W. M. Harrison, 171-95. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Bigliazzi, Silvia. 2020. "From Medieval to Early Modern Choric Threnody in Biblical Plays". In *Enacting the Bible in Medieval and Early Modern Drama*, edited by Eva von Contzen and Chanita Goodblatt, 65-80. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Boyle, A.J. ed. 1994. *Seneca's Troades.* Leeds: Francis Cairns.

Bourne, Claire M.L. 2020. *Typographies of Performance in Early Modern England.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Daalder, Joost, ed. 1982. *'Thyestes': Translated by Jasper Heywood (1560)*, London: Ernest Benn.

Davis, Peter J. 1993. *Shifting Song: The Chorus in Seneca's Tragedies.* Hildesheim, Zurich, New York: Olms-Weidmann.

De Vocht, H. 1913. *Jasper Heywood and His Translations of Seneca's Troas, Thyestes, and Hercules Furens.* Louvain: A. Huystpruyst.

Dolce, Lodovico trans. 1560. *Le Tragedie di Seneca.* Vinegia: Sessa.

Drant, Thomas. 1567. *Horace His art of Poetrie, Epistles and Satyres Englished, and to the Earle of Ormounte by Th. Drant addressed.* London: Thomas Marsh.

Gaffiot, Félix. 2001. *Dictionnaire latin-français.* Paris: Hachette.

Giraldi Cinthio, Giovambattista. 1554. *Discorsi.* Venezia: Giolito.

Hardison, O.B. 1995. *Horace for Students of Literature: The "Ars Poetica" and Its Tradition.* Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

– 1989. *Prosody and Purpose in the English Renaissance.* Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

– 1986. "Tudor Humanism and Surrey's Translation of the 'Aeneid'". *Studies in Philology* 83 (3): 237-60.

Heywood, Jasper, trans. 1559. *The sixt tragedies of the most graue and prudent author Lucius, Anneus, Seneca, entituled Troas . . .* London: Richard Totty.

– 1561. *Lucii Annei Senecae tragedia prima quae inscribitur Hercules Furens . . .* London: By Henrye Sutton.

Horace. 1999. *Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*, with an English Translation by H. Ruston Fairclough (1926; rev. and rpt 1929). Cambridge, Ma., London: Harvard University Press.

– 1989. *Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ('Ars poetica')*, edited by Niall Rudd. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

– 1640. *Q. Horatius Flaccus: his Art of poetry*. Englished by Ben: Jonson. With other workes of the author, never printed before. London: Printed by I. Okes, for Iohn Benson.
– 1555. *M. Antonii Mureti in eundem annotationes. Aldi Manutii De metris Horatianis. Eiusdem annotationes in Horatium*. Venezia: apud Paolum Manutium.
Horatius Flaccus, Quintus / Superchio, Giovanni Francesco / Sforza, Giovanni. 1490-91. *Opera, mit Kommentar von Pseudo-Acro*, Pomponius Porphyrio und Christophorus Landinus. Venedig.
Ker, James and Jessica Winston, eds. 2012. *Elizabethan Seneca. Three Tragedies*. London: Modern Humanities Research Association.
Langbaine, Gerard. 1691. *An Account of the English Dramatik Poets* . . . Oxford: Printed by L.L. for George West and Henry Clements.
Lewis, Charlton T. and Charles Short. 1956. *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Maggi, Vincenzo and Bartolomeus Lombardi, eds. 1550. *In Aristotelis librum De poetica communes explanationes* . . . Venetijs: in officina Erasmiana, Vincentii Valgrisii.
Minturno, Antonio. 1563. *L'arte poetica*. Venetia: Giovanni Andrea Valvassori.
Newton, Thomas ed. 1581. *Seneca His Tenne Tragedies*. London: Thomas Marsh.
Pincombe, Mark. 2012. "Tragic Inspiration in Jasper Heywood's Translation of Seneca's *Thyestes*: Melpomene or Megaera?" In *The Oxford Handbook to Tudor Drama*, edited by Thomas Betteridge and Greg Walker, 531-46. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Pollard, Tanya. 2017. *Greek Women on Shakespearean Stages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Robortello, Francesco, ed. 1548. *In librum Aristotelis De arte poetica explicationes* . . . Florentiae: in officina Laurentii Torrentini.
Scaliger, Julius Caesar. 1561. *Poetices Libri Septem*. Heidleberg: Commelinus.
Seneca. 1541. *L. Annaei Senecae Cordubensis. Tragoediae decem* . . . Lugduni: apud Seb. Gryphium. USTC 157439.
– 1529. *L. Annaei Senecae Cordubensis. Tragoediae X*. Basileae Excudenbat: Enricus Petrus. USTC 671374.
– 1517. *Senecae Tragoediae*. Venetiis: in aedibus Aldi. USTC 855885.
– 1514. *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae* . . . Paris: Badius Ascensius. USTC 144361.
– 1492. *Trag[o]edi[a]e Senecae cum commento*. Bernardinus Marmita. Venetiis: apud Lazarum Isoarda de Saviliano. USTC 991098.
Stevens, Martin. 1979. "The Royal Stanza in Early English Literature". *PMLA* 94 (1): 62-76.
Tarlinskaja, Marina. 2014. *Shakespeare and the Versification of English Drama*, 1561-1642. Farnham: Ashgate.
TLL. Bavarian Academy of Science. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. https://tll.degruyter.com (Accessed 21 June 2020).
Warner, J. Christopher. 2016. *The Making and Marketing of Tottel's Miscellany, 1557*. London and New York: Routledge.
Winston, Jessica. 2016. "Rethinking Absolutism: English *de casibus* tragedy in the 1560s". In *A Mirror for Magistrates in Context*, edited by Harriet Archer and

Andrew Hadfield, 198-215. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Winston, Jessica, and James Ker. 2013. "A Note on Jasper Heywood's 'Free Compositions' in *Troas* (1559)". *Modern Philology* 110 (4): 564-75.