

FLORILEGIUM 9, 1987

## EVERYMAN'S SATURN

Donald A. Beecher

That the various fragments of myth associated with the name of Saturn and implicitly his Greek counterpart Kronos persisted in the mythological writings of the Christian West is, in a theoretical sense, remarkable. Since scholars in that age were no longer in touch with the occult significance of these fragments relating to the fertility cults of the ancient Mediterranean world,<sup>1</sup> it was not particularly obvious to them what to do with a brutal protagonist remembered for consuming and disgorging his own children, and for having his genitals cut off by his son and cast into the sea. Yet certain of those pieces of an assumed story about this pagan cosmocrator not only survived but even managed to preserve their narrative integrity, in spite of internal contradictions and in spite of centuries of adaptation, glossing, moralizing and allegorizing — through which manipulation alone the Christian mythographers could justify their interest in this pagan lore.

The tortuous route by which the Saturn group of narrative parts made its way from the already remotely remembered versions of the late Roman compilers Fulgentius, Macrobius, Servius, and Martianus Capella through the early Christianizing of Lactantius and the encyclopaedic entries of Isidore of Seville and Vincent of Beauvais down through the moral glossing of Bersuire and the cataloguing of Albricus Londoniensis to the first signs of a humanist recovery from original sources in Boccaccio's *Genealogy of*

*the Gods* — this I leave to the description of such scholars as Jean Seznec in his *The Survival of the Pagan Gods*, and to Klibansky, Panofsky, and Saxl in their monumental work, *Saturn and Melancholy*.<sup>2</sup>

What becomes clear is that while the matter of Saturn had staying power, it also contained a heterogeneous complement of elements that brought the same challenge to each redactor of the myth: how to recover the story of Saturn without doing violence to the diverse components of the Saturn tradition. What follows is an analysis of the formula through which a late fifteenth-century court poet met that challenge and thereby produced what was arguably the best known and most widely received version of the Saturn myth in the French- and English-speaking worlds throughout the Renaissance.

For that poet, the task was not merely how to gather up all the parts but also how to make them cohere in a single narrative account of Saturn and his deeds that possessed an acceptable degree, by fifteenth-century standards, both of historical and of psychological verisimilitude. Perhaps once that course of redaction had suggested itself to him, many of the answers would have become apparent, but it cannot be discounted that all the jarring parts of the tradition remained to be dealt with, parts, in fact, so discordant that only a writer of considerable inventiveness could hope to bring them together. Klibansky, Saxl, and Panofsky offer a resumé of the sources for the Saturn tradition from Hesiod and Homer to Macrobius and Lactantius that, together, produce a composite personality marked by contradiction and ambivalence.<sup>3</sup>

According to the surviving episodes of his story, Saturn was at once the god of the golden age, a benefactor and inventor, the ruler over a realm of happy primitive men, and a man tormented by the oracles and doomed to devour his own children in order to avert the prophecy that he would be overthrown by his own son. He was associated with the sickle which was both a symbol of the harvest and the instrument by which he was mutilated. By Homer's account, he was exiled to the nether world and there held a prisoner; by Lactantius' account, he was a wanderer and fugitive. How could the ruler over a state of innocence and prosperity remain identified with a being who practised infanticide and who waged war against members of his own family? Add to the complications inherent in the mythological tradition, the iconographical accounts stemming from Fulgentius of a Saturn with covered head bearing his scythe, and the astrological tradition of Saturn as a planetary deity who presided over old age, melancholy, hopelessness, and physical decay — the Saturn who continued to make his malefic influence

felt through the astral influences upon terrestrial beings — and we have all the ingredients that together defied the syncretist impulses of the humanist compilers.

Boccaccio's *Genealogy of the Gods* contains one of the earliest manifestations of discontent with the didacticism and the uncritical methods of the mediaeval compilers. Boccaccio acknowledged the need to return to the sources, to collate and compare, to separate the authentic and true from the spurious. Throughout the last twenty-five years of his life, he sifted through a massive body of materials, guided by this critical spirit; and he produced a work that Sez nec describes as "the chief link between the mythology of the Renaissance and that of the Middle Ages."<sup>4</sup> But as Sez nec is equally willing to point out, Boccaccio did not have the analytical means to resolve the narrative confusion imposed by his divergent sources and hence was unable to rediscover, beneath the multiple versions, the primitive core of ancient myth — the authentic story of each personality. Sez nec translates a few lines of apology from Boccaccio's "Dedicatory Epistle" that testify to his own sense of failure: "If these things and others are erroneous, it is not my intention to disprove them, nor to correct them in any way, should they not lend themselves to some kind of orderly redaction. I shall be content with reporting what I have found, and shall leave philosophical controversies aside."<sup>5</sup> That lack of an orderly redaction is particularly apparent in his handling of the chapter on Saturn opening his Book VIII. He could do no more, in following his scholarly integrity, than include an account of the iconographical lore, together with a medley of half-digested observations from Macrobius, Lactantius, and Mythographus III, as well as a profile of the planetary force drawn from the Arab astronomer, Albumazar.<sup>6</sup> To his credit, as the authors of *Saturn and Melancholy* point out, "as far as we know, Boccaccio was the first mythographer to declare that the astrological statements were worthy to be placed beside mythological statements concerning Saturn."<sup>7</sup> But his honesty as an historian could only compound the task of the mythological narrator who sought to tell the "story" of the god. Given that Boccaccio considered all of his sources as being equally reliable, their diversity could only pose obstacles to the creation of a unified narrative. Boccaccio's greatest failing for the later mythographers such as Lilio Gregorio Giraldi was his imperfect handling of sources,<sup>8</sup> but for the non-erudite reader, it was that he could not reconcile his scholarly obligations with his narrative impulses. For that reason his work could well become the most consulted of source books during the Renaissance on matters pertaining to the pagan gods, but it could never fulfil the popular need for a unified narrative account.

The late mediaeval writer who, in a sense, resolved the Saturn "perplex" through amplification of the materials found in the mythographers according to the narrative conventions of historical romance was in all likelihood not seeking, as his major preoccupation, to overcome the Boccaccian impasse. Raoul Lefevre (or Le Fèvre), a cleric attached to the Burgundian court during the reign of Philip the Good, was under commission to furnish the court with a monumental account of the fall of Troy, to be written in French prose and, implicitly, in accordance with all the favoured conventions of realism and rhetoric that characterized the romance literature of the age.<sup>9</sup> Undoubtedly his attention was fixed on the matter concerning Saturn as a result of his historical interest in retracing the founding of Troy to the earliest ages of Greek history. Taking Saturn, in euhemeristic fashion, as one of the earliest rulers of the Kingdom of Crete, he set about the creation of his introit to the story of Troy by reconstructing the reign of Saturn as a series of historical events, simultaneously making as much as he could of the surviving fragments of mythological narrative. In the image of these events, he created his characters, furnishing them with the desires and wills necessary to account for those events in human causal terms.

Taking Boccaccio for his source, Lefevre rationalizes the order of events by arranging them in sequence and by furnishing each episode with causal circumstances that arise from preceding events. He begins with the conflict between Saturn and his elder brother Titan over the succession to the throne, and moves through a series of crises from the confrontation with Cybele, Saturn's sister and wife, over the destiny of their children, to the war with Titan, the return of Jupiter, and on to the final struggle between father and son which results in the fulfillment of Apollo's dreaded prophecy that Saturn's rule would be forcefully usurped by his own offspring. That was work for a competent court clerk and *raconteur*. What will prove remarkable about Lefevre's adaptation of Boccaccio's materials is that he does not reject the astrological Saturn in the process, but in fact succeeds in his narrative reorganization largely by tracing the series of doleful calamities that constitute Saturn's life to his own brooding, melancholy, and fateful personality. Probably more by accident than by design at the outset, Lefevre, in the process of disciplining myth through the application of historiographical method, rediscovered the characterological force in the Saturnine Saturn for organizing and motivating the historical narrative, and thereby managed to reconcile the two conflicting traditions.

Lefevre honours his obligation to the established details of the mythographers but always as an historian looking for naturalistic interpretations

that would conform to the level of verisimilitude established by the historical narrative. He therefore accepts the hint from Lactantius, as recorded by Boccaccio, that certain men in ancient times were called gods "after they folyssh and derke custome" (10) because they had performed something of great profit for the commonweal. In this manner, Lefevre carries the euhemeristic mode to its ultimate expression. Saturn is entirely desacramentalized and appears simply as a ruler near the beginning of time when the world was of gold, when men were steadfast and solid as mountains and rude as beasts, in the age just following the repopulation of the earth by the children of Noah. Saturn's father Uranus was, admittedly, the founder of the religion of the pagan gods and son of Demogorgon, but these two personalities Lefevre represented merely as earthly rulers. The process is at its most transparent when the poet deals with the castration myth. Since the act is so graphically specific, it surpassed Lefevre's powers to assign to it a counterpart action at a lower mimetic level; it is one of the few instances when Lefevre is driven to symbolic treatment. Since Jupiter began his reign by distributing his father's treasures to the Arcadians, the poets had reason to claim that "Iupiter geldyd his fader and caste his genytoyrs in to the see . of whom was engendryd venus / That is to saye that he castyd the tresours of hys fader in to the belyes of his men / whereof engendryd alle delectation whyche is comparyd and lykenyd vnto venus &c" (102). Despite the clumsiness of the solution, it clearly illustrates the force of the displacement of myth towards the lower mimetic form of romance which, in Northrop Frye's scheme of genres, falls half way between myth and realistic fiction because of the remote memory of the mythic patterns apparent in the action, the more realistic circumstances, and the more identifiably human causal explanations.<sup>10</sup> That displacement towards a fictive realism remained consistent with Lefevre's purposes as an historian. It is, in fact, by dint of the fictive realism that his mythic narrative could begin to take on the concreteness of historical event.

A good deal has been written about the qualities which create the impression of realism in late mediaeval romance — realism in a relative sense, at any rate, by comparison with the more bare and schematic storytelling conventions of preceding centuries. Seldom did such realism entail the lavish descriptions of places or persons, of customs, gestures and facial expressions.<sup>11</sup> These were offered only where they were essential to an understanding of the action, though exceptions were made for such matter as battle scenes where arms, chariots, the advance and retreat of troops, the blows and wounds were described in great rhetorical detail, whether in def-

erence to convention or to popular taste. Lefevre's detailed accounts of the wars involving Saturn are true to common practice. Rather, the sense of realism is most apparent in the increased sensitivity, on the part of the omniscient narrator, to the relationships between human will, destiny, and the unfolding of events. This is revealed through the rhetorical amplification of key episodes in order to explore in far greater detail motives, feelings, and reactions, and to underscore by the weight of the prose the relative significance of each contributing episode.

Finally, there is the search for logically causal and consequential order in the narrative. Boccaccio tells us only that Saturn made a pact with his brother Titan that he would devour his own children. Lefevre seizes upon that detail and surrounds it with realistic circumstances. We are made to understand, by way of fuller explanation, that Titan was deformed and disfavoured, and therefore was compelled to cede his rights to the throne to the younger but more clever and popular Saturn, upon the condition that Saturn would slay his offspring as assurance that none would succeed him to the throne.

Saturn no longer devours his children, but he will drink their ashes mixed with wine as proof of their deaths. We may pause at the improbability of the scenario, but Lefevre finds here the means for maintaining the substance of myth while gaining the suspension of disbelief at the level of romance fiction — at the level of the possible if not the probable, which makes for the level of adventure and wonder desired for the genre. It is a delicate balance. The repercussions of that initial pact manage to take on a degree of political and psychological importance, and serve in turn to drive the action forward with the logic of a plot to be resolved, through Saturn's passionate conflict with his wife Cybele over the destiny of their offspring, through the collusion of the women to secretly spare the children and to deceive the king with false evidence of their deaths, through the eventual discovery of their existences by Titan and the refusal of the women to reveal their whereabouts, to the declaration of war by Titan and the final release of the vanquished and imprisoned Saturn by his son Jupiter. The destiny inherent in that pact, elaborated upon in each successive episode, serves to create an economy of fable that satisfies the demands for a refined degree of mimetic action. In brief, the order of plot is imposed upon the disorder of the mythic fragments through rhetorical amplification and through a cogent adjustment of action to character at a level in keeping with the habits and conventions of late mediaeval narrative practice.

Equally significant is the fact that such rhetorical amplification also in-

cludes dramatic treatment of the moments of crisis and decision. Literary conventions come even more to bear as the inner thoughts of the protagonists are revealed through pensive monologues and combative dialogues, where the shaping ideas and values of history are polarized in the course of the arguments among the family members. It is during these exchanges that we see most clearly how personalities are at once shaped by and attempt to alter destiny. Faithful to a common mediaeval theme, Saturn is cursed to a life without heirs by the conditions of his oath and at the same time is mortally fearful of each new birth of a child lest that child survive to carry out the prophecy of the oracle. He laments the heavy blows of fortune and imposes upon himself a personal exile in brooding melancholy, sensing only too clearly that he must collaborate against his will in shaping the destiny that he struggles to avoid. Lefevre dramatizes the impasse with destiny in the form of a series of personal lamentations and even more poignantly through a series of passionate confrontations between Saturn and his wife, who assumes a mother's stand in defense of her children. The dynastic chronicle takes on overtones of a domestic tragedy. As the moment of Jupiter's birth draws nigh, Saturn again commands his wife to destroy the child and send him evidence of the murder, even while he agonizes over the unnaturalness of the deed. Cybele raises her voice in prolonged protest against the heinous crime of infanticide which is contrary to honour, reason, pity, equity, and justice, a sin against nature and an intolerable act by a man who should be the mirror and example of his people. Saturn's determination to have his children slain results in a contest between paternal cruelty and maternal pity. Cybele's determination to spare the child, the laughing Jupiter who mocks the knife which the womenfolk hold against his throat, was an equally powerful force; for from it arise the conditions that lead to trickery, the birth legend of Jupiter (which Lefevre makes a long detour to amplify in the same narrative manner), and the eventual war between father and son that replaces the Titanomachy of Greek myth.<sup>12</sup> By repressing the recondite and supernatural through the cultivation of the workaday realism of Burgundian romance conventions, and by investing his characters with feelings and temperaments revealed through dialogue and monologue, Lefevre was clearly in possession of the right formula for reconstituting the legends of the pagan gods in a way that would make them palatable and attractive to the readers of town and court in Artois, Picardy, Dijon, and Bruges.

We cannot protest that his adaptation of the mythic materials represents a further corruption of a primitive mythological core, and certainly not in terms of the presentation of those materials in contemporary sources. The

euhermerizing process had, in ancient times, already obscured the origins in cult and religious belief, and those who followed could only look to the diverse literary traditions with a scholar's eye and attempt to collect them, or set about to recreate a selection of those materials in the image of another age. As a storyteller, Lefevre moved in the only direction open to a late mediaeval writer, namely, to recast his materials in a contemporary form and setting through the application of contemporary literary techniques. In the process of that transformation, Lefevre sheds the accumulated layers of allegorical interpretation and didactic gloss. That, in itself, is a kind of return. With the removal of that moralizing crust, he might have been tempted to restructure the rise and fall of Saturn as a political exemplum, replete with warnings against irrational and tyrannous kings and promises of divine retributive justice. But the striking feature about Lefevre's historized myth is that he avoids the ready-made formulae for shaping history into a lesson for magistrates about the wheel of fortune in the *de casibus* tradition. This is not to say that the work lacks meaning or intimations of theme, but these he allows to emerge by implication through the strength of the characterizations and the situational irony. Thus while it was the instincts of the historian that rescued the myth of Saturn from the confusions of the humanist compilers, it was the intuition of the *romancier* and tragedian that rescued that history from the didacticism of the moralist tradition.

What Lefevre undoubtedly began as a genealogical preamble took him over one hundred quarto pages to complete, with the concluding episodes of the exiled Saturn's voyage to Troy and his pursuit by Jupiter spilling over into the following sections. Lefevre had clearly found something in the matter of Saturn that sustained his interest beyond the simple chronicling of events. To be sure, it required some effort to work up to a degree of historical verisimilitude the series of events built around the broken oath, the fatal prophecy, and the war of the gods now made men that brings the various motifs of the plot to resolution. But more than this, Lefevre became interested in dramatizing the personality of a protagonist driven by his melancholy temperament. With each adversity, Saturn is revealed as a man sinking more deeply into brooding and despair. Astutely, Lefevre avoids letting him lapse into total madness, but he allows the series of bitter personal defeats to lead to the shaking and gradual disintegration of a great spirit.

With the eventual defeat of Titan through the might of Jupiter and his allies, the narrative comes to a moment of repose. Jupiter marries his sister



Juno amidst great rejoicing, and all the land is at peace. Lefevre emphasizes the irony that Saturn could have ended his days in such tranquillity, had not the old fears of the usurpation of his throne suddenly returned to darken his mind yet again. The oracle is now completely internalized as a paranoid fixation, devoid of all provocation; it is the cause that drives him to war with his son. That was Lefevre's own inspired interpretation of the events, to which he adds a dimension of jealous hatred as the aging king looks upon the youth heaped with favour and honour as the tormented Saul looked upon the giant-slaying David. What follows is the agonizing drama of an innocent and noble son besieged in war by a half-crazed father whose every move confirms his unfitness to rule in the eyes of his advisors and soldiers. The more he attempted to force their collaboration in a cause they deemed unjust, the more the people resisted his tyranny and longed for the change of power he was so intent upon avoiding. Lefevre underscores the tragic irony in relating the inevitability of events to the demon of Saturn's own melancholy insecurity. Some of his men defected to other lands; others fought half-heartedly and died in vain. The drama of rhetorical confrontation poignantly returns, this time as father and son meet on the battlefield, as Jupiter exercises all his forensic powers to dissuade his father and as the irrational old man turns a deaf ear. The ensuing battle is long and bloody; in the end "the dede bodyes laye oon vpon an other beheded and smyten in pecys." Saturn is driven into exile with a remnant of his men, lamented at home at the same time that Jupiter is crowned in his place amidst general acclaim.

In this sequence of events, Lefevre allows his amplification of word and event to generate a necessary action, but he shapes that history according to a tragic vision, not of the fall of an overreacher but of a stubborn and tortured mind whose inclinations to melancholy suffering tend to exacerbate the circumstances that cause his grief. Saturn becomes a study in the political incapacitation and the mental disintegration of a once protean personality. Lefevre makes clear that melancholy in relation to events is a two-way avenue insofar as the man who is melancholy because he perceives himself as fortune's foe is simultaneously inclined to contribute to the adversities attributed to fortune. This was no by-product of an accidental arrangement of events. From myth to historical narrative, guided by the conventions of romance realism, Lefevre discovers the substance of a tragedy of character. Trusting to the events and characters themselves to yield up their meanings, he nevertheless arranges them in a way that enhances the ironies of situation, including that of a melancholy ruler whose

misery coincides with the golden age of peace and prosperity. Lefevre could never ultimately reconcile these conflicting elements, but he could juxtapose them through a relation of irony so that even the contradictions of the mythological tradition find a place together in his literary vision.

The success of that vision is not easy to demonstrate today. In all likelihood we must accept that Lefevre's achievement was rather more for an age than for all time. He was a writer for the Burgundian court, and in that role catered to their tastes for elaborate feudal histories, epic wars, and long rhetorical confrontations. But a timely application of his skills, together with the powers of the printing press raised Lefevre to popularity throughout the Renaissance. It was that power of the press that carried his work from the court to the city and, undoubtedly, it is the record of those early editions that will remain the strongest testimony we have today that Lefevre's formula for the handling of the matter of Saturn and of Troy was perfectly adjusted to the tastes of his age. No less than twelve manuscripts survive, and there is clear record that between the first edition, published by Caxton and Mansion in Bruges in 1469, and the last French edition in 1544 there appeared some twelve editions of the *Recueil des Troyennes Yistoires*.<sup>13</sup>

The importance of the work in the English-speaking world is even greater, since William Caxton, under commission by the Duchess Margaret of Burgundy, set about to translate the work into English. His version was completed on December 19, 1471, and by 1474 the work had passed through his press in Bruges, making it the first printed book in English.<sup>14</sup> It was to be many years before the *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye* would fall from popularity in England. Wynkyn de Worde reissued it in 1503, and it reappeared ten times thereafter down to 1684. The editions of 1596, 1607, and 1617 are assurances that it was in demand during one of the most accomplished periods in English literature. Given this evidence of wide popularity and circulation, it would seem prudent to assume that while the myth of Saturn was variously fragmented and redeployed by court poets in celebrating their patrons through flattering associations with the golden age of Saturn and the return of Astraea,<sup>15</sup> by neoplatonic philosophers as the basis for a doctrine of poetic fury and intellectual inspiration, or by astrologers and physicians as the basis for a codification of the melancholy temperament that, in fact, for the common reader, the central mythological tradition of an historical Saturn as a god-man ruler at the beginning of time still held.

At the least, through the widely disseminated mediaevalized version of

Lefevre and Caxton, the patrons of the book industry remained familiar with a Saturn whose dynastic struggles belonged remotely to the story of Troy; they knew him as a ruler whose power was circumscribed by the destiny of a fatal oath to a brother and a foreboding warning by Apollo; and they knew him as a melancholy protagonist who would bring on his own demise through his irrational attack upon Jupiter. For the common reader in the northern Renaissance, Saturn had been rescued from the obscurity of the encyclopaedists and mediaeval mythographers by a recasting of his myth according to the conventions of Burgundian historical romance.

Carleton University

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> For a study of the earliest religious significance of Kronos see W.K.C. Guthrie, *The Greeks and Their Gods* (Boston 1950; 1961) 53: "The scanty remains of actual cult of Kronos which have lingered on into historical times . . . suggest that he had been a god of the harvest." The Titanomachy that brings his reign to an end is, possibly, a symbolic representation of natural forces in conflict, of storm and darkness against light. It may also reflect the defeat of the fertility religions by the war and sky gods of the invading Greeks. There are, nevertheless, traces of a dance cult in the name of Zeus, son of Kronos, showing signs of an amalgamation of the resident with the invading gods in a family structure, advanced in explanation of established rites. See also Mircea Eliade, *A History of Religious Ideas*, Vol. I: *From the Stone Age to the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Chicago 1978) 248 ff. He provides a concise account of the various levels, traditions and early transformations of the myth.

<sup>2</sup> *The Survival of the Pagan Gods: The Mythological Tradition and its Place in Renaissance Humanism and Art* (New York 1961), published first in French in 1940; *Saturn and Melancholy: Studies in the History of Natural Philosophy, Religion and Art* by Raymond Klibansky, Erwin Panofsky, and Fritz Saxl (London 1964).

<sup>3</sup> *Saturn and Melancholy* (at n. 2) 134-35.

<sup>4</sup> *Survival of the Pagan Gods* (at n. 2) 220.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 223.

<sup>6</sup> I have consulted Boccaccio in the facsimile of the French translation, *De la généalogie des dieux* (Paris 1531; New York and London: Garland, 1976), fols. cxxxvi<sup>r</sup>-cxxxviii<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> *Saturn and Melancholy* (at n. 2) 175.

<sup>8</sup> In the Dedication to Ercole d'Este and throughout the work Giraldi makes references to the failures of his predecessors, and to Boccaccio's in particular. *De deis gentium libri sive syntagmata XVII* (Lugduni 1565).

<sup>9</sup> For further information on Raoul Lefevre and the authorship question of *Le Recueil des Troyennes Ystoires*, see the introduction by H. Oskar Sommer to the typographical reproduction of the first edition of *The Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*, trans. William Caxton (Bruges ca. 1474; London 1894) xlvi-lxxi. Hardly anything is known of his life.

"According to the majority of MSS. of 'Le Recueil,' the printed editions, and the English translations, he was a priest and chaplain of the Duke Philip the Good of Burgundy, and compiled as such, at the command of his lord and master, the trilogy of Troye" (p. lxxi). All textual quotations are from this edition.

<sup>10</sup> *Anatomy of Criticism* (New York 1967) 136-37.

<sup>11</sup> For two such studies see Charles Muscatine, *Chaucer and the French Tradition* (Berkeley 1964), esp. "Realism and Romance," pp. 41 f. and "The Realistic Style of the Bourgeois Tradition," pp. 59 f.; John Stevens, *Medieval Romance: Themes and Approaches* (New York 1974).

<sup>12</sup> The birth of Zeus or Jupiter has all the characteristics of a birth of the hero narrative. Otto Rank, *The Myth of the Birth of the Hero* (New York 1952) 61, offers a generic profile of the phenomenon. The child has distinguished parents. Often there is a prophecy "cautioning against his birth, and usually threatening danger to the father. . . ." He is saved by animals or people of low station, grows to power and rediscovers his parents in some dramatic fashion. "He takes revenge on his father, on the one hand, and is acknowledged, on the other." At last he comes to power and honours. Saturn's role is, to a degree, to serve as progenitor and victim of the heroic son. Lefevre, in effect, structurally and causally integrates the two stories, and at the same time offers an interpretation which is the by-product of his elaboration upon both characterological and narrative content.

<sup>13</sup> For a summary of the French editions see Brian Woledge, *Bibliographie des Romans et Nouvelles en Prose Française antérieurs à 1500*, *Société de Publications Romanes et Françaises* 42 (Genève 1954) 129-30.

<sup>14</sup> For a summary of the English editions see the Introduction by H.O. Sommer, *Receuyell of the Historyes of Troye* (at n. 9) lxxxii-cxix.

<sup>15</sup> Among the standard works on the adaptation of the Saturn myth to Renaissance court poetry are Harry Levin, *The Myth of the Golden Age in the Renaissance* (New York 1969); Zoé Samaras, *Le Règne de Cronos dans la littérature française du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris 1983); Frances A. Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London and Boston 1975).