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General Introduction

Argument

The story of Troilus and Criseyde constitutes a metanarrative. This thesis is concerned with versions of the story written by Geoffrey Chaucer, Robert Henryson, and William Shakespeare.¹ I argue that in these three tellings, characters in the texts are aware of the metanarrative. My aim is to show how the authors demonstrate this awareness in their characters, and how the metanarrative is represented and re-embodied, in Troilus and Criseyde, and in the tokens they use.

When the three texts are considered together thematically, patterns emerge showing commonalities and influences among them. Criseyde, who initially appears stable, reveals her instability through a series of transitions. I identify three locations in which these transitions take place, and these provide the structure of my thesis. Location is partly significant in the metanarrative because Troy is the site of a battle. The love story occurs during a truce: the ground is figuratively shifting between the Trojans and Greeks but briefly appears stable. Criseyde and the city of Troy are both revealed to be unstable, and they both literally and figuratively lose ground in a way that makes their pairing significant.

The first chapter, ‘In Troy,’ addresses ways in which Troilus and Criseyde establish what they know and what they wilfully ignore about themselves, with reference to the state of being in Troy. I examine implications of the concept of being in Troy when Troy is part of a

metanarrative that constantly retells its fall. I detail how characters’ knowledge of the metanarrative relates to this precarious location. I examine: how Chaucer’s Troilus and Criseyde use courtly love tokens; how Shakespeare’s Troilus and Cressida use vows; how Henryson’s Cresseid, outside Troy, remembers herself when she belonged in Troy.

The second chapter, ‘Going from Troy,’ addresses a series of symbolic changes that take place when Criseyde is going from Troy, in exchange for the return of a hostage. I consider how characters in the texts identify aspects of their knowledge of the metanarrative while Criseyde and Troilus are negotiating space on the threshold of Troy. I examine: how Criseyde grieves, compared with how Cressida says she will grieve; motifs of exchange, their location and timing; how Cresseid undergoes a dual transition, from Troy and the Greek camp. I consider the implications of Criseyde going from Troy while Troilus stays.

The third chapter, ‘Beyond Troy,’ addresses what it means to be absent from Troy, not just to Criseyde but to Troilus. I examine: ways in which letters and rhetoric represent the bodies of Criseyde, Cresseid, and Cressida in their absence and demonstrate their betrayal; ways in which memorable ideas of Criseyde are formed in Troilus’s heart and mind, and how ‘fantasie’ contributes to his illusion that Troy is a place of truth and reliability; ways in which tokens Criseyde, Cresseid, Cressida, and Troilus use outside Troy demonstrate the breaking of Troilus’s illusion. I consider how this use reflects the fuller meaning tokens and rhetoric gain from the metanarrative, and ways in which Troilus, too, is relocated beyond Troy.

Comparing these texts, it seems to me, a pattern of location, transition, and relocation emerges. In each text, Criseyde has been in Troy, has been exchanged, and now operates outside Troy, looking back at who she was in relation to Troy and Troilus. Courtly love tokens undergo similar transitions, and are, I suggest, profoundly connected with location and circulation. The repeated use of tokens and the repeated location and relocation of both Troilus and Criseyde throughout the metanarrative contributes to the layered effect tokens
and rhetoric acquire in each new telling of the story. Motifs and rhetoric linking the three texts show the transactional value of Criseyde and Troilus.

**Plot**

The story of Troilus and Criseyde\(^2\) first occurs in the *Roman de Troie* by Benoît de Sainte-Maure.\(^3\) Troilus is the younger brother of Paris, and Criseyde is the daughter of the Trojan priest Calchas. Troy is razed and looted, then rebuilt, but Cassandra prophesies that it will fall. Calchas betrays the Trojans and allies himself with the Greeks, leaving Criseyde behind in Troy.

Chaucer’s story begins at this point.\(^4\) Chaucer’s Criseyde is a widow, apparently without children and possibly a vowess (I 97–98, I 132–33, I 169–75). Troilus falls in love with Criseyde when he sees her at the temple (I 267–308, I 325). Pandarus instructs Troilus in the art of writing love letters (I 1142–63, II 1051–92), buttonholes Criseyde at her house (II 1093–1119), and forces her to take Troilus’s letter (II 1142–63). She is inveigled by Pandarus into accepting Troilus as her lover (II 1202–32), and they are lovers for a time (III 1205–1365, III 1714–92), exchanging love tokens (III 1366–72).

Antenor, the soldier, is taken captive by the Greeks (IV 50). Calchas, who abruptly wants his daughter back (IV 64–110), suggests the Greek soldiers return Antenor in exchange

---

\(^2\) Criseyde’s name has many variant forms and spellings. For ease of reference, I refer to the general character as ‘the Criseyde figure’: she is Criseyde in Chaucer, Cresseid in Henryson, and Cressida in Shakespeare and I use these names, specifying the author’s name in cases of ambiguity.

\(^3\) Benoît, *Roman de Troie*. The text dates to the late twelfth century (Benoît, volume 6, 1). Criseyde is called Briseïda in this first story. See Mieszkowski, “Reputation of Criseyde,” for a detailed account of Chaucer’s sources and its connections with Henryson and Shakespeare among others, and C. David Benson, “True Troilus and False Cresseid,” for a useful account of who wrote the story after Chaucer and the kinds of treatment it received. Mieszkowski notes that the foreshadowing of Briseïda’s inconstancy goes right back to Benoît (“R. K. Gordon,” 131–32). The narrator moralises on women’s inconstancy just before Briseïda meets Diomedès, which makes what follows heavily ironical” (132).

\(^4\) *Troilus and Cresside* dates to sometime before 1388, probably the early 1380s (Larry Benson, *Riverside Chaucer*, 471).
for Criseyde (IV 131–38). Troilus, distraught (IV 219–52), wants to elope with Criseyde (IV 1506–25), but she persuades him she will be able to return from the Greek camp by promising her father she can get hold of his precious belongings, which are still in Troy (IV 1365–1400). She promises Troilus she will return in ten days’ time (IV 1590–96).

Troilus takes Criseyde to meet Diomed,⁵ a Greek soldier charged with returning her to the Greek camp. Diomede perceives Criseyde has left someone behind in Troy (V 92–175, V 778–79), but offers her his protection, which she initially refuses (V 176, V 181–89). The narrator foretells that Troy and Troilus will shortly pass from Criseyde’s heart (V 27–28, V 765–70). Troilus waits, and the allotted ten days pass (V 451–686). However, by this time Criseyde has switched her allegiance to Diomede (V 1023–36), in the process giving him some tokens Troilus gave her, and a new token of her own (V 1037–50). Criseyde meanwhile writes a series of letters to Troilus and, ultimately, one final letter whose rhetoric he finds strange, and which shows she has changed (V 1583–1636). When the Trojan soldiers capture an item of Diomede’s clothing on the battlefield and parade it through Troy (V 1649–55), Troilus recognises with horror his own brooch pinned inside its collar, and he realises Criseyde has given it away (V 1655–96). We do not learn from Chaucer’s narrator what happens to Criseyde, apart from her final stated intention to be true to Diomede (V 1058–71). Troilus dies in battle. In spirit, he rises up above it all and laughs at the folly of the world (V 1806–22).

Henryson takes up the story after Criseyde sends the strange final letter to Troilus and before Troilus dies.⁶ Cresseid is ‘excludit,’ thrown out of the Greek settlement, by Diomede, ⁵ V 15–91. Diomede in Chaucer, Diomeid in Henryson, Diomed in Shakespeare.

⁶ The Testament of Cresseid first appears in print in 1593 (Fox, Poems of Robert Henryson, xciv). In a sense one could argue that Henryson reiterates the ending of the final letter motif, when he has Cresseid, who is herself so strange that Troilus does not recognise her, send him a last, testamentary letter and spoken testimonial about her altered circumstances. The ‘kalendes of chaunge’ (V 1634) Chaucer’s Troilus perceives Criseyde’s letter to be is Cresseid herself.
because he has grown tired of her. He sends her a ‘lybell of repudie’ (74), which I think we can imagine as something like a protection notice or divorce papers, an official document that calls her name into disrepute and forbids her to come anywhere near him. Desolate, she wanders, rumour has it in the ‘commoun’ ground of the court. People talk about her (77).

Cresseid joins her father at his temple (92–98), which has a chamber next to it (106–9), and an oratory to one side (120). He seems to live here, a mile or two out of town.

Cresseid, joyless and miserable, prays in private (111–12). On a feast day, she goes to the oratory so no one will suspect she has been expelled by Diomeid (116–23). There she cries out against the gods, Cupid and Venus, blaming them for breaking their word to her, because they had promised her she would be ‘flour of luif in Troy’ (127–40). Cresseid falls into some sort of swoon or dream state and witnesses an assembly of the planetary gods (141–47), who accuse her of blasphemy (274). Cynthia and Saturn declare her sentence: she will be made ‘abominabill’ to all lovers (302–8). Cynthia, who is holding a ‘bill’ (332), reads the sentence over Cresseid’s body, ‘on Cresseid quhair scho lay’ (332): she is to contract leprosy (334–43). When Cresseid wakes, she looks in the mirror, and sees she does indeed have leprosy (345–50). She and Calchas mourn for a time (379), and at her request, he conveys her in disguise by night to the leper house, outside town (380–92), where she attempts to keep to herself (404–6), speaking a formal Complaint (407–69). A leper lady counsels her to make a virtue of necessity (474–80), and ultimately, she joins the lepers in wandering, and hunger and cold compel her to beg with them (481–83).

---

7 71–75. Cressida is also excluded from society. Hodgdon identifies that the handing of the sleeve, her pledge, from Troilus to Diomede through her ‘functions as an emblem of her exclusion from a system which reduces her worth to that of an object within male exchange’ (“He Do Cressida,” 275). I identify exclusion as a key trope in all three texts in connection with use of tokens and the exchange of the Criseyde figure, and her relative value as a commodity.

8 76–77. I don’t think this means she becomes a prostitute so much as that she walks around in a place where she might be for hire or her reputation is prostituted: it becomes possible for people to gossip about her because she is no longer protected by her courtly reputation, either as Troilus’s consort or as Dioméde’s companion.
Troilus returns home victorious from battle with his company of soldiers (484–89). They pass through the marketplace area where Cresseid and the other lepers are begging (489–96), and although he does not recognise Cresseid directly, in some way she reminds him of his former lady, the Criseyde we are familiar with from Chaucer (498–518). He gives her alms out of ‘pietie’ in memory of Criseyde (519–22), and rides away immediately, greatly distressed (523–25). When Cresseid is given to understand who her benefactor was, she undergoes a terrible ‘stound,’ a kind of stunned state or attack (537–39). When she wakes, she accuses herself repeatedly of infidelity (540–74), making her final confession in the process. She makes a testament on paper, bequeathing the items she has left and mourning the loss of tokens she can no longer return to Troilus (575–91), and sends a leper with a ring to act as messenger and carry news of her death to him (592–95). Troilus, devastated, hears the news in Troy (596–602). He allegedly sets up a headstone at Cresseid’s grave (603), with a sombre epitaph warning ladies that Cresseid who was once lady of Troy lies there, a ‘lait lipper’ (604–9).

Shakespeare tells the story of Troilus and Cressida from the point when they are falling in love, until Cressida is exchanged for Antenor and betrays Troilus, and Troilus goes to war with Diomed.9 Troilus, in love with Cressida, accuses Pandarus of pouring the idea of her into the ‘open ulcer’ of his heart.10 He is wounded by the idea of Cressida. Pandarus tries to whet Cressida’s interest in Troilus (1.2.35–155, 1.2.208–259), and although she is non-committal (1.2.157–62, 1.2.240–59), she admits in a soliloquy that she already loves him (1.2.260–73). She fears love (3.2.64), and, more specifically, she fears being seen to love and heard confessing her love (3.2.38–90). Troilus reassures Cressida that the monstrosity in love

---

9 *Troilus and Cressida* dates to 1601–1602 (Cohen, in Greenblatt et al., *Norton Shakespeare*, 1823).
10 1.1.28–60. Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 36–37, 39: the attributes added symbolically to Troilus’s heart are ‘Petrarchan.’
is desire that exceeds people’s capacity to perform it. There is nothing else to fear.\(^{11}\) The lovers eventually admit their feelings to one another (3.2.91, 3.2.102–183), and Pandarus acts as a witness to their vows (3.2.158–83, 3.2.184–85).

Troilus and Cressida spend the night together (3.2.190–95, 4.2.1–20), and the next morning, news comes that Cressida is to be ‘changed’ for Antenor.\(^{12}\) Cressida declares she will not go (4.3.19–34), but is forced to. She and Troilus promise to be true to one another (4.5.23–108), and they exchange tokens, Troilus’s sleeve for Cressida’s glove.\(^{13}\) She is taken to the Greek camp (4.5.109–39), where she undergoes a controversial and abrupt change of behaviour.\(^{14}\) She kisses the Greek soldiers (4.6.20–34) except for Menelaus (4.6.36–45) and Ulysses (4.6.48–53), and Ulysses derides her for having body language that marks her out as a ‘Cressid,’ a prostitute (4.6.55–64).

When Troilus arrives as a messenger to the Greek camp (4.7.38–59), he asks to be directed to Cressida’s tent (4.7.161–77, 5.1.77–78). He, Ulysses, and Thersites witness her using the ‘pledge,’ which is the sleeve Troilus gave her, to tease Diomed and make plans to meet him later in his tent (5.2.1–106). She regrets the loss of her pledge (5.2.79–93), and in a soliloquy regrets women’s ‘error’ (5.2.107–12), before leaving the stage. Troilus is amazed in the fullest sense of the word (5.2.115–35), and the Greeks rebuke him for his reaction (5.2.136, 5.2.161–62, 5.2.180–81). He cannot bring himself to believe this is Cressida who has just betrayed him (5.2.61–63, 5.2.124–160). He vows to avenge himself on Diomed on the battlefield by writing red letters on Diomed’s body, that is, in blood with his sword.

\(^{11}\) 3.2.64–77. Infidelity is represented as monstrous. I think this is seen in Cresseid as a leper, foreshadowed, paradoxically after the fact, by the rhetoric Shakespeare’s Troilus uses about Cressida’s body language when he sees her betray him, and by Cressida’s fear of monsters. For the meaning of monstrosity and ‘monstruousness’ in Troilus and Cressida, see: Charnes, “So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 141–15, 142 fn 12; Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 35–36, 52.

\(^{12}\) 4.2.46–70. Mead, on the timing of this exchange in the context of mercantilist theory: ‘[o]nce Cressida is “known,” she is a calculable quality, assigned a concrete equivalent in quantity. She is bullion minted and ready for circulation, and it is no coincidence that her exchange is effected the morning after’ (“Thou Art Chang’d,” 253).

\(^{13}\) 4.5.69–70. Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 116, 126.

\(^{14}\) 4.6.18–64. Mieszkowski, “Reputation of Criseyde,” 81–84, 93.
(5.2.163–76). When a letter from Cressida arrives for Troilus (5.4.102), he reads it silently, tears it, and throws the fragments on the stage, addressing the letter as if it is Cressida and telling her to ‘[t]urn, wind, to wind.’

We do not see Cressida again, but we see Troilus as he goes on fighting. He returns finally to the stage to announce that Hector is dead and there is no more to say.

**Texts**

I refer to the *Riverside Chaucer*, to Denton Fox’s edition of *The Poems of Robert Henryson*, and to the *Norton Shakespeare*. Largely this is a matter of familiarity and personal preference. All these editions seem to be well received overall.

Chaucer and Henryson were published together in several editions. Walter Cohen is quite clear that Shakespeare ‘almost certainly’ had access to Chaucer and quite possibly had access to Henryson among his sources. It seems reasonable to speculate that Shakespeare would have been very likely to have had access to one of the editions of Chaucer, all of which contain the *Testament* in a way that separates it from but relates it to Chaucer, perhaps

---

16 5.11.3–22. Bradbrook points out that Shakespeare ‘borrows Chaucer’s… Namore to seye’ (“What Shakespeare Did,” 319). The context is that this is Troilus’s last speech, which expresses a death wish for Criseyde: ‘[may God soon deliver her from this world,] I kan namore seye’ (V 1743). I suggest Henryson’s Troilus gets in the same last word as Chaucer’s Troilus when he discovers Cresseid has in fact died: ‘I can no moir’ (600), with the alleged addition of the epitaph for emphasis. I think Shakespeare repeats at least one of these instances of the last word, and I suspect he echoes both Chaucer and Henryson in this.
17 For reviews of *Riverside Chaucer*, see: Brosnahan; McGerr; Windeatt, *Troilus and Criseyde*, 2. For reviews of Fox’s *Poems of Robert Henryson*, see: Ridley; Samson. For reviews of *Norton Shakespeare*, see: Foakes; Rozett; Werstine.
18 Windeatt, *Troilus and Criseyde*, 369: Thynne 1532; Speght 1598, reprinted 1602. Henryson’s *Testament of Cresseid* was ‘reprinted in all editions of Chaucer down to Urry’s’ in 1721.
19 Cohen, in his introductory essay on *Troilus and Cressida*, notes that the ‘early publishing history of the play contributes to [its] unsettled revisionism’ (Greenblatt et al., *Norton Shakespeare*, 1825). He notes differences in genre between the First Quarto of 1609 and the Folio edition of 1623 (Greenblatt et al., 1825. See also Textual Note 1832–33). Cohen lists Homer through Chapman ‘and perhaps through earlier English and French translations’; ‘almost certainly’ Chaucer; he was ‘also indebted’ to Caxton’s *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye* (c.1474); ‘a range of other texts’ including Virgil, Ovid, ‘perhaps’ Euripides, Lydgate and Henryson, and Renaissance sources. In this final category, Cohen suggests Robert Greene’s *Euphues His Censure* and the missing *Troyelles & cresseda* of Dekker and Chettle (Greenblatt et al., 1825).
even more so than other popular forms of the story, given the number of editions in circulation. A couple of years previously, Thomas Dekker and Henry Chettle had written a play which showed, according to the surviving playbook, that Cressida ‘[entered] with beggars.’ As far as I know, the death of the Criseyde figure in penury is Henryson’s invention, and this ending was clearly well known at the time when Shakespeare was writing his play. I argue that certain themes and images key to Shakespeare’s treatment are inspired by aspects of Chaucer and Henryson.

With regard to analysing two poems and a play, the story of Troilus and Criseyde has always lent itself to a mixture of genres and presentational styles, both written and performed on stage. It has elements of romance, history, tragedy, and exemplum. Gretchen Mieszkowski points out that at one point it was even told as a French four-day mystery play. All three texts deal with representations of a Criseyde with a token value: her body, her words, and her movements speak for her and underline the unreliability of what she is reported to say. In a sense, all three texts put an ostensibly private, courtly character on display in public, out of her home town, and out of her comfort zone. They all have elements of a performance and of public humiliation. They are all concerned with ‘personation.’

---

20 Fox, Poems of Robert Henryson, xcvii. Fox lists the editions after Thynne’s first edition of 1532 as: Thynne 1542; Thynne 3rd edition 1545–50; Stow 1561; a new edition ‘partly edited’ by Speght 1598; Speght 1602. Crocker also addresses this grouping of Troilus and Criseyde texts in her analysis of Criseyde and ‘virtue trouble’ (“As False as Cressid,” 2013). She sees a continuity between them, and argues that ‘Shakespeare continues an important late medieval poetic tradition, which highlights the problematic consequences of virtue’s performativity for idealized women in premodern England’ (303).

21 Lost Plays Database, Section 1.2: ‘Plot (Henslowe Papers).’ http://lostplays.org/index.php/Troilus_and_Cressida. A lost version of the play by Henry Chettle and Thomas Dekker, Troilus and Cressida, dated 1599, roughly contemporary with Shakespeare’s, gives a stage direction: ‘Enter Cressida with beggars.’ Thanks to Professor Roslyn L. Knutson for directing me to this information.


23 Mieszkowski refers to Jacques Millet’s play (1450), based on Guido delle Colonne’s Historia Destructionis Troiae (“Reputation of Cresside,” 111–12).

24 Syme, Theatre and Testimony, e.g. 1, 2–4, 5: these ‘transactions’ were ‘based on scripts whose authority was in a … sense absolute: they relied on the physical actions of bodies that were recognizably not the sovereign’s own, but fantastically took on her person for the duration of the act … they rendered an absent voice present and imaginatively audible’; 6: the bodies and voices of stand-ins for royal authority ‘played a crucial part’ in having the queen establish a ‘palpable presence’; ‘[authority, in early modern representation, was … always located elsewhere’; 31, 33, 65, 67, 105, 115, 119, 158, 160, 161–64.
Jonathan Gil Harris and Stephen Mead argue for mercantilist interpretations of Renaissance plays, concerns which, I argue, tie in neatly with themes and images found in all three of these texts. For all these reasons, it makes sense to combine the texts, which together create a very telling picture of the metanarrative, and ways in which multiple tellings affect both Troilus and Criseyde, as characters who are constantly reassembled and reconfigured.

Note

In the course of researching Troilus and Criseyde, I have discovered relevant parallels in texts such as Wolfram von Eschenbach’s Parzival. I identify some areas of potential future research in footnotes in the course of the thesis. I am very uncomfortable with what he writes about race, skin colour, value, and truth, and I find his text difficult to address because it is highly offensive. Particularly because I am not a Person of Colour, and because I approach this and other problematic texts from a position of privilege and unconscious bias, I am reluctant to report these findings. My intention in mentioning Parzival in this thesis is to indicate that there is possible, potentially valuable research that could be done in the field of colour symbolism of light and dark, Christianity and other religions, courtly and strange, relative to ‘trouthe,’ human value, tokens, and I suggest commodity value. The challenge is to do so without appearing to implicitly validate the ideas of problematic texts. There seems to me to be a very fine line between holding a mirror up to offensive aspects of a text and giving those ideas a platform.

Definitions

‘Trouthe’

‘Trouthe’ has multiple meanings in Middle English. Richard Firth Green divides the *Middle English Dictionary* definitions of ‘trouthe’ into four categories: legal, ethical, theological, and intellectual.\(^{26}\) Essentially, by Green’s definition, I am referring in this thesis to legal and ethical senses of the word, to what we would think of as ‘truth’ and ‘troth.’ Simplifying the multiplicity of meanings and synonyms in the *Middle English Dictionary*, I suggest the following meanings of ‘trouthe’ are relevant: fidelity, loyalty in a relationship; promise, undertaking, pledge, fealty, marriage; honour, integrity; honesty in business; confidence, trust, faith; correspondence to reality, accuracy, exactitude, perceptive wisdom.\(^{27}\) For ease of reference, I use Chaucer’s spelling ‘trouthe’ throughout this thesis, together with the negative ‘untrouthe.’

The basic premise of my definition of ‘trouthe’ in relation to Chaucer, Henryson, and Shakespeare is that it stands for reliability and fidelity. I understand ‘trouthe’ as the concept of a good reputation, and also a characteristic of someone who has integrity and keeps his or her word, in other words, the person who contributes to the reputation. Troilus is true because he keeps his word, because he retains the integrity of his courtly status, and because he is known for his wisdom and incisive judgement.\(^{28}\) I address changes that seem to take place in his own sense of the integrity of his judgement in Shakespeare.

---

\(^{26}\) Green, *Crisis of Truth*, 9.

\(^{27}\) *MED*, s.v. ‘treuth,’ n., 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 10.

\(^{28}\) Cresseid refers to Troilus repeatedly as ‘trew knicht Troilus’ (546, 553, 560). His ‘trouthe’ is bound up with his being a nobleman. Part of this noble status is his power of discernment.
In Chaucer, ‘trouthe’ is often paired with ‘routhe’ in the form of end-rhymes.29 ‘Routhe,’ which we could equate more or less with ‘ruth’ in modern English, stands for a particular kind of compassion or ‘pite,’ pity.30 Owen Boynton argues that ‘[i]n the ‘feudal society of Troy,’ ‘trouthe’ is an ‘unspoken, assumed rule.’ The secrecy of Troilus and Criseyde’s affair means there is ‘little fear of shame, if trouthe is breached … To counter this risk, routhe becomes a cornerstone of a code of values for private interactions. It ensures that commitments, promises, and vows are respected should the code of trouthe not do so, supplementing and complementing its value-system.’ 31 Owen Boynton identifies ‘trouthe’ with ‘bonds of public trust’ and ‘routhe’ with ‘bonds of private feeling,’ which hold the bonds of ‘trouthe’ in place.32 The ways in which Criseyde uses objects that signify ‘trouthe’ show how they are degraded. Her own ‘trouthe’ is degraded in the process of exchanging tokens in bad faith, and her use of them reveals her pre-existing reputation for ‘untrouthe.’33

Questions of ‘trouthe’ in this thesis will lead to questions of value in Shakespeare, as the courtly love trope of ‘trouthe’ accompanied by ‘fredome,’ that is, courtly generosity, and love tokens becomes a kind of commercial exploration of commodity value and exchange in the spaces beyond Troy.34

---

29 Murray, “Value of ‘Eschaunge,’” 335: ‘To search for stable value in the poem is to acknowledge that “trouthe” is almost always rhymed with “routhe.”’ I note that this rhyme is found also in Middle High German literature in the forms ‘triuwe’ and ‘riuwe.’ It occurs at crucial points, for instance in the end-rhymes at the moment in Gottfried von Straßburg’s Tristan when Brangäne realises she has left the love potion out, and Tristan and Isolt have drunk it (von Straßburg, Tristan, 11702–5). It also occurs in Hartmann von Ouwe’s poem, Der arme Heinrich, which addresses a nobleman’s pious reaction to contracting leprosy and his crucial ‘triuwe’ and his ‘riuwe,’ which prevents him from allowing his fiancée to be sacrificed to save his life (e.g. von Ouwe, Heinrich, 1001–2), because she displays such ‘triuwe’ to him and Christ (942–43, 1001, 1356, 1366). Christ’s response to the ‘riuwe’ and ‘triuwe’ together is to heal Heinrich of his leprosy (1365–70). I am sure there are other examples in Middle High German literature, and this would be a potential area of future research. I also note that Boccaccio’s Filostrato contains ‘gioia,’ ‘Troia,’ ‘noia’ rhymes that fulfil much the same purpose as the ‘trouthe’/’routhe’ pairing. ‘Trouthe’ and ‘gioia,’ fidelity, honesty, and joy, are part of being ‘in Troy.’ ‘Routhe’ and ‘noia,’ distress and vexation, are part of being separated from the state of being ‘in Troy.’ For text, see Griffin and Myrick, Filostrato.

30 Boynton, “Trouthe/Routhe Rhyme,” 224: ‘routhe is related to but distinct from pite’: ‘[l]ike compassion, mercy, and pity, routhe is an attitude towards suffering, but unlike these … routhe may also be the occasion or condition of suffering’ (224).

31 Boynton, 234.

32 Boynton, 234: ‘[r]outhe’ thus ‘insures against possible failings of trouthe”; 235.


Iteration and reiteration

‘Iteration’ can be defined simply, for the purposes of my argument, as a given instance of a story or a particular event or motif from the metanarrative, that takes place in the context of a series of repetitions. The repeated storytelling about Criseyde and Troilus creates a metanarrative.\textsuperscript{35} The stories take part at different points in time on a roughly similar story arc. There is a known endpoint in Henryson,\textsuperscript{36} echoed in Dekker and Chettle,\textsuperscript{37} towards which Shakespeare is heading.\textsuperscript{38} There is a known fate of Criseyde which involves misery and penury, and there is a known sorrow of Troilus, towards which the characters travel repeatedly.\textsuperscript{39}

Reiteration is a process of constantly reinforcing stories about the ‘trouthe’ and ‘untrouthe’ of the characters.\textsuperscript{40} It can be compared usefully with a palimpsest:\textsuperscript{41} layers of the story overwrite or partially obscure other versions, but the other versions remain visible in reiterated characters who follow one another chronologically.\textsuperscript{42} This pre-existing sense of the

\textsuperscript{35} Charnes describes it as a ‘massively overdetermined story’ (“So Unsecret To Ourselves,” 418); Fly, “Cassandra,” 157; Hillman, Shakespeare’s Entrails, 60: ‘Shakespeare … places the relationship between origins and citations at the core of his play … by reintroducing, as it were, the substance or “matter” of the body to the “Matter of Troy”’; the matter being ‘that of the truth of the body, which has been displaced over countless reiterations by something like pure citationality’; Mieszkowski, “Reputation of Criseyde,” 81.

\textsuperscript{36} Johnson, “Whatever Happened to Criseyde?”, 314: Cresseid shows the foreshortened process of the passage of time which makes a lover unlovely. The punishment of Cresseid accelerates her experience and speeds up her ‘temporal span,’ so that she is ‘allowed to speak from the position of old age.’

\textsuperscript{37} Lost Plays Database, Section 1.2, ‘Plot (Henslowe Papers).’

\textsuperscript{38} Fly, “Cassandra,” 157: ‘Shakespeare exploits the overdetermined nature of his characters’ speech to create and sustain a vision of imminent and radical catastrophe.’

\textsuperscript{39} Lenz, “Base Trade,” 852: ‘Troilus and Cressida stands as (perhaps) an unperformed protest on the nature of performance, a sudden and perhaps disoriented awareness of the status of one’s existence, and one’s bitter resignation to that status.’

\textsuperscript{40} Asp, “Transcendence Denied,” 257; Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 48: ‘the force of the speech lies in the knowledge it shares with the audience: that we are seeing etymology staged. Cressida’s voice, like Cassandra’s, seems to come from an impossible place, both inside and outside the play. It is the story of a woman who has read her own story and who recognizes the textuality of her existence: she exists to be the term which puts closure on a literary declension of woman’s falseness’: Rackin, “Temporality,” 109.

\textsuperscript{41} Charnes, “So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 419.

\textsuperscript{42} Harris, Untimely Matter, 13–17. The text beneath the surface text is not necessarily irrelevant. While vellum may have been reused due to scarcity, underlying layers of text remain visible, however faintly. Text could potentially overwrite the vellum in order to cancel out the validity of what has been written before. Traces of previous information contribute to the meaning of the palimpsest as a material object (15). Harris describes a palimpsest as ‘untimely’ (3). I note that characters in the Troilus and Criseyde story are themselves untimely,
characters and the storyline can affect our interpretation, particularly of whether a character is acting with or without ‘trouthe.’

Truth in Shakespeare is ‘tir’d with iteration.’ It is covered up by layer upon layer of storytelling, and it is also worn out. The audience already knows the story before each telling or staging of it starts. The reiteration of the characters and their behaviour, and the sheer popularity of the story in poems and staged performances, transforms the characters into figures of speech. I argue that the narrators of Chaucer and Henryson and the characters who gloss other characters’ body language in Shakespeare foreshadow the action that has in Linda Charnes’s phrase ‘always already’ taken place. As Charnes argues persuasively about Shakespeare, there is a strong sense that Troilus and Cressida know their own reputation and are worn out by it. Cressida knows she is a symbol of falsehood as Troilus knows he is a symbol of truth. In this way I argue that they have a token value. Part of the process by

because they exist as a series of reputations that extend beyond individual texts. Syme’s description of the annotation of witness statements in early modern legal practice also seems an apt analogy (Theatre and Testimony, 78): annotation ‘constituted a process of permutation … depositions were transformed from records of spoken statements into scripts for evidentiary performances. Although the original examination is not erased, the words and symbols added to the document modify the prior inscriptions, altering the … meaning as well as their physical form.’

3.2.164. Greene, “Language and Value,” 274: ‘the casual banter [between Pandarus and Cressida] suggests the difficulty of “speaking truth” when the relation of language to reality and reality itself have been called into question—when truth is “tir’d with iteration.”’

‘tir’d’ relates to the ‘emergence of an increasingly closed image of the human body,’ in which the ‘heroes’ identities have become ever further removed from their material sources: the pun on ‘tir’d’ (attired/tired) implies the increasing distance from the body; as if each retelling has added a layer of covering—a cover story—to the protagonists’ flesh.’ The phrase is Troilus’s description of ‘truth.’ My interpretation is that the ‘truth’ is both clothed in and worn out by repetition.

Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 48: it ‘requires a certain wrenching of our perspective to accommodate Cressida’s speech [on falsehood], which rings oddly in context as the utterance of a woman vowing fidelity to her lover, but fits instead … the pattern of the story as it is already written. Suddenly the moment of theatrical presence … reveals itself scored with the pressure of a narrative tradition in which Cressida’s betrayal is always an accomplished act.’

Charnes, “So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 433.

Charnes, 418: ‘Shakespeare solves his own representational problems … by passing them along to his characters. Rather than trying to make these figures “new” to his audience, Shakespeare’s strategy is to portray their desire, and their inability, to be new even to themselves; to represent their struggle to produce subjective self-representations that can in fact only be realized at the expense of their notorious identities.’ Also Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 48. For an opposing viewpoint, see O’Rourke, “Rule in Unity,” 139–140.
which tokens reveal a lack of ‘trouthe’ in the Troilus and Criseyde story is that tokens themselves are reissued to new recipients and themselves made untimely.48

Tokens

Tokens are objects that memorialise ‘trouthe,’ and tell the story of a reputation. They can be memorial objects such as an epitaph, designed to be read by members of the public. They can be given and witnessed as signs of a business transaction, as mnemonic devices.49 They are signs of a one-off transaction made in a state of ‘trouthe.’50 Someone gives his or her word to be faithful by swearing an oath while giving or receiving a token. The action of swearing and the object itself both signify ‘trouthe.’51 The object used to conduct this kind of transaction represents the word, and the object can be understood to be a kind of word.52 Tokens can be given and witnessed as signs of a marriage.53 They can be given privately from one courtly

48 Harris details a persuasive theory of ‘multitemporality’ and ‘polychronicity’ and argues tokens are multitemporal (Untimely Matter, 3); Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 117: ‘[r]epeated wearing [of removable tokens] acts as an inscription upon the body that can work with or against alternate forms of inscription.’ See also: Bruster, “Dramatic Life of Objects,” 70–72, 76–77, 89; Stallybrass, “Worn Worlds,” 290–91, 294, 305, 308, 312: ‘clothes have a life of their own; they both are material presences and they encode other material and immaterial presences’; 313 on Troilus’s sleeve; 313–314 on the eroticism and ‘hybridization of bodies made possible by the circulation of clothes.’

49 Boose identifies Othello’s handkerchief as a ‘recognizance or recorded evidence of the pledge of love’ (“Othello’s Handkerchief,” 367); Green, Crisis of Truth, 44–50, 59–60. Wingfield examines ways in which Criseyde and Cresseid can be considered as texts, which voice wider concerns about literary interpretation, authority, and poetic truth (“Chaucer’s Troilus and Henryson’s Testament,” 121–22). I agree with her that Cresseid is presented ‘as an object to be read and interpreted’ (138), and that the markings of leprosy are significant. Wingfield suggests we consider ‘Cresseid’s face as a damaged manuscript’ (141). As I argue in chapter two, I think the markings represent the symbolic transfer of the punishment contained in Diomed’s ‘lybe ll of repudie’ (74) and the ‘bill’ of Cynthia (332) to Cresseid’s body. The marks on her skin and in her eyes and the changes in her voice seem to me to make her stand out as a text on public display that announces and underlines its own unreliability.

50 There are two people who make the oath and participate in the symbolic meaning of the token, so Criseyde’s misuse of tokens always points back implicitly and indirectly to Troilus, who uses them properly.

51 Green refers to the ‘thingness’ of trothplighting (Crisis of Truth, 50).

52 Green notes that in fifteenth-century England, ‘documents were sometimes still thought of as somehow symbolizing, rather than merely recording, the legal facts to which they attested’ (275), though this is by no means absolute (e.g. 277).

53 Green, 50–57: trothplighting was not restricted to marriage, but could be applied to any verbal contract in connection with such tokens. The physical token was gradually replaced by the indenture from the twelfth century, and the two systems ‘operated uneasily’ throughout the Middle Ages (154–63, 263).
lover to another. A token is intended to be a visible sign of 'trouthe,' or, as Lynda Boose calls the handkerchief in *Othello*, 'ocular proof … of fidelity.' Letters can also be a kind of token. They display 'trouthe' and 'routhe' in complicated relationships to one another.

Tokens have a bodied quality. Jewellery and clothing can be understood to have a particular textual meaning. They are inscribed with intense, multisensory value, retaining an impression of having been close to the owner. Social value and status are legible from clothing, and in this way clothing contains the value of a kind of text. Tokens such as gloves, considered as part of the body, can be fetishised. To Boose, '[t]he idea of “token” seems always to have carried overtones for Shakespeare of representative sexual exchange,' which makes sense to me in the way sleeves and jewels are manipulated as love tokens in the texts. Once a token has been exchanged, there is a risk of further exchange and alienation from the original body with which it was associated. I argue that tokens, having been given away, can circulate beyond the control of the original donor.

---

56 de Grazia and Stallybrass, “Materiality,” 280; paper is absorbent. So it is made ‘permeable by the black spots of ink’: “[i]n addition, paper retains the traces of a wide range of labor practices and metamorphoses.’ Clothes and sheets were recycled into paper; later, paper was used to wrap things.
57 Green, *Crisis of Truth*, 269–74, 279.
59 Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 36; Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 275; Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 126–27: the single glove acts as a fetish because it is no longer part of a pair, and it can represent a woman’s body in a way that shows the body as either priceless or valueless; also Stallybrass and Jones, 116, 117, 131.
60 Boose, “Othello’s Handkerchief,” 365: the token Pandarus brings Cressida from Troilus ‘doubles as a metaphor for the “gift” of sexual consummation.’
61 Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 125, 126.
62 This accords with Stallybrass and Jones:
The power of the fetish emerges through an act of separation, but that separation is haunted by the possibility of further separations, further exchanges. If the fetish keeps the absent beloved present to the lover, it also potentially gives a part of the lover away. Troilus, in the form of his sleeve, can be worn by Cressida, but the sleeve can also be taken and worn by Diomedes. In taking the sleeve from Cressida, Diomedes takes not only Troilus away from Cressida but Cressida away from herself … Unpaired, the glove and the sleeve circulate, unpairing Troilus and Cressida, re-pairing Cressida and Diomedes. (126)

I argue that the movement of the sleeve repeats the movement of Cressida’s ‘kind of self’ which ‘resides with [Troilus],’ but is at the same time an ‘unkind self, that itself will leave / To be another’s fool’ (3.2.135–37). Cressida makes a fool of herself with Diomedes (5.2.7–111), in the process making herself into a spectacle the Greeks remark on—for instance, in 4.6.55–64, 5.1.80–89, 5.2.9–10, 5.2.75—but the Greeks also remark on Troilus’s behaviour as he witnesses Cressida’s betrayal, as if he is also a kind of fool: 5.2.136, 5.2.161–62,
When tokens are given away a second time, their value is changed. In a sense they become reiterated stories about ‘trouthe.’ Because each telling of the story takes place as one of a series of reiterations, even at the point when tokens have only been given once and have not yet been reused, they have already been given multiple times. It is impossible for the giving of tokens to remain stable in this inherently reiterative, ‘tir’d’ story.

We can think of the process as one in which the original ‘trouthe’ represented by the exchange and inherent in the token itself is overwritten like a palimpsest. The original value and meaning of the object are disrupted. However, the prior significance of tokens as a marker of a private transaction of ‘trouthe,’ or what passes as a private transaction for the purposes of the story as if it is a one-off, remains visible figuratively speaking: they can be identified by Troilus, for instance, as objects he once gave Criseyde. Their new meaning invalidates but does not entirely obscure the former meaning that can be read into them. It informs the way the old meaning is to be interpreted.

Eric Mallin argues that the Trojans and Greeks are fighting over a ‘totemic sexual and material site—the body of Helen.’ I agree, and this is shown in part by the flaunting of regifted tokens on the battlefield. Tokens represent the commodity value of Criseyde while she has social standing to give them. Joseph Lenz identifies in Shakespeare’s play the translation of chivalric values into mercenary values. I agree with him that the concept of circulation and commodity value plays a significant role in the way in which tokens are publicised in the play, and will argue that this translation into commodification is already

5.2.180–81. They treat him as if he can’t control himself, and as if his unruliness is part of Cressida’s: 5.2.34–37, 5.2.38–39, 5.2.40, 5.2.48–49, 5.2.50, 5.2.60.
63 Harris, Sick Economies, 97: ‘the supposedly intrinsic values of Troilus and Cressida’s objects are … vulnerable to external recoding; as goods circulate from owner to owner, they change, seemingly infected by the wills that evaluate them.’
64 Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 275.
65 Mallin, “Emulous Factions,” 153. Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 36: ‘The woman’s body becomes the means by which masculine desire represents itself to itself, but the insufficiency of the image provokes at moments violent impulses, a rage articulated in images of fragmentation of a woman’s body.’
present in both Chaucer and Henryson. However, I disagree with Lenz’s assertion that Cressida’s sleeve is an ‘[i]nsignificant object.’\footnote{Lenz, 850.} As Boose points out in relation to \textit{Othello}, tokens associated with clothing are profoundly important.\footnote{Boose, “Othello’s Handkerchief,” 366, with regard to \textit{Cymbeline} 1.4.82–85: ‘The point seems clear that the token, like the handkerchief in \textit{Othello}, is never a trifle in the sense of something inconsequential. Objectively it is so because it may be sold or given, stolen or misplaced: symbolically, however, the sexual act it represents is something absolute.’} Just as Othello’s handkerchief represents a sexual act, so does Troilus’s sleeve, which Cressida gives to Diomed. In this I agree also with Barbara Hodgdon, who asserts that ‘through the handling … of this property … Shakespeare’s playtext signifies Cressida’s double transgression and inscribes it on her body.’\footnote{Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 275–76.}

\textbf{Body rhetoric}

‘Body rhetoric’ is my term for ways in which human bodies can be interpreted as texts, and letters can be interpreted as substitute bodies. Put simply, body rhetoric includes body language. It also includes ways in which letters can be things that can act like figurative bodies, in the same way as tokens do throughout the Troilus and Criseyde stories.\footnote{Green, \textit{Crisis of Truth}, 50: the ‘thingness’ of trothplighting.} I also refer to ‘letter-bodies’ throughout the thesis. Letters, tokens, and body language embody rhetoric about how Criseyde behaves, and they contain bodied associations that link Criseyde with Troilus in what is intended to be an expression of a one-off state of ‘trouthe.’ Once she has left Troy, the ways in which Criseyde misuses letter-bodies, like other tokens, are as legible as the physical body language of Cressida in the Greek camp. Letter-bodies, like tokens, are sites of rewriting and reiteration, in which the reputation of Criseyde is changed, refigured, and captured. So body rhetoric includes figurative\footnote{Bright points out the importance of the ‘figure’ in Henryson, and provides a useful overview of its meaning in medieval discussion of scripture (“Medieval Concepts of the Figure,” 137–53). The Middle Scots ‘figour’} and inherently reiterative
descriptions of bodies. Body rhetoric is essentially embodied rhetoric about reputation and about how Troilus and Criseyde are remembered. According to Peter Stallybrass, the Renaissance body is ‘discursive.’

The Troilus and Criseyde of the metanarrative are reconfigured as particular versions of that character in the texts and on the stage, figures of speech turned into figures. Bodies in the texts are made to speak non-verbally about the ‘trouthe’ and ‘untrouthe’ of the characters. The Criseyde figure is described in ways that transform descriptions of body parts into signs about her reputation for ‘untrouthe.’ The rhetoric about the body of the Criseyde figure is made monstrous, and she is made to use rhetoric of monstrosity about her

---

72 Hillman, *Shakespeare’s Entrails*, 59: ‘in placing these endlessly reiterated, rhetoricized, and textualized heroes [Troilus and Cressida] onstage, he could not help but embody them; and the limning of these “unbodied figure[s]” (1.3.16) in flesh and blood presented a perfect opportunity to wrestle with … the relation between language and the body out of which it emanates.’

73 Greene, “Language and Value,” 275: ‘“Discourse” is “handled” (I.i.55) as though it were physical’; Hillman, *Shakespeare’s Entrails*, 71: ‘The irony, of course, is that the actor playing Thersites must use his material tongue to say these words, thereby revealing the odd status of the body in *Troilus and Cressida*: the play both depicts and—in its reiteration of the tale—enacts the body’s displacement by speech even as it reverses this displacement by both foregrounding the role of the body and embodying the tale on stage.’ The play ‘thrusts both its protagonists and the audience back into the body, recorporealizing the epic of the Trojan War. The story’s unparalleled canonicity … created heroes of a deeply textual nature, protagonists who had become by Shakespeare’s time little more than “rhetorical and proverbial figure[s]” …’ (59–60).

74 Bradbrook argues that the ‘imagery of disease … was dissolved into the general language, where … it appeared in the language and person of Thersites’ (“What Shakespeare Did,” 313). I think this is true as far as it goes, but we can go much further. I identify disease in the body rhetoric Cressida and Troilus use about Cressida’s betrayal, and in the idea of her that is created in Troilus’s heart. His illusions about Cressida are grounded in diseased body rhetoric. Hillman, *Shakespeare’s Entrails*, 60: ‘There is little physical action in the play … Yet the play is … compulsively body-bound.’

75 Stallybrass, “Reading the Body,” 121–22: ‘The body, for all its visibility, is always a discursive body, conceptualized in the Renaissance as much through an oral/aural as through a specular economy.’

76 Hillman, *Shakespeare’s Entrails*, 59: ‘Both within the play and in the cultural milieu that produced it, *Troilus and Cressida* enacts a restoration of words, and of the ideals created out of them, to their sources inside the body.’ Time is ‘repeatedly personified’ (65). I note here a connection between time and reputation turned into representations of bodies that act out the reputation seen from the vantage point of the end of the story. Asp, “Transcendence Denied,” 261: Troilus and Cressida ‘define themselves as similes.’ Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 48: ‘we are seeing etymology staged.’

77 Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 275: ‘Cressida is read (or misread) as a split text. Her deeply specularized, even fetishized, body speaks against her voice, or for her lack of voice.’ I think letters in all three stories represent a split idea of Criseyde.

78 Hodgdon, 255: ‘ultimately … to read her is to recognize that “As fals as Cressid” constitutes an almost inescapable constant amidst the generalized slippage of identity and value apparent elsewhere.’
own body. These body parts, and letters that symbolise her body in her absence, act as tokens. Criseyde is intended to be ‘read.’ Partly because tokens themselves can be seen to have a bodied quality, and because they are worn close to the body, we can understand textual tokens such as letters to be inscribed symbolically on the body. Changes to these tokens can effect changes in the ways body rhetoric is described: tokens can be used symbolically to rewrite body rhetoric.

The body parts and letters demonstrate the Criseyde figure’s lack of ‘trouthe’ and its effect on Troilus in the same way as the tokens do when she disrupts their integrity by giving them away from Troilus. Body rhetoric is made to speak for the Criseyde figures in public.

Ritual display

Historic displays of punishment in public for lying place meaningful texts and whetstones in close proximity to the body of a miscreant, who is then displayed where the meaning of the

---

80 Cook, 51–52: “[h]er final appearance in the play, if we can call it that, is as a letter—a complete reduction of woman to text—which Troilus tears and scatters”; Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 284: “[i]n the final sign of her presence Troilus tears up her letter … Splitting her once more into words and deeds, he refuses to give her a public reading … Suppressing her voice, Troilus writes his own (invisible) letter on Cressida’s body, positioning her as she is written, not as she writes.”
81 Hodgdon, 255.
82 Hodgdon, 260, 261: women as theatregoers were ‘[i]nvited … to assent to such fictions being inscribed on their bodies’; Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 117: ‘[r]epeated wearing acts as an inscription upon the body that can work with or against other forms of inscription.’
83 Stallybrass and Jones, 126.
84 Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 275: ‘Cressida is read (or misread) as a split text. Her deeply specularized, even fetishized, body speaks against her voice, or for her lack of voice, much as though the several texts war with one another before being re-canonized, by the male gaze, to prove that woman’s sexuality derives from and depends on its male use’; Stallybrass, “Reading the Body,” 121–22: ‘we may suspect that the specular economy which we inhabit is itself only the end product of the emergence within the Renaissance of a new conceptualization of the specular in an attempt to stabilize the oral and the aural. Theatrical and anti-theatrical texts alike testify to a desire to fix the body as a spectacle of transparency. Yet in those same texts the body (and above all the female body) was simultaneously imagined as exceeding all categories, as the vanishing point of legibility itself.’
85 Green, Crisis of Truth, 191; 412, note 22: the whetstone ‘may have carried the veiled threat that further offences would be punished by mutilation.’ Similar evidence is presented by Smith, for instance in his account of the pillorying of John de Hakford, forced to parade through town on his way to the pillory, in his underclothes with a whetstone about his neck (“Lying for the Whetstone,” 56). Given the transformation and
text, or the object which has properties of a text, is interpreted as a sign of the person’s lack of ‘trouthe.’ Tokens can be used in this way, in public, to make a spectacle of someone, to reveal them to be a monster, that is, a warning or a horror story, or to show that someone has breached faith with someone else.

The whetstone has strong connections in folklore and folklaw with both the recognition that someone is a liar and the public display of punishment for lying. J. B. Smith describes a custom of ‘[lying] for the whetstone.’ While this custom originally showed the winner was the greatest liar, an alternate interpretation arises suggesting the winner is the most transparent liar, the most in need of sharpening his or her tongue with the whetstone.

transferral of value inherent in tokens such as sleeves in the Criseyde stories, I find it interesting that the public transformation of John de Hakford as he is turned into a pilloried ‘false liar’ involves the removal of clothing and by this means the removal of status.

86 I think Cresseid is punished symbolically in this way by Henryson: the papers of dismissal she receives from Diomeid, that is, the ‘lybell of repudie’ (74), and the ‘bill’ Cynthia carries in Cresseid’s dream (332), which Cynthia reads aloud over Cresseid’s body, figuratively transfer the markings of leprosy as a kind of bodied text to her skin and voice. When she is sent to beg in public, she circulates with a token value that is freely available for onlookers to judge as a text of punishment. After the ‘stound’ (538), when she cries aloud and draws attention to herself (540–41), she accuses herself publicly of the lack of ‘trouthe’ that has been written on her body, and to my mind, her speech and voice quality underline the message inherent in the markings on her skin. In this way she ‘personates’ the texts of punishment and exclusion provided her by Diomeid and Cynthia. I think she also re-enacts and re-embodies the suffering Chaucer’s Troilus underwent reading Crisyde’s letters, particularly the one he interpreted as ‘lik a kalendes of chaunge’ (V 1634). See Syme, Theatre and Testimony, 3, 5, 6, 13.


89 Smith, 54: this seems to have been widespread in England between the fourteenth and early nineteenth centuries, at least in theory and anecdote if not in practice. In this custom, to ‘lie for the whetstone’ (54) is to take part in a lying competition. The whetstone is given as a prize to the greatest liar. The accompanying action is known as ‘giving someone the whetstone.’

90 Smith, 56; 59, note 14. Pandarus draws on this proverb in Chaucer:

“A wheston is no kervyng instrument,
But yet it maketh sharppe kervyng tolis;
And there thou woost that I have aught myswent,
Eschuw thou that, for swich thing to the scole is …”

(I 631–34)

I note that everything is declared by its opposite: “By his contrarie is every thynge declared” (I 637). The example Pandarus offers Troilus reveals by its own error the steps Troilus ought to avoid, as well as the steps he ought to take. Pandarus’ function as a whetstone is to be a kind of transparent liar.
The whetstone is a transformative device on several levels. It affects the way the recipient is perceived in his or her social setting.\(^{91}\) It transforms the reputation of the person who is awarded it, literally or metaphorically. The power of the whetstone to transform someone into a laughing stock or to distinguish him or her for the purposes of instruction is the equivalent, it seems to me, of the transformative potential of gossip.\(^{92}\) The whetstone localises in a token the purpose and process of gossip. The whetstone is also described by Shakespeare as a rhetorical object that can transform emotion.\(^{93}\)

The whetstone is characterised as an intermediary, both as a stone and, in Chaucer’s Pandarus, as a character who goes between. Stephen Mitchell notes the precedent in Old Norse literature of Regin the smith, who combines these characteristics.\(^{94}\)

Body rhetoric is concerned with the publication of tokens that should have remained private. Letters and bodies can be staged in public to show the lack of ‘trouthe’ of an accused person. Extrapolating from the evidence about tokens and whetstones used in parodic ritual displays, I argue that tokens staged in public, including love tokens, letters, and the figures of Criseyde and Troilus themselves, embody aspects of rhetoric about ‘untrouthe.’

---

91 I note that the jocular aspect of the transformation a whetstone is able to effect is seen in Shakespeare in Celia’s allusion to Touchstone in As You Like It: ‘the dullness of the fool is the whetstone of the wits’ (1.2.46). By being dull, the fool provokes wit at his expense. He transforms talk into an opposite form.

92 For gossip, see: Coley, Wheel of Language, 163; Phillips, Transforming Talk, 109. The power of gossip is relevant to the fate of Cresseid, when Cynthia decrees she will contract leprosy (330–43). I think Cresseid actively contracts leprosy as Cynthia pronounces the ‘sentence diffynityue’ (333), which both defines and puts an end to the timeline of Cresseid. What I find suggestive is that Cresseid will be abominated, fled from and renowned as someone to flee from. I think the ‘sentence’ transforms Cresseid symbolically, so the power of being made noteworthy in a monstrous way comes from Cynthia’s prediction of gossip through an act of speaking the ‘sentence’ aloud. Reading the bill transforms it into meaningful, legible signs on Cresseid’s skin and in her voice.

93 I note that this sense of transformation is captured in Macbeth, when Malcolm says to Macduff, on the death of his wife and children: ‘Be this the whetstone of your sword. Let grief / Convert to anger; blunt not the heart, enrage it’ (4.3.230–31). The grief of Macduff is the whetstone. Using the rhetoric of anger and revenge is a way of whetting the sword in physical battle. It also changes the rhetorical substance of the ‘whetstone.’ Macduff’s anger and fighting both show that the whetstone has been effective. The whetstone is both the ‘grief’ Malcolm names and something beyond either grief or anger. It is something grief can pass through in order to be converted to anger. It has a kind of separate substance.

94 Mitchell, “Whetstone as Symbol of Authority,” 12: Regin incites Sigurd to slay Regin’s brother Fafnir. He not only explicitly whets Sigurd’s intention to kill Fafnir, he also forges the sword (12). The character Regin, like Pandarus, both is the whetstone and uses it, in the case of Regin rhetorically in egging Sigurd on and literally in sharpening his sword.
Public space

Public space in the most basic sense consists of areas outside Troy—the battlefield, the place where Calchas’s temple is located, the leper lodgings, the marketplace or roadside where the lepers beg, the place where Cresseid is buried, and possibly also the place where Troilus hides in or beside the Greek camp, from which he witnesses Cressida’s betrayal. It is a place that is uncourty except that noblemen do battle in a prescribed part of it. People who are unfixed in location, or of an uncertain or low social value, go there and circulate. Exchanges of personal value, allegiance, tokens, and prisoners take place there. As such, it is a place where ‘trouthe,’ value, and reputation are destabilised and called into question. It is literally and figuratively a place of errancy and disruption, where those who are exchanged, including Criseyde and Helen, can lose commodity value.

In this thesis, I generally use the term ‘no-man’s-land’ to express the sense of the shifting geographical values and ownership of the space. It seems an accurate way to describe a place people who are ‘excludit’ might inhabit. One might equally use the term ‘common ground.’ This has particular resonance with the concepts of value and reputation, the idea that the places beyond Troy and the Greek camp constitute an exclusion zone that is moral as well as geographical.

95 Harris, *Sick Economies*, 97–98; also 94–95, on ‘merchandizing exchange’ and Malynes; 98–99; 98: ‘revaluation,’ the process of ‘foreign exchange [which] necessitated the external attribution of variable value to any commodity,’ takes place in no-man’s-land. This ‘revaluation’ is ‘precisely what happens to the play’s two exchanged women, Helen … and Cressida … as they cross their national borders.’
96 Harris, on Troilus’s sleeve and Hector’s armour, 97: ‘Appetite … seems to have the power to debase its objects throughout *Troilus and Cressida.*’
98 Lenz, “Base Trade,” 849: ‘in both the Trojan and the Greek passages, it is the viewer who assigns value, not the viewed that contains it.’ I note that in Henryson and Shakespeare, Troilus responds while in no-man’s-land to an altered Criseyde figure and partly recognises or fails to recognise her. In each case he carries out transactions using tokens that are made common in the process.
99 *MED*, s.v. ‘commun(e,’ n. The relevant senses are: familiar, widely known, popular as opposed to learned (6); of low rank, inferior, ‘unclean’ (8); having an unfavourable reputation, promiscuous (9).
In Henryson, ‘commoun’ location refers to the alleged rumours that suggest Cresseid may have prostituted herself ‘in the court.’①⑩ In this ‘commoun’ space, her reputation is able to be called into question, whatever the truth of her behaviour might be.①⑩ It is a place of ambiguity, from which ambiguous interpretations can be derived.①② The term ‘commoun’ also suggests common property.

The stage too is a kind of common ground: each part of the stage can represent multiple locations.①③ Acoustic vantage points on the stage will be used repeatedly for volume control and dramatic impact. Stage properties are common properties, shared by more than one performance of a play and reused from one production to another.①④ The stage and...

---

①⑩ The way she walks, ‘vp and doun’ and ‘desolait’ (76), is legible, as is Cressida’s body language, which is read by Ulysses (4.6.55–64). See Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 49: ‘Cressida is not mistaken that legibility breeds contempt. The legible woman becomes a degraded object.’

①① Asp, “Transcendence Denied,” 257: Troilus and Cressida’s characters ‘engage in a continual effort to achieve transcendence by entry into the world of the theater.’ By assuming roles created by a literary tradition, ‘[they] strive … to take unto themselves the stability of the role, the theatrical self’ (257). Shakespeare creates a ‘double view’ through a ‘continual shift between the traditional role each character attempts to play and the impersonated self that is pragmatically in conflict with the role’ (260). The shifting ‘creates an ambiguity that alienates emotional response in the audience and accounts for the seemingly fragmented impression the characters create’ (260).

①② This is borne out by Lenz’s comments on the theatre in Elizabethan London (“Base Trade,” 835–36, 837–38). Lenz points out that the theatre was associated with prostitutes because of the moral associations of being an actor and also because although the theatre was not considered a brothel, it was potentially a place to meet prostitutes (836, 837–38). In the 1590s, the danger is seen as one of moral rather than physical corruption (836). Stallybrass notes that in A Perfect Pathway to Felicite, virtue is ‘conceptualized less as a mental state than as the inscription of a certain regime upon the body’ (“Reading the Body,” 123–24). I note that in a sense the theatre is common ground not unlike Henryson’s mention of Cresseid and the open court (77): there is a possibility of seeing and being seen and being the subject of gossip. On being seen as spectators, see also: Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 49; Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 260–61.

①③ Lenz, “Base Trade,” 835: ‘The first common ground upon which prostitution and the theater traded was, quite literally, common ground’; Rackin, “Temporality,” 102: ‘the action of a Shakespeare scene … is often set in a kind of neutral space. We know that unless the action localizes the scene [or an actor specifies the location,] there is no reason to suppose that the stage represents any particular place … [which] means that when Shakespeare does localize a scene, the location is likely to be significant, not simply as a place where a particular event occurs, but as a milieu which defines and participates in the action.’

①④ Stallybrass, “Reading the Body,” 125: critics contemporary with Shakespeare object more to the ‘actors’ corporeal presence’ and their ‘apparel and the “infection” which their proteanism generates’ than to ‘textual practices’; more generally, Stallybrass, 124–26; Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 117.
the tokens used in playing have multitemporal,\textsuperscript{105} multisensory uses and ownership.\textsuperscript{106} The stage is also a place where rhetoric is embodied.\textsuperscript{107}

Public space is a space for spectacle,\textsuperscript{108} both playing and ritual punishment. The stage is a meeting place for different interpretations of history seen from different viewpoints. There is a disjunction between what the playgoers know of received history and what Shakespeare presents.\textsuperscript{109} Two conflicting stories meet and are resolved.\textsuperscript{110} The public nature of the stage is paralleled by the paradoxically public or semi-public nature of the soliloquy. The sense of private chambers which is so clear in Chaucer and Henryson is blurred in Shakespeare, because private thoughts need to be aired so we can hear them. Cressida’s soliloquies place her temporarily outside the action of the play, and act as annotations to the play or glosses of her behaviour within it.\textsuperscript{111} Soliloquies allow Cressida to stand aside like Thersites, Ulysses, and Troilus, and comment on her own body rhetoric\textsuperscript{112} and her own

\textsuperscript{105} Rackin, “Temporality,” 103: ‘a crucial Shakespearean strategy is the manipulation of the temporal relationship between past events and present audience … Shakespeare uses this strategy in his history plays to dramatize the distance and the intersection between past and present, eternity and time, and to ponder the problematic nature of history itself.’ Also 109.
\textsuperscript{106} Lenz notes that Troilus and Cressida was advertised as never having been ‘staled with the stage’: it is unclear if the play was ever performed, or if it was performed and did not go over well, but it is marketed as if it is new and pure (“Base Trade,” 846); Stallybrass, “Reading the Body,” 125–26. Stallybrass describes an ‘intermingling or hybridization … frequently located in the actor’s body’ (126). A really interesting example is found in the staging of \textit{Toroihi rāua ko Kāhīra}, in which the battlefield is represented on stage by means of a haka in which ownership of the land shifts radically between the warring parties (\textit{Toroihi rāua ko Kāhīra}, directed by Rachel House, 2012. Shakespeare’s Globe: Globe Player. http://globeplayer.tv/videos/troilus-cressida).
\textsuperscript{107} Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 48: ‘we are seeing etymology staged’; Greene, ‘Language and Value,” 275: “Discourse” is “handled” as though it were physical”; Hillman, \textit{Shakespeare’s Entrails}, 71: ‘the play both depicts and—in its reiteration of the tale—enacts the body’s displacement by speech even as it reverses this displacement by both foregrounding the role of the body and embodying the tale on stage.’
\textsuperscript{108} Stallybrass, “Reading the Body,” 121–22.
\textsuperscript{109} The idea of knowing the end is crucial because, as Charnes argues, Troilus and Cressida know their own story (“So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 414–16, 418). Lenz, “Base Trade,” 852: ‘\textit{Troilus and Cressida} stands as (perhaps) an unperformed protest on the nature of performance, a sudden and perhaps disoriented awareness of the status of one’s existence, and one’s bitter resignation to that status.’
\textsuperscript{111} In the same way as the soliloquies and the stage presence entail Cressida being on uncertain ground figuratively speaking, I suggest she exists in a geographical no-man’s-land in Shakespeare’s play just as Cresseid does in Henryson. Cresseid’s distress and death in no-man’s-land are already an established endpoint in the metanarrative when Shakespeare places his play earlier on the timeline. I think Shakespeare echoes Henryson’s treatment by placing Cressida outside “Troy.” It is not always clear where she is.
\textsuperscript{112} Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 49.
relationship to ‘trouthe.’ In a way, she is obliged to objectify herself for the purposes of rhetoric about ‘trouthe’ and language. I suggest this rhetorical process is paralleled by the use of tokens as signs of exchange and exclusion.

No-man’s-land itself in the stories of Troilus and Criseyde can be considered a kind of hybridised space. The land is outside the court and the encampment. It is familiar because it technically still belongs to the people of the town of Troy, but it is fought over in a way that inscribes it with the possible value of Greek ownership, not least because we know the end of the story and we know Troy will fall to the Greeks. The value of people as things to be moved about in war is contested in the court and in the camp, but the actual proof of their value is demonstrated publicly in exchanges outside those restricted locations.

No-man’s-land is also a place where Troilus and Criseyde are each made aware of the loss of the other. Tokens used in no-man’s-land demonstrate that the other partner is absent and is no longer a partner in the true sense of the word. Peter Stallybrass and Ann Rosalind Jones refer to Cressida’s glove and Troilus’s sleeve as ‘objects … imagined as material hauntings.’ Tokens whose meaning has been overwritten and made imprecise, having been reissued and used in public, contain a layer of meaning from the time when they were used as a sign of ‘trouthe’: in a sense they are ‘haunted’ by previous transactions in the court.

113 Within this place of exchange, Cressida remains paradoxically constant as a rhetorical figure: as the simile for falsehood she remains, as Hodgdon describes her, an ‘almost inescapable constant amidst the generalized slippage of identity and value apparent elsewhere (“He Do Cressida,” 255).

114 Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 48: ‘Cressida’s voice … seems to come from an impossible place, both inside and outside the play. It is the voice of a woman who has read her own story and who recognises the textuality of her own existence. She exists to be the term which puts closure on a literary declension of woman’s falseness.’ Similarly, Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 275: ‘Cressida is read (or misread) as a split text.’

115 Hodgdon, 275: ‘the sleeve functions … as an emblem of exclusion from a system which reduces her worth to that of an object within male exchange.’

116 Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 126.
‘In Troy’

In a geographical sense, to be in Troy is to be safely behind the walls of the city. For a time in Chaucer, this is Criseyde’s location. She is with Troilus, and she is literally in the city. The concept of being ‘in Troy’ in a more figurative sense is important to my argument, because so much of what I identify as the actions and effects of the exchange of tokens and body rhetoric in the three texts is concerned with ‘going from Troy.’ I define the state of being ‘in Troy’ as a time and place. The ‘toun’ of Troy exists for the Criseyde figures at a point in the past.\footnote{Charnes, “So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 418–19, 422, 433. The future of Troy has always happened, and the ‘future moment is already encoded as a past moment’ (419).} At this time and in this specific place, that is, while she is still living in Troy, Criseyde appears to be unified with Troilus and part of his social scene. Their allegiance, signified by tokens of ‘trouthe,’ seems to be a one-off transaction. Criseyde’s legendary reputation for instability makes this state as precarious and unreliable as the truce between the Greeks and the Trojans. She has betrayed Troilus in the metanarrative, even while she is represented in a new telling of the story as being in Troy with him and true to him. It is the ‘tyme of trewe’ (III 1779), which unites a specific length of time with a specific emotional and geographical location. The ‘trouthe’ of Troilus and Criseyde, in which they are present as equal, or apparently equal, partners, exists within the confines of a Troy which is itself in a state of truce. Their personal vows of fidelity occur within a fixed space and time.

‘Troy’ and ‘joy’

The series of exchanges I identify in the use of tokens and body rhetoric is concerned equally with the departure of Criseyde from Troy and from the state of being ‘in Troy,’ and with the
departure of ‘joy’ from Troy. This is seen in an extensive series of end-rhymes of ‘joy’ with ‘Troy’ in Chaucer, which to the best of my knowledge have been noted only in quite general terms, as this section will show. However they seem not to have been examined as markers of a figurative and emotional state of ‘Troy.’ ‘Joy’/‘Troy’ rhymes are highly significant, because taken as a whole they denote the departure of ‘joy’ and Criseyde in tandem, and demonstrate the absence of ‘joy’ and Criseyde together with the impossibility of their return. The departure from joy in general marks a change in Criseyde’s social value, and in the way her ‘untrouthe’ is to be understood by Troilus. It reveals what was already there.

Varda Fish notes that in the prologue of Chaucer, the narrator states that Troilus ‘[fell] after out of joie.’\(^{118}\) This to me is very clear evidence that the fall of Troy and the fall of joy are inextricably connected in Chaucer’s poem.

One or two scholars have noted that there is a protracted end-rhyming of ‘Troy’ with ‘joy’ in Chaucer. Boynton makes a passing reference to the ‘Troyel/joye’ rhyme as something scholars might have analysed as end-rhymes along with others that have been examined.\(^{119}\) Barry Windeatt notes the ‘unusual rhyming’ of ‘fro ye’ with ‘joie’ and ‘Troy’ in the first stanza of Chaucer.\(^{120}\) He argues that ‘[t]he collocation of joie with Troie 31 times (23 times in the final couplets of the stanza) develops a particular resonance, ironic and poignant, as the narrative takes its course towards the unhappy end of Troy.’\(^{121}\) Mieszkowski notes the anonymous poem called ‘The Chance of the Dyce’ (c. 1440), to which C. David Benson also alludes.\(^{122}\) Mieszkowski infers that its rhyme of ‘iioye’ and ‘Troye’ ‘probably [comes] from

---

\(^{118}\) Fish, “Origin and Original Object,” 305.

\(^{119}\) Boynton, “Trouthe/Routhe Rhyme,” 222.

\(^{120}\) Windeatt, *Troilus and Criseyde*, 355.

\(^{121}\) Windeatt, 358.

the opening stanza of *Troilus and Criseyde.*" I note the rhymes of ‘gioia,’ ‘Troia,’ and ‘noia’ at several points in Boccaccio’s *Filostrato.*

Alicia Nitecki notes that Henryson’s narrator describes the story Chaucer’s narrator has told in ‘gudelie termis and in ioly veirs’ (*Testament of Cresseid*, 59). The ‘delight is in the form of Chaucer’s poetry, not in its matter, and the use of the word “ioly” to praise the poetry of a tragic text reveals a certain aesthetic insensitivity.’ I think the jolliness here is quite telling, because of the very clear pattern in Chaucer of rhyming Troy as it now stands—that is, without Criseyde—with an absence of joy, which is impossible to regain. The tragic verse is tragic because joy has left Troy in the form of Criseyde. Moreover, joy and ‘trouthe’ have been removed from the meaning of tokens associated with a state of being ‘in Troy.’

Paul Strohm argues that ‘Chaucer’s use of the fall of the city as an emblem of the same mutability he epitomizes in Troilus’s love becomes clear when he interrupts his account of Troilus’s growing realization of Criseyde’s unfaithfulness with his report of Hector’s death.’ While I think this is a very good point, I think it is also very profitable to consider it the other way round. The relationship of Troilus and Criseyde, with their happy union during the lull between rounds of the war, can be seen to symbolise the fragile peace and then the fall of Troy. Their relationship can be considered to be a figurative expression of the devastating impact on Troy of the ending of the truce, and the losses suffered by Trojan

---

123 Mieszkowski, 130.
124 Respectively joy, Troy, and boredom or nuisance. Mieszkowski, “Reputation of Criseyde,” 94: ‘Throughout the *Filostrato* there is a double evaluation of love. Love causes man’s greatest pain, but it is also the source of his greatest joy.’ I have found the following examples in *Filostrato*: IV v. 8, ‘Troia,’ / ‘gioia’—Calcas left Criseida behind in Troy, thus leaving behind his joy; IV v. 38, ‘noia,’ / ‘Troia’; IV v. 133, ‘gioia,’ / ‘Troia’—joy returning to Troy is dependent on peace being declared; IV v. 142, ‘noia,’ / ‘Troia’; VI v. 4, ‘Troia,’ / ‘gioia,’ / ‘noia’; VI v. 23, ‘noia,’ / ‘Troia’; VII v. 75, ‘noia’ / ‘Troia’—in a letter to Criseida, Troilo asks her if it is not tedious or annoying to be in the Greek camp, when she had such a delightful life in Troy. Compare this with Cresseid’s outburst in Henryson: ‘And all in cair translatit is my ioy’ (*Testament of Cresseid*, 130). These end-rhymes in the *Filostrato* would be a valuable area of future research. For the Italian text, see Griffin and Myrick, *Filostrato.*
125 Nitecki, “Fengeit of the New,” 129.
To me, it is no accident that tokens, body rhetoric, themes of exchange, uses of land showing a change from privacy to publicity, public displays of humiliation and grief, and tropes of prophecy that invoke the strength of Troilus, love, and Troy come together to describe the loss of potential for joy and for remaining ‘in Troy.’ The story of Troilus and Criseyde fundamentally shows the pain and the consequences of ‘going from Troy.’

**Areas of potential future research**

I note several potential research topics in footnotes in the course of the thesis, where they occur naturally in relation to the argument, and generally where they show how this research might be usefully applied to other texts.

There are several aspects of the topic of joy, Troy, and ‘trouthe’ in Troilus and Criseyde stories that are beyond the scope of this thesis, and would be valuable areas of research. Here are three ideas.

First, wider investigation of the sources of Chaucer’s *Troilus and Criseyde*, including Latin and Italian texts as well as French. In footnotes, I indicate some instances I have found of rhyming of ‘Troia,’ ‘gioia,’ and noia’ in Boccaccio’s *Filostrato*, and they seem often to be meaningful and not simply handy rhymes. It would be worth discovering if the significance of joy and Troy extends as far back as Benoît and the other sources. Benoît clearly characterises Troilus as someone known for his high spirits and capacity for joy: did Benoît in effect set Troilus up for a fall? Does the emotional journey of Troilus in other texts parallel or foreshadow the fate of Troy? Where is joy/Troy simply a handy rhyme, and where is it

---

127 Arnold considers what Shakespeare owes to Renaissance conceptions of Euripides (“Monsters in Love’s Train,” 38–39): ‘of the Greek tragedians, Euripides turned most frequently to these conflicts, illustrating the effects of suffering on the central characters and representing the complete annihilation of families and cities’ (38).
more meaningful? How is joy connected with characters’ reliability and unreliability, and is it ever made ironic?

Second, how might Troilus’s ability, inability, or refusal to see two kinds of selves of the Criseyde figure relate to questions of authority in Henryson’s and Chaucer’s narrators? How might Troilus’s manifestations of ‘trouthe’ in the sense of clear judgement relate to the concept of authority and the received version of the story that forms the metanarrative? How is his lack of seeing or reluctance to see reflected in narratorial irony, particularly when it comes to assessing the ‘pite’ of the Criseyde figure, and her capacity for ‘routhe’? In what ways do the narrators perform the function of marginalia, glossing or obscuring the text of Criseyde? To what extent is this ironic distance reflected in Shakespeare’s use of bridging characters who act as glosses on the stage? Are these intermediaries authoritative, and how far does their sarcasm and wit fulfil the function of a distanced narrator?

Third, it would be really valuable to consider the role of the carnivalesque, of grotesque subversion of ‘pite’ and ‘trouthe,’ in parades of monstrous bodies and rhetoric within a courtly location, as part of an analysis of figures characterised as somehow strange, monstrous, or alarming, who intrude on the courtly space of Troy in order to speak the truth. Their monstrosity in effect contains or disguises truth. An example of this is Cassandra, though it would be valuable to analyse these ideas together with disturbing dreams of change and betrayal experienced by both Troilus and Criseyde. This topic would also lend itself to comparison with Parzival in the figure of the prophet Cundrie la Surzière. Both Cassandra and Cundrie are characters who tell the truth and are also represented as monstrous. Cassandra’s monstrosity is contained in her voice, which is described as braying in the Roman de Troie (4884–86, 4929–36). Benoît describes her as attractive, brilliant, bright-eyed, and with a way of being and thinking that distinguishes her from other women (5529–40). Neither Cassandra nor Cundrie is shown remaining in the court as part of festivities. They
seem always to be figuratively and physically deflected figures. It would be worth analysing the grotesque in order to see how and when it presents a profound form of truth, such as we might find in Rabelais.
Chapter One: ‘In Troy’

Drawing on the concept of being ‘in Troy,’ I show how characters in the three texts demonstrate that they are aware of the metanarrative, and specifically that they are aware of how their story ends. This awareness takes the form of motifs, tokens, vows, and memorial ideas, which reveal that the idea of being secure ‘in Troy’ is illusory. First, I consider the implications of the concept of being ‘in Troy’ given the collapse of time inherent in the texts. Second, I examine how Chaucer shows awareness of the metanarrative in his narrator, Criseyde, and Troilus. I identify key motifs and set pieces in Chaucer’s poem that show that, even in the supposedly joyful time when Criseyde and Troilus appear to be united, the end of the story and their fear of that end are present. These motifs are drawn on by Chaucer, Henryson, and Shakespeare when Criseyde goes from Troy and once she is absent from it. Third, I examine the garden motif in Chaucer that shows how Troilus’s first love letter to Criseyde relates to her fear of ‘unsikernesse.’ I identify aspects of this motif that mark the beginning of their time together ‘in Troy,’ and will be significant when Criseyde goes from Troy and remains absent from it. Fourth, I show how the idea of truth in the vows of Shakespeare’s Troilus and Cressida shows awareness of the metanarrative. Finally, I examine the formal lament Cresseid makes in no-man’s-land, the Complaint of Cresseid, in which Cresseid describes herself when she was ‘Cresseid of Troy the toun’ (607).

---

1 ‘Sikernesse’: II 771–73, III 981–82. MED, s.v. ‘siker.’ I define ‘sikernesse’ as essentially safety, strength, soundness, security, stability, genuineness, certainty, and reliability.

2 407–79. The idea of performance links the three texts. Patterson has indicated that Cresseid’s formal Complaint has aspects of a performance (“Christian and Pagan,” 706). I suggest that the memorial idea of Cresseid has aspects of a bodied text: she is marked publicly with signs of her reputation and is punished ritually outside ‘Troy,’ and the markings speak figuratively for her reputation. As such, the idea of the ‘material performance’ of a text seems significant (Camille, “Sensations of the Page,” 37–38). This would be a valuable area of future research. For the nature of a ‘public,’ see Yachnin, “Performing Publicity,” 216. To Lenz, Troilus and Cressida is a protest on the nature of performance (“Base Trade,” 852).
The time of Troy

In analysing different states and times and semantic constructs of Troy, I am aware of an anomaly. If these were one-off stories, then each time Troilus and Criseyde met and exchanged tokens to signify their ‘trouthe,’ those objects and the symbolic vows they made by exchanging objects, words, or both, would be the first, unified signifiers of that transaction of ‘trouthe.’ However, if we take the stories to be drawn from a metanarrative, then understanding ‘Troy’ in Chaucer to be a place where one-off relationships, vows, tokens, and commodities are possible is to some extent an act of suspension of disbelief, much like that of Shakespeare’s Troilus who chooses to presume truth is possible in Cressida’s character.

This raises the valid question of why I consider Chaucer’s Criseyde and Troilus to be able to be ‘in’ Troy and in the figurative ‘Troy,’ while the location of Shakespeare’s Troilus and Cressida in the early Trojan scenes of the play is more ambiguous. Part of the answer lies in the concept of disillusionment. The substance has been stripped away from the characters of Cressida and Troilus so that they are constructs of body rhetoric and are ‘tir’d

---

3 Green, Crisis of Truth, 59–60. Green notes the ‘thingness’ of trothplighting (50). Vows, weds, and borrows or witnesses are all crucial parts of trothplighting. For borrows, see Green, 64–69. For ‘multitemporality’ and ‘polychronicity,’ see Harris, Un timely Matter, 3–5, 9–10.

4 Shakespeare’s Troilus presumes truth in Cressida for her sake. She ‘must’ be two things at the same time, just as he ‘must’ believe her able to be true to him: ‘that I thought it could be in a woman— / As, if it can, I will presume in you—’ (3.2.145–6).

5 Weimann, “Bifold Authority,” 409: ‘the Elizabehian platform stage … can … be said to have provided two different modes of authorizing dramatic discourse’; the locus localised the action and ‘tended to privilege the authority of what and who was represented on the stage,’ while the platea ‘was associated with the actor and the neutral materiality of the platform stage,’ and ‘tended to privilege the authority of what and who was representing that world’ (409). In other words, there was an inherent changeability and ambiguity in ways of staging a play that altered the connection of the actor with the role and the actor with the audience. The actor himself carried out a kind of discourse, and a kind of mediating role. See also Weimann, “Playing with a Difference,” 430, on the betrayal scene in Troilus and Cressida, and the idea of bifold authority in connection with ‘divisive uses of authority’ on the stage.

6 Troilus is disgusted with Cressida, as I will make clear when I return to his use of body rhetoric. One effect of the soliloquies and witnessing of the action by the Prologue, Ulysses, Thersites, Troilus, and Cressida is to remove the characters and the audience’s attention one step from the action, to remind us, like Hamlet commenting on the Mousetrap, that we are watching a play. They step back momentarily from the illusion and are intermediary, like borrows such as Chaucer’s Pandarus. Hillman, Shakespeare’s Entrails, 71: the body in Troilus and Cressida is depicted and displaced by speech, even while it reverses the displacement by embodying the story of Troilus on the stage.
with iteration. Words clothe them, and Troilus can symbolically scatter Cressida and her disembodied reputation as ‘[w]ords, words, mere words.’ Their early awareness of their reputation, even while they are supposedly in Troy, places them to some extent outside their story. They are disillusioned and tired of themselves. They are incapable of experiencing the state of being ‘in Troy’ for the first time, because the pretence has worn too thin. There is a sense in Chaucer that Troilus and Criseyde are not yet exactly disillusioned, although their narrator is. Rather, Criseyde is socially calculating, and Troilus is unaware.

---

7 Asp, “Transcendence Denied,” 257; Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 48; Hillman, Shakespeare’s Entrails, 60: the characters of Shakespeare’s play are “tir’d with iteration” (3.2.164); ‘tir’d’ relates to the ‘emergence of an increasingly closed image of the human body,’ in which the ‘heroes’ identities have become ever further removed from their material sources, and the pun on ‘tir’d’ (attired/tired) implies the increasing distance from the body; as if each retelling has added a layer of covering … to the protagonists’ flesh’ (60). The phrase is Troilus’s description of ‘truth.’ The ‘truth’ is both clothed in and worn out by repetition. See also: Rackin, “Temporality,” 109; Stallybrass, ‘Reading the Body,” 121–22: the body is ‘discursive.’


9 This awareness is shown in the motifs that underpin the vows they make supposedly in Troy, that come from a viewpoint beyond the end of the play, and therefore from the end of the metanarrative. Johnson’s analysis of time and Henryson is apt here (“Whatever Happened to Criseyde?”, 314). Troilus and Cressida, it seems to me, are in part speaking from the end of the time of the story. Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 49: Cressida comments on her relation to ‘trouthe’; Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida”: they occupy a dual place on the stage. Cressida is intended to be read (255); her body speaks against her voice, or for her lack of voice (275). I suggest the nature of the staged Troy is partly a case of a dual location, as they step out of the action to gloss it and each other, and partly an effect of operating with an awareness of the end of Troy’s timeline. McNamara, “Language as Action,” 48: the Testament of Cresseid ‘follows temporal rules of its own’; ‘when commentary and metalanguage extend outward from the action, moving outward from the action, moving into a new narrative space, they also enter into a new dimension of time.’

10 Hillman points out that the characters are displaced even as they are embodied on stage (Shakespeare’s Entrails, 71). I agree, and suggest they are hollowed out. The uncomfortable gastric imagery Hillman (Shakespeare’s Entrails, e.g. 68) and Stallybrass (“Reading the Body,” e.g. 121–22, 136–38) identify seems to be like a forensic procedure that removes matter.

11 Chaucer’s narrator describes Criseyde’s effect on Troilus as one of captivity. Other ladies are unable to tempt him. They ‘[k]an nought the montance of a knotte unbynde / Aboute his herte of al Crisyde’s net’ (III 1732–33). Although this is a conventional enough idea, that he is so much in love he is not looking elsewhere, it does suggest she has caught him. The narrator’s observation occurs while Criseyde and Troilus are ‘in Troy.’ When she leaves Troy, the narrator observes that ‘Troilus and Troie toun / Shal knotteles thoroughout hire herte slide’ (V 767–68). Criseyde is capable of unbinding the knots of her own net. Shakespeare draws on the imagery of knots and binding to describe Cressida’s loosing of the bonds of her troth with Troilus and the creation of a knot, ‘five-finger-tied’ (5.2.157), that binds her over to Diomed.

12 Henryson seems to mark a turning point. His Cresseid and Troilus are likewise calculating and unaware respectively, but they are dragged to the endpoint of the metanarrative and are both forced to confront it. We see them losing their illusions. So, Cressida is Cresseid in the sense that she has no illusions left about her own capacity for error or that of women in general. Henryson’s Troilus displays a judgement about all matters including Cresseid that Shakespeare’s Troilus loses. I think Shakespeare’s Troilus suffers as collateral damage, and I address the effects on him of body rhetoric about Cressida in the third chapter.
Time, tokens, and vows are constantly reiterated in the telling of the story of Criseyde and Troilus. When Chaucer’s Criseyde and Troilus exchange love tokens, they appear to be making a series of one-off transactions denoting ‘trouthe,’ joy, generosity, and social equality. They exchange letters, jewels, and a horse while Criseyde is present ‘in Troy.’ The tokens appear to be new, but they have been used before in the metanarrative and have already been inscribed with other meanings. They are multitemporal objects starting the procedure of the metanarrative over again. As already explained, an analogy with a palimpsest is apt here, because a palimpsest is rewritten at different points in time, the new meaning sometimes only partially obscuring the meaning underneath. The two texts read

---


14 III 1368–72. V 1038–41. Chaucer’s narrator begs off telling their whole love story by noting there is a whole ‘epistle’ between them (III 500–504). The correspondence of love, ‘trouthe,’ objects, and love letters—which Troilus rereads in Criseyde’s absence, refiguring her body in his heart (V 470–74), until it becomes clear she has broken the ‘trouthe’—constitute a body that is like a text, and that would also take a long text, an epistle, if the narrator were to tell it in full. The sleeve Criseyde gives Diomeid (V 1043) is part of a larger theme of parades and performance that I turn to in my second and third chapters. For parades, see also: on Benoît Mieszkowski, “Reputation of Criseyde,” 80–81, and “R. K. Gordon,” 128–29; Moran, “Meeting of the Lovers,” 11; Stallybrass, “Reading the Body,” 121–22: the stage is a space for spectacle.

15 Troilus ‘in Troy’ spends liberally and has many changes of clothes (III 1715), so the idea of generosity and newness of possession is present. Just as the world of ‘Troy’ appears to be the place where Troilus lives all his life, as if it is an isolated place, so too the objects exchanged there between Troilus and Criseyde appear to contain their whole value, that is the value of ‘trouthe,’ in isolation.

16 de Grazia and Stallybrass, “Materiality,” 280; Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 275–76; Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 117. For the close association between bodies and clothing, see: Susan Crane, *Performance of Self*, 3, 6–7, 10–38; Green, *Crisis of Truth*, 269–74, 279; Stallybrass, “Worn Worlds,” 291: ‘[i]n a cloth economy … things take on a life of their own. One is paid not only in the “neutral” currency of money but in material which is richly absorbent of symbolic meaning and in which memories and social relations are literally embodied’; also 290, 291: ‘the clothes … absorb the very identity of the actors’; 295. For inscription on bodies, see: Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 260–61; Stallybrass, “Worn Worlds,” 312: ‘[m]emories are literally worn’; 312: ‘clothes have a life of their own; they both are material presences and they encode other material and immaterial presences’; Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 117.

17 Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 36: Helen and Cressida can be enjoyed in fantasy as disbursed and fetishized signs, flickering images, unbodied figures of thought, but as bodies they threaten a monstrous entrapment in finitude, repetition, representation.’ Harris illustrates ‘multitemporality’ by comparing it with Othello’s handkerchief (*Untimely Matter*, 170–71).

18 McNamara makes a fascinating point about ‘a sort of layering,’ through which, he argues, we experience the *Testament of Cresseid* (“Language as Action,” 46): ‘[l]anguage in the narrative is not only stretched out horizontally, on a temporal axis, nor does it simply move vertically to hierarchies of allegorical meaning or moral instruction. The poem also has a certain thickness, extending outward from narrative episodes toward the implied audience in various metalinguistic layers, one on top of the other.’ As an audience, we enter into a space of fiction with the narrator, who ‘can direct his attention, as well as his speech, in two different directions’ (46). The narrator can turn and address us, then turn and address the characters. I find this particularly interesting in connection with Shakespeare’s *Troilus and Cressida*, in which the concept of an aside and the language conventions of the soliloquy create a space between the audience and the characters in the scene.
together can potentially exist in a symbolic relationship, the new text responding to the old by attempting to cancel it out while the under-text remains partially legible.\textsuperscript{19} It seems to me this is the case with the location, objects, and vows in the Criseyde and Troilus story. If we take it on trust and presume the objects and vows to be new, and presume Troy is stable for the sake of argument, elements arise at the heart of descriptions of life in Troy that break this illusion.

\textbf{Staging Troy}

The concept of being in Troy and ‘in Troy’ is made problematic in the staging of a play version such as Shakespeare’s.\textsuperscript{20} Each performance of the play starts over with the same presumed location in Troy. The prologue begins: ‘In Troy there lies the scene.’\textsuperscript{21} It seems to me, however, that this location is not easy to define. The stage itself constitutes a kind of common ground.\textsuperscript{22} Points on the stage fulfill multiple roles as different locations in the course of the play, as Troy, the Greek camp, and no-man’s-land. As previously explained, stage properties bear the figurative imprint of meanings they accrue as the play progresses.\textsuperscript{23}


\textsuperscript{20} On the ‘circulation of authority between writing and performing’ in late Elizabethan theatre, see Weimann, “Playing with a Difference,” 415–17, 420–22, 424, 427-28, 430.

\textsuperscript{21} 1.1. By implication, the Prologue is outside ‘Troy,’ in a space I think is also occupied at key moments by Cressida and Troilus.

\textsuperscript{22} Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 255; Lenz, “Base Trade,” 835: ‘[t]he first common ground upon which prostitution and the theater traded was, quite literally, common ground,’ where there is a danger of moral rather than physical corruption (836). The idea of problematic common ground seems to me to tie in with Cressida’s essential status as property that is made common. Also Lenz, 847, 849, 852; Rackin, “Temporality,” 102: it is neutral space; see also 108 and 109 for ‘multitemporality’ on stage; Spear, “Shakespeare’s ‘Manly’ Parts,” 421; Stallybrass, “Reading the Body,” 121–22.

\textsuperscript{23} Bruster, “Dramatic Life of Objects,” 68, 70–71; Susan Crane, \textit{Performance of Self}, 3, 6–7, 10–38; Harris, “Properties of Skill,” 48; Stallybrass, “Reading the Body”, 124–26, especially 125; Stallybrass, “Worn Worlds,” 290–91, 294, 295, 312: ‘[m]emories are literally worn’ in the form of bequeathed clothing; 313; Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove”: ‘[r]epeated wearing acts as an inscription upon the body that can work with or against alternate forms of inscription’ (117); ‘[b]ut detachable parts—rings, jewels, gloves, for instance—continued to trouble the conceptual opposition of person and thing, even as the concept of the fetish was forged to formalize such an opposition’ (116); 126; Yachnin, “Performing Publicity,” 216: ‘publics are entities not of a moment but … of the concatenation of texts and performances over time.’
Troilus and Cressida stand to one side, and their soliloquies distance them from the action and allow them to gloss its meaning. In this sense, they take over a large part of the role of disillusioned insight provided by the narrator in Chaucer. To this extent, they step away from the direct location of the action in order to comment on it and watch it with the audience. Cressida’s repeated invitation to Troilus, ‘Will you walk in, my lord?’ (3.2.58, 3.2.91), and her declaration that she will ‘go in and weep’ (4.3.30) ostensibly show that she is standing outside Troilus’s bedchamber and then her own, but the phrasing adds to the idea that she is not entirely inside Troy. Geographically, Troilus and Cressida are on uncertain ground, and figuratively they are choosing to believe for the sake of rhetoric that they are or could be ‘in Troy.’

24 On glossing and authority of texts in the margins, see: Coley, “Withyn a Temple,” 60, 66–69, 75, on the inscribed glass in the House of Fame and translation of the vernacular; Tribble, Margins and Marginality, 2, 3, 8: containment, anxiety of authors about ‘allowing their words to circulate beyond their control’; 57–58: ‘the glossed page becomes a site upon which new relationships between author, auctor, and reader are uneasily negotiated’; 70, in the context of Ronsard’s reading circle: ‘Muret represents the act of interpretation as bridging an inevitable gap between the words on the page and the author’s meaning, a meaning that can be only inadequately conveyed by the poems themselves. The gloss will fill that gap by representing a literary community, a circle of friends around the author to whom he will explain his intent.’ On the twin discursive practices of ‘gathering’ and ‘framing’ texts, that is ‘forming, arranging, and assimilating’ them in commonplace books, see Mary Crane, Framing Authority, 3, 4, 62, 69, 72. Concerning the culture of mediation and the deferred presence of authority, Syme, Theatre and Testimony, 2–5, 6, 13, 31; 45, 47, 49, ‘multi-vocal’ records; 65–66, 72–78; 88–91, on ‘dismembering’ and annotation or commonplace book approaches to preparing and interpreting legal texts. Also Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 260–61, 255; Rackin, “Temporality,” 103, 109; Stallybrass, “Reading the Body,” 121–22: the body is ‘discursive’; characters read the ‘writing’ on the body; Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 117. The constant commenting on the action in asides and soliloquies seems to act much like the public viewing of people undergoing ritual punishment, as described by: Green, Crisis of Truth, 191, 412, note 22; Smith, “Lying for the Whetstone,” 56.

25 Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 48: ‘we are seeing etymology staged. [Cressida’s] voice, like Cassandra’s, seems to come from an impossible place, both inside and outside the play. It is the voice of a woman who has read her own story and who recognizes the textuality of her existence.’

26 Ulysses and Thersites similarly take part of the role of the narrators of Chaucer and Henryson in commenting on the legibility of Cressida’s mind published in her body. Standing apart, which is a component of stage practice, finds its counterpart in Chaucer and Henryson: in both of these texts, the Criseye figure attempts to keep a private space around her. Criseye stands out as a widow, in the scene where she begs Hector for clemency (I 108–110), and when she stands a little apart in the temple (I 289–93). Cresseid stands out among the lepers as someone who is clearly of noble kin (397–98). She lies apart in a corner of the leper lodgings to mourn (405–6), and she seems to stand apart while she is begging: the lepers all go towards her after Troilus has given her alms to see what she has received (526–28), and whisper about her among themselves (529).

27 She stands in the same kind of space as the Prologue who also directs our attention inwards to Troy. He is a marker who refers obliquely to the action. The effect of this is to make Troy a kind of rhetorical construct Troilus and Cressida step in and out of but are unable to escape.
The unsteady truce in Chaucer’s Troy

In Chaucer, Criseyde and Troilus are geographically located in Troy, in an actual place behind the city walls. They live there during a truce in the war of Troy. They are also figuratively ‘in Troy,’ because they form an allegiance in which they are of equal, courtly status and are beautiful and happy. This allegiance is a form of ‘trouthe’ they agree on together by exchanging tokens even-handedly: Criseyde is socially permitted to exchange objects of value with Troilus in a context of ‘pleying.’

I find it telling that at the heart of Chaucer’s poem, the narrator refers to this period in Troy’s history as the ‘tyme of trewe’ (III 1779), a time of ‘trouthe’ and of the truce between Troy and Greece. During this time, Troy itself and the relationship of Troilus and Criseyde both seem to be stable. There are, however, constant reminders that they are not. For instance, ‘tyme of trewe’ is rhymed with a description of Criseyde ‘in Troy,’ who is ‘[a]s fresh as faukoun comen out of muwe.’ The description of a newly moulted falcon suggests Criseyde, like Troilus, has just come into a state of joy and security. But the falcon image

---

28 I note the connection between Criseyde’s sense of the security of Troy and the sense of social security she attains once she forms an allegiance with Troilus: ‘That wel she felte he was to hire a wal / Of stiel, and sheld from every disipplesau / And kep the life of se yede’ (III 479–80). Descriptions of secure life in Troy tend to pair Troilus and a mention of his royal status with Troy. He is pinned to a precise status in a precise place.

29 Chaucer’s narrator characterises ‘perfit joie’ (III 1379) as ‘the white and ek the rede’ (III 1384), that is, the ideal of courtly beauty.

30 ‘Pleying’ is part of Troilus’s courtly privilege before he sees Criseyde: ‘Withinne the temple he wente hym forth pleyinge’ (I 267). The start of their allegiance is also marked by Criseyde’s sense of play: having agonised over the risks and benefits of love, slept, and risen, she ‘wente hire for to pleye’ (II 812). She goes into her private garden, and it is here that Pandarus first makes her simultaneously laugh and accept a letter from Troilus. I return to this motif below. She joins Troilus again in playing in Book Three: ‘And pleyinge entrechaungeden hire rynges’ (III 1368).

31 III 1779. MED, s.v. ‘treu(e.’ The first meaning listed is a pledge to cease hostilities for a long period of time, or the peace achieved by such a pledge. I use ‘trewe’ in this sense, noting that this time is delimited by two parties giving their word and honouring it. While this applies territorially to the Greeks and Trojans, in terms of a figurative state of ‘Troy,’ the ‘trewe’ can only be in effect as long as both Troilus and Criseyde honour it.

32 Agreements between Troy and Greece and between Troilus and Criseyde appear to be being honoured, demonstrating the ‘trouthe’ of all parties. For an interesting take on ‘trouthe’ as a public state denied to Troilus and Criseyde, see Boynton, “Trouthe/Routhe Rhyme,” generally, and 234.

33 III 1784. As far as I am aware, scholars have not yet commented on this image in connection with themes of ‘sikernesse’ and mutability.

34 She is ‘[f]ul redy … hym goodly to saluwe’ (III 1785). Her interaction with him has become socially acceptable. Clark and Wasserman note that Pandarus, commenting on Criseyde’s wisdom in accepting Troilus,
also foreshadows further changes, and reminds us she is intrinsically capable of change. This image is directly linked with the ‘fetheres brighte of Troie,’ which the narrator describes as being pulled away by Fortune as Troy heads for the second phase of the war. Troy itself will in effect moult. Truth and truces are mutable.

Warnings of this instability are evident during the time Criseyde and Troilus are united ‘in Troy.’ For instance, Criseyde uses the metaphor of the ‘brotel wele of mannes joie unstable’ (III 820) to refer to human relationships, but Troy itself can also be understood to be a ‘brotel wele.’ It is only possible to be joyful in Troy at a specific point in its timeline, that is, in a place that is perpetually on the edge of falling. Time spent ‘in Troy’ and joyfully is always limited. Before he describes Troilus and Criseyde’s life together, Chaucer’s narrator warns us of this: ‘And thus Fortune a tyme ledde in joie / Criseyde and ek this kynges sone of Troie’ (III 1714–15). The way joy proceeds depends on time and fortune.

The fate of Troy is explicitly tied by Chaucer’s narrator to the fate of Troilus:

uses the image of a ruby: ‘[w]el in the ryng than is the ruby set’ (II 585; “The Heart in Troilus and Criseyde,” 321–22). To me, the image of Criseyde waving at Troilus from her house, as he goes past in a private courtly parade, reinforces the idea that she is a ruby well placed in her setting (her relationship, her house, and courtly society). This idea is borne out by Troilus’s lamentation after she has gone, when he addresses her palace as ‘O ryng, fro which the ruby is out falle’ (V 549). Clark and Wasserman note that this second reference does not come from Boccaccio (321). Fascinatingly, Clark and Wasserman speculate that Troilus is to be ‘the gemstone in Criseyde’s ring’ (322), which, quite apart from sexual implications, I think is very interesting if he is to be her source of tokens, social nourishment, status, and security.

This flighty characteristic is noted by Pandarus, who comments to Criseyde that it was hard to persuade her to love Troilus. He quotes the maxim, “‘Impressiounes lighte / Ful lightly ben ay redy to the flighte’” (II 1238–39).

Benoît, Roman de Troie, describes Briseïda in terms that make it clear she loved and was loved, but her heart changed within her (5285–86). It seems reasonable to suggest that by identifying her as loved and loving, Benoît means she is qualified to be a courtly lover.

V 1546–47. I return to this image in the second chapter.

The idea of a lady as a falcon has a suggestion of a formidable quality perhaps, like the Isolts, mother and daughter, in Gottfried von Straßburg’s Tristan, who are unnerving to Tristan in their courtly presentation. They walk with measured steps, and their upright bearing and gait are compared with a sparrowhawk. They are compared with a parrot in their colourful garments, and a falcon in their way of looking about the court (10990–11001).

III 820. If I am right in this suggestion, then Shakespeare may be alluding to this phrase when he has Cressida swear that she will be remembered for falsehood ‘[w]hen water drops have worn the stones of Troy’ (3.2.173), playing on ‘wele’ and ‘welle.’ To the best of my knowledge, scholars have not yet pointed out this connection.

Just as it is only possible to be a royal person ‘in Troy’ at a specific point in its timeline. Aptly enough, the connection between joy and royalty is made by Chrétien de Troyes in Erec, where there is a feat known as the ‘Joy of the Court’ which, when accomplished, will allow him to return from exile and be reconciled with his wife (Staines, Complete Romances of Chrétien, 68, 79).
The double sorwe of Troilus to tellen,
That was the kyng Priamus sone of Troye,
In lovyng, how his adventures fallen
Fro wo to wele, and after out of joie,
My purpos is …

The loss of joy is Troy’s as well as Troilus’s, given the significant ‘Troy’/‘joy’ rhymes I identify in the course of this thesis. For instance, in this case, the concept of falling out of joy seems to be echoed by Criseyde’s reference to the instability of the ‘brotel wele of mannes joie.’ I find the similarity between ‘wele’ and ‘welle’ in these two instances interesting, given how closely they attend on the concept of ‘joie.’

The story of the fall of Troy always has a known endpoint, and so does the metanarrative of Criseyde and Troilus within the larger story of the war. The location of Troy is always significant in relation to where it is placed in time, because the Troy of the love story only exists at a brief point between phases of the war. The land of Troy is figuratively shifting ground that temporarily appears to have stable ownership. In Charnes’s phrase, Troy has ‘always already’ fallen to the Greeks. For this reason, Troy can only remain standing for a predetermined length of time. And because the metanarrative of Criseyde and Troilus

---

40 I 1–5. Fish’s article brought this example of ‘joie’ and falling to my attention (“Origin and Original Object,” 305). Rather than agreeing with her that the ‘foresight’ shown in these opening lines is ‘unparalleled elsewhere in the poem,’ I think the concept of ‘wele’ and ‘joie’ as emotions from which one falls speaks to the heart of the poem’s concern with the end of the narrative.

41 III 820. As I argued in previous unpublished research, the concept of ‘brotelnesse’ is integral to the story of Criseyde and Troilus because instability is the essence of Criseyde’s character and the cause of Troilus’s suffering. Troilus’s abandonment and Troy’s fall are equally doleful subjects. The sorrow of Troilus, stated clearly from the outset, contrasts with the description of Troilus in Benoît, whose Roman de Troie is the first text in which the Criseyde figure appears. In that text, Troilus is very clearly disposed to be joyful (e.g. 5429–36). Yet Chaucer’s narrator begins the story with a Troilus who is dismissive of love—there is an element of mockery to his ‘pleyinge’ (I 267)—and only made joyful by his temporary union with Criseyde. To me, this characterisation shows an awareness of the sorrow that altered the mood and life experience of Benoît’s Troilus.


43 Harris, Untimely Matter, 13–17.

44 Charnes, “So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 433.
dictates that Criseyde will be exchanged, she and Troilus can only be united ‘in Troy’ for a predetermined length of time.\(^{45}\)

In Chaucer, the narrator signals that time is an essential factor of being ‘in Troy,’ by stressing that the world of courtly joy and largesse is a world of ‘yonge, fresshe folkes’ (V 1835). The courtly people of Troy are young, bright, and merry between battles in the war. Clearly, they can only be young for a limited time.\(^{46}\)

The narrator compacts the joyful part of Troilus’s life into the years of the truce of Troy and the ‘trewe’ time with Criseyde (III 1779). He makes it clear from the opening line that the poem is intended to tell the ‘double sorwe’ of Troilus.\(^{47}\) He emphasises the joyful life Troilus begins to lead at court: when he was united with Criseyde, he ‘gan al his life to lede.’\(^{48}\) The time that constitutes ‘al’ Troilus’s life is the time when he is ‘in Troy’ with Criseyde. The narrator makes it very clear, as I show in the next chapter, that joy leaves Troy when Criseyde does.\(^{49}\)

\(^{45}\) Strohm, “Storie, Spelle, Geste, Romaunce, Tragedie,” 357: ‘Chaucer’s use of the fall of the city as an emblem of the same mutability he epitomizes in Troilus’s love becomes clear when he interrupts his account of Troilus’s growing realization of Criseyde’s unfaithfulness with his report of Hector’s death.’


\(^{47}\) I 1. A very useful area of future research would be a possible connection between this ‘double sorwe’ of Troilus and the ‘bifold authority’ (5.2.144), ‘madness of discourse’ (5.2.142) and questions of the selves of Cressida, both the ‘kind of self’ (3.2.135) and Troilus’s assertion that she ‘is and is not Cressid’ (5.2.146).

\(^{48}\) III 1717. The narrator explicitly associates Troilus’s status with ‘joie.’ The joy he describes in the passage immediately following the couplet in which he pairs Criseyde with the ‘kinges sone’ erases her. He describes Troilus’s extravagant and proper lifestyle and society. Troilus shares his joy in general, and he is generous with his money:

\begin{verbatim}
In suffisaunce, in blisse, and in singynges
This Troilus gan al his lif to lede.
He spendeth, jousteth, maketh festeynges;
He yeveth frely ofte, and chaungeth wede,
And held aboute hym alwey, out of drede,
A world of folk, as com hym wel of kynde,
The fresshest and the beste he koude fynde;
That swich a vois was of hym and a stevene,
Thorughout the world, of honour and largesse,
That it up rong unto the yate of hevene …
\end{verbatim}

(III 1716–25)

Troy is a ‘world’ of appropriate, like-minded people. This lifestyle is also reflected in Cresseid’s Complaint which details her former life as ‘Cresseid of Troy’ (407–69).

\(^{49}\) Troilus describes himself as a useless ‘combe-world’ who cannot live or fully die without her (IV 279–80). The association between ‘al’ Troilus’s life and the world of joy and of courtly company is reflected, I suggest, in Cresseid’s Complaint, when she specifically locates ‘all’ her ‘gret royall renoun’ (424) in the remembered time when she was ‘in Troy.’
The end of security

Chaucer’s Criseyde and Troilus make repeated allusions, through fear, swooning, and fear of falling, that foreshadow the end of the metanarrative, Troilus’s miserable state without Criseyde, and Criseyde’s loss of ‘sikernesse’ (II 773). I identify some instances of these. The idea of Troilus’ joy is undermined by the awareness of sorrow. The idea of Criseyde’s ‘sikernesse’ is undermined by the awareness of her father’s reputation and the narrator’s indications of her fate. She fears losing material and social ‘sikernesse.’ From the outset of the poem, Troilus and Criseyde both fear the particular forms of suffering they have already endured in the metanarrative.50

For instance, Criseyde makes a calculated decision about her status and the risks of forming an allegiance with Troilus. The narrator describes her state as one of anxiety, in which she almost falls in her fear.51 What she fears is social change and loss:

“Allas! Syn I am free,
Sholde I now love, and put in jupartie
My sikernesse, and thrallen libertee?”

(II 771–73)

50 As far as I am aware, scholars have not yet made this point.
51 II 770: ‘So that for feere almost she gan to falle.’ At the crucial point of fear, a thought ‘overspradde hire brighte thoughtes alle’ (II 769) concerning freedom and ‘sikernesse’ (II 771–73). This motif of uncertainty, associating Criseyde with weather, is reflected by Henryson. The weather on the night Cresseid goes to the lepers’ lodgings seems to me to mirror changes in her skin. Cresseid: ‘[w]ith bylis blak ouirsprede in hir visage, / And hir fair colour faidit and alterait’ (395–96). The sky: ‘[t]he cloudis blak ouerheled all the sky’ (401). The sky parallels descriptions of Cresseid’s body in order to treat the poem itself as a kind of body, at a point when Cresseid undergoes profound social change and uncertainty. Henryson’s narrator links the body of the text with the body of Cresseid and the conceptual ‘vther quair’ he reads in the opening sequence of the poem (61–70). In her final self-accusation, Cresseid conflates rhetoric about her body with rhetoric about the weather: ‘Now is my breist with stormie stoundis stad’ (542). The meaning and mood of the surrounding text are brought into her ‘breist’ and find her ‘[w]rappit in wo’ (543). This parallels the opening stanza which explicitly links ‘doolie’ weather to a ‘cairfull’ poem (1). The text of the Testament of Cresseid is also a body that bears symbolic markings.
This moment of fear and calculation marks Criseyde’s first exchange of social status within Troy, from being literally in Troy to being figuratively ‘in Troy.’ The narrator’s description of social anxiety as fear of falling reminds the reader that the wider story of Troy is a story about a fall. The concepts of jeopardy and thralldom reflect that Troy is under siege.

Chaucer’s Troilus feels fear as he is falling in love with Criseyde, and he quite often swoons for love. One instance of this occurs before Criseyde has agreed to their allegiance: in his distress, his feeling ‘fled was out of towne, / And down he fel al sodeynly a-swowne’ (III 1091–92). Even while she is still in Troy, and they are about to be happy and sheltered for a time, the idea of leaving Troy is present. The ‘towne’ itself is strongly linked by end-rhyme with the concept of Troilus’s distressed, swooning state. The narrator describes the swoon in a clear moment of foreshadowing that impacts Troilus and Troy.

Troilus later returns to this motif of fleeing, and indirectly confirms its accuracy. When Criseyde leaves Troy, Troilus describes his status as ‘I combre-world, that may of nothyng serve, / But evere dye and nevere fulli sterve’ (IV 279–80). He enters a kind of half-world without her. His plea to his soul to ‘unneste, / [and f]le forth out of [his] herte’ echoes the earlier image of his consciousness fleeing out of town.

Criseyde’s perception of Troilus in Chaucer while they are both ‘in Troy’ shows she is aware of the instability of love and of her social status there. Criseyde considers Troilus a

---

52 Details of Criseyde’s decision process show she is approaching it rationally and considering risks and benefits as if it is a business venture (II 703–812).

53 Mieszkowski, “Revisiting Troilus’s Faint,” 44, 45, 47, 48–49, 51-55: fainting in medieval English literature is not gendered and does not imply Troilus is effeminate; it is a sign of the depth and epic capacity of his love.

54 Similarly, when he is due to see her again, the narrator states Troilus was told that he would ‘Criseyde his lady mete, / For which he felte his herte in joie flete’ (III 1670–71). His joy rushes off to nag the gods to send her to him (III 1672), and the ideas of joy and fleeing are directly juxtaposed.

55 The narrator returns to this idea when Criseyde leaves Troy and he remarks that ‘Troilus and Troie toun / Shal knoteles throughout hire herte slide’ (V 767–68). It seems clear to me that Troilus and Troy operate as a pair.

56 This suggests that being ‘in Troy’ is a courtly state: the world he encumbers in her absence is distinct from the world of ‘Troy’ in which he ‘gan al his lif to lede’ (III 1716), which is the ‘world of folk’ (III 1721) Troilus draws together in his happiness.

57 IV 305–6. It also echoes the image of joy fleeing to nag the gods into letting him see Criseyde again (III 1671–72).
‘stoon of sikernesse.’\textsuperscript{58} She equates his love with the security of Troy and of his lifestyle: ‘That wel she felte he was to hire a wal / Of stiel, and sheld from every displesaunce’ (III 479–480). He is her protector from social harm.\textsuperscript{59} The risk of harm comes partly from her father’s reputation as a traitor and her isolation among the people he has betrayed (I 85–98, I 105–6), and perhaps from the harm that comes from her being isolated as a widow.\textsuperscript{60} Criseyde’s idea that Troilus is stable is partly an idea that Troy is stable. She seems to conflate the two and ascribe to him the qualities of Troy: Troilus is her wall and shield.\textsuperscript{61}

The ‘misers of joy’ motif

As well as showing Troilus’s fear of falling and Criseyde’s fear of standing out conspicuously, outside the company of the Trojan court, Chaucer has his narrator characterise the instability of Troy by using a money motif, which I refer to as the ‘misers of joy’ (III 1373–86). This motif is relevant to the metanarrative, because it foreshadows the ending of joy ‘in Troy,’ and the end stage of the Criseyde figure’s life as a beggar and leper. It is also

\textsuperscript{58} II 843. Shakespeare likely has Cressida appropriate this description for the ‘strong base and building of her love’ (4.3.28) and for the ‘water drops’ speech (3.2.170–183), in which she turns herself into a figurative memorial to her lack of ‘trouthe.’

\textsuperscript{59} Criseyde’s fear of being stared at and talked about in part allows Pandarus to manipulate her into taking Troilus’s first love letter. Pandarus forces the letter on her, then says facetiously, “Now cast it awaye anon, / That folk may seen a nd gauren on us tweye” (II 1156–57). This facetious aside becomes Cresseid’s genuine and limiting fear of being ‘kend’ (380) after she has contracted leprosy.

\textsuperscript{60} I 97, I 108–12, I 290–92, I 309. She is marked out by her clothing (I 109, I 309, II 222). I suggest that isolation within Troy can be seen as a sanction. During the truce, Benoit’s Cassandra cries out so loudly about the doom of Troy that they confine her to a private room where they can no longer hear her, and go on with the festivities (Roman de Troie, 4884–86, 4931–36). Goodland, Female Mourning and Tragedy, 112, 113: widows could be perceived as dangerous because their grief might trap someone unwary.

\textsuperscript{61} This is seen also when she leaves Troy, and asks: ‘How sholde a fissh withouten water dure? / What is Criseyde worth, from Troilus?’ (IV 765–66). Troilus provides her with ‘kynde noriture’ (V 768); ‘rootles moot grene soone dye’” (V 770). Cresseid strikes me as an embodiment of the ‘displeaunce’ Criseyde fears outside Troilus’s protection. Cresseid embodies social ruin and is a focus for gossip; she suffers terribly without Troilus, and the only ‘noriture’ (IV 768) she gets is his act of ‘pietie’ in giving her alms thinking she is a nobody (519). Mieszkowski, “Chaucer’s Much Loved Criseyde,” 120: “[w]hen Criseyde laments her betrayal of [Troilus], she grieves losing his faithful service, and says she has never known anyone who could keep his lady’s honor so well.”
relevant to themes of financial and emotional transactions demonstrated by movements of tokens and characters outside ‘Troy.’

In the middle of his description of the lovers’ first night together, Chaucer’s narrator explicitly describes the value of love and the ability to feel joy, by providing a negative example:

Lord, trowe ye a coveytous or wrecche,
That blameth love and halt of it despit,
That of tho pens that he kan mokre and kecche
Was evere yit yyeven hym swich delit
As is in love, in o poyn, in som plit?
Nay, douteles, for also God me save,
So perfit joie may no nygard have.

(III 1373–79)

I suggest that the image of the miser, who is too mean and money-grubbing to appreciate the value of joy, is returned to in the economic and emotional concerns of Henryson and Shakespeare’s texts. Henryson draws on it in the alms-giving scene, in which the socially devalued Cresseid is unable to appreciate the value and identity of her benefactor until the other lepers have appraised his gift for its quantity and quality. Shakespeare returns to it in

---


63 As far as I am aware, scholars have not yet pointed out these connections.
Ulysses’s definition of time with ‘a wallet at his back’ into which he puts ‘alms for oblivion.’

Those who fail to appreciate joy, Chaucer’s narrator continues, reject the courtly life of beauty and worth, in order to live in misery:

But it shall falle hem as I shal yow rede:
They shal forgon the white and ek the rede,
And lyve in wo, ther God yeve hem meschaunce,
And every lover in his trouthe avaunce!

Again, this description foreshadows the end of the ‘world of folk’ Chaucer’s Troilus gathers around him ‘in Troy’ (III 1721). The white and the red is a feature of a world of ‘trouthe.’

The narrator foreshadows the time after the ending of the state of youth and freshness which in Henryson’s poem becomes the description of Cresseid’s beauty as ‘faidit and alterait’

---

64 I think the idea of money and almsgiving is deeply related to the oblivion Cresseid suffers once she has left ‘Troy,’ to the ways in which the Criseyde figure forgets the value of Troilus when he is no longer a source of social nourishment to her—her obliviousness, in other words—and to the concept of disease that befalls the memorable idea of Criseyde, as she and Troilus remember her once she has left ‘Troy.’ Money, disease, social ruin, and the obliteration of Criseyde’s social status are thus closely connected. Harris addresses disease, value, exchange rates, foreign exchange, and its effects on value (Sick Economies, 84–85; see also Helen and Cressida, 97–98). Money is changed when it is exchanged across national borders; 96–98: infection, and the ‘infectiousness’ of valuation. Money (96) and Helen (98) have a ‘color’ or a ‘painted’ value which is not necessarily the same as the base value of the metal (see 90); 100: ‘[u]nlke Cresseid, Cressida does not contract any overt infection … Instead, the play’s burden of disease is shouldered by one of the men: Pandarus.’ I argue in the third chapter that the idea of Cressida, which Shakespeare’s Troilus creates in his heart, introduces disease in a way that burdens Troilus with the suffering of Cresseid. Mead, “Thou Art Chang’d,” 250–51; Stallybrass, “Reading the Body,” 121–22: the ‘specular economy’ of the stage; 128–29. I suggest that social oblivion and devaluation such as Cresseid experiences are closely connected with disease.

65 III 1383–86. This echoes a line in which Pandarus, advising Criseyde to love, counsels her to throw her widow’s clothes to ‘mischaunce’ (II 222). Mieszkowski, “Reputation of Crisyde,” 91: Guido delle Colonne’s description of Briseïda’s grief is ‘so preposterously exaggerated that he may well have meant it as a joke.’ He compares her blood-stained cheeks with ‘torn lilies mixed with torn roses.’ I find it striking that white and red imagery is connected with Briseïda in the descriptions of both her grief and her procession out of Troy. Mieszkowski describes the cloak Briseïda parades in (“Reputation of Crisyde,” 80, and “R. K. Gordon,” 128–29). It is astonishingly elaborate, intensely white and red, embroidered with flowers and animals. To my knowledge, scholars have not yet connected this detail with Chaucer’s motif involving the ‘white and ek the rede’ (III 1384). I argue for a strong connection: Chaucer’s narrator’s description of joy ‘in Troy’ contains a warning echo of the parade Crisyde will make out of ‘Troy,’ a parade Briseïda has already undertaken.

66 III 1386. For the world, see III 1721–22: ‘A world of folk, as com hym wel of kynde, / The fresshest and the beste he koude fynde.’
It is notable that when Cresseid leaves Troy and leaves Troilus behind, she loses the ability to discern and value love.\footnote{His value to her seems to change from social to pecuniary. She made a calculated decision to love him in the first place in Chaucer. The cynical and worldly aspect of that decision, in which she decides what the benefits of love are relative to the cost, is borne out in her questioning what she is worth ‘from Troilus’ when she is obliged to leave. This cynicism informs Cressida’s assessments of what women are worth and also informs the general concern of Shakespeare’s play with questions of value in relation to love.}

The image of the white and the red has several courtly applications, which can be illustrated by the following three examples. It denotes an enclosed courtly garden such as is found in courtly love songs, for instance in poems by Walther von der Vogelweide.\footnote{Von der Vogelweide, \textit{Gedichte}. For instance, in ‘Nemt, frouwe, disen kranz’ (‘Lady, accept this garland’: \textit{Gedichte}, 39–40; Middle High German translations are mine), the lover tells the lady of a \textit{locus amoenus} where ‘wîzer unde rôter bluomen weiz ich vil’ (12, ‘I know of many white and red flowers’). He explicitly connects the flowers of the meadow with the skin and blushing cheeks of the lady (19–20), inviting her to go with him and find these flowers to place in the garland because of her worthiness and beauty (9–16). They will both be alone in this place, so there is an expectation that they will sleep together there, as the next poem in the sequence, ‘Under der linden’ (\textit{Gedichte}, 41), makes explicit (10–27).} It can be explicitly associated with the skin of a courtly lady, for instance Heurodis in \textit{Sir Orfeo}, who scratches her white skin red and bloody when she is forced to leave the court.\footnote{E.g. Bliss, \textit{Sir Orfeo}, Auchinleck 107–110.} And it is a component of the descriptions of courtly people, their apparel and locations, such as appear in Chaucer’s \textit{Legend of Good Women}.\footnote{Larry Benson, \textit{Riverside Chaucer}. The god of Love wears a red and white garland (Text G 159–61), and has ‘rede rose-leves’ embroidered on his silk robes (Text F, 228); the narrator states his preference for the red and white daisies above all the flowers in the meadow (Text F, 41–43); Alceste’s elaborate robes are like a daisy (Text F, 214–25), and the narrator dreams he sees her in the meadow he has gone to specifically to see the daisies, ‘this floure that I so love and drede’ (Text F, 211).} The white and red flowers suggest a seasonal limit on the appropriateness of the courtly location as well: the image is only appropriate for a short time in the human life span.\footnote{Johnson, “Whatever Happened to Criseyde?”}, 314: Criseyde is forced to look on the courtly world of love from the outside, from an artificially accelerated vantage point of old age.

For this reason, the misers of joy motif foreshadows the removal of Criseyde from the specific courtly location of ‘Troy’.\footnote{III 1373–86. Part of her punishment for leaving Troilus is to become miserly. This is reflected in her altered status as a beggar in Heneryson, and later in Dekker and Chettle. Compare this with von Straßburg’s \textit{Tristan}, in which the separated lovers still demonstrate ‘trouthe’ to one another, for instance through Petitcriu, a magical token in the form of a dog whose bell causes the hearer to forget their sorrow (15801–65). Tristan sends it to Isolt, who breaks its bell off (16392–95), because her ‘triuwe’ to Tristan—she would be ‘ungetriuwe’ (16373), untrue, to accept and use this gift—leads her to prefer to be miserable apart from him when she knows he is miserable apart from her (16372–91). The manipulation of the token, while they are both exiled from Marke’s court separately, paradoxically shows they are still equal in their exchange of ‘trouthe.’ When they are later exiled from the court together, their ‘triuwe’ is explicitly named as a component of their private company, in the cave known as the ‘fossiur’ a la gent amant,’ the cave of noble lovers (16704). In the \textit{locus amoenus}, they have}
The limits of Troilus’s speech

The limit of the time and space that constitutes the court seems to relate also to the phrase ‘I can no more,’ which shows an awareness of the endpoint of the metanarrative. It appears in Chaucer and Henryson, and has a deliberate echo in Shakespeare. Chaucer’s Troilus’s ‘I kan namore’ is spoken at the happiest point in the story, during his speech praising Love, Venus, and Hymen, a concise formal poem about his joy (III 1254–74). He enumerates Love’s virtues and states that he has said as much and as wisely as he can: ‘I kan namore’ (III 1273). He cannot do anything but praise Love. This is the epitome of ‘trouthe’ in Troilus: his true love is matched by his integrity in courtly expression. Henryson picks up the phrase in Troilus’s reaction to the death and testament of Cresseid: ‘I can no moir; / Scho was vntrew, and wo is me thairfoir.’ Shakespeare’s Troilus echoes it in his final line: ‘Hector is dead, there is no more to say.’

These are speeches in which Troilus proves his ‘trouthe,’ that is, the accuracy and judiciousness of his thinking, and provides us with an insight into his sense of limitation. Chaucer’s Troilus indicates the limits of his ability to express his joy, while he is ‘in Troy.’ Henryson’s Troilus makes a concise formal summary of the sorry end of Cresseid, and follows it allegedly with the gesture of writing a concise, judicious epitaph. He laments the Cresseid who was once ‘of Troy’ (607–9). Shakespeare’s Troilus makes what seems to be an

---

their ‘triuwe’ to each other (17143, 17187), and have everything except their ‘être,’ their courtly honour and social status (16881).

73 601–2. Henryson’s Troilus, according to Johnson, fails to measure up to the challenge of Cresseid’s history (see 314): ‘[i]t seems he both knows no more and can say no more’ (317). I interpret his ‘I can no moir’ as a marker of his proper public presence and the ‘trouthe,’ in this case integrity and wise judgement, with which he receives the news of Cresseid’s decline and death, and is said to dispose of her tomb and epitaph. His incisive judgement about the Crisyeide figure and about the value of love is made clear in Chaucer and Henryson.

74 5.11.22. Bradbrook connects Chaucer with Shakespeare here: ‘the Folio text borrows a climax of Chaucer … Namore to seye’ (“What Shakespeare Did,” 318).

75 We can consider this as an act of annotation of the testimony of Cresseid. See this chapter, fn 24; also Syme 72–78, 88–91.
uncontained gesture towards Cressida by tearing up her letter as if it is her body,\textsuperscript{76} followed by a concise, formal announcement of Hector’s death (5.11.3, 5.11.4–9, 5.11.14–22). In this death announcement, Shakespeare’s Troilus laments the introduction of grievous sorrow into the court of Troy.\textsuperscript{77} Troilus, on common ground and probably still on the battlefield, asks rhetorically who will go in to Troy to relay the news of Hector’s death to the courtiers (5.11.14–22). That person will intrude, the way Cassandra did in Benoît, as a ‘screech-owl.’\textsuperscript{78} The messenger will figuratively take no-man’s-land into Troy with him or her, and the news of Hector’s death will reveal Troy to have fallen and become common ground. Troilus predicts that whoever announces Hector’s death at the court will ‘[s]care Troy out of itself.’\textsuperscript{79} To me, these two ideas are compatible ways of understanding the same process: the horrific news of death symbolically brings the action of the common ground into Troy, and also forces Troy to leave off being Troy. Thus ‘there is no more to say’ marks the revelation of the limits of Troy in time and in the structural integrity or ‘trouthe’ of the court (5.11.22).

Where Henryson’s Troilus acknowledges the end of Cresseid’s life and worthiness, and Shakespeare’s Troilus acknowledges the end of the worthy warrior Hector and the fall of Troy, Chaucer’s Troilus uses the phrase ‘I kan namore’ in Troy during the ‘tyme of trewe’ with Criseyde (III 1779). It seems to suggest that Troilus recognises there are limits to how he can express joy. However, in addition, I think Chaucer uses this expression of limitation in a way that picks up on the motif of the misers of joy (III 1373–86). By having Troilus express

\textsuperscript{76} Stage direction, 5.4.109: ‘tearing the letter.’ See also Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 36, 51–52.

\textsuperscript{77} Fly considers portentous speeches in \textit{Troilus and Cressida} to be an echo of Cassandra’s prophecies ("Cassandra", 162, 164), as if everyone is channelling Cassandra. It is an interesting interpretation, particularly if we consider my argument that in Benoît, Cassandra intrudes monstrously on private courtly space braying. However, I disagree with Fly that no one but Cassandra ‘sees [the] way clearly’ (164). To me, this speech by Troilus is a clear instance of Troilus showing that Shakespeare knows Henryson’s poem, in which news of Cresseid’s leprosy and death becomes a monstrous intrusion on the courtly space in which Troilus hears the news. Troilus forecasts what is going to happen to Cressida offstage.

\textsuperscript{78} 5.11.16. Benoît describes Cassandra’s intrusive braying prophecy at the wedding of Paris and Helen. She is shut away so she does not continue to disturb the festivities (\textit{Roman de Troie}, 4884–86, 4886, 4931–36).

\textsuperscript{79} 5.11.21. I return to the idea of the threshold of Troy in the next chapter.
the idea of joy explicitly connected with the idea of impossibility, Chaucer is warning us once again about the constraints of the metanarrative.

The sense of limitation contained in the phrase ‘I kan namore’ is alluded to by Shakespeare’s Troilus in his assessment of the ‘monstruosity of love’ in which the desire of lovers is ‘a slave to limit.’ The pure joy of Chaucer’s Troilus becomes the monstrous, enslaved desire of Shakespeare’s Troilus.

**Eroding time: the limits of ‘Troy’**

The theme of oblivion is connected with the limits of ‘Troy.’ The operation of time is conceived by Shakespeare’s Ulysses as a process whereby personified Time stores ‘alms for oblivion,’ the ‘scrap’ of ‘good deeds past,’ in his wallet. Shakespeare draws here on the alms Henryson’s Troilus gives Cresseid in her state of no longer knowing ‘quhat scho was,’ which seems to me to be another kind of oblivion. Cressida refers to oblivion in her ‘water

---


81 ‘This is the monstruo of love, lady’ (3.2.75); ‘[i]n all Cupid’s pageant there is presented no monster’ (3.2.69–70). In chapter two, I analyse the ideas of the metanarrative involved in parade motifs and going from Troy. In relation to Troilus’s use of ‘all’ in Shakespeare, Chaucer’s Troilus begins to lead ‘al his life’ (III 1717) in ‘Troy’ with Criseyde. Cresseid refers to her great social fame as ‘[a]ll … areir’ (424). In this phrase concerning the entirety of the pageant of Cupid, Shakespeare’s Troilus encapsulates the concept of being ‘in Troy’: in a self-sufficient courtly space, monsters are not permitted. The monstrous Cassandra is sequestered in Benoit, for instance (Roman de Troie, 4931–36). The place of ‘Troy’ is a place of pageantry and parades. The essence of ‘Troy’ as a place of ‘trouthe’ is that nothing ugly, monstrous or distasteful is permitted to exist there. Thus Cressida can be a monster outside ‘Troy,’ and Cressida’s monstrosity places her outside ‘Troy,’ even though she appears fair.

82 3.3.139–42. The ‘trouthe’ of the ‘good deeds’ is presented as fragmented and placed squarely in the past, where it is destined to be hidden away in the wallet. I think these ‘scrap’ refer both to Chaucer’s miserly coins that a greedy person must ‘mokre and kecche’ in the street (III 1375), and to the ‘fractions of her faith, orts of her love, / The fragments, scraps, the bits and greasy relics / Of [Cressida’s] o’er-eaten faith’ (5.2.158–60), that is, the terms in which Shakespeare’s Troilus describes Cressida’s betrayal of their vows. Ulysses shows an awareness of the metanarrative: his description of Time prophesies what has already happened. This interpretation is in line with Pittock’s view that the alms Troilus gives Cresseid are given in ‘a kind of surrogate sexual act (“Complexity”, 206).

83 ‘Quhair Cresseid sat, not witting quhat scho was’ (497). Pittock, “Complexity,” 260: scholars generally interpret this as meaning Troilus does not know what Cresseid is. Pittock suggests it means Cresseid does not know what she is: ‘Cresseid … has temporarily lost a sense of her identity (note ‘quhat’ instead of ‘quha’) and with it the power to take in outward impressions’ (260). I agree with him, and I suggest the interpretation is complicated further by the ambiguous past tense. Cressida perhaps didn’t know what she was as she sat begging,
drops’ speech, to which I turn shortly: the role of ‘blind oblivion’ is to ‘[swallow] cities up’ (3.2.174). The operation of time is to erase the stones of Troy little by little, like water drops. Agamemnon, too, refers to the ‘formless ruin of oblivion.’ These descriptions delineate the limits of Troy in relation to time. They help to place the characters of Shakespeare’s play outside the time of ‘Troy,’ because they are looking back from somewhere beyond its ending. This imagery of erosion and delimitation applies equally to ‘Troy’ and to the status of the Criseyde who once lived ‘in Troy,’ that is, Troy as a place that stood at one point in time is eroded, and the form of Criseyde that was an individual in Troy is eroded, until they both remain as concepts centred in the past.

Criseyde of Troy is described as clear and bright.

In Chaucer, she ‘was Troilus lady right, / And cler stood on a ground of sikernesse’ (III 981–82). This is an equivocal statement and, I think, a warning by the narrator. It could mean that Criseyde is ‘in the clear,’ that is, safe for a time from public scrutiny and suspicion of being tainted by her father’s treason, when she is in Troy under Troilus’s protection. It could mean in part that she stood in Troy looking beautiful, and was known for standing out on account of her courtly attributes. It could equally mean that she is only as clear—in the sense of both ‘in the clear’ and beautiful—as she is on steady ground, that is, she is not really either even though she seems to be.

that is, a leper, and perhaps didn’t know what she once had been, that is, a lady. I agree with Pittock that the use of ‘quhat’ rather than ‘quha’ is significant: ‘quhat’ refers specifically to her social status in relation to the court, given for instance Old French courtly lyrics in which the courtly lady is reified as ‘la Riens,’ the ‘thing.’ See also McKenna, “Henryson’s ‘Tragedie,’” 29: ‘at [the] final point of the tragic action she has no choice but to bear the burden of knowing who and what she is, paradoxically because at the end she knows that she must also bear the more unbearable burden of knowing who and what she was—‘fals Cresseid’ (546), the one who abandoned the ‘trew knycht Troylus’ and brought all the present misery, destitution and destruction down upon herself.’

4.7.50–51. Cresseid grieves in her formal Complaint at the loss of the form of her face: ‘Now is deformit the figure of my face’ (448). The narrator too has described her seeing ‘hir face sa deformait’ (349). The social face she once presented to the world is damaged beyond repair.

C. David Benson, “‘True Troilus and False Cresseid’”, 162: ‘[d]espite the widespread attacks on her in English literature for more than two centuries, Criseyde could be portrayed as attractive at the conclusion of a 1612 poem by Richard Johnson, addressed to his mistress: ‘Cressed of Troy that was so bright.’

86 The steadiness of the ground in the latter case would be an ironic description on the part of the narrator, which, I suggest, would not be out of character. There are many instances in medieval literature of ladies...
This ‘sikernesse’ is rhymed directly with a line referring to absence of suspicion: ‘Al thoughte she hire servaunt and hire knyght / Ne sholde of right non untrouthe in hire gesse’ (III 983–84). The very concept of ‘sikernesse’ in Criseyde is followed by the concept of Troilus suspecting her of ‘untrouth.’

The ‘cler’ Criseyde on her ‘ground of sikernesse’ is one of the ‘fetheres brighte of Troie.’ In the second chapter, I examine rather fluttery images that symbolise falling away, specifically the ‘fetheres brighte of Troy’ and the joy of Troilus which is torn from him like leaves from a tree (V 1546, IV 225–31). Again, this pair of ideas equates the sorrow of Troy with the sorrow of Troilus. These images of exchange rely on the image of Criseyde already described in the ‘tyme of trewe’ as a newly moulted falcon, mentioned above.

equated with gems, and gems can also have an architectural symbolic value. Here are some examples, in which the ground and buildings are associated with ladies and virtue. Christine de Pizan refers to worthy ladies as ‘beautiful gleaming stones, more precious than any others in the world,’ that constitute the wall of the City of Ladies (de Pizan, *City of Ladies*, 91). Bishop, “Lapidary Formulas,” 471: the poem ‘Annot and John,’ from MS DL Harley 2253, begins, ‘ichot a burde in a bour ase beryl so bryght’ (1: I refer to line numbers in Brook, *Harley Lyrics*), I note that the final line of this poem encloses Annot in that courtly space with John, in a state of joy: ‘gentil ase Ionas, heo ioyeþ with Ion’ (50). Boccaccio’s Pandaro tells Criseida that if she is wise enough to love Troilo, ‘[b]en è la gemma posta nell’ anello’ (II 43, ‘the gem is well set in the ring’; for text, see Griffin and Myrick, *Filostrato*). Chaucer’s Pandarus echoes this: ‘Wel in the ryng than is the ruby set’ (II 585). His Troilus laments outside Criseyde’s empty palace: ‘O ryng fro which the ruby is out falle!’ (V 549).

Her ‘sikernesse’ relies on the passivity and pacific nature of Troilus’s imagination. Even while she is in Troy swearing fealty to Troilus in Book Three, at a time when there is no threat of departure, Criseyde warns him not to let his suspicions get away from him, because his ideas might harm her: ‘Lat in youre brayn non other fantasie / So crepe that it cause me to dye!’ (III.1504–5).

87 V 1546. As far as I know, scholars have not yet pointed out these connections.
88 III 1779, III 1781. There would be a very useful further study to be made of words as feathers, courtly love poets as birds, and micrography. There is precedent in Middle High German literature, for instance, for images like ‘fetheres brighte’ (V 1546) referring to a courtly lover. In the falcon poem of der von Küremberc, the lover is represented by a falcon with gold wound in his wings (von der Leyen, *Deutsche Dichtung des Mittelalters*, 238–39). Gottfried von Straßburg’s narrator refers to the poet Bligger von Steinach as having bound books and letters on his body as if they are feathers (*Tristan*, 4716–18; ‘it is still my belief that he has bound books and letters on himself as feathers’). I infer that the bright feathers of Troy are the lively people in Troilus’s social group while he is with Criseyde, though I note that they can be taken to be the soldiers: this is borne out by Benoît’s description of messengers with plumed helmets (*Roman de Troie*, 6227–32). They are also people who have received favour from a lover, as Troilus did before Criseyde left Troy. Essentially they are people who attract other people, as Bligger von Steinach does with his verses: he sticks the rhymes together, ‘wie kan er rîme lîmen’ (*Tristan*, 4714), and it is with lime that birds are trapped on branches, that is, courtly people are drawn to fall in love, and become stuck as a result (see Riwalîn falling in love, 841–56).
Criseyde’s fear of her reputation

The scene in Chaucer that I identify as the ‘garden set piece’ is significant to a discussion of the metanarrative in relation to the state of ‘Troy.’ It takes place in private space, in Criseyde’s garden, and marks the moment when she agrees tacitly, by taking his first letter, to consider forming an allegiance with Troilus. This moment marks the beginning of the state of being ‘in Troy.’

In this scene, Criseyde stands apart and fears being the focus of unwanted attention. This feeds on her known fear of talk about her reputation as a traitor’s daughter (I 106–112). This statue imagery connected with fear and talk is then resumed, I argue, by Henryson and Shakespeare.

Criseyde is displayed symbolically with a text close to her skin. The letter represents Troilus in his absence, and is bodied, not just because of the sensory experience of medieval vellum or paper, but because on Pandarus’s advice he blots it with his tears a little, and, apparently spontaneously, folds the tears into it. The letter, Troilus’s indirect presence, and the implications for her social life the letter carries invade Criseyde’s private space, and this

90 Stanbury has previously analysed the temple scene in which Troilus first sees Criseyde as one in which Criseyde stands out, separate from the rest of the worshippers and made distinct by her widow’s habit (I 267–73, I 309; Visual Object of Desire, 108–9). Stanbury identifies in Criseyde a kind of icon status, seen from Troilus’s perspective. I agree that this is an important set piece. I think Henryson draws on themes of standing out and of Criseyde’s slightly self-distancing demeanour and ‘chere’ in his portrait of Cresseid, who stands out horrifically and mourns the loss of her ‘mirth’ (368).
91 To me, this private display functions as a forewarning of the punishment Cresseid and Cressida suffer when they are ‘read’ as texts in public. The ritual display of texts against skin and pillorying as established by Green (Crisis of Truth, 191; 412, note 22) and Smith (“Lying for the Whetstone,” 56) seem to be foreshadowed here, not least because this kind of punishment by ritual publication of ‘untrouthe’ was well known in Chaucer’s time. See also the narrator’s regretful line: ‘Hir name, allas! is publysshed so wide’ (V 1095). Ludlum notes the variant readings ‘punished’ and ‘publiished’ for this line (“Hir Name, Allas!”, 37–40).
92 Camille, “Sensations of the Page,” 1998, 36–37, 38: the manuscript ‘embodies’ all five senses ‘in its own material performance’; ‘[r]ead a text was a charged somatic experience’; 40–42: ‘[t]he skin of the parchment somehow chimes with our own skin and not just that of our fingertips’ (41).
93 This contrasts with Boccaccio’s Troilo, who seems to be a more eloquent writer than Chaucer’s Troilus, and spontaneously presses the letter to his cheek. It blots his tears in the process (Filostrato, II v. 107). By contrast, Chaucer’s Troilus blots the first letter he sends Criseyde with his tears on Pandarus’s advice, for effect (I 1027). I suggest this emotional manipulation is figuratively folded into the letter. McKim, “Tracing the Ring,” 450: Fowler’s ‘Last epistle of Criseyde to Troyalus’ shows Criseyde sending Troilus back his ring, sealing the letter with her tears. I agree that the ring ‘bewashed’ with tears links the poem with Henryson and Chaucer.
is symbolised by the way Pandarus thrusts the letter on her.\textsuperscript{94} Criseyde stands in her garden, a private, enclosed area (II 1114–20). When she refuses to take a letter from Troilus (II 1128–32), Pandarus forces her to stand still.\textsuperscript{95} I really like Sarah Stanbury’s point that the letter ‘shapes a space of privacy around her.’\textsuperscript{96} It marks a moment of exchange within Troy. She freezes out of fear and this creates a kind of pre-monument.\textsuperscript{97} Pandarus makes her laugh, and by laughing in return and accepting the letter,\textsuperscript{98} she accepts her entry into ‘Troy’ and engages in the ‘unsikernesse’ that is the consequence of ‘[thralling] libertee.’\textsuperscript{99} At the same time, the action is significant because Pandarus manipulates two tokens: the item of clothing that signifies Criseyde’s secure widowed status,\textsuperscript{100} and the letter, a token of change and insecurity. Both tokens have distinct bodied qualities.\textsuperscript{101}

\textsuperscript{94} II 54–55. Criseyde and Pandarus, a little apart from the ladies in her garden, put on a kind of private performance that runs the risk of being read and glossed by other people present. This is significant given aspects of private and public performance of Cresseid’s Complain, and the representation of Troilus and Cressida as a stage performance in public.

\textsuperscript{95} Mieszkowski suggests that Pandarus would have to lift Criseyde’s veil and that this adds sexual overtones to the gesture (Medieval Go-Betweens, 143–44). Though I am not convinced about the motive, Pandarus is clearly manipulative. He works on Criseyde’s anxiety about freedom from gossip, about her father and about her private life, by making her worry that her use of the proper private space of her garden might seem improper. In a sense he sows a kind of ‘disese’ in a place where Criseyde is supposedly free from being overlooked. He makes her edgy. He asserts an improper, overfamiliar ownership of private space, which, according to Stanbury, would only have been appropriate for a husband and wife to read and write letters in (“Women’s Letters and Private Space,” 271–72), and he takes liberties with Criseyde’s body.

\textsuperscript{96} Stanbury, “Women’s Letters and Private Space,” 281: ‘Troilus’s letter, thrust down her bosom by Pandarus and in a sense sexually annexed to her person, shapes a space of privacy around her.’ See also 274, 278, 280–82.

\textsuperscript{97} Learning Troilus has sent her a letter, Criseyde freezes, refusing to take it, and ‘al hire humble chere / Gan for to chaunge’ (II 1128–29). The idea of change shows the narrator’s awareness of the changes about to take place in Troy and ‘Troy,’ and changes to Criseyde’s reputation that will follow when she leaves off being a vowess. Fear of change thus intrudes on a social space in which she is distinguished, as the idea of Troilus is introduced to private space, along with the letter-body he sends her.

\textsuperscript{98} Criseyde is persuaded by the fear of looking strange to other people if she makes a fuss: ‘[t]hat folk may sene and gauren on us tweye’ (II 1157).

\textsuperscript{99} II 771–73. Pandarus first dares Criseyde to remove the letter and make a scene (II 1156–57), then, when she refuses to write to Troilus (II 1160–61), he makes a joke of the process (II 1162) and makes her laugh: ‘Therwith she lough, an seyde, “Go we dyne”’ (II 1163, also II 1167). In private, Criseyde has previously expressed her fear of losing her ‘sikernesse’ and ‘libertee’ (II 773), that is, her security and her social freedom. In the verse in which she voices these fears (II 771–77), the end-rhymes track Criseyde’s social fear about this transaction and her awareness that it is foolish: ‘free’ and ‘libertee’; ‘jupartie,’ ‘folie,’ and ‘aspie,’ that is, other people will notice; ‘peyne,’ and ‘pleyne.’ Yet in the garden scene, Pandarus makes her laugh ‘at his folye’ (II 1168). Laughter at Pandarus leads Criseyde to ignore her better judgement and Pandarus’s impropriety.

\textsuperscript{100} Pandarus has already told her to cast her widow’s habit to ‘mischaunce’ (II 222–23).

\textsuperscript{101} For the intense ‘subjective quality’ of tokens, see: Susan Crane, Performance of Self, 3, 6–7, 10–38: the value of text is inscribed on clothing rather than the body; Green, Crisis of Truth, 270, 269–74, 279; de Grazia and Stallybrass, “Materiality,” 280; there are close links between text and fabric through cloth recycled into paper; Stallybrass, “Worn Worlds,” 308: ‘the ability of clothing to absorb memory is again and again figured as a site of crisis,’ for instance ‘clothing falls into the wrong hands’ in Troilus and Cressida; 312, 313–14.
The motif is important because it foreshadows the idea of the Criseyde figure as a commodity, as she leaves Troy and outside it. She can be symbolically impressed with a text it is hard for Pandarus to persuade her to take. There is a moment when Criseyde freezes and in effect holds her breath. Criseyde accepts the letter in the context of laughter and the world in which ‘Troy’ and ‘joy’ are connected begins, but it is laughter based on Pandarus’s manipulations. The difficulty of holding the text to Criseyde’s skin is emphasised by Pandarus, who points out it was hard to engrave her heart (II 1241). Figuratively speaking, the action of letters here demonstrates Pandarus’s maxim that “‘[i]mpressiounes lighte / Ful lightly ben ay redy to the flighte’” (II 1238–39). Criseyde’s heart is slippery and capable of letting knots, Troy, and Troilus slide through it (V 767–78; 5.2.157). It seems emblematic that the letter Pandarus forces on her with maximum awkwardness does not remain pressed to her skin. He makes a light impression with it. In the event, she holds symbols of ‘trouthe,’ Troilus’s tokens and her promises to him, lightly, and gives them away lightly.

Henryson and Shakespeare have Cresseid and Cressida represent the meaning of Chaucer’s garden motif. Cresseid has a body that stands apart, because she looks and sounds different as an ‘abieet odious.’ She has undergone a reversal, because she is a distinct character stuck outside Troy who has lost her mirth, that is, she has lost her place ‘in Troy.’ Cressida stands apart through soliloquies, through the anatomisation she, Ulysses, and Troilus carry out on her body. Her body is ultimately so rhetoricised that it can be represented in the form of a letter after she has left the stage.

102 133. She bears symbolic text about her exclusion on her skin, not just because she has leprosy, which is a marker of social exclusion in itself, but in the symbolic markings and personation of the ‘lybell’ (74) and ‘bill’ (332) of Diomeid and Cynthia.
103 368. Henryson has Cresseid complete the circuit. She loses her source of laughter and becomes an object apart, that people will ‘garen on.’ Both of these changes mark out her exclusion from ‘Troy’ as permanent.
104 Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 51–52: Troilus fragments the letter that represents Cressida’s final presence on the stage; Stallybrass, “Reading the Body,” 121–22: the body is ‘discursive.’
105 Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 255, 260–61, 284: Cressida is to be read; Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 117. Shakespeare’s Troilus points out that the letter, which represents Cressida’s body, contains ‘no matter from the heart’ (5.3.110). This contrasts with the matter of descriptions of Cressida’s attributes, poured into Troilus’s heart by Pandarus. I address this in the third chapter.
Laughter is a marker of instability because it marks the beginning and the end of the state of ‘Troy.’ It seems appropriate to me that this laughter is produced by Criseyde, who in accepting the letter accepts the ensuing ‘sikernesse’ of the state of ‘Troy.’ In this first instance in the garden set piece, it is a precarious kind of laughter, a mixture of fear of scandal, outrage and amusement at Pandarus’s behaviour, awkwardness, and uncertainty about the whole enterprise of loving Troilus.

Vows in Shakespeare: vowing to be true, vowing to see

When they admit their love, Shakespeare’s Troilus claims he is ‘as true as truth’s simplicity, / And simpler than the infancy of truth’ (3.2.156–57). He is the truest (3.2.158–69), and Cressida says she will be known as the most false if she ‘be false, or swerve a hair from truth’ (3.2.171).

Shakespeare has Cressida and Troilus use the idea of the value of Troilus’s ‘truth’ as a reflection of the failure of his ‘trouthe,’ in the sense of his perceptive wisdom. Troilus’s surrender of the ability to see Cressida clearly, based on a presumption of ‘truth’ in her, draws on aspects of seeing connected with images of money and spending in the metanarrative.

Extreme vows of love risk being monstrous. In the betrothal scene, when Cressida asks if there is anything monstrous to fear, Troilus replies, ‘Nothing but our undertakings … This is the monstruosity in love, lady’ (3.2.72–76). The vows themselves seem to involve a

---

106 Henryson uses unreliable laughter in his fox characters. Comparison between the Criseyde figure and fox figures would be another useful area of future research. I note that the description of Cresseid creeping in disguise by night to the leper lodgings parallels the description of Henryson’s fox at the parliament. He skulks playing ‘bukhude’ behind the other animals for fear of being apprehended (Moral Fabillis, 970, in Fox, Poems of Robert Henryson). I suggest Criseyde’s laughter here, like Pandarus’s, is a bit shifty. I note also that the narrator’s description of the moral and physiological changes in the face of the disguised fox bears a striking resemblance to the ‘alterait’ Cresseid (Moral Fabillis, 971–77, 980–81).
distorted way of seeing, an overestimation of value, whether that is an estimation of a woman as an angel or pearl, or an estimation of a lover’s prowess.

In this context, Troilus’s claims about his own ‘truth’ just before Cressida departs are quite fascinating. Troilus presumes that there is no ‘maculation’ in Cressida’s heart (4.5.63), and claims he does not fear her to be untrue (4.5.61). Immediately afterwards, he makes her a promise: ‘Be thou true, / And I will see thee’ (4.5.65–66). This promise contains an impossible and paradoxical idea of the ‘trouthe’ of the Criseyde figure and also the ‘trouthe’ value of Shakespeare’s Troilus. It is not possible for any Criseyde to be true, and it is also not possible for Shakespeare’s Troilus to display clear judgement about Cressida.¹⁰⁷

When Cressida asks Troilus, ‘My lord, will you be true?’ (4.5.101), it is not simply an expression of her insecurity as she is taken out of Troy. It is also a question about whether Shakespeare’s Troilus will be able or willing to see her as false when he sees she has betrayed him. It draws on the idea of the Troilus of the metanarrative, who learned to suspect Criseyde’s rhetoric from her letters once she had left Troy, and who in Henryson assessed her and encapsulated a form of judgment of her in the epitaph. Cressida seems to be asking Troilus if he can take up the challenge and the precedent created by the metanarrative.

Troilus, in response, declares that he is true to a fault, that he possesses an entirely unified coin value, that is, the value of bullion:

I true? Alas, it is my vice, my fault.

Whiles other fish with craft for great opinion,

I with great truth catch mere simplicity;

Whilst some with cunning gild their copper crowns,

With truth and plainness I do wear mine bare.

¹⁰⁷ In this, Shakespeare draws on the past history of Troilus and Criseyde in which Henryson’s Troilus fails to see Cresseid, and Cresseid fails to see Troilus. It is the act of spending money in giving alms that marks Henryson’s Troilus out as a benefactor who acts out of ‘trouthe’ and causes Cresseid to see her own lack of ‘trouthe’, but she is untrue, and Henryson’s Troilus can no longer see her when he meets her outside ‘Troy.’
He claims a purity for himself. It is interesting, then, that he is unable or unwilling to see Cressida clearly in the betrayal scene.

The failure of discernment connects the idea of Troilus’s value of truth in Shakespeare with Chaucer’s ‘misers of joy’ motif, which explicitly equates ability to value love with ability to perceive joy, using a money metaphor. There is the potential for the ‘trouthe’ of Shakespeare’s Troilus to be less true than he claims. The ‘truth’ and ‘simplicity,’ the ‘mereness,’ that is, the ‘entire’ quality of it, belongs to the world of ‘Troy’ in which Chaucer’s Troilus has the freedom to express his joy by spending money liberally. That particular kind of ‘simplicity’ belongs to the world where Chaucer’s Troilus lives ‘al his life’ (III 1717). By the time Shakespeare’s Troilus speaks repeatedly about his ‘truth,’ that truth, in the form of perceptive wisdom, has long since been ‘tir’d with iteration’: it has been gilded over in that it has been repeatedly rewritten, and it would not be possible for it to retain a one-off value.\(^\text{108}\)

Selves and the metanarrative

I argued earlier in the general introduction that critics such as Linda Charnes, David Hillman, and Barbara Hodgdon support a reading of Shakespeare’s play in which time has already happened, and Troilus and Cressida have been quite worn out by the reiterations of the

---

\(^\text{108}\) We can understand Troilus to be true, without doubt, but also contaminated by Criseyde. This idea goes right back to Chaucer and the narrator’s choice of words when Criseyde abandons Troilus:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Ther made nevere womman moore wo} \\
\text{Than she, whan that she falsed Troilus.}
\end{align*}\]

(V 1052–53)

Criseyde ‘falsed’ Troilus. I suggest that the idea of ‘falsing’ him is not just that she proves false to him, but that she damages him in the process. I return in the third chapter to the idea of Troilus suffering damage and ‘disease’ in Shakespeare.
metanarrative. By contrast, James O’Rourke argues that Cressida and Troilus idealise one another and enter unreservedly into a relationship ‘without self-consciousness about the utter conventionality of their behaviour.’ However, the vows of falsehood and truth Cressida and Troilus exchange show an awareness that the idea of a ‘self’ is complicated, that in fact they struggle to maintain a sense of a self that is divided from the stock figures of the metanarrative. They are reduced to ciphers of themselves, and again it seems apt to consider them as a layer in a palimpsest that exists in reaction to previous inscriptions of their character. They are nothing if not self-conscious. Their relationship is one in which they go through the motions of attempting to be individual and struggle with the unavoidable link they have to the metanarrative.

The role of rhetoric seems to be key to this. Cressida memorialises rhetoric about her falsehood, as Troilus memorialises rhetoric about his ‘trouthe.’ In addition, Troilus makes it clear to Cressida that the concept of her constancy is one he stubbornly tries to ‘presume’ in her: ‘O, that I thought it [constancy] could be in a woman— / As, if it can, I will presume in you’ (3.2.145–6). I accept Charnes’s idea that Troilus and Cressida struggle with their notoriety and with the unavoidable sense of the telos against which they are constantly fighting, in a bid to be individual characters in some way. But the force of rhetoric is too strong. Troilus and Cressida are fighting a losing battle, and this awareness comes through in the insistence their rhetoric places on the perpetual nature of their truth and falsehood respectively.

110 O’Rourke, “Rule in Unity,” 139.
111 Charnes refers aptly to Cressida’s ‘ghostly subjectivity’ (“So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 422). Re ciphers, Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 126: the tokens they use are ‘objects … imagined as material hauntings.’
112 They react in part to the final speech of Henryson’s Troilus and the epitaph he allegedly writes, which puts Cresseid into place figuratively and literally: her place, like that of Cressida, is elsewhere.
113 Charnes, “So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 418: Shakespeare passes on the representational problems to his characters and has them struggle with their ‘overdetermined citationality.’
114 Charnes, 419.
Charnes argues that they are famous at the expense of their faces, and that they are ‘unsecret to themselves.’ This is a phrase Cressida uses in the would-be privacy of her conversation with Troilus in Troy (3.2.114). Rather than being unselfconscious about their conventionality as O’Rourke argues, they are bound by having too much awareness of what is both ahead of them and behind them.

**Eroding the Criseyde figure’s reputation**

Shakespeare has Cressida speak a vow of love and fidelity to Troilus that already contains within in it the proof of her falsehood and shows she is aware of her reputation. Even though she is ostensibly still in Troy with Troilus, she swears on the reputation she already knows she has, and swears by the eradication of a Troy that is already no longer standing. This speech is significant because it uses motifs of stone, erosion, faceless rhetoric, and time, to suggest the permanence of people’s awareness of what Cressida is:

If I be false, or swerve a hair from truth,  
When time is old, and hath forgot itself,  
When water drops have worn the stones of Troy  
And blind oblivion swallowed cities up,  
And mighty states characterless are grated  
To dusty nothing, yet let memory  
From false to false among false maids in love  
Upbraid my falsehood …

---

115 Charnes, 418.  
116 Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 48: Cressida’s ‘is the voice of a woman who has read her own story and who recognizes the textuality of her existence. She exists to be the term which puts closure on a literary declension of woman’s falseness’; Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 255: her falsehood is the only ‘almost inescapable constant amidst the generalized slippage of identity and value.’
Yea, let them say, to stick the heart of falsehood,

‘As false as Cressid.’

I note here the effect of water, which erodes the ‘stones of Troy,’ and time’s capacity to ‘[grate] mighty states’ until they are devoid of specific features, until the distinguishing text is removed from them. They are made ‘characterless,’ free of characteristics and free of lettering.

This passage suggests to me that Cressida rhetorically wills her reputation for falsehood to endure, while knowing she already has the reputation she protests against. What is recognisable and specific about her, what makes her physically distinguished from anyone else, will be eroded, and what remains will be the knowledge that she is false.

Cressida describes a time beyond the fall of Troy, when the city has been eroded by grief. This is the Troy that Troilus describes at the end of the play, the court that will be turned into mourners, over the ‘statues’ constituted by the soldiers’ bodies, when Troy falls. Cressida is ostensibly making a vow of ‘trouthe’ to Troilus. But any suggestion of a vow of fidelity is counteracted, because she plainly predicts what has already happened many times over. Troilus is already betrayed. Cook points out the strangeness of a speech that is supposedly one of fidelity but fits with the idea of the Criseyde figure from the metanarrative:

[The] moment [of the speech] requires a certain wrenching of our perspective to accommodate [it … It] rings oddly in context as the utterance

117 3.2.171–83. The alms of Henryson’s Troilus stick the heart of Cresseid, which is the heart of falsehood. Her reaction to identifying her benefactor is a ‘stound’ (538) that passes ‘[t]hrowout hir hart’ (539) with an action described as being ‘[s]tiffer than steill’ (538). In line with images of the whetstone as defined in the general introduction, Troilus’s almsgiving acts as a whetstone to Cresseid’s outburst about her own falsehood after the ‘stound.’ Shakespeare is very likely to be drawing on Henryson here.

118 Yet like Cresseid who claims a pre-eminence in suffering, Cressida claims for herself a pre-eminence in falsehood. She will not just be false, she will be the epitome of falsehood.

119 5.11.18–20. Fly considers this prophetic aspect to be part of the residual presence of Cassandra and her prophecies, which he identifies working throughout the play (“Cassandra,” 162). This is an interesting viewpoint. I suggest that Cresseid, who is outside Troy, also takes on parts of the traditional role of Cassandra, who is in Troy.

120 Charnes, “So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 433.
of a woman vowing fidelity to her lover, but fits instead … the pattern of
the story as it is already written. Suddenly the moment of theatrical
presence … reveals itself scored with the pressure of a narrative tradition in
which Cressida’s betrayal is always an accomplished act.121

The idea of Cressida ‘[swerving] … from truth’ is axiomatic. Cressida describes the way in
which she will become what she has already become, a simile for falsehood.122

Cressida’s rhetoric shows an awareness of motifs, from both Chaucer and Henryson,
that are connected with the time when the Criseyde figure has gone from Troy. These are
themes of oblivion, memory, and erosion. Cressida’s iteration of these themes while she is
still in Troy with Troilus pre-empts the latter stages of the story of Criseyde and Cresseid,
and draws on them.

Shakespeare draws particularly on the fears and public humiliation Criseyde and
Cresseid undergo. When she ‘[falses] Troilus,’123 Chaucer’s Criseyde laments the loss of her
‘name of trouthe’ (V 1055): her sense of individual distinction as a specific lady will be lost
as she becomes the subject of gossip and is ‘[r]olled … on many a tonge.’124 The substance of
the idea of Criseyde that people remember will be figuratively abraded as she is gossiped
about, until the story about her is what remains. Cresseid undergoes physical changes, on
account of leprosy, that quite literally abrade her once courtly appearance, and make her
unrecognisable and socially unknowable.125 people including Troilus do not know who she is,
and do not wish to know her, that is, to acknowledge that they know her. Shakespeare draws
directly on Criseyde and Cresseid in the speech he gives Cressida at this point in the play.

122 The implication seems to be that ‘false maids in love’ will use her as a benchmark of falsehood to measure
their own progress in falsehood, rather than as a corrective. Cressida does not intend to be a corrective example
to them.
123 V 1053. This expression occurs when Criseyde wrongs Troilus having left Troy. But the expression is
prefigured in her speech in III 806, during which she reacts with horror to the very idea of wronging him.
124 V 1061. Hillman, Shakespeare’s Entrails, 60: the characters of Shakespeare’s play are “‘tir’d with iteration”
(3.2.164), ’ that is worn out as well as clothed in repeat performances.
125 The ‘figour’ of her socially acceptable ‘face’ is now ‘deformit’ (448).
Both Criseyde and Cresseid are figuratively worn down by social fear and distress, by fear of public talk, by humiliation, and by means of the ways in which their individuality is abraded.

**Monsters on display**

Cressida is afraid to be ‘unsecret’ (3.2.114). She is afraid to tell Troilus she loves him and to be seen loving him. He reassures her, and suggests she ‘apprehend no fear,’ because ‘in all of love’s pageant there is presented no monster.’ This is a clear example of awareness of the metanarrative, which draws on both Chaucer and Henryson. As I argued earlier, Chaucer’s Criseyde and Troilus both feel fear early in the poem before they make their allegiance: Troilus fears love and not having his love returned by Criseyde, a fear characterised by swooning and by his senses metaphorically fleeing out of town. Criseyde fears the risk of ‘unsikernesse’ inherent in entering the social scene of Troy and loving Troilus, and she fears being seen acting strangely in her garden, a fear that leads her to accept Troilus’s letter. From the start of Chaucer, it is safe to say that Criseyde fears being put on display.

Henryson’s Cresseid is an example of a monster on display, and is an example of the strange culmination of Criseyde’s fear of being stared at. Cresseid is like a public version of Cassandra in Benoît’s *Roman de Troie*. Where Cassandra disrupted private courtly space and was hidden away as a result (4931–36), Cresseid occupies no-man’s-land and is only

---

126 This seems to build on the social fear Criseyde and Cresseid experience connected with standing out.
127 3.2.69–70. Charnes, “‘So Unsecret to Ourselves,’” 414–15; 421, footnote 12; Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 35–36, 39, 52; Nitecki, “Fenget of the New,” 126. It seems to me that if ‘discourse is handled as if it is physical’ (Greene, “Language and Value,” 275), then the ‘madness of discourse’ in which Troilus ultimately addresses Cressida’s betrayal handles and segments discourse about her body. The effect on him of its presence in his heart is that it is a distasteful, monstrous body, like Cresside’s: he has a diseased body in his body. Shakespeare’s Troilus displays a visceral distaste towards Cressida that Henryson’s Troilus does not display towards Cresseid. For a ‘pathological capacity for disgust’ in Troilus, see Harris, *Sick Economies*, 97.
128 Charnes points out that Cresseid is a ‘monster’ in two senses: she is a monster and a warning (“So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 421).
disposed of by the end of her illness, hastened by her social disgrace at realising she has been seen on display, as a monster, by Troilus.

The ideas of monstrosity, oblivion, financial transactions, and display are brought together in two motifs in Shakespeare. The first is the concept of Time gathering ‘alms for oblivion,’ described by Ulysses as a ‘great-sized monster / Of ingratiations’ (3.3.139–42). To my mind, this description applies to Criseyde, who turns out to be a miser of joy, and who seems to me to calculate the social value of being associated with Troilus and receiving his ‘kynde noriture’ and protection, rather than appreciating him just for the joy of being with him and valuing love in its own right (IV 768). Ulysses’s description of Time applies also to Cresseid, whose blasphemy against her gods and whose ingratitude for the length of time she was allowed to be the ‘flour of luif in Troy’ leads her to be transformed into a socially repugnant figure, whose fate it is to be on public display, begging. As Lesley Johnson argues, the effects of leprosy on Cresseid are the effects of accelerated ageing, that allow her to speak from the end of time, which ‘makes lovers unlovely.’ Although I cannot claim absolutely that Shakespeare has drawn directly on the idea of Cresseid as a monster, it seems a reasonable inference, particularly given three aspects of the life of Cresseid. First, Henryson’s narrator is quite clear that oblivion is a feature of Cresseid’s life as a leper: ‘Quhair Cresseid sat, not witting quhat scho was’ (497). Second, Cresseid, once she has gone from Troy, is forgotten as an individual and remembered as a horror story. Third, Cresseid

128. She misses the vital point that she was only promised that praise as long as she was ‘in Troy.’ Hillman, Shakespeare’s Entrails, 65: ‘time is repeatedly personified.’ It would be interesting to compare this representation of time as an ungrateful monster with the portrayal of the traitors in Shakespeare’s Henry V, the ‘English monsters’ (2.2.81–82), particularly Lord Scrope, who ‘almost [might] have coined [Henry] into gold’ (2.2.95).

130 The nature of Cresseid’s blasphemy is debated. McKenna argues convincingly that Cresseid is punished for an act she committed while she was the Crisye of Chaucer’s poem, that is, for betraying Troilus rather than crying out against her gods (‘Henryson’s Tragedie,’” 28).


132 She creates this story in her public outcry and her testament, and Troilus affirms the accuracy of it with the symbolic seal of his judicious public displays of ‘trouthe’ and concise, apt judgement. His contained and appropriate grief and ‘pietie’ make his affirmation of the change of Cresseid socially valuable.
receives alms from a Troilus who is unable to recognise in her who she is or was. She is forgotten and placed in the past, as she remarks herself: ‘All is areir, thy greit royall renoun.’

The second motif that brings these concerns together is the response of Troilus to Cressida’s fear. He observes that ‘[i]n all Cupid’s pageant there is presented no monster’ (3.2.69–70). As Charnes points out, Troilus describes Cressida’s fears as monsters and as warnings. Troilus is alluding to the public image of Cressida as a monster who is a servant of Cupid and Venus and who is punished by the gods by being put on display. In this speech, Troilus describes the ‘monstruosity’ of love, which is its promises and its rhetoric: the lover gives ‘undertakings’ to perform feats (3.2.72), and makes vows that cannot be fulfilled. Extravagant rhetoric is monstrous.

The contained value of Cressida

There is an interesting point to be made in connection with awareness of the metanarrative and being ‘in Troy.’ Many critics such as Harris, Mead, Molly Murray, and Mallin have detailed the way the value of Cressida relates to exchange and commodity value. In chapter 424. I note also that to Cresseid, the world ‘of Troy’ is designated as ‘all,’ just as Chaucer’s Troilus lived ‘al his life’ (III 1717) in that space of ‘Troy.’ It was a space where Troilus’s ‘trouthe’ and his ‘renoun’ had an effect on those in proximity to him. Cresseid experienced a reflected ‘renoun’ in his company, and now must reflect on it from the outside. Also, the ‘name of trouthe’ (V 1055) and the ‘greit royall renoun’ of Criseyde and Cresseid, both described in their absence, become in Shakespeare the simile spoken ‘[f]rom false to false, among false maids in love’ (3.2.177).

Extravagant claims are a sign of presumption that goes beyond the actual limits of what is possible. I suggest they are a sign of lack of ‘trouthe’ in the sense of lack of judicious and concise speech. The nature of the location of ‘Troy’ as a place of ‘trouthe’ is that it is a place where Troilus can spend extravagantly, but the difference, it seems to me, is that his ‘frendome’ is a received attribute of a courtly lover.

Harris Untimely Matter, 16; Mead, “Thou Art Chang’d,” 248; 259; 238: ‘the extraliterary debates over the meaning of money, wealth, and exchange show themselves in the very rupture that makes Troilus and Cressida

---

133 424. I note also that to Cresseid, the world ‘of Troy’ is designated as ‘all,’ just as Chaucer’s Troilus lived ‘al his life’ (III 1717) in that space of ‘Troy.’ It was a space where Troilus’s ‘trouthe’ and his ‘renoun’ had an effect on those in proximity to him. Cresseid experienced a reflected ‘renoun’ in his company, and now must reflect on it from the outside. Also, the ‘name of trouthe’ (V 1055) and the ‘greit royall renoun’ of Criseyde and Cresseid, both described in their absence, become in Shakespeare the simile spoken ‘[f]rom false to false, among false maids in love’ (3.2.177).

134 Charnes, “So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 421.

135 3.2.75. Cook, in the context of ‘monstruosity of love,’ observes that women ‘are produced as objects’; ‘[t]he woman’s body becomes the means by which masculine desire represents itself to itself, but the insufficiency of the image provokes at moments violent impulses of rage, articulated in images of fragmentation of a woman’s body’ (“Unbodied Figures,” 36). In other words, the idea of bodies being fragmented is part of the process of monstrosity. Fragmentation is a grotesque use of body rhetoric.

136 Extravagant claims are a sign of presumption that goes beyond the actual limits of what is possible. I suggest they are a sign of lack of ‘trouthe’ in the sense of lack of judicious and concise speech. The nature of the location of ‘Troy’ as a place of ‘trouthe’ is that it is a place where Troilus can spend extravagantly, but the difference, it seems to me, is that his ‘frendome’ is a received attribute of a courtly lover.

137 Harris Untimely Matter, 16; Mead, “Thou Art Chang’d,” 248; 259; 238: ‘the extraliterary debates over the meaning of money, wealth, and exchange show themselves in the very rupture that makes Troilus and Cressida
two, I examine how the Criseyde figure’s value relates to going from Troy, and how this revaluation of Criseyde depends on an awareness of the metanarrative, and draws on motifs Chaucer has established to characterise and display Criseyde and Troilus ‘in Troy.’ For now, I turn my attention to the concept of the contained value of Cressida, that is to say, the idea of value that pertains to her before she has been exchanged. As with the concept of being ‘in Troy,’ this is problematic, because Cressida has always been exchanged and is characterised by means of her own instability.\textsuperscript{138}

There are two main ideas to analyse. The first is the idea expressed by Troilus in the context of valuing Helen: ‘What’s aught but as ’tis valued?’\textsuperscript{139} The second is the concept of Cressida as a ‘pearl,’ which is Troilus’s description of her (1.1.96). Critics have noted that there is a widespread concern with questions of transnationality, value, and exchange in the works of Shakespeare and his contemporaries, so I want to acknowledge that this is a general trend. But within that, the question of value can be traced back to questions of the value of the problematic play it is: the discrepancy between abstract ideals and manipulated commodities’; Murray, “Value of ‘Eschaunge,’” 340: ‘[i]n both love and war … substitutions compensate the losses of separation and absence with new forms of value. In Troilus and Criseyde, a poem concerned with both love and war, Chaucer … interweaves these analogous modes of arbitrary productive exchange’; Murray, 335–36: ‘the poem makes use of the resonances of ransom to suggest that value and meaning are not threatened, but rather generated by separation and exchange’; 337: ‘a ransom debt was created not by action alone but by a subsequent transaction’; 339–40: ‘[t]he ransom debt originated … in an arbitrary act of substitution and equivalence: merely in being captured and then “translated” from one side of a conflict to another, a man [sic] became an emblem of what Christine de Pisan terms “fynaunce.”’

\textsuperscript{138} Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 255: Cressida’s falsehood is the only constant amid the general slippage of identity and value”; Mead, “Thou Art Chang’d,” 248: commodity value is tied to reputation; “[t]he war itself may be understood as a bullionist contention between two principalities. The bullion, which those societies understand as wealth itself, is Helen … Those who win praise fighting to win or keep her become enriched with the currency of reputation—a currency backed by Helen’s agreed-upon worth.”

\textsuperscript{139} 2.2.52. O’Rourke: Cressida knows that her only place in such an order is an unhappy one; when a simple mutuality of desire is alienated to the judgment of a totalizing authority, women lose their identities as they become the ‘things’ men use to demonstrate mastery and achieve priority within the Symbolic Order. There is a fundamental incompatibility between the fame Troilus hopes to win by warring over Helen and the satisfaction Cressida can offer. Although Troilus describes Helen as a ‘pearl,’ he knows that her value is entirely a construct and that it is only the war itself that paints her as ‘the most beautiful woman in the world’; in herself she’s like any other ‘thing’ in the Symbolic Order: ‘[n]aught but as ’tis valued’ (2.2.52). In order to get satisfaction from Cressida, however, he needs to believe in her intrinsic value if her opinion of him is to satisfy his need for self-esteem. (“Rule in Unity,” 150)
Chaucer’s Criseyde, first ‘in Troy’ and then beyond it. When Criseyde leaves Troy, she asks herself, ‘What is Criseyde worth, from Troilus?’ This fundamental question of value describes the appraisal of Criseyde as a kind of commodity. Shakespeare’s Troilus applies the same quality of appraisal to his question about Helen’s value.

The basic premise of some arguments is that Cressida has a value when she is located in Troy that is not economically transferrable. Mead, for instance, discusses Troilus’s description of her as a pearl. To Gary Spear, Cressida and Helen are characterised both as pearls and as prostitutes, who can only be owned as commodities for a prescribed length of time. As a pearl, Cressida has a value that is beyond price, yet as Mead argues, she is second in value to Helen, so the pearls within Troy are part of a hierarchy of sorts. Harris notes that Helen is the ‘yardstick of value’ to the male characters in Troy.


141 IV 765–66. That is, Criseyde questions her own worth if she is separated from Troilus. Criseyde refers to her means of existence in terms of being a fish out of water and plant that receives no nourishment, that is, the question of what Troilus can do for her socially and practically. It is striking to compare this question of value with a motif of ‘trouthe’ in love from the lai of ‘Chevrefoil’ by Marie de France (Lais). In this poem, Tristan and Isolde exchange a secret token and Marie de France’s narrator observes that they are like a honeysuckle vine growing on a hazel bush: neither can live without the other (68–70, 77–78). They go to great efforts and risk to meet one another in secret and derive nourishment from their meeting, without there being any sort of social or pecuniary advantage to either of them.

142 Spear: The image of a woman as a “pearl”—a passive object completely within the control and ownership of men, available for their exchanges and transactions in a wholly unproblematised way—has its counterpart in the disorderly, threatening images of both Cressida and Helen as prostitutes or “strumpets” . . . If the woman-as-pearl bespeaks a certain male fantasy of complete control over the feminine, then the woman as prostitute reverses that fantasy . . . In the mercantile terms of the play . . . the prostitute is perceived as a threat to male autonomy because she is a woman capable of being owned only for a prescribed period of time. (“Shakespeare’s ‘Manly’ Parts,” 421)

143 Mead, “Thou Art Chang’d,” 252: ‘Cressida’s pearl like quality . . . is far less stable [than Helen’s]. She is only a pearl so long as she is untaken . . . she only has untouchable worth so long as she assumes a negative existence’; “[l]ike a pearl, like Helen herself, Cressida is a priceless abstract: a signified. Because it is unique, a pearl has no equivalent; it has no measurable or concrete value. A pearl is outside of currency; it cannot be minted or counterfeited . . . But because Helen is the preeminent pearl, Cressida’s value must in fact be finite and subordinate.’

144 Harris, Sick Economies, 98: to Diomedes, Helen represents ‘contaminated carrion weight’ (4.1.72). The idea of disease and contamination is relevant to my argument that the memorial idea of Troilus is affected by the body rhetoric of Cressida once she has been exchanged and has betrayed Troilus.
Cressida are subject to ‘revaluation’ when they undergo public exchange. Critics consider Cressida’s value to be in exchange, whether she is a substitute for Helen or for Antenor. Her value is initiated and engaged by exchange. As such the image of her as a ‘pearl’ is debased because a ‘pearl’ does not have a transactional value the way bullion would. The inference I draw from this is that there is an idea that Cressida could be contained within Troy and be a pearl. Yet it seems to me that Troilus in describing her as a pearl is presuming she has a particular value for the sake of getting to be with her. For her sake, he presumes, against reason. If he wants to retain a sense that it might be possible for him to be in Troy with his own Cressida, he needs to wilfully ignore questions of her transactional value.

The background criticism describes Cressida as a pearl with a value relative to the value of Helen. They both gain their value in translation beyond national borders, according to Harris and Mead. To me, Cressida is already aware of her value as a Cressid within the nominal borders denoting space within Troy and outside Troy, because she already has an awareness of the world of the metanarrative. To this extent, the idea of her as a pearl is a non-starter. If she were unknowing and hence in some way able to be secret to herself, she might

---

145 Harris, *Sick Economies*, 94–95; 98: Cressida recognises that ‘her value emerges not from her “own” intrinsic qualities but from patriarchal markets of fluctuating value and demand’; Harris, 99: Cressida ‘cannot avoid becoming whatever male evaluators determine her to be.’ I think the idea of what Cressida is relates to the description of Cresseid not witting ‘quhat scho was’ in Henryson (497). Harris, 100: ‘even as the play disqualifies the possibility of fixed and intrinsic worth, it is important not to forget that it also literally pathologizes attributive value.’

146 Mallin, “Emulous Factions,” 153, 162: Troilus is ‘conditioned’ to think an exchange of Antenor for Cressida is ‘a good trade’; O’Rourke: the ‘actual object being fought for’ is irrelevant and this is seen in the ‘declension of the role of the *femme fatale* from Helen to Cressida to Thersites’ (“Rule in Unity,” 142); the term “‘whore’” refers to ‘those who have been forcibly transferred from one man to another’ rather than to ‘women paid for sexual services’ (141). So, I infer, the value of description lies in transfer.

147 Mead, “Thou Art Chang’d,” 250–51: in the context of Ulysses and ‘alms for oblivion,’ ‘[h]oardéd money, like dusty gold, is unpraised and hence virtually worthless. Reputation, like money, is movement, and that which does not move is bound for oblivion.’
have a non-transactional value and might be a pearl. However, she makes it clear that she identifies two kinds of self in herself:

I have a kind of self resides with you—

But an unkind self, that itself will leave

To be another’s fool.

(3.2.135–37)

She identifies the self that is perhaps her own Cressida and the self that is Troilus’s Cressida. She is already negotiating transfers of herself inside what passes for Troy.

I recognise what Mead, Harris, O’Rourke, Mallin, and Murray say about the nature of value in transfer particularly across national borders. I agree that Cressida has a financial value when it comes to ransoming Antenor and has a commodity value to Diomed. However, I disagree that there could be a place somehow ‘in’ Troy where she was not already making transactions and calculating where her ‘self’ will go and stay. Mead in particular argues from a standpoint in which Cressida as a pearl is ‘valued because she is untaken.’ To me, this idea sits uncomfortably with Cressida. In the fuller context of Chaucer, we see that

---

148 C. David Benson, “True Troilus and False Cresseid,” 161: ‘Pistol in Henry V calls Doll Tearsheet a “lazar kit of Cressid’s kind,” and, aided by alliteration … “Cressid’s kind” became a common term for a … prostitute’; Mead, “Thou Art Chang’d,” 253: Cressida ‘has a sense of her own calculable worth, for she implies that Troilus overrates her.’

149 O’Rourke, “Rule in Unity,” 150: ‘the Symbolic Order that has brought about this war is, in linguistic terms, a metaphoric order of substitution in which Cressida stands for Helen and Helen for an abstraction. The romantic narrative that has joined Troilus and Cressida depends upon a metonymic (or Lacanian imaginary) order in which Cressida is simply herself.”

150 Greene. “Language and Value,” 272: ‘[s]uch a shift had … occurred between the time of Aquinas, who defined value as inherent and absolute, and Hobbes, who saw it as subjective, relative, and conferred by “opinion”—alternatives which are reflected in the dichotomy between “truth” and “opinion” central to this play”; [a] universal, hierarchically ordered reality assured permanent, intrinsic value and standards of valuation … But … sanction for the worth of a person or object, as well as means of knowing that worth, are [sic] called into question’; Mead, “Thou Art Chang’d,” 235: ‘[o]nce Cressida is “known,” she is a calculable quality, assigned a concrete equivalent in quantity. She is bullion minted and ready for circulation, and it is no coincidence that her change is offered the morning after.’

151 Mead, 252. I note that Mead acknowledges that Cressida is not priceless ‘if someone agrees to let [her] go for a price’ (255), and that she is not an absolute anything. In my opinion, if we presume constancy to be possible for her, as Troilus does, and suppose she has one-off value, she can still only be a pearl for a limited time. The pearl is like the clarity of Chaucer’s Criseyde who ‘cler stood on a ground of sikernesse’ (III 982). The pearl-like nature of the Criseyde figure can surely only be ironic. In Shakespeare as in Chaucer, she can only be as much a pearl as value and Troy itself can be said to be stable. That is, the pearl and the ownership of the stage are illusory.
Criseyde enters the world of ‘Troy’ and is to use Mead’s expression ‘taken’ into that world and absorbed into Troilus’s life there. She does so by means of first engaging in a transaction with Pandarus during the garden set piece. It is not possible to have the love story without Criseyde’s first transaction. So by the time she is reiterated as Cressida, she is already well and truly engaged in the world of transactions that takes Criseyde and Cresseid beyond ‘Troy.’

Thus, Cressida’s motif of selves reflects the instability of the Criseyde of the metanarrative. There seem to be at least two selves in the motif, and one of them is equivocally Cressida’s own property and possibly destined to be someone’s ‘fool’ other than Troilus’s. She seems to prefigure and reiterate the idea that Cresseid leaves and makes a fool of herself with Diomeid, and is then humiliated by him when he sends her papers forcing her exclusion from his courtly company. It also prefigures Cressida’s own ‘error’ speech, in which she bids Troilus farewell outside Troy and divides her body figuratively into parts that are drawn in several directions.

152 She led a life with the ‘kynges sone of Troy’ (III 1715), and the description of that life, which begins immediately after the narrator tells us Criseyde has become part of it, is all about Troilus (III 1714–25). The talk is all of Troilus (III 1723–25) and his largesse and joy. Criseyde seems to me to become invisible.

153 5.2.107–112. Hearts and eyes are clearly a matter of innuendo. See for instance Partridge, Shakespeare’s Bawdy, s.vv. ‘eye,’ ‘hearten.’ The anatomisation Cressida carries out on her figurative body, dividing herself into ‘heart’ and ‘eyes,’ echoes Troilus’s description of the effect on him of body rhetoric about Cressida in 1.1, and foreshadows his furious dissection of her once he has seen her betraying him. This dissection is rhetorical, again severing body descriptions, and symbolic, in the tearing of her letter/body. To me, the dissection Troilus carries out is monstrous in itself, a kind of ritual display of evisceration, which shows and underscores the public humiliation of Shakespeare’s Troilus. On ‘visceral knowledge’ more generally, see Hillman, Shakespeare’s Entrails, 47, 51: in Troilus and Cressida, ‘the satiric urge collapses almost completely into radical scepticism’; 52: ‘the play’s restoration of language and action to its sources within the body serves both to undermine the overblown, idealised rhetoric of the protagonists (within the play) and to counteract the disembodied, over-rhetoricated status of the heroes.’
Cresseid ‘of Troy’

When Cresseid makes her *Complaint*, she is in no-man’s-land, looking back at what she was ‘in Troy,’ when she could rightly be referred to as ‘Cresseid of Troy the toun,’ the ‘flour of luif in Troy’ (607, 128). Cresseid attempts to cling to a memorial idea of herself as a lady who was the ‘yonge, fresshe’ lady of Chaucer’s poem (V 1835), at a time when she was clear and bright. She creates an image of herself that has something of a performance about it, and that starts out very beautifully, describing her pre-eminence in beauty, voice, and movement, the ‘mevyng and … chere’ (I 289) that characterised Criseyde in the temple.

Criseyde, as the narrator tells it, stood ‘cler … on a ground of sikernesse’ (III 982) when she was in Troy. I have already indicated that the narrator is likely to be equivocating here on the nature of stability in Troy. Henryson uses Cresseid’s *Complaint* to display the inherent instability of ‘Troy.’ In this case, Henryson demonstrates his awareness of Chaucer’s narrator’s equivocation through the series of disruptions that occur in Cresseid’s imagery.

She describes what she ate, the fabric, company, music, and dancing of the court. 154 These

154 Boffey gives a useful account of associations and expectations readers would have had of Lydgate’s *Testament* and Henryson’s *Testament* (“Lydgate, Henryson”: for Henryson, see 52–56). Boffey notes that the items Cresseid specifies in her *Complaint* ‘persuasively recall the items listed in many actual wills’ (55). I find this interesting in light of the idea that Cresseid is effectively mourning her social transformation in a way that shows her new circumstances beyond ‘Troy’ overwriting the old. In a sense, she is putting the old ideas to bed, and I think Boffey’s conception of them as items being bequeathed is apt. Lewis, “Women, Testamentary Discourse, and Life-Writing”: women who wrote wills tended to be widows (58); women could use wills as ‘a form of self-definition,’ and ‘[t]he female will can be perceived as a self-representational text, and the composition of it as an autobiographical act’ (59); gifts and benefaction created a posthumous reputation for generosity and piety (62–63); as texts, women’s wills have elements of autobiography. Though based on the testator’s life, they ‘can be manipulated to leave a particular impression behind’ (67–68); women tended to leave jewellery and clothing, partly because they likely had less property of their own, but partly to ‘project [their] key affective relationships onto the afterlife in very precise terms’ (70–73). This is very interesting in light of Criseyde’s reaction to being obliged to leave Troilus and ‘Troy’ in Chaucer. The narrator details her display of grief (III 731–70). Criseyde speaks a declaration of intent which I suggest is itself a kind of testament, declaring to the absent Troilus that she will die (IV 770, 776), and wear black (IV 779) to symbolise that she is ‘as out of this world agon’ (IV 780). I think ‘this world’ is the social world of ‘Troy’ in which she had the ‘kynde nature’ of Troilus and his status (IV 778), without which she is deprived of nourishment (IV 770, IV 775). She bequeaths her ‘herte and ek the woful goost therinne’ to mourn with Troilus’s forever more (IV 785–86), claiming they will be united in Elysium someday (IV 790–91).
elements, which create an image not unlike a stained glass window,\(^{155}\) are altered symbolically and almost ceremonially by Cresseid, who lists a series of substitutions.\(^{156}\) For comfortable beds, take this straw, for spiced wine and rich food, take this cider and bread (438–41). The reality of her altered state outside ‘Troy’ intrudes on the illusion. I think this is part of the hard reality of Cresseid’s life with leprosy, that ‘cauld and hounger sair’ (482) intrude on her attempts to tell herself a private story about who she was, as she lies in the corner of the leper’s lodgings.\(^{157}\) However, Henryson is also reading the message of instability in the apparent clarity of Chaucer’s Criseyde as she stood on apparently stable ground, and drawing on it in Cresseid’s rhetoric. In effect, the transactions that occur in Cresseid’s rhetoric about her commodities and her own commodity value, which are described in terms of changes leprosy makes to her skin and voice, disrupt rhetoric about tokens, vows, and the illusion of the pre-eminence she says she experienced in Troy. This motif of standing apart draws on Criseyde’s standing apart, in the temple and in her garden.\(^{158}\) It is striking that this series of changes and compartmentalisation occurs in the rhetoric of Henryson’s Cresseid. The effect of this description is to show Cresseid both deluding herself and failing to delude herself. I think it is the ultimate failure of illusion in Cresseid that Shakespeare draws on in Cressida.

A similar process occurs in the body rhetoric Shakespeare’s Troilus uses about Cressida. At first, when he is in Troy falling in love with Cressida, Troilus enumerates her beautiful physical attributes and accuses Pandarus of pouring bits of her into his heart

\(^{155}\) In lines such as ‘[h]ad paintit plesandly in euerie pane’ (427), I think Cresseid can be said to create an image not unlike a window a pious benefactor might have bequeathed: Lewis, 62–63; Coley, “Withyn a Temple,” 67–70, 72, 74, 78. She speaks a series of highly colourful ideas of herself as she was ‘in Troy,’ very much for show, as a window might be.

\(^{156}\) Gros Louis analyses Henryson’s Orpheus and Eurydice (“Henryson’s Orpheus and Eurydice,” particularly 648). I am struck by the series of substitutions Orpheus makes in his formal farewell lament before he goes into exile. The relevant lines are Orpheus and Eurydice, 154–63 (in Fox, Poems of Robert Henryson).

\(^{157}\) Her attempts to hide away in the corner and sequester herself from the other lepers are important because they show Cresseid trying to cling to the kind of privacy that was available to her ‘in Troy,’ in her dwelling place there but also perhaps in her agreeable camouflage and absorption into the ‘world’ of Troilus’s Troy.

He describes his heart as an ‘open ulcer’ (1.1.50) even before he has been betrayed by Cressida.\textsuperscript{159} Later in the play, outside the Greek camp, when Troilus witnesses Cressida betraying him, he describes her segmented body parts in gross corporeal terms that describe them as bits, greasy scraps that constitute her ‘o’er-eaten’ faith.\textsuperscript{160} She unbinds herself from Troilus, he says, and binds the remnants of her faith and love, picked over, greasy, and distasteful, to Diomed. The Petrarchan, beautiful ideas Troilus had of Cressida in Troy are stripped away and replaced with unpleasant and intrusive imagery that shows the illusion of ‘Troy’ and the illusion of his presumption of the possibility Cressida could be constant.

I suggest this is not the only time aspects of the punishment of Cresseid are passed on to Shakespeare’s Troilus, rather than to Cressida as one might expect. Cresseid undergoes a very painful mind-body crisis in no-man’s-land when she discovers that it is Troilus who has given her alms. The ‘bitter stound’ passes through her heart ‘[s]tiffer than steill’ (538). This image draws on Criseyde’s perception of Troilus in Chaucer, that he was her personal ‘wal / Of stiel, and sheld from every displesaunce’ (III 489–90). The bitterness of the broken illusion about her status, the knowledge that she is no longer ‘of Troy’ and that Troilus has seen her as she is now, causes the very bitter ‘displesaunce’ of the world beyond ‘Troy’ to symbolically pierce Cresseid’s heart like steel. Shakespeare draws on this when he has Troilus complain to Pandarus, in Troy, about the illusory and dangerous ideas that are puncturing his heart and causing him distress. He makes it clear that the ulcer stings as Pandarus talks about Cressida, and also complains that in speaking of her, Pandarus puts the

\textsuperscript{159} Hillman, \textit{Shakespeare’s Entrails}, 68: ‘Troilus and Cressida partakes of [the] satirical tradition of figuring the puncturing of deceit and delusion as a puncturing of the body.’

\textsuperscript{160} 5.2.156–60. I suggest the idea of an over-eaten feast is connected with Ulysses’s depiction of Time in the ‘alms for oblivion’ speech (3.3.139–42). The ‘scraps’ that go into time’s wallet consist of ‘good deeds past.’ I imagine there is an element of innuendo about deeds: see Partridge, \textit{Shakespeare’s Bawdy}, s.v. ‘do it.’
knife that made the wound directly into it (1.2.59–60). I argue for a likely connection here between Chaucer, Henryson, and Shakespeare.\footnote{Generally speaking, I think Troilus suffers pain that Cressida shrugs off. In her speech about ‘error,’ to my mind, she essentially shrugs at the audience, and says, ‘Oh well, it’s a shame, but that’s what women are.’}

**Conclusion**

The time Criseyde and Troilus spend in Troy is limited. Troy appears to be stable. Troilus and Criseyde exchange tokens that demonstrate they both have courtly status. Criseyde’s fear of her reputation as the daughter of a traitor is quietened, and she is absorbed into the courtly lifestyle of Troilus which is characterised by joy and liberality. Chaucer uses motifs, however, that show that Troy is unstable, that the state of union in which Troilus and Criseyde can be said to be ‘in Troy’ is precarious. What I have identified as the garden set piece demonstrates Criseyde’s fear of being stared at and judged, and her fear of jeopardising her security and stability as a widow. Criseyde is characterised as one of the ‘yonge, fresshe folkes, he or she’ (V 1835), not only as a bright young lady but also as a newly moulted falcon. When Troilus swoons for love, his senses figuratively flee the town. And in the heart of the love story, the narrator characterises love using the motif that contrasts the ability of lovers to appreciate joy with misers of love who scrabble for coins. These ideas all foreshadow events further along the timeline of the metanarrative.

Cressida’s speech about the stones of Troy as an enduring monument to her falsehood resumes an idea of the Criseyde figure as one who stands apart to be stared at and gossiped about. Cressida is in this sense Criseyde’s fear made real in the form of gossip. The body of the representation is eroded but the rhetoric about ‘trouthe’ and falsehood remains as a figurative construct. Likewise, Cressida’s innocuous-seeming question to Troilus concerning
the strength and endurance of his truth, while they make their vows in what passes for Troy, shows the importance to the play of seeing the end of the story, an end Cressida could not be aware of without knowing the story of the metanarrative. Troilus and Cressida know the end of their story before Cressida has left Troy, and in this sense it seems to me she and Troilus are only precariously located in Troy.

The nature of time and oblivion is characterised in Shakespeare in a series of small financial transactions which draw on Chaucer’s misers of love. Cresseid in her Complaint details the time when she was ‘in Troy’: she attempts to recreate a sense of what she was then, detailing people’s opinion of her, her beautiful physical attributes which made her stand out admirably, the tokens she had it in her power to give and receive, and the commodities she had access to. Her new reality intrudes on this golden idea. The Complaint has aspects of a performance about it. It is an attempted reiteration of a past self, and the reiteration itself undergoes a series of substitutions. To me, it demonstrates the difficulty Cresseid has in retaining a grasp on her sense of identity, and it suggests the inherent slipperiness and ambiguity that characterises Chaucer’s Criseyde even when she was ‘in Troy.’ The mixed world of tokens and substitutions in the Complaint creates a kind of hybrid idea despite Cresseid’s best efforts to paint a noble, beautiful portrait of herself, and this mixed world is very much like the uncertain ground of Troy in Shakespeare’s play.
Chapter Two: Going from ‘Troy’

The idea of going from Troy is informed by characters’ awareness of the metanarrative in Chaucer, Henryson, and Shakespeare. I analyse themes and motifs that demonstrate exchanges in bodies, tokens, and body rhetoric, and that highlight the significance of what I refer to as the threshold of Troy. These themes emblematise the tipping point in the story of Troy itself and the story of Troilus and Criseyde. The threshold is a place where temporal and moral instability are foreshadowed. It marks the point at which joy leaves ‘Troy,’ and it leaves both Troilus and Criseyde in a state of exile. First, I consider joy and the threshold of ‘Troy.’ I examine motifs in Chaucer that denote the loss of joy of both Criseyde and Troilus, and show how these relate to Criseyde’s loss of security. These motifs show how symbolism of falling relates to the concept of leaving ‘Troy.’ Second, I consider the exchange of bodies, seen in themes of processions, pageantry, and monstrosity in the texts. I show how they relate to: the display of the Criseyde figures beyond ‘Troy’; the symbolic encroachment of no-man’s-land on the ground of Troy; the dual expulsion of Cresseid from ‘Troy’ and from the Greek camp. Third, I consider the exchange of tokens, identifying motifs that monetise Troilus and Criseyde at the point of exchange in Chaucer and Shakespeare. I consider the significance of the timing of the exchange of pledges in Shakespeare. I show how these themes of tokens that commemorate the loss of ‘Troy’ relate to Cresseid and Troilus in Henryson. Finally, I consider the exchange of body rhetoric, by examining ways in which the body of the Criseyde figure in all three texts is disrupted, physically, rhetorically, and symbolically, as she reacts to the idea of going from Troy.
The fall of Chaucer’s Troilus

I address the question of where Chaucer’s Troilus is located when Criseyde leaves Troy, and how this relates to awareness of the metanarrative. To a marked extent, the idea of ‘Troy’ as a figurative place of ‘trouthe’ is connected with the idea of Troilus’s imagination, also referred to in Chaucer and Henryson as his ‘fantasie.’ Motifs that occur on the threshold of Troy show the beginning of a kind of slow, freefall collapse of Troilus’s trust in Criseyde. The motifs show an awareness that Troilus will at length lose faith in Criseyde and acknowledge that she has abandoned him. They reflect that the idea of falling is part of the metanarrative. Troilus, Troy, and ‘Troy’ all fall.

Chaucer’s narrator begins writing from a place in which Troilus has already lost his joy:

The double sorwe of Troilus to tellen
That was the kyng Priamus sone of Troye,
In loyynge, how his aventures fellen
Fro wo to wele, and after out of joie …

---

1 To the best of my knowledge, scholars have not yet noted this connection. MED, s.v. ‘fantasie.’ ‘Fantasie’ is broadly defined as imagination, a mental image produced by ‘fantasie,’ a deluded idea or figment of the imagination, a preference, as in ‘fancy,’ and desire or longing. For more on ‘fantasie,’ see Stearns, “Henryson and the Aristotelian Tradition,” 493–94, 496, 500. Fantasy, dreams, dream visions, and swooning are key features of the Troilus and Criseyde story. See, for instance: Godman, “Henryson’s Masterpiece,” 293; Hanna III, “Cresseid’s Dream,” 289, 290, 292–93, 295; McNamara, “Language as Action,” 43; Twycross-Martin, “Moral Pattern,” 41. I think Chaucer and Henryson use these forms of altered consciousness to show how Troilus and Criseyde enter and leave the state of ‘Troy,’ while in Shakespeare they are transformed into the idea of ‘bifold authority’ (5.2.144), two competing ideas of the ‘presumed’ (3.2.145–48) state of reality. The state in which Cressida could ‘[be and not be] Cressid’ (5.2.146) seems to me to be a manifestation of the vital prophetic, revelatory, and transformative dreams in Chaucer and Henryson. This would be a very useful avenue of future research.

2 I am aware of the temporal and logical complexity involved in describing a threshold of Troy, because the changes have always already happened. Each new set of Troilus and Criseyde figures pre-empts and reiterates movement across a threshold on which Criseyde is exchanged for Antenor and the process begins by means of which Troilus will be exchanged for Diomedes. As in the previous chapter, I aim to indicate how a sense of ‘Troy’ and of no-man’s-land relates to the processes of exchange.

3 These ideas have consequences for Shakespeare’s treatment of Cressida’s betrayal outside Troy, and for the non-recognition scene between Troilus and Cresseid outside Troy.
Henryson refers to the ‘ioly vers’ of Chaucer (*Testament of Cresseid*, 59). Nitecki questions the sensitivity of this: ‘the delight is in the form of Chaucer’s poetry, not in its matter, and the use of the word “ioly” to praise the poetry of a tragic text reveals a certain aesthetic insensitivity.’ It is certainly possible Henryson is being ironic: the idea that a poem about Troilus’s sorrow, whose lines weep as the narrator writes them (*Troilus and Criseyde*, I 7), could be described as ‘ioly,’ not just as a passing mood but in the fabric of the ‘vers’ itself, is not inconsistent with irony he has been known to use elsewhere, for instance in the speech of his fox figures in the *Moral Fabillis*. The connection, however, is deeper than this. Henryson has had his narrator choose his words very carefully. The narrator is very likely picking up on the sense of the metanarrative contained in lines I 1–4 of Chaucer: the ‘double sorwe’ of Troilus is built on a double loss of joy. Troilus loses not only ‘wele’ but also ‘joie.’ Thus the basis of the sorrowful verse is joy in its absence.

The purpose of Chaucer’s narrator is to tell about the sorrow that followed joy and followed a fall. The verb ‘fellen,’ occurring between ‘Troye’ and ‘joie,’ suggests that the act of falling interrupts the connection between Troy and joy, that is, that ‘Troy’ is disrupted. Prepositions link ‘wo,’ ‘wele,’ and ‘joie’ directly with the verb. The effect is to suggest that

---

4 Nitecki, “Fenƺeit of the New,” 129.  
5 To my knowledge, scholars have not yet noted the connection between ‘ioly vers’ and ‘Troy’/‘joy.’  
6 Tellingly, Benoît characterises Troilus as an overwhelmingly joyful character, whose courtly virtues include a laughing face and sparkling eyes, and who has an aptitude for joy and delight. Some examples of this from Benoît are: ‘[c]hiere ot riant’ (*Roman de Troie*, 5394, ‘he had a laughing face’; my translation throughout); his eyes were ‘pleins de gaieté’ (5399, ‘full of merriment’). The narrator remarks he never saw a man ‘[q]ui tant ait joie ne deduit … Ne qui tant ait riche corage’ (5429–31, ‘who had so much joy and delight … nor who had [literally] such a rich heart’). I find the adjective ‘riche’ really interesting, given the concept of ‘misers of joy’ in Chaucer. Troilus’s ‘rich’ heart is full of joy and delight. He is ‘liez e gais e amoros’ (*Roman de Troie*, 5434, ‘joyful, gay, and loving’).  
7 This initial ‘wo’ can be explained as both the ‘wo’ Troilus experiences by virtue of falling in love with Criseyde in the course of the poem and the ‘wo’ he suffers in the metanarrative. The narrator both prefigures the end of his own tale and reflects Criseyde’s abandonment of Troilus in the metanarrative.  
8 *MED*, s.v. ‘wele.’ ‘Wele’ has two listings, of which the relevant meanings are wealth, possessions, welfare, prosperity, happiness, the common good, a benefit or advantage. *MED*, s.v. ‘welle.’ A ‘welle’ is a fountain or natural source of water, or a spring. Although Fish argues that the opening lines of the prologue contain foreknowledge of the metanarrative ‘unparalleled elsewhere in the poem’ (“Origin and Original Object,” 305), Chaucer has Criseyde echo the idea of falling that occurs between ‘wele’ and ‘joie’ in the opening lines in her
the love story of Troilus falls through an emotional landscape. Troilus progresses from a location in ‘Troye’ to a location ‘out of joie.’\textsuperscript{9} It seems clear that any depiction of Troilus’s joy in love will contain ideas of sorrow and falling, together with a sense that the joy is in the past. He has always already fallen ‘out of’ it.\textsuperscript{10} The story takes place not just outside ‘Troy’ but after ‘Troy.’\textsuperscript{11}

When Criseyde leaves, Troilus describes himself using a ‘Troy’/‘joy’ rhyme: ‘[a]nd here I dwelle out cast from alle joie, / And shal, til I may sen hire eft in Troie’ (V 615–16). This couplet subtly dislocates Troilus. It echoes the sense of the prologue, in which Troilus’s varying state of mind prevents the combination of Troy and joy, and this is reflected in the syntax. In Troilus’s description of his status, the ‘here’ is a location outside ‘alle joie,’ and therefore outside the figurative state of ‘Troy.’\textsuperscript{12} If Criseyde returns, Troilus will be able to return also from the ‘here’ outside ‘joie’: ‘For was ther nevere fowel so fayn of May / As I shal ben whan that she comth in Troie / That cause is of my torment and my joie’ (V 425–27).

His own return to ‘Troie’ depends completely on Criseyde’s. In a letter to Criseyde once she is beyond ‘Troy,’ Troilus expresses his hopes that he can be made joyful again: ‘youre coming hom ayeyn to Troie’ will ‘encressen in me joie’ (V 1380, V 1382). This hope is negated by the narrator who states as Criseyde leaves town: ‘But Troilus, now far-wel al thi joie, / For shaltow nevere sen hire eft in Troie!’ (V 27–28).

---

\textsuperscript{9} For disillusionment, see Lynch, “Idealism of Shakespeare’s Troilus,” 25. Lynch argues that Troilus keeps illusions about himself while losing illusions about Cressida.  
\textsuperscript{10} For the concept of action ‘always already’ in the past, see Charnes, “So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 415.  
\textsuperscript{11} Charnes, 415; Johnson, “Whatever Happened to Criseyde?”, 314.  
\textsuperscript{12} The completeness of the sense of joy he has lost echoes the way he ‘gan al his lif to lede’ (III 1717) when he was ‘in Troy’ with Criseyde. He is an outcast from ‘Troy’ just as Criseyde will prove to be.
The tree motif: Chaucer’s Troilus in captivity

Chaucer’s Criseyde goes from a figurative state of ‘Troy.’ Chaucer’s Troilus also goes from this figurative state. He is isolated behind the walls of Troy, and he is cut off from ‘Troy.’ It is as if Criseyde takes a step forwards out of ‘Troy’ when she is changed, and Troilus takes a step backwards out of ‘Troy’ at the same time. Although he appears to be where he was, he is characterised as falling through a miserable landscape, in which the narrator’s awareness of the metanarrative, made explicit in the prologue, is realised in Troilus’s emotional shift.

The matter of Troilus’s location once Criseyde has left is debatable. Motifs of falling act to place him in a sequestered private location in Troy. The imagery seems to show that the process of Troilus’s growing suspicion of Criseyde has begun. Two motifs serve to illustrate Troilus’s isolation from ‘Troy.’ In the first of these, Chaucer’s narrator continues the idea of ‘wele’ from the prologue. He compares Troilus gradually losing one form of ‘welfare’ after another with leaves falling from a tree:

And as in wynter leves ben biraff,
Ech after other, til the tree be bare,
So that ther nys but bark and braunche ilaft,
Lith Troilus, byraft of ech welfare,
Ibounden in the blake bark of care,
Disposed wood out of his wit to breyde,
So sore hym sat the chaungynge of Criseyde.

(IV 225–31)

To the best of my knowledge, scholars have not yet noted this.
Troilus falls from ‘wele’ and ‘welfare’ into melancholy. The narrator presents the idea as if Troilus is a tree, and more specifically the image suggests that he is confined inside a tree, bound by melancholy. He lies alone there, bereft in a bare landscape, and he is disposed to go ‘out of his wit.’ He leaves behind his clear knowledge of himself, that is, to some extent he is disposed to lose his sense of ‘trouthe.’

The tree motif indicates that Troilus’s mind undergoes a kind of transformation. The changing of Criseyde acts like the ‘blake barke of care’ in weighing on Troilus and keeping him isolated from ‘welfare.’ Troilus’s imagination is restricted by his melancholy. Hodgdon notes that Shakespeare’s Troilus is immobilised by self-doubt when he witnesses Cressida betraying him. His ‘act of looking … threatens to destabilize his identity as well as Cressida’s.’ I agree with Hodgdon. This sense of immobilisation and instability in Shakespeare very likely follows Troilus’s figurative transformation in Chaucer’s tree

---

14 The idea of falling is contained in ‘meschaunce.’ MED, s.v. ‘mischaunce.’ This derives from Old French ‘meschëaunce,’ from ‘meschëoir,’ literally ‘to fall badly.’ Pandarus uses this expression to attempt to persuade Criseyde to love Troilus and to attempt to persuade Troilus to love someone new once Criseyde has left.

15 Stanbury argues that Troilus here ‘seems to transpose into an image’ (Visual Object of Desire, 106). She links the tree quotation with IV 235, in which Troilus rushes home, shuts himself in his chamber, and sits ‘[f]ul like a ded ymage, pale and wan’ (106). Re ‘[i]bounden in the blake bark of care’ (IV 229), she writes: ‘[f]irst black, then pale or ghostlike, Troilus also takes on forms of both death and stasis … Troilus is figured as substance, trapped in the tree itself, and going nowhere … first he is wood, encased in bark, and then a carved figure, the tree … morphed into a statue—or even an idol’ (106). Stanbury notes that the term ‘dead image’ is connected with Wycliffite texts, ‘often naming the particular deadness of idols’ (107). It is ‘uncertain’ whether Chaucer takes his language from this source, but Stanbury notes that ‘Lollard sect vocabulary generated a set of terms that many writers, among them Chaucer, borrowed, and not always to the expected purpose’ (107).

16 Chaucer draws on this by describing Criseyde who ‘[f]il gruf, and gan to wepen pitously’ (IV 912). Henryson draws on this idea when Cresseid falls ‘on grouf’ (362), hiding her face in her arms and weeping. In all three characterisations, the character experiences being weighed down by grief—Cresseid is ‘heuie in hir intent’ (116) as she refuses to worship her gods in public during their festival (112, 117–19)—and undergoes a form of constraint in a private space. For Troilus in this image, it is the space inside the bark of a figurative tree, but the metaphor represents him hiding his grief from society. In each case, depictions of emotional and physiological heaviness relate to the character’s reluctance to go from ‘Troy.’

17 It seems clear to me that Henryson draws on Troilus’s melancholy to figure Cresseid’s. Lynch, “Idealism of Shakespeare’s Troilus,” 25, 27: Troilus’s sudden disillusionment in Shakespeare has no precedent in Chaucer; Mieszkowski, “Reputation of Criseyde,” 94: Filostrato describes a woman as ‘[v]olubil sempre come foglio al vento’ (VIII, v. 30): ‘inconstant ever as leaf on the wind’ (Mieszkowski’s translation).

18 Murray, “Value of ‘Eschaunge,’” 345: in the moment when Troilus learns Criseyde is to be exchanged, his face changes: ‘[f]or which ful soone chaungen gan his face’ (IV 150). I note that Troilus hides his changed face and his sorrow. I think Henryson replicates this action in Cresseid.

metaphor. Chaucer’s Troilus is immobilised by the ending of ‘Troy,’ as Shakespeare’s Troilus is by the ending of his ‘trouthe’ with Cressida.

It is striking that Chaucer’s narrator’s description of the tree ends explicitly with the ‘chaungynge of Criseyde.’ In this image of a tree out of the green season, the narrator explicitly makes Criseyde’s changing the pivot in Troilus’s state of mind, and the cause of his change in location. This idea is echoed when Troilus receives Criseyde’s final letter from beyond Troy and identifies it as both ‘straunge’ and ‘lik a kalendes of chaunge.’ Criseyde and the tree both symbolically mark a change of season in the fortunes of Troilus and Troy. When Criseyde first goes from Troy, Troilus withdraws from courtly company to the solitude of his chamber, or, more colourfully, the interior of a gloomy tree. Troilus is isolated from company and isolated from Criseyde. He is alienated from ‘Troy.’

‘Fetheres brighte’: the fall of Troy and Troilus

In the second motif of falling, when Chaucer’s narrator refers to the ‘fetheres brighte’ of Troy, the ‘chaungynge’ of Criseyde is the unspoken pivot. The motif that shows Troilus falling is so similar in effect to the motif of Troy falling that they constitute a deliberate

---

20 Johnson, “Whatever Happened to Criseyde?”, 314: Cresseid is given ‘superior perspective’ by a ‘foreshortened experience of the effects of earthly time and change.’

21 Tylee cites G. Wilson Knight’s assertion that the arrival of Cressida at the Greek camp is the “pivot incident” of the play (“Text of Cressida,” 53–54).

22 V 1632, V 1634. Chaucer’s narrator in the Legend of Good Women describes Alceste as a calendar (F 542–43).

23 The leaves protect Troilus from melancholy, and the feathers protect ‘Troy’ and Troilus from isolation and from falling ‘out of joie.’ Stanbury describes a fourteenth-century tract by Walter Hilton called the Scale of Perfection, a ‘devotional guide to an unnamed anchoress’ which advises her to ‘withdraw her thoughts from all earthly things and bodily sensations’ (Visual Object of Desire, 52). The result of ‘the inevitable cracks in self-control’ (52) is a ‘“merk ymage,” a dark and painful image of our own soul’ which is ‘both visual and physical’ (53). It is a ‘representation of the image of sin as a thing, and even as a body’ (53), and an idol (56). I find this particularly interesting as a description of the perils of withdrawing from the world.
pairing. The narrator again shows everything falling away from the bright and joyful aspect of Troy, as if figurative ‘Troy’ escapes the grasp of literal Troy:

Fortune …
Gan pulle awey the fetheres brighte of Troie
Fro day to day, til they ben bare of joie.
(V 1541–47)

Troy is left like a flightless bird. The end-rhyme emphasises the importance of the joy of which ‘Troy’ is being laid bare. Troy, like Troilus, is gradually made bereft of ‘wele.’ It is also revealed to be unstable as a potential source of joy. The contrast between the brightness of ‘Troy’ and the bareness of joy in this couplet marks a transition from the liveliness of the court of ‘Troy’ to the barrenness of Troy without its people. ‘Troy,’ like Troilus, is shown gravitating towards a threshold.

“Fantasie’ and social death

Criseyde makes it clear that she will be cut off from Troilus’s ‘kynde noriture’ when she goes from Troy (IV 764–70). She will lose her knight. She will be a fish without water, she will be...

---

24 The idea of falling feathers echoes the description of Criseyde in her house, ‘fressh as faukoun comen out of muwe’ (III 1784). Troilus’s distress after Criseyde has left, in which he bids his soul ‘unmeste’ and fly forth out of his heart (IV 305–306), also harks back to the image of the falcon which represents Criseyde, all the more so as the idea of the ‘goost’ in Troilus’s heart suffering together with Criseyde’s is contained in her bequest of her heart and its ‘goost’ to him, just before she leaves (IV 785–87). The brightness of the feathers relates to the ‘fresshnes’ of the falcon, and also to Troilus’s exclamation of sorrow when he addresses Criseyde’s house, after her departure, as the ‘ryng, fro which the ruby is out falle’ (V 549). Troilus falls ‘out of joie’ (I 4) in the same way as Criseyde falls out of ‘Troy.’ As far as I am aware, scholars have not yet noted these connections.

25 The idea of bareness and barrenness of joy implies that ‘Troy,’ like the misers of joy of the narrator’s metaphor in Book Three, is in the process of ‘forgo[ing] the white and ek the rede’ (III 1384). ‘Troy’ becomes something of a wasteland when Criseyde leaves and Troilus shuns company.

26 This reflects Criseyde’s earlier exclamation: ‘O brotel wele of mannes joie unstable!’ (III 820).

27 Shakespeare draws on the idea of this barren Troy when he has Troilus ask who will go in to Troy and tell them Hector is dead (5.11.14–22). The women will weep and the young men will die in battle. The feathers will in effect be plucked away from Shakespeare’s Troy. Also, as Benoît shows (Roman de Troie, 6227–32), the warriors wear plumed helmets, so I think it’s reasonable to imagine feathers representing plumed headgear of warriors. The ‘feathers’ head to the battleground and are systematically destroyed there.
like a rootless plant, and she will wear black as a token that she is ‘as out of this world agon’ (IV 780). The world she leaves is the ‘world of folk’ accumulated by Troilus. Criseyde’s speech shows her fear of dying a social and material death without Troilus’s protection, and it draws directly on the fear with which she spoke to Troilus in ‘Troy’ about the power of his ‘fantasie.’ Troilus’s inclination, in Chaucer’s tree metaphor, to go ‘out of his wit’ as he leaves joy behind follows a warning Criseyde gives him, in bed ‘in Troy,’ against letting suspicion of her infidelity enter his brain: ‘Lat in youre brayn non other fantasie / So crepe that it cause me to dye!’ (III 1504–5). Dangerous ideas about her ‘trouthe’ will lead to her social death. Fantasy is imagined creeping into ‘Troy.’ Pandarus, by contrast, once Criseyde has left, counsels Troilus to ‘[d]rif out’ his ‘swevnes’ and ‘al swich fantasie’ (V 358–59), which he claims proceed from the melancholy of Troilus (V 360).

Criseyde and Pandarus are both aware of the dangerous ideas that can arise from Troilus’s brain. Their protection comes from Troilus being pacified. Both these instances of ‘fantasy’ foreshadow the point in the narrative where Troilus acknowledges that the proof of Criseyde’s betrayal is no longer fantastical. This applies also to Shakespeare’s betrayal scene, to which I return in my third chapter, and in which Troilus’s reaction is characterised as ‘madness of discourse.’ Chaucer’s ‘cote-armure,’ a garment worn by Diomede in battle and captured by the Trojans to display in triumph, and the letters of Criseyde will be tangible

28 She regrets the loss of the world within the walls of Troy, and uses a ‘Troy’/‘joy’ rhyme to do so. The effect is to show that joy is contained in Troy and is behind her (V 729–30).
29 After she has left, Troilus lies down, ‘[y]magynynge ay that she was unkynde, / For which wel neigh he wex out of his mynde’ (V 1441–42). This combines the effect of the tree motif, Criseyde’s fear of ‘fantasie’ creeping into Troilus’s brain, and her fear that she will be cut off from Troilus’s ‘kynde noriture’ (IV 768). He suspects she is ‘unkynde,’ behaving in a way inappropriate to a lover in a state of ‘trouthe.’ Here the idea of Troilus’s mind paired with the concept of driving things out of his mind is reiterated.
30 Pandarus suggests Troilus should simply accept Criseyde has gone and choose another lady. This ties in with Boynton’s assessment of Pandarus and ‘trouthe’: “Trouthe/Routhe Rhyme,” 229, 230: Pandarus places ‘relatively small value … on Troilus’s trouthe to Criseyde and hers to him; they are foolish ideals to hold if they get in the way of more pressing practical demands.’
31 For ‘fantasie’ in relation to Aristotelian memory theory, see Stearns, “Henryson and the Aristotelian Tradition,” 495.
32 Kaula, “Will and Reason,” 274: Troilus commits ‘mad idolatry’ by converting Helen and Cressida into pearls.
tokens of Criseyde’s lack of ‘trouthe.’ Troilus’s final acknowledgement of this will cause his hope of a return to ‘Troy’ to be cut off decisively, and thus the fantasy proceeding from misery will cause the figurative Criseyde ‘of Troy’ to die. His fantasy leads to the end of Criseyde’s fantasy life. It remains to question what this does to Troilus’s value as Troilus ‘of Troy.’ I address questions of the characters’ value beyond ‘Troy’ in the third chapter.

The idea of ‘fantasie’ connected with the social death of Criseyde is echoed by Henryson. During an ambiguous fantasy state, Cresseid has the ‘sentence diffinityue’ of leprosy and social exclusion read over her by the goddess Cynthia (332–33). I interpret this ‘sentence’ as words that will define the way Cresseid ends her life outside ‘Troy,’ with no ability to be socially reconciled with Troilus. Cresseid’s embodied and fully realised social death is a culmination of the alienating effect of Troilus’s fantasy and his alienation from ‘Troy,’ implicit in the tree motif. I think Cresseid is punished because Chaucer’s Criseyde steps forwards out of ‘Troy,’ and because Chaucer’s Troilus steps backwards out of ‘Troy.’ She is punished for both forms of alienation, and the punishment is connected symbolically with the fantasy of Cresseid herself, while she is in an altered state of consciousness.

The changing of Criseyde takes her from the sphere of ‘Troy,’ where she had social currency value, to the sphere of Troy, where she has a ransom value. The idea of this translation is reflected by Henryson in Cresseid’s expression of grief: ‘And all in cair

33 This is echoed in Shakespeare when Troilus’s act of seeing Cressida reveals her to ‘[be and not be] Cressid’ (5.2.146), and splits her into the two ‘[kinds] of self’ she has already warned Troilus she has (3.2.135–37).
34 This is all complicated as far as the time line is concerned because it has always already happened (Charnes, “So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 415). The idea of fantasy is continued by Henryson in Cresseid’s highly colourful description, in the Complaint of Cresseid, of her life with Troilus (407–69). Godman identifies a ‘primacy of suffering’ in Cresseid (‘Henryson’s Masterpiece,’ 297). I think Cresseid looks back on her life ‘in Troy’ in a way that shows she considers herself to have attained a ‘primacy’ of status and renown. It is very likely that the power of fantasy attributed to Chaucer’s Troilus and the exaggerated rhetoric in letter writing attributed to Chaucer’s Criseyde contribute to Henryson’s treatment of Cresseid’s recollections of ‘Troy’ that place a question mark over the reliability of her account.
35 For the nature of the dream vision, including its possible connections with prophecy, see, for example: Godman, “Henryson’s Masterpiece,” 293; Hanna III, “Cresseid’s Dream,” 289, 290, 292–93, 295; McNamara, “Language as Action,” 43; Twycross-Martin, “Moral Pattern,” 41.
translatit is my ioy’ (130). Cresseid has left ‘Troy’ behind entirely. Like Chaucer’s Troilus, she is made to inhabit a landscape where the joy has been translated into care and she is ‘birait of ech welfare,’ though hers is a loss embodied on common ground.

Although Troilus remains in Troy, he enters a kind of half-world. We see this in the tree metaphor, which shows him hiding from the society that is gradually depleted. We also see it in Troilus’s description of his status when Criseyde has left: ‘I, combre-world, that may of nothyng serve, / Bot evere dye and nevere fulli sterve.’ Troilus here describes himself in complete terms—nothing, ever, never—as an outcast from ‘Troy,’ the state of complete joy shared with Criseyde (V 615–16). He retreats to private space in Troy. Aspects of Cresseid’s expression and demonstration of grief draw on Chaucer’s Troilus. Like him, she deals in extremes of emotion, and, like him, she attempts to retreat to private space, in the oratory and then in the corner of the leper lodgings. While Troilus lies bound in ‘bark,’ Cresseid kicks against the wall and moans quietly to herself.

**Turning Troilus and Criseyde out of ‘Troy’**

Chaucer has his narrator and Diomede use ‘Troy’/‘joy’ rhymes which show awareness of the metanarrative, as Criseyde is exchanged for Antenor and in the aftermath. Here are some examples of this. In Chaucer, Criseyde goes out of Troy accompanied by Troilus. Diomede has come into Troy to fetch Criseyde (V 15–16). Troilus rides out with her, bearing a hawk

---

37 IV 279–80. His plea to his soul to ‘unneste, / [and] Fle forth out of [his] herte’ (IV 305–6) echoes the image of his consciousness fleeing out of town (III 1091–92).

38 406, 475. To the best of my knowledge, scholars have not yet pointed out this connection. Cresseid embodies a version of the performance of noble grief that lacks ‘trouthe.’ Chaucer’s Troilus remains true to Criseyde, but their troth is broken, and he retreats from the specific state of ‘Troy’ in which their ‘trouthe’ led to a particular understanding. He acts with a kind of pitiable quality. Henryson makes the idea of Cresseid’s pitiable quality more complicated. It seems easy to empathise with Troilus’s suffering, whereas Cresseid’s is more divisive of critics.
and with a great company of knights (V 64–67). This is a courtly parade carried out openly,\(^{39}\) and, as in Benoît’s account, it is a ceremony.\(^{40}\) The ‘world of folk’ that constitutes ‘Troy’ thus accompanies Troilus, who accompanies Criseyde. Troilus rides as far out of town as courtesy permits, then actively turns\(^{41}\) and draws away from Criseyde, who is left outside the walls and outside that courtly company.\(^{42}\) The action of the company riding back into Troy completes the symbolic exchange of Criseyde by placing her outside the procession, and this is where she remains in Henryson and Shakespeare, as I show in my third chapter.\(^{43}\) The circumstances of the turning give Chaucer’s Diomed an opening to pursue Criseyde.\(^{44}\) He sees Troilus’s distress, and he begins to act on Criseyde when he ‘[sees] the folk of Troie aweye’ (V 93).

Chaucer’s narrator makes it clear, before Criseyde and the company have set out, that Troilus’s joy and Criseyde are going permanently: ‘But Troilus, now far-wel al thi joie, / For

---

\(^{39}\) V 15: ‘at prime.’ The company is ‘huge’ and rides a long distance ‘[keeping] hire companye’ (V 65–67). Cresseid travels to join her father on her own and in disguise (94–95)—she is ‘in this wyse destitute / Of all comfort and consolatión’ (92–93), and she seems to be deprived of a lover, her reputation, and financial comfort—and hides from people in the oratory so no one knows about her ‘expuls’ from Diomeid (118–119). She is actively excluded in isolation (75). She receives a personal ‘lybell of repudie’ (74) from Diomeid and goes somewhere away ‘fra his companie’ (75). Where she goes is then her responsibility. Cressida is fetched by Diomed with little ceremony and no sense of parade. The idea of displaying Cressida is represented by the kissing scene (4.6.18–64), in which she is passed from one Greek to another, and also represented by the ‘language’ Ulysses identifies in her body (4.6.56–57) and Thersites identifies in her mind (5.2.113–14). She is displayed as a ‘Cressid’ where Criseyde is accompanied out of town like a lady, Cressida hovers somewhere in between, laying low and then travelling to the leper lodgings by night, in disguise.

\(^{40}\) Mieszkowski, “Reputation of Criseyde,” 80–81: Benoît makes it clear Briseïda is impressively dressed in order to attract another man, despite her grief at leaving Troilus.

\(^{41}\) ‘Bot torne he moste, and it was ek to done’ (V 70); the moment of turning his horse about is very distressing to Troilus (V 85–87).

\(^{42}\) Criseyde rues the loss of courtly life, the ‘plesance and the joie’ she has experienced ‘withinne yonder walles,’ using another ‘Troy’/‘joy’ rhyme (V 729–733). She thinks of her lost lifestyle before she thinks of Troilus.

\(^{43}\) The movement out of Chaucer’s Troy in the convoy becomes the exclusion of Cresseid from the court of Diomeid and from society. McKenna, “Henryson’s “Tragedie,”” 31: the tragedy of Cresseid is encapsulated in her question, ‘Quha sall me gyde? Quh a sall me now conuoy?’ To McKenna, this question sums up ‘the core of the tragic’ mystery’ of Cresseid (26): she first sees herself as misled by Cupid and Venus (26), but comes to realise that she must guide herself (29, 32). I think ‘Troy’ effectively turns its back on Criseyde in Chaucer when the parade turns and leaves without her. Criseyde has stated that her return to ‘Troie’ will ‘torne us alle to joie’ (IV 1631), and this falsely bright reassurance is countered by the narrator in his assessment of Troilus’s actual loss of joy, for instance in V 27–28.

\(^{44}\) The turning of the company of ‘Troy’ is like the motifs of sliding and knotlessness that describe the action of Criseyde’s heart in shrugging off the idea of Troilus. This turning becomes the ‘error’ Cressida identifies in all women, a kind of restlessness that can be anatomised (5.2.107–12).
shallow nevere sen hire eft in Troie!" Criseyde looks back on the location of her former life with regret. The narrator allows Criseyde five verses to express her ‘wo’ and resolve to return to Troy (V 729–65), then states outright that ‘bothe Troilus and Troie town / Shal knotteles throughout hire herte slide, / For she wol take a purpos for t’abide.’ The verb ‘wol’ here echoes and undercuts Criseyde’s statement of intent five lines earlier: ‘To Troie I wol, as for conclusioun.’ The firmness of this resolve and the sense of a definite endpoint is immediately rendered suspect by the description of Troilus and Troy sliding through her heart, and by the narrator’s description of her during her first hours in the Greek camp as ‘slydyng corage’ (V 825).

Immediately after this, Diomede identifies that ‘[Criseyde had] a love in Troie, / For nevere … Ne koude he sen hire laughe or maken joie.’ He explicitly advises Criseyde to:

Lat Troie and Troian fro your e herte pace …
For Troie is brought in swich a jupartie
That it to save is now no remedie.

---

45 V 27–28. This phrase, with its reference to what happens after Troy, so to speak, echoes the prediction of the opening lines of the poem (I 1–4). Both comments introduce the idea of there being no possible joy for Troilus after ‘Troy.’ It also echoes the description of Troilus’s union with Criseyde ‘in Troy’: ‘Troilus gan al his life to lede’ (III 1717). The world of ‘Troy’ seems to be a world of entirety and integrity.

46 There are other instances of ‘Troy’/’joy’ rhymes. Diomede makes general remarks as they travel to the Greek camp and suggests that the Greeks can offer Criseyde as good cheer as she will find in Troy: he ‘preyede hire she wold hire sorwe apese, / And seyde, “Iwis, we Grekis can have joie / To honoure n yow a s wel as folke of Troie.” V 117–19. Criseyde looks back regretfully: ‘Ful rewfully she loked upon Troie … “Allas,” quod she, “the pleassance and the joie”’ (V 729–30).

47 V 768–70. See also the description of Criseyde, ‘slydyng corage’ (V 825), which echoes Benoît: ‘Mout fu amee et mout amat, / Mes sis corages li chanjot’ (Roman de Troie, 5285–86; ‘she was much loved and loved greatly, but her heart changed within her’). Shakespeare has Troilus identify the betrayal of Cressida as the untying of a ‘knot, five-finger tied’ (5.2.157). See also Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 255: “[u]ltimately … to read her is to recognize that ‘As false as Cressid’ constitutes an almost inescapable constant amidst the generalized slippage of identity and value apparent elsewhere.’

48 V 765. The idea of a firm conclusion is resumed by Henryson in Cynthia’s ‘sentence diffinityue’ (333). Unlike Cresseid’s heart, which is defined by slipperiness and changeability, Cynthia makes her ruling stick. The definition of Cresseid’s end is one in which the ‘slydyng corage’ (V 825) of Criseyde is turned into circumstances that force Cressida to wander perpetually, in a way Shakespeare characterises in Cressida’s acknowledgement of her ‘error’ (5.2.110–13).

49 V 780–81. As far as I am aware, scholars have not yet noted connections between Diomede’s assessment of Criseyd’s commodity value and ‘joy’/‘Troy.’

When Diomede offers himself to her, he is aware that she is not ready to accept his advances, and that outside Troy there is no joy to be had by Criseyde: ‘I am, al be it yow no joie, /As gentil man as any wight in Troie’ (V 930–31). I note that he claims the Greeks can offer her as much joy as the Trojans can (V 117–119), an idea Shakespeare turns into Cressida’s wry ‘[a] woeful Cressid ’mongst the merry Greeks!’ (4.5.11). Chaucer builds on the poem of Benoît, who characterises Diomedès as a mean, shifty, persistent womaniser. Criseyde’s resolve to be true to Diomede ‘algate’ looks desperately sad given what we know of Diomede from Benoît’s Diomedès and from what Chaucer’s narrator tells us of Diomede’s opportunism. Henryson’s Diomeid is characterised likewise as someone who lacks ‘trouthe’ and fails to keep a troth with Cresseid. The implication is that whatever Diomede is offering Criseyde is a transaction that does not involve ‘joie,’ and it does not involve ‘trouthe.’

Just before she leaves Troy, Criseyde assures Troilus, ‘my wendyng out of Troie / Another day shal torne us alle to joie.’ The idea of turning intervenes between Troy and joy, and this echoes the structure of the opening lines of the prologue, in which the idea of falling intervenes between Troy and joy. Chaucer is reintroducing the idea of the dislocation of Troy and joy at the point of exchange. The description of the pain and pallor of Troilus, who

51 Roman de Troie, 5211–5224. For instance, ‘[c]ist fist mainte fausse pramesse’ (Roman de Troie, 5214, ‘[he] made many a false promise’).
52 Once the idea of ‘trouthe’ between Troilus and Criseyde is divided, ‘trouthe’ itself seems to splinter. We can consider Criseyde circulating like a fetish (Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 126), and as a ‘devalued … (common) property’ (Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 255). For circulation and reuse of props, see also: Bruster, “Dramatic Life of Objects,” 68, 70–71: “[b]ecause they are detached, and easily held, [hand props] are more easily transformed from one character, play, and genre to another. Much like coins and currency, hand props testify by their size and portability to an open potential”; 72, 76–77; Harris, “Properties of Skill,” 48–49; Stallybrass, “Worn Worlds,” 290, 291, 294: ‘[i]t is … because the costume can endure after the performance has ended that it takes on a curious precedence to the actor, as if through the donning of a costume alone the actor puts on [the character]. Indeed, the guild accounts suggest the ability of the clothes to absorb the very identity of the actors”; 308: ‘clothing falls into the wrong hands in Othello or Troilus and Cressida’; 312.
53 IV 1630–31. The phrase ‘alle to joie’ suggests an entirety or integrity of emotion that is lost.
54 The idea of the importance of ‘turning’ was suggested to me by McKim’s observation concerning Cresseid: ‘[a]lthough she may have turned Troilus out of her thought for a time, she has not been able, as Criseyde foresaw in Chaucer’s poem, to turn him out of her heart, because of the image “engraved” there’ (“Henryson’s ‘Memorial,’” 6). There is more to be considered on this point, perhaps in light of the ‘widdercok’ image that relates to women’s constancy (567).
forces himself to turn his horse (V 85–87), takes place on ambiguous ground, outside Troy but not yet in the Greek camp. The location is one of danger for Troilus and Criseyde, because Diomed intervenes just as Troilus turns away.\textsuperscript{55} Just as Criseyde’s assurance that she will return is decisively overwritten by the foreshadowing of the narrator, so too the concept of Criseyde turning or returning is overwritten by the description of Troilus turning back on his own.\textsuperscript{56} Both Criseyde’s promise that her return will ‘turn’ Troy back the way it was and Troilus’s physical act of turning his horse around show that a figurative turning point has been reached, and that Criseyde’s leaving turns ‘Troy’ and Troilus into something else.\textsuperscript{57}

The ‘cote-armure’ disrupts Troilus’s illusion of ‘trouthe’

The parading of Chaucer’s Diomed’s ‘cote-armure,’\textsuperscript{58} which has been captured in battle, is significant to a discussion of the symbolic threshold of Troy, because it represents the incursion of no-man’s-land into Troy.\textsuperscript{59} Specifically, it represents the way in which Diomed symbolically rewrites ownership, not just of a token Criseyde has given him but of the ground of Troy itself and Troilus’s place in it. He reminds us that Troy is on borrowed time. What seems a triumphant gesture, the capture of clothing that symbolises the presence of a Greek warrior of note, proves a turning point in the ‘fantasy’ of Troilus.\textsuperscript{60}

---

\textsuperscript{55} He begins to manipulate the topic of Troy and joy while he and Criseyde ride progressively closer to the Greek camp. So the procession out of Troy turns into a kind of private audience on horseback. By contrast, Shakespeare’s Diomed intervenes before they have even travelled in convoy out of town.

\textsuperscript{56} At this point in the description of the procession, the narrator speaks of Troilus’s demeanour as he turns his horse, and Troilus’s return to Troy, without mention of the other knights. His return contains a kind of private sorrow. The return trip isolates him like the tree motif.

\textsuperscript{57} Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 257: ‘Trollus and Cressida “turns” Cressida from idealized to fallen woman …’

\textsuperscript{58} The Riverside Chaucer glosses this as ‘a tunic embroidered with a heraldic device, worn over the armour’ (Larry Benson, 582).

\textsuperscript{59} As far as I am aware, scholars have not yet noted this.

\textsuperscript{60} Charnes, “So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 417: Shakespeare explores ‘the deeply conflicted relationship between absolutist authority and its coercive forms, and a contrary fantasy … represented explicitly during this time, of the possibility of a “self-authored” subjectivity.’ This idea accords well with my ideas about the precarious state of ‘Troy’ in relation to the security of Troilus’s ‘fantasie’ in Chaucer.
Diomede’s garment is captured and paraded through Troy (V 1646–52). Troilus notices a brooch he gave Criseyde inside the collar.\textsuperscript{61} He realises at this moment that Criseyde has used a particularly personal item of his to signify a new alliance with Diomede.\textsuperscript{62} The parade of the ‘cote-armure’ echoes an earlier event in Benoît, when Diomédès and Ulyssès come into Troy as messengers after the first phase of the war.\textsuperscript{63} They parade through town in eye-catching clothes, stirring up feeling against the Greeks, and provoke another battle, not just with their official message but in their demeanour. They act as if they own the place. Given the known close association between tokens and bodies,\textsuperscript{64} and between clothing and bodies,\textsuperscript{65} the parade of Diomede’s battle clothes through town in Chaucer bears several meanings.\textsuperscript{66} Literally, Deiphebus has managed to get Diomede’s clothing and it is displayed in triumph. However, the presence of the brooch on the ‘cote-armure’ suggests that Diomede has a degree of ownership of Criseyde,\textsuperscript{67} and that the token

\textsuperscript{61} V 1660–66. Clark and Wasserman note the brooch contains a ruby heart (“The Heart in \textit{Troilus and Criseyde},” 316). Note also that ‘in Troy,’ Criseyde pinned a brooch of some sort on Troilus’s shirt (III 1370–72). She replicates the gesture of pinning the shirt, which was private, in a way that is made public.

\textsuperscript{62} V 1688–94. Massey, “Double Bind of Troilus,” 30: ‘[f]or Criseyde, Troilus’s brooch is simply a commodity, to be reused as profits her most, or when a repayment is required of her … Troilus is no longer in Criseyde’s economic circle, so his brooch has no real value to her.’ I infer that Criseyde values Troilus so little, she is able to give away the most hurtful item she could have thought to give Diomede. By contrast, Clark and Wasserman identify a change in the value of tokens rather than Criseyde’s sense of Troilus’s value. Clark and Wasserman, “The Heart in \textit{Troilus and Criseyde},” 316: ‘for Criseyde, the gift of jewellery has ceased to function as the gift of one’s heart.’

\textsuperscript{63} \textit{Roman de Troie}, 6211–14, 6227–32. Their clothing is described as extravagant, and they have headgear plumed with feathers from exotic talking birds. The clothes are designed to draw attention and add to the effect of their procession through Troy.


\textsuperscript{65} Susan Crane, \textit{Performance of Self}, 3, 6–7, 10–38; Stallybrass, “Worn Worlds,” 291, 294, 308, 312: ‘clothes have a life of their own; they both are material presences and encode other material and immaterial presences.’

\textsuperscript{66} Harris, \textit{Sick Economies}, 97: ‘the supposedly intrinsic values of \textit{Troilus and Cressida}’s objects are … vulnerable to external recoding; as goods circulate from owner to owner, they change, seemingly infected by the wills that evaluate them.’

\textsuperscript{67} Boose, “Othello’s Handkerchief,” 365: a token ‘seems always to have carried overtones for Shakespeare of representative sexual exchange.’ The act of victory implicit in the parade of the clothing and the brooch attached to it feeds into the dream Troilus has just had about the boar. This represents Criseyde’s new alliance with Diomedes in place of Troilus (V 1233–74). Interestingly, given the way the ‘cote-armure’ is paraded up and down, he seeks ‘up and doun’ (V 1237) in his dream and finds Criseyde lying with the boar. The concept of ideas wound up and down in the imagination characterises the falling in love of Troilus, and Criseyde’s assessments of Troilus and Diomede, in Chaucer. This would be a useful area of future research particularly in connection with themes of error and wandering in the Troilus and Criseyde stories of Henryson and Shakespeare.
that once signified a one-off transaction of ‘trouthe’ between Criseyde and Troilus has been disrupted and has branched off into a new transaction.\(^{68}\) The parade of the ‘cote-armure’ symbolically overwrites the story at the heart of Chaucer’s representation of ‘Troy.’\(^{69}\) The so-called triumph of parading spoils of victory brings the end of ‘Troy’ into Troy.\(^{70}\) It also symbolically brings Diomede into Troy to parade in a kind of triumph on the ground where Troilus has previously paraded in triumph, in relation to both the Trojan war and the courtship of Criseyde. Because the token is closely associated with Criseyde as well as Troilus, it returns her symbolically to town in a way that shows she is partnered with someone new, and outside ‘Troy’ and ‘trouthe’ as a result.

The parade of the ‘cote-armure’ echoes the initial triumphal parade of Chaucer’s Troilus in Book One.\(^{71}\) But it is particularly telling that in Book Three, Troilus rides to and from ‘Troy’ with his hawk, and Criseyde greets him from her window as he returns triumphant to town.\(^{72}\) The mutability of Criseyde, contained in the narrator’s description of her, in connection with Troilus hawking, as a ‘faukoun comen out of muwe’ (III 1784), is

\(^{68}\) Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 126; Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 275: the sleeve of Criseyde is ‘one of several shifting signifiers of value … the sleeve—passed from one pair of male hands to another through Cressida—functions as an emblem of her exclusion from a system which reduces her worth to that of an object within male exchange.’ I note that the brooch is another such signifier. Spear, “Shakespeare’s ‘Manly’ Parts,” 415, 421; Clark and Wasserman, “‘The Heart in Troilus and Cressida,’” 316: Chaucer’s Diomede sets his ‘mind’ on Criseyde, not his heart; ‘there is no exchange of hearts between Diomede and Cresside’ (319). This applies equally to Cressida and Diomed.

\(^{69}\) Boose, “Othello’s Handkerchief,” 361: the handkerchief in Othello is a “‘presentational image.’” So, to my mind, is the ‘cote-armure.’ The parading of the ‘cote-armure’ is a spectacle intended to mock the enemy and represent his overthrow. It is a mock battle not unlike a dumb show. However, as it turns out, it also mocks Troilus with proof that his suspicion is justified. As Boose might put it, the brooch is ‘ocular proof’ of Criseyde’s infidelity (“Othello’s Handkerchief,” 368).

\(^{70}\) Strohm, “Storie, Spelle, Geste, Romanaunce, Tragedie,” 357: the fall of Troy is ‘an emblem of the … mutability [Chaucer] epitomizes in Troilus’s love.’ I think the incursion of items that symbolize Diomede brings the beginning of the end of Troilus’s faith in Criseyde into “Troy.” I am reminded of the process of ritual humiliation in which a text about lack of ‘trouthe’ was displayed in public, as detailed by Green (Crisis of Truth, 191; 412, note 22), and of the procession in which John de Hakford was led to the pillory (Smith, “Lying for the Whetstone,” 56). Chaucer’s Troilus feels the display and the message of the brooch as a personal, ritualised humiliation. He is aware of the particularly pointed choice of object Criseyde has made. As Thersites says in Shakespeare, ‘[a] proof of strength she could not publish more’ (5.2.113).

\(^{71}\) Moran connects the triumphal return of Troilus in book two with the non-recognition scene in Henryson (“Meeting of the Lovers,” 11).

\(^{72}\) III 1779–85. Note particularly ‘[a]nd whan that he com ridyng into town’ (III 1782): the emphasis is on his triumphant return.
paralleled by the mutability inherent in the repurposed brooch that comes into town. The parading of the ‘cote-armure’ bears the public message of temporary victory and high spirits of the Trojan soldiers, and it also contains a private message that catches Troilus out. This message, which makes his heart cold (V 1659), marks the awareness that Criseyde is no longer engaged in a state of ‘trouthe’ with him. The motif of a parade that provokes Troilus’s suspicion, and that contains a message brought into Troy hidden ‘fond withinne’ the collar (V 1660), is a direct echo of the stated fear of Criseyde that some ‘fantasye,’ creeping into Troilus’s ‘brayne,’ will mark her social death (III 1504–5).

The return of Diomede’s person in the symbolic form of the ‘cote-armure’ reminds us that he was present in Troy when Criseyde set out to be exchanged. Shakespeare echoes this idea of incursion when Diomed comes to the space that represents Troy in order to collect Cressida. Shakespeare’s Troilus also alludes to the idea of incursion of no-man’s-land into Troy and the end of ‘Troy’ when he asks rhetorically on the battlefield who will go into Troy and tell the court that Hector is dead (5.11.14–17). That movement into Troy, as I argued in my first chapter, reminds us that Troy has already fallen to the Greeks. Perhaps most significantly, as Cook and Hodgdon have also argued, the final letter Cressida sends Troilus can be understood to represent her body. She sends it from whichever part of no-man’s-land she has disappeared to, and it marks her final presence on the stage in a symbolic, bodied

---

73 To the best of my knowledge, scholars have not yet noted this connection. The brooch, and by extension Criseyde, becomes what Mead terms a ‘manipulated [commodity].’ Mead, “Thou Art Chang’d,” 238: ‘the extraliterary debates over the meaning of money, wealth, and exchange show themselves in the very rupture that makes Troilus and Cressida the problematic play it is: the discrepancy between abstract ideals and manipulated commodities.’ The discrepancy between ideals and commodities Mead refers to is reflected in the shock Troilus experiences in all three texts: when he recognises the brooch in Chaucer; when he fails to recognise Cresseid, but is nonetheless deeply distressed by something about the way she looks at him in Henryson; when he sees Cressida betraying him with the pledge, and is forced to try to reconcile what Cressida is and is not in Shakespeare. The degree of recognition and failed recognition reflects the extent to which the Criseyde figure and the Troilus figure can be said to be ‘in Troy’ at any given time. Troilus recognises a version of Criseyde ‘in Troy’ in Chaucer, and elsewhere he struggles.

74 The parade is one of the means by which Criseyde is made legible. Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 49: “[t]he legible woman becomes a degraded object.”

incursion into the space where Troilus is standing (5.3.102), which is a kind of common
ground, subject to rewriting. The letter, judging by Troilus’s reaction and his angry
destruction of it (5.3.110–14), marks the final proof of Cressida’s inconstancy. 76

Chaucer’s ‘cote-armure’ and Shakespeare’s kissing scene

Building on the idea of the ‘cote-armure’ as a representative body of Diomede placed on
display in order to be read, I turn now to ways in which this relates to Cressida and public
display. In the kissing scene and the betrayal scene, Shakespeare draws at least in part
on Chaucer’s parade of the ‘cote-armure’ and its properties as a figurative, legible body. 77
In these scenes, Cressida is a legible token who bears similar meaning and visibility to the ‘cote-
armure.’ 78 This contributes to the very troubling nature of the kissing scene. 79 Cressida, who
has been taken to the Greek camp, is jostled about among the Greek soldiers who insist on
kissing her. 80 They hand her about like an object, 81 and she is, like the ‘cote-armure,’ a ‘signe

---

76 This role is played in Chaucer by Criseyde’s final letter, which she sends Troilus while he is in Troy and
while she is in the Greek camp. In her letter, which is ‘al straunge’ (V 1632) and ‘lik a kalendes of chaunge’ (V
1634), Troilus identifies an end to their troth. The sense of entirety in descriptions such as ‘[t]his Troilus gan al
his life to rede’ (III 1717) in ‘Troy,’ and Criseyde’s promise that her return will ‘torne us al to joie’ (IV 1631) is
replaced by the sense of entire strangeness Troilus identifies in her last letter.

77 To the best of my knowledge, scholars have not yet noted this connection.

78 Tokens can represent sexual exchange: Boose, “Othello’s Handkerchief,” 365. Clothes retain an impression of
cleness to their owner, as seen in: Susan Crane, Performance of Self, 3, 6–7, 10–38; Green, Crisis of Truth,
Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 116, 117. To my mind, Cressida is fetishised in this scene. She is
a woman who is a token, a sign of her reputation from the metanarrative.

79 I assume Shakespeare in part has his characters exchange pledges on stage because it is easier than staging a
whole procession. The scenes in which Cressida seems to be handled like a pledge, the kissing scene and the
betrayal scene, take over part of the role of display that is present in Chaucer’s procession in a stylised form.

80 Harris, Sick Economies, 97: values are recoded as goods circulate. Barfoot, “Troilus and Cressida: Praise,”
46, 49–53, delineates connections between the ideas of praise, prize, price, and possession.

81 At least one production of the play has represented this scene as a ritualised form of sexual assault in which
Cressida is powerless. I find it a very difficult scene. In Tooriihi rāua ko Kāhira, the physical intimidation of the
Greek warriors assessing Kāhira as an object is very clearly threatening as they tower over her on the stage, so I
acknowledge this as another way of investigating and understanding the scene (Tooriihi rāua ko Kāhira, directed
notes that Juliet Stevenson’s Cressida, from the 1985 production, is sympathetically portrayed (58) as a
brutalised character who is helpless until she defends herself with sarcasm (59): ‘Stevenson acted the flirtation
of victory.’

This adds to her status in the kissing scene, when Ulysses describes her explicitly as one of the ‘sluttish spoils of opportunity’ (4.6.63). In this speech (4.6.55–64), Ulysses recognises Cressida as a ‘Cressid,’ and describes her not only as an opportunist but as a prize the soldiers have come across by chance: opportunity has led to her being one of the ‘spoils’ of war, and Ulysses suggests she takes advantage of the opportunity to flaunt herself in a way that advertises she is one of the ‘daughters of the game.’

When she refuses to kiss Ulysses, he responds by degrading the language her body speaks:

There’s language in her eye, her cheek, her lip;
Nay, her foot speaks. Her wanton spirits look out
At every joint and motive of her body.

He responds to her lack of responsiveness to him by turning her rhetorically into a body that speaks for her reputation. Her value is translated into the value of an object that was noble but has been hijacked on common ground.

Cressida is a spoil of war. Throughout the kissing scene, she still bears a token she has received from Troilus, that is, the pledge, which is a sleeve. First Cressida herself is shown

---

82 Hodgdon compares the assessment of Cressida in the kissing scene with an early assessment of Hector’s prowess in the play: ‘[f]or like Hector, males feed their eyes on her “with exact view,” quote her joint by joint, position her as a marketable commodity, read her “like a book of sport”’ (“He Do Cressida,” 254). O’Rourke, “Rule in Unity,” 150.

83 O’Rourke, “Unbodied Figures,” 36, 38, 49, 52.

84 O’Rourke, “Rule in Unity,” 141: in the play, ‘[t]he term “whore” … refers to those who have been forcibly transferred from one man to another.’

85 4.6.56–58. Asp, “Defense of Cressida,” 409: ‘[b]ecause the play reveals no fixed intrinsic value in objects, it presents an ambiguous world in which value is elicited from or projected onto objects by observers’; Hillman, Shakespeare’s Entrails, 65: ‘Shakespeare was interested in … a kind of Nietzschean genealogy, an enterprise of (re)linking words, and the values and ideals constructed out of them, to their bodily origins’; Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 261: women as theatregoers were ‘[i]nvited … to assent to such fictions being inscribed on their bodies.’

86 Greene, “Language and Value,” 275: ‘“[d]iscourse” is “handled” (I.i.55) as though it were physical’; Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 275: ‘Cressida is read (or misread) as a split text. Her deeply specularized, even fetishized, body speaks against her voice, or for her lack of a voice.’

87 Cressida and the sleeve can both be understood as ‘presentational images,’ to borrow Boose’s term (“Othello’s Handkerchief,” 361). Also Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 116: ‘[r]epeated wearing acts as an inscription upon the body.’
jostled about as if she is a pledge. Then she is shown jostling the pledge about, giving it to Diomed and snatching it back, and ultimately allowing it to be taken. In the process of giving the pledge away, Cressida herself, who has just been described by the Greeks as a legible token, gives the pledge to Diomed in a way that allows Troilus to read the transaction. Chaucer’s Troilus is given the opportunity to read Criseyde’s betrayal at a remove when he sees the location of the token on Diomede’s collar and begins to realise the ‘trouthe’ is broken. In effect, the truce is over, along with Chaucer’s ‘time of trewe’ (III 1779). Shakespeare’s Troilus is given the same opportunity. However, he sees Cressida actively giving away an object that reveals the ‘truth’ of the metanarrative, and that also symbolises part of his body as well as part of hers. Thus the ownership of part of his own body, as Hodgdon observes, is given away from him.

**Handing Cressida over**

Shakespeare echoes the opportunism of Chaucer’s Diomede in his own Diomed. Cressida is conducted from the stage by Troilus and Diomed. Troilus tells Diomed he will hand Cressida

---

88 Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 116: ‘detachable parts … [troubled] the conceptual opposition of person and thing.’

89 Stallybrass and Jones:

The power of the fetish emerges through an act of separation, but that separation is haunted by the possibility of further separations, further exchanges. If the fetish keeps the absent beloved present to the lover, it also potentially gives a part of the lover away. Troilus, in the form of his sleeve, can be worn by Cressida, but the sleeve can also be taken and worn by Diomedes. In taking the sleeve from Cressida, Diomedes takes not only Troilus away from Cressida but Cressida away from herself … Unpaired, the glove and the sleeve circulate, unpairing Troilus and Cressida, re-pairing Cressida and Diomedes. (126)

90 Harris, *Sick Economies*, 97. I think tokens and the Criseyde figure in the three texts function as forms of currency. I suggest Cressida uses the sleeve in her transaction with Diomed in the same way as Criseyde uses Troilus’s brooch. The way Cressida uses the pledge shows that she gives it a transactional value beyond her troth with Troilus and beyond the ‘trouthe’ state of ‘Troy.’ The way she symbolically changes the value of the pledge demonstrates that Shakespeare continues Chaucer’s motif of the misers of joy: Cressida shows in no-man’s-land that she does not appreciate the meaning of the bond she made with Troilus. Massey, “Double Bind of Troilus,” 30: ‘[f]or Criseyde, Troilus’s brooch is simply a commodity, to be reused as profits her most, or when a payment is required.’

91 The tokens, like the Criseyde figure, function as ‘discursive bodies,’ to use Stallybrass’s phrase (“Reading the Body,” 121).
over: ‘[a]t the port, lord, I’ll give her to thy hand, / And by the way possess thee what she is.’

Cressida is a ‘what,’ not a ‘who.’ In this, perhaps Shakespeare is echoing Henryson, who describes Cresseid sitting in no-man’s-land ‘not witting quhat scho was.’

Troilus will ‘possess’ Diomed of information about Cressida’s importance and status, but he is also giving Diomed a ‘possession.’ The idea of giving Cressida ‘to [Diomed’s] hand’ prefigures the betrayal scene, in which Troilus characterises Cressida’s betrayal as the replacement of their troth with ‘another knot, five-finger-tied’ (5.2.157). Troilus states that Cressida is of particular value to him and that he will spare Diomed in battle in her name (4.5.113–16).

Diomed openly anatomises and appraises Cressida, rejecting Troilus’s claim to be Cressida’s protector and offering himself (4.5.119–20). He overwrites the value of Troilus’s word by rhetorically assuming the right to be commanded by Cressida. Although we do not see Troilus finally handing Cressida over to Diomed, the exchange has both already happened and will happen during the procession out of town. Where Chaucer’s Diomede sees the Trojans ‘awey’ outside Troy then makes his move, Shakespeare’s Diomed figuratively sees Troilus off, in Troilus’s presence, and before he has removed Cressida from the space that represents Troy.

While the vows and the opportunism of Diomed occur early in Shakespeare relative to Chaucer, the exchange of tokens takes place on the threshold of what passes for Troy, just

92 4.5.111–12. This is interesting given the sea imagery and merchant imagery Troilus uses. I infer it is a play on port and portal.

93 Cressida has a commodity value. On reification of Cressida, see, for instance, Charnes, “So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 420, 422. Charnes identifies that ‘the play seems mimetically to represent the process of reification, a process inevitable in the reinscription of the legendary’ (420).

94 Pittock, “Complexity”, 206: Cresseid is described as a ‘what’ rather than a ‘who.’

95 Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida, 275–76. Particularly 275: ‘the sleeve—passed from one pair of male hands to another by Cressida—functions as an emblem of her exclusion from a system which reduces her worth to that of an object within male exchange.’

96 4.5.118–20. Troilus objects to Diomed’s discourtesy when he ignores Troilus’s claim of protection and persists in ‘praising’ Cressida, which I take to mean praising and appraising (4.5.121–23). For correlation between praise, prize, and price, see Barfoot, “Troilus and Cressida: Praise,” 55.

97 The exchange and appraisal prefigure the assessment of Ulysses in the kissing scene, and show that Cressida is already a commodity. Diomed is already aware of the metanarrative at this point.
before the procession.\textsuperscript{98} The tokens in Shakespeare become signs of immediate separation and revelation of the metanarrative,\textsuperscript{99} where in Chaucer they were signs of union, and the fantasy state and equality of ‘Troy.’ The exchange in Chaucer took place in a location separate from common ground. The exchange of vows between Cressida and Troilus takes place in Troy, but the tokens are a symbol of worldly exchange as well as ‘trouthe.’ They are almost a reminder on the threshold that Cressida will forget her troth. It is as if the tokens seal the agreement between the characters and the metanarrative that Cressida will betray Troilus and become what she fears, in the form of Cresseid.

Just like the pledge, Cressida is turned into an object to be fought over in transit by Troilus and Diomed,\textsuperscript{100} then given to the Greek soldiers to be handed about, whatever interpretation we might put on that scene. She is turned into a sign of a victorious exchange, as ransom for Antenor, and as a signifier of Diomed’s psychological victory over Troilus, in getting something Troilus overtly values. Cressida and the pledge are given a worldly exchange value,\textsuperscript{101} and this combined transaction, giving a gift to Cressida and giving her to Diomed’s hand almost immediately, monetises both the sleeve and Cressida. The sense of ‘trouthe’ is lost. The sleeve and Cressida both become a kind of hand-me-down, immediately disposable.

\textsuperscript{98} Nordlund, “Divergence,” 65: ambiguities in stage directions in Shakespeare’s plays can make it unclear when a soliloquy is entirely private and also when exactly characters leave the stage. 
\textsuperscript{100} For ransom and ‘translation,’ see for instance Murray, “Value of ‘Eschaunge,’” 339. 
\textsuperscript{101} Clark and Wasserman, “The Heart in Troilus and Criseyde”: Diomede sets his ‘mind’ on Criseyde (318), and there is ‘no exchange of hearts’ between them (319). For Criseyde, ‘the gift of jewellery has ceased to function as a gift of one’s heart’ (323). I think the same can be said of Shakespeare’s sleeve.
Cresseid’s fear of monsters and exclusion

There are ways in which Cresseid and Cressida are characterised in terms of fears of exclusion and monstrosity. These fears build on the idea I explored in my first chapter that Chaucer’s Criseye has a precarious presence ‘in Troy.’ The fears of exclusion and monstrosity that relate to the concept of leaving Troy show awareness of the metanarrative, and therefore show how the Criseyde figure leaves ‘Troy.’ I consider ways in which Cresseid’s experience of a dual expulsion from the company of Diomeid and then from her father’s dwelling connects with her fear of being seen in a monstrous state. The procession of Criseyde in Chaucer is turned into a pair of secretive, furtive exits in Henryson. These are based on fear of monstrosity and Cresseid’s awareness that she has been cast out of ‘Troy.’

Next, I consider how Cressida’s fear of monsters is presented in Troy, and ways in which the presence of monstrosity invalidates the ‘presumption’ that Troilus and Cressida are ‘in Troy.’

Cresseid undergoes a dual exclusion in the space of Henryson’s poem. She has already gone from Troy, but the poem shows first her ‘expuls’ from the company of Diomeid (117–19), and then the detailed ‘[deprivation]’ that sees her expelled from the oratory.103 The process of deprivation of courtly qualities in the oratory turns Cresseid into a monster, who fears being recognised as a monstrous object that was once the ‘flour of luif in Troy.’

Diomeid excludes Cresseid from his company by sending her divorce papers, the ‘lybell of repudie’ (74). I think of the ‘lybell of repudie’ as a combination of divorce papers

102 Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 52: Cressida’s infidelity is ‘monstrous in itself.’ I would suggest the same can be said of Cresseid’s. The Criseyde figure’s abandonment of Troilus is inherently monstrous.
103 Cynthia, reading her ‘bill’ (332) containing the ‘sentence diffinityue’ (333) over Cresside’s body, ‘depriv[e]s’ her formally of youth, health, beauty, and society (334–41). That is, she deprives her of ‘Troy’ and the capacity to return to ‘Troy.’
104 128. Cresseid recognises that she has been made into an ‘abiect odious.’
and a protection order.\textsuperscript{105} Cresseid allegedly goes into the ‘commoun’ ground of the court,\textsuperscript{106} where she wanders up and down, desolate.\textsuperscript{107} In this she begins to echo the trajectory of the ‘misers of joy’ in Chaucer’s motif.\textsuperscript{108}

Cresseid fears being seen. At length she returns in secret from the common ground, without company (92–95), and in disguise, to her father’s house on the edge of town. She hides in the oratory and in her father’s chamber out of fear that people will learn of her ‘expuls fra Diomeid’ (119). She is ‘destitute’ of ‘comfort’ (92) and ‘consolation’ (93). She, like Chaucer’s Troilus, is ‘byraft of ech welfare’ and ‘out cast from alle joie.’\textsuperscript{109} Cresseid is prefigured, before the leprosy is even made manifest, as one of Chaucer’s narrator’s ‘misers of joy.’ She is the image of a ‘coveytous or a wrecche’ as she returns to her father’s house.\textsuperscript{110} And Henryson’s narrator carries out the logical extension of the suffering of Chaucer’s Troilus in the circumstances of Cresseid.\textsuperscript{111} Henryson has Cresseid experience the fear and exile from joy that Chaucer’s Troilus experiences when Criseyde fails to return.\textsuperscript{112}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{105} 74–77. DSL, s.v. ‘repudie.’ DSL defines ‘repudie’ as ‘[r]ejection, dismissal, repulse; divorce.’ The verb ‘repudiat’ can mean to ‘put away or divorce,’ or to ‘refuse to accept … to reject.’ Just as Chaucer’s Troilus ‘[dwell] out cast from alle joie’ (V 615), entirely removed from the company of Criseyde, so too Henryson’s narrator shows Cresseid removed from the entirety and the self-sufficiency of Diomeid’s ‘companie,’ which is not just his own company but also the social acceptability of being among his ‘world of folk.’ The ‘repulse’ of Diomeid turns Cresseid into a repulsive outcast (128).
\textsuperscript{106} The suggestion is that Cresseid is potentially ‘commoun,’ her reputation is questionable, and the ground on which she wanders becomes common ground, paradoxically given that it is a kind of outer court. Cresseid is ‘excludit’ here not from ‘Troy’ but from the lesser court of ‘Grece.’
\textsuperscript{107} The narrator’s comment that she goes ‘amang the Greikis’ (82) walking up and down and ‘desolate’ is echoed by Shakespeare in Cressida’s wry aside on the subject of her exchange: ‘A woeful Cressid ’mongst the merry Greeks!’ (4.5.55)
\textsuperscript{108} Henryson’s narrator rues the ‘mischance’ (84) that sends Cresseid out to ‘go amang the Greikis’ (82). ‘Mischance’ derives, as already noted, from Old French ‘meschëance’ (MED s.v. ‘mischaunce’). This derives from ‘meschëoir,’ ‘to fall badly.’ The concept of ‘mischance’ suggests that Cresseid, like Chaucer’s Troilus, has fallen badly into a dubious landscape.
\textsuperscript{109} IV 228, V 615. Cresseid specifically states: ‘Now am I maid ane vnworthie outwaill, / And al in cair translatit is my ioy’ (129–30). This is a deliberate reference by Henryson’s narrator to Chaucer’s narrator’s descriptions of Troilus’s state without Criseyde.
\textsuperscript{110} III 1373. She wanders the street, deprived of joy. The narrator describes her experience ‘amang the Greikis’ (82) as one of ‘foull plesance’ (83) and ‘mischance’ (84). It is interesting that this is the consequence of Criseyde’s having followed Pandarus’s suggestion to cast her widow’s habit to ‘mischance’ (II 222).
\textsuperscript{111} The narrator shows Cresseid engaging in joyless behaviour that gives rise to talk about her reputation, and has her wander and dwell outside a ‘court’ on common ground. She is no longer dwelling outside Troilus’s Trojan court: she is one remove further from Troilus, just like the tokens she has redistributed, and is now outside Diomeid’s court instead. The relocation of Criseyde to the ‘court, commoun’ (77) encapsulates the way in which Criseyde has been placed outside the court of ‘Troy’ in Chaucer.
\textsuperscript{112} This exile from joy is emblematised in Chaucer’s tree motif.
In the oratory, Cresseid complains to the gods, using a ‘Troy’/‘joy’ rhyme, claiming they have broken their promise to make her the ‘flour of luif in Troy,’ yet now ‘all in cair translatit is [her] ioy.’ She is made an ‘vnworthie outwaill’ (129). Cresseid has been figuratively ‘translatit’ in that she has been pushed out of Diomeid’s company, but this verb also reflects the reality that she was first exchanged in Chaucer. She crossed a national border as well as an emotional one.

Cresseid claims that she has been ‘excludit’ from the company of Troilus and Diomeid. She expresses fear concerning who will ‘gyde’ and ‘conuoy’ her. The word ‘conuoy’ provides a useful insight into the importance of processions in the Criseyde story. Benoît and Chaucer show a strong ceremonial procession which reflects the wealth and the commodity value of the Criseyde figure. Henryson’s and Shakespeare’s treatments of the Criseyde figure’s exit show the commodity value of a Criseyde with no social resources behind her. Chaucer’s Troilus takes a company from his ‘world of folk’ (III 1721) and travels with Criseyde out of Troy. Shakespeare’s Troilus tries to have Cressida travel under his verbal protection, and she wears his sleeve, even though that ownership and the sense of who will convey Cressida is immediately challenged and overtaken by Diomed. Cresseid travels ‘disagysit’ (95), without ‘felawschipe or refute’ (94), from the court to her father’s house,

---

113 127–28. She seems not to have noticed that flowers have a season, or that she was to be the flower as long as she was in Troy.
114 130. Nitecki, “Fengeit of the New,” 122: ‘Cresseid loses her ‘renoun,’ which ‘designates fame or reputation as well as display, ironically suggesting that Cresseid’s reputation is at one with her property or display, that she lacks intrinsic value, that she is appearance.’
115 75. The two courts and the two noblemen seem to be of different value. Henryson’s narrator describes Cresseid as the ‘flour and A per se / Of Troy and Grece’ (78–79). Cresseid in her outburst against the gods states that she is excluded ‘fra Diomeid and nobill Troylus’ (132). The speeches of Cresseid consistently underline the ‘trouthe’ of Troilus, and this pairing of plain Diomeid with noble Troilus is deliberate, and not exclusively a feature of scansion. Shakespeare very likely echoes the distinction made by Henryson’s Cresseid when he has Cressid tell Diomed whose the pledge was: ”Twas one’s that loved me better than you will” (5.2.90).
116 131. McKenna argues that the question “[q]uha sall me gyde?” lies at ‘the core of the “tragic” mystery’ of the poem (“Henryson’s “Tragedie,”” 31).
117 For the ceremony of the exit procession of Briseïda, see: Mieszkowski, “Reputation of Criseyde,” 80–81; Mieszkowski, “R. K. Gordon,” 134. She comes from and is going to money.
118 The narrator describes her travelling alone. She describes herself as entirely alone in her accusations to Cupid: ‘[a]nd I fra lufferis left, and all forlane’ (140). She speaks as if they have gone from her rather than the reverse. Her complaint that she is ‘fra lufferis left and all forlane’ is nuanced: she is punished for having left
and travels in disguise accompanied only by her father to the leper lodgings. In Chaucer, when the procession reaches the limits of the distance Troilus can appropriately travel, he leaves her unprotected. This sense of lack of protection continues in processions made by Cresseid and Cressida, which occur after Chaucer’s Troilus has reached a turning point.

**Cresseid’s leprosy: ‘personation’ and monstrosity**

During the dream or vision of the assembly of the planetary gods, Cynthia literally reads a ‘bill,’ which contains the ‘sentence diffinityue’ agreed on by the gods (332–33), ‘on Cresseid, quair scho lay’ (332). The ‘sentence’ shows how Cresseid will end her life. It symbolically deprives her of youthful, courtly qualities. Cynthia performs a desiccation of Cresseid, for instance in the line ‘[f]ra heit of bodie here I the depryue’ (334). The removal of beauty and lovability marks Cresseid out as having forgone ‘the white and ek the rede’ mentioned by Chaucer’s narrator in the ‘misers of joy’ motif. The ‘bill’ represents a social death sentence that symbolically and finally removes Cresseid’s ability to return to ‘Troy.’ It realises, that is embodies, Cresseid’s self-identification as ‘clene excludit, as abiect odious.’ She is transformed into a monstrous object to the extent that she is afraid of being recognised: “‘Father, I wald not be kend. / Thairfoir in secreit wyse ûe let me gang.’”

---

119 386–89. The description of Cresseid’s stealthy exit is reminiscent of the attempted exit of the fox in Henryson’s fable, *The Trial of the Fox* (964–70; in Fox, *Poems of Robert Henryson*).
120 Cressida travels with Troilus but he is overruled by Diomed: in Chaucer, Diomede had control of the bridle of Criseyde’s horse (V 90, V 92), but waited to claim her until Troilus had left. Cresseid travels without courtly protection, just as she has wandered in the ‘court’ without protection.
121 334. I agree with Johnson that Cresseid experiences an acceleration of time and views her story from the end-point (“Whatever Happened to Chaucer’s Criseyde?”, 314). I suggest the bill of Cynthia is responsible for speeding up Cresseid’s aging process and in Johnson’s phrase, ‘making [a lover] unlovely.’
122 133. Nitecki, “Fengeit of the New,” 126: ‘the catalogue of her traits is a catalogue of her physical and moral decay.’
123 380–81. The only solution is for her to travel further outside society.
In reading the bill aloud over Cresseid, Cynthia personates the judgement contained in Diomeid’s ‘lybell of repudie.’ She confirms that Cresseid has been ‘excludit,’ and at the same time changes the physiological presentation of Cresseid so that she becomes someone to avoid. Diomeid’s ‘lybell of repudie’ symbolically contains the idea of and reasons for Criseyde’s exile from ‘Troy,’ that is, it acknowledges and responds to her ‘untrouthe’ towards Troilus in Chaucer. When Cynthia reads her ‘bill’ over Cresseid, she relocates the meaning of ‘untrouthe’ and exile, contained in the ‘lybell,’ from the ‘bill’ to Cresseid’s body, by speaking the ‘sentence’ aloud. In this way, Cresseid’s body becomes a text of exclusion from ‘Troy.’ For this reason, I find Holger Schott Syme’s analysis of personation, deferral, and the location of authority in absent sources pertinent. He writes, for instance, that ‘the evidentiary value of texts was generated through statements about them’; the authenticity of witness statements was ‘attested by report.’ The marks on Cresseid’s skin and in her eyes and voice act as a form of annotation. Syme describes annotation in this way:

[Annotation] constituted a process of permutation … depositions were transformed from records of spoken statements into scripts for evidentiary performances. Although the original examination is not erased, the words and symbols added to the document modify the prior inscriptions, altering the … meaning as well as their physical form. (78)

Cynthia stands in for Diomeid, who in turn stands in for Chaucer’s Troilus. Syme points out that the bodies and voices of stand-ins for royal authority ‘played a crucial part’ in having the royal figure establish a ‘palpable presence’: the authority of stand-ins ‘derived from royal writs … the power inherent in them could only become functional through embodiment.’

Though Syme here refers to the bodies and voices of the stand-ins themselves, I find it telling

125 Syme, 26.
that Cynthia re-enacts an act of placing illness, punishment, and exile in Cresseid’s body. She translates Cresseid’s body so it reflects her outcast state. Cresseid becomes an embodied version of a text that delineates her changed status, that is the ‘lybell,’ but inherent in that is the authority such a ‘lybell’ gains from an awareness, on the part of the narrators and readers of Chaucer and Henryson, of the suffering Chaucer’s Troilus undergoes. His suffering is presented to Cresseid and made present in the way she experiences and interacts with the world, through her appearance and her subsequent speeches. When she speaks about her reputation and her ‘untrouthe’ in public, she draws on the authority of the ‘bill,’ the ‘lybell,’ and Troilus’s suffering.

The markings of leprosy Cynthia places on Cresseid and in her voice are textual markings, such as are known to have been used in contemporary ritual punishment. Cresseid becomes ‘abhominabill’ as someone with leprosy, but she is specifically ‘abhominabill’ to ‘all loveris’ (308). She is placed completely outside the courtly sphere. The text of Cresseid’s skin and voice is made memorable and made into a kind of monument, and she becomes a monster in Charnes’s terms, a monstrosity and a warning. Condemned to wander in public, she draws attention to the grotesque changes she has undergone. She is sent out of seclusion into no-man’s-land where she engages in a perpetual parade in which she is a monster. Her fear of being seen is brought home to her.

127 We can consider the ‘bill’ and the markings of Cresseid’s skin and voice to be a kind of travel document: they mark Cresseid being placed into circulation and they are signs under which she travels outside courtly society: ‘[q]uhair thow cummis, ilk man sall fle the place’ (341), as Cynthia tells Cresseid. They are warnings that her presence in circulation is monstrous.
Cressida’s fear: ‘dregs’ and monsters

While Shakespeare’s Troilus and Cressida are in Troy, they discuss Cressida’s fear of monsters in ‘Cupid’s pageant.’ They are discussing an idea of ‘Troy’ in which love that involves ‘trouthe’ is put on display in a proper way, into which no ideas of monstrosity can be admitted. They are both afraid to see Cressida for who and what she is. They are afraid to see ways in which she is monstrous, and ways in which she is put on display as a monster, both a horror and a warning, in the metanarrative. If Cressida and Troilus recognise that Cressida is a kind of monster who exhibits monstrous behaviour and body rhetoric in public, as she is proved to be once she has been changed for Antenor, they will have to acknowledge that they cannot be in ‘Troy.’ Although they try not to admit fear, they inhabit a Troy where there are monsters, and this places Troilus and Cressida outside ‘Troy.’

When Cressida first implies she is concerned, Troilus asks her: ‘What too-curious dreg espies my sweet lady in the fountain of our love?’ (3.2.62–63). Cressida replies, ‘More dregs than water, if my fears have eyes.’ It is highly likely that Shakespeare draws on Chaucer and echoes the ‘brotel wele of mannes joie unstable’ (III 820). Criseyde refers to the ‘wele’ on the threshold of making an allegiance with Troilus. Shakespeare’s Troilus’s description of dregs in a fountain suggests he and Cressida are drinking from a cup, which

129 3.2.69–70. For monsters, see Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 35–36, 38, 49, 52.
131 Charnes, “So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 414.
132 Mead, “Thou Art Chang’d,” 238: ‘the extraliterary debates over the meaning of money, wealth, and exchange show themselves in the very rupture that makes Troilus and Cressida … problematic … the discrepancy between abstract ideals and manipulated commodities.’
133 Harris, Sick Economies, 95, 97, 98: Helen and Cressida are revalued as they cross national borders. The value of the Criseyde figure has already been reassessed in Chaucer, and we see the revalued and translated Criseyde figure in Henryson and Shakespeare.
134 3.2.64. With regard to the stage and the error speech, Lenz, “Base Trade,” 841: ‘Here we have the common ground, the topos, upon which the theater as prostitution metaphor is based. The theater is seen through prostitution seeking eyes because the eyes, quite naturally and reflexively, seek prostitution. That is, they are attracted by, submit to, and enjoy visual stimulation.’
implies the vessel that holds the water is unsteady. Cressida’s reply alerts us to the danger of seeing too clearly, and also prefigures Cressida’s assessment of her ‘error’ (5.3.107–12), which is anatomised into a description of her ‘eye’ and ‘heart.’ Her ‘error’ will prove a source of fear about her future reputation, because it will prove her to be monstrous.

Troilus identifies fear in Cressida: ‘let my lady apprehend no fear. In all Cupid’s pageant, there is presented no monster’ (3.2.69–70). Cressida’s fear of monsters echoes Cresseid’s fear of being seen in a monstrous state outside courtly company. Cressida’s fear of monsters is a fear of recognition. Troilus’s fear of seeing Cressida acting outside Troy, in the betrayal scene, is a fear of having to recognise her as a monster, and therefore acknowledge that she is permanently outside ‘Troy’ and outside ‘Cupid’s pageant.’

Troilus ‘presumes’ there is truth in Cressida. He is afraid of recognising monstrosity or falsehood in Cressida, presuming they are in a situation that is within Cupid’s territory, and therefore to keep this fantasy alive, he needs to believe there are no monsters.

The concept of ‘apprehension’ contains the ideas of fear, suspicion, apprehension, and recognition. These destabilise the ‘fantasy’ the Troilus figure has of unity with the Criseyde figure. They also destabilise the idea of social security expressed by the Criseyde figure in Chaucer and Henryson, in ways that makes it clear she is terrified of losing status.

---

135 This reflects Henryson’s narrator’s idea that Cresseid is ‘spilt’ (91), spoiled by ‘wickit langage’ (91). ‘Spilt,’ although it means spoiled, resembles ‘spilt’ as in spilled, like a drink, or water spilling from a well.

136 The connection between ‘fear’ and ‘eyes’ perhaps reflects the almsgiving scene in Henryson, in which Cresseid is unable to see that her benefactor is Troilus. When she discovers his identity, the horror of his having seen her causes a health crisis and seems to kill her. She fears Troilus not only having seen her in her monstrous state but having recognised her in some measure.

137 In the pledge scene, Troilus swears he will be patient and will not have ‘cognition’ of what he sees (5.2.62–63). I address this scene in my third chapter. Charnes, “So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 421: ‘Troilus’s denial of Cressida’s fears … signals the particular form of Troilus’s “neurosis,” which is precisely to not own what he already knows, to not “apprehend” monsters. To rename Cressida’s fears “monsters” is at once to dismiss them as bogeys and to mark them as revelations, as warnings. His repression of his own “knowledge” of the outcome of this story returns in the form of obsessive, even excessive, denial.’

138 The fear of Shakespeare’s Troilus is a reaction to the almsgiving scene in Henryson, in which Troilus is reminded of Cresseid by the body and demeanour of Cresseid in no-man’s-land, but fails to recognise her. There is a failure of body rhetoric to communicate itself to him.

139 Chaucer’s Criseyde is afraid of Troilus’s ‘fantasie’ leading him to doubt her ‘trouthe’: this would place her outside ‘Troy,’ and make her ineligible to take part in any pageant of love.
Henryson’s Cresseid is presented as a monster in public. Cresseid fears being recognised, and when she undergoes a crisis after the alms-giving scene, it is because she is horrified that Troilus has seen her in her current state.

Troilus indicates that the ‘monstruosity in love’ is found in lovers who make extravagant promises on which they cannot deliver. In Chaucer and Henryson, the Criseyde character is guilty of extravagant rhetoric, particularly connected with her ‘trouthe’ and her status ‘in Troy,’ on which she does not deliver. In Shakespeare, other characters reflect on the exaggerated and clearly legible body language of Cressida in the Greek camp.

The presence of monstrosity invalidates ‘Troy’ as a location. It is impossible to be a monster and be in ‘Troy.’ Chaucer characterises ‘Troy’ and Criseyde as inherently ‘brotel.’ They both lose their joy. By losing their joy, the ‘fetheres brighte’ and the ‘chere,’ they are both placed outside the time and place where monsters were impossible, that is, the ‘tyme of trewe’ (III 1779). Monstrosity contributes to the destabilising effects of war and the changing ‘wele’ of ‘mannes joie.’ Henryson presents a Cresseid whose social status and body are both destabilised by monstrosity. Monstrosity in these narratives consists of a loss of stability, a loss of ‘joy,’ and a loss of the fantasy state in which the Criseyde figure appears to be true.

141 In Chaucer, Criseyde describes herself as a fish out of water (IV 765), ‘as out of this world agon’ (IV 780), and she herself questions what ‘Criseyde [is] worth from Troilus’ (IV 766). In Henryson, Cresseid, the narrator, and the gods variously describe her in gruesome terms. To herself before the leprosy develops, she is an ‘vnworthie outwaill’ (129), ‘clene excludit, as abiect odious’ (133); in her subsequent Complaint she is ‘deformit’ in ‘figour’ (445–449); to the gods, she is ‘to al louers … abhominabill’ (308), capable of making (by implication decent) men flee: ‘[q]uhair thow cummis, ilk man shal fle the place’ (341); to the narrator, she possesses an ‘vglye lipper face’ (372). Witnessing Cressida’s betrayal, Troilus describes her in gruesome terms that echo what Hillman (Shakespeare’s Entails, 64, 65, 68) identifies as the gastric concerns of the play, and what Harris identifies as its sick economy. Note also Stallybrass, “Reading the Body,” 122: texts ‘testify to the desire to fix the body as a spectacle of transparency.’ Troilus’s gruesome enumeration of aspects of the Cressida who has betrayed him also echoes the grotesqueness of Cresseid’s body and the corporeal unseemliness and distastefulness Henryson’s narrator enumerates and has Cresseid enumerate about herself. I return to these concerns in my analysis of value and contamination in my third chapter.
142 This loss is reflected in Henryson, when Cresseid tells Calchas her ‘mirth’ is gone (368), and when she tells herself ‘[a]l welth in eird, away as wind it weiris’ (467).
When Criseyde learns that she is to be ‘chaunged’ for Antenor (IV 793), Chaucer’s narrator describes her carrying out processes that follow the protocol for displaying grief, and that enact a degree of violence on her body:\(^{143}\) she tears her hair and wrings her fingers, and weeps piteously (IV 731–42). She falls onto her bed as if she were dead (IV 733), and her skin changes from brightness to pallor.\(^{144}\) There is a temporary physical disruption to her body, in the signs of grief. Her grief is written on her body, but it passes.\(^{145}\)

There is a sense of physical heaviness in the way Criseyde and Cresseid grieve about the idea of going from ‘Troy.’ Criseyde grieves in private.\(^{146}\) Cresseid grieves in private in the oratory, and in the corner of the leper lodgings, where she expresses a wish to be ‘grauin’ (414) under the earth.\(^{147}\) Criseyde falls onto her arms and weeps: ‘she on hir armes two / Fil gruf, and gan to wepen pitously’ (IV 911–12). A child brings Cresseid a message in the

---

\(^{143}\) Another example of courtly grief expressed as bodily violence is found in *Sir Orfeo*: Heurodis tears her hair and skin and scratches herself until she bleeds when she is threatened with abduction from the court (Bliss. *Sir Orfeo*, Ashmole 61, 68). The violence Heurodis carries out on her body is echoed by the King of Faerie’s threat that she will be ‘to-torn,’ ripped away from the court. It seems a kind of violent grief is appropriate in a courtly context. I note that Heurodis returns in *Sir Orfeo* minus a voice, where Criseyde turns into Cresseid and circulates without a voice that would be proper to use in court.

\(^{144}\) IV 740. The combination of falling as if dead and losing brightness echoes the suffering of Troilus in the tree metaphor (IV 225–31). As Stanbury points out, Troilus is ‘lik a ded ymage’ (IV 235; Stanbury, *Visual Object of Desire*, 106).

\(^{145}\) Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 49; Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida”; Stallybrass, “Reading the Body,” 121: the body is ‘discursive,’ it is ‘oral/aural’ as much as ‘specular’; Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 117. Greene, “Language and Value,” 275: discourse is handled as if it were physical. I think grief is also handled as if it makes a physical mark. Where this is transitory in Criseyde, it is made permanent in Cresseid’s body.

Cressida’s physically unmarked body is made legible and noteworthy in her use of exaggerated body language and in the symbolic inscription of the Criseyde figure’s reputation on Cressida. It embodies a kind of worn out grief. For the effects of iteration, see: Charnes, “So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 413–14, 416, 417–18; Hillman, *Shakespeare’s Entrails*, 60.

\(^{146}\) ‘And thus lith now Criseyde allone’ (IV 868). She is alone because she is separated from joy; her face is ‘al ychaunged in another kynde’ (IV 865), like Cresseid after the dream vision: ‘[n]ow is deformit the figour of my face; / To luik on it na leid now lyking hes’ (488–89). Criseyde’s joys have flown: ‘[t]he playe, the laughter, men was wont to fynde / On hire, and ek hire joies everichone, / Ben fled’ (IV 866–68). This is highly significant because it echoes the motif of Troilus’s senses fleeing the town as he falls in love with Criseyde, and because it shows that with her revoked citizenship and admittance to the ‘world of folk’ of ‘Troy’ and Troilus, her access to joy has also been revoked.

\(^{147}\) 110–111, 116–17, 120–22, 403–4. She wishes to be buried out of sight and earshot of Trojans and Greeks because she wants to hide the monstrous alteration of her skin and voice. The corner of the lodgings is the nearest Cresseid can get to private space. She ‘spurnis’ against the wall (475), not unlike a child, and moans quietly to herself.
oratory: her father ‘hes merwell sa lang on grouf ze ly’ (361). Cresseid is lying face down, like Criseyde.\(^{148}\) It is highly likely that Henryson’s narrator draws on the image of Criseyde hiding her face in her arms.\(^{149}\) Criseyde and Cresseid are figuratively hiding from change, and that they show their reluctance to go from ‘Troy’ by making themselves physically heavy and difficult to shift, like a child who does not want to be moved. In Henryson, this idea is reinforced by the leper lady’s counsel to Cresseid as she lies in the corner of the lodging, moaning to herself and kicking the wall (475–77).\(^{150}\) The idea of heaviness and grief echoes the image of Chaucer’s Troilus bound in his tree with the ‘chaungynge of Criseyde’ weighing on him.

Criseyde and Cressida both express determination not to go from Troy. Cressida is outside her chambers on the stage, which, as I argue in my first chapter, is an ambiguous space outside Troy. She claims she will ‘go in and weep’ (4.3.30) and declares, ‘I will not go from Troy’ (4.3.33). In this statement of determination, Cressida echoes Criseyde’s statement of intent to return, ‘To Troie I wole, as for conclusioun’ (V 765). Criseyde and Cressida are both outside ‘Troy.’

Both these declarations of intent are superseded by knowledge of the metanarrative. Before Criseyde leaves town, she states ‘I soone shal be chaunged.’\(^{151}\) Chaucer’s narrator cuts off the reader’s hope of Criseyde’s return decisively before Criseyde has gone from Troy (IV 27–28).

In Shakespeare, the hope of staying in ‘Troy’ is undercut by Cressida’s knowledge of herself, expressed while she is in Troy with Troilus, as possessing two selves, and possessing

\(^{148}\) DSL, s.v. ‘grouf.’

\(^{149}\) In connection with Cresseid’s reluctance to be ‘kend,’ Adamson, “Henryson’s Testament”, 48: ‘[w]hat Henryson brings us to realize is that Cresseid’s pride and shame are merely the symptoms, not the cause, of her wish for secrecy, that her fear of being recognized is really a fear of recognizing herself.’

\(^{150}\) It is interesting that according to the leper lady, Cresseid’s weeping doubles her woe. I wonder if this is an echo of the ‘double sorwe’ (I 1) of Troilus and the ‘woful vers, that wepen as I write’ (I 4).

‘fears [that] have eyes’ (3.2.64). These ‘eyes’ can see that monstrosity is part of the future of the metanarrative. And they prefigure the ‘error’ speech which occurs beyond ‘Troy’ and just after Cressida has betrayed Troilus, in which Cressida divides women into hearts and eyes.

The concept of Cressida’s ‘self’ is problematic, because she and Troilus are so overdetermined and over-cited, and because Cressida seems to have two selves, which like her ‘eye’ and her ‘other eye’ are capable of looking in different directions (5.2.107–11). In the metanarrative, the Criseyde figure looks at ‘Troy’/Troilus and beyond ‘Troy.’ That is, once she has left ‘Troy,’ which contains the protection and social advantages of association with Troilus, she looks more generally and in a way that is uncontained and unspecified.

For this reason, although we can plausibly consider Cressida’s looking or her selves as a dichotomy of Troilus versus Diomedes, there is also room for an understanding of Cressida’s ‘kind of self’ as a more diffuse and unclear entity.

In Troy, Cressida tells Troilus:

I have a kind of self resides with you—

But an unkind self, that itself will leave

To be another’s fool.

In addition to the idea of Troilus’s self or Diomed’s, Cressida could be saying she has one self, but it is an unkind, that is unnatural, one. Charnes ‘[reads the “unkind self”] as dissimilar

---

152 Hillman argues that Shakespeare reintroduces ‘the matter of the body, which has been displaced over countless reiterations by something like pure citationality’ (Shakespeare’s Entrails, 59–60).

153 In this sense, Cressida is like tokens that, having been given away once, can continue to be redistributed.

154 Greenfield argues, for instance, that Calchas ‘precipitates’ a ‘[destabilisation of Cressida’s identity] … splitting her into a Trojan self, Troilus’s lover, and a Greek self, which Troilus calls “Diomed’s Cressida”’ (‘Fragments of Nationalism,’ 193). Greenfield, 193–94: ‘Cressida’s self-division begins with a conflict between her prudence and her desire for Troilus … one might describe this as a split between Cressida as proprietor of herself and Cressida as erotic commodity.’ To Charnes, the “kind of self” that resides with Troilus is Troilus’s Cressida, while the “unkind” self … will be “Diomed’s Cressid” (“So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 422). For the idea of the self, see also Charnes, 413, 417–18. Charnes considers the nature of the self and the risk of being mistaken for another to be central to the play (413).

155 3.2.135–37. Asp, “Transcendence Denied,” 265–66. Asp identifies the two selves of Cressida as ‘the one imputed by tradition and the one imposed on her by Troilus’ (265). Troilus ‘denies her identity’ because she does not and cannot perform the role he assigned her (260).
to, unlike, the former self.' I think this is valid, and I also think the idea of ‘kind’ or ‘kynde’ contains a sense of kinship, a relationship where people are contiguous, as Troilus and Criseyde seem to be ‘in Troy,’ where they are socially ‘touchable.’ There is also a sense of what kind of heart Cressida has: the nature, or ‘kind,’ of her heart is to be unnatural and ‘unkind’ to everybody. She is emotionally and socially detached. Perhaps we can understand her heart to consist of layers of ‘kind’ or nature. She has a self that is inherently, and repeatedly, unkind to Troilus. She can peel off a layer of her ‘self,’ equally ‘unkind,’ to give to Diomed. What remains seems to me to be a ‘presumption’ that Cressida has a self, much like Troilus ‘presuming’ Cressida to be capable of ‘truth.’

To me, the sense of a self without ‘kind’ very likely draws on Chaucer’s concept of ‘kynde’ in relation to the world of ‘Troy.’ Criseyde loses her ‘kynde noriture’ when she leaves ‘Troy.’ Troilus ‘in Troy’ assembles a ‘world of folk, as com hym wel of kynde’ (III 1721). Troilus lies down after Criseyde has gone from Troy, ‘[i]magynyng ay that she was unkynde, / For which wel neigh he went out of his mynde.’

The idea of an unkind self is the idea of an unnatural self, a kind of monster in Troy.

Chaucer’s narrator describes the outburst of grief and self-harm Criseyde undergoes, and the reader or listener witnesses it in real time. Cressida, however, takes on the role of narrating what she will do once she has ‘[gone] in’ to Troy:

I’ll go in and weep …

Tear my bright hair, and scratch my praisèd cheeks,

Crack my clear voice with sobs, and break my heart

---

156 Charnes, “So Unsecret to Ourselves,” 422.
157 Kaula, “Will and Reason,” 276, identifies ‘the discrepancy between [Cressida’s] two selves, her “kind,” loving self, and her “unkind,” skeptical self;’ ‘she will succumb to her unkind self and prove false.’ I agree that this is part of the meaning of ‘kind.’ However, it also builds on a sense of that which is natural to someone of a particular social status, as in ‘[a] world of folk, as come him wel of kynde’ (III 1721).
158 That is, that which is appropriate to courtly status: worthy or true, in other words.
159 V 1441–42. The idea of her being ‘unkyne’ is among other things the idea of her no longer being related to him, by personal relationship or by rank.
160 In this sense, Cressida and her ‘self’ are only worth what her reputation is worth.
With sounding ‘Troilus.’ I will not go from Troy.

(4.3.30–33)

Cressida tells the audience that she will enact changes in her hair, voice, and cheeks that mirror the changes Chaucer’s narrator identifies in Criseyde. However the audience does not see a change in her.

Cressida retains attractive physical features, but they are overwritten by awareness of the metanarrative. Cressida already knows she will become a ‘Cressid,’ that she will be read in a certain way. She loses her social camouflage, in as much as she leaves Troy for a society of soldiers, in which her body language is read as monstrous, and in which she is put on display. Ulysses defines the language of her eyes, cheeks, voice, and foot (4.6.56–58).

Cresseid undergoes changes in her body and in body rhetoric. There is a continuity of altered, monstrous body rhetoric, from Cynthia to Cresseid, and from Cresseid to Cressida and Shakespeare’s Troilus, to whom I turn in the third chapter when I examine ideas of value and contamination.

Henryson uses body rhetoric about Cresseid’s grief and the destruction of her joy, in the act of distancing her from ‘Troy.’ He does this in two ways. First, he takes the description in Chaucer of Criseyde’s physical self-harm, and has Cynthia and Saturn describe physical changes that will take place in Cresseid’s body when she has leprosy. Cynthia reads a series of changes into Cresseid’s body that affect her skin, voice (338), eyesight (337), and social acceptability (341–43). Second, the narrator has Cresseid enumerate aspects of the life she remembers from her time as ‘the flour of luif in Troy.’ Cresseid tells herself, ‘All is decayit, thy weird is welterit so’ (436). Her world decays and changes as she speaks about the

161 The rhetoric Cressida uses to describe how going in and weeping will affect her appearance echoes Chaucer, but the description of its effect on her voice echoes the public punishment of Cresseid, and echoes Cresseid’s public calling out of the name of Troilus.

162 The violence she describes herself carrying out on parts of her body is resumed in the grotesque rhetoric Troilus uses about it: he reduces her rhetorically to ‘o’er-eaten’ and fragmented body parts.

163 318, 334, 339–40. The loss of heat and moisture will dry out Cresseid’s skin and voice.
changes: she contributes this rhetoric about degradation to the metanarrative, and this rhetoric changes subsequent Criseyde figures. The narrator has her describe the grotesque alteration of commodities (416–42), and he has her describe to herself monstrous changes in her voice, skin, eyesight, general ability to feel and sense her surroundings, and her sense of belonging to ‘Troy.’ These monstrous changes in rhetoric, which Cresseid is compelled to enumerate, and to embody and inhabit outside ‘Troy,’ are direct antecedents of some of the more monstrous body rhetoric found in Shakespeare’s play.

Henryson’s use of what I identify as body rhetoric combines the changing social value of Cresseid with the changing value of tokens that are part of a ‘world of folk’ (III 1721) such as ‘Troy.’ The changing body rhetoric Cynthia and Cresseid, among others, use to describe Cresseid reveals her to have a token value. As a courtly figure, she has outlived her usefulness. She is no longer able to travel back into ‘Troy.’ I agree with McKenna that Cresseid is punished for having broken her ‘trouthe’ with Troilus in Chaucer’s poem. Criseyde clearly has no intention of returning to ‘Troy’ by the end of the poem. The use of body rhetoric in Henryson would make a return impossible. The new conditions of Cresseid’s body mean that she can only be described as a kind of monster. And as Shakespeare points out, there are no monsters in ‘Cupid’s pageant.’ Cresseid’s body rhetoric encapsulates the sense of ‘commoun’ ground because it shifts from ‘Troy’ to outside ‘Troy,’ it is fundamentally disrupted and disruptive. The changes in body and body rhetoric are a means also for Cresseid and Cressida to describe their relationship to ‘Troy’ as permanent outsiders.

---

164 407–13, 443–50. Cresseid’s question to the other lepers, ‘Haue ye na feill [who the benefactor was]?” suggests that she has lost her sense of touch and her literal connection with her environment.
165 Cresseid is ‘compellit’ by her circumstances to go and beg with the other lepers (482–83).
166 Hillman, Shakespeare’s Entrails, 59–60: ‘[t]he play thrusts both its protagonists and the audience back into the body, “recorporalising” the received story of the Trojan War. The story’s unparalleled canonicity had created heroes of a deeply textual nature, protagonists who had become by Shakespeare’s time little more than “rhetorical and proverbial figures.”’
167 To the best of my knowledge, scholars have not yet noted this.
Conclusion

I have identified several motifs and themes that are important to characters’ awareness of the metanarrative beyond ‘Troy,’ and these are set in motion on the threshold of Troy. The Criseyde figure begins to re-enact her translation from a state of apparent unity with Troilus to a state where her lack of ‘trouthe’ is clear to Troilus. His suspicion travels with Criseyde out of Troy, and he engages in a series of fantasy ideas in all three texts. In Chaucer and Shakespeare, he is shown deluding himself, and in the third chapter I show why the fantasy of Troilus is significant in relation to the concept of being beyond ‘Troy.’ The fantasy state of Troilus parallels the idea of ‘Troy’ as a place of joy, ‘trouthe’ and fair dealing between the Troilus figure and the Criseyde figure. Chaucer’s narrator and Shakespeare make it clear that ‘presuming’ Criseyde can be true is entirely dependent on Troilus’s state of mind. When Troilus falls into melancholy, the ‘trouthe’ of ‘Troy’ is revealed to be unsteady.

Troilus’s distress at the leaving of Criseyde places him in a precarious position. He travels through an emotional landscape characterised by motifs of falling that symbolise and predict the loss of ‘Troy’ for Troilus as well as Criseyde. The welfare of Troilus is shown being slowly but inevitably stripped away. Processions involving Criseyde reveal ways in which Troilus’s partnership with Criseyde is overwritten by her betrayal of him with Diomede. This will be revealed more fully in the betrayal scene in Shakespeare, but the way in which Diomed takes possession of Cressida while she is still in Troy with Troilus reveals the instability of her value as a token of ‘trouthe.’

The idea of processions and display is connected in Henryson with the monstrosity of Cresseid. Cresseid’s monstrosity is characterised as a continuation of the description of Criseyde’s violent grief in Chaucer, together with the description of the melancholy state of Troilus. Criseyde’s violent display of grief is made permanent in the altered body and voice
of Cresseid. Perhaps Henryson finds something distasteful or extravagant in Criseyde’s expression of grief. Shakespeare has Cressida declare her intention of not going from Troy, but this is devalued by body rhetoric she uses to describe a grief we do not see her enacting.

The violent appearance of grief in Chaucer becomes the disruptive body rhetoric of Henryson and Shakespeare. Cresseid formalises Chaucer’s rhetoric about the displays of grief of Chaucer’s Troilus and Criseyde, together with the alteration enacted by Cynthia’s sentence, in her *Complaint* and in her reaction to her altered body.

Cresseid attempts to recreate a fantasy of her state when she was ‘in Troy,’ but the alteration disrupts the rhetoric and makes it monstrous. Shakespeare reflects the monstrosity of Cresseid, which is in part a fear of being seen outside ‘Troy,’ in Cressida’s rhetoric of grief she does not enact, and in the exaggerated body language other characters identify in her. In the next chapter, I show how fear of being seen, the rupture of Troilus’s trust in the Criseydes, monstrosity on display, and concerns about circulation and value combine beyond ‘Troy.’
Chapter Three: Beyond ‘Troy’

The state of ‘Troy’ that exists in Chaucer’s poem depends on the state of the ‘trouthe’ between Troilus and Criseyde. ‘Troy’ is a place in which Troilus sees and creates for himself an idea of Criseyde as someone who keeps a state of ‘trouthe’ with him, and whose exchange of tokens with him is even-handed. They keep a kind of truce in this space, and this truce or ‘trewe’ matches the illusion that Troy itself is stable. The illusion that keeps the ‘tyme of trewe’ between Troilus and Criseyde steady depends on Troilus’s state of mind and the degree to which his idea of Criseyde as true to him remains unchallenged. Once Criseyde has gone from ‘Troy,’ however, Criseyde’s use of tokens, body rhetoric, and letters changes, and by seeing a second or potentially multiplied idea of the Criseyde figure, who is a reflection of the Criseyde of the metanarrative, each version of Troilus sees that each Criseyde has betrayed him. In this way, Criseyde can be seen to have gone from ‘Troy,’ if Troilus is able and willing to look, and the illusion of ‘Troy’ is broken. In the process she also pushes Troilus out of ‘Troy.’ I examine ways in which letters and rhetoric represent Criseyde, Cresseid, and Cressida as stand-ins for their physical presence, once they are unable to return to ‘Troy.’ These surrogate presences overwrite the concept of Criseyde as a single, stable idea of ‘trouthe’ in the perception of Troilus. Body rhetoric that figuratively speaks of Criseyde’s lack of ‘trouthe’ challenges Troilus’s ability and willingness to see the Criseyde of the metanarrative. Next, I examine the illusion of Troilus, which takes the form of memorable ideas he creates of Criseyde, Cresseid, and Cressida in his ‘fantasie,’ figured in the texts by images showing the location of body rhetoric about the Criseyde figure in Troilus’s mind and heart. He recalls these ideas of her in her absence, while they are still both living in ‘Troy’ and also once they are beyond ‘Troy.’ When the Criseydes are represented to him and
personated by texts, tokens, and body language, their substitute presence damages Troilus’s illusion of them, and in Shakespeare, it damages body rhetoric about Troilus himself. I examine ways in which their figurative return to Troilus’s presence demonstrates to him that the fundamental idea of ‘Troy’ is broken. I address ways in which the brooch in Chaucer, the alms in Henryson, and the sleeve in Shakespeare are used in transactions that reveal the breaking of this ‘trouthe,’ and demonstrate that Criseyde and Troilus are now both beyond ‘Troy.’ Finally, I examine ways in which the damage Criseyde causes Troilus affects his ‘trouthe,’ in the sense of judicious speech and actions, ways in which he is able and unable to carry out transactions that involve new ways of seeing and not seeing Criseyde.

**Absent bodies**

In the general introduction, I argued for an interpretation of body rhetoric as a series of ways in which a body speaks, that is body language, and ways in which objects such as letters and tokens can be said to have value as bodies and as legible objects. Courtly love tokens tell the story of ‘trouthe,’ a reliable pact between lovers made on equal terms. Letters and objects exchanged by the lovers ‘in Troy’ maintain the value of a world in which Troilus and Criseyde can exchange things, and in which they can also touch one another, literally and figuratively, as equals. Criseyde is qualified in this world, for instance, to pin the brooch to Troilus’s shirt (III 1372).

I consider the illusion contained in Troilus’s way of seeing Criseyde, Cresseid, and Cressida, and ways in which use of body rhetoric brings home to Troilus that his idea of being able to see just one Criseyde is an illusion. Letters and body rhetoric show Criseyde’s

---

1 Prendergast, “Aesthetics of Railing,” 77: *Troilus and Cressida* is a ‘radical performance of disillusion.’ If we read it and *Coriolanus* ‘in light of a crisis of aristocratic identity, then it becomes clearer why their metatheatrical rhetoric represents theatre as a site where audiences … initially participate in the delights of
estrangement from Troilus. Letters arrive in all three texts once Criseyde has left the scene. They place her outside a geographical and social location in which she would be able to speak to him directly. They personate her in her absence.²

Chaucer and Henryson show letters and personated testimony sent to Troilus in Troy by a Criseye who is already estranged from Troilus and from the location. In the section that follows, I indicate ways in which reading the objects makes this state of prior estrangement clear to Troilus. Shakespeare has Cressida send a letter likewise once she has left the stage for the last time. Meanwhile, however, Troilus observes the body rhetoric of her betrayal of him with the sleeve. From a remove, he observes her actively estranging herself from him, and obtains the knowledge of her estrangement that the mere presence of a physical letter arriving for him on stage later will confirm. Where in Henryson it is Cresseid who receives the ‘lybell of repudie’—the papers that act in Henryson as divorce papers and a kind of courtly protection order on Diomeid’s behalf—directly from Diomeid (74), Criseyde, Cresseid, and Cressida all send Troilus textual proof through body rhetoric that he is excluded from their company, and that they have chosen no longer to see him. By sending letters that force him to reread them as characters, the Criseydes create the conditions that lead to their exclusion in turn, because they disrupt his illusion, which is what holds the idea of ‘Troy’ together.

The texts all show a legible version of Criseyde who is absent and estranged. They show the kinds of deferred presence she sends to Troilus, in the form of a letter which is an idea of her, rather than keeping her ‘trouthe’ and returning to him. They act as bridges that show ways of conducting transactions not only between private and public selves, as

² Syme, *Theatre and Testimony*, 8, 9, 13, 31. Syme’s description of transactions carried out by royal writs is also apt: these transactions ‘relied on the physical actions of bodies that were recognizably not the sovereign’s own, but fantasmically took on her person for the duration of the event … they rendered an absent voice present and imaginatively audible’ (5).
Stanbury points out, but crucially between Troilus and Criseyde once ‘Troy’ has been invalidated. The indirectness of the contact between the former lovers, conducted only through letters that represent bodies, and through body rhetoric observed from a distance which makes social contact impossible, highlights that the worlds of Troilus and Criseyde no longer touch.

The unstable space of ‘Troy’

The problem with the letters and body rhetoric is that they show there is more than one idea of the Criseyde figure. I agree with Hodgdon, for instance, who argues that Cressida can be ‘read or misread as a split text. Her body speaks against her voice, or for her lack of voice.’ The body rhetoric of Cressida, observed from a distance in the kissing scene and the betrayal scene, presents a text that can be read by an observer who stands aside and comments on its language. The body rhetoric and the letters Criseyde, Cresseid, and Cressida send back to Troilus from elsewhere present them as legible objects in their absence. The tokens they send put them on display. They no longer occupy the same social and geographical space as

---

3 Stanbury, “Women’s Letters and Private Space,” 280: letters move ‘between the self and someone else at a physical remove’ and ‘voice tensions between seclusion and exposure, private and public, personal voice and epistolary conventions’ (274). They ‘formalize and isolate private from public zones as they materialize a portion of individual thought and transport it across time and space’ (274).

4 For the concept of characters as bridges between the world of the play and the performance of it, see, for example: Weimann, “Playing with a Difference,” 415–16, 420, 427, 430: ‘bifold authority’ relates to a discourse but has an ‘equivalent of sorts’ in the use of the stage; Thersites, who is not ‘lost in the presentation, presents it and views it in perspective’, Yachnin, “Performing Publicity,” 213: public space is ‘plural and multiform’; there is ‘an organized movement from inner to outer and actor to spectator’ (209). For the idea of interpretive bridges for texts, and that consist of glosses in the margins, see Tribble, Margins and Marginality, 68–70, particularly in the context of Ronsard’s reading circle: ‘Muret represents the act of interpretation as bridging an inevitable gap between the words on the page and the author’s meaning ... The gloss [he provides] will fill that gap by representing a literary community, a circle of friends around the author to whom he will explain his intent’ (70). Syme, Theatre and Testimony, 3–4. In the Troilus and Criseyde texts, we find a deferral of royal presence in the personation and presentation of decrees, similar to the deferrals Syme terms ‘surrogate presences’ in relation to Elizabeth I (2): the Lord Keeper’s speech and the presence of the royal seal on a document represented the body of the queen (Syme, 3–4); royal writs were presented first to a small group of insiders, who personated them more widely (3).


Troilus. Even in Shakespeare, in which Troilus experiences a telling of Cressida’s betrayal in real time, his observation of the Greek camp places him outside it: he sees Cressida’s behaviour without interacting with her body in any way; he stands helpless while she operates. As Troilus remarks about Cressida’s letter, ‘[t]h’ effect doth operate another way’ (5.4.111). Troilus uses curiously passive language in his condemnation of Cressida as if the consequences of her behaviour act, rather than Cressida herself.

I am concerned with the idea of the Criseyde character as Troilus initially conceives it. His way of remembering and thinking about Criseyde constructs her as a one-off iteration of a character, to whom he attributes ‘trouthe,’ and in whom he sees ‘trouthe’: the idea of true Criseyde sustains the idea of a ‘Troy’ that is a ‘world of folk’ (III 1721), as I argued in my first chapter. Troilus and Criseyde are both equally present in Troilus’s idea of ‘Troy.’ Here, I examine these one-off ideas of Criseyde, in order to show how the incursion of letter bodies and body rhetoric forces Troilus to reread Criseyde, and to see that he and Criseyde cannot be ‘in Troy,’ because she cannot be the simple Criseyde he imagines. The incursion of letters and bodies brings an end to his fantasy of a ‘tyme of trewe’ (III 1779). Harris identifies an instability in Troilus’s ‘intense investment’ in the power of the sleeve. To me, Troilus’s investment in the idea of ‘Troy’ as a whole is unstable. The state of ‘Troy,’ the idea of its stasis and its status, is predicated on the idea I expand on in chapter two that Criseyde stands ‘cler … on a ground of sikernesse’ (III 982), and on the idea of ‘Troy’ as a place of joy constituting a ‘brotel wele’ (III 820). That is to say, the state of ‘Troy’ is inherently unstable like the state of joy. It is only as steady as Criseyde is ‘cler,’ clear and worthy. It is only as

---

8 Harris, Sick Economies, 97: ‘in … less than a hundred lines it degenerates from a “pretty pledge” … to a “greasy relic” … its value altered less by its passage from Cressida to Diomedes than by the unstable nature of Troilus’s intense investment in it … that barely conceals a pathological capacity for disgust’; Stallybrass, “Worn Worlds,” 313; Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 126: ‘material hauntings.’ For the intense ‘subjective quality’ of tokens, see: Susan Crane, Performance of Self, 3; Green, Crisis of Truth, 270, 269–74, 279.
stable as Troilus’s own capacity to sustain the illusion of the place and to remain joyful, his capacity, in other words, to see Criseyde as ‘cler.’

**Forming memorable ideas of Criseyde**

The idea of Criseyde can be considered to be a kind of fetish. This idea of her as a fetishised object connects her with tokens that symbolise her ways of engaging in and breaking the ‘trouthe’ with Troilus. She and the tokens operate in tandem to affect Troilus’s way of seeing her. Stallybrass and Jones argue that separation of the person from the token, for instance a glove or sleeve such as Troilus and Criseyde exchange, animates the object and gives it the power to conjure the presence of the absent person.

Troilus has what Henryson terms ‘the idole of ane thing’ (507), the idea of a courtly Criseyde, printed in his heart in Chaucer, in his fantasy in Henryson, and in his heart in Shakespeare. I examine these in turn.

Chaucer’s narrator describes the process by which Troilus falls in love with Criseyde as one in which Troilus recreates an idea of her in her absence. He sees her in the temple, and is so struck by her standing apart, her attitude, and her beauty that ‘in his herte botme gan

---


10 Green, *Crisis of Truth*, 50: the ‘thingness’ of trothplighting; Stallybrass, “Worn Worlds,” 313: ‘[w]ith the transmission of clothes, there is a transmission of identity, but a transmission which is staged as constantly undoing the mutual dependences materialised in the gift of cloth’; the ‘transmission of clothes in the Renaissance’ could have a ‘curious erotic charge’ due to the memory of a lover who wore the item or from the ‘hybridization of bodies made possible by the circulation of clothes; (313–14); Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 116, 126.

11 Stearns, “Henryson and the Aristotelian Tradition,” 495: ‘[Henryson’s] “fantasy” is the same faculty as Aristotle’s imagination.’

12 Stambury, *Visual Object of Desire*, 108–110: ‘[Criseyde] … seems framed within [the temple], occupying space as an image in a niche’; she is ‘iconized’ as an object of Troilus’s gaze.

13 Holley, in her fascinating article on framework and perspective relating to Chaucer’s *Troilus and Criseyde*, notes, concerning the ‘mirror’ of Troilus’s mind in which he ‘saugh al holly hire figure’: ‘[t]he double-entendre is significant: he sees her in full there in the temple, and he perceives her holy, out of the ordinary context of the real world and as if he sees all’ (“Medieval Optics,” 32). When he visits their old haunts after Criseyde has left, ‘[h]e sees her wholly, and his visual process suggests the devotee’s composition of place, the first step towards contemplation of holy things. It is as if we were asked to see the stations of the cross’ (32).
It is Troilus’s idea of her that sticks in his heart. He goes to his chamber and daydreams about seeing her, and finds her in his heart: he makes ‘a mirrour of his mynde’ and ‘koude [hir] in his herte fynde’ (I 365–67). Troilus uses his mind to reflect the idea of Criseyde he holds in his heart.

Again, in the ten days after Criseyde has left Troy and before she sends the strange letter, Troilus reads over letters she sent him while they were together ‘in Troy:’

The lettres ek that she of olde tyme
Hadde hym ysente, he wolde allone rede ...
Refiguryng hire shap, hire wommanhede,
Withinne his herte …

(V 470–74)

These letters constitute part of the illusion of equality and reciprocity that suggests to Troilus that Criseyde mirrors his ‘trouthe.’ The letters are abstract bodies that belong to the ‘olde tyme.’

---

14 I 297–98. Shakespeare echoes the significance of the ‘botme’ of the heart, not just in the way Troilus forms a memorable idea, but also more generally. Fly argues that in connection with Achilles’s observation, ‘[m]y mind is troubled like a fountain stirred, / And I myself see not the bottom of it’ (3.3.303–4), the ‘bottom’ refers to ‘some future calamity’ (Fly, “Cassandra,” 164). To Fly, ‘bottom’ represents a fundamental truth (165, 266). It seems to me that the connection Shakespeare has Achilles articulate between the mind and its bottom echoes the description of image formation in Chaucer.

15 Clark and Wasserman, “The Heart in Troilus and Criseyde,” 317: with reference to Troilus’s ‘herte, which that is his brestes ye’ (I 453), ‘the heart receives the image of Criseyde but is itself contained within the breast’; ‘Troilus’s love is more internalized than Criseyde’s’ (319). I note a possible instance of a difference in the deep-seatedness of ‘trouthe’ in Criseyde’s bequest of her heart and the ‘goost’ within it to Troilus, which she declares in private before she leaves ‘Troy’: she bequeaths her spirit and heart to mourn with his (IV 785–87). She symbolically anticipates the removal of the components of her ‘trouthe’ with him, the heart and soul she imagines unified with his as they came to be ‘in Troy,’ from her rhetorical body, before she has apparently left ‘Troy.’ In this case, she says she will grieve forever, but in a way she pushes that idea and that responsibility away from herself onto Troilus. She gives him the mourning heart with the soul in it, giving away her own suffering in the process. Her declaration takes place in a context in which Chaucer’s narrator distances himself from a full description of Criseyde’s grief, ironically suggesting he might understate it (IV 799–805). The extreme forms in which Criseyde displays her grief in Troy and displays it in letters from beyond Troy are part of a system of making ‘festes,’ which I can’t help but look at with suspicion.

16 Carruthers, Book of Memory, 47–60; memory formation is ‘highly bodied’ (56); a memory is an image impressed in the brain and heart (17, 21, 27); ancient and medieval theory locates judgement in the brain, and memory in the heart (49). Stearns, “Henryson and the Aristotelian Tradition,” 493–95: Henryson makes subtle use of Aristotelian psychology in connection with sense impressions and what Stearns considers the almost-recognition of Cresseid by Troilus.
Henryson shows Troilus looking inwards to the ‘idole of ane thing’ (507), in this case the idea that represents Cresseid as she was ‘sumtyme’ (504), which is:

Sa deip imprintit in the fantasy
That it deludis the wittis outwardly,
And sa appeiris in form and lyke estait
Within the mynd as it was figurait.

(508–11)

This description is highly important, not just because it locates the ‘idole’ of Cresseid in the ‘fantasy’ and the ‘mynd’ of Troilus, but also because it fixes the idea of her in a particular form and with a particular ‘estait’ or social status. The idol is a reflection of the Criseyde Chaucer’s Troilus saw in the temple before they entered into their ‘trouthe.’ Henryson’s Troilus here sees a reflection of the idea of Cresseid that Cresseid herself tries and fails to create and sustain in her Complaint, a Cresseid of ‘hie estait.’

When Shakespeare’s Troilus is first falling in love, he describes his love of Cressida as a madness to which Pandarus adds speech about her beauty:

I tell thee I am mad
In Cressid’s love; thou answer’st ‘She is fair’,
Pour’st in the open ulcer of my heart
Her eyes, her hair, her cheek, her gait, her voice;
Handlest in thy discourse, O, that her hand …

---

17 I have borrowed the term ‘hie or low estait’ from Henryson’s Moral Fabillis (60, in Fox, Poems of Robert Henryson), as a useful concise term.

18 1.2.48–52. It would be very interesting to consider if there is any connection between ‘handling discourse’ and ‘handling’ money or commodities, i.e. mercantile themes, which might draw on ways in which Cresseid uses the alms Troilus provides, and ways in which all three Criseydes use and trade with tokens Troilus has given them.
The ideas of madness and discourse are present here at the moment when Troilus uses rhetoric about the Petrarchan attributes that describe Cressida. He locates the discourse specifically and actively in the body rhetoric Pandarus uses. The madness is fed by discourse about body rhetoric. Troilus’s heart is already wounded: ‘Thou lay’st in every gash that love hath given me / The knife that made it’ (1.2.59–60). The act of speaking about Cressida’s body shows us the moment when the idea of love in Troilus is joined with the idea of taking Cressida’s hand, that is, the idea of their betrothal. This is the moment when he speaks a kind of ‘trouthe’ to her, a moment in which she is absent except for the words about her body parts. He remembers an idea of her to which he can be loyal.

Making a fuss: ‘festes’ and grotesque body rhetoric

Letters and body rhetoric are made grotesque. The strangeness of the ways in which Criseyde is represented to Troilus in her absence leads him to see her in a new way that jars with the idea he had of her. I examine two aspects of this: the concept of ‘festes’ and the concept of grotesque personation of the Criseyde character.

19 Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 36–37; Kaula, “Mad Idolatry,” 25, 29: Hector defines the war over Helen as ‘mad idolatry’; Lynch, “Idealism of Shakespeare’s Troilus,” 20: Lynch takes quite a dim view of Troilus, noting his ‘frequent use of Petrarchan clichés’; ‘[i]t appears that if Troilus is in love, he loves Petrarch and not Cressida, or more precisely, he loves his own fabrication of a Petrarchan love affair’; Troilus’s presumption of Cressida’s truth is a ‘rapture of delusion’ (21).
20 Hillman, Shakespeare’s Entrails, 59–60: ‘the play is compulsively body-bound from start to finish, its language is replete with inner-somatic imagery.’
21 Kaula, “Mad Idolatry,” 35: Troilus, about to give up Cressida, compares himself to ‘a priest sacrificing himself on an altar.’ Although I find Kaula’s thesis on idolatry a bit far-fetched, I do wonder if there is a connection between the idea of Shakespeare’s Troilus sacrificing his heart and Chaucer’s Troilus creating the image of the funeral urn containing his heart in ashes.
22 Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 37–38, 46: ‘Cressida does not appear as a body here at all, but only as a disembodied experience which nearly defies representation’; Cressida’s is ‘a body savored sequentially in imagination’ (37).
23 MED, s.v. ‘feste.’ ‘Feste’ is defined as a celebration, religious or secular, or feast, or an enjoyable occasion or event. To ‘maken feste’ is to ‘treat (someone) with due ceremony or respect, treat respectfully or in a friendly fashion, pay homage, show respect, pay compliments.’
Chaucer establishes the importance of the idea of ‘festes’ when he describes the behaviour of both Troilus and Criseyde ‘in Troy.’ Troilus’s celebration of life with Criseyde involves ‘festeynges’ (III 1718). When Criseyde realises Troilus is true and her social fears are stilled, she celebrates him in a context of joy and cleanness:

Criseyde, al quyt from every drede and tene,
As she that juste cause hadde hym to triste,
Made hym swich feste it joye was to sene
When she his trouthe and clene entente wiste …

(III 1226–29)

She benefits from the pure intentions of Troilus and his pure understanding of her.24 Her ‘festes’ are expressed in the context of Troilus’s ‘trouthe’ and cause him to look at her with joy.

The idea of the ‘festes,’ as celebration or a fuss Criseyde makes of Troilus, is subverted in a specific letter she sends him from beyond ‘Troy.’ In her letter, she uses such extreme language about her own love and ‘trouthe’ that it causes ‘wonder’ in Troilus. It strikes him that her rhetoric is not grounded in truth:

But in hire lettre made she swich festes
That wonder was, and swerth she loveth hym best,
Of which he fond but botmeles bihestes …

(V 1429–31)

24 I infer that Troilus’s ‘clene entente’ can be considered to be a form of clear understanding, with reference to MED. ‘Clene’ seems to be generally clean, clear, or pure (MED, s.v. ‘clēne,’ adj., 1a, 1b, 2a), and can also mean clear, fair, unclouded (4a), and complete, entire, full, thorough (6a). ‘Entente,’ which primarily refers to intention, aim, desire or will (MED, s.v. ‘entente,’ 1a, 3a), can also refer to frame of mind, opinion, view, idea, ‘understanding (of a certain matter)’ (4, 5 a). While the primary sense in the passage cited is that Criseyde realises Troilus has pure intentions towards her, I suggest it can also be taken to mean that he is thoroughly lacking in corruption in his mind and understanding. His ‘entente’ is linked to his integrity and perceptive wisdom. See definition of ‘trouthe’ in the general introduction (11).
Unlike the idea Troilus creates of her in Book One, the ‘trouthe’ has not stuck in Criseyde’s ‘herte botme’ (I 297). This accords with Pandarus’s rebuke to Criseyde that it was hard to engrave her heart (II 1241).

Criseyde’s final letter to Troilus follows the discovery of the brooch in Diomede’s ‘cote-armure.’ Troilus reads the abstract body of Criseyde in both the location of the brooch and the letters that represent the only return to Troy she is prepared to make. As a representative body, her final letter seems to him ‘al straunge’ (V 1632) and a ‘kalendes of chaunge’ (V 1634). Criseyde’s rhetoric, described as ‘festes,’ becomes grotesque, something inherently strange that shows Troilus Criseyde is now entirely estranged from him.25

In Henryson, the ‘festes’ become the exaggerated rhetoric of status in Cresseid’s Complaint. She elaborates on the luxury items she enjoyed and also on the attention she received ‘in Troy.’ The reality of her situation in no-man’s-land, however, disrupts the ‘festes’ of her rhetoric, as I argue in the second chapter.

The ‘festes’ of Criseyde, subverted in the ‘strange’ letter, become the grotesque rhetoric in Shakespeare, by means of which Troilus describes Cressida’s betrayal. Troilus’s idea of Cressida is disrupted. His effort to see a disrupted idea of Cressida becomes in Shakespeare the ‘madness of discourse’ (5.2.138). The way Cressida reuses the sleeve in the betrayal scene creates a discourse which changes the way Troilus sees her.26 The discourse is carried out by both the sleeve—an extension of her body, Troilus’s body, and their ‘trouthe’—and her body rhetoric. Her behaviour with the sleeve adds a layer to the Cressida Troilus sees: it demonstrates that she can be seen as his Cressida and Diomed’s Cressida. To Stallybrass and Jones, the ‘separation’ of person from token ‘is haunted by the possibility of

---

25 Another striking point here is that ‘[t]his Troilus this lettre thoughte al straunge’ (V 1632, my emphasis): it is this particular Troilus who sees the strangeness in Criseyde’s letter. ‘This’ Troilus is the Troilus who has also been exiled from ‘Troy.’ He sees through his melancholy and his suspicion, using a different kind of ‘trouthe’ to assess the claims of Criseyde’s festive rhetoric.

26 Greene, “Language and Value,” 275; Stallybrass, “Reading the Body,” 121.
further separations, further exchanges.’\textsuperscript{27} Troilus tries to see first one Cressida and then the other: ‘[t]his is and is not Cressid’ (5.2.146), as if in Cook’s term she is herself a ‘flickering’ image, who ‘[threatens] a monstrous entrapment in finitude, repetition, representation.’\textsuperscript{28}

**Handling the sleeve and ‘madness of discourse’**

Cressida’s sleeve acts like the letters of Criseyde in that the way she uses it as a form of rhetoric about ‘trouthe’ makes Troilus suspicious. He sees her using it to promise Diomed that she will cheat on Troilus with him. Shakespeare’s Troilus actually sees Cressida giving the sleeve away. The ‘madness of discourse’ (5.4.142) that arises builds on the exaggeration of her body language. This language is so easily decipherable at a distance and so grotesque that it causes him to wonder.

The reaction of Shakespeare’s Troilus echoes the association between madness and discourse with which Troilus describes falling in love with Cressida earlier in the play (1.2.48–52). The body rhetoric Pandarus pours into Troilus’s heart (1.2.50) adds a way of recreating an idea of Cressida, a way of talking about her, to the pre-existing state of love which Troilus characterises as madness. The idea of the Cressida Pandarus presents Troilus with in the body rhetoric is a kind of ‘presentational image’ that he carries in his heart.\textsuperscript{29}

When Troilus witnesses Cressida’s betrayal of him with the sleeve, a process in which she takes the sleeve away from him and pairs it with someone new, he visualises the body parts she has forcibly removed from the ‘open ulcer’ of his heart and he uses them again figuratively in the same way that she has literally and figuratively reused the sleeve: he

\textsuperscript{27} Stallybrass and Jones, “Fetishizing the Glove,” 126.
\textsuperscript{28} Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 36.
\textsuperscript{29} Boose, ‘Othello’s Handkerchief,” 361. Boose here cites Maurice Charney’s term.
makes them grotesque. This moment marks a transaction in the value of those body parts. When in the first act he describes the madness of talking about her and the madness of loving her, the body parts and the way she uses her body, which Chaucer calls Criseyde’s ‘mevynge and hir chere’ (I 1289), are characterised as pure and clear: ‘her hand / In whose comparison all whites are ink’ (1.2.53–54). Her hand is characterised by its ‘soft seizure’ (1.2.54). By contrast, in the betrayal scene Troilus questions the validity and value of what he has seen. He has seen the hand of Cressida, which he described to himself as capable of ‘soft seizure,’ of courtly gestures and gentleness, physically seizing and relinquishing the sleeve in a negotiation with Diomed (5.2.64–105). Defining an idea of Cressida reveals itself to be maddening at the moment when he describes having witnessed her betrayal:

O madness of discourse,
That cause sets up with and against thyself!
Bifold authority, where reason can revolt
Without perdition, and loss assume all reason
Without revolt! This is and is not Cressid.
(5.2.142–46)

Yet the act of creating the impression in the first place was one of madness as well as discourse, and the implication is that he already knew there was more than one idea of Cressida. He is the one who described it as mad. This is borne out by his statement that he ‘will presume’ Cressida is capable of constancy (4.5.145–46). The body parts whose description was poured into Troilus’s heart by Pandarus are removed and rewritten, and at the same time they were rewritten before they were placed in his heart. They already show

30 For handling of discourse, see: Hodgdon, “He Do Cressida,” 275–76; Kaula, “Mad Idolatry,” 35: Diomedes uses ‘dregs’ to refer to Helen, associating her with the idea of prostitution; ‘[Troilus’s] frequent images of tasting and feeding’ show that ‘his love is actually a profane love unconsciously masquerading itself as divine: its controlling impulse is not soul but sense’ (35); Kaula, “Will and Reason,” 274, re distaste towards Helen as ‘remainder viands’: the ‘imagery of tasting, satiety, and revulsion … anticipates the moment when [Troilus] will recoil in disgust from the end result … the “bits and greasy relics” of Cressida’s o’er-eaten faith.’
awareness of the metanarrative, and show that it is inherently ‘mad’ to trust the body rhetoric associated with ‘Cressid’s love’ (1.2.47–48). There is a discourse between Shakespeare’s iteration of the story and the metanarrative.

Seeing monsters

The argument for and against the Cressida Troilus first thinks he sees, his own Cressida, provides a figurative location in which Troilus’s way of seeing Cressida undergoes a kind of translation. Earlier, in Troy, he asks Cressida what dregs she spies in the fountain of their love without admitting he can see dregs there himself (3.2.62–63). The weight of the idea of seeing dregs as things to be feared (3.2.64) is echoed in Agamemnon’s statement of apprehension: ‘[m]y mind is troubled like a fountain stirred, / And I myself see not the bottom of it’ (3.2.295–96). The altered value of the rhetoric Troilus uses to describe Cressida’s body demonstrates that he now sees dregs, things to fear, in Cressida’s betrayal of him. The new language he uses shows that he has been forced to face the question of whether or not he should discard his presumption of her constancy.

Troilus declares he loves Cressida ‘in so strained a purity’ (4.5.23). This fits in with the theme of winnowing, seen in Troilus’s description of his own ‘winnowed purity in love’ (3.2.154), and in Agamemnon’s description of distinction ‘[winnowing] the light away’ (1.3.23). It also indicates that Troilus is constrained by his perception. The effect of ‘strained’ is to suggest his love has had the dregs removed, like the fountain water in which he chooses not to see fears and monstrosity. He claims not to see the monsters. In Henryson he does not truly stop to look at the monster: the presence of Cresseid drives his thoughts inward to his fantasy (505–11). In both cases, he retreats to a purified idea of a Criseyde of whom he is not afraid or suspicious.
Troilus changes the rhetoric about the image he has created of Cressida as a consequence of reading her body language. He fights against proof, ‘instance’.31

Instance, O instance …

Cressid is mine, tied with the bonds of heaven.

Instance, O instance …

The bonds of heaven are slipped, dissolved, and loosed.

And with another knot, five-finger-tied,

The fractions of her faith, ors of her love,

The fragments, scraps, the bits and greasy relics

Of her o’er-eaten faith, are bound to Diomed.

(5.2.153–60)

It is as if Cressida has reached into Troilus’s heart and taken the sleeve from it. Shakespeare has her transform the value of the pledge and of her body. The language of dissolving and loosing of the value of Cressida’s ‘trouthe’ echoes the ‘slydyng of corage’ (V 825) of Chaucer’s Criseyde. In response to Cressida’s actions, Shakespeare has Troilus fight to see her and not see her, and has Troilus reveal the value of her attributes. The descriptions of equivocal body parts, dissected by Troilus and vaguely regretted by Cressida in the error speech, are turned into actions carried out by Cressida’s staged body where Troilus can see them. The ‘festes’ of Criseyde’s language, read by Chaucer’s Troilus in a letter that has a figurative bodied connotation, become the descriptions of Cressida’s betrayal which are represented as a grotesque pre-eaten and repurposed feast.

In changing the value of Cressida’s body rhetoric, Shakespeare’s Troilus alters her body in the way leprosy alters Cresseid’s body in Henryson. Shakespeare has Troilus take on

31 Boose points out the importance of the concept of ‘ocular proof’ of fidelity in Othello (‘Othello’s Handkerchief,’ 368). The idea in relation to infidelity is equally applicable to Troilus and Cressida.
Cresseid’s suffering as well. Troilus struggles with the question of seeing the body rhetoric of Cressida as grotesque, just as Cresseid does when the reality of her circumstances in no-man’s-land breaks through into the rhetoric of her *Complaint*, which details the commodities and attributes she used to enjoy ‘in Troy.’ In Henryson, it falls to Cresseid to experience the horror of her transformation and to feel her inability to push back against the reality that is intruding. Shakespeare gives that horror and that inability to push back to Troilus: ‘[w]ithin my soul there doth conduce a fight’ (5.2.147). The fight divides ‘a thing inseparate’ (5.2.48) which paradoxically although it is divided wide apart doesn’t let the idea of separation in: ‘the spacious breadth of this division / Admits no orifex’ (5.2.50–51). Troilus is fighting as hard against realisation as Cresseid does in the leper lodgings. Perhaps ironically, the body rhetoric he uses about Cressida continually separates her into pieces. Troilus both can and cannot fragment Cressida. Both Cresseid and Shakespeare’s Troilus suffer immensely as the reality of the second world they are forced to see, the world in which the Criseyde character has left ‘Troy’ and can no longer return to it, breaks into their rhetoric and transforms it as they try to process what they are experiencing. They see a world made ‘commoun’ (*Testament of Cresseid, 77*), susceptible to multiple interpretations.

**Grotesque ‘personation’ of Cresseid**

In addition, the idea of grotesque body rhetoric in Shakespeare draws on the grotesque personation of Cresseid in Henryson. In order to understand this, we need to consider the effect of Cresseid’s testimony on Henryson’s Troilus. Henryson’s Troilus looks inward at the ‘idole’ when he is faced with the leper Cresseid in no-man’s-land. His vision is bound by

looking inward much as Chaucer’s Troilus was bound inside the ‘blake bark of care.’ The full horror of the idea that the leper lady is Cresseid is brought home to Troilus through the personation of her testimony by the leper who acts as messenger and witness.

Cresseid makes her testament on paper (575–76). When she is dead, ‘ane lipper man [takes] the ring’ (592). It is an anonymous fellow leper who buries Cresseid, then goes to Troilus with her testimony: ‘[t]o Troylus furthwith the ring he bair, / And of Cresseid the deith he can declair ...’ (594–95). It is not clear that the written testament of Cresseid is taken to Troilus. The leper declares her death and takes the ring as a token of the ‘trouthe’ of the account he gives Troilus.

Crucially, Troilus hears the testimony: ‘[q]uhen he had hard hir greit infirmitie, / Hir legacie and lamentatioun ...’ (596–97). The narrator makes it clear that Troilus hears a deeply distressing account of the sickness and death of Cresseid. Part of the horrific effect this has on Troilus is that Cresseid announces her lack of ‘trouthe’ in a loud, harsh voice and through skin affected by signs of leprosy, in no-man’s-land. The amplification of the testimony acts much like the replication inherent in gossip. Cresseid’s body markings turn her into a kind of letter, so she unites letters and body language in the way she is described to Troilus in her absence.

34 Green, Crisis of Truth, on ‘borrows’: 64–69.
36 Syme, Theatre and Testimony, 1–6, 158, 160: Syme writes about ‘second-level witnesses’ of accounts of events one was not privy to directly. One could be an ‘eye- and ear-witness to at least some of the writing about those events’ (160). The concept of an eye and ear witness is apt here as Troilus reacts to testimony that recreates the last words and actions of the translated Cresseid, and also bears its own witness to her grotesqueness because of the health status and presentation of the messenger.
37 Camille, “Sensations of the Page,” 37–38, 41. Wingfield also considers Criseyde and Cresseid to be texts vulnerable to interpretation ("Chaucer’s Troilus and Henryson’s Testament," 121–22, 126, 138). She argues that Cresseid can be understood to be a kind of ‘maculait’ text, in that she is marked by leprosy (140–41). Yates notes illustrations of visual alphabets on skin as a medieval concept (Art of Memory, 119–20). The markings on Cresseid’s skin and in her voice act as a kind of perceptible added text which glosses her testimony.
Cresseid’s final testimony is personated in Troilus’s presence by a leper who, like Cresseid, speaks through an altered voice in an altered body. The leper’s body acts as a seal to the idea of the leper lady Troilus was unable to see in person as Cresseid. Troilus hears her ‘infirmitie’ in the ‘infirmitie’ of the man who personates her. The combination of her grotesque body rhetoric, her testimony, and this personation creates a memorable idea that overwrites the idea of ‘Cresseid of Troy’ (607), ‘sumtyme [Troilus’s] awin darling’ (504).

‘Fantasie’ destroyed by letters

Chaucer’s Criseyde expresses her fear that ‘fantasie,’ a suspicion that she has another lover, will creep into Troilus’s brain and cause her social death (III 1504–5).38 Ironically, the ‘fantasie’ that ends ‘Troy,’ that causes Criseyde’s social death by putting an end to Troilus’s illusory way of seeing her, is brought into his presence in all three stories by means of her own body rhetoric. One way of understanding Shakespeare’s phrase, ‘madness of discourse,’ is that it is not just Troilus’s dilemma in working out how to see Cressida. The madness of discourse also consists of the ‘festes’ of Chaucer and Henryson, of language made unbelievable. The exaggeration of the language of the Criseyde figure allows an ‘other fantasie’ to creep into Troilus’s brain and ‘cause her to die’ (III 1504–5). Equally, the message of the leper to Henryson’s Troilus allows ‘Cresseid of Troy the toun’ (607) to die in Troilus’s eyes, because it is a description of her grotesque body and her grotesque rhetoric.

In this way, Troilus becomes aware of a deeply distressing alternate and altered idea of Criseyde, which overwrites the value of the illusion he had of the Criseyde he was united with ‘in Troy.’ The stability of Troilus’s faith in Criseyde and his trust in the security of the

38 On learning she must leave Troy, Criseyde asks ‘How sholde I lyve if that I from hym twynne?’ (IV 758). This can be interpreted as an expression of someone who doesn’t want to be separated from her lover, but it also underscores ideas expressed elsewhere that Criseyde depends on Troilus as her ‘wal / Of sti / Of stiel’ (III 479) and as her source of ‘kynde noriture,’ that is as her social protector. See chapter one.
‘trouthe’ they made ‘in Troy’ is fundamentally shaken. Troilus was only able to see Criseyde in one way, as his true Criseyde, when they were together ‘in Troy.’ If he can see more than one idea of Criseyde, he must see that she is outside ‘Troy.’ He sees the version of her that is outside ‘Troy’ as well as the one he thought was inside ‘Troy.’ Because she is outside ‘Troy,’ the ‘trouthe’ is broken. And because the ‘trouthe’ is broken, Troilus’s illusion that ‘Troy’ can be sustained and that Criseyde can come home to ‘Troy’ is also broken. Letters and body rhetoric show ways in which Criseyde invalidates Troilus’s previous way of seeing her, and it is his ability to see her as true that held ‘Troy’ together.

**Parading ‘disese’: the Criseyde figure on display**

The concept of handling discourse, which is a central feature of the betrayal Shakespeare’s Troilus identifies in Cressida’s body language, draws on ways of handling body rhetoric in Chaucer and Henryson.39 I show how it relates to the activity and passivity in Troilus in order to show that where he is unable to move, his ‘trouthe’ and the efficacy of his rhetoric are also affected.

Stanbury argues that in Chaucer’s temple scene, Troilus imagines Criseyde’s ‘look’ (III 291) as having agency over him. Stanbury identifies a reversal of the ‘familiar trope of the lover’s gaze,’ which is used to ‘exploit the illusion that Troilus’s gaze has agency over the object, piercing Criseyde rather than himself … his self-wounding is imagined as an act of violence on Criseyde’s body.’40 There is no indication that Criseyde looks at Troilus, but his

---

40 Stanbury, *Visual Object of Desire*, 108; Cook, “Unbodied Figures,” 36: ‘[t]he woman’s body becomes the means by which masculine desire represents itself to itself, but the insufficiency of the image provokes at moments violent impulses, a rage articulated in images of fragmentation of a woman’s body.’ The tearing of Cressida’s letter body by Troilus constitutes an imagined act of violence.
gaze ‘fictively mobilizes’ hers and he ‘imagines its agency on him.’\(^{41}\) I find Stanbury’s argument convincing. I agree that Troilus’s experience of creating a memorable idea of Criseyde is active and passive. He is rendered ‘astonished’ by the sight of her (II 274), and he sits down in his chamber while he recalls Criseyde.\(^ {42}\) He parades the idea of her in the mirror of his mind, and he handles the body rhetoric by showing it to himself from all angles: he sees ‘al holly hire figure’ (II 366).

This is reflected in the way male characters in Shakespeare observe Cressida’s body: they read ‘every joint and motive of her body’ (4.5.58); her intentions are as clear as her movements. Cressida is a monstrous spectacle in the same way Cresseid is. The marking of Cressida’s body rhetoric is foreshadowed by the description Henryson’s narrator makes of Cresseid’s body:

```
how was thow fortunait
To change in filth all thy feminitie,
And be with fleschelie lust sa maculait …
```

(79–81)

Shakespeare’s Troilus echoes Henryson’s narrator’s idea of ‘maculation’ as part of his presumption of Cressida’s ‘trouthe’: ‘[f]or I will throw my glove to Death himself / That there’s no maculation in thy heart.’\(^ {43}\) The matter that makes the idea of Cresseid ‘maculait’ is ‘fleschelie lust,’ the same kind of ‘wanton spirit’ as Ulysses identifies in the body rhetoric of Cressida in the kissing scene (4.6.57). Troilus challenges the idea that this ‘maculation’ exists. This highly bodied marking and the idea of Cresseid’s desire damaging her body and

\(^ {41}\) Stanbury, 109.
\(^ {42}\) This is part of a broader pattern of swooning in Chaucer and Henryson.
\(^ {43}\) 4.5.62–63. Mieszkowski, “Reputation of Criseyde,” 98: in her account of treatments of Criseyde after Chaucer, Mieszkowski cites a poem that is possibly Chaucer’s, ‘Against Women Unconstant.’ I note the line: ‘That tache may no wight fro your herte arace.’
her ‘feminitie’ is transferred in Shakespeare to the grotesque body rhetoric Troilus finds in his heart after the betrayal scene. So the idea of ‘maculation’ is transferred to Troilus’s heart.

This builds on Chaucer. When Criseyde cautions Troilus about suspecting she has another lover, she describes the ‘illusiou[n]’ that causes him to be jealous as a ‘disese’:

\[\textit{youre passioun} \]
\[\textit{I wol nought calle it but illusioun}\]
\[\textit{Of habundaunce of love and besy cure,}\]
\[\textit{That doth youre herte this disese endure.}\]

(III 1040–43)

Criseyde here pinpoints the association of disease with the idea of Criseyde Troilus has formed in his mind. ‘Disese’ suggests both uncertainty and sickness.\(^{44}\) The concept of uncertainty and distress is already present, just as Troilus’s falling ‘out of joie’ is foreshadowed by Chaucer’s narrator in the prologue (I 4). Any suspicion Troilus might come to have about Criseyde’s ‘trouthe’ will allow him to see that there is already ‘maculation’ in the idea of Criseyde, not just in her heart but figuratively in his heart and mind.

Cressida and Cresseid are given a degree of agency in the way they parade. Cressida handles the body rhetoric for herself in the betrayal scene.\(^{45}\) She is handed up and down by the Greeks in the kissing scene in a way that is equivocal and unsettling, a way that critics have described as involuntary. However, she hands herself back and forth in the betrayal scene, and she hands Troilus back and forth at the same time, through the sleeve which has qualities of both Troilus’s body and her own. She takes over the role of self-display outside

---

\(^{44}\) MED, s.v. ‘disēse.’ ‘Disese’ is defined broadly as material discomfort, suffering, hardship; something that inflicts hardship; distress of mind, concern, anxiety, annoyance; bodily discomfort or suffering, pain; infirmity; generally, a troubled state of affairs. Harris associates disease with fluctuation in value of money, in foreign exchange, and Helen and Cressida across national borders (Sick Economies, 94, 96–97, 98–99).

the courtly parade that was part of Criseyde’s presence ‘in Troy’ in Chaucer and is a feature of Cresseid’s use of mirrors. Cressida and Cresseid both circulate on ground outside ‘Troy,’ which they inhabit in a time zone occurring after Chaucer’s Troilus has turned his horse and returned with his company to Troy. Cressida, like Cresseid, is a spectacle of wanton body rhetoric (4.6.56–64).

Cressida and Cressida parade their unreliability within a particular geographical area. Cresseid is made ‘abhominabill’ to all lovers (308). She is compelled to go begging with the other lepers (342, 481–83), whose location is limited to no-man’s-land. There are no socially recognised people there: Cynthia tells Cresseid, ‘Quhair thow cummis, ilk man sall fle the place’ (341). She cannot go where there is company. Cressida and Cresseid display themselves to those who know how to read them and how to interpret their value. They are stuck on display.

**Troilus’s inertia**

Cressida and Cresseid take over a role of parading themselves. To this extent they take agency in movement away from Troilus. Chaucer’s Troilus parades with Criseyde within ‘Troy’ and travels to and from Troy, hawking and displaying himself in courtly ways to a Criseyde who is also present. After Troilus has accompanied Criseyde out of town and turned back (V 85–86), the nature of parades and display changes. Troilus now stands in Troy and witnesses the incursion of the ‘cote-armure’ in a kind of parade (V 1649–55). As he watches, he stands motionless, fixed in a melancholy state: ‘[s]tood on a day in his

---

47 Chaucer’s Criseyde seems to disappear more into Greek society. She becomes part Greek, part Trojan, as Greenfield argues. Calchas forces her to split her identity (“Fragments of Nationalism”, 193).
48 For example, III 1714–21, in which Fortune leads Troilus and Criseyde; III 1779–85.
49 Moran connects the return of the ‘cote-armure’ with the non-recognition scene in Henryson (“Meeting of the Lovers,” 11).
malencolie’ (V 1646). He is helpless and simply goes home (V 1666). However, because he is contained in a state of melancholy, from which by definition joy is absent, he is outside ‘Troy.’ Pandarus chides Troilus, claiming Troilus’s bad dreams and ‘al swich fantasie’ (V 358) proceed from his melancholy (V 360), and commands him to drive the ‘fantasie’ out. Though it seems Pandarus intends Troilus to drive the ideas out of his head, the phrasing, ‘[d]rif out and let hem faren to meschaunce!’ (V 359), is applicable both to the idea of exile from ‘Troy’ generally and the idea of the fate Cresseid undergoes.

Troilus rides to and from battle in Chaucer and in Henryson. But he no longer accompanies Criseyde, and he is bound by melancholy which renders him passive like a tree (IV 229). The melancholy that holds Chaucer’s Troilus inert, captive, and helpless echoes the function of the idea of Criseyde that early in the story sticks fixedly in his ‘herte botme’ as he sits alone in his chamber (I 297–98). The formation of his melancholy is like the formation of his joy, built on seeing objects that represent the idea of Criseyde to him in her absence.

Once Criseyde has left ‘Troy’ in Chaucer, Troilus describes himself as bereft of guidance. He recollects the time when he accompanied her: ‘“[a]nd to the yonder hille I gan hire gyde, / Allas, and ther I took of hire my leve!”’ (V 610–11). He takes leave of his ability to guide Criseyde and, in his melancholy, himself. When he sees her empty house, he laments the absence of the Criseyde who was his guide: ‘“[w]el oughtestow [Criseyde’s palace] to falle, and I to dye, / Syn she is went that wont was us to gye!”’ (V 545–46). Troilus loses his ability to be guided. A fear of lack of guidance and conveyance in courtly company is taken over by Cresseid in Henryson after she has been excluded by Diomeid (131–33). Cresseid is

---

50 I note Troilus’s description of himself, as a ‘combe-world’ in Book Four, ‘lurkynge in this wo’ (IV 305). Troilus is unable to dislodge himself from the half-state of existence in a Troy that is no longer ‘Troy.’

51 This directionlessness is also an expression of being bereaved and unable to find a purpose. There is a sense of captivity, helplessness, and blind grief similar to Troilus’s in the poems of d’Orléans, for instance in ‘En la forest d’Emmuyeuse Tristesse’ (Champion, Charles d’Orléans: Poésies, 88–89; ‘in the forest of grievous sorrow’), in which the refrain is ‘[l]’omme esgaré qui ne scet ou il va’ (8, 16, 24, 29, ‘the lost man who does not know where he goes’). He blindly feels about with a stick (26–27). Sir Orfeo is another example. Associations between grief, exile, and inability to find one’s way through a bleak landscape outside court would be a useful area of future research.
given Chaucer’s Troilus’s uncertainty, and she, like him, is fixed to one location in a state of melancholy. It is not accidental that where Chaucer’s Troilus is covered with figurative ‘blake bark of care’ (IV 229), Cresseid is covered with ‘spottis’ (339) and ‘bylis blak’ (399), signs of her distress and her death wish. These are signs of maculation beyond ‘Troy.’

Shakespeare’s Troilus is both passive and active. He is passive in that the idea of Cressida operates on his heart without his consent. Both Pandarus and Cressida manipulate the way he sees her. But he is active in that he tears the letter. Although Shakespeare’s Troilus is held captive, first in a state of mad love and then in a state of disbelief, he is still effective in carrying out the act of fragmenting the letter body, in a way that draws on Henryson’s Troilus.

There is a suggestion of passivity in Henryson in that Troilus looks inward to the ‘idole’ of Cresseid, which operates on him. But he carries out rhetorical and worldly transactions in ways that draw on Chaucer, and elude Chaucer’s Troilus. We see this in the urn motif in Chaucer, compared with the almsgiving and the tomb and epitaph in Henryson.

**Troilus’s ineffectual transaction: the urn in Chaucer**

The misery of Chaucer’s Troilus is described by the narrator in ways that reflect the ideas of ‘pite,’ the ‘brotel wele of mannes joie,’ and falling through a miserable landscape, which I explore in the second chapter:

His eyen two, for piete of herte,

Out strenedden as swifte welles twanye;

---

52 Stallybrass identifies a kind of self-harm in Troilus’s actions with the sleeve, because the sleeve is still part of him. “Worn Worlds,” 313: ‘Troilus gives his sleeve to Cressida as a token of his love. In the first line of the first scene of the play, [he says,] “I’ll unarm again” [referring to his armour]; here, he “unarms” again, but it is something both literally and symbolically closer to his own arm, his own flesh, his own identity”; ‘Troilus, in fighting Diomedes, attacks his own sleeve, and hence himself. The material of cloth matters so much because it operates on, and undoes, the margins of the self.’
The heighe sobbes of his sorwes smerte
His speche hym refte; unnethes myghte he seye …

(IV 246–49)

The melancholy that binds Troilus in the tree outside ‘Troy’ almost deprives him of speech. Henryson draws on this in having his Troilus and Cresseid unable to speak to one another in no-man’s-land.

In this state, Chaucer’s Troilus attempts to make a rhetorical transaction which shows his ‘trouthe’ has no effect on Criseyde. He bequeaths to Criseyde the idea of a memorial urn, imagining it as a container for the ashes of his heart:

‘The poudre in which myn herte ybrend shal torne,
That preye I the thow take and it conserve
In a vessell that man clepeth an urne,
Of gold, and to my lady that I serve,
For love of whom thus pitouslich I sterve,
So yeve it hire, and do me this plesaunce,
To preyen hire kepe it for a remembraunce.’

(V 309–315)

This piteous idea is not carried out.\(^53\) It remains an illusory idea Troilus tells himself and Pandarus of his ability to go beyond ‘Troy’ to the place where Criseyde is, to wander as she does. The idea of Troilus fails to connect with the idea of Criseyde once she has left ‘Troy.’ He does not have the power to influence her. The ineffectual quality of the urn motif underlines the ineffectual quality of his letter bodies.

\(^{53}\) Clark and Wasserman link this motif to the ruby in the gold ring (‘The Heart in Troilus and Criseyde, 323–24). They write that there is no mention of ‘any attempt’ to carry out this wish after Troilus dies.
Troilus’s effective transaction: giving alms in Henryson

In the urn image, Troilus describes himself dying piteously. In Henryson, Troilus gives alms out of ‘pietie,’ pity and piety, and as a ‘memoriall’ to Cresseid who dies piteously. The idea in Henryson’s poem of ‘pietie’ and a ‘memoriall’ draws on the failed ‘remembraunce’ of Chaucer’s Troilus. Cresseid is the beneficiary of a rhetorical idea that shows the extreme suffering of Troilus. The idea that she is suffering reminds us that he himself suffered greatly and ineffectually.

The urn motif and the almsgiving episode are connected also by a lack of physical contact in Henryson. The reason for this is twofold: Henryson’s narrator draws on the ineffective memorial object in Chaucer; Henryson’s Troilus shows himself to be capable of action. Chaucer’s Troilus and Shakespeare’s Troilus are fixed to one spot by their reaction to Criseyde’s body rhetoric. Henryson’s Troilus, however, travels directly between the battlefield and Troy without touching or being touched by objects on common ground. The effect is that Henryson’s Troilus is a man of action whose great sorrow does not prevent him from carrying out transactions that relate to his status, and to his execution of clear, concise judgement, that is, ‘trouthe,’ when he ultimately assesses the testimony of Cresseid. He seems not to be bogged down in quite the same way as the other two Troiluses.

Henryson’s Troilus seems to remain on his horse as he stops near the lepers (489, 496), though this is ambiguous. Cresseid casts her eyes up at him (498), which suggests he is still high up, and I infer that he is still on his horse. He drops the alms into her skirt, and the

54 MED, s.v. ‘pite.’ ‘Pite’ is broadly defined as: a quality of mercy; a feeling of pity; sorrow, distress, remorse; godliness, reverent and devout obedience to God, that is, piety; a Pietà.
55 In both these gestures there is also the air of someone who has a death wish, and who is giving away valuable items in the expectation of not living much longer.
56 Pandarus accuses Troilus of a lack of ‘hardyment’ when he refuses to elope with Criseyde (IV 533).
suggested sound effect of the verb ‘swak’ implies he drops them with some force, likely from a height.\(^{57}\) He then rides away immediately without saying a word (523):

For knichtlie pietie and memoriall
Of fair Cresseid, ane gyrdill can he tak,
Ane purs of gold, and mony gay iowall,
And in the skirt of Cresseid doun can swak

\(^{57}\) There is a sexual overtone to the gesture. Nitecki, “Fengeit of the New,” 129:

The courtly, elevated language of the quatrain is punctuated with the monosyllabic Middle Scots word “swak,” and the flowing verse arrested by the three long vowelled monosyllables at its close. As a result, the gesture—the flinging of the purse into Cresseid’s lap—is accentuated and given relish. The word “swak” is most often used in Middle Scots poetry to express violent action, frequently denoting “hurl” or “dash.” The use of the vernacular here, jarring … with the courtly language, and combined with the fact that the gesture is preceded by sexual arousal, suggests that Troilus’s action is prompted by passion, by rage, and renders ambiguous the meaning of the explicit motivation, “knichtlie Piotic.”

I find this interesting in light of Hodgdon’s and Cook’s diagnosis of the sexual frustration inherent in Shakespeare’s Troilus’s tearing of Cressida’s letter (“He Do Cressida,” 284; “Unbodied Figures,” 36). To Pittcock also, the almsgiving is “a kind of surrogate sexual act” (“Complexity,” 206).

Mann, “Planetary Gods,” 91: the vision of the planetary gods ‘constitutes the pivotal moment in Cresseid’s passage from prosperity to misery.’ While I don’t dispute the importance of the vision sequence, it seems to me that the action of distributing alms, physically and figuratively represented as a movement from high to low, constitutes an equally important, and pivotal, moment in the way Cresseid sees herself.

\(^{58}\) Mann, “Planetary Gods,” 91: the vision of the planetary gods ‘constitutes the pivotal moment in Cresseid’s passage from prosperity to misery.’ While I don’t dispute the importance of the vision sequence, it seems to me that the action of distributing alms, physically and figuratively represented as a movement from high to low, constitutes an equally important, and pivotal, moment in the way Cresseid sees herself.
Chaucer’s Troilus and Henryson’s both nearly fall on account of sorrow in scenes related to falling gems. Riding away, Henryson’s Troilus almost falls down many times, presumably out of his saddle, ‘for greit cair’ (525). This description echoes Chaucer, whose narrator describes Troilus’s reaction to seeing Criseyde’s empty house in Troy,\(^5\) which he addresses as a ‘ryng, fro which the ruby is out falle’\(^6\). ‘[f]or whan he saugh hire dores spered alle, / Wel neigh for sorwe adoun he gan to falle’ (V 531–32). The ruby that has fallen symbolises the falling of Criseyde from a state of ‘trouthe.’ Henryson’s description of jewels falling into Cresseid’s lap is a deliberate echo. In both cases, falling jewel imagery shows that ‘Troy’ is done and Troilus has really lost hope.

The alms are poured into Cresseid’s skirt, just as the idea of Cressida is poured rhetorically into Troilus’s heart. And the heart into which the idea is poured is wounded, an ‘open ulcer’ (1.1.50). I think Shakespeare draws here on Henryson’s almsgiving. Henryson’s Troilus gives alms to a wounded Cresseid whose body is ravaged by illness, and who is troubled by physical pain (482). The act reveals how wounded she is, and also how wounded he is, and how he too has lost his hope of ‘Troy’. Troilus’s heart suffers like Cresseid’s body. Troilus does not touch Cresseid in the process, because she is no longer socially touchable or recognisable. As I argue in the second chapter, he and Criseyde are both relocated outside ‘Troy’ but they are in places where they are absent from one another. Their experience even of the same common ground, in Henryson and in Shakespeare after the exchange, is one of mutual exclusion.

Troilus’s almsgiving highlights to Cresseid that she has left ‘Troy.’ Her interpretation also has implications for Troilus. The message she receives from the knowledge that her benefactor was Troilus seems to realise the rhetoric she uses earlier in the poem to rebuke her

\(^5\) He is also on horseback (V 538).

\(^6\) V 549. Clark and Wasserman, “The Heart in *Troilus and Criseyde*,” 321: ‘Chaucer does not obtain this reference to the ruby from Boccaccio. Clearly, Criseyde is the jewel that is no longer in its setting.’ See also 322. The image of the ruby is ‘explicitly linked’ with the heart and the gems the lovers exchange.
gods in the temple: ‘[n]ow am I maid ane vnworthie outwaill, / And all in cair translatit is my joy’ (128–29). The transaction of money and tokens shows Cresseid definitively that she is ‘vnworthie,’ ineligible to return to ‘Troy,’ just as she cannot regain her joy. Crucially, it also shows Troilus’s own joy translated entirely into ‘cair.’ Insofar as he loses his place in ‘Troy,’ he loses part of his worthiness as well. He loses the aspect of his ‘trouthe’ that was bound with ‘Troy,’ and with Criseyde as an equal. Troilus’s witnessing of Cressida’s betrayal in Shakespeare acts like the almsgiving in Henryson, in that he sees Cressida carrying out the transaction with his token and his ‘trouthe.’

Henryson’s Troilus is ‘[p]ensiwe in hart’ (524) while he is outside Troy. A spark of love from the ‘idole’ in Troilus’s fantasy (508) springs to his heart (512), and the recollection of the ‘idole’ of Cresseid carries a particularly unhappy kind of thoughtfulness into his heart. The seat of thoughtfulness is his heart. His heart contains his ‘trouthe,’ his sorrow and his loyalty to fair Cresseid, whom he still sees in his fantasy. The pensiveness is key because in the completion of the public act of almsgiving and in his concise summary of and seal to the testimony of Cresseid, he shows that he possesses ‘trouthe’ in the sense of accurate judgement.

**Figurative press releases: Cresseid’s epitaph and Cressida’s letter**

The establishing of the tomb and epitaph by Henryson’s Troilus and the tearing of Cressida’s letter by Shakespeare’s Troilus are both examples of active transactions, of active distribution of the idea of a changed or rather revealed Criseyde. Although Henryson’s narrator describes the existence of the tomb and epitaph as a hearsay memorial idea, the concept is grounded in the almsgiving, which we witness. The value of the almsgiving is underscored by the lepers’ recognition of the significance of the gesture. They notice that Troilus’s outward act of
‘pietie’ contains a profound inward meaning for him when they assess the alms: ‘bot quhen thay saw … [they] said, ‘Ʒone lord has mair affectioun … vnto ƺone lazarous / Than to vs all; we knaw be his almous’ (528–31). The alms provide a tangible, legible coin value attached to Troilus’s valuing of Cresseid. The valuation of the coins by the general group of lepers, as those coins are given away, shows a public face of the story of Troilus’s loss. He is recognised in no-man’s-land as having lost something so valuable that the loss of costly items is secondary, or acts as an appropriate seal to the story of that loss. In this way, even though the tomb is hearsay, the almsgiving transaction shows that the story of Troilus is in some measure already distributed.

Assuming the tomb and epitaph are created, Troilus makes a secondary gesture on the level of reason and rhetoric. He has engaged in courtly behaviour by giving alms. He displays what I call judicial ‘trouthe,’ the qualities of accurate judgement and reason, the properties of a sound and clear assessment of Cresseid, in the epitaph:

\[
\text{Sum said he maid ane tomb of merbell gray,} \\
\text{And wrait hir name and superscriptioun …} \\
\text{In goldin letteris, conteining this ressoun:} \\
\text{‘Lo, fair ladyis, Cresseid of Troy the toun,} \\
\text{Sumtyme countit the flour of womanheid,} \\
\text{Vnder this stane, lait lipper, lyis deid.’}
\]

(603–9)

The object itself echoes the funerary urn Chaucer’s Troilus wants to send to Criseyde. But the tomb and its message show the efficacy of Troilus’s transactions in Henryson. Henryson’s Troilus completes the gesture of Chaucer’s Troilus. He does so with a heart that is profoundly
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61 Green, Crisis of Truth, 274–75; Syme, Theatre and Testimony, 6, 14. Seals represent the royal presence embodied.
‘pensiwe’ (524): he is thoughtful right to the bottom of his heart. He assesses the revised idea of Cresseid in his heart, the location in which his ‘fixe and depe impressioun’ of her was made in Chaucer (I 297–98). The two ways of seeing an idea of Criseyde come from the same place, though Henryson’s Troilus reviews Cresseid with the judgement that comes from having gone from ‘Troy.’ He conducts a transaction of ‘ressoun,’ that accords with the concise speech with which he meets the news of her death despite his personal sorrow: “‘I can no moir; / Scho was vntrew and wo is me thairfoir’” (601–2).

The idea of the monument is enough for people to talk about. The act of speculation about the existence and location of the tomb dispenses its message. In this way, Henryson’s Troilus both contains Cresseid’s body, confirming it is contained on ‘commoun’ ground, and disperses her through a description of the changes in body rhetoric that mark the changes in her ‘estait.’

The activity of this gesture is repeated by Shakespeare’s Troilus when he takes out his anger and sexual frustration on Cressida’s letter. Shakespeare’s Troilus symbolically contains the idea of Cressida in ‘commoun’ ground by tearing pieces of the letter body and dropping it on the stage. The prop itself becomes part of the symbolism of falling pieces of the Criseyde figure contained somewhere ambiguous, that is, the pieces despite his rhetoric stay where they have fallen, on a stage that bears multiple meanings. At the same time, he condemns her reputation to circulate like wind: ‘[g]o, wind, to wind: there turn and change together’ (5.4.112). He declares her value to be like the value of the letter, devoid of ‘matter from the heart.’ In the course of the play, Troilus and Agamemnon both refer to the idea of winnowing virtue. Troilus wishes to be convinced he can find a ‘winnowed purity in love’ in Cressida that matches his own (3.2.154). Agamemnon foreshadows this concern with winnowing in his description of virtue:

Distinction … winnows the light away,
And what hath mass or matter by itself
Lies rich in virtue and unminglèd.
(1.3.26–29)

Discernment allows virtue and matter to be sifted. Agamemnon also refers to the husks that are part of the process of winnowing: ‘[w]hat’s past and what’s to come is strewed with husks / And formless ruin of oblivion’ (4.5.50–51). Matter that is found wanting is destined to be forgotten by time. The idea of winnowing and spying the ‘dregs’ (3.2.64) that remain when Cressida has been sifted applies to the image of her redistribution: she is light and blows away; what remains is the gross matter of the body rhetoric that represents the collateral damage done to Troilus. He describes the continuing deceit with the letter as part of the imagery of eating and error: ‘[m]y love with words and error still she feeds, / But edifies another with her deeds’ (5.4.113–14). She continues to place ideas connected to body rhetoric in Troilus’s heart, but this is now revealed to be body rhetoric she directs at Diomed at the same time. So every time an idea of her ‘trouthe’ enters his heart, it is already ‘o’er-eaten.’

The transactions show the failure of stability in values that go right to the heart of the Troilus and Criseyde story. There is a series of breakdowns in the value of ‘trouthe,’ rhetoric, tokens, Criseyde, status, the nature of Trojan identity, and Troilus’s judgement. Bodied and financial transactions that show how Troilus is wounded and affected sit next to the claims of Shakespeare’s Troilus that he is still pure and simple and an ungilded coin. Shakespeare shows Troilus clinging to an idea of himself that certainly relates to the memorable idea of true Troilus, as true as Troilus. Troilus suffers because he is true to his idea of Criseyde. He re-embodies and personates a character whose ‘trouthe’ in love involves a quietening of the
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‘trouthe’ of accurate judgement and assessment: Troilus can only see himself ‘in Troy’ with Criseyde, Cresseid, or Cressida if he ignores the ways in which he sees the illusion breaking down. Although his love remains worthy and remains proof of his value as the good guy, his ‘trouthe’ is only valid for a short time, like the ‘wele of mann’s joie.’ When the transactions I have identified cause Troilus to see beyond his idea of Criseyde to other layers of the palimpsest, to other ideas of her that coexist with his illusion, his courtly ‘trouthe’ breaks down and the judicial ‘trouthe’ remains in Henryson’s Troilus’s transactions. The anger and destruction of Shakespeare’s Troilus’s reaction show that he is torn from that state of illusion. His act of judgement on Cressida in re-describing her and in tearing up the letter, seems curiously to be both active and almost ineffectual, as if he is stamping his foot about something that is already long decided by others. Perhaps he loses the sense of agency to the metanarrative in which the Troilus figure has already seen through and disposed of Cresseid. What Shakespeare creates in his Troilus is a character who is true but remembered for believing in a ‘trouthe’ that cannot be true, and his ‘trouthe’ is made true and suspect at the same time.

**Conclusion**

The transactions Troilus and Criseyde make beyond ‘Troy’ all involve translations of value. The transactions show that the whole idea of ‘Troy’ as a thing is based on Troilus hanging onto an illusion that being ‘in Troy’ is possible. Criseyde’s social stability and social ‘joie’ depend on the state of Troilus’s ‘fantasye.’ The effect of the translations of value, of Criseyde, of objects that represent Criseyde, and of Troilus’s ‘trouthe’ and his sense of his own judgement is to show that he and Criseyde both fall away from this illusory state of being ‘in Troy.’ Once Criseyde reveals herself to be suspect as a source of rhetoric, and
susceptible to multiple readings, Troilus is forced to see the reality of her being beyond ‘Troy,’ and in so doing we see that he is also beyond ‘Troy’ and beyond remedy.

The process of Troilus learning to see Criseyde is part of a process in which Troilus and Criseyde see the metanarrative in which ‘trouthe’ is impossible. All the transactions I have examined in this chapter, which involve letters, body rhetoric, tokens, the coin value of Troilus relative to Criseyde, lead to this end point. This idea is encapsulated in Shakespeare’s description of time with a wallet into which it puts ‘alms for oblivion.’ All the transactions I have identified here lead towards the end point at which courtly ‘trouthe’ and the status of being ‘in Troy’ exist in a long distant past for Troilus and Criseyde, if they existed at all.

Troilus is damaged and contaminated in the process. He suffers a blow to his trust in his own judgement. In Chaucer and Shakespeare he doubts what he sees. In Henryson, he operates on the level of ‘pietie’ and of judicial ‘trouthe,’ and it is in Henryson that Troilus travels through no-man’s-land and makes transactions without being contaminated by the space or the objects he uses. A large part of this lack of contamination is that he looks inward to his fantasy and is unable to see Cresseid once she is outside ‘Troy.’ Henryson shows a Troilus who operates still on a level of ‘trouthe,’ but it is different from the ‘trouthe’ of Chaucer’s ‘world of folk,’ the world of love and joyous company. The ‘trouthe’ displayed in public by Henryson’s Troilus shows rather that he keeps his integrity when everything else is lost, including ‘Troy.’

Taken as a whole, the three texts show Troilus struggling with the power of his mind. Henryson shows Troilus retaining reason and carrying out a kind of logical, concise judgement on Cresseid, completing the emotional transactions Chaucer’s Troilus is unable to complete, and summarising Cresseid’s account of herself. Shakespeare shows Troilus bearing the effects of the contamination of Cressida by the Criseyde of the metanarrative, that is, by aspects of Chaucer’s Criseyde and of Henryson’s Cresseid. Shakespeare pairs the
contamination of Troilus’s fantasy about Cressida with the loss of courtly ‘trouthe’ and complicates Troilus’s ability to judge Cressida. Shakespeare’s Troilus suggests he is ‘as true as truth’s simplicity, / And simpler than the infancy of truth’ (3.2.156–57). We see a kind of simple, functional, judicial ‘trouthe’ in Henryson’s Troilus that is lost in Shakespeare in the contamination of his Troilus by ideas of Cressida that realign the way Troilus sees her. She contaminates the way he sees himself. She is revealed as part of the Criseyde figure beyond the play, who is susceptible to multiple readings, and she is beyond the scope of an individual Troilus figure to assimilate.
Criseyde and Troilus both fear what they will see. They fear the ending of the ‘tyme of trewe,’ not just the fall of Troy but the breaking of the illusion that they are united ‘in Troy’ in a state of joy and ‘trouthe.’ Their fear looks beyond the ‘olde tyme’ to a point beyond the individual narratives in which they are apparently contained. The metanarrative contains the memorable ideas of Troilus and Criseyde. In that metanarrative, Troilus is sorrowful and has lost Criseyde, and Criseyde is elusive. She eludes both a return to ‘Troy’ and a simple reading of her character. Troilus loses the ‘trouthe,’ the agreement he had with Criseyde and the faith he had in her. Criseyde loses the idea that she could be true to Troilus, but the focus of her regret is the location of ‘Troy’ and the security she had there during the truce, the time of ‘trouthe.’

The imagery of transactions Troilus and Criseyde make and observe shows a series of action sequences that are echoed in motifs in all three stories: sequences of falling, pouring, breaking down, and display in public. These transactions overwrite the value of the objects and bodies with which they are made. They reveal the potential for more than one reading of tokens and bodies which relocates the objects to a ‘commoun’ location, the location of the metanarrative. All these transactions complicate the idea of ‘trouthe’ in how the objects are used and how they are seen to be used. Troilus and Criseyde are both estranged, from ‘Troy’ as well as from one another. They are relocated beyond ‘Troy’ and fixed in ground that has been made ‘commoun’ by reiterations of the story, by the instability of Criseyde’s ‘trouthe,’ and by the effects of Criseyde’s transactions on Troilus’s faith in his own judgement.
Ultimately, Troilus and Criseyde are both afraid to look at Criseyde, who has become grotesque. They are both afraid to judge her. And they are both afraid to look at ‘Troy’ as a place in the past, because seeing clearly shows them that their ‘trouthe’ is lost. The illusion of ‘Troy’ as a place that still exists for Troilus and Criseyde, and a place to which they could return, hinges on Troilus’s ability to sustain the illusion that he and Criseyde are engaged in a ‘trouthe’ once she has been exchanged. The illusion has a very limited time during which it can be effective. The concept of joy in Troy, of steadfastness in Criseyde, and of equilibrium in Troilus’s temperament and state of mind hinges on an impossibility that is encapsulated in themes of the ‘brotel wele’ and of dregs in the fountain of Troilus and Criseyde’s expressions of ‘trouthe.’ Motifs of falling into ‘disese,’ into distress and discomfort, link the fates of Troy, Troilus, and Criseyde. The loss of the social world of the lovers is the loss of the ‘world of folk’ that inhabited and animated ‘Troy’ for a fixed length of time. The ideas of Troilus and Criseyde that are made memorable in the metanarrative constitute multilayered characters who no longer qualify to return to ‘Troy.’ They no longer fit in that joyful, uncomplicated location. They can’t go back, because the more the story is told and the characters are re-embodied, the more complicated they become, and the more ineligible they are to live and remain ‘in Troy.’
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