FOOLS ON BOTH SIDES:

Similarity and Division in Shakespeare's

Troilus and Cressida

Mary Spoel

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

English

Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts at
Concordia University
Montréal, Québec, Canada

March 1979

ABSTRACT

Fools on Both Sides:
Similarity and Division in Shakespeare's
Troilus and Cressida

Mary Spoel

There are real similarities underlying the apparent differences between the Trojans and the Greeks in Troilus and Cressida. After commenting on the circumstances of the play's early presentations, my thesis examines Shakespeare's own interpretation of the Troy stories which emphasizes the callousness of Hector and Achilles and presents Cressida unfavourably. Shakespeare differs from some of his sources by delineating the heroes both as stock figures of tradition and as individual characters; and he differs from Chaucer, in the love story, by accentuating the speed of its actions.

The ethical standards of the Trojans deteriorate as the play proceeds, and this is illustrated by Hector's decreasing regard for courtesy as he leads them away from support for those elements I classify as "romantic" towards those I see as "martial." The Trojans become less chivalrous and the Greeks assume only a veneer of courtesy; this pattern is also suggested by variations in the play's imagery.

A comparison of Achilles with Troilus shows evidence of "romantic" interest among the Greeks as well as the Trojans. Unlike most of the characters in Troilus and Cressida, both Troilus and Achilles are temporarily aware of a world beyond their own immediate environments, but Achilles' aims there are only corp[illegible]. And when these heroes finally turn to savagery they obliterate all hope for either spiritual or physical continuity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks are due to several members of the Concordia University Department of English for their encouragement in my writing of this thesis. Professor Edward Pechter invited my participation in his seminar discussions of Troilus and Cressida; Professor Leonard Mendelsohn provided me with valuable information and with the loan of his own dissertation on the play; and Professor David McKeen supervised my writing with "persistive constancy." His interest and patience helped me to begin this thesis, and his kindly, constructive criticism enabled me to bring it to an end.

CONTENTS

Chapter I: Introduction

Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida has increased in popularity within this century both as a drama and as a literary study of heroism which is ironically portrayed, while present-day actors and audiences respond more positively than those of preceding eras to this atypical tragi-comedy. Thus a re-assessment of the conflicting martial and romantic elements in this play is appropriate now. When compared to their predecessors, the critics and the public of the twentieth century are less bewildered by the equivocations in Troilus and Cressida, and they are also more understanding of Shakespeare's accommodation, within it, of the themes of love and of war: for he presents each theme seriously in the tragic mode at the same time that he parodies each in bitter comedy. It seems, therefore, that our appreciation of the dilemmas of the characters (who are operating under the threat of annihilation), as well as our ability to identify with the play's accelerated pace, enables us to relate empathetically to the complex and superficially confusing actions which are presented in Troilus and Cressida.

George Bernard Shaw understood the altering outlook of his times when he stated, about this play, that "Shakespeare is ready and willing to start at the nineteenth century if the seventeenth would only let him,"[1] and Olwen Campbell, writing soon after the first World War, saw Troilus and Cressida as

---

[1] George Bernard Shaw, Plays Pleasant and Unpleasant (New York: Brentano's, 1912), I, xxii.

essentially displaying the horror of war.[2] Subsequent critics have concurred with her view: for example, J. T. Newlin considers Troilus and Cressida to be the "most ethical thing Shakespeare ever wrote," because it comically "undermines military posing" and tragically "exposes the endless futility of war."[3] She points out how popular the play is when staged in significantly war-conscious eras. After being neglected as a stage production, it was rediscovered at the turn of this century,[4] and since then it has appealed particularly when war-clouds were heavy. (The first major production was made by William Poel, in 1912;[5] Troilus and Cressida was again successfully staged when post-war weariness predominated, in 1922;[6] and in 1938, a Lewis Casson production in modern, khaki dress, featuring Thersites as a "left-wing railing journalist,"[7] was also a success.) Kenneth Tynan commented favourably on a 1956 production which mocked "the last epoch which thought war glamorous;"[8]

---

[2] Olwen Campbell, "'Troilus and Cressida:' A Justification," The London Mercury, 4 (1921), 48.

[3] Jeane T. Newlin, "The Modernity of Troilus and Cressida," Harvard Library Bulletin, 17 (1969), 354.

[4] J. C. Trewin, Shakespeare on the English Stage, 1900-1964: A Survey of Productions (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1964), p.16, states that in 1900 Troilus and Cressida was "almost unknown as a play."

[5] Trewin, p.49.

[6] Newlin, p.362.

[7] Newlin, p.364.

[8] Kenneth Tynan, Curtains: Selections from the drama criticisms and related writings (London: Longmans, 1961), p. 126. The "epoch" to which Tynan refers is the close of the nineteenth century.

in 1963 Clifford Leech found the play to be appropriately modern because it exemplified the truism that "men belong together," and that "when they kill each other [they also] kill themselves;"[9] and in 1972 R. A. Yoder stated that Troilus and Cressida "makes sense especially to Americans of the 1970's who know the meaning of a protracted seven years' war."[10]

But, before I offer my own interpretation which is twentieth-century and essentially anti-war, I wish to mention some points which must have contributed to the unfavourable reception of Troilus and Cressida by theatre audiences and by critics, and to general misunderstanding of it, in the past. Its history is more complicated than that of any other play in the Shakespeare canon, and the questions raised concerning its earliest productions have not been resolved satisfactorily. These include uncertainty as to its most authoritative text, ignorance about its initial performances, and continuing controversy about the exact definition of its genre.

It is uncertain whether the 1609 Quarto or the 1623 Folio text of Troilus and Cressida should be considered the more authoritative. Although most critics who are searching for Shakespeare's own hand in the original version find greater evidence of it in the Quarto (a suggestion that there may have been two manuscripts printed in the 1609 Quarto having now been refuted

---

[9] Clifford Leech, "Shakespeare's Greeks," Stratford Papers on Shakespeare (1963), p.10.

[10] R. A. Yoder, "Sons and Daughters of the Game," Shakespeare Survey, 25 (1972), 11.

decisively),[11] opinions are still divided about its authenticity. Peter Alexander considers that the Quarto was set up from Shakespeare's own hand,[12] while E. K. Chambers judges that to have been the origin of the Folio.[13] Priscilla Martin states that "the Quarto, probably deriving from a copy of Shakespeare's manuscript, is generally believed to be the better text;"[14] Alice Walker questions the manuscript authority of the Folio;[15] and Anne Barton considers that "both Quarto and Folio are derived ultimately from the same source."[16] Thus the most authoritative text for citation is one

---

[11] Philip Williams, Jr., "The 'Second Issue' of Shakespeare's 'Troilus and Cressida,' 1609," Studies in Bibliography: Papers of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia (1948-49), II, 32-33. After considerable research, Williams states that, although "copies of the 1609 Quarto of Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida differ ... the so-called 'first' and 'second' issues of Troilus and Cressida are not separate issues at all."

[12] Peter Alexander, "Troilus and Cressida, 1609" Library, 9 (1928), 279.

[13] E. K. Chambers, William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930), I, 440-41: "The manuscript used for F was probably the author's original and the variations between Q and F are intelligible on the assumption that this was so and that Q was printed from a transcript, perhaps made for a private owner."

[14] Priscilla Martin, ed., "Troilus and Cressida:" A Casebook (London: Macmillan, 1976), p.12.

[15] Alice Walker, "The Textual Problem of Troilus and Cressida," Modern Language Review, 45 (1950), 460, where she points out that the "copy of the Quarto (used in compiling the Folio text) must have been supplemented by reference to an authoritative MS ..." On p.462, she states that: "the evidence thus lies in favour of the Quarto's representing a good quarto based on a MS that may have been a private transcript." And she feels that, because of a probable collation of texts for the Folio, it is best to "regard with legitimate suspicion quite a number of the Folio readings."

[16] Anne Barton, ed., Troilus and Cressida, in The Riverside Shakespeare, textual ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974), p.491.

based on both Quarto and Folio together, "with general preference given to Quarto variants."[17] For that reason, all references to Troilus and Cressida in this thesis are made to the eclectic text of The Riverside Shakespeare.

There have been other confusions surrounding the origins of Troilus and Cressida, and these include uncertainty about the circumstances of the play's initial performances, which still remains unresolved. There were, apparently, two separate title-pages in the text of the Quarto, and the later of these claims that the play had "never been stal'd with the Stage" (before 1609), while the former announces that it had, in fact, been performed "by the Kings Maiesties seruants at the Globe,"[18] but supplies no further details to corroborate this.

Explanations for these contradictory statements about the first performance have been offered by various critics. W. W. Greg points out that the claim of the second title-page does not necessarily exclude all possibilities of the play's having been staged, and he is of the opinion that Troilus and Cressida had indeed been performed, but only privately, before the year 1609.[19] (The probable date of composition is now accepted

---

[17] Barton, p.491.

[18] Barton, p.492.

[19] W. W. Greg, The First Shakespeare Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), pp.339-40.

as 1601-2, with a former suggestion of 1608 having been, generally, abandoned.)[20]

The theory of a private performance has been set out in detail by Peter Alexander, in his 1928 article, where he suggests that Troilus and Cressida was first produced for an audience of law students at one of the Inns of Court.[21] Greg qualifies his support for Alexander's hypothesis by emphasizing the lack of corroborating "external evidence" for the staging of such a performance;[22] but, nevertheless, the theory has gained wide acceptance in subsequent criticisms. On the whole, most critics view Alexander's theory with favour, but, despite the controversy it has aroused, no one has satisfactorily explained the conflicting evidence about the location of the play's first production.

Another question concerns the placing of Troilus and Cressida within the 1623 Folio. Greg explains how this play may have been removed from

---

[20] H. W. Hillebrand and T. W. Baldwin, eds., A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: Troilus and Cressida (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1953), p.367: "Those who believe that Troilus expresses Shakespeare's revulsion from a personal, sexual experience date the play near Hamlet and the 'unpleasant' comedies, i.e. about 1602. Those who see in it some reflection of the Essex crisis place it in 1600-01 ... [although there is] the possibility that Shakespeare may have begun the love story some years before the play was completed. ... As to 1608, a date which used to have considerable favor, it has been pretty generally abandoned. 1602 has now a common acceptance (largely, it must be admitted, faute de mieux, with allowance made for one or more later retouchings)."

[21] Alexander, p.278, considers that the most likely occasion for the first performance of Troilus and Cressida was "that of some festivity at one of the Inns of Court."

[22] Greg, p.340n.

the middle of the Tragedies and later replaced at their beginning, next to the Histories;[23] and W. R. Elton raises the question of a connection between this change and the uncertainty concerning definition of the play's genre.[24] He does not, however, subscribe to Alexander's view that the text was "removed from its first position because it was not a tragedy,"[25] preferring to support Greg's opinion that the altered position of Troilus and Cressida, within the Folio, has little to do with a possible change of genre.[26] We have therefore no firm basis for considering that these two matters are connected with each other.

In his article on the play's text and genre, Elton also comments on its Epistle, which was added to the later title-page of the 1609 Quarto, and which accompanied the claim that the play had never previously been staged in public.[27] This Epistle emphasizes the love plot of Troilus and Cressida

---

[23] Greg, pp.342-46.

[24] W. R. Elton, "Textual Transmission and Genre of Shakespeare's Troilus." Literatur als Kritik des Lebens, Festschrift zum 65: Geburtstag von Ludwig Borinski (Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer, 1975), p.74.

[25] Alexander, p.285.

[26] Elton, p.79. He quotes Greg's opinion that there is no connection between the changed position of Troilus and Cressida in the Folio and any editorial doubt concerning the play's genre.

[27] Elton, p.65, referring to the two "states" of the Quarto, of which the first calls Troilus and Cressida a "Historie" while the second describes it more as a comedy. He considers that "the first title-leaf was thus replaced by a two-leaf cancel with a partly reset title-page and a new Epistle ... [which may] be understood as a means of reconciling the publication's appeal to its revised circumstances" [of public, after private, staging].

and the comic role of Pandarus, so that its addition might have been due to a changed definition of the genre. And the explanation, that a private production of the play was followed by a public one which made the "never previously staged" claim necessary, could also account for possible variations in its ending. Originally, Troilus and Cressida could either have closed, tragically, at V:x:31, or else, comically, at the completion of the Epilogue spoken by Pandarus (V:x:54). These alternative endings may have been used for different audiences. R. A. Foakes suggests that "Shakespeare clearly conceived at some time a bitter or 'tragic' ending, culminating in Troilus' fine speech in V:x, after one false ending [which was] omitted in the Quarto."[28] And, if the play ended at V:x:32-34, the Epilogue by Pandarus would not be included; this idea was debated by some nineteenth-century critics.[29] But Neville Coghill suggests that both the Epilogue and the Prologue

---

[28] R. A. Foakes, "Troilus and Cressida Reconsidered." Troilus and Cressida, ed. Daniel Seltzer, The Signet Classic Shakespeare (New York: The New American Library, 1963), p.265. Foakes is referring to the lines in which Troilus finally dismisses Pandarus, which were repeated in the text of the Folio (Pandarus: "... heare you?" and Troilus: "Hence ... thy name"). These were placed in the Quarto at V:x:33-34 only, but in the Folio both there and at V:iii:132-34 as well, thus introducing the Epilogue.

[29] Hillebrand and Baldwin, pp.294-95, quote (among others) the following opinions about the repetition:

"Walker (1860): 'This [V:iii:132-34] is the proper place for these two speeches ... Pandarus' epilogue must, therefore, be an interpolation.' Thiselton (1907): 'it may be inferred that, when or after the Quarto version came eventually to be acted, it was found convenient to end the play at V:x:34, and to dismiss Pandarus here ... [because] Shakespeare in writing thought it in keeping to bring him in at the end of the Play, and this was found to be ineffective in actual representation.'"

were added after the play's first public performances as a "frame" to protect it from the ridicule of a later, sophisticated, private audience.[30] Although his theory does not explain the claim made in the Quarto's second title-page, it could perhaps account for the differences in the endings. And, if Troilus and Cressida was performed for two very different types of audiences in the years immediately following its initial composition, this fact may also account for any change that may have been made in the definition of its genre.

Shakespeare's tone in Troilus and Cressida is harsher and more bitterly ironic than in most other plays of the canon, and this would be appropriate to its presentation, privately, before an audience of law students. The play is more extreme than the others in the extension and intensity of its language, particularly in the bawdiest speeches, and this has been considered another indication of its being intended for performance in a "coterie" theatre.[31]

---

[30] Neville Coghill, Shakespeare's Professional Skills (Cambridge: University Press, 1964), pp.96-97, poses the hypothesis that: "Troilus and Cressida was originally written for, and performed to, public audiences at the Globe in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I from 1602/3 and onwards, and then had neither Prologue nor 'Epilogue'. Later, possibly for the Christmas Revels in 1608 at some Inn of Court, it was revived ... [and was] given an armed Prologue and a lewd, laughing 'Epilogue' to protect it.... If the 'Epilogue' was the afterthought we have seen it to be, added some six years later, then the play originally ended on a note of tragic grief. ..."

[31] Alexander, pp.278-79, finds it unlikely that Troilus and Cressida was first performed either at Court "because there is much scurrility [in it] and because the audience is at times addressed directly and familiarly," or at the Globe Theatre. His opinion is supported by W. W. Lawrence, Shakespeare's Problem Comedies, 2nd ed. (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1960), p.127, who considers that: "Shakespeare wrote the play for a special audience of the more sophisticated sort," and J. W. Ramsey, "The Provenance of Troilus and Cressida," Shakespeare Quarterly, 21 (1970), 227, who thinks that, although Troilus and Cressida was not actually written for the lawyers, it may have been first presented on stage at the Inns.

Other reasons, however, have been suggested for the unusually ironic and pessimistic approach to life taken by Shakespeare in Troilus and Cressida. He may have used the play to gain an advantage for his company in the contemporary "War of the Theatres;" or he may have used it to reflect the prevalent political gloom and disillusionment at the time of its writing (as the glories of the sixteenth century and the reign of Elizabeth were both drawing to a close). At that time there was increasingly acrimonious rivalry between the several London companies of actors, and Shakespeare's possible involvement in this "war," on behalf of the Chamberlain's Men, is investigated thoroughly by Robert Boies Sharpe in The Real War of the Theaters.[32] Sharpe points out that Shakespeare's company of actors had at first avoided the morbid and cynical "railing" which was employed by their stage rivals in public satirization of each other; but, by the time that Troilus and Cressida was probably being written,[33] even Shakespeare might have caricatured his quarrelsome opponent, Ben Jonson,[34] in order to further their feud and to humiliate him. Thus, it is not impossible that the play was written for the purpose of parodying some of the rivals to Shakespeare's company. Yet it

---

[32] Robert Boies Sharpe, The Real War of the Theaters: Shakespeare's Fellows in Rivalry With the Admiral's Men, 1594-1603 (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1935: rpt. New York: Kraus, 1966), p.19.

[33] Hillebrand and Baldwin, p.375, accentuate the dates of 1599-1602 as most important in the "War of the Theatres."

[34] Sharpe, p.164, cites examples of lampoons and ridicule against Ben Jonson which were made at the beginning of the seventeenth century.

is highly improbable. For only the description of Ajax as a possible caricature of Jonson is accepted as potential evidence of Shakespeare's participation in this theatrical "War;"[35] and this uncertain proof alone is not enough to establish his interest, or personal concern, in the contemporary "warlike" competition.[36]

Oscar J. Campbell is one of the critics who consider that Shakespeare's direct ridicule of Jonson was unlikely;[37] and, in exploring the possibility that Shakespeare was parodying some political figures in his writing of Troilus and Cressida, Campbell finds that the case for seeing the Achilles of the play as a caricature of the petulant and rebellious Earl of Essex is also untenable.[38] Such a parody would have reflected unfavourably on Essex, because Shakespeare presents his Achilles as cowardly and arrogant, on the surface; and at that time

---

[35] Hillebrand and Baldwin, p.375, quoting the one known reference to Shakespeare's possible participation in the "War," which was made at the time when Troilus and Cressida was, probably, first being performed. (In The Returne from Parnassus, II, one character is reported to have said: "our fellow Shakespeare puts them all down, I and Ben Ionson too ....")

[36] Not all critics consider that Ajax is a caricature of Jonson. For instance, John S. P. Tatlock, "The Siege of Troy in Elizabethan Literature: Especially in Shakespeare and Heywood." Publications of the Modern Language Association, 30 (1915), 720, does not correlate these two, because there is much literary evidence, of an earlier date, which shows Ajax as a standard comic figure.

[37] Oscar J. Campbell, Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's "Troilus and Cressida" (Los Angeles: Adcraft Press, 1938: 2nd rpt., privately, San Marino, Calif.: 1959), p.219: "It is extremely doubtful that any audience of the time could recognize Ajax as Jonson."

[38] Oscar Campbell, p.223. After discussing the contemporary concern for Essex, among Shakespeare's company of actors, who were favoured by the Earl, Campbell points out that Shakespeare "can hardly be imagined writing a lampoon of Essex that would have filled his enemies with delight."

it was more diplomatic and customary to compare Essex flatteringly with the Greek hero (as George Chapman did in his dedication of the first seven books of his Iliad).[39] Thus, an intended caricature of contemporary artistic or political figures is unlikely in Troilus and Cressida.

None of the theories as to when, where and why the play was first produced helps to illuminate Shakespeare's purpose in writing it; and the idea that he may have chosen its bitter tone and selected its well-known subject material because of some unusual motivation for combining them is itself only an assumption. If he was mainly concerned with writing for the "coterie" theatre in satire Shakespeare was attempting a genre which would have been exceptionally uncongenial to him.[40] But if he found that his choice of subject was traditionally limited in its interpretation, he succeeded none-the-less in giving to the play his own subtle depths of characterization, despite the restrictions imposed by the current English adulation of the Trojans and by established contempt for the roles of both Pandarus and Cressida. And, although

---

[39] Hillebrand and Baldwin, p.378, quote G. B. Harrison, "Shakespeare's Topical Significances," The Times Literary Supplement, 29 (1930), 974: "Shakespeare read the story of Achilles in Chapman's translation ... wherein he found this dedication: 'To the most honoured now living instance of the Achillean virtues eternized by divine Homer, the Earl of Essex...'."

[40] Alfred Harbage, Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1952), pp.220-21, where he compares Shakespeare's usual ribaldry [quoted, in the words of Coleridge, as: "sometimes ... gross, but ... always moral and modest"] with that of the "Coterie drama ... [where] the simplicity and normality are gone." Although Shakespeare comes closer, in Troilus and Cressida, than in the other plays of the canon, to these terms used for the Coterie theatre, he does not indulge in that "quality of lewdness" which Harbage describes as typical of those plays which were explicitly written for its "sophisticated" audiences. See n.31, above.

there is no known reason to attribute his writing of Troilus and Cressida to any one particular cause, those contemporary circumstances I have mentioned may have affected, without dictating, his choice of subject; and they may have heightened, without inducing, the anti-climactic mood which predominates in the play, and which contributes to the apparent callousness of its characters.

Traditionally, the English supported the Trojans rather than the Greeks in their view of the war;[41] and Shakespeare shows this in his initial presentation of both sides. At the beginning of Troilus and Cressida he emphasizes the expediency of the Greeks, at the expense of their care or consideration for others, and their brutality, at the cost of any sign of true chivalry. In this Shakespeare is reflecting the attitude of his contemporaries, who treated the play's hackneyed themes with irreverence and its characters with ridicule as well as with admiration.[42] Most of the incidents, and the two themes of love and war, of Troilus and Cressida, come from two different origins: the "Homeric" legend of the Siege of Troy, and the medieval romance of Troilus'

---

[41] E. M. W. Tillyard, Some Mythical Elements in English Literature (London: Chatto and Windus, 1961), pp.47-9, explains the pro-Trojan attitude of sixteenth-century Englishmen.

[42] Robert Kimbrough, "The Troilus Log: Shakespeare and 'Box-office,'" Shakespeare Quarterly, 15 (1964), 207, considers that Shakespeare chose the stories of Troilus and Cressida because "their characters' destinies were firmly fixed in the minds of his spectators," and that he made use of a love affair "that was already notoriously debased."

unhappy love affair with Cressida. These may have been brought together for the first time by Shakespeare;[43] but they were both common knowledge to most Elizabethan theatre-goers. The mythological connection between Trojans and Englishmen, and the debates on the moral failings or virtues of that ancient race, recur in the literature and the theatre of the sixteenth century.[44]

The reasons for English quasi-identification with the Trojans are given by E. M. W. Tillyard, who explains the Tudor emphasis on building a legitimate background to support the family's claim to the English throne. This was done both through the myth of the seventh-century Welsh king, Cadwallader (a supposedly Tudor ancestor, who was himself said to be descended from the Roman, Brutus), and through that of Brutus himself, who was supposed to be the direct descendant of Aeneas.[45] Tenuously linked to the Tudor dynasty, therefore, was the legend of a defeated but glorious nation which would reassert itself again

---

[43] Kimbrough, p.206, citing Troilus and Cressida as "the only extant work about the Trojan war in English which tries to tell with equal emphasis the stories of the lovers and the siege. Chaucer and Henryson focused on Troilus and Cressida and kept the war in the background, but Lydgate, Caxton, Peele in The Tale of Troy (1589), the author of the Troy-play which is suggested by the extant fragment of a plot owned by the Admiral's Men (c. 1598-1602), and Heywood in his Iron Age (1609) all but exclude the love story. Except for brief mention of the affair as pitiable but morally lamentable they kept their attention on the war story."

[44] Barton, p.445, states that Shakespeare received the Troy story "augmented by all the commentary and literary reworkings of the Middle Ages and early Renaissance."

[45] Tillyard, p.49: "Chief among [Henry VII's] claims to distinction was descent from Cadwallader and through him from Brutus himself, founder of the British race."

as unconquered; and the loyalty of late sixteenth-century Englishmen understandably favoured the straightforward, ingenuous Trojans and condemned their opponents, the dissembling and calculating Greeks.

The difficulties of determining Shakespeare's own attitude toward his presentation of Troilus and Cressida are thus not only caused by the possibility of its performance before a limited audience, but are also inherent in the subject matter of the play. By the end of the sixteenth century the story of Troy had been staged publicly, and in fragmented "Interludes," on many occasions; it had been burlesqued frequently and many people were familiar with the actions of its characters.[46] The very title of the play would, therefore, arouse audience expectations for heroism and for ridicule, which could impede a deeper understanding of the subtleties which Shakespeare personally added to the standard characterizations of the story. Thus, his Troilus and Cressida would appear to repeat the usual shallowness and lack of character development, and Shakespeare's serious intentions in writing the play would not be fully appreciated.

---

[46] Leonard R. Mendelsohn, "The Legends of Troy in English Renaissance Drama," Diss. University of Wisconsin 1966, pp.7-35; 40-71, where he gives details of sixteenth-century productions which were connected with the story of Troy, where he refers to a similar listing which was made by Tatlock in "The Siege of Troy ..." Mendelsohn states (p.60): "There have been numerous studies pointing out that Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida was either prompted or influenced, or both, by the plays on that theme popular during this period." He also states (p.5): "The list of plays dealing with Troy [from 1516 onwards] is impressive neither quantitatively nor qualitatively. Even counting translations and those which but borrow a title from the legends, the number known to exist is less than three dozen in 150 years. Of these only Marlowe's Dido and Shakespeare's Troilus claim some sort of prominence as dramatic works....The rest consists of pageants, loose chronicles for the stage, interludes and translations, and a scattered array of lost plays."

There are, therefore, two main concerns to be considered in entering the controversy on the play's genre. First, whether Shakespeare meant Troilus and Cressida to be accepted as comedy or tragedy. (Its definition as a "Historie" on the first title-page of the Quarto may merely have indicated that it would unfold a "story.") Second, whether the method by which he presented the play justifies its label as predominantly "satire." Equivocations in defining the play's genre have been apparent ever since the Quarto's title-page was altered (accentuating its content of comedy) and its position changed within the Folio (lessening its emphasis on tragedy). Succeeding critical consideration has not resolved these doubts successfully, but has increased the tendency to place Troilus and Cressida in a variety of categories. Thus the play still defies exclusive definition within any one of the standard genres.

Some of these differing opinions are of interest, either because they seem decisive or because they are innovative; but in quoting from among them I am necessarily omitting many others of equal value. In one of the play's earliest criticisms John Dryden called it a "tragedy which falls off into confusion;"[47] while, in this present era, Neville Coghill defines it as a "straight tragedy, of the traditionally anti-Homeric, anti-Greek kind," considering that the play itself is "shapely and complete if taken to begin and close with the griefs of Troilus."[48]

---

[47] Quoted by John Munro, ed., The Shakspere Allusion-Book: A Collection of Allusions to Shakspere from 1591 to 1700 (Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1909: rpt. 1932: rpt. 1970) II, 244.

[48] Coghill, p. 125. Coghill's theory is that both Prologue and Epilogue were added after the first performances of Troilus and Cressida, and that this additional framing protected the play from the derision of a later "disillusioned and sophisticated" audience on some special occasion.

R. A. Foakes also states that the play would be tragic if it closed with a couplet [V:x:30-1] on the young hero's "hope of revenge."[49] But, whereas Coghill suggests that Troilus and Cressida would qualify as a tragedy without its Epilogue,[50] Foakes goes on to explain that the different modes of the alternative endings express two complementary tragic and comic genres.[51] These are both valid and they are both contained within Troilus and Cressida.

E. K. Chambers suggests first that Troilus and Cressida was "written as a comedy,"[52] but he later calls it a "tragedy of disillusionment."[53] The label of satirical comedy has, since then, been applied more exactly by O. J. Campbell, who started a controversial discussion as to the importance of its irony in determining the genre of the play. Campbell maintains that Troilus and Cressida is one "of a group of satirical dramas which, by 1601-2, had developed clearly defined methods,"[54] and he sums up his thesis by stating that the fate of the principal characters, in this play by Shakespeare, "is harmonious with that

---

[49] Foakes, p.265.

[50] Coghill, p.78.

[51] Foakes, p.266.

[52] E. K. Chambers, Shakespeare: A Survey (London: Penguin Books, 1925), p.150: "The comedy sets the issues with a grave irony which alone differentiates it from a tragedy."

[53] Chambers, "Shakespeare: An Epilogue" Review of English Studies, 16 (1940), 400.

[54] Oscar Campbell, pp.231-32. He continues: "Its tone is necessarily cheerless unless the spectator is able to derive a measure of mirth from critical and derisive laughter. The principal characters, for the same reason, are ridiculous, contemptible, and often detestable."

prescribed by both the artistic ends and the moral purposes of all satire."[55]

There are few critics who agree wholeheartedly with Campbell in his definition, but there are some who accept the play's label of satire while adding to it their individual qualifications. Robert Kimbrough avoids the tragi-comic-historical issue by following the lead of Frederick Boas, who grouped Troilus and Cressida among the "problem plays" in 1912;[56] and while concurring with Campbell's definition of "satire" he also points out its limitations. Kimbrough considers that Shakespeare's characters deserve more profound investigation, and that his portrayal of "even such a stock figure as Cressida raises questions which interrupt the flow of automatic satiric response [and which therefore] force the audience to be reflective."[57] And E. M. W. Tillyard states that Troilus and Cressida is not fundamentally satirical, places it within the genre of "problem play," and suggests that it is "predominantly pessimistic," displaying a "tragi-comic view of man."[58] Peter Ure accommodates the play's use of both the conventional

---

[55] Oscar Campbell, p.233.

[56] Frederick Boas, Shakspere and his Predecessors (New York: John Murray, 1896: rpt. Greenwood Press, 1969), p.345: "Dramas so singular in theme and temper [as All's Well that Ends Well, Measure for Measure, Troilus and Cressida and Hamlet] cannot be strictly called comedies or tragedies. We may therefore borrow a convenient phrase from the theatre of today and class them together as Shakspere's problem-plays."

[57] Robert Kimbrough, Shakespeare's 'Troilus and Cressida' and Its Setting (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964), p.177.

[58] E. M. W. Tillyard, Shakespeare's Problem Plays (London: Chatto and Windus, 1950), p.5.

genres by calling Troilus and Cressida a "tragical satire."[59] My own opinion favours that of Kimbrough, who avoids categorizing the play altogether; although I also find that Foakes' suggestion of a tragedy which asserts itself in the final revenge motif of Troilus and a comedy which trails off with Pandarus after the Epilogue, helps to explain much of the play's puzzling but essential duality.

I do not agree with Oscar Campbell's view that the intention of the play is chiefly satirical. But I do concur with the conflicting opinion, voiced by Olwen Campbell in 1921, which suggests that Troilus and Cressida denigrates the purposes of war. She considers that it differs from the other plays of the canon by showing that "in every war there is an element of irredeemable shame and misery,"[60] and that in this play, particularly, Shakespeare "has given to the world a picture ... of the desolation wrought by human conflict."[61]

I therefore consider that the genre of Troilus and Cressida is compounded of both tragic and comic elements, but that neither of these is expressed exclusively or predominantly. The play cannot be only a tragedy, because of its ending with Pandarus, which gives continuity to the ludicrous element in "romantic" comedy and which stresses the play's recurrent sense of bathos. It cannot be only a satiric comedy because, although the play's protagonists are

---

[59] Peter Ure, William Shakespeare: The Problem Plays (London: Longman's, 1961), p.33.

[60] Olwen Campbell, p.48.

[61] Olwen Campbell, p.59.

condemned in it (by the situations to which the playwright finally brings them) they also win sympathy from the audience. And the fate of all the characters at the close of its action eliminates its interpretation as a straightforward comedy ending happily within the terms of the play's own world. Troilus and Cressida therefore includes some part of both standard definitions within the scope of its actions, but it should be assigned unequivocally to neither one of these genres alone.

It is my opinion that although Troilus and Cressida was probably written and first produced in surroundings that affected its mood and its style, Shakespeare did not have any special purpose for this play which was different from that for the rest of the canon. Its atmosphere of frustration and anti-climax therefore owes as much to his intention of emphasizing its wartime setting as to any contemporary circumstantial effects. I also consider that the view (based on its two different source stories) of the play's separate themes tends to obscure the fact that its "romantic" elements are not limited to its love plot. And I consider that, as the action of the play progresses, the Trojans do not retain their chivalry, nor the Greeks their practical expediency, as these are exemplified initially. Instead, these differing characteristics of the opposing nations become merged, and to some extent exchanged, as Troilus and Cressida approaches both climax and nadir.

In this thesis I therefore intend to demonstrate that, in bringing its two stories together, Shakespeare differs from his sources by emphasizing the callousness of the Trojans as well as the Greeks; that he shows the deterioration of ethical standards among the Trojans in the course of the action; and that there are elements of "romance" among the Greeks as well as the Trojans.

Chapter II: Shakespeare's Use of his Sources

"... the Chance of War" (Prologue: 31)

The plots of Troilus and Cressida have two distinct sources of origin, which are based on the legends from Homer's Iliad and on the story related by Chaucer. The play is often divided along these lines and the two different actions are then referred to as the "war plot" and the "love plot" respectively. In my view, however, Troilus and Cressida contains "martial" and "romantic" elements which are mutually opposed but which cannot be separated exactly into these divisions; for I consider that some of the protagonists who predominate in the war plot also display "romantic" interests, similar to those of the leading characters in the love plot. I therefore propose to show that those elements which I classify as "romantic" do not only exist within the actions of the love plot; and I also intend to investigate the ways in which the play's "martial" elements (as I classify them) are antagonistic to its "romantic" elements, and eventually overwhelm them.

For, although Troilus and Cressida appears to portray the worst features of a world peopled by corrupt Trojans and cynical Greeks, its derisive humour and sophisticated veneer of disillusion hide the less obvious expression of the potential for unselfish, kindly and constructive standards of conduct which can prevail among men if not prevented by the circumstances of war. But these attitudes are submerged and not easily discernible, and their expression decreases as the play progresses, until the "martial" elements finally obliterate them. The "martial" elements include: the struggle for power, the desire for fame, and

the self-seeking exploitation of others. They are displayed particularly by the war-bent characters, who are martially dedicated throughout, and who compete against the more peaceable characters, in their vacillation between opposing loyalties to "romance" and to war.

My classification of "romantic" elements includes all expressions of religious, chivalric and courteous ideals, which are potentially spiritual; and all interests in domesticity, husbandry and reproduction, which suggest a concern for physical continuity on earth. In terms of the play's specific characters, I shall demonstrate how the aims of Ulysses (which are entirely "martial") overcome these "romantic" elements within the play. The "romantic" elements are supported by Hector, Troilus and Achilles, among others, so that the physical death of Hector and the rejection of "romance" in favour of war by both Troilus and Achilles represent the end of all hope for either spiritual or earthly continuity for the play's protagonists. But the course of the action shows that man's innate gentleness and capacity to care for humanity underlies the harshness of his destructive behaviour, even though these qualities are shown to be obsolescent.

I shall also investigate the exchange of values between the Greeks and the Trojans which occurs in Troilus and Cressida. They are divided out clearly at the beginning of the play, but they do not remain exclusive to either side at its end. I consider that Shakespeare's purpose was to show that similarities underlie the apparent contrasts between men who oppose each other in war. He does this by emphasizing the resemblances between the situations and actions of individual Greeks and Trojans, and by suggesting an exchange of their attitudes, so that some features which are originally shown as Greek become Trojan, and vice versa.

At the outset of Troilus and Cressida the two sides display the traditional attitudes epitomized in "reason" and "passion" respectively. (Mythologically, Pallas Athene favoured the Greeks and Venus supported the Trojans, so that the former were depicted as cerebral, cold and pragmatic, and the latter as physical, hot-blooded and unrealistic.) Wilson Knight, who sides with the Trojans himself (and sees Shakespeare as doing the same) distinguishes between the two races of Troilus and Cressida in terms of intellect and intuition.[1] The difference is also expressed by the Greeks' secretive and subtle behaviour in contrast to the generous, carefree outlook of the naive Trojans. The language of the Greeks is complex and devious, but that of the Trojans, simple and clear. Shakespeare's Trojans are concerned with external beauty, preoccupied with their immediate surroundings, and softened by luxurious domesticity. But his Greeks are dissatisfied transients without secure base, whose harsh dissensions are expressed in an ugliness which pervades their speeches and attitudes, and which affects all references to them at the beginning of the play. Despite their discord, however, Shakespeare's Greeks appear to be concerned with their nation and to be working towards its well-being, whereas his Trojans show greater harmony, but are also motivated by individually selfish interests.

The Greeks seem physically static, but are mentally ingenious and lively,

---

[1] G. Wilson Knight, The Wheel of Fire (London: Methuen, 1954), p.47: "The Trojan party stands for human beauty and worth, the Greek party for the bestial stupid elements of man, the barren stagnancy of intellect divorced from action, and the criticism which exposes these things with jeers.... These two primary aspects of humanity can ... be provisionally equated with the concepts 'intuition', and 'intellect' or 'emotion' and 'reason.'"

while the Trojans are dynamic in movement but verbally and intellectually slow. Superficially, therefore, the contrasts between them are clearly set out when the play begins; but as it progresses a variation in these established attitudes becomes apparent. It is shown by alterations in the speech styles (and content) of individual characters, and by the exchange of differing attitudes, so that some of the features which initially characterize the Greeks are taken on by the Trojans, and those that characterize the Trojans, by the Greeks.

By examining Shakespeare's sources for Troilus and Cressida and his use of them I shall explain how his selection and re-arrangement of the incidents emphasize the expediency and brutality of the Trojans as well as the Greeks. Next, I shall show how there is some small hope for constructiveness among the Trojans, at the beginning of the play, and some indication of a former standard of ethics. (These are epitomized in Hector, who follows the lead of Troilus when he turns away from these values, even though Hector is himself aware of their significance.) Lastly, I intend to investigate the presence of the "romantic" elements among the Greeks, by tracing the parallels between the situations of Troilus and Achilles, and by emphasizing Shakespeare's suggestions of similarities in their attitudes and their actions.

The "romantic" and "martial" aims conflict with each other in the course of Troilus and Cressida, and war is finally proved stronger than love, in terms of the play's resolution. Although I consider that Shakespeare's presentation of these "martial" and "romantic" elements (as I classify them) is different from the traditional grouping of "war plot" and "love plot" I shall nevertheless separate the play along the latter, conventional lines (which originate with the

two stories of the Trojan war and the young lovers, respectively) in order to investigate Shakespeare's use of his sources, and his consequent innovations.

It is probable that the sources of the war plot in Troilus and Cressida all originated in Homer, but that Shakespeare did not obtain them directly from the Greek. This is the opinion of Robert Presson (in 1953) and of Antony Chapman (in 1975). Presson considers that "the medieval tradition played a large part in the formation of the play ... [but that] the 'new' or classical conception [introduced by George Chapman's English translation of the Iliad] must not be overlooked as a major source that influenced Shakespeare in writing Troilus and Cressida."[2] And Antony Chapman judges that William Caxton's translation of the third book of The Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye, by Raoul Le Fevre, is the chief basis for the war plot of Troilus and Cressida.[3] (Chapman ranks John Lydgate's Troy Book next in importance, and he cites the Troilus and Criseyde of Geoffrey Chaucer as the main source for the love plot.) He is of the opinion that the war plot material comes originally from Homer, but that the means whereby Shakespeare received it remains unknown. Chapman himself considers that the medieval variations of the legends taken from the Iliad provide the most likely sources for Troilus and Cressida. His authority for

---

[2] Robert K. Presson, Shakespeare's "Troilus and Cressida" and the Legends of Troy (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1953), p.8.

[3] Antony U. Chapman, "The Influences of Shakespeare's Sources on the Dramaturgy of Troilus and Cressida" Diss. Kent State University 1975, p.72, citing "Caxton's Chronicle history of Troy" as "Shakespeare's principal source for the war plot."

this view is John Tatlock, who "had shown, by the end of World War I, the uselessness of the nineteenth-century debate on the relationship between Shakespeare's characters and Homer's, by demonstrating that the sources of the play were mainly medieval."[4]

Geoffrey Bullough, however, as editor of the Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, cites the Iliad as "Source I" for Troilus and Cressida, with the Metamorphoses of Ovid as probable "Source II." He gives place to Lydgate's Troy Book and to Caxton's Recuyell only as "possible Source III" and "Source IV" respectively.[5]

Bullough lists the sources for the love plot as secondary to those for the war plot; but the other critics give prominence to Chaucer (and so to the love plot). Kenneth Muir cites Chaucer, followed by Robert Henryson in The Testament of Cresseid, for Shakespeare's love plot, and considers Chaucer to be Shakespeare's "main source" for the play as a whole.[6] E. K. Chambers also gives primary importance to the sources for the love plot, and allots first place to Chaucer.[7]

---

[4] John S. P. Tatlock, "The Chief Problem in Shakespeare," The Sewanee Review, 24 (1916), 138.

[5] Geoffrey Bullough, ed., Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966), VI, ix-x.

[6] Kenneth Muir, Shakespeare's Sources, I (London: Methuen, 1957), p.78. Muir considers that, for the war plot, Shakespeare also consulted Chapman's Homer (the first instalment, of 1598); possibly the translation by Hall; Virgil's Aeneid; Caxton; Lydgate; and Golding's translation of Ovid.

[7] Chambers, William Shakespeare, I, 447.

These variations in authoritative opinions are accounted for by Alice Walker, who points out that already, in medieval times, Homer had been discredited as an approved source for the Troy story.[8] Then, Dictys the Cretan and Dares the Phrygian were preferred. Their most popular narrative disciple was Raoul Le Fevre. The Troy story came down to him from Dictys and Dares through the twelfth-century writings of Benoit de Sainte-Maure and the thirteenth-century work of Guido delle Colonne. Le Fevre's Recuyell was translated into prose by Caxton, in 1475, and became the most widely read account of the Trojan war in sixteenth-century England. Lydgate's slightly later verse translation of Guido delle Colonne came next in popularity. Walker, however, concedes that Shakespeare shows "an awareness of [direct] Homeric material."[9] It therefore seems wisest to consider that Troilus and Cressida owes most to the Iliad (probably in the "Seven Books" of George Chapman's 1598 translation); to Caxton's translation of the Recuyell; and to Lydgate's Troy Book, for the origins of the "war plot" within it.

Shakespeare makes only two other long references to the Troy story which are of significant interest. These are both concerned with the "war plot" but they are also connected with the "romantic" elements in Troilus and Cressida as well. They occur in The Rape of Lucrece (of 1592) and in Hamlet (of 1601), which is the play nearest to Troilus and Cressida for its probable date of composition.

---

[8] Alice Walker, ed., Troilus and Cressida (Cambridge: University Press, 1957), pp.xxxviii-xli.

[9] Walker, p.xlii.

Shakespeare's long, early poem presents the story of Troy with the same sense of foreboding,[10] but without the depth of irony which later characterizes his treatment of the subject in the plays. In both Lucrece and Hamlet he emphasizes the despair and gloom of the Troy catastrophe theme; and in both of these two works, Shakespeare's own plots are concerned with violence and the inevitability of death because of a crime in which the central character is innocent (the rape of Lucrece by Tarquin and the murder of Hamlet's father by Claudius). In both he implies that the audience's, or reader's, familiarity with the significance of the Troy story will supply the atmosphere of doom that pervades his own tale of hopeless disaster.

Shakespeare uses the Troy story in Lucrece to parallel the plight of his betrayed heroine with that of the Trojan women, and Lucrece contemplates her suicide while she gazes at a tapestry which shows the downfall of Troy (lines 1366-1442). The innocent Trojan women are depicted in it at one place as fearing the deaths of their men (lines 1429-35) and at another as mourning the loss of them (line 1376). And this same scene is the subject of the Players' speeches in Hamlet (II:ii:452-518), when Hamlet is contemplating the use of these players in order to establish evidence of Claudius' guilt. In the play, which was written nearly ten years later, the theme of Troy is not only treated tragically, as in Lucrece, but also with irony and a sense of humour.

---

[10] Muriel C. Bradbrook, "What Shakespeare Did to Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde," Shakespeare Quarterly, 9 (1958), 312, citing the Troy story as a "disaster" which Shakespeare uses in his "most ostentatiously literary work Lucrece as an emblem of betrayal."

Thus, in his later work, Shakespeare deals with the intensity of emotion aroused by this popular theme with a touch of satire; and he is presumably ridiculing its well-worn associations of catastrophe at the same time that he uses seriously its real sense of violence and disaster. We can therefore judge from these references to the Troy story that for Shakespeare it was connected with the idea of destructiveness where crimes are committed against the innocent; with the disastrous effects of war on the women of Troy, especially; and with an atmosphere of doom, which pervades these two works in which he alludes to it. It is not, therefore, surprising that these aspects are also particularly emphasized in Troilus and Cressida.

So we are prepared for the fact that Shakespeare includes the partially "romantic" elements in his play about Troy, even when he appears to be only concerned with the war plot. The development of his ambiguous treatment of the Troy theme between Lucrece and the later writing of Hamlet also prepares us for Shakespeare's dual attitudes of seriousness towards the disastrous story and of irony in his manner of presenting it.

Virgil Whitaker points out that "any attempt to interpret a Shakespearean play must include detailed comparison of that play with its sources" and that "any deviation from them is likely to be deliberate."[11] I therefore intend to

---

[11] Virgil Whitaker, "Shakespeare's Use of his Sources," Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hardin Craig, eds. Baldwin Maxwell, W. D. Briggs, Francis R. Johnson, E. N. S. Thompson (Stanford, Calif.: University Press, 1972), p.188: "Any comparison of Shakespeare's plays with their sources shows clearly that, in general, he simply dramatized the material before

show some of the ways in which Shakespeare has given his own interpretation of the Troy story, and how these may differ from the conventional presentation of its incidents in the sources. In this, I shall concentrate on Shakespeare's concern with the actions of Hector and Achilles, and on the attitude shown by all the warriors towards the women in the play, with emphasis on Troilus' treatment of Cressida. Shakespeare would have found it necessary to conform to the audience's expectations of these characters' established roles on the Elizabethan stage, and he does this in his reproduction of many incidents which come from his sources. But he also changes some of them, and thereby emphasizes his portrayal of the characters in small, but significant, ways, and adds depth and ambiguity to the traditional figures of the story.

Shakespeare's own use of the war plot differs from its treatment in his chronicled sources both by his overall interpretation (according to Robert Presson)[12] and by his development of the characters (according to Antony Chapman.)[13] Shakespeare allows for the demands of tradition in depicting Hector's magnanimity and Achilles' brutality, and in

---

him ....," pp. 189-90: "taking it as axiomatic that whenever possible Shakespeare follows his sources, the conclusion follows inevitably that any deviation from them is likely to be deliberate and to reflect Shakespeare's methods as a dramatic artist of his aims in writing the particular play."

[12] Presson, p.7, stresses Shakespeare's interpretative affinities with Homer rather than the medieval chroniclers, by stating that "his characters, like Homer's, are individuals rather than types."

[13] Chapman, p.78, describes Caxton's work as a "formless history ... in which chivalric honor or [sic] the lack of it are the only forces motivating the myriad characters."

emphasizing Cressida's promiscuity; while his own portrayal of these heroes also shows Hector as self-seeking and Achilles as finally savage despite, and not because of, the circumstances which precede his entry into the battle. And his illustration of Cressida's licentious behaviour also shows that her actions are caused by the treatment which is meted out to her, as well as by her own inclinations. These points are stressed by various discrepancies between Shakespeare's characterizations and the prototypes for his protagonists, which are taken from the chronicle sources for the war plot. They are also illustrated by the way that Shakespeare has altered the emphasis in the events which he received from these earlier narratives of the Troy story.

The first appearance of Hector in Troilus and Cressida shows him enunciating firm ethical standards; but he immediately follows this by supporting actions which contradict them. This scene originates in the medieval sources. Presson points out that "Shakespeare's presentation of the Trojan council scene" is, in some ways, derived from Caxton;[14] and, in referring to the influence of Lydgate, Presson shows that the speeches used by Shakespeare's Hector are derived from those of his prototype in the Troy Book, where the Trojan leader wishes to discontinue the war. In Lydgate, Hector speaks against the war because he considers that the Greeks are too powerful for the Trojans, and that his aunt, Hesione (whose abduction is the cause for their Council) is too old to be worth revenge.[15] But he does, first, mention the "law" of

---

[14] Presson, p.138.

[15] Presson, p.152, where he mentions that this scene is also in Caxton.

"naturis" which makes it "fittying" for the Trojans to put right such a wrong.[16]

Shakespeare has placed these incidents together in Troilus and Cressida (II:ii:72-193), so that the caution of Hector merits less praise than in Lydgate, being so speedily reneged (II:ii:186-91), and his advocacy of the laws "Of Nature and of Nations" (II:ii:185) mocks the way in which Lydgate's Hector uses a similar phrase. (Lydgate employs it to stress the righteous indignation of the Trojans when their aunt has been stolen,[17] but Shakespeare's Hector is assigned the same words to describe the theft of Helen, which is perpetrated by them.) He then proceeds to further their immoral cause by immediately agreeing to continuation of the war.

Thus, when Hector undercuts the ethical position he has just built up, in Troilus and Cressida, he is shown not as cautious or righteous (as in the separate incidents of the Troy Book), but as a leader whose integrity is uncertain. The volte-face of Shakespeare's Hector stresses his favour for his brothers' enjoyment of war, and it emphasizes his irresponsibility, depicting him as capable of actions which are selfish, abrupt and inexplicable.

> ... Thus to persist
> In doing wrong extenuates not wrong,
> But makes it much more heavy. Hector's opinion
> Is this in way of truth; yet ne'er the less,
> My spritely brethren, I propend to you
> In resolution to keep Helen still,
> For 'tis a cause that hath no mean dependance
> Upon our joint and several dignities. (II:ii:186-93)

---

[16] Presson, p.152.

[17] Presson, p.153.

Unlike the sources, Shakespeare apparently attributes Hector's motive for continued fighting only to his share in his brothers' desire for fame, and not to any caution or care for his family and compatriots.

The reaction of Paris to the caution of Hector is also taken from Lydgate, where Paris volunteers his intervention to rescue Hesione; and the warnings given to the Trojans concerning the doom of Troy are given by Lydgate, as well.[18] But there they are voiced by Helenus, the seer. Thus the interaction of the Trojan princes in Shakespeare comes unaltered from Lydgate, and preserves the same division between those wishing for war and those desiring peace. Shakespeare, however, has changed the emphasis on the warnings; for, instead of giving first importance to the protests of Helenus, he makes his forebodings mere preludes to the cries of Cassandra. In this way the drama strengthens the atmosphere of fear and superstition aroused by her prophecy in Troilus and Cressida; and it also goes further than the chronicles in stressing Hector's disregard both for the voice of the gods, and for his sister as an individual.

The scene in Troilus and Cressida in which the Trojan women try to prevent Hector from going out to his final battle has origins in both Lydgate and Caxton. But Shakespeare has increased the role of Cassandra there also, beyond that which is attributed to her in the medieval stories (for example, Caxton dispenses even with her nominal presence, mentioning only that of Hector's "susters").[19]

---

[18] Presson, p.153: "The council is suddenly abashed by Helenus' warning..."

[19] Chapman, pp.128-29.

Thus Shakespeare emphasizes traditional sympathy for the doomed Trojan women and innovatively stresses the importance of Cassandra as the voice of religion, not just as a member of the Trojan family. Shakespeare's Hector is unique in using his vow to the gods (that he would return to battle) as a reason for going against the domestic entreaties;[20] for in the account by Lydgate, Hector gives in to their pleas until he is droused by the death of his bastard brother, Margareton. (Shakespeare gives Margarethon a part in his play at V:vii: 13-23, but without directly connecting him to Hector.) And Shakespeare also makes the scene of ineffective dissuasion by the women different from its literary predecessors by omitting the presence of Hector's children.[21]

These points all show that the Trojan prince, in Troilus and Cressida, pays apparent respect to religion only where his own vow (and implied wish for fame as a warrior) is concerned; that he pays decreasing attention to the voice of prophecy, as the play proceeds (for in II:ii Hector shows apprehension on hearing Cassandra, but in V:iii he disregards her, when swayed by Troilus); and that he finally sets his ambition for personal glory ahead of family, religion and duty to his country. They also show that the domestic world which Hector thereby repudiates is presented less sentimentally, by Shakespeare, but with more sense

---

[20] Presson, p.60, pointing out that this Shakespearean innovation gives the Trojan prince "a justifiable reason for combatting the logic of Priám, the seeming phantasy of Cassandra, and the dream of Andromache [and] strengthens Hector's character [making him] a match for the emotional women."

[21] Presson, p.60: "Shakespeare intentionally omitted from his play reference to Hector's children, since he could not overlook their presence in the Recuyell or in the Troy Book."

of universal doom than it was by the earlier chroniclers.

In distinguishing the attitude of Shakespeare's Hector towards ethics and religion from that shown by his predecessors in the sources, it is notable that the character drawn by Shakespeare has greater moral responsibility for his own actions. As Presson points out: "Shakespeare disengaged the Homeric deities from ...direct participation" in the war;[22] and this suggests that the references made to "the gods" in Troilus and Cressida indicate a more abstract spirituality than that which was formerly connected with the humanly motivated gods of Greek mythological tradition. (And the interference of these Olympians in the Trojan conflict, in Homer, removes much of the onus of responsibility from the mortals.) The moral load carried by Shakespeare's Hector is thus heavier than that of his predecessor in the Iliad; and the behaviour of Hector, which is illustrated by the medieval chroniclers, shows less irresponsibility than it does in the later Shakespearean characterization. Presson judges that the Hector of Troilus and Cressida is blinded by "love of personal fame and glory,"[23] and this seems to be particularly exemplified in the incidents I have mentioned. Thus, in his development of them, Shakespeare illuminates Hector's shortcomings, as well as portraying his traditional virtues.

An investigation of the episodes involving Hector and Ajax, both in the sources and in Shakespeare's play, shows that the wrath expressed by Hector

---

[22] Presson, p.50n.

[23] Presson, p.138.

against Ajax, who has "cop'd him in the battle" (I:ii:32) is original to Troilus and Cressida.[24] But the peaceful end to their duel is not. Hector's wish to discontinue the duel because of his kinship to Ajax originates in the sources: in Lydgate, Hector expresses his desire to cease fighting as the two warriors are related, but Ajax refuses to stop;[25] while, in Caxton, as in Shakespeare, Ajax agrees to end the fight and embraces Hector.[26] Shakespeare has thus chosen that version of the combat which gives as much credit for peace-making to Ajax as to Hector, and he adds nothing to increase the Trojan prince's traditional magnanimity.

So, although his presentation of Hector's nobility and goodwill conforms to expectations in the scenes with Ajax, Shakespeare chooses to show the Greek sharing the role of peacemaker with Hector, following his prototype in Caxton instead of that in Lydgate. And in the scenes concerning Hector's challenge, Shakespeare differs from his sources by introducing a delay between pronouncement of the challenge to the Greeks (by Aeneas, at I:iii:265-83) and its actual enactment, which occurs only at IV:v:65-155. Thus he lengthens the intervening episodes between the challenge and its implementation, giving both time and

---

[24] R. A. Small, The Stage Quarrel Between Ben Jonson and the So-Called Poetasters (Breslau, 1899: rpt. New York: A.M.S. Press, 1966), p.168: "The first part of the scene (I:i:1-46) seems to be introduced for the express purpose of making a place for this description; for the defeat of Hector by Ajax, and the consequent wrath of Hector, find no place in Caxton's Recuyell or in the Iliad."

[25] Presson, p.146.

[26] Bullough, p.94.

opportunity to reveal the hypocrisy of Trojan chivalry. The overall effect of the changes in these incidents is to lessen the nobility of Hector, who is cited as the exponent of courtesy in I:iii, but who is already shown to renege and neglect his duties of chivalry by the time that IV:v is presented. Shakespeare therefore does nothing to improve Hector's image, and his biased presentation seems to undercut our wholehearted acceptance of the Trojan prince's integrity.

Caxton's narrative stresses the characteristic magnanimity of Hector, which Shakespeare exemplifies at times (for instance, in that "final act of generosity that will cost him his life,"[27] when he lets Achilles escape unharmed in the battle, at V:vi:14-21). Hector's mercy towards his opponent, and Achilles' subsequent assassination of the Trojan, are vivid portrayals by Shakespeare of the one as "the soul of honor" and the other as "the dishonorable braggart and bully."[28] Neither of these characters, however, is as unequivocally virtuous or vicious as he would be if Shakespeare had reproduced the events exactly as they are recounted in the sources.

Shakespeare highlights the incident of Hector stripping the armour from an unknown soldier whom he has "hunted for [his] hide" (V:vi:31), and although this comes from the sources it is shown in them with less discredit to Hector. Caxton's version of the incident is kindest to him: in the Recuyell Hector is surrounded by the Myrmidons after he has killed Patroclus and while he is taking

---

[27] Small, p.159.

[28] Chapman, p.134.

his victim's armour, and he only narrowly escapes.[29] In the Troy Book, Lydgate shows Hector stripping an unarmed corpse of its accoutrements, but not as pursuing a live soldier for them.[30] Shakespeare's Hector, however abandons courtesy towards an inferior and favours savage opportunism. Thus, the character in Troilus and Cressida retains the apparent chivalry which is attributed to Hector in the sources, but also shows his hypocrisy, by displaying the greed of his nature in warfare.

The personal descriptions of Achilles are presented with heavy irony in Troilus and Cressida, and although these originate in Caxton, Shakespeare has altered their effect. In his play they are usually uttered spitefully by Ulysses, or boorishly by Ajax, and not used sincerely as they are in the chronicles. But the phrases themselves are quite similar.[31] Ulysses' description of Achilles as "plagu'y proud" in Troilus and Cressida (II:ii:177) does not, however, have its precedent in Caxton. As Presson points out, the only source for Achilles' overweaning pride, as Shakespeare sets it out, lies in Homer[32] (and it is really only in that epic that the character of Achilles is drawn at all, for in the other narratives his portrayal is merely episodic).

---

[29] Bullough, p.197.

[30] Presson, p.151, quotes those lines from the Troy Book which describe Achilles' sight of Hector "taking the armour from a corpse on the battlefield."

[31] Small, p.158, quoting from Sommer's edition of the Recuyell: "of right grete beaulte ... an hyghe man of grete stature ... desyring to fight." In Troilus and Cressida I:iii:142, 162, 176: "The great Achilles;" "the large Achilles:" "Sir Valor...."

[32] Presson, p.26.

The Achilles of Shakespeare owes his pride and his anger to Homer; but his other characteristics are not notably derivative. Although Shakespeare's Greeks use a derogatory way of describing Achilles which is apparently unflattering, their words also emphasize his courage and physical grandeur, as well as his traditional failings. Significantly, Shakespeare introduces one comment on Achilles made among his opponents, by Cressida, when she repeats the current saying that "Achilles is a better man than Troilus" (at I:ii:247). So Shakespeare is in this way subtly asserting the real valour of Achilles and also stressing his unpopularity among his envious and dissatisfied fellow-countrymen.

Some differences between Shakespeare's own interpretation of the characters and their original actions in his sources are due to his alteration of the chronological order of events in the war story. This changes motives for some of the actions of the heroes and varies the emphasis on others. The change in chronology particularly applies to Shakespeare's characterization of Achilles, because that hero's threats to Hector are less excusable (at Troilus and Cressida, IV:v:242-51) than they are in Lydgate, where Hector has killed Patroclus before Achilles insults him. In the Troy Book this gives a cause, which is absent in Shakespeare's play, for the Greek's personal anger against the Trojan.[33] Achilles' threats therefore lose much of their emotional impact in Shakespeare's play, and appear unnecessarily brutal.

---

[33] Presson, p.51, describes Achilles' encounter with Hector at the Greek camp as it is given in the Recuyell. On p.147 he mentions the same incident occurring in the Troy Book, where Achilles vows "above all to revenge Patroclus' death."

His motive for avoiding the battlefield (which is that of wooing Hector's sister Polyxena) also fails to win sympathy for Achilles in the play, because of the hidden way in which Shakespeare presents it. Achilles' love is shown as comparatively unimportant by Shakespeare (when compared to Caxton)[34] because of the ridicule accompanying Ulysses' mention of it, in one of the very few allusions made to Polyxena in Troilus and Cressida (III:iii:212); and also because Shakespeare shows Achilles to be preoccupied by his homosexual affair with Patroclus. The mutual affection of Achilles and Patroclus is obvious in the Iliad, and is mentioned in the sources, but only Shakespeare connects it so directly and openly with Achilles' refusal to fight.[35] Thus Shakespeare emphasizes Achilles' "romantic" involvements for most of the play, and effectively reserves his ferocity for Achilles' final expression, in warfare, of savage wrathfulness.

The contrast between Achilles' peacetime and wartime capacities for showing emotion, and his equivocation between personal and political loyalties, make Shakespeare's character in Troilus and Cressida far more complex than his predecessors in the chronicled sources. This is due to Shakespeare's double presentation of him as both the wrathful warrior of tradition, who comes "martially"

---

[34] Presson, p.23, describing Achilles' love for Polyxena, in the Recuyell, as "the cause and beginning of a mischief that reduced Achilles to inactivity and even led him to plead for peace between the Greeks and Trojans." Shakespeare therefore understates the effect of this love on Achilles, by comparison.

[35] Presson, pp.27-28: "Such a motive for Achilles' continued secession is Shakespeare's own, though the affection of Achilles for Patroclus is obvious in the eighteenth book of the Iliades."

to life when aroused by revengeful anger, and as the potential husband of Polyxena, who seeks a peaceful lifestyle but whose "romantic" aims are thwarted when his male lover fatally precedes him into the battle. But Shakespeare makes the first of these two rôles far more clearly evident than the second one.

Shakespeare gives two reasons for Achilles' wrathful return to battle (at V:v:30-42) and these are the death of Patroclus and the attack made by the Trojans against Achilles' Myrmidons. These events occur separately in the sources for the war plot. In Homer, Achilles' anger is aroused by the death of Patroclus as instantly as it is in Shakespeare; but in Caxton, Achilles re-enters the fight because of the slaughter perpetrated among his Myrmidons.[36] Chapman considers that Shakespeare plays down the effect of Achilles' wrath by describing it indirectly through the speech of Ulysses; but I disagree with Chapman, because, elsewhere in the canon, this style of narration in no way detracts from the emotional effect of an event.[37] In fact, in Troilus and Cressida this long-awaited approval of Achilles on the part of Ulysses, in place of that leader's preceding insults and warnings, contributes to the sense of exultation

---

[36] Chapman, p.127.

[37] Chapman, p.130: "Shakespeare ... dismisses the whole problem of the wrath of Achilles, on which all of the earlier movement of the war plot has been based, in the few lines of Ulysses' report at V:v:30-42." But I consider that this moment of hearing the news that Achilles has returned to the battle is presented by Shakespeare climactically. And there are other important events in the canon which also provoke great emotion even though the audience learns of them at second-hand; for example, Gertrude's account of the death of Ophelia, in Hamlet (IV:vii:166-83).

among the Greeks as they finally go into action. It also brings together, within the play, the victory of the "martial" elements and Achilles' own rejection of interest in the "romantic" elements, as he renounces his role of hopeful suitor and becomes only the brutal fighter of tradition.

Overall, therefore, Shakespeare's Achilles is motivated more complicatedly than his prototypes in the sources, and he needs a greater impetus to make him reject possible "romance" for a totally warlike style. But once the Achilles of Shakespeare becomes entirely "martial" he combines the fiercest and most brutal traits of his predecessors in the savagery of his revengeful actions. Achilles kills Hector unchivalrously in Caxton,[38] and his slaying of Troilus (in both Caxton and Lydgate) sets the example for his slaughter of Hector in Shakespeare, where he surrounds his victim with his Myrmidons and outnumbers him mercilessly (V:viii:5-22).[39] (But, according to Chapman, Shakespeare is alone in portraying Achilles as standing by while his cohorts do the actual killing.)[40] Presson states that Achilles' murder of Hector is extenuated in Lydgate because Agamemnon instructs him to slay the Trojan prince by superiority of numbers.[41]

---

[38] Presson, p.75: "Achilles finally achieves victory by slaying Hector when he is unarmed."

[39] Presson, p.78: "it is possible that [Shakespeare] transferred to Hector's death the circumstances under which Troilus meets his death as it occurs in the Troy Book and in the Recuyell."

[40] Chapman, p.136: "Having the Myrmidons kill Hector, rather than having Achilles do so himself (V:viii:10) seems to be Shakespeare's own addition to the story."

[41] Presson, p.77.

He also points out that the details of Hector's body's being dragged come from the Iliad, and those of its being attached to his horse's tail from either Vergil or Marlowe.[42] Shakespeare has attributed all the savagest and most cowardly incidents from the sources to his Greek hero, while depicting him, earlier in the play, as "romantic." This shows Shakespeare's Achilles to be a man of extremes. Once he starts fighting, he is vindictive and ruthless, but before that he is vacillating and hesitant, and reluctant to be involved in the war.

Shakespeare has changed the actions of the minor characters little from those of their originals in the sources, and his delineation of their personalities is therefore not marked. But these characters in Troilus and Cressida are of interest because Shakespeare uses them to illuminate the major protagonists, even though they have few original characteristics themselves. Presson considers that Patroclus is shown only as a hindrance to Achilles and as a participator in his insubordination, by Shakespeare;[43] but I consider that Patroclus' significant lines give some depth to his own character and certainly add dimensions to that of Achilles. For Patroclus regards them both with objectivity when he says:

> They think my little stomach to the war,
> And your great love to me, restrains you thus. (III:iii:220-21)

And he understands his fellow Greeks, with their threat to neglect Achilles' fame, when he points out that:

---

[42] Presson, pp.76-78.

[43] Presson, p.66.

> Omission to do what is necessary
> Seals a commission to a blank of danger,
> And danger like an ague subtly taints
> Even then when they sit idly in the sun. (III:iii:230-34)

These two speeches show that Patroclus is both realistic and perceptive; and his urging of Achilles to retrieve his lost glory, at the expense of their love affair, suggests his own unselfishness. Patroclus' words and his importance to Achilles, as the companion to his withdrawal from the battlefield, originate in Shakespeare. None of these is derived from any source material.[44]

Shakespeare has used several different sources for depicting Ajax. He combines two heroes of that name from Homer and from Ovid,[45] and draws Ajax as the typical buffoon of sixteenth-century Interlude tradition, ridiculed obscenely and consistently gross and ungainly. Shakespeare, however, also develops Ajax' capacity for kindness, moderation and even for some tolerant objectivity, in the later part of the action. This is strikingly different from that character's foolish anger and vanity in the early scenes of the play, and from his traditional behaviour as a stupid, insensitive soldier.

The Thersites of Shakespeare is considered to be amplified but not changed

---

[44] Presson, p.27. See n.34 above.

[45] Bullough, p.88, considers that the Ajax of Troilus and Cressida is drawn from Homer's Ajax Telamon (Iliad XI); Lydgate's Ajax Oileus (who is "boastful"); and is influenced by the Ajax of Arthur Golding's translation of Ovid's Metamorphoses XIII. As Bullough points out: "the dramatist had already used this Ovidian passage in The Rape of Lucrece (1394-1400)."

significantly from his set part, in Homer, as "railer" against the war.[46] In Troilus and Cressida he is even more vulgar,[47] but this is probably due to his role in contemporary Interludes, and there is little indication of his own character development in the lines given to him by Shakespeare. But, as in the case of Ajax, there are some subtle changes suggested in his attitude between the beginning and the end of the play, and these are expressed by Thersites' part as a mediator. Shakespeare's full characterization of Thersites is therefore not entirely limited to fulfilling his role as the cynical and vitriolic commentator on the follies of the warfaring Greeks.

Chapman considers that the last seven scenes of Act V have been culled and adapted "accurately and ingeniously" from the medieval sources, except for the actions of Ajax and Thersites.[48] For instance, in Caxton's account of the battle, Diomedes takes Troilus' horse and sends "hit to Breseyda" as the token of proving himself her knight; this is the origin of Shakespeare's V:v:1-5. And in the account by Caxton, Diomedes and Ulysses go to Priam as envoys asking for the return of Helen to the Greeks, which explains the enmity between Aeneas and

---

[46] H. Ulrici, "Ist Troilus and Cressida 'comedy' oder 'tragedy' oder 'history?'" Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, 9 (1874), x-xi, stating that Shakespeare generally follows medieval tradition in his depiction of these characters, but, while Troilus as a warrior comes from Dictys and Dares, Thersites is developed entirely from Homer.

[47] Presson, p.90: "Homer's Thersites does not express himself in the colloquial or vulgar style employed by Shakespeare's (and Heywood's) Thersites ...."

[48] Chapman, p.132.

and Diomedes in Troilus and Cressida at IV.:i: 10-33.[49] So Shakespeare is following his sources in delineating the antagonism between these characters.

Shakespeare's Aeneas has significant origins by name, and his role as survivor of the Trojan catastrophe also underlies the use Shakespeare makes of him in the play. Aeneas' presence emphasizes the most critical moments when Troilus vacillates between "romantic" and "martial" interests; and although the characterization of Aeneas himself is slight, it is innovative and therefore significant in Troilus and Cressida.

Apart from these minor characters, the depiction of Ulysses by Shakespeare also owes much to his sources, yet has some individual traits of its own. According to R. A. Small, the character of Ulysses in Troilus and Cressida, corresponds to the description of him in the Recuyell (in that source he is said to be "deceynable ... subtyll ... [a] right grete lyar ... [and] best bespoken").[50] Shakespeare emphasizes these characteristics, and gives added depth to them. He also gives to his Ulysses much of the governing power that in Homer belongs to Nestor,[51] and makes him the manipulator among the dissenting Greeks, who shows up their official leaders as inept (this is illustrated in I:iii:75-211 and I:iii:310-91). As Presson points out, Shakespeare's

---

[49] Presson, p.122.

[50] Small, p.158, quoting from the Recuyell.

[51] See especially Presson, p.140.

Ulysses extends the role of his prototype in the Iliad;[52] and, as Shakespeare leaves out what Presson characterizes as: "the honorable reason for Achilles' withdrawal"[53] from the battle, his Ulysses becomes all-important among the Greeks in his negotiations with Achilles, because Agamemnon's "insult" (from the Iliad) is omitted. Thus, the most important result of Shakespeare's re-arrangement of his source material in the later portrayal of Ulysses is the emphasis placed on that leader's part in provoking and manoeuvring Achilles towards the slaying of Hector.

The scenes concerning Cressida have no real emotional basis in the "war plot," as she is entirely a matter for the love story; but there are events in the war plot sources which have been taken by Shakespeare to illustrate some of her actions. In the Iliad there is a precedent for Cressida's viewing the battle (shown in Troilus and Cressida at I:ii:178-247), when Helen identifies the Greek warriors for Priam.[54] And it is notable that Shakespeare does not use Helen in this part of his interpretation, reserving her appearance until III:i, where Pandarus comes to her "court." This later scene is mostly original; but it could be faintly influenced by the scene from the Iliad VI, where Hector rebukes Paris

---

[52] Presson: "Ulysses in both (Chapman's translation of the Iliad and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida) is the power behind the scenes and the true ruler of the army ...."

[53] Presson, p.142.

[54] Presson, p.115, n.2: "In the Iliad, Book III, Helen identifies for Priam the Greek warriors as they appear on the field."

for staying with Helen; and it is probably derived in situation (but not tone) from Troilus and Criseyde.[55] And, the emphasis that Shakespeare gives to the atmosphere of corruption and sterility surrounding Helen, in III:i of Troilus and Cressida, has no precedent in literature.[56]

There is some precedent for incident, but not for interpretation, in the first part of IV:v (lines 16-63) where Cressida is received by the Greeks with kisses; but there is no precedent for either in V:ii, the climactic scene of the play's "love plot." In the kissing scene of Troilus and Cressida her promiscuity is suggested; and in the scene with Diomedes it is given emphatic visual proof (to the audience, to her former lover, and to the Greeks who condemn her, Ulysses and Thersites). The kissing scene is a cruel parody of one which is presented without irony in the sources, for in Caxton the account of Breseyda's arrival at the Greek camp relates how she was welcomed with feasting, and with a gift of a jewel from each of their leaders.[57] Shakespeare has thus debased

---

[55] Chapman, p.23, considers that this scene may have been suggested to Shakespeare by Chaucer's "principal appearance of Helen (at a dinner party, which is Pandarus' means of bringing Troilus and Cressida together) but that "the Helen Shakespeare presents seems to be of his own devising with, perhaps, a hint from the Iliad, Book 6."

[56] Chapman, p.60: "Its action represents a situation not found in any of the known sources and is presumably of Shakespeare's own devising."

[57] Bullough, p.94, points out that the kissing in this scene is Shakespeare's innovation. He mentions that in Caxton the name Briseyde (later changed to Criseyde, and so passed from Boccaccio's Filistrato to Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde) originates in the Iliad story of the slave girl taken by Agamemnon from Achilles. This action causes Achilles to withdraw from the battlefield, in Homer.

the episode with discredit to all its participants. It is notable that those scenes in Troilus and Cressida which are entirely original are bitterly ironic. They concern the women of the Troy stories, and they emphasize the callousness and cruelty of the Greek men towards them, at the same time that they display the undignified licentiousness of Helen, among the Trojans, and of Cressida, among the Greeks.

The character of Cressida is developed in the love plot and not in the war plot, and this also applies to the character of Troilus. As the warrior, Shakespeare's Troilus conforms to his original role, in the "war plot" sources; but as the lover of Troilus and Cressida his complex characterization should be compared with its prototype in Chaucer, whose Troilus and Criseyde was the main source of the love plot for Shakespeare.

Most of the critics consider that Chaucer is a source for Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida, although Bullough cites Henryson as Source V (and as analogue), the lost manuscript of "The 'Troilus and Cressida' Plot" as a possible Source VI, and notably excludes Chaucer's work from this listing.[58] In his introduction to the play itself, however, Bullough states that the characters of Pandarus and of "Troilus in love" are both taken from Chaucer.[59] H. Ulrici cites Chaucer as the closest and most distinguished source for Shakespeare's play;[60] Tatlock states that "Shakespeare made much use of

---

[58] Bullough, pp.ix-x.

[59] Bullough, pp.94-95.

[60] Ulrici, p.xxxv.

Chaucer;"[61] while Chambers (as I have already mentioned) considers that Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde was the primary source for Shakespeare's drama of the same name.[62] It is doubtful whether the text of Troilus and Cressida is greatly influenced by the other source of the love plot which these critics cite: the Testament of Henryson. But its heroine owes much of her notoriety to that poem, which appeared together with Chaucer's, in the fifteenth century, and which was generally accepted as the didactic continuation of Troilus and Criseyde. Its "addition" probably accounts for the increasingly debased reputation of Cressida during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.[63] Even though "the Elizabethan writers did not know the origin of the Cressida myth,"[64] she was nevertheless constantly depicted in her traditional role as the personification of wanton infidelity.

Shakespeare's own attitude towards Troilus and Cressida, outside the play of that title, is condemnatory and distasteful in each mention of her: for example, he evokes the effect of Henryson's poem (which emphasizes the disease and the poverty associated with her leprosy, inflicted as punishment for her promiscuity) in Twelfth Night (III:i:54-61) by a reference to "Cressida (as) a beggar;" and

---

[61] Tatlock, "The Siege of Troy..." p.722.

[62] Chambers, p.447. See n.7 above.

[63] Hyder E. Rollins, "The Troilus-Cressida Story from Chaucer to Shakespeare," Publications of the Modern Language Association, (1917), 396-97.

[64] Rollins, p.401.

in Henry V (II:i:80) by the words: "lazar kite of Cressid's kind." But he alludes more sympathetically to the lovesick Troilus in The Merchant of Venice (V:i:3-6). Small considers that, in Troilus and Cressida Shakespeare modified his character of Cressida "to accord with the traditional notion that she was fickle and light from the beginning," and that, in so doing, he was conforming to contemporary tradition.[65] And the Elizabethan attitude towards the three stock figures of Shakespeare's play exemplified ridicule, contempt and denunciation of both Pandarus and Cressida, but ironic sympathy for the betrayed lover, Troilus.

The atmosphere of Henryson's poem with its final condemnation of the beggared Cressida, who is unrecognizable to Troilus, is reflected in Shakespeare's treatment of the love story.[66] But, although his incidents and characterizations are apparently biased against sympathy for Cressida, and in favour of Troilus as the victim of her inconstancy, there is an undertone of irony directed towards the helplessness of her situation and towards the unchivalrous treatment of Cressida by all the male protagonists, in this play. This irony also ridicules the self-centred posturing and sorrowing of her Trojan lover.

---

[65] Small, p.156.

[66] Bradbrook, p.313, pointing out that, although "Shakespeare made no direct use of this poem, the disease imagery from the Testament has been "dissolved into the general language" of Troilus and Cressida, and into "the person of Thersites" as he is drawn in the play. (In this connection, Rollins, p.428, cites Cressida's use of the word "plagu'd" at V:ii:105; I should also add Thersites' word "biles" at I:ii:5; the references he makes to "lazars" at II:iii:33 and V:i:65; and Cressida's own suggested comparison of herself to a bell, which a leper carried, at IV:ii:108-9: "Crack my clear voice with sobs, and break my heart/With sounding Troilus.")

Chaucer sets the precedent for Troilus' indulgence in self-pity and humourless despair, but his irony towards the hero is more sympathetically directed than that of Shakespeare. Shakespeare also takes the lover's lack of realism, which is followed by his acceptance of Cressida's infidelity, from Chaucer, but these are altered by the quickened pace of Troilus and Cressida. Shakespeare presents the sequence of events so hastily that the gentler emotions of the leisured poem appear distorted and crude,[67] and our reactions to all the protagonists are thus harsher and more shocking. Chaucer's Troilus discovers Criseyde's unfaithfulness by means of a dream, and at first he refuses to accept his sister Cassandra's interpretation of it;[68] and even when he does believe her and knows that Criseyde is probably unfaithful to him, Troilus still loves his mistress:

> But natheles, though he gan hym dispaire
> And dradde ay that his lady was untrewe,
> Yet ay on hire his herte gan repaire. (V:1569-71)

In the poem many days pass while Troilus comes to this realization;[69] whereas in the play the hero experiences all the disillusionment of his love affair in less

---

[67] Bradbrook, p.315, describes Chaucer's Criseyde as "dissolving her hesitancies only at the last possible moment, after three separate stages in the wooing have been depicted, and several years are supposed to have elapsed."

[68] Geoffrey Chaucer, The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, ed. F. N. Robinson, 2nd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1957), p.476: Troilus and Criseyde, V:1520-26.

[69] Chaucer, V:1538-39: "And day by day he gan enquere and seche/ A sooth of this with al his fulle cure;" while, at V:1574-75: "And in his herte he wente hire excusynge,/That Calkas caused al hire tariynge." Thus Troilus still clings to his hope that Cressida is true.

than an hour of watching Cressida with Diomedes. And, although Shakespeare's Troilus also confirms that he still loves Cressida, despite her infidelity, his assertion is qualified by the division of his emotions between love for the girl and hate for the man who has supplanted him:

> ... as much [as] I do Cressid love,
> So much by weight hate I her Diomed. (V:ii:167-68)

Chaucer's Troilus is given time to discover the reality of his mistress' betrayal, for it is not confirmed, visually, until he sees the brooch that he gave to her taken from the possession of Diomedes (V:1653-66). But Shakespeare's Troilus is put through this process far more quickly, being brutally shown all the evidence at the same time. Nevertheless, both lovers display the same sequence of reactions, although the later Troilus experiences them at speed. In Troilus and Cressida the hero suffers just as deeply as he does in Troilus and Criseyde, but more harshly and with greater spontaneity. At first, Troilus refuses to accept what he sees:

> This she? No, this is Diomed's Cressida.
> If beauty have a soul, this is not she; (V:ii:137-38)

but once he understands the truth, Troilus recuperates quite hastily and redirects his passion towards revengeful war:

> Farewell, revolted fair! and, Diomed,
> Stand fast, and wear a castle on thy head. (V:ii:186-87)

In between these two speeches, however, Shakespeare's lines suggest that his

hero has suffered through a lifetime of experience.[70] Shakespeare's Troilus differs mostly from his Chaucerian prototype because he makes his passion for love (which is thwarted) appear only equally important to, not greater than, his passion for war.

Chaucer's Troilus, on the other hand, is more of a lover than a proud warrior, and the poem concerns the love plot primarily, whereas Shakespeare's play makes the war plot predominate. The circumstances of war do not seem to affect the earlier Troilus as they do the later hero. And the lover's acceptance of his disillusion, in Chaucer, all takes place in the security of his own environment, so that it lacks the sense of danger which surrounds the sudden disillusionment of the hero in Shakespeare, and which occurs entirely on enemy soil.

The superstitious fears of Andromache and Cassandra in Troilus and Cressida (V:viii) are connected (according to Bullough[71]) with Troilus' dream, and with its interpretation by Cassandra, in Troilus and Criseyde. But in Chaucer this episode concerns only the lover's personal life, while in Shakespeare its

---

[70] Shakespeare's Troilus changes from: "This was not she" (V:ii:142) to ambivalence: "This is, and is not, Cressid." (V:ii:146) to self-knowledge: "Within my soul there doth conduce a fight" (V:ii:147) to rejection of past illusions: "The bonds of heaven are slipp'd..." (V:ii:156) to acceptance of the present situation: "the bits and greasy relics/Of her o'er-eaten faith are given to Diomed." (V:ii:160) Finally, he becomes even more objectively aware of himself and of the end of his love affair: "Never did young man fancy/With so eternal and so fix'd a soul." (V:ii:165-66).

[71] Bullough, p. 106.

development is far more significant,[72] being centred on Hector, who represents the city of Troy itself. His return to the battlefield, effected by Troilus, shows the final turning point in Troy's disastrous Fall. This scene in Shakespeare also has origins in his medieval war plot sources, and it is of importance in stressing how the "romantic" elements of the play, among the Trojans, finally lose out to its "martial" elements. For it is particularly Hector's disregard for prophecy, at this moment, which brings catastrophe to his nation.

Shakespeare emphasizes the scene's significance by moving from the more credible dream experienced by the wife of Hector, which showed "bloody turbulence" (V:iii:11), to the religious vision of the prophetess, Cassandra (V:iii:81-90), and then to the subsequent profanity of Troilus' rejecting her as a "foolish, dreaming, superstitious girl" (V:iii:79). As Presson points out, the importance of Cassandra's role has increased between the medieval sources and Shakespeare's use of them,[73] both in the amount she speaks in the play, and in the effect she has on the other protagonists. So this scene exemplifies the repudiation by the Trojan princes of reverence for traditional standards and for domestic obligations (a disrespect which Shakespeare shows as increasing throughout Troilus and Cressida). But his significant use of the dream episodes owes little, interpretatively, to Chaucer.

---

[72] Presson, p.61: "The treatment [of this scene] is Shakespeare's own."

[73] Presson, p.61: "Cassandra, whose importance in the play is considerable, is not mentioned as present by Caxton [and] in the Troy Book, she is numbered among the [other Trojan] women ..."

In Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde the men still appear to practise courtesy in their attitude towards the women;[74] but in Shakespeare's play neither Greeks nor Trojans display the attributes of true chivalry, even though the Trojans seem to show outward signs of courtesy, at first. These, however, are only superficial, and are never implemented with any real effect. In guarding the secrecy of a love affair (essential to the tenets of Courtly Love),[75] or in considering Cressida's circumstances, all the men dround her are negligent and contemptuous.[76] Chapman points out that Pandarus and Troilus, in Shakespeare, are ineffective in keeping the knowledge of her love affair from widespread circulation, once the lovers are united.[77] But, in both Chaucer and Shakespeare, Troilus is scrupulous in preserving his own reputation, while he is pursuing Cressida; and, in the poem, both men are careful, later, about preserving hers.[78]

While Chaucer's Diomedes is initially discreet in his intention: ... with shortest trayinge/Into his net Criseyde's herte [to] bring." (V:775), and takes

---

[74] Bradbrook, p.314, refers to the loss of courtesy in Shakespeare's play, and to Pandarus' observance of the Courtly Love code in Chaucer, when he "does not dare to press even for an interview [with Criseyde]."

[75] William W. Lawrence, Shakespeare's Problem Comedies, 2nd ed. (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1960), p.147: "Secrecy was essential."

[76] Bradbrook, pp.315-16, quotes Chaucer's Pandarus as asking Troilus not to betray Criseyde "to the world." She contrasts this with Shakespeare's later character, who identifies his role as that of a "trader in the flesh."

[77] Chapman, p.50.

[78] Presson, p.110: "Shakespeare's Troilus is anxious to keep from the court all knowledge of his possion for Cressida ... Chaucer's Troilus is as scrupulous in keeping the secret."

time to enquire about her former lover when approaching Criseyde (even though he is eventually as pragmatic as his Shakespearean namesake), the later Diomedes displays his own coarse antipathy to courtesy in his denunciation of Helen (IV:i:70-76). And he completely rejects all traces of emotional sensitivity in his seduction of Cressida (V:ii:7-61). In Troilus and Cressida, the question of her previous attachment is curtly put by Ulysses (at IV:v:280), who is himself only too ready to condemn Cressida by calling her irretrievably "wanton" (at IV:v:55-63), after she flirtatiously refuses to kiss him.[79] That scene's parody of the "very courtly counsel" which Nestor advises (at IV:v:22) reveals the contempt and callousness which is meted out to Cressida by Shakespeare's Greeks.

In Chaucer, Calchas makes a long-drawn-out sentimental appeal to the Greeks for the exchange of his daughter (IV:64-133), and this is treated ironically by the author who shows Calchas' wish to attract sympathy for his own plight. In Shakespeare, Calchas' request is shorter and harder, but actually shows more genuine fatherly concern, both by its emotional compression and by its reference to previously unrequited demands for Cressida's return:

> ... her presence
> Shall quite strike off all service I have done
> In most accepted pain. (III:iii:28-30)

Thus, in comparison to Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde, Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida enforces the harshness of Cressida's treatment by her menfolk,

---

[79] Chapman, pp.55-56, points out that "This scene has been interpreted both as proof of Cressida's wantonness and as bearing no reflection on her character at all."

while their speeches in the play imply that they are themselves driven in their actions by the expediency of the times. Shakespeare's portrayal of the heroine is generally considered far less complimentary than Chaucer's sympathetic characterization, because of Cressida's shallowness, and because of her lack of dignity.[80] Yet Shakespeare adds something to the characterization of Chaucer's Criseyde by stressing her "wit,"[81] and by showing her facile use of it. This shows up Cressida favourably in contrast to the crudity and stupidity of Pandarus (in I:ii:41-271).

In Troilus and Cressida, I:ii, which is derived from Chaucer as well as from Homer,[82] Cressida is watching the Trojan warriors with Pandarus, and she is superior to her uncle in both intelligence and poise. Chapman sees their roles here as reversed from their Chaucerian originals (in II:120-217), and he comments that Shakespeare's presentation "is not so much a deliberate coarsening of

---

[80] Bradbrook, p.314, compares the two heroines and finds, by contrast, that "Chaucer's lady [is] gracious and dignified ... restrained by modesty and pride."

[81] Chapman, pp.15-16, points out that "the rôles of uncle and niece, as they appear in the corresponding passages in Chaucer (II:120-217), where Pandarus teases Criseyde," have their comparative abilities to speak wittily reversed by Shakespeare. He adds that, "as Pandarus teased Troilus" in the previous scene of Troilus and Cressida, Shakespeare's heroine is "two stages beyond her lover in wittiness."

[82] Small, p.154, states that this scene "is suggested by the passages in Chaucer in which Cressida watches Troilus come home with battered helmet ... and that in which Pandarus makes Troilus ride by the window in which he and Cressida are sitting ...."

Cressida's character ... as an adaptation of a character, born in one set of conventions, to a different set."[83] For instance, Cressida's first appearance with her servant, in I:ii, is an original Shakespearean scene,[84] which stresses Cressida's gift for repartee and her high-spirited humour, as well as emphasizing her familiarity with the manservant. This illustrates the habitual lack of decorum at the Trojan court, and is an aspect of its corruption which is suggested by Shakespeare in all of Cressida's surroundings. It explains, and partially exonerates, her indiscretions; Cressida has lost her innocence, but not necessarily her virginity,[85] in this sullied environment. The heroine portrayed by Shakespeare is thus lively and youthfully amoral when the play begins, and he has skilfully combined her initial wittiness and naivété with a later fatalistic resignation to the role demanded of her in Troilus and Cressida. In this, the Cressida drawn by Shakespeare changes more than the Criseyde of Chaucer, who is dignified and reserved,[86] but potentially weak-willed and faithless, throughout.

The most important difference between Shakespeare's presentation of the "fall" of Cressida, and its precedent in Chaucer, lies in the compressed time

---

[83] Chapman, p.18

[84] Presson, p.112.

[85] As Bradbrook, p.314, points out, until the love-scene Cressida is "on Pandarus' word, still a virgin ('How now, how now, how go maidenheads?')."

[86] See n.80 above.

scheme which crowds all the actions of the play together, and which destroys the sympathy that could be aroused for the characters if their dilemmas were longer-lasting. This applies most of all to our view of the actions of Cressida. In terms of its pretended duration Troilus and Cressida is one of the shortest plays in the Shakespeare canon. (P. A. Daniel, in his "Time-Analysis of the Plots of Shakspere's Plays," points out that "it is impossible to assign to it more than four days, with an interval between the first and second.")[87] This has most effect on our reactions to those episodes of the love plot which originate in Chaucer. Unlike the leisured poem, Shakespeare's play does not give us time to appreciate the anguish of the lovers, nor to sympathize with their frustrations and with the helplessness of their situations.

Cressida is made far more quickly unfaithful to Troilus by Shakespeare than she is in the "two months" wait attributed to her in Chaucer (V:766). This is illustrated by the speed with which Shakespeare's scene V:ii succeeds his IV:iv,[88] and suggested by the emphasis which he apparently places on her

---

[87] P. A. Daniel, "Time-Analysis of the Plots of Shakspere's Plays," The New Shakspere Society's Transactions 1877-79 (London: Trübner, 1890), p. 183.

[88] Presson, p.130, points out that this later scene "shows dependence on, and at the same time independence of, Chaucer's version. In the poem, Troilus gets no closer to the Greek camp than the wall of Troy .... His doubts are prolonged over a considerable period of time ... [and Shakespeare] of necessity reduces Troilus' period of waiting ... [making him] an eyewitness of Cressida's unfaith ... because he saw an opportunity of building up an effective and rather striking situation."

easy winning by Troilus in the fast-moving events of scenes I:ii, III:i and III:ii.[89] And, as Presson points out, in Chaucer "the decision of the council does not occur the morning after the first night Troilus and Criseyde spend together. Troilus' passion has more than one night's satisfaction (III: 1718)." But, in Shakespeare, the lovers are separated only a few hours after they unite.[90] This stresses the intensity of their love-making and the emotional trauma of their parting. It also shows them to be the victims, romantically, of the "martial" elements in Troilus and Cressida, whereas the lovers are themselves the main concern in Troilus and Criseyde. This interpretative difference between the two is particularly disadvantageous to Cressida, because, in Shakespeare's drama, she seems hastily promiscuous yet comparatively unimportant.

In Troilus and Cressida the two major scenes which describe the lovers' parting (III: 1415-1533 and IV: 1688-1701 of Troilus and Criseyde) are compressed together in the juxtaposition of IV:ii:59-109 with IV:iii and IV:iv.[91] And, although Cressida reacts to this hasty separation with anguish, we do not have time to appreciate the unhappiness of her situation nor the real depth of her emotion. Troilus, on the other hand, accepts the end of their love affair with

---

[89] Neville Coghill, Shakespeare's Professional Skills (Cambridge: University Press, 1964), pp. 106-7, states that Shakespeare successfully gives "the idea that she was hard to win in the opening scene when she is not yet won ... but after that things must move swiftly ... because the other elements in the story demand speed."

[90] Presson, p. 126.

[91] Presson, p. 126, "Shakespeare purposely altered the original story in such a fashion in order to gain strong emotional contrasts."

surprisingly calm resignation. He does protest, but rather weakly, and his words: "How my achievements mock me" (at IV:ii:69) express more interest in his own loss of status as a lover than in any concern for his mistress. The episode where Troilus agrees to "sacrifice" Cressida (at IV:iii:7-10) also shows his love-sickness to be egocentric self-dramatization rather than unselfish love for his newly-won sexual partner. This difference in the attitude of the two lovers is brought out by Shakespeare, and has no precedent in Chaucer, where the hero is as deeply involved in despair at their parting as is the heroine.[92]

But in spite of his brusqueness and selfishness, and in spite of the hastened time scheme which makes him accept the loss of Cressida with more readiness than his Chaucerian prototype displays, Shakespeare's Troilus needs harsher evidence to convince him of his mistress' infidelity. Though he is faced with the "ocular proof" of it, in V:ii, and though this contracts vividly against the long-drawn-out process of disillusion which Chaucer's Troilus experiences,[93] the hero of Troilus and Cressida undergoes real suffering and a violent change in

---

[92] In Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde the hero: "Disposed wood out of his wit to breyde,/So sore hym sat the chaunging of Criseyde" at IV:230-31. From there on, Troilus laments his loss, refusing Pandarus' consolations and considering himself: "the wofullest wight/That evere was: for tyme is that I stewe,/Syn in this world of right nought may I serve," at IV:516-18.

[93] Pandarus considers it unlikely that Criseyde will return to her lover, as is shown by V:507-8, but Troilus persists in trusting her, for at V:686 he still hopes "That she shal come." After another ten days of waiting in vain he becomes jealous (V:1213); dreams of a "bor" embracing Criseyde (V:1240); receives a letter from Criseyde promising to come (V:1428); and another "but she nyste whenne" (at V:1619). This brings Troilus to realization of his loss, at V:1645, and his suspicions are confirmed when he sees the brooch he gave to Criseyde being worn by his brother Delphobus, who won it from Diomede, at V:1660-66.

his attitude, when he is shown her unquestionable betrayal (at V:ii:116-60). In all, therefore, Shakespeare's characterization of Troilus displays the toughness of his warrior origin, and a selfish blindness which is more desperate than the weakness and gentleness of the lover in Chaucer.[94] Of the two, Shakespeare's hero is less sensitive but more obdurate in his determined "constancy."

As my comparison of Shakespeare's love plot with its origin in Chaucer's poem illustrates, the accelerated time scheme of Troilus and Cressida shows how the war plot intrudes upon the love plot, and deleteriously affects it. An awareness of time soon running out for them is inherent in the behaviour of all its characters: and this also affects the judgment of the audience. There are other ways in which "Time" is of particular importance in Troilus and Cressida,[95] and they include an aspect which is investigated by John Bayley, in his article

---

[94] Small, p.154: "The character of Troilus ... shows an enthusiastic dreaminess like that of Chaucer's young lover; this is combined with the stern, warrior-like qualities corresponding to Caxton's characterization of Troilus." Troilus' first known appearance in literature occurs in the Iliad, where he is mentioned in only one line, 95, as the youngest son of Priam.

[95] The play is noted for its preoccupation with time. For instance: Derek A. Traversi, "Troilus and Cressida" Scrutiny, 7 (1939), 305" ... the action of time is simultaneously creative [and] the flaw at the heart of passion .... Troilus and Cressida aims at a dramatic presentation of this contradiction"; and Kenneth Muir, "Troilus and Cressida," Shakespeare Survey, 8 (1955), 29: "the Troilus situation [shows] an obsessive concern with the power of Time." Other similar comments include Kimbrough, Shakespeare's "Troilus and Cressida ...," pp.177-78: "the theme, [that] of Time the common arbitrator, the force in life which works to defeat our successive expectations. ... tend [s] to prevent our being drawn emotionally into the action of the play."

"Time and the Trojans," where he states that it "is evidently not the emphasis on time that counts here but the dramatic use which Shakespeare made of it."[96]

Bayley distinguishes Troilus and Cressida from the rest of the Shakespeare canon. "In all Shakespeare's other plays," he says, "we feel that the present time as enacted on the stage not only depends on the past but is in the service of the future." He states that the apparent "freedom" of Shakespeare's characters elsewhere is due to their implied consciousness of what is external to the world of their play (whereas in Troilus and Cressida everything apparently "takes place, and ends in, the present").[97] Thus it is "simply a play confined to the time it takes to act ... a two dimensional unity."[98] Bayley sees the unusual absence of "novelist's time," as contributing to the incoherence of the personalities as they are presented in Troilus and Cressida,[99] and to the apparent domination of Thersites, who is "disconcertingly on top in his conviction that everything is meaningless except the present moment," and whose claim that it is only "fashion" which has significance is never refuted.[100]

---

[96] John Bayley, "Time and the Trojans," Essays in Criticism, 25 (1975), 57.

[97] Bayley, p.57.

[98] Bayley, p.57.

[99] Bayley, p.58: "Novelist's time - and in general Shakespearean time - accumulates character and perspective ... (but) if the playwright ... implies that novelist's time does not exist for him he is left with the headless and senseless trunk of an action, devoid of the reality which can only come from knowledge of what went before and must come after. 'This is where such a playwright as Beckett begins .... The only surprise here must be a perpetual present."

[100] Bayley, p.64.

This preoccupation with the present explains, for Bayley, the strangely persistent effect of Thersites' unpleasant words, in spite of the audience's desire to repudiate them. It also explains, for him, the play's emphasis on short-term values in its imagery, structure, and apparent lack of character development. In my own view, however, some of these characters are developed, though this happens too quickly for easy discernment. Shakespeare's concentrated use of images and similes emphasizing transiency and neglect for continuity are indications of the short-term outlook which is held by most of his protagonists, and this outlook is partly caused by their wartime situation and not only by their personal superficiality. There are, however, suggestions among some of them of an attitude based on longer-term values. And, although I find Bayley's description of most of the play's characters as "two-dimensional" to be generally applicable, I also see a few of them as acquiring some depth of characterization in the course of the action. But these protagonists owe their appearance of shallowness to their preoccupation with the immediate moment. 1

I would therefore suggest that Shakespeare has deliberately hidden their actual long-term associations so as to stress the play's sense of impending doom; so as to accentuate their self-centredness; and so as to emphasize the traditional connections, for many of his leading war plot characters, with the epic of Homer. I would also suggest that the style of Shakespeare's presentation may have been influenced by the narrative method of the sources used for the war story. Such a method accounts for actions only in external terms, and does not lend itself readily to perceptible introspection among the characters. The "shallow" effect of Troilus and Cressida can thus be compared with one of the definitions set out

by Eric Auerbach at the beginning of his book Mimesis, where, in his examination of the differences between pre-Christian writers of epic,[101] he makes a distinction between two contrasting styles that he labels as "Homeric" and "Old Testament." In defining the "Homeric" style Auerbach cites "a local and temporal present which is absolute;" and this seems to apply, dramatically, to Troilus and Cressida. The "Homeric" style never "gives any impression of perspective in time and place"; but relies on "fully externalized description, ... (with) all the events in the foreground, (and) ... few elements of historical development."[102] (But the other style, according to Auerbach's definition, has some parts shown in high relief while others are obscure, suggesting "multiple meanings and the need for interpretation.")[103]

Application of Auerbach's "Homeric" definition to this play shows that Troilus and Cressida displays many of its "stylistic" restrictions. The descriptions within it, which are "externalized," are epitomized in the constant use of personal comments between the protagonists, and in the emphasis on their concern for only physical attributes (as, for example, when Thersites insults his fellow Greeks by bestial comparisons in his descriptions of Ajax at V:iii:251 and 263, and when Pandarus tediously recites an anecdote about Helen at I:ii:102-69). The "official" descriptions which are given by Ulysses or Aeneas

---

[101] Eric Auerbach, Mimesis, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton: University Press, 1953), p.7.

[102] Auerbach, p.23.

[103] Auerbach, p.23.

are also concerned almost entirely with outward appearances (in I:iii:163-84, IV:v:56-63, and IV:v:96-112), and Hector's final recognition of the Trojan hypocrisy and corruption is symbolized by his own words when he finds that the corpse he has stripped of its armour is "fair [only] without," (V:viii:i). Thus Auerbach's "Homeric" definition of a "lack of perspective [in] time and place"[104] applies to Shakespeare's presentation of most characters in Troilus and Cressida, and it is corroborated by Bayley's judgment of them as being concerned only about the "present time."

In all, therefore, some of the re-arrangement of events which have been taken by Shakespeare from his various sources for both the war plot and the love plot in Troilus and Cressida, and his unusual emphasis on the different aspects of "Time," provide us with protagonists who are mostly limited to the "extant moment," and who have little regard for the past or for the future. Shakespeare stresses this latter neglect by showing their decreasing concern for matters of productive and lasting value (and these are all interests which I have categorized among the play's "romantic" elements). I consider, however, that this unconcern is not entirely predominant when Troilus and Cressida begins. I therefore intend to demonstrate that the increasing neglect for the elements of "romance" which is shown by the Trojans as the play proceeds is one way in which Shakespeare illustrates the deterioration of their spurious chivalry into final and obvious savagery.

---

[104] Auerbach, p.23.

Hector especially takes on the pragmatic materialism which is at first associated with the Greeks and loses his apparent courtesy so that he eventually cannot distinguish between external richness and internal worth. Each of the major characters in Troilus and Cressida has an equivalent opposite among the Greeks, so I therefore intend to examine the change in Hector's character by comparing him to Ulysses, and I intend to examine the development of Troilus' character by comparing him to Achilles. I shall investigate the actions and attitudes of both these pairs of protagonists and show that Hector follows the indirect lead of Ulysses in becoming more pragmatic and less chivalrous while Troilus and Achilles both dedicate themselves, finally, to those "martial" elements, which Ulysses epitomizes. Thus, even though some of the play's leading protagonists favour its "romantic" elements when it begins most of them give their total support to its warfaring aims, when it ends.

Chapter III: Hector and Ulysses

"And fame in time to come canonize us" (II:ii:202)

Shakespeare illustrates two of his major innovations in the story of the Trojan war by his dramatizations of Hector's challenge to the Greeks, and of Ulysses' plan to meet it. These are both based on incidents from the sources,[1] which Shakespeare has extended significantly, and in which he has emphasized the development of the characters instead of presenting an impersonal catalogue of events. Although Shakespeare's innovations include the lapse of a period of time between Hector's issue of his challenge (I:iii:261-83) and the fighting of his duel (IV:v:65), and although this is filled by several eventful scenes of the play, Hector himself figures in only one of them. In this time, therefore, Shakespeare gives the audience the opportunity to consider Hector's ambivalent qualities (as they are displayed in the Trojan council scene at II:ii), and he also emphasizes the machinations set in motion on the other side, by Ulysses, and devotes much of the intervening time to the Greeks' discussion of their strategy.

The schemes of Ulysses (particularly in his attempt to make Ajax the unwitting means of pulling "Achilles down" at I:iii:385) contribute to a portrait of this Greek leader which stresses his inherent duplicity. Shakespeare shows that Ulysses, in his plan to manipulate the characters and circumstances of the play

---

[1] Small, p.166, "Hector's challenge to single combat with a Greek ... is taken from the Iliad, Book VII .... This is one of the main motives of the play. As in Shakspere ... so in the Iliad, the Greek champion is selected by lot, and the lot falls on Ajax." But Ulysses' manipulation of the lottery is original in Shakespeare.

towards the war, represents the strongest force for those "martial" elements which eventually overcome all the "romantic" elements that are initially represented by Hector. But, on examination, Shakespeare's characterization of the Trojan prince reveals an ambivalence between his apparently chivalrous values and his contradictory actions so that he appears to have double standards. Thus Hector is finally exposed as having much the same attitude of pragmatism as Ulysses rather than that of unselfish courtesy with which he is ostensibly identified at first. He does not "romantically" oppose Ulysses' "martial" aims but instead replicates them; and while Ulysses pursues his aim of power among the Greeks through the renewal of warfare,[2] Hector's actual goal is that of fame for himself in fighting even at the expense of his life.

Other apparent differences between these two protagonists hide several attitudes in which they are actually alike. Most criticisms of Troilus and Cressida interpret the two nations throughout in terms of their respective initial characteristics without investigating the changes that occur in the course of the play's actions. They are defined as: "The Greeks [who represent] a realistic attitude to war in the calculating Ulysses and the troublesome stupidity and might of Ajax and Achilles ..." and "the Trojans [who represent] a chivalrous and courtly attitude to war ..."[3] (with Hector often cited as epitomizing chivalry).

---

[2] Robert Grudin, "The Soul of State: Ulyssean Irony in Troilus and Cressida," Anglia, 93 (1975), 56, points out that "Though superficially a counselor, Ulysses is actually a leader whose suggestions and devices dominate Greek policy throughout the play ... [and that] as a subordinate prince, Ulysses must contrive to lead without letting his associates know how completely they are being led."

[3] R. J. Smith, "Personal Identity in Troylus and Cressida," English Studies in Africa, 6 (1963), 9.

These definitions are correct when the play begins, but they are changed as it proceeds and although the qualities of courtesy are ingrained more deeply within the personality of Hector than within that of any other warrior in the play,[4] the only satisfactory explanation that can be given for the way in which they are shown to lose their inner meaning, as it progresses, is that these virtues are supposed ultimately to be seen as merely an outward shell.

There are three important standards of conduct which should be supported by the behaviour of Hector, (although their ethical value is implied rather than explicitly stated), and in the course of the play's actions, Hector lets all three fall. They specifically concern: the sanctity of marriage; the sense of religion; and the tradition of obedience within an hierarchical system of order. All of these are shown, at first, as attributes which are disregarded by the Greeks; and in turning away from them, Hector is therefore following the lead of his opponents, who appear to be divorced from care for matrimony, for spirituality, or for loyalty to their own code. The most obvious perpetrator of this neglect, among the Greeks, is Ulysses;[5] and the Trojan who first follows his example, is Troilus. Thus, the youngest prince acts as intermediary in passing on the loss of these standards to his eldest brother.

Throughout the play, therefore, there is a pattern of Greek disrespect for these ethical standards being steadily imitated by the Trojans; and it is in those

---

[4] Kimbrough, Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida ...", p.112, cites Hector as "a perfect knight."

[5] R. J. Smith, p.8, describes Ulysses as "cold, calculating and realistic without any hint of heroic qualities."

scenes which involve Hector especially that the Trojan leader is seen as increasingly neglectful of those values which are associated with him at the beginning of the play.

In Troilus and Cressida, "sanctity of marriage" includes the regard for chastity, domesticity, kindness and careful ceremony towards women, and its observance suggests fruitfulness and fertility, both for individuals and for the welfare of their surroundings. Its absence is therefore shown by references in the play to thwarted growth and to organic sterility. The "sense of religion" is defined less by traditional attitudes to the deities (because they were partisan in the Trojan war and even fought in it) than by the manner in which the characters of the play take oaths, and their consequent regard for keeping them; by all suggestions of supernaturally operating powers; and by care for the mystery behind the meaning of the words which they utter. These aspects suggest a latently Christian concept of ideals and their neglect therefore shows, in late sixteenth-century terms, a movement away from the worship of God, and towards evil. As for the play's traditions of obedience, the Greeks are primarily members of an army and the Trojans a family unit; so that both sides should be expected to show unquestioning loyalty to their leaders and the Trojans should also observe absolute paternal authority. Among the Greeks, this last standard would be classified as "martial"; but among the Trojans, it is both "martial" and "romantic" because it is connected with domesticity. The other standards that I have mentioned also fall within that "romantic" category.

But any such orderliness is notably absent in the scenes where the Trojans' conduct of the war is debated. Their attitude is similarly disobedient

and resembles that of the Greeks in their council.[6] The Greek view of authority is unequivocally male while consideration for females intrudes into that of the Trojans, and diverts their attention from total involvement in war. In his article "War and Manliness in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida," Emil Roy sees this play as setting out the contrasting identity patterns of allegiance to the father figure against allegiance to the mother figure, with the Greeks representing a "competitive fatherland outside Troy, and seeing themselves as father and sons ... while the Trojans see masculinity as submission to an idealized form of woman .... Troy and Helen [represent] the mother figure ... [and the] Greeks emphasize Jove [in their] grasping and heroic masculinity, while the Trojans have a fraternal, more beautiful world."[7] This definition certainly applies at the beginning of the play, where the absence of respect for the father figure, Priam, and the immoral presence of Helen, have a corrupting and softening effect on the general appearance and the self-expression of the Trojans, in contrast to the severity and the apparent harshness of the Greeks. The few references to family that are made by the latter significantly concern only the men: for instance, Ajax says to Nestor "Shall I call you father?" (at II:iii:253) and Ulysses tries to provoke Achilles by suggesting his son's loss of respect for him, if Achilles abstains from fighting because of a woman:

---

[6] Kimbrough, Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida ...", p.113, points out that, because Priam "is the observer and not the observed" at the Trojan debate, "there arises the dangerous implication that the 'specialty of rule' is being neglected within the walls of Troy just as it is in the Greek camp."

[7] Emil Roy, "War and Manliness in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida," Comparative Drama, 7, (1973), 109.

> But it must grieve young Pyrrhus now at home,
> When fame shall in our islands sound her trump,
> And all the Greekish girls shall tripping sing,
> 'Great Hector's sister did Achilles win,
> But our great Ajax bravely beat down him.' (III:iii:209-13)

The trojan princes, however, emphasize the importance of their women: for instance, Hector issues his challenge in the name of his wife (at I:iii:275) and Troilus refers to "mothers" (at V:ii:130) at a point where Ulysses finds it totally inappropriate to mention them (V:ii:134). Later, Troilus stresses the fact that the news of Hector's death must be broken to Hecuba as well as to Priam (at V:x:15). All this shows that the Trojans continue to observe their chivalric concern for women, which is part of the "romantic" elements in the play, even when they begin to turn away towards other "martial" interests. But although their apparent dependence on women, and their interest in the mother figure, lingers, their attitude of respectful care for her is steadily decreased.

Hector is twice mentioned in the play before his first appearance on the stage, and both references prepare the way for his increasing disregard of courtesy. Divergence from his customarily chivalrous behaviour is recounted (at I:ii:2-11) when Hector's impatience and anger have been directed, by word, against his wife, and by deed, against his subordinate: "He chid Andromache and strook his armourer" (at I:ii:6). Here the use of the terms "virtue fix'd" and "husbandry" (at I:ii:5-7) indicates that he is usually a kind spouse and carefully industrious. This difference between Hector's reputation and his present behaviour becomes clearer in the references Aeneas makes to him when delivering his challenge to the Greeks (at I:ii:261-83). The

ambiguity is reinforced in two ways: by connecting the Trojan prince's ostensible respect for his "lady, wiser, fairer, truer..." with Andromache, the wife who has been so recently "chidden," and by interpreting Hector's words of challenge as veiled insults towards the Greeks, because these deride their womanless situation. (I:iii:275-83 show Aeneas sneering and gloating over the Greeks because the Trojans have their queen while the Greeks have only the moral right to possess her.) Thus, the courtesy of Aeneas is merely a veneer which transparently covers his mockery; and by association, this suggests that the courtesy of Hector is itself not entirely sincere.

When Hector directs the Trojan debate and finally decides for war to keep Helen, who is not the wife of Paris, (in II:ii) he is obviously guilty of disregarding the sanctity of marriage, despite his own lengthy support of its moral and peaceful effectiveness. The fact that he sees it as being upheld by the laws "Of Nature and of nations" (II:ii:185) is directly contradicted when he decides to keep Menelaus' wife at Troy. He thereby surprisingly aligns himself with Troilus and with the adulterer, Paris, and reneges against his own ethical argument.[8]

---

[8] Those who condemn Hector for his volte-face include Muir, "Troilus and Cressida," p.34, who states that Hector: "deliberately jettisons justice in favour of prestige"; and V. M. K. Kelleher, "Troilus and Cressida: Shakespeare's Vision of Fallen Man," UNISA English Studies, 6 (1973), 13: "Hector's moral failure must surely be the single most important event in the play .... His refusal to stand by his ethical position thus has a vital bearing on the subsequent action." But some exoneration for Hector is suggested by Reuben Brower, Hero and Saint: Shakespeare and the Graeco-Roman Heroic Tradition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), p.239, who considers that Hector "both sees the 'truth' and is drawn by his feeling of community and chivalric obligation to his brothers." I support Muir and Kelleher in finding Hector's denial of ethics unvindicated by his interest in his own, or his brothers', honour.

Hector's disrespect for the warnings of Cassandra, which he knows to come from "divinations's ... high strains" (II:ii:113-14), also indicates that he is ignoring his true sense of religion. And his clear rebuttal of the "way of truth" (at II:ii:189) goes against his father's admonition to Paris (II:ii:142-45). Hector thus shows a lack of respect for superior paternal authority.

As king and as head of the family Priam does open the Trojan debate but his role there is increasingly and significantly reduced as Hector takes over the council, even though Priam acquiesces in this subversion of established patriarchal order.[9] By implication, Hector then changes the Trojans' allegiance from respect for those "moral laws" which he has himself quoted (at II:ii:184) to support for the "appetite" of adultery. He justifies this disorder and neglecf by setting the "dignities" of his brothers and himself above the less selfish concerns of family tradition; thus, the strength of his fraternal feeling and his own ambition in warfare mean more to Hector than adherence to the standards of chivalry and domesticity. In this important change from his fundamentally ethical decision Hector is, therefore, initiating a decrease in support for the play's "romantic" elements, and an increase of interest in its elements of war.

In this scene Shakespeare shows that Hector is repaying his father's trust in him by indulging the unreasonable wilfulness of his youngest brother (and Troilus'

---

[9] Kimbrough, p.113, "Priam asks Hector for his opinion, then ... sits silently throughout the ensuing debate ... [although] Priam should be visualized in a central position during the scene."

own speeches are patently irresponsible).[10] Here Hector is indirectly following the lead which has been given by Ulysses in the preceding Greek council scene (I:iii).[11] The two-faced Greek politician expounds (at I:iii:78) the ideal of "specialty of rule" among his compatriots, but then proceeds to turn against it, and against his own words in its favour, by undermining the authority of the generals. He does this by means of his plan to rig the lottery so that choice of the duelist falls on Ajax (I:iii:310-91). Hector follows the example of Ulysses in being secretive, for, at the end of that scene, Ulysses confides privately, to Nestor, his plan for Ajax to be set ahead of Achilles. And Hector also practises a minor deception on the Trojans which he reveals (at II:ii:208) by admitting that he has already issued his challenge to the Greeks, even before they meet in debate to discuss the continued fighting.[12]

---

[10] Patricia Thomson, "Rant and Cant in Troilus and Cressida," Essays and Studies, 22 (1969), 42, "Hector never speaks again with quite the same moral fervour. For he has voluntarily joined his irrational younger brothers."

[11] Hector's assumption of his father's position in the council, and his following the lead of those younger than he, parallels the disorder of Ulysses' attitude towards Agamemnon and his instigation of the plot to discredit the Greek "General" (Achilles, so described at II:ii:211) by favouring his subordinate, Ajax.

[12] Coghill, p.121, sees Hector's admission that he has already sent the challenge to the Greeks as "the first of three misguided actions taken by him that lead to his death." Coghill describes the other two as: Hector's mercy towards Achilles, in battle, and his "pillage" of the "man in gorgeous armour," there. My own interpretation of these incidents emphasizes the "moral fatality" which starts with Hector's volte-face and ends with the pillage, but I see the intervening incident as Hector's refusal to listen to Cassandra or to his father, in V:iii, and my own intention is to emphasize the downfall of Hector in terms that are moral as well as physical.

After upsetting the former family rule of order, Hector's contempt for married propriety becomes more marked at his next appearance (in IV:v). He taunts Menelaus about Helen (IV:v:177-80)[13] and he shows, as Aeneas did earlier, an unpleasant irony under his style of straightforward chivalry (which has been suggested earlier in the play by the way in which Aeneas delivers Hector's challenge to the Greeks). In IV:v:252-56 Hector at first retains his respect for religion, but later disregards it when Achilles insults him. After his sense of family affection has effected a peaceful outcome to the duel, because Ajax is his "father's sister's son" (IV:v:120), Hector resists Ulysses' attempt to goad him into anger by mention of the potential Greek victory. Ulysses' prophecy (which events verify) is repudiated by the Trojan, but this is done with modesty. Hector says, significantly, "I must not believe you" (IV:v:221) and he defers judgment to "that old common arbitrator, Time" (at IV:v:225) thereby suggesting a more objective and magnanimous view of their fates than any expressed by the play's other protagonists. Hector voices this with an unaggressive diplomacy which Ulysses then reciprocates. But this moment of harmony between the Greeks and the Trojans is short-lived. Boasting is a feature of the Greeks' worst manners, and Hector's pride makes him succumb to their influence, so that when Achilles rudely confronts him the Trojan prince is unable to retain his calm neutrality. Hector then follows his opponent's

---

[13] Martin, p.21, [illegible] this passage while noting that the "levity with which both Greeks a[illegible]ns speak of Helen's adultery ... provokes even Hector to ... lapse from [illegible]ourtesy."

ill-spoken lead in an exchange of verbal antagonism. Both of the generals start to war with words and for Hector their pronouncement adds another step down in his moral degeneration, and in his decreased support for "romance" because of absorbing concern in the war.

When Achilles calls on the "heavens" for confirmation of his future killing of Hector (IV:v:246) his oaths are less sacrilegious than those of the Trojan which follow them because events will prove that Achilles, not Hector, is foretelling the future correctly.[14] Hector, however, utters extremes in defying the "oracle" (IV:v:252) and the god "Mars" at the same time, and, by mentioning "the forge that stithied Mars his helm" (IV:v:255) Hector also implies an insult by referring to Vulcan, the husband who was cuckolded by the war god (and who was therefore the prototype for Menelaus). Although Hector acknowledges his fault of thus "bragging" (IV:v:258) he persists in it by declaring that he will "kill (Achilles) everywhere" (IV:v:256). Thus, Hector's words of false prophecy violate the essential need for silence about the future so that his speeches in this part of the scene both defile the sanctity of marriage and display the hubris of Hector in his boasts. His deeds, however, remain chivalrous when he ends the fight against Ajax. So he still displays care for his own extended area of humanity because he continues to observe filial duty towards his father's relative.

---

[14] Richard D. Fly, "'Suited in Like Condition as our Argument:' Imitative Form in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida," Studies in English Literature, 15 (1975), 280: "Hector also seems half aware that Achilles speaks prophetic truth when he predicts in precise detail how he soon intends to kill him, yet Hector can respond defiantly."

But in his last scene with his family Hector neglects this third important concern. In V:iii he rejects the claims of the Trojan women to keep him back from the war, in the interests of all of them, and it is in this scene that he repudiates all three standards on which his chivalry has formerly rested by a mounting crescendo of denial. Hector sets aside marriage by rejecting Andromache "ungently" (V:iii:1) in the opening line of the scene; he sets aside religion by disregarding also the pleas of Cassandra, when she supports the ill-omen of Andromache's dreams by speaking on behalf of the "gods" (V:iii:16), and on behalf of that essential "purpose" (V:iii:23) which should exist behind the words of a vow. Hector's desire for fame on earth now leads him to put his "honor" ahead of his life (V:iii:27), ahead of his domestic responsibilities, ahead of the ideals suggested by his innate sense of religion, and ahead of his duty towards his fellow countrymen and it is only when the women bring in his father to remind Hector of his commitments as a loyal son that he hesitates in going to the battlefield.

Troilus is now designated a "savage" by his eldest brother (V:iii:49) because of his attitude towards warfare, and he has rejected all traces of courteous standards.[15] This Troilus has done deliberately, by reversing former implied values, and by calling Hector's "mercy" a "vice" (V:iii:37), which suggests that he sees it not as a human quality, but as a bestial attribute "that better fits

---

[15] Martin, p.21, mentions how "Ulysses remarks that, unlike Hector, Troilus shows no mercy and Hector rebukes his brother as a 'savage' (IV:v:104-7: V:iii:49)."

a lion than a man" (V:iii:38). The reversal of Troilus' standards (which again affects those of Hector after him) also occurs under the auspices of Ulysses, and it is during the scene where the Greek leader takes Troilus to witness his betrayal by Cressida that Troilus' unmerciful values first take effect. (They are indicated by his increasing references to "hell," as at V:ii:43, to the "devil," as at V:ii:95, and to "Pluto," as at V:ii:102). And Troilus' dedication, here, to hatred of Diomedes in place of full love for Cressida (V:ii:167-71) reinforces his adherence to revengeful standards, so that the youngest Trojan prince now totally rejects courtesy (thus also "romance") and turns instead to "vindicative(ness)" in war.

But for the recklessness of his youngest brother who now (V:iii:51-58) leads Hector away from his family and from its implied structure of primogeniture (for the following of the youngest brother by the eldest shows disorder) Hector might still obey Priam. After his father's entrance and appeals, based on Priam's own prophetic knowledge of his son's danger (V:iii:65), after the domestic fears of Hector's wife and mother, and after the supernatural vision of Cassandra Hector falters and pays attention to Priam's "thou shalt not go" (V:iii:70). He then asks his father for permission to fight. But although Priam does not grant it Hector follows Troilus to the battlefield and thus flouts the tradition of filial obedience.

He is also denounced by Cassandra as an insincere leader of his people, at V:iii:90, and by his "deceit" (V:iii:90) Hector is shown to have changed to the hypocritical standards and expedient pattern of behaviour which were originally associated with Ulysses and the other Greeks, instead of keeping to those which were initially Trojan. Thus, by putting his own desire for fame

ahead of all his formerly gentle chivalry, Hector is shown to be more interested in his personal glory than in the general concerns of his race and his nation.[16]

Shakespeare marks each of these scenes, where Hector turns away from "romance," by an episode after it in which Troilus undergoes the same process on a smaller scale. In the Trojan council Troilus' concern with the choice of a wife and with his subsequent loyalty to her (II:ii:61-67) is undercut ironically by his dishonourable seduction of Cressida, where marriage is totally unconsidered.[17] In V:ii his disillusion in love and his new allegiance to revenge follow the same pattern of deliberate "religious" neglect as that of his eldest brother (as they are shown in IV:ii:252-58). After accompanying Hector to the battlefield (at the end of V:iii) Troilus turns away from Cressida's letter in a final repudiation of those "words" (V:iii:111) which her betrayal of him have proved to be meaningless. And in a different way this repeats Hector's own rejection of Andromache's pleas and avowals. Thus Troilus is openly discarding that softer, kindlier allegiance towards women which his brother has been steadily neglecting, although he now has cause to consider them unworthy of it. Both princes now seem to regard their oaths to fight as their first concern, and they also seem to have shed their "romantic" idealism and to fight only for personal glory or revenge. In this they

---

[16] A. Arnold, "The Hector-Andromache Scene in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida," Modern Language Quarterly, 14 (1953), 338, considers that "Hector makes 'honour more precious than life'" in this scene.

[17] Barton, p.461, n. for line 61, points out that Troilus "sets a hypothetical analogy" in the words "I take today a wife" (II:ii:61). This implies that his interest in Cressida is not honourable if he can, even theoretically, contemplate marriage with another.

resemble the Greeks (as they were portrayed from the play's beginning) by behaving as "Realists...[who] believe that what matters is to win."[18]

Hector's last appearances in Troilus and Cressida underscore both his innate magnanimity and the fact that this is becoming ineffective as it is detached from the core of the code to which he still adheres outwardly. In V:iv he spares Thersites in the battle because that Greek is not his own "match" (V:iv:24), at V:vi:11 he praises Troilus, and at V:vi:12-21 he fights Achilles and lets him rest, then chases an unidentified Greek soldier for the sake of obtaining his armour. In this last incident Hector's use of the words "beast" and "hunt" (V:vi:30,31) suggests his own deterioration to the level of a "savage" (as in the epithet he has recently given to Troilus), and it reflects ironically on their attitude towards war as a sport. (This has been exemplified at the beginning of the play by Troilus' departure, with Aeneas, at the end of the first scene. There it gives a corollary to Troilus' thoughts of physical love, at I:i:110-18, so that it also sets out a paradox of the pursuit of the beloved in "destructive" sexual terms, where the hart, or the hare, is hunted down for the sake of the pleasure to be enjoyed by the hunter in its "death.")[19]

---

[18] Coghill, pp.109-10, gives this definition of the Greeks' attitude, and calls the Trojans "Idealists or Romantics (who) believe that what matters is a code of honour and loyalty."

[19] The sexual puns on "hare" and "die" are explained by E. A. M. Colman, The Dramatic Use of Bawdy in Shakespeare (London: Longman's, 1974), pp. 191 and 197.

In considering the episode of Hector and the "one in sumptuous armour," which Shakespeare includes in his dramatization of the Troy story, some critical opinions try to exonerate Hector's savage behaviour but many more condemn him for it.[20] As this incident climaxes his mounting disregard for the former Trojan standards of courtesy Hector's pursuit of the soldier for his "hide" highlights the process of his own increasing adherence to that value system which was originally associated with the Greeks, and to neglect of "romance" in favour of covetousness and "martial" expediency. Hector's wartime actions in Act V can be ambiguously interpreted. He is prevented by pride from fighting against an inferior (Thersites, at V:iv:26-35), and in this he is scornful, not courteous. And his generosity to his peer, Achilles, is to his own advantage as well because he indicates that he personally needs a rest (by regretting that he is not "a fresher man" at V:vi:20). So the way is prepared for his pragmatic chase of the soldier in armour, which establishes Hector's loss of chivalry, and also displays his avarice.

---

[20] For instance, Adrien Bonjour ("Hector and the 'One in Sumptuous Armour'," English Studies, 45 [1964], 107) sees this incident as degrading the warrior who flees more than Hector himself. He asks "Should we brand [Hector] with a lapse from chivalric courtesy because he assimilates the fleeing soldier to a beast?" His interpretation shows the soldier to be rotten, or "putrefied," within. But A. S. Knowland ("Troilus and Cressida," Shakespeare Quarterly, 10 [1959], 356) considers that this scene "cheapens the value of [Hector's] chivalric vein" and shows his covetousness; while Joyce Carol Oates, as J. Oates Smith ("Essence and Existence in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida," Philological Quarterly, 46 [1967], 172) states that Hector "does this out of lust for the man's armour." She adds that Hector has, previously, "refrained from killing Achilles because of his egoistic desire to uphold his reputation" and that "the scene is also an allegorical little piece [most of the scenes involving Hector have an obviously symbolic, 'vertical' thrust] which suggests that Death itself is present on the battlefield, tempting everyone with an external show of sumptuousness."

Troilus, however, has previously pointed the way that Hector would follow towards "Greek" materialism by his own worldly attitude of possessiveness for Cressida.[21] He also regards Helen as an object to be bought and sold; "Why, she is a pearl,/Whose price has launch'd above a thousand ships,/And turn'd crown'd kings to merchants," (II:ii:81-83) and then he applies the same terms to his own acquisition of Cressida: "We two, that with so many thousand sighs/Did buy each other, must poorly sell ourselves..."(IV:iv:39-40), so that in the later scene he sees the materialism of their love as mutual.

Thus, when Achilles finally proceeds to attack Hector (V:viii) the cry of the Trojan prince that he is "unarmed" represents more than an announcement of his physical vulnerability. It also includes his quasi-spiritual realization that his own chivalry, like the symbolic appearance of the soldier he has just hunted, is only "fair without,"[22] and that he has forfeited from beneath its glistering exterior the essence of his concerns for the obligations of home, of religion and

---

[21] T. J. Stafford, "Mercantile Imagery of Troilus and Cressida," Shakespeare in the Southwest: Some New Directions (El Paso: Texas Western Press, 1969), pp. 36-37, points out that the "two worlds of merchantry and love (are) joined coherently" in Troilus and Cressida, showing "debasement of Greek and Trojan values" by means of "corrupted commercial images," and that Troilus is free of these when he is free "of the corrupting influence of Cressida." My own interpretation stresses the fact that the corruption is present in the attitude of the "possessor."

[22] S. L. Bethell, Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition (London: Staples Press, 1948; rpt. 1954), p.104, suggests "that Shakespeare saw in (this) incident in Lydgate an allegory similar to the 'whited sepulchre' of Holy Scripture: 'sumptuous armour' stands for the 'outward show' which covers an inner corruption." Bethell also points out that the word "sumptuous" was introduced to the stage directions by Malone, and did not appear "in the Quarto and Folios."

of his formerly high, "romantic" standards for the care and protection of his father's nation.

At the same time that Hector loses the attributes of true chivalry Ulysses begins to display more outward signs of acquiring them. Previously he supports the "martial" elements in style as well as endeavour but later on his style becomes, apparently, more "romantic." And he seems to take on some attitudes, which are, at first, exemplified by the Trojans, as the play progresses. These concern Ulysses' increasing outspokenness, his smoother style, and his references to religion (but not his attitude towards it). For when the play begins the Greeks show no awareness of any potentially religious power beyond their own human limitations;[23] and though both Greeks and Trojans make nominal references to the Olympian gods (who, according to legend, came down to earth and participated in the Trojan war), these do not fulfil the roles of moral deities.

Ulysses also resembles Hector in being described by others in the play before he himself speaks. In I:iii Agamemnon's ironic comparison of Ulysses and Thersites (I:iii:72-73) implies that the words of the former will be more worth hearing than those of the latter, who is the play's most scurrilous character. But, in fact, Ulysses has little to say of much import at the beginning of the council

---

[23] Knight, p.61, considers that the world of Troy, in Troilus and Cressida, "suggests the infinite and the unknown purposes of fate or God," while (on p.70) he even goes so far as to consider that the "intellectual" Greeks epitomize "the demon powers of cynicism." Although I agree with him (p.62), in his statement that the "love and honour of parents, humour, conviviality, patriotism [are, at first, present among the Trojans and are] lacking among the Greeks," I also consider that these "romantic" attributes decrease among the Trojans, and that they are later suggested, with cynicism and mockery, among the Greeks.

scene (I:iii:75-214) apart from a diagnosis of the cause for his compatriots' apathy and discord (which is the withdrawal of Achilles); and he offers no obvious remedy for that.[24] Thersites' condemnations and unattractive epithets, on the other hand, are unpleasantly voiced but do prove to be factually true, as the play progresses.[25] So a double irony operates: on the level of satire, Thersites is repugnant and, therefore, despicable in his suggestions, while Ulysses is exemplary in his wisdom; but at a deeper level, it is the speech of Thersites not Ulysses which comes closest to the truth in the overall interpretation of Troilus and Cressida. Thus Shakespeare's initial association of these two Greek characters implies a stronger similarity than that which is understood by the other protagonists' appraisal of their obvious differences.

Ulysses sets the pattern for Hector's later repudiation of domestic and ethical standards by his speech on degree, and by then personally undercutting its suggestions. This famous speech stresses the need for strict observance of an hierarchical order, yet Ulysses follows it by voicing (at the end of I:iii) his own intention of organizing the dishonest usurpation of Achilles' place as first warrior. He also undercuts the apparent worth of these values by his emphasis on them.

---

[24] Muir, p.34: "Just as Hector is the spokesman for sanity in Troy, so Ulysses speaks for sanity in the camp. But in both cases what they say has little effect."

[25] Paul M. Kendall, "Inaction and Ambivalence in Troilus and Cressida," English Studies in Honor of James Southall Wilson, ed. Fredson Bowers (Charlottesville, Va.: University of Virginia Studies, 1952), p.140, notes the "ambivalence between our revulsion towards [Thersites] and our unwilling acknowledgement of his truthfulness."

After a passing reference to the ideal "married calm of states" (I:iii:100) Ulysses states more strongly that: "each thing [now] meets/In mere oppugnancy;" (I:iii:110-11) and by stressing the word "dividable" more than its contextual neighbour "peaceful commerce" (I:iii:105), which should be made more desirable, Ulysses then proceeds to give far greater emphasis to the quarrelsome features, which he professes to abhor, than to those tranquil features, which he pretends to praise.[26]

Ulysses therefore effectively sets out a situation where everything is disordered, and by stating it makes it more real than the harmony, peaceful productivity, and traditional priorities of place and birth which he supposedly extols. He subtly denigrates paternal authority (I:iii:115), shows the position of "justice" as ambivalent under, not supervisory over, "right and wrong" (I:iii:117) and fails to suggest any obligation or kindness towards the weak and the foolish by deriding the opposite of strength as "imbecility" (I:iii:114). His Greek "sense of religion" extends no further than sight of the "planet Sol" resembling, and not superior to, an earthly king. And, although Ulysses sets out the Chain of Being impeccably from mankind down he gives no indication of its potential for upward progression above humanity. (As Tillyard points out

---

[26] Grudin, 57, points out that "an close reading [the speech] shows what happens without "Sol": chaos, appetite, etc."

"In Ulysses' speech on Degree the angelic end of the chain of being is omitted.")[27] By assiduously reporting the details of Patroclus' irreverent mimicry of "great Agamemnon" (I:iii:145-61) he manages to repeat the subversion of that general's authority, by spreading the ridicule further. Thus Ulysses shows himself ready to upset the Greeks' hierarchical order, while, at the same time, he ostensibly promotes it. He then attempts to establish control by disorder in his plot which would use Ajax to "pluck down" the "plumes" of Achilles (I:iii:385) and thus to usurp the military primacy of the indolent general.

Ulysses confides to Nestor, secretly, his plan for moving Achilles at the end of the scene where Aeneas delivers the challenge from Hector (I:iii:215-309). This is a dishonest scheme expressing the antithesis of courtesy or sportsmanship. Ulysses acknowledges that "'tis meet Achilles meet not Hector" but, at that point, he hides the actual reason for his own disquiet at Achilles' withdrawal, which also causes him uneasiness at the prospect of these particular men coming together.

---

[27] Tillyard, Shakespeare's Problem Plays, p.84. And J. Oates Smith, "The Ambiguity of Troilus and Cressida," Shakespeare Quarterly, 17 (1966), 143, points out that this speech on order is military, not religious, with imagery that is earthbound: "It is not a chain of being from man to God but a chain of command of the individual." The controversy aroused by Ulysses' speech includes the opinions of Theodore J. Spencer (Shakespeare and the Nature of Man, [New York: Macmillan, 1949], p.111) who sees Shakespeare as using these lines to "set up a standard of conduct which the main action of the play violates," and who cites Ulysses as "the voice of common sense;" of Terence Hawkes (Shakespeare and the Reason [London: Routledge and Paul, 1964], p.75), who sees these words as a "coloured overstatement" and who denounces the over-emphasis of the "medieval principles" of the speech; and of J. Kleinstuck ("Ulysses' Speech on Degree as Related to the Play of Troilus and Cressida," Neophilologus, 43 [1959], 63), who concludes his article by stating that the speech's "idea of a stabilized society, which is based on degree, is a mere dream ..., in which not even the man who preaches it actually believes."

It is not until III:iii:193-94 that Ulysses discloses Achilles' plan to marry the sister of Hector. He hints at it, however, when he is plotting to continue the warfare (at the end of I:iii) and he thus reveals the "romantic" aims of Achilles which would conflict with his own "martial" interests.

Ulysses uses sexual and childbirth terminology in his speech to Nestor, by the words: "young conception" (I:iii:312), "seeded pride" (I:iii:316), "blown up" (I:iii:317), and "breed a nursery" (I:iii:319).[28] These allusions also refer back to the scene's earlier imagery of sylvan growth which is used by Agamemnon and then by Nestor (I:iii:49-50). To Ulysses, Nestor indicates his understanding of the real matter behind these images by replying in similar sexual terms, with "small pricks" (I:iii:343) and with: "The baby figure of the giant mass/Of things to come at large," (I:iii:345-46). All these references show the implied necessity of a "mutual act" (I:iii:348) "miscarrying" (I:iii:351). Thus, in their double talk, Ulysses and Nestor agree to thwart the potential marriage of Achilles and the birth of his children which might result from it. Ulysses is politically destroying the hope for matrimony held by the Greek general and his aim in so doing is entirely "martial." On the other hand, the successfully "romantic" result of a marriage between Achilles and Polyxena would confound Ulysses' objective of continuing the war. This plotting by Ulysses exemplifies his devious approach, as well as his desire to manipulate his fellow Greeks.[29]

---

[28]Muir, p.34, mentions that there are fourteen phrases showing the sexual undertones of the dialogue between Ulysses and Nestor, at the end of II:iii.

[29]Kelleher, p.11: "The only person who has any real motive for continuing the war is Ulysses, and he merely hopes to increase his personal power by means of it."

In his later scene with Achilles Ulysses is more open and his manipulations appear to be less furtive. The arguments which he uses in III:iii are clear and plausible, and his denunciation of Achilles' wish for domesticity and personal advancement (by marriage into the Trojan royal family) is understandable when Ulysses openly shows it to be motivated by his own loyalty to his country's cause. Once again his "nursery" imagery ("cradles" in III:iii:200) is used to express the implied threat of an alliance befween the two warring nations which could result in a half-Trojan child for Achilles; for Ulysses' own purpose of extending their mutual enmity would be defeated by such an alliance. At this stage of the play, such intended treachery by Achilles is the only sign among the Greeks of positive support for the "romantic" elements and of hope for a return from their "wartime" lifestyle to normal, peaceful productivity. Ulysses' attitude, and "martial" justification, in working against "romance," is becoming more clear; and the loss of hope for co-operation between the two sides is also becoming sure.

Ulysses merges his admonition to Achilles with a reminder of his own intelligent power by showing that the "mystery" of "the soul of state" (III:iii:201-2) is an open secret to him. But in these lines Ulysses goes on to refer to the meaning and silence which lie behind prophecy, order and the making of oaths, on earth. Up till this point these have only been respected by the Trojans who avoid words about the future or about forces beyond their control (except in the legitimate case of Cassandra). But now Ulysses' mention of the "mystery" is an act which violates it, and his attitude reduces everything to pragmatic, worldly terms, which keep all matters within his own sphere of operation.

So he either deliberately ignores, or else is incapable of sensing, the existence of any power outside his own immediate area.[30] Once he has thus destroyed the power of "unknowability" of the "mystery" he assumes for himself the role of supreme and impenetrable authority. Ulysses' greed for power does not lessen as the play progresses, but his secrecy in pursuing it, does.

Ulysses therefore epitomizes the pragmatic rationality for which the Greeks have been noted, from the first. There are other signs, among the Greeks, of their sacrilegiously considering themselves equal with the gods and acknowledging no other spiritual superiors. These occur in their use of such words as "holy altars" (III:iii:74) and "worship" (III:iii:182) and especially in "providence" (III:iii:196) whose position, judging by the implication of his speech, is usurped by Ulysses. Thersites scoffs at ideas of sanctity or reverence in religion (for example, his profane speech of III:iii:6-21 ends with: "devil Envy say amen"), and the overall Greek attitude suggests that their mock-spiritual allegiance, if it exists at all, is paid to the personifications of sin and expediency.[31]

Ulysses demotes unworldly ideals to an entirely earthly level, and, after making the "soul" of the Greek "state" seem man-centred, he proceeds to equate Achilles' marriage with a pragmatic business deal. And this resembles the Trojan

---

[30] David Kaula, "Will and Reason in Troilus and Cressida," Shakespeare Quarterly, 12 (1961), 282, explains how Ulysses does not "try in any way to reform the collective will so as to bring it into closer harmony with that all-embracing providential will, which, according to the humanistic view, is implicit in the universal order of things for, as both his speeches on degree and the negativity of time demonstrate, he conceives of no such will as existing."

[31] Knight, p.59, describes Thersites as the "extreme personification of the view of life developed in the Greek party of Troilus and Cressida."

confusion of their spurious Courtly Love idolatry with merchandizing, when their ideals in love are debased by their connection with the lover who sees himself as buying his mistress. Troilus sets out this attitude when he calls Cressida "a pearl" and himself "the merchant" at I:i:100 and 103. In the word "commerce" (III:iii:205) Ulysses shows the Greek attitude towards materialism in matrimony (and this is reflected by Troilus' own expressions of it, in love).[32] But, while the Trojan prince employs the language of trade for precious luxuries (talking of "silks" at II:ii:69, as well as the "pearl" again, at II:ii:81) the Greek leader voices it more mundanely by describing the substitution of Ajax for Achilles as the "merchants'" show of "foul wares" (I:iii:358) in dry calculation. So, although the Trojans are affected by the commercial outlook of the Greeks, they still retain their illusions of beauty and think of their buying and selling in more elegant terms.

In their commercialism, therefore, Troilus resembles the pragmatic Greeks, even when the play begins; and during its action, Hector follows Troilus in becoming more commercial. This is finally expressed in the eldest prince's portrayal of covetousness. When Hector's "hunt" of the armour (V:vi:31) has brought him to understanding of the worthlessness of the "putrefied core" beneath its external beauty (V:viii:1-2) this scene becomes symbolic rather than realistic, for no corpse could have had time to rot in the interim. Hector's words concerning it have, therefore, more than immediate significance, and when he says: "Most

---

[32] Stafford, p.36, notes that the "basic commercial family of images" becomes the "primary means for expressing deflated values in the play, especially those involving love;" and he cites examples from among the Greeks as well as the Trojans, on p.37.

putrefied core, so fair without/Thy goodly armour thus hath cost thy life" (V:viii: 1-2) his words can be taken to refer to the whole stratum of chivalry with which he identifies, and they can also be interpreted as a foreboding of his own ungracious end. In his final self-disgust Hector now realizes that his Trojan standards have been hollow, and that, since: "value dwells not in particular will,/(But) holds his estimate and dignity/As well wherein 'tis precious of itself/As in the prizer ..." (II:ii:53-56) his own recent adherence only to the outmoded form of chivalry, and not to its inmost core, has no integrity. In arriving at this conclusion, Hector has followed the lead of his youngest brother and of the Greek leader towards unspiritual, earthbound, materialism.

The difference between Ulysses' pragmatic values and those to which the Trojans ostensibly adhere is also shown by the significance of Ulysses' reference to Ajax as "foul wares", (I:iii:358). Here Shakespeare is exemplifying another irony which goes deeper than the speaker's own understanding of it; for Ulysses' "foul wares" prove, instead, to be "fair," when Ajax's generosity at the duel matches that of Hector. In terms of "romance" Ajax acts beneficially by prolonging that moment in the play when its antagonists come closest to peace (IV:v: 119-233) and it is significant that Shakespeare gives to him the final dignity of speaking Hector's epitaph (V:ix:6). In "martial" terms Ulysses' use of Ajax is undercut by the responsive chivalry beneath his "blockish" appearance (I:iii:374); and, as Ulysses' values extol warfare and deride peacefulness, Ajax is "foul" in this behaviour where the "martial" aims are concerned. But, in terms of the values which Hector sets out in II:ii, before he reneges in the Trojan debate,

Ajax's behaviour is actually "fair" and benefits the elements of "romance."

The opposition of fair and foul is significant elsewhere in the Shakespearean canon,[33] and it is notable that the word "foul" is only used once, for certain, in the whole of Troilus and Cressida.[34] "Fair," on the other hand, is overemphasized by the Trojans (it is repeated forty-four times, with twelve other variations of the [redacted][35] and is most often connected with Helen). The over-use of "fair," therefore, and the absence of its corollary "foul" show an imbalance in the values of the protagonists and suggest that they are confused about knowledge of good and of evil, and particularly about the difference between outwardly "fair" appearances and inwardly "foul" reality. Their stress of "fair" epitomizes their absorption in surface beauty and unwillingness to look beneath it; while even Hector's originally sincere use of this epithet finally gives way to his discovery of its emptiness, when he adds to it the qualifying word "without" (V:viii:1).

In his efforts to bring Achilles back to the battlefield Ulysses had begun to assume some of the outward aspects of Hector's behaviour at the beginning of the play, so that he is less obviously "martial" and certainly operates less

---

[33] As, for instance, in Macbeth, where the witches' "Fair is foul and foul is fair" (I:i:11) sets the scene for the hero's entrance, where he first of all pronounces these words: "So foul and fair a day I have not seen." (I:iii:38).

[34] Hillebrand and Baldwin, p.277, cite the alternative Quarto and Folio$_2$ (also F$_{3-4}$) readings of V:ii:169 as "By-fould" and "By foule" (also "By Foul"), respectively. They state, however, that "most editors have silently preferred the Q reading without comment."

[35] T. Howard-Hill, ed., Troilus and Cressida: A Concordance to the Text of the First Quarto of 1609 (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1972), pp.97-98.

deviously. But this appearance of chivalry is only a veneer, assumed in place of his former cynicism, which covers his ruthless determination to continue the war. Ulysses' change of manner is shown by his speech which becomes more direct and less elaborate in style than it was in the Greek debate.[36] By appealing to Achilles' pride as a father, at III:iii:209, Ulysses is also, apparently, following the Trojan example of concern for family; and he projects this increasingly chivalrous image further, by his courteous behaviour towards his visiting enemy (at IV:v:211-29), where he speaks as decorously as his "modest" opponent, Hector. But Ulysses' veil of urbanity only covers his persistent irony. The uncertainty always aroused by his habitual deceitfulness still pervades this scene, for Ulysses' pretended "courtesy" is only a covering for his actual "martial" interests, as his threat to Hector shows (IV:v:217-21).

By mocking the Trojan style of speech at the same time that he uses it to improve his own persuasiveness, Ulysses speaks more clearly and pleasantly as the play progresses. He eloquently describes Achilles' wrath, in V:v, and there his previously contorted style is replaced by a balance and flow of diction which are delivered without any hint of his former deviousness and subtlety. And he extols the beauty of Troilus' exhilarating fight in near-poetic terms which have lost all traces of trickery:

> With such a careless force and forceless care
> As if that luck, in very spite of cunning,
> Bade him win all. (V:v:40-42)

---

[36] For instance, the contorted order of clauses in lines I:iii:205-210 is complex and unclear, when compared to the succinct, but still dignified, sentences of III:iii:145-74.

Thus, in the last act the Greek leader loses his habit of guile, once he achieves his purpose of resumed hostilities (which has been his objective throughout). The Greeks and the Trojans together merge their initial differences of expression because their two outlooks are becoming more nearly the same and both sides finally admire excellence in the practice of war. And the gracious and generous behaviour which was at first a cover only for the faults of the Trojans is now assumed by some of the Greeks; but their use makes it obviously travestied and this pseudo-chivalry is employed to celebrate the predominance of the play's "martial" elements by the protagonists on both sides. It is apparent that the imitation of Trojan manners, by the Greeks, is only a veneer of chivalric gestures.

The corresponding use of formerly Greek behaviour by the Trojans seems, on the other hand, to be quite sincere. From the end of IV:v, where Hector replies roughly to Achilles' threats, the language of the Trojans becomes harsher and more inelegant, thus differing from their earlier speeches in Troilus and Cressida. For example, in contrast to Hector's eloquence in the council and to Troilus' elaborate love-protests, Hector uses brutal words to the soldier: "I'll frush it and unlock the rivets all" (V:vi:29), and Troilus also speaks brusquely, in the same scene: "He shall not carry him: I'll be ta'en too/Or bring him off. Fate, hear me what I say!" (V:vi:24-25). Thus, while the Greeks assume a thin covering of courtesy over their essentially "martial" behaviour, the Trojans finally abandon their "romantic" appearance for the rougher style formerly shown only by the Greeks. But, although the Greeks' use of this "romanticism" is hypocritical and transparent, and suggests no depth of purpose, the Trojans join in Ulysses' support for the "martial" elements, totally. Their intentions as well

as their manners become rude and merciless; they also plunge to savage brutality towards the end of the play.

This exchange of values and their expression, by the two opposing sides, is also indicated by the image patterns of Troilus and Cressida. These may be connected with the conflict between the play's "romantic" and "martial" elements; for they suggest the "romantic" aims of domesticity and chivalry, and one pattern is at first delineated in terms of healthy productivity. It is implied, and then later denied, in the allusions made by the Trojans; while a contrasting pattern shows the "martial" elements and the savagery (to which both sides finally commit themselves) by the recurring associations of bestiality with the mangled remains of food.[37]

The gustatory images in Troilus and Cressida are seldom wholesome or pure, but usually stale or tainted so that they accord with the final unhealthy and unregenerative state of both of the warring nations. But some normal food imagery is, at first, connected with the Trojans: Pandarus refers to cake-baking, grinding, and milling (in I:i:14-28) and he continues these metaphors of production in some of his later speeches (with "egg" at I:ii:131, and "porridge" at I:ii:241). Cressida's responses of "millstones" and "baked ... pie" at I:ii:145 and 258 follow the same pattern. Although these are vulgar they also give the picture of a healthy, basic environment of husbandry and domesticity. And this aura of

---

[37] Donald A. Stauffer, Shakespeare's World of Images: the Development of his Moral Ideas (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1949), p.141: "The enemy, in the small and great worlds, is gluttony. And appetite, an universal wolf, at last eats up itself."

creativity is significantly absent from the background of the Greeks, at the opening of the play;[38] while, after they effect the exchange of Cressida, there is no more evidence of it in the Trojans' later references to eating and drinking.

Troilus (whose personal aspirations are phrased in Olympian terms) speaks of "nectar." And the much-emphasized "sweetness" of love, at III:i:19, 22 and 133, is overused by the Trojans. Yet, despite their sickly connotations, these terms are also connected with homely industry. Although these epithets all suggest the sentimentalized, sugary corruption of the Trojan Court,[39] they still retain the idea of productivity. In the later part of the play, however, even Troilus ceases to use them, for they represent the superficiality of the Trojan Courtly Love style, and by III:i, its insincerity is apparent. Here the references to "honey" and to "doves" are salubrious but indulgent, for they show Paris as a homebound drone, with Helen as "queen," in a setting where his potential wholesomeness has become debauched. And the misuse of the beehive metaphor (by Ulysses at I:iii:81 and by Priam at II:ii:144) indicates that both governments, which should be hardworking institutions, are out of

---

[38] Knight, p.59, substantiates this image of the Greeks by his denunciation of their "critical intellect ... unimpelled by intuition or some mode of faith [which] contains the seeds of its own destruction ... [and which is] uncreative."

[39] Edward A. Armstrong, Shakespeare's Imagination (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963), p.168, explains the habitual association of dogs, candy and flattery, in Shakespeare. Here, there is no dog; but the connection of insincere adulation, with "honey," prevails.

order, and suggests that a woman is wrongly in charge. (They support Roy's theory that the Greeks repudiate female rule but that the Trojans' lifestyle incorporates it). But the traditional hierarchy of rule among the Trojans is ostensibly patriarchal, with Priam in charge; therefore this metaphor of domination by the queen bee, Helen, in III:i points out its fatal corruption.

After III:ii, which is the play's central love scene, all fertile husbandry is absent from the vocabulary, for the Trojan security of situation and hope for continued prosperity are gone. Before this, Pandarus mentions an "orchard" (III:ii:16), and in bringing the lovers together, he refers to a "farm" (III:ii:50); but this wholesomeness disappears from the images used by all the other Trojans after they hand over Cressida to the Greeks. Only Pandarus retains his connection with the everyday products of nature and with the land. This is illustrated by the images which he uses at the very end of the play, by the "goose" and the "humble-bee" of the Epilogue (V:x:54 and 41), which then grossly caricature his earlier homely concerns.[40] But their bawdy connotations make Pandarus' final speech ludicrous, and accentuate its unhealthiness, so that his imagery in the Epilogue gives only a mocking echo of his former associations with healthy domesticity.

The Greeks' outlook, however, is shown to become slightly more healthy after the exchange of Cressida. From then on their behaviour is pleasanter

---

[40]Armstrong, p.58, where he emphasizes the unpleasantness of the Epilogue's lines, and investigates the sexual connotations of "goose" and "disease" elsewhere in the canon.

towards each other, while the Trojans are contrastingly quarrelsome. (In the battle of Act V the Greeks abandon disunity and are cooperative, as Nestor's words show: "So, so, we draw together" at V:v:43. And although Hector and Troilus are also united in its enactment they squabble inharmoniously before going to the battle, in V:iii.)

Before this "martial" unity takes over for both sides at the end, however, the play's domestic, farmyard imagery shows a decrease in the Trojans' "romantic" interests and an increase in the parodying of these among the Greeks, where it is connected with Achilles and with Thersites. Throughout, Achilles is the only Greek who consistently finds food to be appetizing, for among the others the images concerning eating are unpleasant or even suggest contamination, in the early part of the play. (For instance, they speak about Achilles as "fair fruit" which is spoilt by its "unwholesome dish," at II:iii:119, as "bast (ing) his arrogance with his own seam," at II:iii:185, and as "enlard (ed in) his fat-already pride," at II:iii:195.) But Achilles himself speaks of food without this unpleasantness as, for instance, when he mentions "cheese" at III:iii:41 and "batch of nature" at V:i:7.

These last two epithets apply to Thersites who describes food more wholesomely as the play progresses (although his own early gustatory images are themselves unappetizing: "vinew'st leaven" and "toadstool" at II:i:12 and 20; while "fusty nut with no kernel" at II:i:101 also suggests sterility). But some of the rural and homely outlook which is associated with Pandarus is also present in the later imagery of Thersites. He replies to Achilles' "nature" epithet (of V:i:7) with "thou full dish of fool," (at V:i:9); and in the last act he gives several

terms for healthy food by the words: "almond" (at V:ii:193), "cheese" (at V:ii:10) and "blackberry" (at V:ii:11).

Overall, therefore, Achilles does not show the same distaste for food (and by implication, for sexuality and for "romantic" interests generally)[41] that is displayed by his fellow Greeks. Their dislike of productivity, early in the play, is followed by some healthier consideration of it later (which is used mockingly). This is epitomized in the imagery of Thersites. After Cressida arrives among them, the Greeks' enthusiasm for food increases, while that of the Trojans decreases correspondingly; and this reaches a climax at V:ii:159-60 where the images employed by Troilus resemble those of the Greeks, earlier. At III:iii:148, Ulysses speaks of "scraps" of food as being greedily "devoured" and this same unpleasant carniverous metaphor is used later by Troilus, when his former "relish" (of III:ii:19) is changed to nausea at the sight of Cressida's infidelity: "the orts of her love,/The fragments, scraps, the bits and greasy relics/Of her o'er eaten faith are given to Diomed." (V:ii:158-60)[42]

At the beginning, the theme of healthy productivity is mostly associated with the Trojans and that of sterility with the Greeks. But as it progresses, these

---

[41] Caroline Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1936), p.147, points out that love is both food and hunger, and emphasized as "bitter-sweet," in Shakespeare.

[42] Muir, pp.29-30, also notes that these lines show a connection with the same imagery, concerning time and food, in Lucrece:

To feed oblivion with decay of things, (l.947)

and: Let him have time a beggar's orts to crave,
And time to see one that by alms doth live
Disdain to him disdained scraps to give. (ll.985-87)

divisions are less clear. And the play's images of disease also follow the same pattern of predominance among the Greeks, at first, with increase among the Trojans, as it progresses. These images pervade the Greeks' personal remarks to each other at the outset (for instance, at II:i:2-19, II:iii:18, 73, 84 and 175) and they finally infect the forebodings of the Trojans at the conclusion. Even though, according to Muir, "the numerous images related to sickness ... [are] confined to the Greek scenes,"[43] it is notable that, after their night of love, Troilus also hints at the thought of disease to Cressida: "you will catch cold" (IV:ii:15) and that she replies with a reference to "pestilence" (at IV:ii:21). And, although Thersites lets forth one more "disease" diatribe, (at V:i:18-22) all other references to sickness after that occur among the Trojans. (These are made by Troilus, at V:ii:35, by Cassandra, at V:iii:18, and finally by Pandarus, at V:iii:101-5 and V:x:18). Thus the infections of the Greeks are being passed on to the Trojans; but, after Troilus has had intercourse with Cressida, his attitude towards health and productivity changes from enjoyment to increasing distaste and bitterness.

The play's several allusions to childbirth suggest a similar reason behind the images of productivity. At first, these are appropriately bawdy when made amusingly by the Trojans and abortive when made wryly by the Greeks. But once the Trojan lovers have been parted there are no references to children within the play at all so that the later Trojan attitude resembles that of the

---

[43] Muir, p.30

Greeks at its outset. Ulysses employs childbirth imagery in his words to Achilles in III:iii:311 (and Diomedes disparages "breeding" in his talk of Helen, at IV:i:65), while Troilus' last words when parting from Cressida resemble those used earlier by Ulysses (for both are contra-productive). Ulysses has a "young conception in [his] brain" (at I:iii:312) when he discusses with Nestor his plot for goading Achilles into battle, but he plans to make Achilles' own plotting "miscarry" at I:iii:351. And Troilus uses the same imagery to describe his separation from Cressida, which: "strangles our dear vows/Even in the birth of our own labouring breath."

Ulysses' anti-fertility attitude is clearer still where he uses the terms of metallic imagery in contrast to "the organic suggestion of Achilles' 'marriage' metaphor," so that Ulysses denies Achilles' suggestion of 'creative mutuality' (at III:iii:112-23).[44] But sterility replaces the potential for fruitfulness for both sides in Troilus and Cressida. This is illustrated by Helen's ambiguous allusion to "two" possibly making "three" after "falling in" (at III:i:102) because this should refer to the natural process of love where the "third" suggested would be a child, in a healthy environment. But the "third" is instead exemplified as another person or rival lover, in the affair of Troilus and Cressida, so that together they are shown to lack the normal impetus towards productivity. This limits Cressida to her later role as a "daughter of the game" and denies her potential for motherhood. Thus, the apparently domestic attitude of the Trojans

---

[44] L. C. Knights, "Troilus and Cressida Again," Scrutiny, 18 (1951), 149.

changes to one of disintegration and depravity, while the Greeks' assumption of its former veneer does not contain any of its original associations with creative generation, or with the "romantic" element of productivity.

The exchange of attitudes between the Greeks and the Trojans shows that the parody of chivalry assumed by the former emphasizes the lack of integrity which underlay the veneer of the latter. For instance, Troilus' own interpretation of his role as devoted lover includes that of reaching up further in his "elevation" because he is wooing Cressida (at III:ii:15), but when Ulysses points out that Diomedes "rises ... in aspiration" (at IV:v:15-16) he is alluding to that Greek's ambition to be her lover, bawdily, and in a brutal parody of Troilus' sensual approach towards his lady. Diomedes' "courtesy" totally lacks any suggestion of spiritual idealism; and this also applies to the other "romantic" attitudes taken on by the Greeks.

Shakespeare's emphasis on the mockery thus implied is illustrated by his use of beast and bird imagery. The bestial imagery shows an exchange of animal attitudes between Greeks and Trojans, but the bird imagery indicates that the Trojans are closer to spirituality at the play's beginning than are the Greeks at its end.[45] An indication of the Greeks' inherent respect for the "martial"

---

[45] Walker, Troilus and Cressida, p.xxxvii; "Trojan light headedness runs to bird imagery, though I doubt whether this has much significance, for Animal Grab is to some extent a symbolic game for the idle Greeks until the dogs of war are unleashed and can show their paces in Act V." My own hypothesis is that this imagery reinforces Shakespeare's indication of the Trojans' spiritual potential becoming lower by the play's end (while that of the Greeks becomes higher in merely worldly terms).

elements is shown by their greater association with beasts of prey in the earlier scenes (while the same images apply to the Trojans in the later scenes). For instance, Ulysses speaks of "appetite" as "an universal wolf" at I:iii:121, Nestor of "mastiffs ... (at a) bone," at I:iii:390, and a "tiger" in the same scene (I:iii:48-49). Ajax is compared to a "lion" and to a "bear" at I:ii:20 and 21, Thersites to a "wolf" at II:i:80, and several other canine epithets are also applied to the Greeks.[46] But later in the play the predatory animals appear among the Trojans. After referring to themselves as objects of the hunt in the early scenes ("buck and doe" at III:i:117, and "hare" at III:ii:48, a metaphor which Cressida combines with that of "lion") the Trojans later acquire fiercer epithets. Aeneas calls himself a "lion" at IV:i:21 (a comparison that also applies to Hector at V:iii:38) and Troilus uses that term to follow it with mention of the princes as "tigers" at III:ii:77. Thus the Greeks and the Trojans exchange their predatory symbols in the course of Troilus and Cressida and although the Greeks appear to be fiercer the Trojans are, in fact, almost equally rapacious. (The interesting exception to this pattern is again Achilles, who is also both hunter and hunted, the "lion," at II:iii:86 and the "hart," at II:iii:258. These expressions about him resemble the early scenes' epithets for the Trojans.)

At the beginning of the play, however, the Trojans are connected more spiritually with birds, and this imagery is later assumed, with a difference, by the Greeks. Pandarus calls his fellow countrymen "eagles", or "crows and daws"

---

[46] Armstrong, p.169: "Shakespeare detested dogs."

at I:ii:244, Cressida is like a "new ta'en sparrow" at III:ii:33, and Paris talks of "doves" at III:i:128. Troilus mentions the "cygnet" in his eulogy on Cressida at I:i:60, and in the love scene, Cressida and he are respectively compared by Pandarus to the "falcon" and the "tercel" (III:ii:52). The Greek warriors are compared to birds after Cressida's movement among them, but in most cases they are represented as captive or unable to fly. Ajax is called a "peacock" at III:iii:251, "quails" are connected with Agamemnon at V:i:51, while Thersites (who is responsible for making most of these bestial and ornithological allusions) is himself still able to fly, but gives voice forebodingly as a "raven" (V:ii:191). In his similar comparison of Patroclus to a "parrot" Thersites implies that they are both kept confined, trained to speak for their owners but restricted from freedom. In this way Shakespeare's later presentation suggests a mockery of that spiritual potential which was originally the Trojans' but which is now utterly absent from their opponents' "chivalric" practice.

If the Trojans have descended to earth from their earlier height as "eagles," they still retain their kingship in their similarity to "lions." But the Greeks are elevated only to the dubious status of captive or ambulatory birds. The most domesticated and the most vulnerable creature is finally the "goose" which is mentioned by Pandarus in the Epilogue, and who may represent Cressida.[47] The

---

[47] Armstrong, p.63, where he notes the associations of "goose" with "gall." It is therefore of interest that Priam uses the word "gall" (II:ii:144) to denote the bitter effect of keeping Helen who is strongly associated with the word "honey" in the play's images. Thus, the Epilogue recapitulates the theme of the woman being fought over (formerly Helen, now Cressida), who is "bitter to her country" (IV:i:69) as well as "sweet." The questions raised here by the association of "Winchester" with "goose" have several possible answers. Hillebrand and Baldwin

fiercest and most overpowering creature suggested is the "dragon" of Achilles' threats towards Hector (V:viii:17) which takes over the earth, destructively, and blocks out the light of the sky. The goose reminds us of the lost world of farmyard domesticity while the dragon presages the chaos and barrenness of a waste land (and its coming has been suggested in the mention of fabulous creatures by the Greeks as the fifth act accelerates: the "Sagittary" at V:v:14, and the "sprites and fires" at V:i:64.) These contrast forebodingly and subhumanly with the Trojans' earlier descriptions of themselves as among "angels" at I:ii:287 and as "sprightly" at II:ii:190. Thus the Trojan hope for spiritual elevation has become, among the Greeks, a descent towards demonic subhumanity.

All these interchanged patterns of symbols and imagery and the loss of genuine courtesy which they indicate on the part of the Trojans is balanced by the gain of its hypocritical veneer on the part of the Greeks. The exchange appears after Cressida's movement from Ilion into the camp of the Greeks, but it may in fact begin when Troilus has intercourse with Cressida, or when her return is promised to Calchas. It can therefore be related to the presence, or abuse, of a woman among the different warriors on both sides. The changes in

---

(p.316) explain its theme of prostitution (as a "strumpet" was called "a Winchester goose" and the "publick stews were anciently under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Winchester"). Also, as Anthony Petti ("Beasts and Politics in Elizabethan Literature," Essays and Studies, 16 [1963], 88-89) points out, animal imagery frequently set out political allegories. So, when Shakespeare mentions "the humble-bee and the goose" in "an epilogue [to Troilus and Cressida which was] perhaps added in September 1603," he refers to the failure of Essex's rebellion and to "the fact that Ralegh [the goose] was to stand trial at Winchester, and might give evidence against him."

speech and behaviour also radiate from this point in the action, occurring just after the love scene and becoming more marked as Cressida is established within the Greek camp. Then, the word associations for the Greeks become softer and more wholesome, whereas those for the Trojans have lost their sense of productivity.

Thus the Greeks assume the outward aspects of chivalry which were, at first, predominantly Trojan, but without any of its original integrity, and all the symbols actually show that the Greeks have no hope for spiritual elevation. Finally, their "martial" attitude is shown as destructive, while the Trojans' "romantic" aspirations are shown as hollow and sterile and as entirely earthbound. Although Ulysses has indirectly influenced Hector in the Trojan's loss of chivalry, Hector's reciprocal effect on the Greeks promotes only the appearance of "romance" without its meaningful benefits of productivity, domesticity and respectful care for women.

Chapter IV: Troilus and Achilles

"The present eye praises the present object" (III:iii:180)

In this chapter I intend to show how the "romantic" elements of Troilus and Cressida are supported, for a time, by both Troilus and Achilles. That support is related to the awareness, shown by these two men, of a world which is greater than that of their own immediate environments. Shakespeare suggests that both Troilus and Achilles (unlike most of the play's other characters) have concerns beyond the limits of the place and the time of its actions, and he indicates that they each look for some greater sense of continuity, outside it. In this search, Troilus seeks an extension of his own identity in terms of fame and immortality, but Achilles only looks for it in terms of physical continuity. Suggestions of a life outside the scope of the play's action, and of a world outside its characters' immediate environments, are rare in Troilus and Cressida, but they are made nonetheless for some of the leading protagonists. These allusions are significant because they contribute a depth and an added dimension to the characters, developing them beyond their standardized limits as the stock figures of tradition, and thus making both Troilus and Achilles into individual Shakespearean personalities.

In considering the depth and background which are absent from most of the characters in Troilus and Cressida, it is interesting to note that John Bayley makes a distinction between Shakespeare's depiction of the protagonists in this particular play, and those in most other plays in the canon. Bayley defines Troilus and Cressida as the one play where Shakespeare fails to suggest the

characters' extra-dramatic existence in terms of "novelist's time," and he says that "we do not know what (they) are like because there is neither time nor occasion to find out ... neither we, nor they, can be aware here of the other world, of the novelist's world, in which time stretches into the past and the future." And he adds that "Shakespeare's technique (in Troilus and Cressida) deliberately abandons his usual sure mode of creating a complete human being, complete not only in terms of history but in relation to a family and a social situation."[1]

In my own view, Bayley's definition of this "lack of completion" is accurate for most of the characters in the play, most of the time. I consider, however, that in the course of the play's action both Troilus and Achilles show the potential for acquiring this "completion" by displaying their interests in extra-immediate concerns. But they each turn away from these interests and lose the opportunities to develop them. Thus, both these heroes give priority to the elements of "romance," for a time, although they both, finally, reject them. (For those qualities which I have cited above as exemplifying the play's "romantic aims" are connected with any interest that could be shown in a longer-term, deeper existence outside the limits of the play's "immediate" world.) There are occasions when Troilus strives towards an extra-momentary identity, but his self-centred attitude in love, and his misinterpretation of its promise of spirituality, prevent him from achieving it. And Achilles also attempts to establish himself in "the future" and thus beyond the play's temporal limits, looking for a greater, and

---

[1] Bayley, p.61.

deeper, existence in terms of the "novelist's time"; but he fails to realize it, losing his hope for long-term identity because his pride and sensuality keep him within the realm of "immediacy."

I shall therefore explain my own view of the circumstances in which these two characters come close to being "logically and soundly related to environment." At the beginning of the play Troilus shows an interest that stretches beyond his "moment in life" by his wish for posthumous fame, both as a warrior who dedicates himself to the pursuit of "honor and renown," at II:ii:199, and as the "true swain in love," at III:ii:165. (I shall henceforth refer to this as the awareness of "external time.") Troilus' claim for immortality is erroneously based on his illusion that the cause in which he practises the chivalry of warfare is just,[2] and that the "spirituality" which he looks for in his love affair should benefit only him. So when he discovers in witnessing Cressida's infidelity that their love together has been merely physical for both of them, he loses his faith in women as "idols," both generally (and this is suggested by his words at V:ii:132-33) and also, particularly, in Helen, as the "theme" of his chivalry. When Troilus' basis for

---

[2] Troilus apparently finds Helen "a theme of honor and renown" (II:ii:199), but, as Derek A. Traversi ("Troilus and Cressida," Scrutiny, 7 [1939], 313-14) points out: "the whole trend of Troilus' reply [to Hector's questioning of his brother's judgment] is to annihilate, or at least wilfully to confuse, the distinction between 'will' and 'judgment,' to show that 'judgment' is powerless and irrelevant once the sensual will has impelled man towards action. In other words, the basis of Troilus' honour is simply sensual impulse ..." This weakness of Troilus' conception of honour "is implied in the very situation upon which the play turns [the 'reality of Helen'] ... and this same lack of solid foundation is apparent in the undertones of ... the unacknowledged sensual basis of his idealism" in Troilus' affair with Cressida.

achieving fame becomes untenable he therefore rejects all hope for personal immortality; and he then denies his own potential as a character with more-than-immediate existence.

Achilles also shows the potential to belong in a time and a place which are "external." For him, however, these are only physical, not spiritual or eternal. Achilles' connection with an extra-immediate world gives him that "sense of character" which the play's other protagonists lack, for his apathy as a warrior covers his efforts to establish himself as a "lover," which are presented, at first, only negatively.[3] But Achilles later rejects this chance to make a place for himself within the "novelist's time" when he turns away from his hope for marriage with Hector's sister (which would give him identity in terms of earthly continuity) and when Ulysses finally succeeds indirectly in provoking Achilles' return to the war.[4] Thus, both Troilus and Achilles come close to relating themselves to "external time," and in doing so they both show temporary support for the play's "romantic" elements.

Troilus shows his awareness of "external time" in his ambition for fame and in

---

[3] In Chapter II, p. 40, above, I point out that Achilles' role as the lover is subordinated to that of the reluctant warrior, by Shakespeare; and in Chapter III, p. 90, I describe the secrecy with which Ulysses mentions Achilles' projected marriage. Altogether, Achilles' part as lover or potential husband seems to be deliberately understated.

[4] Although Ulysses' manipulations fail in their direct attempt to return Achilles to the field of battle, I consider that Patroclus' speech (at III:iii:222-24) results from Ulysses' preceding taunts against Achilles, and so, therefore, does Patroclus' own resumption of fighting. This leads to the news of his death (at V:v:13) and thus to Achilles' own "wrathful" return.

his early protests as the lover who hopes for transcendence in his merely sensual pursuit. But he bases the first on the false surmise that Helen is worthy of knightly devotion, and he disregards Hector's warning of "bad success" in a "bad cause" (II:ii:117) by making Menelaus' adulterous wife his "theme of honor." And in his own love affair with Cressida Troilus also ignores the implications of its immorality. He sees his own constancy as a lover as sufficiently ennobling to elevate him spiritually, even though his desire for Cressida is fulfilled only physically. (For, at this point, Troilus is unable to distinguish any difference between the spiritual and physical selves of a woman, so that carnal possession seems to him to incorporate "religious" devotion and inspiration, for himself.)

After the Trojan princes (apart from Helenus) follow Hector in turning away from the warnings of Cassandra, and thus deny the efficacy of any "religious" power outside their immediate world, they become pragmatic and earthbound, as are their Greek opponents, and they lose their potential for spiritual awareness or transcendence. If there is another world in which Priam and Hecuba have believed (and the implied importance of Cassandra's prophecy suggests that for the older generation, there is) only Hector respects it at the beginning of Troilus and Cressida. But once he turns away from its connection with morality, in favour of personal glory, Hector shows progressive corruption in his code of chivalry, which becomes thereafter a form that is empty. And when Troilus himself discovers the falsity of his ground for expecting immortality he also turns away completely from care for the future, or for his former spiritual idealism, by openly defying the gods' "imminence" (V:x:13) and by devoting himself to earthbound revenge in a deliberate reversal of his earlier hope for "canonization" (II:ii:202).

There seems to be a connection between the references to Time which are made in Troilus and Cressida and the capacity of its characters to relate themselves to the "external time" of the novelist because those who can view Time objectively also have the ability to establish themselves beyond their immediate environments. This applies to the attitude of the Trojan princes. Hector is able to look outside his own circumstances and his view of Time is co-operative, not antagonistic (IV:v:225), and so is that of Troilus (at II:ii:202). But Ulysses exemplifies, throughout, the contrasting view of total preoccupation with the immediate moment and his disparaging attitude towards Time depicts it cynically as a "monster" (III:iii:144-47) and as a "fashionable [and therefore insincere] host" (III:iii:165). Ulysses shows Time as essentially "envious and calumniating" (III:iii:174) towards its human victims; and he correspondingly gives no sign of interest in, or capacity for, relating to a world beyond his immediate surroundings.[5] His personal short-term values and his disbelief in the constancy of others is illustrated by this attitude towards Time, which he depicts as merely destructive without suggesting its productive complement; and this difference between Hector and Ulysses epitomizes a fundamental divergence between the play's "romantic" and "martial" elements. For in terms of "romance" Time can

---

[5] Knights, p.149, investigates Ulysses' underlying motives in his words to Achilles and concludes that Ulysses "is concerned neither with self-knowledge nor with mutual relationships. What he is concerned with ... comes out at 'applause.'" This suggests that, for Ulysses, the predominant power is "fashion" which is always transitory.

be spiritually or physically productive, but in terms of war it is an agent for destruction.[6]

In his attitude of short-term, "martial" values Ulysses resembles the Trojans' prime war-maker, Aeneas; for neither of these two men destined to survive the Trojan war shows any awareness of "external time" in Shakespeare's play about it, and each is preoccupied throughout with returning the action towards the battlefield. Among the Trojans Aeneas shows most interest in continuing the war, and least interest in a possible world beyond it. He exemplifies the superficiality (and thus the transiency) of the Trojans' formerly deep and lasting values. Aeneas carries on only the ritual of chivalry, and whereas Hector shows awareness of its true meaning, Aeneas displays its trappings with mockery, by taunting the Greeks (I:iii:257, 281-82), by his "despiteful gentle greeting" to Diomedes (IV:i:33), and by his consistent appearances whenever the love plot gives way to the war plot. Shakespeare thus indicates that Aeneas is more loyal to the "martial" than to the "romantic" elements of Troilus and Cressida.

He serves the purpose of leading Troilus back to the "sport" of war (I:i:115), of contemptuously complaining (after Cressida is handed over to Diomedes) "How have we spent this morning!" (IV:iv:140), and of finally steering Troilus towards

---

[6] Knight, p.71, sees the play's world as being "ruled by murderous and senseless time." A less one-sided explanation is given by Traversi, 304, who refers to the "apprehension of the simultaneous fulfilment and destruction of human values by Time" in the Sonnets, and who considers that "Troilus and Cressida aims at a dramatic presentation of this contradiction." The essential difference here between the Sonnets and Troilus and Cressida is that the verses offer hope, within Time, because of human procreation, while the actions and images of the play negate that possibility.

the battle (V:ii:182-84). The manners of Ulysses and Aeneas epitomize the early contrasts of oratory, in the play, between the Greeks and the Trojans, for, while the irony of Ulysses is more subtle and leads to constant uncertainty about the reliability of his opinions, the speech of Aeneas is openly ambiguous in his role as herald for the apparently chivalric Trojans.[7] But the ridicule implied by Aeneas' words to the Greeks is obvious by the time of IV:v, although only expressed slightly in such epithets as "the noble Menelaus" (IV:v:176) and "the old Nestor" (IV:v:201). Aeneas does not convey any sense of "romantic" value in his sarcastic speeches, and he always redirects the action back to the war (and thus towards its inevitable chaos which will destroy all hope for continuity).

The other Trojan character who survives (in terms of legend) and who makes no connection with "external time" is Helen. (She epitomizes Bayley's definition of the play's two-dimensional characters, and he compares the scene where she presides with a visit to a night-club where no one is at all concerned with their own outside lives or with those of others.)[8] Shakespeare's presentation of Helen is the play's most cruel parody, for, in becoming the Trojans' "goddess of love" she has apparently relinquished all qualities other than personal beauty and eroticism. When at last she is seen, in III:i, the misplacement of value in her on the part of the Trojans is obvious. Helen is blatantly stupid and obsessed with

---

[7] Although Lawrence, p.141, describes Aeneas as "brave and chivalrous," my own view shows him to be only superficially courteous (see Chapter III, p.75, above).

[8] Bayley, p.65.

her own idolized position at their court, as her few undignified words show: "Yea what he shall receive of us in duty/Gives us more palm in beauty than we have," (III:i:156-57). She is unable to talk about anything except the immediate moment; and among the many references made to her previous life, by other characters, only Troilus' remark on her appearance alludes to a time outside that of the play: "A Grecian queen, whose youth and freshness,/Wrinkles Apollo's, and makes pale the morning," (II:ii:78-79). Significantly, Helen has not changed from this, except for her loss of "freshness."[9]

In writing about her presentation in Troilus and Cressida Coghill points out that it is not the person of Helen but the ideal made from her by the Trojans that is the subject of discussion in the play, and that "it is not what she is (the realist's criterion) but how she is valued that counts."[10] Her worthlessness, however, is also cited by those same terms, for although Troilus finds Helen to be "a theme of honor and renown" (II:ii:199) the play's exemplification of his own standards for those values makes that definition questionably high. The denunciations of Helen as the cause for bloodshed are far more accurate (for example, those made by Hector at II:ii:18-20 and by Diomedes at IV:i:70-73). In a sense, these do connect Helen's image with the past, before the time of the play, but they cannot attribute an awareness of "external time" to her, because the "goddess" herself

---

[9] Traversi, p.312, points out that in this passage: "The juxtaposition of 'fair' and 'soil,' 'freshness' and 'stale,' touches the basic weakness of Trojan idealism."

[10] Coghill, p.118.

shows no interest in any time other than the present, and she has apparently no view beyond its immediacy. Thus these three characters, Ulysses, Aeneas and Helen, are the most fervent supporters of the play's "martial" elements, being dedicated to continuance of the war.[11] They epitomize the short-term view of their world, and they allow for no effective future or meaning for "external time" beyond the immediate moment.

Among the Trojans, however, Hector and Pandarus both suggest awareness of an extra-immediate world, the former consciously, the latter (probably) unconsciously. They can therefore be at one with "external time" and accept its effects; for, at the opening of the play, Pandarus observes that "time will friend or end" Troilus in his pursuit of Cressida (I:ii:77). This same attitude is shown later in Hector's more eloquent reference to "That old common arbitrator, Time/ [which] Will one day end it," (IV:v:225-26). But Hector is alone among the Trojans in retaining such objectivity, after the council scene, and his acceptance of Time's comprehensive jurisdiction gives him that added "external" dimension which is less evident in the other characters (although it is also suggested at first by the attitude of Pandarus). These two Trojans therefore represent that long-term view of a world beyond the play, and its accompanying sense of permanence, which is connected with the "romantic" elements of Troilus

---

[11] My view of Ulysses and Aeneas as essentially pro-martial is explained on p.116, above. As for Helen, Coghill, p.105, points out that she is obviously happy and content with the wartime status quo, in Troy; and the double meaning of her ability to "Disarm great Hector" (III:i:154) shows that Shakespeare is suggesting that her presence works against the forces of chivalry (and thus, by my definition, of "romance").

and Cressida.

Although the Greeks make more factual references to Time, these two Trojans regard it with greater respect, and do not try to make Time subject to man, as in the manner of Ulysses.[12] But Ulysses' expedient values and subtler speech style eventually affect the Trojans (except for Hector) after the exchange of Cressida, and his inimical attitude towards Time also influences them in the later part of the play, when the forces of war are taking over from those of love and productivity.

Cressida is herself the victim of Time, but she can be sufficiently objective to recognize this and she finds the strength to defy Time, while accepting its inevitable condemnation (because she fatalistically expects only derision or neglect from every quarter).[13] In the love scene she swears by "Time ... [when it] is old and hath forgot itself" (III:ii:184), thus expressing her own long-term ability to understand its "external" dimensions. When she becomes the victim of wartime expediency, being exchanged for Antenor, Cressida claims a type of spiritual (but earthbound) immunity for her incorporeal self:

> Time, force and death
> Do to this body what extremes you can;
> But the strong base and building of my love
> Is as the very centre of the earth
> Drawing all things to it. (IV:ii:101-5)

---

[12] Ulysses' personification of Time as a "monster of ingratitudes" (III:iii:147), or as a "host" (III:iii:165), indicates that, in his opinion, Time can be reduced to the level of a human creature.

[13] Traversi, p.309: "Cressida's falseness (comes) ... from a flaw inherent in the human situation. Her tragedy, such as it is, derives from awareness of her helplessness."

Her distinction between her body, which can be mortally destroyed, and her "love," which can be compared to the "centre of the earth," shows Cressida's awareness of "external time," because of her hope for some terrestrial continuity beyond physical death.

Troilus is unlike Cressida in that he thinks of Time, at first, as an adjunct to his own religion of self-indulgence. He pursues glory in war even more than potential transcendence in love, by suggesting that he and his brothers will earn a heavenly reward for their warfare and that "fame in time to come (will) canonize (them)" (II:ii:202) for their actions. Later, however, when Time takes away Cressida, Troilus takes on the view of Ulysses, seeing it as an "injurious robber" (at IV:iv:42). (This ironically echoes his own impatience earlier, to seduce Cressida in spite of Pandarus' injunctions to "tarry," at I:i:14, and his debasing of his love for her by the commercial images comparing her to a "pearl" that can be bought, at I:i:100, and therefore successfully stolen from him.)[14] And Paris also refers to the "bitter disposition of the time" (at IV:i:50) which is removing Cressida. For the Trojans, therefore, it is apparently Time itself, and not their own decision to exchange her, which should be blamed for Troilus' losing his mistress; and in the later part of the play they follow Ulysses in this view of Time as an enemy, thus adhering to support of its "martial" aims rather than to those of "romance."

---

[14] Stafford, p.37, states that Shakespeare uses the mercantile images as his "primary means for expressing deflated values in the play, especially those involving love."

Throughout Troilus and Cressida Time is interpreted to be whatever its victims or manipulators themselves make of it, and they either support the elements of "romance" or those of "war" according to their capacity to be in accord with Time or at odds against it. Those characters who are able to understand its external dimension, outside their own immediate lives, can also accept its long-term arbitration. The Trojans turn bitterly against Time when they realize that they are losing the war, and when Cressida has to be exchanged for Antenor. Only Hector is constant in his vision of "external time," while Pandarus clings to the shreds of his earlier secure outlook in his ultimate pathetic reference to "that time ... (of) ... two months hence" (at V:x:56 and 52) which ambiguously asserts some small hope for continuity outside the war-torn world at the end of the play, but which also sets a limit to its possible duration.

The circumstances of the war only allow Cressida to establish identity for herself, in "external time," discreditably; and she is also denounced within the terms of the play's immediate action. Shakespeare's re-arrangement of the incidents in her story rushes all its events together, so that Cressida's reactions are shown as being too hasty, and she is passed from uncle to lover to father to untrustworthy "guardian" in a fast-moving sequence. This is accelerated, not by Cressida herself, but by the demands of those upon whom she should be able to depend. They are exploiting her while they themselves feel the threat of obliteration in the war (for even though they are individually ignorant of their doom, the sense of crisis and of human expendability affects their actions, and

causes them to grasp desperately at the pleasures of the moment).[15]

The first two scenes of the play show Cressida's wish to avoid the exigencies of Time and to gain from it instead: "That she was never yet that ever knew/Love got so sweet as when desire did sue," (I:ii:286-91). At this stage Troilus vouches for her chastity: "she is stubborn-chaste against all suit" (I:i:97); but by the end of the play, Cressida has already become the untrue mistress of one man and the property of another, and has been rightly condemned by Ulysses as the "daughter of the game" (V:i:63). This shows her character as stained by the abuse of others, and totally deprived of any consideration for her original wish to be continent. Cressida has been called "a chameleon,"[16] and she learns to take her protective colouring from her fast-changing surroundings, while she is also the "burr" which sticks wherever it is "thrown" (III:ii:111-12). Her actions are therefore not motivated by her own desires but by her need for survival in harsh circumstances.[17] By putting her own existence first she differs markedly from Shakespeare's other heroines, for Cressida never hints at the bold unselfishness of Juliet (or even at the ambiguous sacrifice of Cleopatra) in being ready to die rather than betray a husband. Cressida notably cannot achieve any trace of

---

[15] Traversi, p.309: "Any attempt to subject her inconstancy to a moral judgment fails because the spirit in which Shakespeare created her made it impossible for her to be really responsible for her actions."

[16] Coghill, p.106.

[17] R. A. Yoder ("Sons and Daughters of the Game," Shakespeare Survey, 25 (1972), 22-23) points out that Cressida "knows about war, and has learnt to survive with it" and that "She knows ... estrangement is a means of self-preservation."

spiritual immortality through transcendent love, because she sets her own need to survive ahead of her real love for Troilus. And once she has given in to Troilus' importunities, she cannot be friended by Time and it becomes her enemy, for it shows her reputation and her unavoidable actions in the most unfavourable light.[18]

Thus, although Cressida is aware of "external time" she knows that she is herself powerless to achieve any worthwhile personal part in it. Because of her worldly circumstances, Cressida cannot acquire continuity in a conventional way, by marriage, by religious acknowledgement of her love affair, or by the protection of a place within an established family. No one other than Pandarus considers that she should take on a wifely or motherly role, not even Cressida; and she understands her need to protect herself so that she can survive, alone.

In the early part of Troilus and Cressida she holds the corrupt Trojan view of their court as the heaven for love, with its women playing the parts of "angels" (I:ii:286) in their game of debased Courtly Love. But Cressida's cynicism and display of expedient superficiality towards love-making actually covers her real emotions. The Courtly Love code of the Trojans is the only religion Cressida knows, and she both takes advantage of its ambiguity towards chastity (when she goes to bed with Troilus) and uses it sincerely (if tritely) to express her genuine feelings of physical, and spiritual, love for Troilus (as, for instance, in her soliloquy of I:ii:282-95). During her love scene with him, however, Cressida

---

[18] But, in terms greater than the play itself, Cressida has not been obliterated by "Blind Oblivion." Her identity has survived, unflatteringly.

becomes aware of a force beyond humanity which affects her own feeling for him more deeply than her earlier view of love had comprehended. And, although Troilus does not understand it at the time, Cressida has a glimpse in their love scene of a world which is external to their own immediate environment, and which might be reached by the reciprocation of spiritual love between them.

When they make their mutual confessions of love, her avowal that she has "lov'd (him) night and day/For many weary months," (III:ii:114-15) is a true one.[19] Cressida has really loved and wanted Troilus, as well as playing the part of a coquette. But she also now realizes (though Troilus does not) that his corrupt Courtly Love attitude towards her, and its hope for "transcendence," is for himself alone (because his wishes for "swift transportance," at III:ii:11, or to "fly" to "Cressid," at III:ii:15, exclude any consideration for her accompanying spiritual "elevation"). He sees her as earthbound in her love-making, and Troilus thinks of Cressida only as a means of raising up himself. Cressida also sees herself as inferior and useful to others (and reflects on this earlier in her words: "Achievement is command; ungain'd, beseech;" (I:ii:293). Thus, although Cressida does understand their ability to relate their love to "external time," she also knows that her own spiritual potential will not be realized by Troilus.[20]

---

[19] Coghill, p.107, considers that Shakespeare does not show Cressida "as wanton from the start" and that (later) "the presence and passion of Troilus gradually wins her to ... a kind of sincerity."

[20] Knights, pp.153-54, refers to the "intense subjectivism" of Troilus' self-dramatizations.

The moment of Cressida's awareness of "external time" and its connection with their love-making comes with her understanding of Troilus' unusual silence when they are brought together (III:ii:54). But Troilus is ignorant of its significance. Cressida loses her accustomed poise and stammers: "Wish'd, my lord? The gods grant - O my lord" (III:ii:62): and then proceeds to question the existence of forces outside their immediate world. She sees "dregs" rather than pure water in the merely physical expression of their love (III:ii:67), and she feels "fear" (III:ii:72) for their insensitivity to something that may be "monstruous" (III:ii:76). Thus she may be referring in the "ability that [lovers] never perform" (III:ii:85) and in their "voices of lions and [their] acts of hares" (III:ii:88) to a misunderstanding or denial of love's spiritual potential. This uncertainty that confuses Cressida is a force greater than either of the lovers, and she realizes this because of the silence in Troilus' earlier lack of "words" to her. But he is unconscious of its presence and does not allow for any love-experience for Cressida other than the physical. He therefore denies reciprocation, to her, in her awareness, at that moment, of "external time."

Cressida has to stay within the role Troilus expects of her of representing a love that is based within, not above, the earth while he sees himself as totally in control of the situation, and answers her questions about the force they have together invoked in ridiculously self-centred terms:

> Are there such? Such are not we. Praise us as we are tasted ... a mock for his truth, and what truth can speak truest not truer than Troilus. (III:ii:90-98)

In reply, Cressida can only reiterate her invitation to the limitedly earthbound love-making to which his ideal confines her, with the <u>double entendre</u>

of her request "Will you walk in, my lord?" (III:ii:99).

The love-scene epitomizes Cressida's inability to step outside her role of woman-of-the-moment which is assigned her by Troilus (and later by Diomedes). Pandarus hustles her to bed when she hesitates and is later concerned only for the feelings of Troilus when the lovers are to be separated (IV:iv:83-95), and this shows that he also is uninterested in Cressida's long-term well-being. Once she is gone from Troy, Pandarus cares only about those who are left in his own environment (although he does try to use her letter, vainly, as a means of regaining his favoured position). Ulysses denounces Cressida as the "sluttish spoil {s} of opportunity" (IV:v:62) and points out what she has become (the girl who spent only one night with Troilus and who is now accompanied by her "aspiring" new lover). By these words he also describes her future situation among the Greeks, who will show their jealous resentment for the abduction of Helen by insulting Cressida.

Because Cressida fears this situation she tries to secure a firm place for herself, when she hears of her exchange, by appeal to that earth where she stands (IV:ii:103-5). She does not attempt to draw Troilus with her into a reciprocal spiritual love that might give them the power to exist outside their immediate world (and it is notable that when Cressida swears by the Elements, at III:ii:192, in her oath to Troilus, she omits the highest of the four, fire).[21] Nor does she ask him, directly, for hope of physical continuity either by their living together or by

---

[21] At no point can Cressida approach the attitude of the dying Cleopatra, who is "fire and air" (Antony and Cleopatra, V:ii:289).

propagation of children. But Cressida does try to establish some form of immortality for herself which is based on the earth-forces. When she hears she is to leave Troilus, she tries to find strength by comparing her love to the "centre of the earth," as if to give it lasting terrestrial identity (IV:ii:104). And her oath to Troilus in the love-scene has also appealed to the life force which comes from the earth. Its association with everyday husbandry and domesticity is illustrated by Cressida's references "lamb," "heifer's calf," and "stepdame" (III:ii:193-94). Thus Cressida resembles Pandarus in turning for succour towards the earth, and reflects his view of a fertile world which is utterly unspiritual but which has lasting potential for physical continuity.[22]

Cressida never offers hope for having children, nor of establishing a family of her own; and, although Pandarus' lewd suggestions lead eventually to his remark "If my lord get a boy of you" (III:ii:104) Cressida herself seems determined not to reproduce. She describes her defences against pregnancy as well as against loss of reputation (which significantly hide the stigma of impurity rather than give hope for remaining virginal) in words which emphasize her realistic attitude: "Upon my back, to defend my belly, upon my wit, to defend my wiles, upon my secrecy, to defend mine honesty, my mask, to defend my beauty, and you, to defend all these" (I:ii: 260-64). But in the love-scene Pandarus sends her to "bed" for sexual intercourse so that her "belly" is undefended; in the previous scene he has ineptly let both Helen and Paris into his niece's "secrecy" about her lover; and at her appearance before Troilus, in person, Cressida completely

---

[22]See my Chapter III, p.100, above.

loses her "mask" of sophisticated repartee. Thus her habitual "wit" deserts her (at III:ii:151) and she has lost her other worldly defences which she claimed as her protection earlier. So Cressida makes herself totally vulnerable through her love for Troilus.

Troilus does not appear to consider Cressida as a means through which they might together be connected with "external time." He makes no suggestion of their personal continuity by children, and when he talks of "tak [ing] a wife" (at II:ii:61) he cannot be thinking of Cressida in that role, as he takes care to conceal his relationship with her from his parents. Troilus therefore denies to Cressida all thought of procreation with him, and closes the ways in which she might be creditably connected with "external time." Her love-making is confined to the merely physical, she will not be considered a means of continuing the human life-cycle, and she cannot be accepted as part of a family.

But in spite of her earlier clichés and slick pretensions to understanding love as physical and transient ("joy's soul lies in the doing!" at I:ii:287) Cressida "blabbs" to Troilus, in the love-scene, of her genuine emotional involvement (III:ii:117-30). Her capacity for such feeling is corroborated in the play by Troilus' definition of her as "stubborn-chaste" (I:i:97), by Pandarus' view of her as being "long ere [she] be woo'd" (III:ii:110), and by her own claim to having loved Troilus "for many weary months" (III:ii:115). These references to her probable virginity and pertinacity before the play's action begins suggest a less transient role for her than is shown by its later progress;[23] and this is reinforced

---

[23] Coghill, pp.106-7, and my Chapter II, p.59, n.85, above.

by a maternal analogy which is strikingly different from her usual pose as unproductive: "My thoughts were like unbridled children grown/Too headstrong for their mother" (III:ii:122-23). Cressida has therefore realized her existence as a mother in theory, but it has passed her by too quickly, without fulfilment, as if she has grown up into and out of womanhood with even greater speed than that which condemns her promiscuous behaviour in Shakespeare's presentation of her love affair.

And she then proceeds to renounce maternity so as to conform with Troilus' sterile use of her. When his: "... silence/Cunning in dumbness, from [her] weakness draws/[Her] very soul of counsel" (III:ii:131-33), Cressida becomes aware of the spiritual potential in true love which will be denied by their illicit love-making, but Troilus and Pandarus stifle its growth by refusing to let her go away bodily. She tries to explain her realization that she is "two selves": one spiritual, that is devoted to Troilus for more than sexual love, and the other "unkind" and physical, which is the only Cressida in whom he is interested, and over which she cannot have complete control:

> I have a kind of self resides with you
> But an unkind self, that itself will leave
> To be another's fool. I would be gone. (III:ii:148-50)

In this scene, Cressida's apparent reference to foreknowledge of her infidelity is disturbing. Rather than explain it by considering her to be a puppet figure playing a set piece, or openly acknowledging her promiscuity to an audience which expects it, I would suggest that she is here speaking with the naiveté and unhappy realism of extreme youth, having been brought up in a corrupt, wartime environment and abandoned by a treacherous father so that she has had to learn

all the tricks of womanhood, theoretically, before she has the need for them. Cressida understands her vulnerable situation only too well and knows that Pandarus' giving of her to Troilus will mark her as licentious so that her condemnation to short-term affairs may follow; she has little hope that their mutual attraction will last and she is also aware of the likelihood that she will again yield to temptation. And this explains the cautions and conditions with which her vow of "fidelity" to Troilus is hedged (III:ii:184-96).[24]

When Troilus declares to her that he is "bereft of words" he unconsciously admits to feeling some force towards real love outside themselves but he does not comprehend Cressida's speech which tells him that she is divided into these two spiritual and physical selves. It is not until he later sees her giving one of them to Diomedes that he understands the dichotomy (V:ii:146). For in their love-scene Troilus allows Cressida no dimension in "external time," still regarding her as commercial goods and Pandarus as the "bark" which conveys her to him (I:ii:103-4). Troilus mistakenly combines this trader's attitude with the Trojan

---

[24] Interpretations of Cressida's ambiguously-worded vow vary. For instance, Kendall, p.141, sees her protestations as "obviously ironic," while Coghill, p.107, considers that "she has taken up the tone and manner of Troilus and his mood of passionate sincerity." Both these aspects are involved. The clear dramatic irony should not obscure the fact that Cressida, according to Shakespeare's individual characterization, has already shown verbal proof of a wish to love Troilus and a conflicting awareness that circumstances will probably cause her to be unfaithful. My own contention is that Shakespeare phrases these lines conditionally both to satisfy the audience's knowledge of her future behaviour (but not necessarily to show her as wanton at the time of speaking them); and to illustrate her personal wish to join Troilus in his idealistic view of their love. (Shakespeare uses this same style to express Falstaff's ambivalent moral outlook, where he both attracts audience sympathy and shows self-knowledge of his ethical inadequacy.)

version of Courtly Love, and by idolizing his own desire for Cressida he hopes to achieve transcendence. But his wish for recreation in love to alleviate the "starv'd" argument of his boredom and frustration in the war (I:i:92-93) is based on an earthly, not heavenly, foundation. Troilus' hopes for "canonization" (I:i:202) as a warrior lean on the dubious "honor" of fighting for Helen, and the exposure of falseness in the Trojan code of chivalry, as well as its parody of religion by erotic love (in Shakespeare's presentation of Helen) show that Troilus' hope for elevation cannot be truly spiritual. His "expectation" of Olympian "nectar" is part of the self-deception which covers the real nature of his desire for Cressida. This is, in fact, carnal, and it is revealed by Troilus' choice of words (to "wallow" in the "lily-beds")[25] at III:ii:12, and by her own metaphor of "walking," (III:ii:99) which contrasts with his suggestion of "flying" (at III:ii:29) for the earthbound expression of their sexual union.

Cressida takes on the part of promiscuous wanton and renounces alternatives when she becomes the mistress of Troilus. But Shakespeare shows that the circumstances of war cause their physical love affair to end, and that the enforced separation of the lovers causes Cressida's fickleness. And in the oaths which they swear, under the auspices of Pandarus, she seems to understand their situation far more realistically than he does. Her oath is worded equivocally, so that her breaking, as much as her keeping of it, fulfils its conditions. (For Cressida sees herself as powerless over her own life, in which survival, even on someone else's

---

[25] Traversi, p.311, suggests that this "striking choice of verb" shows "a corrupt satisfaction".

terms, takes precedence for her.) Troilus' oath, however, is one which he cannot be sure of keeping. He could not do so if his actions were to follow the pattern which he sets out at the play's beginning, and his attitude towards his mistress is actually short-term, throughout. (He carefully conceals their affair from his family, knowing it would never gain parental approval, and therefore cannot consider that, in practical terms, their love will last.) Troilus' love for Cressida never comes first, for him, and when he allows her to go to the Greeks he acknowledges the primacy of his "martial" interests over the "romantic." Thus the potential situations of both Troilus and Cressida make them powerless to keep their oaths, and in these circumstances Cressida is no more dishonest than Troilus in making hers. It is the sight of hers being broken that confirms her untruth and his constancy; and Shakespeare both accentuates this visual fact and also stresses Cressida's probable infidelity in the uncertain wording of her vow:

> ... If I be false...
> From false to false among false maids in love
> Upbraid my falsehood! ...
>
> Yea, let them say, to stick the heart of falsehood,
> "As false as Cressid." (III:ii:184-96)

Cressida tries to tell Troilus that "to be wise and love" (III:ii:156), that is, to be aware of the spiritual self in love even when the physical self is in action, is not possible for a human, only for a god. But Troilus characteristically misunderstands her warning and misinterprets it as expressing her adulation of him as a deity. He is so engrossed in extolling his own "truth" and perfection as a lover that he disregards her hesitancy at this point, and by indulging in verbal self-dramatization Troilus remains insensitive to the thought that he might not be

in complete control of the situation. Thus he also misuses Cressida, treating her as the physical means to his own supposedly spiritual "fame" as a lover: "True swains in love shall in the world to come/Approve their truth by Troilus," (III:ii:173-74), while being unable to care for her, in any way, beyond the immediate moment. Troilus denies to Cressida any credit or consideration either in present time with him or in "external time" outside their difficult circumstances.

Troilus' loss of words, which is significantly expressed in the love-scene of Troilus and Cressida, indicates a change of emphasis from speech to action within the play, and this culminates in the decisive movements of the last act. The first acts demonstrate the verbosity of nearly all the characters, and their indecisiveness is suggested by variations in their manner of speech, which changes its style either to accord with the person who is being addressed, or in relation to another character who is being discussed; and the consequent vacillations stress the lack of direction in the outlook of each individual.[26]

The exceptions to this uncertain behaviour are Hector and Achilles; for the courtesy of Hector pervades his own language consistently, and it also takes effect when others describe or make contact with him. Hector and Achilles each maintain their own decorum of speech despite those whom they address until they come together and then it is Hector who loses when the rougher style of Achilles overcomes the Trojan's display of courtesy. Thus the pattern of their verbal

---

[26] Kendall, p.141, states that "Shakespeare has delicately underlined [the] ambivalence of his characters in the texture of the blank verse itself..."

confrontation (at IV:v:231-69) is analogous to the final outcome of the drama, where expedient brutality takes over from outmoded chivalry, and where Hector is defeated by Achilles.

Among the other characters, however, there is little consistency in speech styles. Ulysses changes his language to accord with that of Hector (in IV:v:213-26) and similar diversity in diction occurs among the lesser protagonists at the play's beginning. For example, Alexander starts by using courtly verse for his recital of Hector's exploits (I:ii:4-11), changes to basic, unaspiring prose for the description of Ajax (I:ii:18-30), and, after confirming Hector's supreme gallantry "in the world" (I:ii:40), leaves Cressida to converse with Pandarus in the banal, vulgar terms of that low character.

The lovers are also subject to this uncertainty. When Cressida talks of her apparent feeling for Troilus (I:ii:282-95) her poetry is trite in expressions although elegant in style, so that it is suited to the outward image of her love affair with him. And Troilus' own speeches about his love for her are Courtly Love dramatizations of his personal "suffering." Thus the superficial exaggerations made by both of them are appropriate to the cynicism and superficiality of their situations, but do not suggest the real love that could be expressed by a different use of the same conventions. Troilus' unrelieved hyperboles are absurd enough to be taken with humour:

> When I do tell thee there my hopes lie drown'd,
> Reply not in how many fadoms deep
> They lie indrench'd. I tell thee I am mad... (I:i:49-51)

But he alters his style as his love affair progresses to the expression of deeper feeling (in his protestations and oath of III:ii), through disillusion (after their

love-making, in IV:ii), to an attitude of less dramatic resignation when Cressida has to leave him. When Troilus describes the harsh treatment of Time, the "robber" (at IV:iv:33-48), his language changes from its former flowery softness to become harder and more abrupt; and when he abandons his position as the courtly lover in handing over Cressida to Diomedes, his words take on increasingly the tone of the pragmatic warrior (in accordance with those of the man to whom he is speaking):

> I charge thee use her well, even for my charge;
> For by the dreadful Pluto, if thou dost not,
> Though the great bulk Achilles be thy guard,
> I'll cut thy throat. (IV:iv:126-29)

Thus the language of Troilus reverts from his superficial idea of courtesy to wordly terms of practicality. And the style of his words correspondingly indicates his new, stronger, allegiance to the "martial" elements of the play, in place of its "romantic" elements.

The language of Cressida reaches its peak when she recognizes her feeling of spiritual love for Troilus (III:ii:117-33) and from then on it retains its high level of diction whenever she speaks of that love. This is shown in her scene with Diomedes:

> Thy master now lies thinking on his bed,
> Of thee and me, and sighs, and takes my glove,
> And gives memorial dainty kisses to it,
> As I kiss thee, (V:ii:78-81)

where line 80 indicates her imitation of Troilus' high-flown terminology, but lines 79 and 81 display her own pathetic memory of real love, in diction that is appealingly simple and sincere. (Cressida, understandably, does not change her allegiance from "romance" to war, but continues to support that travesty of

"romantic" aims with which she becomes associated.)[27]

These genuine words from Cressida echo her earlier style of speech where she realizes her love's spiritual potential (III:ii:62-76) and a connection can be seen in the play between sincerity of purpose and clear humility of language.[28] This is also indicated by the implication that paucity of words, or silence itself, comes closer to a truth (which is outside the comprehension of those characters who do not look beyond the world of the play) than do verbal protestations and high-flown oratory. Ulysses himself points out that the meaning of silence is sacred, although he then proceeds to profane it by his own use of words:

> There is a mystery (with whom relation
> Durst never meddle).... (III:iii:201-2)

And Hector respects the enigma of the future, refusing to speak beyond his own knowledge, until he is goaded into doing so by Achilles:

> It would discredit the blest gods, proud man,
> To answer such a question .... (IV:v:247)

---

[27] Kendall, p.138, finds the ambivalence of character (which he distinguishes in most of the play's other protagonists) less notable in Cressida, "because Shakespeare is less interested in her. She illuminates Troilus and thus serves a secondary purpose. Shakespeare fits her into his design pretty much as he inherited her, i.e., with something of the charm of Chaucer's Cressida but with the uncompromising wantonness she had acquired in the succeeding centuries. These two Cressidas Shakespeare takes little trouble to reconcile, probably because reconciling them is not necessary to his design." My own interpretation disagrees with Kendall's in his view of Shakespeare's characterization being undeveloped from the prototypes of Cressida; but I agree that she appears less ambivalent than the play's other characters. This I attribute to her "support" of the elements of "romance," which does not change, as theirs does, to support of the elements of war.

[28] For example, a comparison can be made between the speeches of Priam, in II:ii, and those of Ulysses, in I:iii.

It seems, therefore, that glimpses of a truth beyond expression in words are afforded to a few characters at moments when they become aware of "external time," and when they acknowledge the importance of a world outside that of their actions in Troilus and Cressida. Hector is conscious of this throughout; thus he is determined in his style of speech and does not vacillate or express himself confusedly; and Cressida becomes consistent in her language after recognizing the spiritual potential of her love for Troilus.

But Hector leads the Trojans away from respect for integrity in speech by reneging his own statement of moral values made at II:ii:173-88, and in this way he sets up a pattern in which the words of the Trojans become empty forms, as valueless as their chivalry. Troilus does not understand this until V:iii:108 when he reads Cressida's letter which charms him with its "words" while he knows, from visual proof of her unfaithfulness, that she "edifies another with her deeds," (V:iii:112).

When Troilus declares to Cressida, at the time of their love-making, that he is "bereft...of all words" (III:ii:54) he does not understand that her spiritual love for him is depriving them both of their customary self-control, although she realizes that she loves him both physically and spiritually. Cressida wishes to avoid sexual intercourse because, if his desire for her is only corporeal, their act would abuse her newly discovered sensibility. But Pandarus will not let her go (III:ii:141), and as Troilus does not consider Cressida's spiritual self to be important (only wanting to make love to her physically) he ignores her premonitions and the suggestion that bodily love between them might not be all that they can achieve together. It is only when he eventually sees Cressida as

the physical mistress of Diomedes that Troilus comes to appreciate the fact that her "two selves" have indeed been separated;[29] for Cressida then tries to defend her spiritual allegiance to Troilus against violation, while she is physically unable to keep herself true to him in her body.

She makes a pathetic attempt to preserve some memory of her affair with Troilus (and thus gain a sense of continuity) by trying to guard her more-than-physical love for him by her refusal to profane it with words. After perceiving that "a kind of self" (Cressida's spiritual love for Troilus) remains with

---

[29] Varying interpretations of Cressida's declaration that she has two "selves" (II:iii:148-49), and Troilus' subsequent realization of this fact (V:ii:137-52) have been suggested. They include that of J. Oates Smith ("Essence and Existence...." p.181) which considers that "Troilus fails to distinguish between the impulses of body and spirit," in his relationship with Cressida. Kimbrough and Knight investigate only Troilus' speech [in V:ii] on the division of Cressida. According to Kimbrough (p.87) Troilus "first posits that Cressida is goodness, with all its neo-Platonic implications. Yet, he recognizes the truth of what he has seen; therefore, there is no other conclusion but that she is not goodness. His retreat from a kind of pathetic, subjective idealism is graphically summed up [in V:ii:153-60]." And, according to Knight, ("The Metaphysic of Troilus and Cressida," Dublin Review, 185 [1929], 241), Troilus sees his mistress as "two Cressids" because he finds it easier to say she is divided than to admit he loved a worthless woman. My own interpretation agrees with that of Smith, and follows the suggestions made by Baldwin (p.157n.) that Cressida's words [at III:ii:148-49] resemble a similar statement of this concept in Antony and Cleopatra (I:iii:102-3): "Our separation so abides and flies, That thou, residing here, goes yet with me." As Baldwin points out, "this Platonic literary device is too frequent in Shakespeare and his age to require further citation." On p.275, Baldwin comments on Troilus' words of V:ii:166: "The rule of unity, then, seems to be (in Cressid's case) indivisibility. Shakespeare may have got it from Aristotle, or from some intermediary of his own time... which would give a good deal of logical armament for this speech of Troilus." And he continues, on p.276: "There is no suggestion, of course, that the author is here using Aristotle directly; but his thinking is conditioned, at least ultimately, by the Aristotleian position." The real difficulty lies in the fact of the "essential" and not the "spatial and numerical Cressida", and "this fact Troilus is loath to accept," and so he develops the paradox that she cannot be divided.

her first lover, she tries to keep their past mutual feeling intact by denying his name to her next lover. In his uncouth seduction Diomedes overcomes each of Cressida's defences, in turn. By "let your mind be coupled with your words" (V:ii:15) he insists on access to her body; by holding Cressida "to (her oath" (V:ii:26) he defeats her "wiles"; by demanding a "token for surety" (V:ii:60) he removes all hope for secrecy and protection of her reputation; and by taking away the "sleeve" which she was given by Troilus (V:ii:76), he robs Cressida of the symbol of her love's memory. But her last effort to keep something of her former, spiritually aroused "self," which she now considers to be the property of Troilus, is successful. Cressida's vow "I will not tell you whose" (V:ii:91-92) is made under the chaste auspices of "Diana's waiting-women" and it is one which Diomedes cannot force her to betray.

In watching this scene Troilus apprehends the existence of Cressida's two "selves" but for him, at this point, that which is spiritual and so still his ("Cressid is mine, tied with the bonds of heaven," at V:ii:54) is valueless, now that the other, which is bodily, has become the property of Diomedes. Troilus' mistake has been made by his own misunderstanding of the location of "heaven" and by his insistence on a "religion" where he is himself the god. He realizes that the effectiveness of his union with Cressida is no greater than that which now humanly ("five finger tied," at V:ii:157) makes her one with his rival, because there has been no higher sanction for their earlier love-making than the physical one. He insists on equal "weight" in his love for Cressida and in his hatred for Diomedes (V:ii:168, 167) but he sets out in positive pursuit of the latter while seeing the former only as a reflection on his own honour because of Cressida's

"stained name." Troilus turns his attention to the material object involved, which is now only the sleeve (V:ii:169); but because of his commercial attitude towards Cressida as a worldly possession, it can replace the girl as the object of his jealousy, and he therefore concentrates on regaining it.

Troilus continues to see their affair in terms of his own "achievements" (IV:ii:71) as a lover, and of his possession of Cressida as a "pearl" (I:i:100), even though he now understands that he failed to acknowledge any spiritual potential in their love-making. So he is not consoled by the thought that Cressida's spiritual self is still with him, in her view, because he has no use for it, and because his desire for her was only carnal. Troilus now considers that his previous "heaven" has betrayed him, and he therefore reverses his former "religious" outlook by contradicting its associations in his words. He starts to use perjorative terms for Christian virtues, and in the scene where he parts with Cressida (IV:iv:81) his calling of jealousy a "virtuous sin" and "Truth" "a vice, a fault," indicates his new values which the later scene shows to be totally reversed. Troilus swears by "Pluto's gates" (at V:ii:153) and urges Hector to forego the cause of romance (in V:iii) by denouncing attributes which, elsewhere in Shakespeare, are those of Christianity. (For instance, Hector's "mercy" is a "vice," at V:iii:37, those who "play fair" are "fools," at V:iii:44, and the "venom'd vengeance" on which Troilus calls, is significantly devoid of "pity," at V:iii:45-48.)

Troilus has now also lost his respect for the efficacy of words, in spite of his earlier exaggerated use of them. When he reads his letter from Cressida (at V:iii:108) their proved meaninglessness epitomizes his disillusionment in the

oaths he and she have sworn. Now he is able to understand that there is a force behind spoken vows which may operate outside immediate time, one that is more powerful than their enacted deed of love, and one which he previously ignored in his love affair. But while recognizing its existence Troilus turns against it. For he has no interest in Cressida's spiritual "self" alone. He therefore proceeds to change his allegiance from support of the Trojans' corrupt Courtly Love code to admiration of vices, and to emulation of standards which oppose "religion" utterly.

In all of this Troilus expresses, personally, the play's inherent division between the forces of romance and those of war. He has followed the "romantic" elements, as he saw them, blindly, and has only enjoyed their superficial benefit (that of physical love). But when he understands that a deeper significance was available to him, and that he failed to grasp it, Troilus rejects romance and its associations, totally. His language has symbolized the veneer of chivalry, without its true dedication, and his dislike of "words" now shows his preference for the practice of an existence that is entirely "martial."

Shakespeare implies that the love of Troilus and Cressida is doomed to be spiritually (as well as physically) sterile, by means of the procreative imagery used by both Cressida and Troilus. Her few child-bearing references suggest a type of motherhood which is bypassed quickly, and his words do not ever suggest the role of father for himself. Her first crude allusion to pregnancy ("swell past hiding," at I:ii:270) takes later intellectual form in: "... thoughts like unbridled children grown/Too headstrong for their mother," (at III:ii:122), and is extended by Pandarus' down-to-earth hints in that scene (for instance, "Shame's a baby," at III:ii:40-41, and "If my lord get a boy of you" at III:ii:104). But Troilus'

childbirth references never reach maturity: he speaks, in wooing, of his own "unpractic'd infancy" (at I:i:12); he will "not name desert before his birth" (at III:ii:94); and he refers to "the infancy of truth" (at III:ii:170). Troilus compares Cressida's "senses" to those of "infants" (at IV:ii:5) after their night of love, but he makes their affair analogous to a stillbirth when Cressida has to leave him: "... strangles our dear vows/Even in the birth of our own labouring breath" (at IV:iv:37-38). This shows an immaturity in Troilus' attitude and gives no sign of his considering that his liaison with Cressida would ever achieve continuity or be connected to the outside area of creative, "external time" and it seems to suggest that Troilus gives to himself the part of the child in their otherwise unproductive love affair.

Thus Troilus does not achieve any connection with "external time," through his love affair with Cressida, and he allows neither of them any hope for continuity from it. He finally repudiates all parts of the code of Courtly Love, which he has, in fact, only supported superficially. Shakespeare's presentation of Achilles shows some similarity to that of Troilus, in his situation as a lover and in the decisions that he makes. Childbirth imagery is also used for Achilles when Ulysses tries to persuade him back into the war (at I:iii:312-19) and this is later shown to have a factual connection with the Greek general's secret intention to marry the sister of Hector. Achilles contemplates the physical continuity of marriage with Polyxena and delays participating in warfare while hoping to achieve it (and this indicates his interest in "external time"). But Achilles also turns away because of the loss of an immediate lover, and he also finally concentrates his actions into the expression of hate and brutality, instead of supporting kindness

and concern.

Achilles' wish to marry Polyxena, which is only revealed to the audience after the climax of Troilus' love affair with Cressida, (at III:iii:193-94), makes his situation similar to that of Troilus in several ways. His withdrawal from the battlefield is at first cited as being due to pride alone, (I:iii:144-45) and pride is also the cause of Troilus' dedication to love for Cressida (being basically self-interested). Achilles' absence from fighting is explained later (III:iii:193-94) as being due to love-sickness, and so is Troilus' respite from battle (I:i:5) caused by his unrequited longing for Cressida. Both warriors indulge in too much introspection and consequent self-absorption after withdrawing from battle, and this is expressed for both of them in terms of war: "Kingdom'd Achilles in commotion rages/And batters 'gainst it self" (III:iii:178-79), and: "Why should I war without the walls of Troy/That find such cruel battle here within?" (I:i:7-8).

Achilles' two "loves," his matrimonial ambition for Polyxena and his homosexual affection for Patroclus correspond in some ways to Troilus' two possible loves for Cressida. One of Achilles' "affairs" could lead to generational continuity; and even though it is not spiritual (as is that love which Troilus denies to Cressida) it is potentially productive. But the other "affair" of Achilles is naturally barren, even though physical, and thus it corresponds to the momentary, sensual infatuation which Troilus realizes with Cressida. Finally, each of these men is aroused to passion by this short-term emotion which causes each of them to rush off savagely when deprived of his sexual lover, and then to immerse himself in destructive warfare.

Troilus makes his affair with Cressida a matter for the moment, and he only

gives one indication of considering a love that could last longer (in his words: "I take today a wife," at II:ii:61), but this does not concern Cressida. Thus he does think of the long-term relationship of marriage at the same time that he indulges his merely physical desire for Cressida.[30] Both Troilus and Achilles show their capacities for two "loves," in this way, by each enjoying an illicit sexual affair while contemplating a conventionally acceptable attachment to another (which, in the case of Troilus, is hypothetical; but in that of Achilles, the object of direct intrigue). Neither of them, however, retains his interest in his first love (which could be spiritually or physically productive), and each of them is finally engrossed by the emotions aroused in his second, short-term, love affair.

Shakespeare presents the mutual love of Achilles and Patroclus with a sensitivity which leaves its definition open to the reader's, or viewer's, personal interpretation, in deciding whether they are actually lovers. Only Thersites sneers at Patroclus as the "male varlot" and "masculine whore" of Achilles (at V:i:16, 17), but the clear reiteration of this accusation indicates that Shakespeare is emphasizing the physical nature of their relationship, and the playwright's own view often seems to support that of Thersites. Similarity of attitude, however, does not necessdrily include similarity of tone, and Shakespeare's own bias is not as unpleasant as that of Thersites, nor does it necessarily assume the style of

---

[30] Barton, p.446: "He never mentions marriage to Cressida and this silence, in a world where Chaucer's courtly-love convention does not obtain, seems strange."

that character's denunciations.[31]

The truth of Shakespeare's definitions frequently appears unduly scurrilous because they are articulated by Thersites, and the mockery in the play which is conveyed to the audience by his railing can have the effect of arousing sympathy for whatever he so unattractively opposes. But factually, the analyses of Thersites are usually correct, and the anger of Patroclus (V:i:25-29) at the accusation of homosexuality implies its real truth. Achilles and Patroclus keep apart from their fellow Greeks in their comradeship, and they are thus isolated at first by their mutual goodwill as well as by their anti-social outlook. Their enjoyment of life together affords the only atmosphere of kindness or affection in the Greek camp,[32] although it also detracts from respect for military loyalty and leadership. But Achilles' accompanying (and subsequently acknowledged) interest in a peaceful life outside the wartime environment suggests that he himself also has the capacity to wish for a connection with "external time," by means of his long-term (and potentially productive) love for Polyxena.

So, although Achilles' dalliance with Patroclus is unlikely to exceed the duration of the war, his alternative love displays his own wish for continuity beyond it, when the play begins. This gives him an outlook that extends beyond

---

[31] Discussion as to whether or not Thersites speaks for the playwright includes the opinions of L. F. Cazamian (Development of English Humor [New York: A. M. S. Press, 1965], p.269), who sees Thersites as expressing Shakespeare's own censure of lawless love and sensuality; and of R. A. Yoder, p.11, who considers that Thersites is right, but that he does not necessarily speak for Shakespeare. In my own view, Shakespeare corroborates the facts of Thersites' words, but his attitude is not expressed by their tone.

[32] Coghill, p.100.

the immediate world of the Greek camp, and that could give him a dimension within "external time." It lasts throughout most of the play, but is finally lost when his immediate grief at the death of Patroclus overwhelms him. Troilus, on the other hand, shows no thought of the future in his momentary love for Cressida and he does not aim realistically at a connection with her, in terms of "external time." Before he loses Cressida his idea of a world beyond that of the play is based on ideals for himself so that, when he finds them unrealizable because of her infidelity, Troilus repudiates all his concerns with the elements of "romance"; and he rejects all thoughts of the potential benefits of domesticity, religion and filial obedience (with Hector, at V:iii:79-96). But Achilles does show a desire for domesticity and peace (which is at first understated by Shakespeare) and he is therefore the main character in Troilus and Cressida to work against continuing the war, and, for a time, the strongest supporter of the play's "romantic," rather than its "martial" elements.

Thus, although Achilles' own connection with "external time" is presented negatively, at the beginning, his pacificism is shown to exonerate his indolence as the play's action progresses, and in his support of peace he favours its "romantic" aims. But these lose, therefore, all potentially "religious" connections. For as the play progresses the interests of the physical world overcome all hope for spirituality for both nations, and this is exemplified by the increasing dramatic predominance of Achilles (rather than Troilus). His pragmatically corporeal outlook is shown to be stronger than the misguidedly "spiritual" attitude of Troilus. The increasing importance of Achilles is stressed by the pattern of totally earthbound, physical concerns which eventually obliterate all potentially

higher ideals,[33] (and this is repeated in the imagery, and in the Greeks' influence on Hector).

It is shown by the way that the emphasis on Troilus' affairs, in the earlier scenes, gives way to display of Achilles' actions, later. And, the role of Achilles as the most important figure in the play is suggested by both Trojans and Greeks, throughout. The lesser characters treat him with a respect which is only accorded elsewhere to Hector, and Achilles is mentioned by name frequently (eighteen times in all) before his actual appearance.[34] Ulysses shows envious dislike of "this naming of him" (II:iii:228), and when the opposing factions meet (in IV:v) it is significant that Aeneas is able to recognize Achilles in person, and to salute him respectfully: "... If not Achilles, sir/What is your name?" (II:iii:75), whereas his own earlier failure to know Agamemnon (at I:iii:232-34) is either an insult or else an example of that Greek king's lack of presence. And Cressida, also among the Trojans, suggests that Achilles is "a better man than Troilus" (at I:ii:247).

While allowing for the effect of Achilles' imposing demeanour (there are

---

[33] Knights, 156, "The answer towards which the play seems to tend is that time is an ultimate reality to those who live in a world of appearance.. a world from which something essential is missing, or a subjective world like Troilus's from which reason is excluded." Achilles' world is not that of Troilus, but for a time, he resists identity in the other, which is that of Ulysses. According to my own view, the "two worlds" suggested here by Knights both exemplify an expedient outlook on life, which is only concerned with the present moment, and which thus denies the existence of "romance" and finally supports the elements of war.

[34] T. Howard-Hill, ed., Troilus and Cressida: A Concordance ..., pp.3-4.

several allusions to his large physique in Troilus and Cressida) and for the Trojan courtiers' probable knowledge of his matrimonial intentions, the difference between their reactions to Achilles and to the other Greeks shows that Shakespeare's own characterization emphasizes the Greek general's legendary importance. In the second part of the play the actions revolve more around Achilles than around Hector or Troilus, and his predominance increases at the same time that the action of the play moves towards deeds, and away from words. Once the fighting erupts, there is no questioning his supreme position at its vicious resolution. All of this shows how the vestiges of spiritual, or peaceful, hope for both sides become secondary to esteem for physical power, as most of the protagonists forsake "romance" in order to support the prowess of war.

Achilles' identity is built up also by the references made about him by others; and they allude to his past achievements. (For instance, by Ulysses' words that: "The cry went once on thee .../Whose glorious deeds but in these fields of late/Made emulous missions 'mongst the gods themselves "(III:iii:184-89); by Patroclus' mention of the Greeks' former admiration: "... They were used to bend/To send their smiles before them to Achilles" (III:iii:71-72); and by his own exclamation: "... What, are my deeds forgot?" (III:iii:144).

Ulysses' clever persuasions, which are based on the false assumption that immediate time is all that matters: "For beauty, wit/High birth, vigor of bone, desert in service/Love, friendship, charity are subjects all/To envious and calumniating time "(at III:iii:171-74) do not sway Achilles from romance towards war, but they do convince Patroclus, instead, of his lover's need to regain his reputation. So he insists unselfishly on Achilles' need to recapture his former

glory, and Patroclus sets his case favouring war above their love for each other, eloquently:

> ... I stand condemn'd for this;
> They think my little stomach to the war,
> And your great love to me, restrains you thus.
> Sweet, rouse yourself, and the weak wanton Cupid
> Shall from your neck unloose his amorous fold,
> And like a dewdrop from the lion's mane,
> Be shook to air. (III:iii:219-24)

This leaves Achilles alone in his wish to avoid the war, and his threatening speeches towards Hector (at IV:v:231-76) may result from a defensive need to reassure himself (and others) of his essentially masculine brutality.[35] The contrast between Hector's gentleness and Achilles' belligerence is startling; Achilles employs the terminology of a butcher's shop "feeding" his eyes (IV:v:231) as if he "would buy" Hector (IV:v:238), to be answered by his opponent's gentler reference to "a book of sport" (IV:v:239). But Achilles' appeal to the heavens to foretell his killing goads Hector past endurance so that he answers Achilles in the same threats and in equally boastful and unchivalrous language. It is the only point in the play where anyone fails to respond to Hector's courtesy by matching him with similar decorum, and it is the only place where Hector descends to the lower level of his enemy. Thus its verbal victory for Achilles symbolizes the

---

[35] Apart from his homosexual affair with Patroclus, the play contains another allusion to Achilles' effeminacy. He says: "I have a woman's longing:/An appetite that I am sick withal,/To see great Hector in his weeds of peace" (III:iii:237-39). This suggests his support of the play's "romantic" elements, and it correlates his war-weariness with his "pregnancy" metaphor. Achilles is thus concerned more with the "female principle" than are the other Greeks in Troilus and Cressida.

action of Greek overcoming Trojan in battle, and the final overwhelming of the "romantic" elements by the "martial," in terms of the play as a whole.

Although his behaviour in this scene shows Achilles as influenced by the pragmatism of Ulysses and by the unselfish love of Patroclus, his own desire for peace and his conventional wish for matrimony make him turn back from his savage intentions and express, instead, his respect for the women of Troy and for his oath to them. When Thersites brings his letter from Hecuba (V:i:7) Achilles reasserts his peaceful and "chivalrous" attitude and his previous order of priorities:

> An oath that I have sworn. I will not break it.
> Fall Greeks, fail fame, honor or go or stay,
> My major vow lies here; this I'll obey. (V:i:42-44)

Achilles' wish to keep his oath is estimable in terms of romance and by it he is "gentler" than the Trojans, because he considers that his word to Hecuba is more important than his own "fame" and "honor." Thus the Greek general shows support for those elements which the Trojan leader, Hector, decreasingly respects; and it is ironic that Hector insists on keeping his oath, which he has been goaded into declaring by anger at Achilles, at IV:v:256 , and which is selfishly concerned with personal fame, whereas Achilles puts his oath to a woman higher than his own ambition for similar glory. This shows Achilles to be further from entertaining motives which would redirect him towards the war at the beginning of Act V than is Hector, and yet Achilles utterly rejects this determination when he is later faced by the death of Patroclus. His extremes of emotions therefore exceed even those of the Trojans; and he shows a wider range of ambivalence than they do between war and "romance."

But Achilles only considers existence in terms which are earthbound even when he looks outside the limits of the play's world, and so his final moment of victory reduces it to expedient, physical immediacy unrelieved by any hope or wish for a "higher" ideal of eternity. The events which start with the downfall of Hector (as he neglects his own standards and their understood long-term objectivity) and with the vacillation of Achilles (between his extremes of loyalty to warfare and to the "external" world of physical continuity) culminate in the meeting of these two leaders at the time of the duel (IV:v:230). This is the moment in Troilus and Cressida when the combatants seem to come nearest to peace. Yet, although Hector moves towards peacefulness with Ajax he turns away from it again with Achilles and allows himself to be provoked into anger and concern for his own pride. At this point Achilles also succumbs to his ambition in war and moves away from his interest in peace-promoting love. Even though he subsequently wavers and decides to forego fighting because of his letter from Hecuba (V:i:37-46), his own wish for fame has been aroused by the presence of Hector. When the death of Patroclus also spurs on his Greek sense of honour (which has been stirred by his lover's earlier reproaches, at III:iii:222-24) Achilles abandons all extra-immediate interests and gives way to pride and to revenge in the war.

Thus the leaders of both armies turn away from hope for constructive peacefulness towards sterile destruction. After the death of Hector, Troilus assumes and implements his older brother's role even more viciously, by negating values which Hector less intentionally neglected. The death of Patroclus drives Achilles with an emotion similar to that motivating Troilus, because his love also has turned into hatred and revenge (and his care for his fellow-fighters has, at

the same time, been renewed). And the physical as well as the spiritual hope for a longer-term outlook (which is exemplified by Achilles' procreative love for the sister of Hector) is finally denied by the leading Greek protagonist. Achilles, as well as Troilus, thus repudiates "romance" as both of the heroes reject it, and as they determinedly pursue the war.

Chapter V: Conclusion

My own view that the "martial" elements in Troilus and Cressida finally triumph over all that is worthwhile in the "romantic" elements of the play (although something does remain of their former existence) is influenced by a personal dislike of war and a belief in the persistence of humanity. I have therefore presented this thesis with a bias which underemphasizes the opposing view, one which can equally well be supported by the play's ambivalence of attitudes. For, although I have shown that in it Shakespeare condemns the horror of war and suggests the defeat of the forces for productivity and peace, stress could also be laid on his condemnation of both Trojans and Greeks, which exemplifies their self-indulgent corruption and pragmatism; and the conclusion could also be reached that all the characters, within the play, well deserve their untimely ends.[1]

I have shown Hector throughout as ignoble, because he turns from chivalry to ambition for personal fame; and I have shown Troilus and Achilles as despicable because they forsake love affairs offering spiritual or physical continuity in favour of those that are merely corporeal, and because they both finally release their emotions in revenge. But if the criteria for judging these characters were taken

---

[1] Knights, p.157, "if something vital is missing from the public world of the Greeks, Troilus' subjectivism is equally flawed." Ulysses is preoccupied with the immediate moment, and Troilus with himself; the only view which could overcome these is that shown by Hector before he succumbs to support of his brothers. But from then on any such unflawed attitude is impossible in Troilus and Cressida.

to be glory in victorious warfare and the search for personal honour, then their neglect of the "romantic" elements and their patriotic support of the play's "martial" elements would show them to be worthy exponents of the standards held throughout by Ulysses, which are not necessarily undesirable. Even though a charitable viewpoint shows the exploitation of Cressida (and the disregard for the Trojan women) as shameful, the final embodiment of "romance" in Pandarus can be taken to indicate that this view of the play (which contradicts mine) proves the ultimate superiority of military nationalism over ineffective, self-centred treachery and unrealistic sentimentality.

In summing up my own view, however, I consider that Shakespeare supports the losing "romantic" elements of Troilus and Cressida at the same time that he demonstrates their abortive potential among the Greeks as well as the Trojans. I consider that Hector is influenced by Ulysses' standards of "pro-martial" conduct, in the loss of his own ethical Trojan values, so that he fails to uphold "romance" in its highest form, but pays instead too little respect to marriage, religion and filial duty. I also consider that Troilus does not realize his ideal of spiritual ecstasy in his love affair with Cressida, because he bases its pursuit on a false premise of idolatry (which is actually self-worship) and because he disregards Cressida's incorporeal self while indulging his physical infatuation for her. And I consider that Achilles turns away from a love that might give him continuity (in an earthly sense only) because he is motivated by a passion of sensual deprivation similar to that experienced by Troilus. Both these thwarted lovers then express their emotions in savage and destructive bellicosity.

The courtesy initially exhibited by the Trojans, and by Hector among them

in particular, is thus finally shown to be hollow and meaningless. After the exchange of Cressida the Greeks assume its veneer, but, as the play's imagery patterns emphasize, they display only its worldly trappings of chivalry and none of its spiritual associations. Achilles epitomizes the outlook of the Greeks which is utterly earthbound (though he sees further than the others in his view beyond the world of the play) and his final brutality shows that all the protagonists descend to near-bestial barbarity, in spite of the spurious "spritely" elevation which the Trojan princes originally considered their due.[2] But although the warriors of Troy are aware of higher ideals than this ultimate savagery, Pandarus holds a different view and he finally represents a sense of permanence in the world, suggesting an unspiritual but earth-centred hope for some kind of physical continuity.

This is indicated throughout the play by his support for the elements of "romance" (albeit in their most degraded aspects); by his bringing Troilus and Cressida together; and by his initial interest in earthly productivity. And it is illustrated by his allusions to procreation (at I:i:23-26 and at III:ii:104). Even though the lovers' liaison is illicit, Pandarus supports earthly regeneration and peaceful domesticity. His opening words "Will this gear ne'er be mended?" (at I:i:6) imply that he favours reparation and unity; the imagery which he uses in the early scenes, and in the love scene, suggests prosaic but healthy farmyard

---

[2] Early in the play various words associate the Trojans with their own "heavenly" idealism and their elevated images of themselves. These include: "angels" (I:ii:286); "spritely" (II:ii:190); and "canonize" (II:ii:202).

productivity (at I:i:15-26, I:ii:241, and at III:ii:16, 50-53); and his insistence on the lovers' "bargain" of fidelity (at III:ii:197) may show Pandarus' mistaken view that their betrothal is permanent.[3] He also refers to the women of the Trojan court without distinction between those who are unchaste and those who are virtuous, grouping Helen together with Hecuba and Cassandra in his conversation (at I:ii:140-51). It seems, therefore, that when he comes to worship "the mortal Venus" (of III:i:33) Pandarus is himself unaware (in his visit to Helen and Paris) of the significance of their adulterous "marriage," of the Trojans' corrupt morality, and of the falseness which he supports by observing their courtly "religion."

There are several indications of the actual corruption which surrounds Helen's court, and these are revealed in this scene with Pandarus. Before entering the presence of "love's invisible soul" (for whom the Servant's emphasis on "invisible" should be queried, in view of Helen's traditionally visual beauty, because this remark makes his adulation ironical) Pandarus misunderstands the words "grace" and "lordship" (at III:i:15 and 16) and takes them to refer only to his mundane

---

[3] Most critics consider that the oaths made at the end of III:ii suggest the stereotyped roles of Pandarus, Troilus and Cressida outside the play itself. But Hamill Kenny("Shakespeare's Cressida," Anglia, 61 [1937], 170) is of the opinion that "Troilus and Cressida are ... indeed married, according to Elizabethan common law." This has been refuted by Pierre Legouis ("Troilus devant le Mariage," Les Langues Modernes, 42 année [1948], A4) who points out decisively that: "la scène en question copie les formes du mariage, puisque c'en est la parodie." It would certainly distort the play's tone if Shakespeare intended to suggest any real marriage for the lovers in these vows; but Pandarus might informally see the betrothal as pledging them to each other for life.

status. He recognizes that the music is "broken" (III:i:49) but he does not appreciate what this means in terms of true harmony,[4] and when he joins in the praises of "love" (in his song of III:i:114-26) Pandarus pays service to a force which is patently unprogressive.[5] Thus he is contaminated by (but ignorant of) their "love's" inevitable unproductivity.

This scene epitomizes the voluptuous sterility of the Trojan court, where Helen is idolized as a "theme of honor and renown" (II:ii:199), and the presence of Pandarus there immediately before he brings Troilus and Cressida together stresses the debauchery and the self-indulgent sterility which underlie the Trojan veneer of chivalry, and which work against his own vulgar but genuine support for domesticity and the forces of earthly procreativity.

It seems that Shakespeare places this blatantly satirical scene just before the meeting of Troilus and Cressida so as to emphasize the unlawfulness of both love affairs, and that Pandarus therefore contaminates the younger pair of lovers because of his recent assistance at Helen's "melody" (III:i:68). But the Servant's

---

[4] Frederick W. Sternfeld, "Troilus and Cressida: Music for the Play," English Institute Essays (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954), p.135, investigates the indecorum of this scene, and points out that "Pandarus' air is the music of depraved Elizabethan gentry" and that "it is quite proper for Pandarus [as a lord] to be reluctant to sing, but improper for him to do so." Its "exclusive musical diet of aristocratic airs show the sickening softness and hotness which is [due to the] fever of Troy." On p.131 Sternfeld states that the "consort" [music composed of different tone colours] of Paris and Helen which is "broken" shows them to be the "prototypes of depravity."

[5] Peter Joseph Seng, The Vocal Songs in the Plays of Shakespeare (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967), p.176, comments that "the whole effect of [Pandarus'] song is to describe a sensual love which culminates only in a permanently unsatisfied satiety."

ridicule of Pandarus and Helen's mockery of him suggest that his "religious" participation is not intentionally idolatrous, and that he is too "courtly" (that is, too much concerned with sycophancy and the gaining of favour from Paris and Helen) to understand that their rule of "love" is pervertedly self-destructive and sterile.

So Pandarus represents the lowest most worldly extreme of the Trojan "romantic" elements while Hector epitomizes their highest aims and ideals. Once Hector is dead and Troilus has rejected all allegiance to "romance" only the ignorant and mundane adherence of Pandarus remains to support the cause of peaceful productivity. Shakespeare may be suggesting, in this way, that even the farmyard level of mankind has a voice in human considerations; for, although the "martial" elements in Troilus and Cressida are more clearly presented among the Greeks and the "romantic" elements among the Trojans the two most inferior characters on each side both operate in favour of "romance" and against the resumption of the war. Pandarus is shown as trying to further the cause of "romance" in its most despicable form, and he epitomizes the unworthiest "romantic" elements in the play while his gross degradation makes a mockery of "love." He is, nevertheless, an agent for physical continuity.

The part played by Thersites on the side of the Greeks is in many ways similar to that played by Pandarus among the Trojans, but it is much less in evidence. (Thersites' part resembles and balances that of Pandarus in the same way that Achilles' role as a lover is similar to that of Troilus.) The Greeks' "romantic" aims are weaker than those of the Trojans and Thersites' support for them is shown only negatively. His vituperative insistence on the Greek warriors' shortcomings

implies, rather than states, his antagonism to their "martial" endeavours and his part in furthering Achilles' romance is small but temporarily decisive.

Thersites' role as railer against the war is traditional, but in the play he virulently denounces only his fellow Greeks,[6] excoriating those who are especially inclined to warfare. (They are Agamemnon, at II:i:2-6, Ulysses and Nestor, at II:i:104-5, Menelaus, at V:i:54-56, and Ajax and Achilles, as fighters; at V:iv:13-15.) It is notable that Thersites supports Troilus against Diomedes in their mutual battle: "I would fain see them meet, that that same young Troyan ass, that loves the whore there, might send that Greekish whoremasterly villain with the sleeve back ..." (at V:iv:5-8), and that he also denounces Achilles for his stupidity, at the end of III:iii:310-12: "Would the fountain of your mind were clear again, that I might water an ass at it! I had rather be a tick in a sheep than such a valiant ignorance." All this suggests, therefore, that Thersites' own unpatriotic pacificism is in line with that of Achilles and that he rails essentially against the foolishness of those characters who allow the others to make them take part in the war.

Thersites' presence in the scenes where Achilles and Patroclus display their resistance to the fighting emphasizes his own "romantic" sympathies (II:i:1-119, II:iii:1-75 and V:i:5-97), although his insulting words expose their love and idleness in a harshly unfavourable light. His role as letter-carrier from Hecuba to Achilles (V:i:7-9) parallels that of Pandarus when he brings a letter from

---

[6] Coghill, p.99.

Cressida to Troilus (V:iii:99) and in both cases these missives come to the lovers from the "higher" objects of their two-fold loves. But while Troilus' reason for rejecting Cressida's letter is that she only sends him "words" at the time when another enjoys her "deeds" (V:iii:112) and while this shows that he does not care for her in his mind if her body is unfaithful to him, Achilles obeys the request of Hecuba's letter when he receives it. At this stage Achilles has not repudiated his aim of a "higher" matrimonial liaison with Polyxena despite the loss of "fame" for him which it incurs (V:i:43) and despite Patroclus' incitement for him to recuperate his honour (III:iii:222-25). He therefore supports "romance" more strongly than does Troilus; and of the two, Achilles has greater justification, later, in deserting its cause. Thersites upholds the "romantic" aims of the Greeks in the same way that Pandarus supports those of the Trojans, and they both operate effectively until the moments when Achilles and Troilus each react passionately to the loss of their respective physical loves, by the death of the one and the proven infidelity of the other.

It seems that these two lowest characters also epitomize that corporeal and selfish disregard for true chivalry which the personal actions of Hector show as the underlying cause for the moral "fall" of Troy. The presence of Pandarus and Thersites and their comments emphasize the play's pattern of descent from the original Trojan indication of high ideals (which are the only suggestions in the play of possible spiritual elevation) to their neglect by the Trojan princes, in favour of the Greeks' expedient standards; to the assumption by the Greeks of a "romantic" veneer over their predominantly "martial" aims (when love for Cressida is reduced to its degraded aspect of sexual exploitation by her reception

and treatment among them); and finally to the exemplification of that "lechery" which Pandarus embodies and which Thersites unpleasantly, but correctly, denounces (V:ii:195).

In this pattern of descent Pandarus holds the same level as Thersites in supporting aims that are only carnal, so that they are also alike in expressing the view that the world is entirely limited to the physical. And although the outlook of Pandarus towards Time at the beginning of the play shows his attitude to be one which encompasses the idea of growth and fruition within the earth, his unwitting support of the Trojan princes in their adulation of Helen is shown to be worship at the shrine of sterility, which destroys his ability to represent the earth's reproductive forces, effectively.

Thersites' views resemble those of all the other Greeks in never suggesting any potential spirituality, but in seeing man as all-powerful within his own environment. (This is shown in Ulysses' speech, at I:iii:89-93, where he reverses the expected comparison by making "the glorious planet Sol" to be "like ... a king" instead of likening the monarch to the sun, and showing that, of the two, the king should be the inferior.) But when the play's "martial" elements are winning Thersites denounces his fellow Greeks for their support of the war and he thereby deprecates all that is destructive and fruitless in terms of earthbound creativity. This suggests that Thersites also supports these basic elements of "romance," if only negatively, by excoriating the cause which opposes them.

Without Hector, all the "fools on both sides" finally assume attitudes that are hopeless in terms of physical, as well as spiritual, continuity, and their future becomes no more than an extension of the present moment's savage warfare.

This is caused by their own selfishness: by Troilus' "bad cause" in fighting for Helen and by his "lower" love for Cressida; and by Achilles' indulgence with Patroclus. It is also caused by Hector's support for his younger brothers' pursuit of "fame," and his own desire for it where he sets such "honor" ahead of the virtues of true chivalry. And in his version of the Troy story Shakespeare ironically shows that the fame which is acquired by these warriors could better be described as ignominy, which is exemplified by Hector's covetousness and lack of consideration for others; by Troilus' final unmerciful savagery; and by Achilles' brutality and treachery.

But for the world of the play as a whole, this view of "martial" predominance and of Ulysses' victory over the "romantic" elements is not final, and at the very end Shakespeare brings our attention back to a world outside the bounds of the war. It is suggested by the person of Pandarus, who finishes Troilus and Cressida with a bathetic Epilogue which undercuts the absorbing concerns of the battle and which reminds us of the human ability to survive despite the threats of annihilation. Pandarus' final appearance offers hope for the forces of earthly productivity, or at least for their memory, in the lowest and most diseased form. Shakespeare may have found that the play's first ending, at Troilus' "hope of revenge" (V:x:31) gave the final impression that its "martial" elements were completely overwhelming and that the physical side of human continuity was also doomed to oblivion. Thus, he may have added the Epilogue so as to give the last word to the degraded "romantic" elements and so as to have Pandarus speak for the surviving remnants of human interests. Once Hector is dead "there is no more to say" (V:x:22) for with him all hope for continuity in terms of man's

mind or soul is gone. But the bodily self of Pandarus persists, and his tenacity shows that there is always hope for physical continuity, even though it fails in this play. It can defy warfare and spiritual desolation and so it can, ultimately, represent the human life-force.

In accommodating both the "martial" and the "romantic" view-points I should add, however, that Pandarus' last attestation of continued humanity is given a limit, of "two months' hence" (at V:x:52). Thus, the consistent ambivalence of Troilus and Cressida gives a final glimpse of possible perpetuity, yet undercuts even that at its end.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, Peter. "Troilus and Cressida, 1609." Library, 9 (1928), 267-86.

Almeida, B. H. C. de M. F. de. "Troilus and Cressida: Romantic Love Revisited." Shakespeare Quarterly, 15 (1964), 327-32.

Armstrong, E. A. Shakespeare's Imagination. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963.

Arnold, A. "The Hector-Andromache Scene in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida." Modern Language Quarterly, 14 (1953), 335-40..

Auerbach, Eric. Mimesis, trans. by Willard R. Trask. Princeton: University Press, 1953.

Bacon, Wallace A. "Reason and Will in the Disordered World of Troilus and Cressida." Speech Monographs, 40 (1973), 88-100.

Bartlett, Phyllis B. "The Heroes of Chapman's Homer." Review of English Studies, 17 (1941), 257-80.

Barton, Anne, ed. Troilus and Cressida. The Riverside Shakespeare, textual ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1974, pp.443-94.

Bayley, John. "Time and the Trojans." Essays in Criticism, 25 (1975), 55-73.

Bethell, Samuel Leslie. Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition. London: Staples Press, 1948; rpt.: 1954.

Birney, Alice. Satiric Catharsis in Shakespeare. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

Boas, Frederick Samuel. Shakspere and his Predecessors. New York: John Murray, 1896; rpt.: Greenwood Press, 1969.

Bodwell Smith, Marion. Dualities in Shakespeare. Toronto: University Press, 1966.

Bonjour, Adrien. "Hector and the 'One in Sumptuous Armour'." English Studies, 45 (1964), 104-8.

Bowden, William R. "The Human Shakespeare and Troilus and Cressida." Shakespeare Quarterly, 8 (1957), 167-77.

Bradbrook, Muriel C. "What Shakespeare Did to Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde." Shakespeare Quarterly, 9 (1958), 311-19.

Brandes, Georg. William Shakespeare: A Critical Study, trans. by William Archer and Diana White. 2 vols. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1898; rpt.: 1963.

Brower, Reuben. Hero and Saint: Shakespeare and the Graeco-Roman Heroic Tradition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Bryant, J. A. Hippolyta's View: Some Christian Aspects of Shakespeare's Plays. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1961.

Bullough, Geoffrey, ed. Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, Vol. VI. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.

Campbell, Olwen W. "'Troilus and Cressida:' A Justification." The London Mercury, 4 (1921), 182-97.

Campbell, Oscar J. Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's "Troilus and Cressida." Los Angeles: Adcraft Press, 1938: 2nd rpt. (privately) San Marino, 1959.

Cazamian, L. F. Development of English Humor. New York: Macmillan, 1930: rpt.: A. M. S. Press, 1965.

Chambers, E. K. "Shakespeare: An Epilogue." Review of English Studies, 16 (1940), 385-401.

_____. Shakespeare: A Survey. London: Penguin Books, 1925.

_____. William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930.

Chapman, Antony U. "The Influences of Shakespeare's Sources on the Dramaturgy of Troilus and Cressida." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Kent State University, 1975.

Chapman, George. Homer, ed. Allardyce Nicoll, 2 vols. New York: Pantheon Books, 1965.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, ed. F. N. Robinson. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin, 1933.

Coghill, Neville. Shakespeare's Professional Skills. Cambridge: University Press, 1964.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. A Selection of the Essays, Notes and Lectures of Samuel Taylor Coleridge on the Poems and Plays of Shakespeare, ed. Terence Hawkes. London: Penguin Books, 1969.

Colman, E. A. M. The Dramatic Use of Bawdy in Shakespeare. London: Longmans, 1974.

Daniel, P. A. "Time-Analysis of the Plots of Shakspere's Plays." New Shakspere Society's Transactions, 1877-79. London: Trübner, 1890. II, 180-83.

Eagleton, Terence. Shakespeare and Society. London: Chatto and Windus, 1967.

Edwards, Philip. Shakespeare and the Confines of Art. London: Methuen, 1968.

Ellis-Fermor, Una. The Fontiers of Drama. London: Methuen, 1945.

Elton, W. R. "Shakespeare's Ulysses and the Problem of Value." Shakespeare Studies, 2 (1966), 95-111.

_____. "Textual Transmission and Genre of Shakespeare's Troilus." Literatur als Kritik des Lebens, Festschrift zum 65: Geburtstag von Ludwig Borinski, ed. Haas et al. Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer, 1975.

Empson, William. Some Versions of the Pastoral. London: Chatto and Windus, 1935.

Enck, J. J. "The Peace of the Poetomachia." Publications of the Modern Language Association, 77 (1962), 386-96.

Farnham, Willard. "Troilus in Shapes of Infinite Desire." Shakespeare Quarterly, 15 (1964), 257-64.

Fluchère, Henri. Shakespeare, trans. by Guy Hamilton. London: Longman's, 1953.

Fly, Richard D. "'Suited in Like Condition as our Argument:' Imitative Form in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida." Studies in English Literature, 15 (1975), 273-92.

Foakes, R. A. "Troilus and Cressida Reconsidered," in Troilus and Cressida, ed. Daniel Seltzer, The Signet Classic Shakespeare. New York: New American Library, 1963, pp.265-80.

Foy, Ted. "Shakespeare's Use of Time: A Study of Four Plays." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Delaware, 1974.

Gagen, Jean. "Hector's Honor." Shakespeare Quarterly, 19 (1968), 129-37.

Gallagher, Mollie Elizabeth. "Unity and Disorder in the Problem Plays." Unpublished M. A. dissertation, Sir George Williams University, 1969.

Greg, W. W. The First Shakespeare Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Grudin, Robert. "The Soul of State: Ulyssean Irony in Troilus and Cressida." Anglia, 93 (1975), 55-69.

Harbage, Alfred. Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1952.

Harrier, R. C. "Troilus Divided." Studies in the English Renaissance Drama, in memory of Karl Julius Holzknecht, eds. Josephine W. Bennett, Oscar Cargill and Vernon Hall, Jr. New York: University Press, 1959.

Hart, Edward L. "'War and Lechery:' the Thematic Unity of Troilus and Cressida." Bulletin of the Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association, 27 (1973), 181-86.

Hawkes, Terence. Shakespeare and the Reason: A Study of the Tragedies and the Problem Plays. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964.

Hazlitt, William. Characters of Shakespeare's Plays. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1906.

Henderson, B. Drayton. "Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida: Yet Deeper in its Tradition," in Essays in Dramatic Literature, ed. Hardin Craig. New York: Russell and Russell, 1935, pp. 127-56.

Henryson, Robert. The Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson, ed. H. Harvey Wood, 2nd ed., revised. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1958.

Hillebrand, H. N. and T. W. Baldwin., eds. A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: Troilus and Cressida. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1953.

Howard-Hill, T. H., ed. Troilus and Cressida: A Concordance to the text of the First Quarto of 1609. The Oxford Shakespeare Concordances. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Jones-Davies, M. T. "Discord in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida: or, the Conflict between 'Angry Mars and Venus Queen of Love'." Shakespeare Quarterly, 25 (1974), 33-41.

Kaufman, R. J. "Ceremonies for Chaos: the Status of Troilus and Cressida." English Literary History, 32 (1965), 139-57.

Kaula, David. "Will and Reason in Troilus and Cressida." Shakespeare Quarterly, 12 (1961), 271-83.

Kelleher, V. M. K. "Troilus and Cressida: Shakespeare's Vision of Fallen Man." U. N. I. S. A. English Studies, 6 (1973), 8-14.

Kendall, Paul M. "Inaction and Ambivalence in Troilus and Cressida." English Studies in Honor of James Southall Wilson, ed. Fredson Bowers. Charlottesville, Va.: University of Virginia Studies, (1952), pp. 131-45.

Kenny, Hamill. "Shakespeare's Cressida." Anglia, 61 (1937), 163-76.

Kermode, F. "Opinion, Truth and Value." Essays in Criticism, 5 (1955), 181-87.

Kernan, Alvin. The Cankered Muse. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959; rpt.: Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1976.

Kimbrough, Robert. Shakespeare's 'Troilus and Cressida' and Its Setting. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964.

_____. "The Troilus Log: Shakespeare and 'Box-office'." Shakespeare Quarterly, 15 (1964), 201-9.

Kleinstück, J. "Ulysses' Speech on Degree as Related to the Play of Troilus and Cressida." Neophilologus, 43 (1959), 58-63.

Knight, G. Wilson. "The Metaphysic of Troilus and Cressida." Dublin Review, 185 (1929), 228-42.

_____. The Wheel of Fire. London: Methuen, 1954.

Knights, L. C. Some Shakespearean Themes. London: Chatto and Windus, 1969.

_____. "Troilus and Cressida Again." Scrutiny, 18 (1951), 144-64.

Knowland, A. S. "Troilus and Cressida." Shakespeare Quarterly, 10 (1959), 351-65.

Kott, Jan. Shakespeare Our Contemporary, trans. by Boleslaw Taborski. London: Methuen, 1964.

Lawrence, William W. Shakespeare's Problem Comedies, 2nd ed. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1960.

_____. "Troilus, Cressida and Thersites." Modern Language Review, 37 (1942), 422-37.

Leech, Clifford. "Shakespeare's Greeks." Stratford Papers on Shakespeare, ed. B. W. Jackson. Toronto: W. J. Gage, 1963, pp.1-20.

Legouis, Pierre. "Troilus devant le Mariage." Les Langues Modernes, 42 (1948), A1-A6.

Lewis, Wyndham. The Lion and the Fox. London: Methuen, 1927.

Marsh, Derek R. C. "Interpretation and Misinterpretation: the Problem of Troilus and Cressida." Shakespeare Studies, I (1965), 182-98.

McAlindon, T. Shakespeare and Decorum. London: Macmillan, 1973.

Martin, Priscilla, ed. Troilus and Cressida: A Casebook, London: Macmillan, 1976.

Mendelsohn, Leonard R. "The Legends of Troy in English Renaissance Drama." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1966.

Morris, Brian R. "The Tragic Structure of Troilus and Cressida." Shakespeare Quarterly, 10 (1959), 481-91.

Muir, Kenneth. Shakespeare's Sources, Vol. I. London: Methuen, 1957.

_____. "Troilus and Cressida." Shakespeare Survey, 8 (1955) 28-38.

Nagarajan, S. "Measure for Measure and Elizabethan Betrothals." Shakespeare Quarterly, 14 (1963), 115-19.

Newlin, Jeane T. "The Modernity of Troilus and Cressida: the Case for Theatrical Criticism." Harvard Library Bulletin, 17 (1969), 354-72.

Nosworthy, J. M. Shakespeare's Occasional Plays: Their Origin and Transmission. London: Edward Arnold, 1965.

Nowottny, Winifred M. T. "'Opinion' and 'Value' in Troilus and Cressida." Essays in Criticism, 4 (1954), 283-94.

Oates, Joyce Carol. "The Ambiguity of Troilus and Cressida." Shakespeare Quarterly, 17 (1966), 140-50.

Oates Smith, J. "Essence and Existence in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida." Philological Quarterly, 46 (1967), 167-85.

Partridge, Eric. Shakespeare's Bawdy. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1947.

Petti, Anthony G. "Beasts and Politics in Elizabethan Literature." Essays and Studies, 16 (1963), 68-90.

Presson, Robert K. Shakespeare's "Troilus and Cressida" and the Legends of Troy. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1953.

Rabkin, Norman. "Troilus and Cressida: the Use of the Double Plot." Shakespeare Studies, 1 (1965), 265-82.

Raleigh, Walter. Shakespeare. London: Macmillan, 1907.

Rickey, M. E. " 'Twixt the Dangerous Shares: Troilus and Cressida Again." Shakespeare Quarterly, 15 (1964), 3-13.

Rollins, Hyder E. "The Troilus-Cressida Story from Chaucer to Shakespeare." Publications of the Modern Language Association, 32 (1917), 389-429.

Rossiter, A. P. Angel With Horns; and Other Shakespeare Lectures, ed. Graham Storey. London: Longman's, 1961.

Roy, Emil. "War and Manliness in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida." Comparative Drama, 7 (1973), 107-20.

Schanzer, Ernest. The Problem Plays of Shakespeare. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.

Seltzer, Daniel, ed. Troilus and Cressida. The Signet Classic Shakespeare. New York: New American Library, 1963.

Seng, Peter Joseph. The Vocal Songs in the Plays of Shakespeare: A Variorum Edition. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Shakspere Allusion-Book: A Collection of Allusions to Shakspere from 1591 to 1700, ed. J. Munro, revised by E. K. Chambers. 2 vols. Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1909; rpt.: 1932; rpt.: 1970.

Shalvi, Alice. "'Honor' in Troilus and Cressida." Studies in English Literature, 5 (1965), 283-302.

Sharpe, Robert Boies. The Real War of the Theaters: Shakespeare's Fellows in Rivalry With the Admiral's Men, 1594-1603. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1935; rpt.: New York: Kraus, 1966.

Shaw, George Bernard. Plays Pleasant and Unpleasant. 2 vols. New York: Brentano's, 1912.

Sisson, C. J. "The Mythical Sorrows of Shakespeare." Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy, 1934. New York: Haskill House, 1964.

Slights, Camille. "The Parallel Structure of Troilus and Cressida." Shakespeare Quarterly, 25 (1974) 42-51.

Small, Roscoe Addison. The Stage Quarrel between Ben Jonson and the So-Called Poetasters. Breslau: 1899; rpt.: New York: A. M. S. Press, 1966.

Smith, R. J. "Personal Identity in Troylus and Cressida." English Studies in Africa, 6 (1963), 6-23.

Spencer, T. J. B. "Commentary on Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida." Studies in English Literature, 16 (1936), 2-42.

_____. Shakespeare and the Nature of Man. New York: Macmillan, 1949.

Spurgeon, Caroline. Shakespeare's Imagery; and what it tells us. New York: Macmillan, 1936.

Stafford, T. J. "Mercantile Imagery of Troilus and Cressida." Shakespeare in the Southwest: Some New Directions. El Paso: Texas Western Press, 1969, pp.7-37.

Stauffer, Donald. Shakespeare's World of Images: the Development of his Moral Ideas. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1949.

Sternfeld, Frederick W. "Troilus and Cressida: Music for the Play." English Institute Essays. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952, pp.107-37.

Symons, Arthur R. "Troilus and Cressida." Harper's Monthly Magazine, 115 (1907), 659-64.

Tatlock, John S. P. "The Chief Problem in Shakespeare." The Sewanee Review, 24 (1916), 129-47.

_____. "The Siege of Troy in Elizabethan Literature: Especially in Shakespeare and Heywood." Publications of the Modern Language Association, 30 (1915), 710-25.

Thomson, Patricia. "Rant and Cant in Troilus and Cressida." Essays and Studies, 22 (1969), 33-56.

Tillyard, E. M. W. Shakespeare's Problem Plays. London: Chatto and Windus, 1950.

_____. Some Mythical Elements in English Literature. London: Chatto and Windus, 1961.

Traversi, Derek A. "Troilus and Cressida." Scrutiny, 7 (1939), 301-19.

Trewin, J. C. Shakespeare on the English Stage, 1900-1964: A Survey of Productions. London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1964.

Tynan, Kenneth. Curtains: Selections from the drama criticisms and related writings. London: Longman's, 1961.

Ulrici, H. "Ist Troilus and Cressida 'comedy' oder 'tragedy' oder 'history'?" Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, 9 (1874), ix-xl.

Ure, Peter. William Shakespeare: The Problem Plays. London: Longman's 1961.

VanDoren, Mark. Shakespeare. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1953.

Voth, Grant L. and Oliver H. Evans. "Cressida and the World of the Play." Shakespeare Studies, 8 (1975), 231-39.

Walker, Alice. "The Textual Problem of Troilus and Cressida." Modern Language Review, 45 (1950), 459-64.

_____, ed. Troilus and Cressida. Cambridge: University Press, 1957.

Whitaker, Virgil K. "Shakespeare's Use of his Sources." Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hardin Craig, ed. Baldwin Maxwell, W. D. Briggs, Francis R. Johnson, E. N. S. Thompson. Stanford, Calif.: University Press, 1972, pp. 185-97.

_____, ed. Troilus and Cressida. The Pelican Shakespeare. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1963.

Williams, Charles. The English Poetic Mind. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932.

Williams, Philip, Jr. "The 'Second Issue' of Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida, 1609." Studies in Bibliography: Papers of the Bibliographical Society of Virginia, (1948-49), II, 25-33.

Yoder, Audrey. Animal Analogy in Shakespeare's Character Portrayal. New York: Columbia University Press, 1947.

Yoder, R. A. "Sons and Daughters of the Game." Shakespeare Survey, 25 (1972), 11-24.