A TALE OF TWO NATIONS: CHAUCER, HENRYSON, SHAKESPEARE, TROILUS AND CRISEYDE*

Murat ÖĞÜTCÜ**

Abstract

The matter of Troilus and Criseyde had been dealt in both England and Scotland in similar yet different ways from the late 14th to the early 17th century. In Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* (ca. 1385), the conflict between worldly and heavenly love is depicted in a controversial way. Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid* (ca. 1480) seems to give a Scottish, or rather Catholic, answer and after thought to the loose ends he inherited from Chaucer. However, a new twist in the literary relation between England and Scotland occurs when the Matter of Troy is put on stage. Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* (ca. 1602) combines Chaucer and Henryson's versions. In the former, Shakespeare merely continues the English tradition, yet in the latter, Shakespeare seems to deviate from that tradition in embracing Scottish literature at a time when England was ruled by Elizabeth I and James VI of Scotland was a strong candidate for the succession to the English throne. Thus, through the work, the unification of the two countries is maintained on a literary level, which would be maintained later also practically under the future James I of England. Thus, the Troilus and Criseyde story sheds light into the Anglo-Scottish relations and the reciprocal influence of each side on the other reflected in literature. Therefore, this paper will compare and contrast Chaucer's, Henryson's and Shakespeare's dealing of Troilus and Criseyde.

Key Words: *Chaucer, Henryson, Shakespeare, Troilus and Criseyde, Anglo-Scottish Interactions.*

İKİ ULUSUN HİKAYESİ: CHAUCER, HENRYSON, SHAKESPEARE, TROİLUS VE CRİSEYDE

Özet

14. yüzyılın sonlarından 17. yüzyılın başlarına kadar, Troilus ve Criseyde konusu hem İngiltere hem de İskoçya'da benzer ama birbirinden farklı olarak ele alınmıştı. Chaucer'ın *Troilus ve Criseyde* (1385 civarı) adlı eserinde dünyevi ve ilahi aşkın çatışması tartışmalı biçimde tasvir edilmektedir. Henryson'ın *Cresseid'in İfadesi* (1480 civarı) adlı eseri ise Chaucer'dan kendisine intikal eden boşlukları doldurmak için bir İskoç veya daha doğrusu bir Katolik bakış açısıyla cevap verdiği ve fikrini beyan ettiği görülmektedir. Ancak, İngiltere ve İskoçya ilişkilerinde yeni bir dönemeç Truva konusunun sahneye taşınmasıyla görülecektir. Shakespeare'in *Troilus ve Cressida* (1602 civarı) adlı eseri Chaucer ve Henryson'un yorumlarını birleştirmektedir. Chaucer'ı kullanarak sadece İngiliz geleneğini devam ettirdiği düşünülse de, Henryson'u kullanarak bu gelenekten uzaklaştığı ve I. Elizabeth tarafından yönetilip İskoçya Kralı VI. James'in İngiliz tahtının en güçlü varislerinden olduğu bir dönemde İskoç geleneğini benimsediği görülmektedir. Böylece eser sayesinde iki ülke edebi anlamda birleşmektedir, ki bu birleşme siyasi olarak İngiltere Kralı I. James sayesinde de gerçekleşecektir. Böylece, Troilus ve Criseyde konusu İskoç-İngiliz ilişkilerini ve karşılıklı edebi etkileşimleri aydınlatmaktadır. Bundan dolayı bu makalenin amacı Chaucer, Henryson ve Shakespeare'in Troilus ve Criseyde konusunu ele alışlarını karşılaştırmaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Chaucer, Henryson, Shakespeare, Troilus and Criseyde, İskoç-İngiliz İlişkileri.*

**Assist. Prof. Dr., Munzur University, Faculty of Letters, Department of Western Languages and Literatures, TUNCELI.
e-posta: murat_ogutcu@yahoo.com (orcid.org/0000-0003-1523-8321)

1. INTRODUCTION

In the Late Medieval and Early Modern Period, Scotland and England lived politically, culturally and literarily both together and apart. On a political level, the togetherness of Scotland and England started with the marriage of Henry VII's daughter, Margaret, to James IV of Scotland. The marriage, which was celebrated by Dunbar as *The Thistle and the Rose* (1503), marked an important turning point of Anglo-Scottish relationships (Kratzmann, 1980: 3-4; Baugh, 1948: 2.318) before the accession of James VI of Scotland as James I of England a hundred years later. Yet, it is interestingly enough that the initial transnational communication of the two countries in the period started with a literary interaction before moving into a political one. In particular, the emergence of Scottish Chaucerians, poems and counter-poems of English and Scottish poets from the 15th to the 16th centuries, and the printing of Scottish poetry in England in anglicised form (Kratzmann, 1980: 7; Wood, 1967: 9; Fox, 1964: 164) have been major points that led to the development of Anglo-Scottish literary relationships.

Furthermore, starting from the 14th century, this interaction resulted in a literary hybridisation, in which, however, both countries developed their distinct "literary decorum;" accordingly, Scottish poets followed Chaucer's example, whereas their English counterparts followed Lydgate's (Kratzmann, 1980: 7; Robinson, 1972: 234-8). This literary hybridisation, on the other hand, could be best observed in the handling of the matter of Troy which has been one of the most famous meeting points of Anglo-Scottish literary relationships. Particularly, the story of Troilus and Criseyde had been dealt with in both England and Scotland in similar yet different ways from the late 14th to the early 17th centuries, the most famous examples of which are Chaucer's, Henryson's and Shakespeare's retellings.[1]

Yet, the choice of the matter of Troy by the poets of both countries is not just haphazard. The matter of Troy has been used for political ends in line with the concept of *translatio imperii* according to which each nation tried to connect its ancestry to Troy as a political manifesto of its national and international importance (James, 1997: 21-2; Bellamy, 1992: 33-7). The creation of such an ancestral connection is crucial in the formation of identity, which, as Hall argues, is maintained through "identification" based on the "recognition of some common origin" (Hall, 2007: 2). Therefore, to give a good literary output of the matter of Troy was equalled with gaining "cultural authority" (James, 1997: 8) and was, thus, important in the creation of a national identity. For instance, when Chaucer re-writes *Troilus*, he is conscious that there "was a litil envye" between the authors from different nations of the Troy legend (*HF* 3.1471-6) as each wanted to give the accurate version of the story related to his national origin. In this sense, Henryson enters the battle by formulating a Scottish version of the story of Troilus. Along with his Scottish references in his work, Henryson wants to show that Scottish literature is capable of reformulating the "tragedie" (*TestC* 4) of Troy and is, thus, as important as other European literatures, cultures, hence, identities. However, when Shakespeare combines the Scottish and the English version in his criticism of the nobility in *Troilus and Cressida* (ca. 1602) he achieves the unification of the two countries on a literary level. This unification, however, is reflective of the problems of the hybridisation of the transnational literary interactions. Thus, the Troilus and Criseyde story sheds light into the Anglo-Scottish relations and the reciprocal influence of each side on the other, reflected in literature. Therefore, this essay will compare and contrast Chaucer's, Henryson's and Shakespeare's dealings of Troilus and Criseyde/Cresseid/Cressida and show how it united Scotland and England on a literary level.

2. CHAUCER'S *TROILUS AND CRISEYDE*

Chaucer is the first English poet to write about the story of Troilus and is, thus, not only the "father of English poetry" (Dryden 16) but also one of the fathers who initiated the reciprocal literary relationship of Scotland and England. He re-reads Boccaccio's *Il Filostrato* (1335) and composes his *Troilus and Criseyde* (ca. 1385) as the most celebrated English example to the *translatio imperii* that has been seen as a romance, an epic, a history, a tragedy, a lyric, a fabliau, an allegory and even a "psychological novel" (Windeatt, 1992: 138-180; Kittredge, 1915: 112). Chaucer's *Troilus* depicts the conflict between worldly and heavenly love in a controversial way. The crux of the work is that although worldly love is elaborated throughout, it is, like most of the love poetry in the Middle Ages, retracted in the palinode (*TC* 5.1786-1869) at the very end. Therefore, critics of Chaucer's works have quarrelled about whether the work celebrated (Lewis, 1979: 196; Donaldson, 1970: 67) or condemned

---

1 Throughout the article, the references to Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* are abbreviated as *TC* and are from Geoffrey Chaucer (1988). *The Riverside Chaucer*, (Ed: L. D. Benson), 3rd ed., Oxford University Press, Suffolk. References to Chaucer's *House of Fame* are abbreviated as *HF* and are again from *The Riverside Chaucer*. References to Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid* are abbreviated as *TestC* and are from Robert Henryson (1958). *The Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson: Schoolmaster of Dunfermline*, (Ed: H. Harvey Wood), Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh. References to Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* are abbreviated as *Tro.* and are from William Shakespeare (1994), *Troilus and Cressida*, (Ed: Kenneth Palmer), Routledge, London.

the romance between Troilus and Criseyde (Robertson, 1962: 479; Carney, 2009: 359, 360-1; Ege, 2000: 263) and how the moral to embrace divine love should be regarded, at all. Defying such schism, however, it could be argued that Chaucer might have rather created a third space through ambiguity presenting worldly and heavenly love "simultaneously" (Öğütcü, 2011: 292). Peculiarly, Troilus in this sense can be considered not only as the "sexual aggressor," the "sperhauk" of his "larke" Criseyde (Mann, 1980: 329; *TC* 3.1191-2), but as someone who ascends to heaven and gains divine knowledge at the same time. Whatever the stance is, it cannot be denied that the possibility of opposite readings and simultaneity rendered Chaucer's unconventional work variable in signification.

3. HENRYSON'S *TESTAMENT OF CRESSEID*

However, Chaucer's controversial re-reading of the story of Troilus initiated a much more controversial development in the Anglo-Scottish literary relationship. The Scottish poet who built up that controversial development would be both the most famous and for a long time unknown interpreter of the story of Troilus. Following an opposite reading of Chaucer's work, Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid* (ca. 1480), seems to give a Scottish, or rather religious, answer and afterthought to the loose ends he inherited from Chaucer. Noted for his translations of Aesop, *Morall Fabillis of Esope the Phrygian* (ca. 1480), Henryson might have been dissatisfied with the lack of poetic justice on the side of Criseyde, which may be why he reduces her to a leprous harlot.

Nevertheless, Henryson's reading and adaptation of Chaucer's work creates two conflicting sets of assumptions about the Scottishness of the work. The very fact that Henryson has been called as a Scottish Chaucerian makes it difficult for the reader/critic to consider his *Testament* as a Scottish work. His use of rhyme royal, the subject matter of the story of Troilus itself, his direct references to Chaucer (*TestC* 41, 58, 64), and the parallels between Chaucer's and his work (*TestC* 4, 589; *TC* 5. 165, 5.1611, 5.1669, 5.1688, 5.1690) makes Henryson live in the shadow of Chaucer. This is why Henryson's straightforward and less ambiguous style has been labelled as "mundane, unheroic, and uncourtly," which is why some critics even argued that Henryson rather "misread" Chaucer (Johnson, 1990: 314; Bennett, 1992: 94).

In this aspect, it can be asked whether Henryson's work should be considered as an appendix to Chaucer's poetry that shows the bondage of Scottish literature to English literature and culture (Carruthers, 2009: 41)? Or could it be considered as a creative resistance that mocks and mimics its English source? If agreed with the former, the bondage makes it quite questionable to call the *Testament* a part of Scottish literature at all. Yet, if the latter is to be considered as a possible answer to locate Henryson's work, Henryson could be seen as a literary figure who transformed Chaucer's version, hence English literature, by creating his own unique version of the Troilus and Criseyde story (Goldstein, 1999: 240; Sweney, 2000: 124; Speirs, 1982: 85). This, on the other hand, makes Henryson's work a manifesto of Scottish literature asserting that the Scottish language and literature is capable of following the *translatio imperii* concept and create its ties with the Trojan literary ancestry.

In his *translatio imperii* attempt, Henryson achieves to create a Scottish point-of-view by adapting Chaucer's work into the tradition of moralistic Scottish literary tastes. Taking "hints" from Chaucer's work without "depend[ing] on it," Henryson abbreviates Chaucer's version (Bennett, 1992: 90; Johnson, 1990: 314-5). Thereby, he tries to create a unique and Scottish version of the story of Troilus. Henryson's national consciousness can be seen when he used the word "Kirk" (*TestC* 117) for the temple of Venus for Chaucer's "temple" (*TC* 1.267), which makes Calchas appear like "a Scottish priest" (Bennett, 1992: 93-4; *TestC* 367-77, 392). As for the moralistic Scottish tastes, Henryson, like the later critics of Chaucer, acknowledges both the worth of Chaucer and his telling of Troilus's "distres" (*TestC* 57-8). Yet, he is critical of the truth of Chaucer's retelling marked for its solely "gudelie termis" that lacks the justice upon Cresseid's "unfaithfulnes" (*TestC* 59-64, 570). For instance, while Chaucer is concerned about the presentation of the "double sorwe" of Troilus (*TC* 1.1), Henryson is not interested in Troilus whom he resurrects in order to focus on "the fatall destenie / Of fair Cresseid, that endit wretchitlie" (*TestC* 62-3). Likewise, Chaucer presents the story like a *double entandre* from its earthly and heavenly perspective "simultaneously" (Öğütcü, 2011: 292). Yet, Henryson, within a "different," yet single, "perspective" (Johnson, 1990: 314), is merely concerned with "Instructioun" (*TestC* 611). For Henryson the chief element of composing his work is to achieve "*moralitas*" (Bennett, 1992: 103). This moral instruction, on the other hand, is not achieved by the *anagnorisis* of Troilus when he is killed in his youth as in Chaucer (*TC* 1807-32), but through Cresseid's *nemesis* whose gradual downfall we see in her metaphorical old age marked by her leprosy (Johnson, 1990: 134). Therefore, Henryson is rather concerned about "the double sorrow of Cresseid in losing both Troilus and Diomeid" (Bennett, 1992: 94), which satirical re-reading is shaped by Henryson's aim to instruct his "worthie

Wemen" (*TestC* 610). A satirist always wants to "compel" his specific understanding of "truth" (Sutherland, 1962: 4-5) by using his characters as puppets and hiding under the mask of the satirist (Highet, 1962: 13, 241). In a similar manner, Henryson uses Cresseid as a puppet while hiding himself and asserts that a "giglotlike" kind of "mynd in fleschelie foull affectioun" which is "[i]nclynit to Lustis Lecherous" (*TestC* 83, 558-60) will and should be punished. Hence, if we agree with Ramson that the *Testament* was read aloud to women in the Scottish court (as cited in McKim, 2006: 113), it can be put forth that Henryson reads the English Troilus, rewrites a Scottish Cresseid and presents it to a Scottish public in Scottish to make them take an example of her misfortunes and follow under the prescripts of Henryson's understanding of Scottish identity marked for celebrating moral perfectness and condemning looseness.

4. THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD AND SHAKESPEARE'S *TROILUS AND CRESSIDA*

Henryson's Scottish and moralistic retelling of the *translatio imperii*, on the other hand, affected Anglo-Scottish literary relationships to a great deal. Particularly, in the Early Modern Period, we see that Henryson's satirical re-reading of the story of Troilus evolved as a very important turning point. Whether or not Henryson intentionally "misread" Chaucer (Bennett, 1992: 94), Henryson's work had a greater influence than Chaucer on the English popular understanding of the story of Troilus in Early Modern England, seen especially in the rather misogynistic description of Cresseid.

However, during this process, Henryson was known as the author of the *Testament* only in Scotland and was not acknowledged as the author in Early Modern England. On the one hand, there were several MSS and printed versions of the *Testament* in Scotland (McKim, 2006: 105; Mapstone, 1985: 307-10). Likewise, the possibility that it was recited to "worthie Wemen" (*TestC* 610) in the Scottish court (Ramson as cited in McKim, 2006: 113) makes it almost certain that the *Testament* was quite popular in Scotland and that Henryson was known as its originator. On the other hand, William Thynne's Chaucer compilation printed in 1532 "made the *Testament*, but not Henryson, known to English readers" (McKim, 2006: 105; Mapstone, 1985: 307-10). This earliest printed version of the *Testament* was an anglicised version appended as a sixth book to Chaucer's *Troilus*, which presumption lasted until Henryson was acknowledged as the author of the *Testament* by Kinaston in 1639 and by critics generally in 1721 (McKim, 2006: 105; Forni, 2001: 107).

Nevertheless, the fact that the *Testament* did not, at least, belong to Chaucer was known by some of the critics in the Early Modern Period, as well. As Forni indicates, in the MS of "his *Animadversions* (1599) on Speght's 1598 edition, the *Testament of Cresseid* is one of the few works Francis Thynne specifically designates as 'adulterat.'" (as cited in Forni, 2001: 109), which means that it is an apocryphal work that belongs to someone else. Similarly, the textual references to Chaucer (*TestC* 41, 58, 64) seem to be strong clues for the Early Modern English literary audience to consider the *Testament* as the work of someone other than Chaucer. Yet, since Thynne's definition of the *Testament* as a spurious work is retracted in the 1602 Speght version, it is very difficult to claim whether or not the audience, poets and playwrights of the Elizabethan Age noticed the *Testament* as a non-English work.

The most notorious of the English adaptations of Henryson's *Testament* was William Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* (ca. 1602). Shakespeare was actually familiar with the *Testament* even before he wrote his *Troilus and Cressida*, particularly when he was referring to loose women. In his *Henry V* (1599), for instance, Pistol calls Doll Tearsheet "the lazar kite of Cressid's kind" (1995: 2.1.76), and in *Twelfth Night* (1601), Feste quibbles with Viola and refers to "Cressida" as "a beggar" (1975: 3.1.50-2). This shows that Shakespeare had a particular knowledge of and interest in Henryson's version that was familiar with his audience who could understand the jokes about it.

As for Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*, it was primarily based on Chapman's translation of the *Iliades* (1598), Chaucer's *Troilus* and Henryson's *Testament*, and entered into the Stationers' Register in 1603. References about contemporary performances in the two published quartos, however, have rather confused critics whether there had been any performances of the play in Shakespeare's life at all. One of the quartos in 1609 asserts that it was acted out at the Globe theatre (Shakespeare, 1609b: Title page). However, another quarto in the same year retracts this supposition and argues that this is "a new play, neuer ſtal'd with the Stage, neuer clapper-clawd with the palmes of the vulgar" (Shakespeare, 1609a: 2ʳ). Whether this confusion indicates that the play was probably performed in the Elizabethan Period, right before its entry into the Stationers' Register, but actually never in the Jacobean period, is a matter of dispute (Apfelbaum, 2004: 32-8) that problematises the aesthetic reception of the play, as well. Accordingly, in line with this dispute, the play also engendered aesthetic discussions among Shakespeareans regarding his use of his sources, particularly, of the *Testament*. Many critics have argued that

Shakespeare did not know that the *Testament* was not Chaucer's (Forni, 2001: 120) which, as Rollins, Tatlock and Root maintained undermined the story of Troilus in Shakespeare's play (Rollins, 1972: 396-7; Tatlock, 1916: 129; Root, 1906: 104-5). Notorious for downgrading Helen of Troy to a "whore" (*Tro*. 2.3.70-4), the vulgarity of the play due to the source material has been even regarded as an indication that the play was not enacted at all, as the play was marked for its corruption, disgusting "disease imagery" and "references to divine retribution" (Waterfield, 2009: 402; Apfelbaum, 2004: 101; Thompson, 1978: 121; Yüksel, 2013: 72-6). Thus, Shakespeare's use of the so-called Sixth Book of Chaucer's *Troilus*, that is Henryson *Testament*, created negative responses from critics who attributed the vulgarity of the play to Henryson's misogynistic work.

Nonetheless, albeit the negative attitudes towards Shakespeare's handling of the matter of Troy, the play is important to form a new stage in the literary relation between England and Scotland. Shakespeare in his *Troilus and Cressida* combines Chaucer and Henryson's versions of the love story, along with many others related to the Trojan War. In his references to Chaucer, Shakespeare merely continues the English tradition. Yet, in references to Henryson, Shakespeare, without knowing it, seems to deviate from that tradition in embracing some aspects of Scottish literature at a time when England was still ruled by Elizabeth I and efforts about the succession of James VI became a delicate issue. Particularly, the Earl of Essex had a strong relationship with King James VI of Scotland the latter of which considered the former in correspondences as a "very loving friend" whom he would make "use [of] his advice" (Devereux, 1853: 311). Starting from 1597, this friendship extended in such a way that Essex campaigned and intrigued for the recognition of James VI as the heir of Elizabeth I (Gajda, 2012: 37-40; Lockyer, 1998: 159; Goodman, 1839: 13). Following his frustrations with the Elizabethan government upon the disenfranchisement of non-Cecilian groups in the patronage, in 1599 Essex even considered invading England with an Irish-Scottish force to place James VI on the throne, which was never enacted because of the lack of support from his own friends and the fact that James VI did not consent with a violent transition of power (Bruce, 1861: xii; James, 1986: 441-2; Gajda, 2012: 39; Black, 1959: 442-3). After the premature and "abortive" Essex rebellion in 1601, a great part of the disenfranchised Englishmen became frustrated as they had hoped that a strong leader would emerge to change the system (McCoy, 1989: 133).

This frustration is reflected in Shakespeare's *Troilus* where the notion of nobility is criticised. The Earl of Essex had supported Chapman's *Iliades* and was often resembled to Hector and Achilles who had been considered as the personifications of chivalry and heroism (James, 1997: 89, 91; McCoy, 1989: 79-102; MacCaffrey, 1994: 514-5; Hammer, 1999: 54, 199-200, 203, 350-1, 381; Harrison, 1974: 262.). Shakespeare's scepticism of the neo-chivalric cult as expressed in his characterisation of Hotspur in the Henriad (2002: 1.3.200-6; 1967: 1.1.162-79) was extended in *Troilus and Cressida* in which the concept of nobility became a laughingstock. Shakespeare's criticism of the nobility is "subverting conventional notions of degree, [honour], and value" (Forni, 2001: 117). Controversial to the *translatio imperii* to touch upon the nationalistic feelings by creating the literary bond between a heroic ancestry and the present audience, Shakespeare presents demythologised masculine heroes of the matter of Troy.

Similar to the Elizabethan society polarised by the quarrelsome followers of the Earl of Essex and Robert Cecil, the frustration about the lack of order in the play is initially elaborated on in Ulysses' famous speech on degree that criticises a society torn by "factions" into "chaos" (*Tro*. 1.3.75-137). As Doğan Adanur elaborates, Ulysses' "speech" underscores the importance that "everybody [acts] in accordance to their hierarchical places," the contrary of which is "more disastrous" than "the lengthy war" (Doğan Adanur, 2017: 1052).Thereby, *Troilus and Cressida* depicts a society in which degree is shattered and whose members are far from the expectations of the Homeric heroes. For instance, although Hector seems to be presented as a realist and offers to surrender Helen (*Tro*. 2.2.8-119), he is too sensitive about "fair play" in the war (*Tro*. 5.3.43). He follows the honour code naïvely and even wishes his enemies to "live" rather than die (*Tro*. 5.3.40-3). This insistence makes Hector an "anachronistic" character, as his "chivalric ideals" are outdated (Doğan Adanur, 2017: 1053), both on and off the stage. Hector fights for "honour['s] sake (*Tro*. 5.3.25-8), or rather just for sport, seen when he chases a man merely for his armour (*Tro*. 5.6.27-31). His opponent Achilles, on the other hand, is the opposite of Hector. Conscious about the "slippery" constitution and fickleness of retaining "honours" (*Tro*. 3.3.74-92), Achilles is depicted as a shameless opportunist, seen when he wants to get the credit for killing Hector alone, although he ordered his Myrmidons to murder the unarmed Hector (*Tro*. 5.8.13-4). Likewise, another supposed hero, Ajax, is downgraded in *Troilus and Cressida* to a blockhead. Ajax is likened to an amalgam of a "valiant [...] lion," "churlish [...] bear," and "slow [...] elephant" which makes him full of "folly" (*Tro*. 1.2.15-31). Ajax is termed as a "dull brainless" man (*Tro*. 1.3.381-2) and the word "fool" is used 24 times in the play and for the most time Ajax

is referred as a "fool" (*Tro*. 2.1.24, 64-5, 81, 83, 85, 86, 118). Thus, the play depicts a male world that is at odds with expectations regarding order and masculinity.

Furthermore, the demythologising of the Homeric heroes is aggravated with the farcical and misogynistic handling of the love affair between Troilus and Cressida. Love effeminises and takes the virile power of the warrior, as it is manifested in Troilus' behaviour who proclaims that he cannot fight because he has a "battle" with his "heart" (*Tro*. 1.1.1-5). The performance of this amorous battle, however, is vulgarised by Pandarus' jokes at the expense of Troilus and Cressida (*Tro*. 4.2.21-41). Reflective of this vulgarity, in her relationship with Troilus, Cressida is presented as a character who constantly defeats herself by bragging about her constancy while the audience knows the opposite. When Cressida is to be exchanged for a captive and sent to the Greek camp, she exclaims:

> I will not, uncle: I have forgot my father;
>
> I know no touch of consanguinity;
>
> No kin no love, no blood, no soul so near me
>
> As the sweet Troilus. O you gods divine!
>
> Make Cressid's name the very crown of falsehood,
>
> If ever she leave Troilus! 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. I'll go in and weep,—
>
> […]
>
> Tear my bright hair and scratch my praised cheeks,
>
> Crack my clear voice with sobs and break my heart
>
> With sounding Troilus. I will not go from Troy. (*Tro.* 4.2.95-108)

Subsequently, when she is brought to the Greek camp, however, she is paraded and "kiss'd" by all of the Greeks there (*Tro*. 4.5.21), through which she becomes the "crown of falsehood" and her "body" starts to be objected to all "extremes." Cressida's wanton flirtations with Diomedes, observed in secret by Troilus and others (*Tro.* 5.2.1-199), which adds insult to injury, is followed by an equally notorious exit. In her monologue, almost like a spokeswoman of misogyny, Cressida attributes her "error[s]" to her gender and condemns her "sex" which is governed by lust (*Tro.* 5.2.108-14). Thereby, Shakespeare parodies Troilus's tragic form of dramatic irony and turns it into a comic one, which condemns Cressida and women in advance.

The comedy in *Troilus and Cressida* is a derisive one that condemns femininity and especially their manipulative rule over men. This equation and the excess of the negative depiction of women in the play were chiefly taken from Henryson's *Testament* which was considered then as the Sixth Book of Chaucer's *Troilus.* Yet, these seem to be used in order to appeal to the contemporary attitudes of frustrated male audiences. Albeit Elizabeth I's long reign, her "female magistracy" that was at odds with the patriarchal society was always considered as unnatural and disruptions were said to "proceed 'chiefly from the sex of the Queen'" (James, 1986: 434-4). She was likened to *Vanitas* and biblical female tyrants by her opponents (Montrose, 2006: 244; 1Kings 16:30-21:25, Geneva Bible; 2Chronicles 15:16). Thus, Shakespeare's choice to make use of the misogynistic elements of the *Testament* might have either spurred or reassured the resentment towards the presupposed manipulative rule of women over men in the Elizabethan and/or Jacobean Period.

Moreover, similar to the misogynistic resentment towards women by some of the Elizabethans, James VI of Scotland was noted for his obsession with virility, seen for instance, in his misogynistic writings in his *Daemonolgie* (1597). In his book on daemons, James VI frequently points out the handicaps of being a woman. For example, intellectually "the wit of woman could neuer haue fore-spoken" future events, but that of a man could (James, 1969: 1.1.4) or that the Devil rather chooses females as his companion because "the Devill findes greatest ignorance and barbaritie, there assayles he grosseliest," which is "the reason wherefore there was moe Witches of women kinde nor men." (James, 1969/1597: 3.3.69). In this aspect, the use of references to Henryson's version of the "fals"/"false" Cresseid/Cressida (*TestC* 546, 551, 560; *Tro*. 5.2.178), would be recognised by James VI of Scotland, or James I of England at least in the 1609 quarto, in accordance with Henryson's popularity in

the Scottish court. What is more, he would enjoy the play, if we take his misogynistic accounts of women for granted. Thereby, through Shakespeare's intentional or unintentional combination of Chaucer's and Henryson's story of Troilus, the unification of the two countries is maintained on a literary level, which would be maintained also practically under James I of England. Hence, as a reflection of the *translatio imperii*, it can be seen that through the story of Troilus a common national identity is created where the English and Scottish perceptions, of especially masculinity, merge through what Hall would call an "identification" by a "common origin" (Hall, 2007: 2), which is the story of Troilus.

5. CONCLUSION

Constant re-readings of the story of Troilus in accordance with nationalistic preferences have resulted in unique literary outputs in both England and Scotland. These outputs, on the other hand, have created multiple significations, which, however, are reduced to problems of originality and how the works affect each other's interpretation. Chaucer only initiates the interaction, Henryson makes it Scottish and Shakespeare unintentionally reflects the unification of the two countries on a literary level. Chaucer's, Henryson's and Shakespeare's dealing of Troilus create within each country an intra-national literary hybridisation, which forms a tale of two nations that have been so close yet so apart from each other.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apfelbaum, Roger (2004). *Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida: Textual Problems and Performance Solutions*, University of Delaware Press, Newark.

Baugh, A. C., ed (1948). *A Literary History of England*, 4 Vols., Prentice-Hall, New Jersey.

Bellamy, Elizabeth J. (1992). *Translations of Power: Narcissism and the Unconscious in Epic History*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

Bennett, J. A. W. (1982). *The Humane Medievalist and Other Essays in English Literature and Learning from Chaucer to Eliot, (*Ed: Piero Boitani), Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, Rome.

The Bible Tranſlated according to the Ebrew and Greeke (1581), Chriſtopher Barker, London.

Black, John Bennet (1959). *The Reign of Elizabeth: 1558-1603*, 2nd ed., Clarendon, Oxford.

Boccaccio, Giovanni (1967). *The Filostrato of Giovanni Boccaccio,* (Trans.: Nathaniel Edward Griffin and Arthur Beckwith Myrick), Biblo and Tannen, New York.

Bruce, John, ed (1861). *Correspondence of King James VI. of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil and Others in England, During the Reign of Queen Elizabeth,* Camden Society, Westminster.

Carney, Cliodhna (2009). "Chaucer's 'litel bok', Plotinus, and the Ending of Troilus and Criseyde." *Neophilologus* 93/2, 357–368.

Carruthers, Gerard (2009). *Scottish Literature*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.

Chapman, George (Trans.) (1598). *Seauen Bookes of the Iliades of Homere*, Iohn Windet, London.

Chaucer, Geoffrey (1988). *The Riverside Chaucer,* (Ed: L. D. Benson), 3rd ed., Oxford University Press, Suffolk.

Devereux, Walter B (Ed.) (1853). *Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex in the Reigns of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I.: 1540-1646,* Vol. 1, John Murray, London.

Doğan Adanur, Evrim. (2017). "The Uses of Anachronism in Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*." *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 16/4, 1048-1056.

Donaldson, Talbot E. (1970). *Speaking of Chaucer*, University of London The Athlone Press, London.

Dryden, John (1928). *Preface to the Fables*, (Ed: W. P. Ker and M. G. Lloyd Thomas), Clarendon, Oxford.

Dunbar, William (1863). "The Thistle and the Rose." (Ed. James Paterson), *The Works of William Dunbar, Including His Life, 1465-1536, with Notes, and Glossarial Explanations,* James Stillie, Edinburgh, 118-126.

Ege, Ufuk (2000). "The Portrayals of the Universe in Medieval Literature." *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* 40/3-4, 255-274.

Forni, Kathleen (2001). *The Chaucerian Apocrypha: A Counterfeit Canon,* University Press of Florida, Gainesville.

Fox, Denton (1964). "The Scottish Chaucerians." (Ed: D. S. Brewer), *Chaucer and Chaucerians: Critical Studies in Middle English Literature*, Nelson, London, 164-200.

Gajda, Alexandra (2012). *The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Goldstein, R. James (1999). "Writing in Scotland, 1058–1560." (Ed: David Wallace), *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 229-54.

Goodman, Godfrey (1839). *The Court of King James the First*, Vol. 2, Samuel Bentley, London. *Google Books.* Retrieved June 18, 2011.

Hall, Stuart (2007). "Who Needs 'Identity'?" (Ed: Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay), *Questions of Cultural Identity,* Sage Publications, London, 1-17.

Hammer, Paul E. J. (1999). *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-1597*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Harrison, G. B. (1974). *A Second Journal: Being a Record of Those Things Most Talked About During the Years 1595-8*, Routledge and Keagan Paul, London.

Henryson, Robert (1958). *The Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson: Schoolmaster of Dunfermline,* (Ed: H. Harvey Wood), Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh.

Highet, Gilbert (1962). *The Anatomy of Satire*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

James, Heather (1997). *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire,* Cambridge University Press, New York.

James, King of England (1969/1597). *Daemonologie*, Da Capo Press, New York.

James, Mervyn Evans (1986). *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Johnson, Lesley (1990). "Whatever Happened to Criseyde? Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid*." (Ed: Keith Busby and Erik Kooper), *Courtly Literature: Culture and Context,* Benjamins, Amsterdam, 313-322.

Kittredge, G. L. (1915). *Chaucer and His Poetry*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Kratzmann, Gregory (1980). *Anglo-Scottish Literary Relations, 1430-1550,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Lewis, C. S. (1979). *The Allegory of Love: A Study of Medieval Tradition,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Lockyer, Roger (1998). *James VI and I,* Longman, London and New York.

MacCaffrey, Wallace T. (1994). *Elizabeth I: War and Politics, 1588-1603*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Mann, Jill (1980). "Troilus's Swoon." *Chaucer Review,* 14, 319-35.

Mapstone, Sally (1985). "*The Testament of Cresseid*, lines 561-7: A New Manuscript Witness." *Notes and Queries,* 230, 307-10.

McCoy, Richard C. (1989). *The Rites of Knighthood: The Literature and Politics of Elizabethan Chivalry,* University of California Press, Berkeley.

McKim, Anne (2006). "*Orpheus and Eurydice* and *The Testament of Cresseid*: Robert Henryson's `fine Poetical Way'." (Ed: Priscilla J. Bawcutt and Janet Hadley Williams), *A Companion to Medieval Scottish Poetry*, D. S. Brewer, Cambridge, 105-118.

Montrose, Louis (2006). *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender, and Representation*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Öğütcü, Murat (2011). "How to Handle with 'Bliss' in Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde in Turkey." (Ed: Evrim Doğan Adanur), *IDEA: Studies in English,* Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle, 289-298.

Robertson, D. W. (1962). *A Preface to Chaucer: Studies in Medieval Perspectives,* Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Robinson, Ian (1972). *Chaucer and the English Tradition*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Rollins, Hyder Edwards (1972). *The Troilus-Cressida Story from Chaucer to Shakespeare*, Haskell, New York.

Root, Robert K. (1906). *The Poetry of Chaucer: A Guide to Its Study and Appreciation*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston.

Shakespeare, William (1609a). *The Famous Hiſtorie of Troylus and Creſſeid*, G. Eld, London.

Shakespeare, William (1609b). *The Hiſtorie of Troylus and Creſſeida,* G. Eld, London.

Shakespeare, William (1967). *Henry IV: Part 2,* (Ed: A. R. Humphreys), Methuen, London.

Shakespeare, William (1975). *Twelfth Night,* (Ed: J. M. Lothian and T. W. Craik), Methuen, London and New York.

Shakespeare, William (1994). *Troilus and Cressida*, (Ed: Kenneth Palmer), Routledge, London.

Shakespeare, William (1995). *Henry V*, (Ed: T. W. Craik), Arden, London.

Shakespeare, William (2002). *Henry IV: Part 1,* (Ed: David Scott Kastan), Arden, London.

Speirs, John (1982). "A Survey of Medieval Verse and Drama." (Ed: Boris Ford), *Medieval Literature: Chaucer and the Alliterative Tradition,* Penguin, Harmondsworth, 43-96.

Sutherland, James (1967). *English Satire*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Sweney, Matthew (2000). "Robert Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid*." *Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis,* 73, 123-8.

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

Thompson, Ann (1978). *Shakespeare's Chaucer: A Study in Literary Origins*, Liverpool University Press, Liverpool.

Waterfield, John (2009). *Heart of His Mystery: Shakespeare and the Catholic Faith in England under Elizabeth and James*, iUniverse, Bloomington.

Windeatt, Barry (1992). *Oxford Guides to Chaucer: Troilus and Criseyde*, Clarendon, Oxford.

Wood, Henry Harvey (1967). *Two Scots Chaucerians Robert Henryson, William Dunbar*, Longmans, London.

Yüksel, Ayşegül (2013). "Ne Komik Ne Trajik: *Troilus ve Cressida*." *Dram Sanatında Sınırları Zorlamak*, Mitos-Boyut Yayınları, İstanbul, 69-76.