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9 Arrogant authorial performances: Criseyde to Cressida

Wolfram R. Keller

In the burgeoning research field of medieval and early modern emotions and in studies of the performance of passion, little space has been devoted to arrogance. Defined by modern psychology as 'an acute or chronic affective state characterized by attitudes of undue superiority towards others and manifested by an overbearing manner, presumptuousness, haughtiness, superciliousness, insolence and even insulting behaviour', arrogance may seem a straightforward, slightly uninteresting phenomenon, especially compared to the more 'dramatic' emotions, love and hate. In the Middle Ages, however, arrogant behaviour was highly problematic, given that arrogance, disdain and haughtiness were discussed and perceived of as a modality, 'if not [the] chief incarnation of that fountainhead of vice, pride', operating at the other extreme of the foremost virtue, humility. Arrogance was exclusively valued negatively, engendering 'more moral indignation than any of the other venerable vices of the old theological set', many valuations of which have changed in the course of time. As a branch of Pride (with six twigs: Singularity, Prodigality, False Strife, Boasting, Scorn, Rebellion), arrogance was 'the sin of rebellion against God ... of exaggerated individualism'. Arrogant individuals believed they were someone they were not, or they boasted qualities or abilities they lacked, deeming themselves aloof of social norms and responsibilities, treating others with disdain. Such definitions of sourpusserie can be found in many widely circulated compendia like the Somme le roi by Lorenz d'Orléans (1279) and are echoed by Chaucer's Parson: 'Arrogant is he that thynketh that he hath silke bountees in hym that he hath noght, or weneth that he sholde have hem by his deserts, or elles he demeth that he he be that he nys nat' (395). Embedded in such definitions are social claims that are problematic in so far as they bespeak 'a sharpened sensibility, if not anxiety, over the overt exploitation of new venues for social
advancement' and concomitant transcendence of the social order. Arrogance becomes a threat to the fabric of communities in that it encodes excessive forms of individualism. As Petkov writes, arrogance 'best accommodates anxiety over the shifting relations between social dynamics and normative values. Residing within the relatively stable parameters mapped out by scriptural morality and ancient Greek ethics was a permeable core that soaked up the angst engendered by the particularly Western showdown between individual and society. Given arrogance's association with pride and attendant anxieties about individual(ist) transgression, it perhaps deserves closer scrutiny, both with a view to the history of emotions and vis-à-vis attendant aesthetic concerns.

In literary works, as Petkov illustrates, arrogance not only connotes the negotiation of valuation, it often determines new valuations; it signifies novelty and innovation. The originality often marked by arrogance is not reduced to negotiations of social and political claims and group identities, however; especially on account of its relation to the opposing virtue of humilitas, arrogance frequently operates poetically as well, that is, arrogance negotiates anxieties about (new models of) literary authorship. In this chapter, I trace the poetological and literary-historical dimension of arrogance in Chaucer's and Shakespeare's treatments of the story of Troilus and Criseyde/Cressida. Both authors, I argue, utilize arrogance in their 'Troy stories to test notions of 'counter-authorship' by means of poet-playwright characters who self-consciously, albeit obliquely stage their own literary-historical predicaments, reflecting issues of temporality, or periodization. In order to show how arrogance functions as a means to test and advance models of literary authorship across the period divide, I first situate arrogance within recent discussions of authorship, starting with Patrick Cheney's work on the deeply embedded bid to literary fame in Shakespeare's works, his counter-authorship: the oblique representation of the conflation of poetry and drama, of Chaucerian self-effacement and Spenserian self-crowning. Such a conception of authorship finds an analogue in Chaucer, not so much in the often-studied, self-effacing extra- and inadricetic narrators, but in his characterological representation of authorship, especially in Criseyde. It has to be pointed out, however, that her poetic individuality - that is, her (and the Poet's) model of authorship - is explicitly encoded as arrogant. Through Criseyde, Chaucer's Poet displaces authorial humility as arrogance. Revisiting the 'Troy story (and the negotiation of authorship therein) during the competitive rivalry of poet-playwrights of the Poets' War, Shakespeare consciously constructs a dichotomy of humble, 'medieval' Trojan poetry and arrogant, 'modern' Greek playwriting and performance, in which Cressida, like Criseyde, synthesizes Trojan and Greek poetological characteristics. Shakespeare's Troilus, however, inverts the Chaucerian conception of authorship: Cressidian humility is displaced as authorial arrogance. Recuperating the medieval humility top or and reinvesting his arrogant poet-playwright figures with a modicum of humility, Shakespeare advances his (seemingly) innovative model of counter-authorship, embedding even more deeply the authorial bid for self-crowning and obfuscating analogical, medieval conceptualizations of counter-authorship, tangible in Chaucer's Troilus and the fifteenth-century engagement with Chaucer, both of which are increasingly acknowledged as important for early modern poetics and languages of statecraft.

The question of Shakespeare’s authorship has recently incited much debate and further scrutiny. Reading both Shakespeare’s plays and poetry, Cheney presents a revaluation of Shakespeare’s strategies to represent his own authorship in the many poet-playwright characters who can be read as proxies of Shakespearean authorship - and who, I would add, are frequently (if not exclusively) arrogant. 'Conspicuously' avoiding self-representation, the Bard advances a form of 'counter-authorship: the authorial imprint is obfuscated, but traceable, translucently hidden, as it were, 'behind the veil of his fictions'. Such a hidden form of authorial self-representation rejects the popular Renaissance model of the laureate poet, of which Virgil is the model and Spenser the Renaissance representative. Writers like Marlowe challenged such Virgilian-derived models by means of adopting the competing Ovidian paradigm, following the Roman author in penning both poems and plays, becoming poet-playwrights. Shakespeare, too, Cheney argues, 'invents his famed authorship - self-concealment, complementarity, undecidability, negative capability - by countering the idea of the laureate or national poet. This view of Shakespearean authorship suggests not only that the latter is a matter of engaging ancient career models but that there are medieval precursors for a self-concealing, anti-laureate, counter-authorship. Comparing the 'politics of authorship' in Chaucer's Parliament of Fowles and 'The Phoenix and the Turtle', Cheney argues that Shakespeare’s poem is not about the clarification of the poet’s voice but about the displacement thereof, which amounts to
the 'most self-reflexive representation of authorship in his canon'. As Cheney concludes, '[t]he paradox of an authorial voice clarified yet displaced results ... , because Shakespeare lets collide the two major English models of authorship then available: Chaucerian self-effacement and Spenserian self-crowning'. The potential collision of medieval humility with Renaissance self-crowning notwithstanding, Chaucer’s self-effacement emerges, at a second glance, as entailing an oblique Virgilian claim to fame. Especially concerning questions of arrogance and humility, there appears to be a strong connection between Chaucerian and Shakespearean counter-authorship in their representations of Criseyde/Cressida.

Unlike Shakespeare, Chaucer does represent ‘himself’ in his works, usually as a humble narrator rejecting fame. Studies of Chaucerian authorship by and large conclude that Chaucerian self-presentation amounts to ‘the presence of a self-conscious author’, as Alastair Minnis puts it, while others highlight a late-medieval rejection of authorial fame and Chaucerian humility with the aim, as Stephanie Trigg argues, of attracting ‘sympathetic readerly identifications’ through ‘attractive narrative voices’. As far as Chaucerian self-representation in extradiegetic narrators is concerned, audiences witness such a humble author, cautious not to transgress against auctoritas and seemingly avoiding literary innovation. While in the narrative poems, Cheney summarizes, Chaucer ‘foreground[as] himself as the primary character, ... in The House of Fame he presents himself as humbly rejecting self-identification, producing a fiction in which his name is left blank and his identity held in question. Cunningly, Chaucer’s strategy for securing literary fame works through a fiction that rejects the quest for fame.12 The humility of the self-conscious medieval author, fearing inventio and the transgression against auctoritas, confirms the idea of a late-medieval rejection of authorship, and yet, this rejection itself lends itself for articulating a bid for fame. Such claims to authorial fame are frequently entailed in the excessive humility attendant upon self-presentation – as in Geoffrey’s rejection of fame in the House of Fame (counteracted in Troilus and Criseyde) where, at the end of the poem, he includes himself modestly as the major English Trojan poet.13 While studies have largely focused on such extradiegetic representations of authorship, Minnis has pried more deeply into the fabric of Chaucerian fiction, identifying the authorial work reflected by means of extradiegetic narrators, specifically the Wife of Bath and the Pardoner. Robert Edwards extends the study of medieval authorship further beyond...
beautiful, a 'hevenyssh perfitt creature,' That downe were sent in scornynge of nature' (I.104–5), who nevertheless has to humbly beg for Hector's protection.

A crucial moment that captures Criseyde's vacillation between humility and arrogance occurs when she considers whether she is worthy of Troilus's love. Initially deeming herself worthless, she rapidly gains more confidence, culminating in her rhetorical question 'What wonder is though he of me have joye?' After all, she is 'oon the fairest' in Troy and her 'owene womman, wel at esse' (II.749, 746, 750). Later in the Troilus, after learning of the pending prisoner exchange, she also boasts about qualities she does not have, making promises she cannot keep, for instance, her stratagems to fool her father and the promise to return. This and other moments belie the repeated narrative claim that she has 'no lak' (e.g. V.814, similarly in V.824). Perhaps the most prominent nexus of humility, arrogance and authorship occurs in Criseyde's farewell letter, which E. Talbot Donaldson described as one of 'the most poetically hypocritical letters in the annals of literature', in which, 'with exquisitely selfish cruelty', she refuses to assert that she does not love Troilus and will never come back. In this letter, Criseyde, seemingly disdainfully, prays for Troilus's 'good word and of youre friendship ay' (V.1622). The letter highlights Criseyde's and the Poet's transgressive poetological predicaments in that it alludes to the Epistulae ex Ponto, where Ovid laments his exile on account of his 'error' (in all probability the Ars amatoria), asking his Roman friends to stay friends and to intervene on his behalf, restoring his literary fame. This reference is oblique, however, and, read outside this Ovidian context, the letter must appear despicably disdainful. In its oscillation between arrogance and humility, between authorial invention and literary tradition, it ultimately remains ambiguous – although, for Troilus, Criseyde's action cannot stem from anything 'But for despit' (V.1693). Both at the beginning and the end of the Troilus, then, Criseyde is perceived as arrogant, significantly at narrative junctures that are related also to the generation of a new narrative of Criseyde.

Criseyde's arrogance, I believe, has to be seen in the context of a displaced bid for literary fame, a bid enabled by the Poet's rejection thereof. All three characters have, of course, been linked to the narrator (albeit not always regarding authorship), especially Pandar, given that his (theatrical) machinations drive forward the Poet's plot. Pandar's curtailed literary knowledge, however, pales in comparison with Criseyde's literary self-consciousness, so that Pandarian theatre can only be half of the picture. The poetological overlap between Troilus and the Poet represents the other half, and both halves are literally combined in the changeable correlative of the fickle Poet, in Criseyde. As the late Charles Muscatine observed, Criseyde speaks both Troilus's and Pandar's idioms, she assimilates both Troilus's poetic emotionality – encoded in the poem as Trojan–Ovidian discourse, and Pandar's theatrical pragmatism, associated with Virgilian epic. Criseyde is a poet-playwright: she is a performer aware of the dramaturgy she utilizes and, within the limits that curtail her autonomy, she is able to stage-manage some of the scenes. Moreover, Criseyde is the embodiment of literary invention, and the Poet's altered characterization marks Chaucer's chief departure from tradition. The narrative bestows on Criseyde the kind of sympathy Chaucer's actual author-figures are meant to evoke in the audience, and both self-consciously reflect upon their literary afterlives, anticipated as blackened; Chaucer later even uses the construction of his heroine to promote a 'querelle de Criseyde'. Criseydan authorship, then, hybridizes Trojan elegy and Pandarian theatre as a means of warranting her exilic self; it is a self-concealing authorship, however, that displaces the arrogant authorial bid to literary fame so deeply into the poem that the humble authorial rejection of authorship threatens to obscure it. And yet, it is a Criseydan arrogance sympathetically looked upon or determined by the Poet and his author, Chaucer.

By Shakespeare's time, arrogant performances had become cornerstones of courtly self-presentation (sprezzatura), associated with the Inns of Court where Troilus might have first been staged. Arrogance likewise becomes an instrument in artistic self-representation, especially in the Poets' War, in which the arrogant poet-playwright Ben Jonson played a chief role. Whether or not Shakespeare was involved in the Poets' War – Shakespeare apparently had insolent Jonson in mind when penning the Troilus – the play certainly broaches questions of literary authorship qua arrogance and poet-playwright figures. Already at the outset, the Prologue sets the scene (Troy), drawing attention to the arrogant Greeks: 'The princes orgulous, their high blood chafed'. Anticipating the Greeks' likewise arrogant performances, the Prologue subsequently muses on the play's humble status, too: 'And hither am I come, / A Prologue armed, but not in confidence / Of author's pen or actor's voice' (Pro. 2, 22–4). The professed lack of confidence in author and actors introduces a metatheatrical
performance anxiety that permeates the play, while simultaneously highlighting arrogance/humility as an important yardstick for judging (authorial) performances.26

On the plot level, Shakespeare’s Greeks confidently believe they are able to deliver what they promise, as criticized by Ulysses in his speech on degree, which, by means of the mentioned mask/masque, alludes also to theatrical performances: ‘Degree being vizarded, / Th’unworthiest shows as fairly in the mask’ (1.3.83–4, 162n), kindling a pageant of ‘disdained’ superiors in ‘an envious fever / Of pale and bloodless emulation’ (1.3.129, 133–4). Such (dramatic) emulation appears to leave little room for invention. Achilles’ performance is a case in point: ‘full of his airy fame’, he ‘pages’ the Greek leaders with Patroclus, ‘like a strutting player’, infecting others to do likewise, as evidenced by ‘self-willed’ Ajax, keeping ‘full as proud a place’ and directing Thersites (associated with the imprinting of money) to slander their uppers (1.3.144, 151, 153, 188–9). The nature of pride as its own mirror and chronicle (2.3.151–5) is further explicated – and staged by Agamemnon and Ulysses. In turn, they direct the Greek generals to walk by Achilles and ‘either greet him not’ or else disdainfully, which shall shake him more ‘/ Than if not looked on’ (3.3.52–4). Achilles should thus realize his arrogance, since ‘Pride hath no other glass / To show itself but pride; for supple knees / Feed arrogance, and are the proud man’s feet’ (3.3.47–9). Indeed, Achilles is perplexed, given how he was formerly approached ‘humbly’ (3.3.72). Confronting Ulysses, the latter refers to the book by a ‘strange fellow’ (3.3.996) that he is reading, which emerges as the ‘playbook’ for the procession in so far as it imparts ‘That man, how dearly ever parted, / How much in having, or without or in, / Cannot make boast to have that which he hath, / Nor feels not what he owes, but by reflection’. Moreover, ‘no man is the lord of anything, / Though in and of him there be much consisting, / Till he communicate his parts to others; / Nor doth he of himself know them for aught / Till he behold them formed in th’applause’ (3.3.97–100, 116–20). With this nod towards the author’s dependence on audiences in the public theatres,27 Ulysses makes an important point about (authorial) arrogance: one cannot claim one’s own (literary) greatness.

Ulysses’ (not-so-)modest interventions notwithstanding, the Greek camp is characterized by arrogant dramatic performances, while the Trojans appear to be remnants of a medieval world, associated with a humility that is suitably disdain’d by the Greeks,28 for instance, when Hector courteously interrupts his duel with Achilles so that the latter can catch his breath (5.6.15). Trojan humility also emerges when Aeneas stops boasting of the Trojans’ military skills to Agamemnon: “The worthiness of praise distains his worth / If that the praised himself bring the praise forth. / But what the repining enemy commends, / That breath Fane blows; that praise, sole pure, transcends” (1.3.241–4). Questioned about his identity by Agamemnon, he implicitly matches the honesty that goes hand-in-glove with medieval humilitas by addressing Agamemnon as Greek, associating him with cunning and quietness, with ‘modern’, Machiavellian dissimulation (173n). Additionally, the play seems to oppose arrogant Greek performance with humble Trojan poetry, highlighted, as Gary Schmidtall observes, in Troilus’s ‘ornate’ poetry of the ‘old age’ and his ‘oath-plighting duet with Cressida’ (e.g. 3.2.167–91) that alludes, tellingly, to the defamed women in the false compare of poets of Sonnet 130.29 After all, it is the (ill-) fame of women that fames the Trojans (and Trojan authors); thus Troilus, when describing Helen as a ‘theme of honour and renown’ (2.2.199–202). On the one hand, the binary of medieval Trojans and Renaissance Greeks seems to organize also the opposition of humble Trojan poets and supercilious Greek playwrights. On the other hand, as the example of Troilus illustrates, these dichotomies do not always obtain. As with the binarism of Renaissance, Machiavellian Iago and chivalrous, medieval Othello, such temporal dichotomizing, as Andrew James Johnston argues, serves to veil continuities with the Middle Ages: Othello obscures the medieval origins of Renaissance Man.30 In the case of Troilus, the play veils the medieval advancement of counter-authorship.

Several characters synthesize Trojan and Greek qualities, for instance, the arrogant poet-playwrights Ulysses and Pandarus. Ulysses’ arrogance has already been mentioned; Pandarus, who performs two songs, direct the consummation scene and overrates the effects of his performance (3.1.109–21, 5.11.35–44), arrogantly mistaking himself for a god. Cressida, by contrast, is a humble character whose self-sacrificing nature obscures an authorial conjunction of poetry and playwriting. Discussed in scholarship as ‘open to multiple interpretations’, as a ‘creature of intertextuality’, she is also a ‘creature’ of intratextuality, being versed in Pandarus’s and Troilus’s idioms.31 Moreover, before she appears on stage, Troilus describes her with a veiled reference to authorship. Among her many charms, he single out her hand, ‘In whose comparison all whites are ink’, an observation extended by Pandarus to include her ability to seem fair even if she were not: ‘she has the mends in
her own hands'. Cressida, by logical extension, writes in invisible ink (1.1.53, 64–5). Related to her transformational (un-)writing skills is her ability to engage effortlessly in courtly repartee and her (constrained) directing of events, for instance, when she (up) stages the 'sneaking' Troilus (1.2.218–21). She also draws attention to her acting skills: '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; and at all these warts I lie, at a thousand watches' (1.2.251–5), which, in her soliloquy (if it is a soliloquy (158n)), emerge as performances in the service of self-protection: since 'Men prize the thing unguessed more than it is' and even though she sees a 'thousandfold' more in Troilus than does Pandarus, 'Yet hold I off' (1.2.280, 275, 277). Additionally, Cressida is associated with poetry. Besides her 'oath-plighting' with Troilus, other scholars have commented on her 'singing' (5.2.10–13), and she is also linked to a more obvious poet-playwright in Shakespeare's *overture* – Berowne in *Love's Labour's Lost* – through an intertextual reference in Ulysses's oft-cited comments on her acting skills and the unclasping 'of the tables' of women's thoughts to 'every ticklish reader!' (4.5.56–7, 67–2), which also point back to Chaucer's description of Criseyde's beauty as disdaining Nature and, implicitly, her 'deignous' look.33

In the absence of narratorial commentary, the veiled poet-playwright Cressida could be perceived as arrogant, especially perhaps in her 'teasing' in the Greek camp, which, however, is used to prevent her from being kissed by the Greeks 'in general' (4.5.22). While the perception of her actions finally depends on the staging, the text notably mutes references to Cressidan disdain. Moreover, among the few Chaucerian insights into Criseyde's emotional life retained by Shakespeare, it is Cressida's humility that stands out.34 When 'Troilus laments, with reference to an authorial Will, that 'the will is infinite and the execution confined' (3.2.78–9, 233n; see Sonnet 135), Cressida concurs: 'They say all lovers swear more performance then they are able ... They that have the voice of lions and the acts of hares, are they not monsters?' (3.2.81–6) The (repeated) reference to lions relegates issues of performance to the discourse of arrogance (and ethical lack), with which the play's lions are associated. Given his professed inability to conform to Greek standards of performance (especially 4.4.74–90), Troilus is incapable of reconciling his two Cressidas: the 'woeful Cressida 'mongst the merry Greeks' (4.4.55), the 'Trojan poet's performance in the Greek theatre. It is Thersites who appreciates Cressida's poet-playwriting, characterizing her ability 'to be secretly open' as her 'juggling trick' (5.2.26). Cressida's secret openness, her counter-authorship is subsequently published, as she speaks for the last time, humbly musing on the 'error' she did not commit,35 one eye on Troilus and Trojan poetry, one eye on the Greek performance culture she will join, 'A proof of strength she could not publish more', as Thersites discerns (5.2.113–19). Cressida inhabits a temporal and cultural liminality here in which she emerges, as Heather James remarks about her selves in Act 3, 'a closed and open book'.36 Cressida's secret openness is that of a humbler, published poet-playwright, without the option to redeem or explain herself fully: and this is precisely the raison d'être and predicament of the voice of the 'counter-author': clarified, yet displaced.

Amidst the rivalry of arrogant, self-crowning poet-playwrights during the Poets' War, Shakespeare, like Chaucer before him, characterologically reconsiders questions of counter-authorship through poet-playwright Cressida. From a seeming dichotomy of humble, medieval poets and overly self-assertive Greek actors and playwrights, Cressida emerges as partaking of both Trojan and Greek discourses, whereby Shakespeare inverts the Chaucerian configuration of counter-authorship, authorial humility displaced as Criseydan arrogance, to Cressidan humility displaced as authorial arrogance. The Bard recuperates a seemingly medieval humility the topas and invests formerly arrogant poet-playwright figures with a modicum of humility in the advancement of a (seemingly) new model of counter-authorship. In ways that invite further study, oscillations between arrogance and humility from the late medieval to the early modern and attendant, self-conscious constructions of temporality frequently appear to connote veiled re-negotiations of literary (counter-)authorship, the question as to when and how to 'hold ... off'.
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Changing emotions in *Troilus*: the crucial year

David Wallace

The *Troilus* and Criseyde/Cressida saga is a perfect vehicle for tracing the history of the emotions, in that it offers an unparalleled darkening of mood over time. This saga begins with Boccaccio, who isolates and expands the love affair between Troiolo and Criseida to vent his sexual frustration. The conceit of the work, as laid out in its prose prologue, is that the teenage Boccaccio, living in Naples, has been abandoned by his female love object (who has moved on to another town). The story of Troiolo and Criseida thus functions as a scudo or shield that both protects and reveals the sufferings of its youthful author. The poem gives literary form to the sighs or sospiri that leak from the authorial body:

Che dirò de' sospiri li quali nel passato piacevole amore e dolce speranza mi solevano infiammati trarre del petto? Certo io non ho altro che dirne se non che, multiplicati in molti doppi di gravissima angoscia, mille volte ciascuna ora di quello per la mia bocca di fuori sono sforzatamente sospinti. (Proemio, 15)

(What shall I say of the sighs which, in the past, pleasing love and sweet hope used to draw inflamed from my breast? Certainly I have nothing other to say of them except that, multiplied in many duplications of the gravest anguish, a thousand times each hour they are violently forced out through my mouth.)

Boccaccio thus marks the turn from pre-articulate emotional excess to regulated literary expression. The literary artifice of this barely post-adolescent composition is so palpable that issues of truthfulness and historical veracity hardly arise. There was a great cult of Trojan narrative at the French Angevin court of Naples; the *Filostrato* is very much focused upon contemporary Neapolitan fashions rather than upon ancient civilizations. The joys of lovemaking here are relatively straightforward: Criseida tosses off her shirt, and the lovers enjoy 'the ultimate value of lovemaking'