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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 Cresside 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.
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, 1967: 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.1

Furthermore, starting from the 14th century, this interaction resulted in a literary hybridisation, in which, however, both countries developed their distinct “literary decorum;” according to Geoffrey Chaucer (1988), Troilus and Criseyde 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.2

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 litel 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 Cressida 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 Cressida/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.
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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 CRESEID

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; Sweeney, 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 “unfaithfulness” (TestC 59-64, 570). For instance, while Chaucer is concerned about the presentation of the “double sorrow” 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 entendre 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 leprousness (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” (*Test C* 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 (Hight, 1962: 13, 241). In a similar manner, Henryson uses Cresseid as a puppet while hiding himself and asserts that a “gig errlike” kind of “mynd in fleschlie foull affection” which is “[i]nclynit to Lustis Lcherous” (*Test C* 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 precepts 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” (*Test C* 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 (*Test C* 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 lazart 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 fitt’d with the Stage, neuer clapper-clawd with the palmes of the vulgar” (Shakespeare, 1609a: 2’). 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 Iliaides 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’s 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 naively 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 exclams:

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 Daemonologie (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 mie 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.
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