BOĞAZİÇİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
DERGİSİ

Hümaniter Bilimler — Humanities Vol. 1 - 1973

THE PARADOX IN THE EPILOGUE OF TROILUS AND CRISEYDE

Dilek Doltaş

Chaucer has accurately described **Troilus and Criseyde** as a poem dealing with «the double sorwe of Troilus.» Troilus suffers before he wins Criseyde, and he suffers after the decision of the parliament. But the poem does not end with the cycle of events involved in the courtly love of Troilus and Criseyde. Chaucer takes us beyond death. We see Troilus up in the heavens. From there he looks down to where he was slain and despises the joys of the earth in comparison with the joys he now experiences.

> And in hymself he lough right at the wo
> Of hem that wepten for his deth so faste;
> And dampned al oure werk that foloweth so
> The blynde lust, the which that may nat laste,
> And sholden al oure herte on heven caste. (V, 1820-25)

This passage, together with Troilus's famous speech on free will and necessity in Book IV, were inserted by Chaucer in his revision of the poem. There have been many disputes as to its meaning and significance. Some critics accept it as a mere palinode,[1] arguing that medieval writers on love were accustomed to add at the end of their works a recantation of what had gone before and that Chaucer here is merely following their example. Others see the whole poem as a moral tale, illustrating the Christian truth that nothing but misery comes from trusting earthly love.[2] A third view is to see **Troilus and Criseyde** as a romance where Boethian ideas are acted out, but where the lover's fate is shown to be controlled by, not a Fortune directed by God, but by one that is irrational and blind.[3]

None of these views, I believe, gives a correct interpretation of the epilogue. It is true that there are ideas that are heavily Boethian throughout the poem and that the end seems to be in line with them. It is also true that this poem is «in praise of love.» But does Chaucer repudiate one world, one form of love in favor of another? In **The Parliament of Fowls,** an earlier work of his, he shows the world to come as an extention of this world, not as an alternative for it.[4]

For a correct appreciation of this great love-poem, a knowledge of the nature of the love therein treated, the personalities of the characters who act it out and of the limi-

tations within which the poet, voluntarily or involuntarily worked, is particularly necessary.

Chaucer builds his tale on Boccaccio's **Il Filostrato** and on Guillaume de Lorris's section of **The Romance of the Rose.** He owes the skeleton of his plot to Boccaccio and the specific treatment of his love theme to Guillaume de Lorris. He uses a traditional plot because in the age he lived reality meant the Platonic ideal which was complete and unchanging, and, therefore, was reflected in similar plots through the ages-Ian Watt, in **The Rise of the Novel** explains this clearly.

> . . . Defoe and Richardson are the first great writers in our literature who did not take their plots from mythology, history, legend or previous literature. In this they differ from Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare and Milton, for instance, who, like the writers of Greece and Rome habitually used traditional plots, and who did so, in the last analysis because they accepted the general premise of their times that, since Nature is essentially complete and unchanging, its records whether scriptual, legendary, or historical, constitute a definite repertoire of human experience.[5]

On the other hand, the tradition of courtly love, as codified by **The Romance of the Rose** and **The Art of Courtly Love,** two well-known books of the Middle Ages, was a question of great importance in Chaucer's time. Chaucer discusses this problem in the majority of his works. **The Book of the Duchess, The House of Fame, Anelida and Arcite, The Parliament of Fowls, The Legend of Good Women** and a number of tales in **The Canterbury Tales** are all based on the theme of love. Boethius had said **in The Consolation of Philosophy** that «this accordaunce of thynges is bounde with love, that governeth erthe and see, and hath also comandement to the hevene.» [6] God loves and he commands man to love. Therefore the problem discussed in **Troilus and Criseyde** is not whether to accept or to reject love. Chaucer, in line with Boethius, accepts the inevitability of love. But the question posed here is whom and how to love.

Pandarus, in Book I says:

> . . . I herd seyd of wyse lered,
> Was nevere man or womman yet bigete
> That was unapt to suffren loves hete,
> Celestial, or elles love of kynde: [7] (I, 976-79)

Does Troilus at the end of the poem really reject the «love of kynde» in favor of the «celestial love,» or does Chaucer want to incorporate one in the other as he had done in **The Parliament of Fowls?**

Il Filostrato is the story of a lover who wins a woman and loses her because she proves faithless. In the story there are four main characters: Troilo, Criseida (sometimes spelt Griseida), Pandaro and Diomede. These are also the main characters in Chaucer's poem, but he greatly changes the first three, or in Lewis's terms «medievalizes» them. When he shows how Troilus and Criseyde feel the anxieties, hopes, joys and

sufferings that all courtly lovers experience while living their specific and unique lives he reflects what is general in what is particular. Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde conform exactly to the rules for the behavior of ideal courtly lovers as laid down in **The Romance of the Rose** and in **The Art of Courtly Love**.[8]

Troilus's qualifications and experiences highly resemble those of the Dreamer in **The Romance of the Rose**. Chaucer even modifies a fact about Troilo's life to make him more like the Dreamer of the French poem. The Troilo of Boccaccio, as we are told at the beginning of **Il Filostrato** has been in love once before. Troilus, on the other hand, like the Dreamer, has never before experienced love. Thus, portrayed as a conventional courtly lover, Troilus is made to possess all the qualities that are proper for him to have. By the common consent of all in Troy, he is known for «trouthe,» «alle gentillesse,» «wysdom,» «honour,» «fredom,» «worthinesse,» «prowesse in war,» and «courtesye.» At the end of Book I we are told of the qualities he has attained through love:

> For he bicom the frendlieste wight
> The gentilest, and ek the mooste fre,
> The thriftiest and oon the beste knyght,
> That in his tyme was or myghte be.
> Dede were his japes and his cruelte,
> His heighe port and his manere estraunge,
> And ecch of tho gan for a vertue chaunge. (I, 1079-85)

Later on, in the second book, we see Pandarus sounding the praises of his friend in answering Criseyde's inquiry about Hector.

> And ek his fresshe brother Troilus,
> The wise, worthi Ector the secounde,
> In whom that alle vertu list habounde,
> As alle trouth and alle gentillesse,
> Wisdom, honour, fredom, and worthinesse. (II, 157-61)

In short, in **Troilus and Criseyde**, Troilus's character is modified towards a grater gentleness and sensibility. We see him following the book of love closer than Troilo. Nevill Coghill calls him a paragon of courtly love,[9] and so he is.

Nevertheless, «Troilo into Troilus ,» says Coghill, «is a less radical change than Criseida into Criseyde.»[10] Criseyde besides fitting the formula for a courtly beloved has overtones which Troilus has not. In the first three books Chaucer paints a picture of a prudent, cool-headed, affectionate, virtuous and amorous woman. She is worthy enough to deserve Trollus's love. She is at once the heroine of **The Romance of the Rose** and Criseyde, a human and unique personality. As **The Romance of the Rose** heroine we see Bialacoil, Pity, Shame, Curtesy, Chastity, Drede, Daunger, Mercy and Venus all unite in her and from time to time make battle within her. When Coghill accuses Criseyde of being «a creature of reticences and reluctances» [11] he seems to overlook this aspect of Criseyde's character. She is the courtly lady and is scared of the attacks of Wicked-Tounge. It is because of this that secrecy is emphasized throughout the poem both by Pan-

darus and by Criseyde herself. On the other hand, as a unique and particular personality trait, we see, in Criseyde, the excellent mental habit of looking at a subject or a proposition from several points of view.

When Pandarus talks to her of Troilus's love, he first reminds her of his «gentilesse,» «wisdom,» «trouthe,» and «honour,» all the qualities that make him fit to be a courtly lover. Then he appeals to her Pity, saying that if she refuses Troilus they will both die (meaning himself and Troilus). In order to break down the resistance of her «Drede,» he says that they can hide their relationship under the cloak of friendship.

> Swych love of frendes regneth al this town:
> And wry yow in that mantel evere moo;...

And finally he appeals to her youth and to the amorous disposition, that is the Venus, in her.

> Thenk ek how elde wasteth every houre
> In ech of yow a partie of beautee;
> And therfore, er that age the devoure,
> Go love: for old ther wol no wight of the.
> Lat this proverbe a loore unto yow be:
> «To late ywar, quod beaute, whan it paste»;
> And elde daunteth daunger at the laste. (II, 393-99)

Pandarus knowing his niece's mind well enough, presents a very comprehensive and convincing argument. Criseyde all through the conversation is weighing her uncle's words,

> Criseyde, which that herde hym in this wise,
> Thoughte, «I shal felen what he meneth, ywis.»
> «Now em,» quod she, «what wolde ye devise?
> What is youre reed I sholde don of this?» (II, 386-89)

But is there a tone of calculation in his quatrain? I cannot see it. Criseyde is trying to understand the problem presented to her from all points of view; she is testing her uncle's sincerity and then is looking for a means of finding a solution. After Pandarus tells her of the intensity of Troilus's love and vows once again that if she refuses him he will surely die which will also make Pandarus commit suicide, Criseyde is very much moved.

> «Criseyde, which that wel neigh starf for feere,
> . . . and herde ek with hire ere
> And saugh the sorwful ernest of the knyght,
> And in his preier ek saugh noon unryght,
> And for the harm that myghte ek fallen moore,
> She gan to rewe, and dredde hire wonder soore,
> And thoughte thus:
> . . . «if this man sle here hymself, allas!
> In my presence, it wol be no solas.
> What men wolde of it deme I kan nat seye:
> It nedeth me ful sleighly for to pleie.» (II, 449-69)

To many critics these lines have seemed calculating and insincere. Professor Root for instance quotes them to prove Criseyde's designing nature.[12] But if we analyze them with all her other traits in mind we can call them prudent and cautious but by no means designing and insincere. In this book she is the same cool-headed Criseyde of Book I who was able to arrange her affairs smoothly even under the awkward condition her father's departure had put her into.

As Pandarus leaves Criseyde in Book II, she does not give him her word to love Troilus. She only promises to «plese him fro day to day» as far as her honour allows. She knows the rules of courtly love and understands that to accept a knight for a lover carries with it the implication of its final consummation. She clarifies this point as she says:

«And here I make a protestacioun,
That in this proces if ye depper go,
That certeynly, for no salvacioun,
Of yow, though that ye sterven bothe two,
Though al the world on o day be my fo,
Ne shal I nevere of hym han other routhe.» (II,484-90)

When finally Criseyde does accept Troilus's service and love in Book III, her promise to love and reward him is given out of her free will.

Some critics with reference to Books III and IV, point out Criseyde's regret at having loved, or her sudden insight into the fickleness of earthly felicity.[13] One of the quotations they give is Criseyde's speech in Book IV where Criseyde says,

«Endeth thanne love in wo? Ye, or men lieth!
And alle worldly blisse, as thynketh me.
The ende of blisse ay sorwe it occupieth;
And whoso troweth nat that it so be,
Lat hym upon me, woful wrecche, ysee... (IV, 834-38)

These critics must have overlooked Criseyde's speeches in Book II. Criseyde sees the dangers involved in love before she gives her love to Troilus. In Book II we read:

«For love is yet the mooste stormy lyf,
Right of hymself, that evere was bigonne;
For evere som mystrust or nice strif
Ther is in love, som cloude is over that sonne.
Therto we wrecched wommen nothing konne,
Whan us in wo, but wepe and sitte and thinke;
Oure wrecche is this, oure owen wo to drynke.» (II, 778-84)

The same is true of Troilus. Troilus addresses the lovers as such before he falls in love:

«Youre hire is guyt ayeyn ye, God woot how!
Nought wel for wel, but scorn for good servyse.
In feith, youre ordre is ruled in good wise!
. . . . .
But take this: that ye loveres ofte eschuwe,
Or elles doon, of good entencioun,
Ful ofte thi lady wol it mysconstruwe,
And deme it harm in hire oppynyoun:
And yet if she, for other enchesoun,
Be wroth, than shaltow have a groyn anon.
Lord, wel is hym that may ben of yow oon!» (I, 334-50)

So neither Troilus nor Criseyde are ignorant of the sorrows involved in love before or after they fall in love. Yet Criseyde chooses to love Troilus in Book III. She emphasizes the importance of her free will in falling in love twice in Book II. Once, while talking with Pandarus, she says:

«Ne love a man kan I naught, ne may,
Ayeins my wyl;...» (II, 477-78)

And later on when she is thinking alone, she says to herself:

«For man may love, of possibilite,
A womman so, his herte may tobreste,
And she naught love ayein, but if hire leste.» (II, 607-9)

Chaucer, in line with Boethius, believes in the irresistible nature of love. He writes in the proem to Book III,

God loveth, and to love wol nought werne:
And in this world no lyves creature
Withouten love is worth, or may endure. (III, 12-4)

What Criseyde means by referring to love as being controlled by her will is not her freedom to decide whether to love or not but her freedom to choose whom to love. She can love God or man, and if the latter, possibly Troilus. Finally her own inclinations together with Troilus's virtuous qualities and attractiveness make her fall in love with him. It is in Deiphobus' house that she vows to love him. The conversation of the lovers here is highly conventional. They both play the parts traditionally expected of courtly lovers. Troilus swears to serve her, be true, patient, loyal and humble towards her. He promises to follow the code of secrecy with all his energy. In return he says he expects Criseyde to ask his support and aid in all things concerning her and to reward him from time to time for his good deeds with a kindly gaze or to punish him for his misconduct. Criseyde swears to accept Troilus's service as far as honour sees fit; and, as long as he pays his due respects to her honour, she will reward him for his pains. She emphasizes the importance of her sovereignty in this relationship. What Criseyde means by «her honour» throughout the poem is the good and virtuous name that she has among the people. If secrecy is not observed then «Wicked-Tounge» may spoil it. That is why «Wic-

ked-Tounge» becomes the worst enemy of the lovers in **Troilus and Criseyde,** as it was in **The Romance of the Rose,** and secrecy, together with loyalty, becomes the most important articles of the code to be observed.

The answer to how Chaucer can so triumphantly celebrate the flesh without becoming sensual, a question which some critics have wondered about,[14] lies in his complete command and application of the conventions of the system of courtly love. Throughout the poem Troilus and Criseyde believe in a religion and that is the religion of love. As long as they act within its code, they stay noble and their acts are justifiable.

Criseyde does not sin when she gives herself up to Troilus in Book III. It is right, and is expected of her, according to courtly love. Her sin lies in her betrayal of Troilus. Critics have been at variance in their opinions as to whether Criseyde came to Pandarus's house knowing that Troilus would be there and that their love would be consummated then and there, or whether circumstances forced her to surrender to Troilus that night.[15] They argue as to the interpretation of Criseyde's assertion that

> «Ne hadde I or now, my swete herte deere,
> Ben yold, iwys, I were now nought here!» (III, 1210-11)

Such an argument does not seem of fundamental importance to me. Criseyede knew, according to the codes of courtly love, to what end her «amour» with Troilus would come, when she took her solemn oath in Deiphebus's house. Whether she had the idea of surrender in mind when she went to her uncle's house or not does not reveal any significant trait of her character. Chaucer most probably left this point vague on purpose. A Criseyde who runs to her lover's arms, like the Crisedia of Boccaccio, would be too amorous or improper as the ideal heroine of courtly romance. The lady of that tradition should be reluctant to give in but when she does eventually give herself to her lover it should be of her own free will. Andreas Capellanus says that nothing which a lover gets from his beloved is pleasing unless she gives it of her own free will.[16] Thus Chaucer, in creating the circumstances in which Criseyde can give herself to Troilus at once under the compulsion of events and yet freely, fulfills the contradictory requirements of courtly love. Some of those who base their interpretation of Criseyde's character on the fatal rain which forced her to stay overnight overlook the fact that Criseyde, though forced to stay, is not forced to consummate her love.

The moment of consummation is far from being vulgar; it is pure and lovely. Chaucer himself is in ecstacy while describing their happiness and love.

> O blisful nyght, of hem so longe isought
> How blithe unto hem bothe two thow weere!
> Why nad I swich oon with my soule ybought,
> Ye, or the leeste joie that was theere?
> Awey, thow foule daunger and thow feere,
> And lat hem in this hevene blisse dwelle,
> That is so heigh that al ne kan I telle! (III, 1317-23)

This stanza is later followed by two others that assert in almost similar words the ideas of the song of love that Antigone had sung in Book I.

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

They wol seyn «yis,» but Lord! so that they lye,
Tho besy wrecches, ful of wo and drede!
Thei callen love a woodnesse or folie,
But it shall falle hem as I shal yow rede:
They shal forgon the white and ek the rede,
And lyve in wo, ther God yeve hem meschaunce,
And every lovere in his trouthe avaunce! (III, 1373-86)

After reading these stanzas, I find it difficult to conceive how Professor Tatlock comes to the conclusion that «Chaucer, in spite of his earlier surrender to romance... had come to the feeling that it really was the nature of the first «amour» which led so quickly to the second... he ceased to be content with fashionable irresponsibility.» The nature of the first «amour», as is apparent in the above quoted lines, is perfectly beautiful and commendable. Criseyde is intensely sincere when she says:

«Now God, thow woost, in thought ne dede untrewe
To Torilus was nevere yet Criseyde.» (III, 1053-54)

The effect of love on her, as well as on Troilus is ennobling. When it is decreed that she will be sent to the Greek camp, like a true and faithful lover she thinks of Troilus's *sorrow and pain before she thinks of her own. When she cries, tears her hair and faints,* her agony is as sincere as her oath of faith to Troilus was in Book III. To say that she wished to go to her father is as false as claiming that Troilus wanted her to go, or that he was too weak to change the course of events. In Book IV it is perfectly clear that Criseyde is honest, she is yet true to her lover: and her sorrow at leaving is as poignant as that of the hero who remains behind.

It is also necessary, at this point, to dwell on the reasons why Troilus behaved the way he did both during the meeting of the Trojan parliament and afterwards. The interview he holds with Pandarus in Book IV, following the decision, is important in this respect. Pandarus finds him in the the midst of lamentations over his cruel fate. In his *usual practical way he suggests Troilus to take another mistress. Troilus rejects this* suggestion outright. He says not only that he is bound to be faithful by the rules of courtly love, but his personal integrity and all he feels for her would not allow him to be otherwise. He would be a «fiend» not a human being to do that. Since he has vowed to be true, he will remain so till he dies. Defeated in this argument, Pandarus then suggests the alternative of of forcibly abducting Criseyde. Troilus says that he had thought of this and of other ways before his friend suggested them but that abduction is out of the question both from his own point of view and from that of Criseyde's. Everybody would *blame him for opposing his father and Criseyde's name would be soiled. The thing that* he fears most of all is bringing slander upon his lady: he would rather die than do this.

'Yet drede I moost hire herte to perturbe
With violence, if I do swich a game,
For if I wolde it openly desturbe,
It mooste be disclaundre to hire name.
And me were levere ded than hire diffame.' (IV, 561-65)

His conclusion is that there is no way out of his difficulty. Some may wonder why he did not consider marriage. But as explained earlier, medieval poets respected what they regarded as the facts of the story, its plot, even though they felt themselves entirely free to give their own interpretation of it. Chaucer throughout the poem avoids the mention of marriage because there was no place for it in his plot and to insert the idea of marriage would ruin it.

Criseyde, on the other hand, is sincere when she convinces Troilus, through her arguments that she will return within ten days of her departure. She builds up her arguments on three points. First that the war will soon end favourably to the Trojans; then, she says, she believes her father wants her because he thinks she is not happy in Troy and when he sees it otherwise he will let her come back. As a third and last possibility, she says she can work on her father's lust for money and fool him into sending her to Troy to get some more of what she will take to him with her. But when Criseyde does get to the Grecian camp she finds that all her hopes and beliefs were false. The war will not end soon and if it does end, it now seems that it will end in favor of the Greeks. Her efforts to fool her father are not successful. Her plans to steal away at night fail even before she puts them to the test. But the fact that she fails to carry them out is not because she is the «weak,» «fearful,» creature that C. S. Lewis makes her into.[17] She fails to carry them out because she is unsentimental and cool-headed and considers every side of an action before she acts.

When Diomede woos Criseyde in Book V he does not only talk of love but he also breaks down all her arguments in favor of returning to Troy. Diomede, in so doing, follows the behavior of Pandarus in Book II. Just as Criseyde had begun to consider the pro's and con's of loving Troilus after Pandarus had left, she starts thinking over Diomede's argument after his departure in Book V. At his departure Diomede gets no more promise of her love than Troilus had achieved through the intermediacy of Pandarus in Book II:

«To - morwe ek wol I speken with you fayn,
So that ye touchen naught of this matere.
And whan yow list, ye may come here ayayn...» (V, 995-98)

Later on, when she is alone, Chaucer reveals her thoughts:

Retornyng in hire soule ay up and down
The wordes of this sodeyn Diomede,
His grete estat, and perel of the town,
And that she was allone and hadde nede
Of frendes help; and thus bygan to brede
The cause whi, the sothe for to telle
That she took fully purpos for to dwelle. (V, 1022-29)

«And so, true to her nature,» as W. G. Dodd observes, «she decides to act in accord with what she considers her best interests and her happiness.» [18] She had done so before when she had given her love to Troilus. She does so now when she yields to Diomede. In the former case, though her action involved a surrender to the passion of her lover, she did nothing wrong according to the code by which her actions were supposed to be tested. In the latter, she commits a definite and a henious offence against this code. According to **The Art of Courtly Love** she will be punished by being sent to the section of humiliation in the God of Love's Garden in the life to come.[19] It is well to note that Criseyde herself realized the enormity of the offence. It never occurred to her, we may also observe, that she had done anything wrong in yielding to her amorous nature in her relations with Troilus. Her sole sin was this particular definite falseness in love, and it was this which caused her remorse.[20] And this sin arose from her strongly amorous nature and cool-headedness, **not** from the operation of Fate.

Troilus is «the embodiment of the medieval ideal of lover and warrior» [21] and stays so *until the end. Criseyde is not only the heroine of a love affair but also a common* human being with certain weaknesses of character. If she was not forced to leave Troy, she would have been a faithful lover but going to the Greek camp becomes a test of her strength and she fails. Chaucer knows the faults of Criseyde but sympathizes with her and tries to excuse her throughout Book V.

Pandarus, the third actor in this love romance, also plays two roles at once. He is both the «Frend» of **The Romance of the Rose** *and the practical, sensitive man who, in* Lewis's words. «gets things done.» [22] His splendid humanism comes out not only in his insight into other people's sufferings but also in his own behavior. In Book IV. for example, he advises Troilus to take another lover after Criseyde leaves Troy.

> «Forthi be glad, myn owen deere brother!
> If she be lost, we shal recovere an other.» (IV, 405-6)

Troilus's answer to him though, is enough to point out Pandarus's true nature.

> «But telle me now, syn that the thynketh so light
> To changen so in love ay to and fro,
> Whi hastow nat don bisily thi myght
> To chaungen hire that doth the al thi wo?» (IV, 484-87)

The author himself emphasizes Pandarus's stable and faithful character in the same scene.

> Thise wordes seyde he for the nones alle,
> To help his frend, lest he for sorwe deyde;
> For douteles, to don his wo to falle,
> He roughte nought what unthrift that he seyde. (IV, 428-31)

His genuine friendship for Troilus is one of the most noticeable things about him. He offers Troilus not only all the help he can give in attaining Criseyde's love but also his own life and the lives and the money of his relatives in backing him to abduct Criseyde. All through the poem he feels the moral conflict that arises from his opposing roles. He is both the «Frend» of Troilus and the uncle of Criseyde. As her uncle he ought to play the role of «Jealosy», he ought to guard her honour. As Troilus's friend he is

bound to help him in winning Criseyde. In the poem h's friendship overcomes his other responsibilities. But Chaucer does not want us to accuse him of moral laxness. From time to time he takes us into his mind. In Book III we read:

> «But wo is me, that I, that cause al this,
> May thynken that she is my nece deere
> And I hire em, and traitour eke yfeere!» (III, 271-73)

Pandarus is one of the most complex and rich characters that Chaucer has ever created. On the one hand, he is the committed idealistic lover who loves and stays faithful to his beloved all his life without apparently getting any rewards from her. On the other hand, he is practical enough to laugh at the foolish actions of the lovers and to give them advices opposed to the codes he himself is following. Lewis rightly points out that the character of Pandarus cannot be put in a nutshell.

> . . . The subtlety of a poet's creation is «far greater
> than the subtlety of discourse.» There is fold within
> fold to be disentalgled in him, and an analysis, with
> its multiple distinctions, will never exhaust what
> imagination has brought forth with the unity of nature herself [23]

The whole poem exhibits «the unity of nature herself.» To draw clearcut answers to the problems of life and love that Chaucer puts forth here, will only criple our sense of apprehension of the poem. The Heaven of God, as presented in Book V, is beyond change, sorrow and anxiety, but this world, controlled by a Fate which seems fickle to us because we are blind to the Divine Order underlying it,[24] with its petty worries, rules, conventions, and sorrows is also attractive and fascinating. Troilus and Criseyde know that earthly felicity is short lived, that earthly love is not worth the pain it causes one to suffer but they stil choose to love mortal man. Troilus, in the epilogue, recommends «celestial» love saying that it is the only means of attaining absolute happiness. «Celestial» love is beyond change and betrayal. But the same Troilus in Book iII celebrates human love as «perfit joy» though painful; and in his hymn to Love he seems to recommend exactly the opposite of that of Book V:

> «Love, that of erthe and se hath governaunce,
> Love, that his hestes in hevenes hye,
> Love, that with an holsom alliaunce
> Halt peples joyned, as hym lest hem gye,
> Love, that knetteth lawe of compaignie,
> And couples doth in vertu to dwelle,
> Bynd this acord, that I have told and telle.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> So wolde God, that auctour is of kynde,
> That with his bond Love of his virtu liste
> To cerclen hertes alle, and faste bynde,
> That from his bond no wight the wey out wiste;
> And hertes colde, hem wolde I that he twiste
> To make hem love, and that hem liste ay rewe
> On hertes sore, and kepe hem that ben trewe!» (III, 1744-71)

In **Troilus and Criseyde**, Chaucer presents different kinds of love points out the shortcomings of one by contrasting it with the virtues of the other. He holds the two possibilities of love in a sort of tension. Being a man of the Middle Ages he has to admit the glory in the unchanging, perfect love of God. But being a humanist he is fascinated by the sincere and piercing nature of human love. To say that Chaucer rejects one in favour of the other would distort the whole impression that Chaucer aims to create. Chaucer is the dramatist he does not give answers, he merely raises questions with the help of which people can reevaluate the world about them.

Therefore, the epilogue of Book V can neither be taken as a mere palinode, as C. S. Lewis claims, nor can it be considered as the illustration of a Christian truth, as Shanley and Denomy and Robertson suggest. Chaucer does not deny at the end of Book V the glory and the satisfaction of earthly love previously suggested. He rather shifts the point of view from the earthly plane to the heavenly one. Yet, as he suggests throughout, Heaven and Earth are not utterly separate. The great chain of love extends from one to the other. To understand the ideals of one, one has to comprehend the ideals of the other.

In short, the love of Troilus and Criseyde fails not because it was sinful or less glorious, but because it was earthly. Earthly love, specially courtly love, even in its most ideal state is bound to fail. The sorrow one feels at the end is more for the failure of an ideal than for the fate of the characters.

TROILUS VE CRISEYDE'IN EPILOG'UNDAKI PARADOKS

ÖZET

Ben bu yazımda **Troilus and Criseyde** hikâyesini hem ortaçağ edebiyatı gelenekleri açısından, hem de Chaucer'in diğer eserlerinde de görülen temel inançları yönünden inceliyerek, son beş kıtanın, iddia edilenlerin aksine, ne tutarsız ve bağlantısız bir ek ne de dünyevî aşkın reddini öneren bir ana fikir olduğunu ispat etmiye çalıştım. Troilus, Criseyde ve Pandarus'u temsil ettikleri geleneksel tipler ve aynı zamanda kişilik sahibi karakterler olarak inceledim. Bütün hikâye boyunca uygulanan anlatım tarzı beni Chaucer'in dünyevî aşk ile ulvî aşk kavramlarını tamamen iki ayrı unsur olarak almadığı, her ikisini de bir büyük zincirin iki ucu olarak kabul ettiği sonucuna götürdü.

Troilus'un bütün gençlere kendilerini ulvî aşka vermelerini öneren son satırları, hikâyenin başından beri var olan bir amaçtır. Ancak Chaucer, karakter yapıları nedeni ile kendilerini bu aşka adayamıyacak kişileri de sevip, onların duyduğu dünyevî aşkı da övecek kadar «humanist» bir yazar olduğunu **Troilus and Criseyde**'in her satırında ispatlar. Bütün ortaçağ yazarları gibi Chaucer da ulvî aşkı dünyevî aşka yeğ tutar. Ancak dünyevî aşkın da bir kutsallığı ve güzelliği vardır ve Chaucer **Troilus and Criseyde**'de bunu bütün canlılığı ile gösterir.

REFERENCES

[1] C. S. Lewis, **The Allegory of Love** (New York: A. Galaxy Book, 1965), p. 197.

[2] J. L. Shanley, «The Troilus and Christian Love» in **Chaucer: Modern Essays in Criticism**, ed. Edward Wagenknecht (New York: A Galaxy Book, 1964), p. 389, D. W. Robertson, Jr., «Chaucerian Tragedy» in **Chaucer: Modern Essays in Criticism**, p. 118; and A.J. Denomy, «The Two Moralities of Chaucer's **Troilus and Criseyde**» in **Chaucer Criticism**, Vol. II, ed. R. J. Shoeck and J. Taylor (Notre Dame, Ind.: Notre Dame Press, 1965), pp. 164-65.

[3] Curry, «Destiny in **Troilus and Criseyde**» in **Chaucer Criticism**, Vol. II. pp. 132-33.

[4] Refer to D. Dollaş, «The Parliament of Fowls: An Appreciation,» **Hacettepe Bulletin of Social Sciences and Humanities**, Vol. III No. 1 June 1971, pp. 49-51.

[5] Ian Watt, **The Rise of the Novel** (London: Chatto and Winders, 1967), p. 14.

[6] Boece, trans. by Chaucer in **The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer**, ed. F. N. Robinson (Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press, 1961), p. 340.

[7] All quotations are from the edition by F. N. Robinson, **The Works of Geoffery Chaucer**. (Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press, 1961)

[8] Whether Chaucer knew Andreas Capellanus's **The Art of Courtly Love** or not is disputable, but that he knew **The Romance of the Rose** is certain. We have his own testimony in **The Legend of Good Women** that he made a translation of it (**The Legend of Good Women**, 1, 329).

[9] N. Coghill, **The Poet Chaucer** (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 71.

[10] **Ibid.**

[11] Ibid., p. 71.

[12] R. K. Root **The Poetry of Chaucer** (Gloucester, Mass: Peter Smith, 1957), p. 103.

[13] J. S. P. Tatlock, «The People in Chaucer's **Troilus**» in **Chaucer: Modern Essays in Criticism**, pp. 342-3.

[14] Lewis, p.196.

[15] Dodd, Kittredge, Root, Shanley and Robertson claim that Criseyde came to Pandarus' house knowing she would surrender herself to Troilus. Mizener, Roberts, Curry, Lowes, Everett and Lewis are agreed that Criseyde's surrender was not an action of her will alone, but that it came about in part as a result of circumstances or Fate.

[16] Andreas Capeuanus, **The Art of Courtly Love**, trans. and introd. J. J. Parry (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1964), p. 31.

[17] Lewis, pp. 188-189.

[18] W. G. Dodd, **Courtly Love in Chaucer and Gower** (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959), p. 174

[19] Andreas, p.79.

[20] Dodd, pp. 174-175.

[21] Lewis, p. 195.

[22] **Ibid.**, p. 190.

[23] **Ibid** p. 194.

[24] Boece, p. 374.