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Disillusionment in *Troilus and Cressida*

Mayuko Sakuta

Relations between appearance and reality seem to be one of Shakespeare's deepest concerns. In almost all his plays, we find the appearance-versus-reality motif to be recurring in some form or other. The best example of this concern can be found in *Hamlet*.

In this play, the disparity between appearance and reality is the very source of dramatic action. Gertrude, Hamlet's mother, who once appeared to be a faithful wife to the late king, hurries "with such dexterity to incestuous sheets"(I.ii.157). Claudius who pretends to mourn his brother's death is, in reality, the murderer. The discrimination of reality from appearance is, as it were, the task assigned to Hamlet by the Ghost. The Ghost itself, however, might be an instance of deceitful appearance.

Thus Hamlet, awakened to the deceptive nature of appearance, devises the play, "The Murder of Gonzago" to reveal reality. He intends to know whether the Ghost's accusations are just or not by virtue of art—in this case, a play, which can itself be regarded as a kind of appearance.

In *Hamlet*, Shakespeare seems to be particularly conscious of the two functions of art. Art reveals reality as is seen in the case of the play-within-a-play devised by Hamlet. It reveals the fact of Claudius's fracticide. On the other hand, art, since it has the quality of artificiality, conceals reality as is seen in the case of Claudius's hypocrisy.

Considering the latter case, it can be understood that art is, in an aspect, deeply related to deceptive nature of appearance. It seems that Shakespeare presents Claudius as no less accomplished a player than the Player-King in the play-within-a-play. At least, Hamlet suggests to the

audience such a view of him. When Hamlet is informed that the travelling players are to arrive soon, he says, "He that plays the king shall be welcome; his majesty have tribute of me..." (II.ii.319-320). He perceives, I believe, hypocrisy, a kind of acting, in the present king's behaviour. In his mind, Claudius's appearance seems somehow associated with the art of the theatre. That appearance is closely connected with the art of play-acting in Hamlet's mind is evident in his own words in the earliest part of the play. The queen asks him to cast his "nighted color off"(I.ii.68). Hamlet is offended by the word "seems" which she has used and bitterly replies: "Seems, madam! nay, it is; I know not 'seems'. 'Tis not alone my inky cloak, good mother, / Nor customary suits of solemn black,"—and not alone, he adds, the sighs, the tears, "the dejected 'haviour of the visage"—"that can denote me truly". He says:

these indeed seem,
    For they are actions that a man might play;
    But I have that within which passes show,
    These but the trappings and the suits of woe.(I.ii.83-86)

Claudius himself seems to feel himself detestable when he feigns to be a good king and a kind uncle. He expresses the pangs of conscience in an aside: "The harlot's cheek, beautied with plastering art, / Is not more ugly to the thing helps it / Than is my deed to my most painted word: / O heavy burthen!"(III.i.51-54). This aspect of art, artifice or artificiality, is also referred to in the Nunnery Scene. Hamlet speaks to Ophelia reproachfully about women's make-up and coquetry as a disgusting trick: "I have heard of your paintings too, well enough; God has given you one face, and you make yourselves another: you jig, you amble, and you lisp, and nick-name God's creatures, and make your wantonness your ignorance"(III.i.148-152).

In this way it is suggested that art—the concept of which is deeply related to that of appearance in this play—helps not only to conceal but also to reveal reality, by the same power of illusion. Severely criticizing
women's "paintings" as well as Claudius's hypocrisy—art as concealment, Hamlet is at the same time fascinated by the art of play-acting—art as revelation, and even makes use of the art himself. Thus in Hamlet, the duality of art or appearance functions as a causative factor in generating struggles, and the subtly balanced presentations of the dual qualities are one of attractions of this play. Shakespeare is aware of both aspects and seems to enjoy dramatizing the double-edged power, himself remaining objective toward it. In that sense, this play can be regarded as an achievement in the study of appearance as well as that of art.

However, in Troilus and Cressida, a play supposedly written one or two years after Hamlet, we feel a shift in Shakespeare's attitude toward the art of the theatre, though in this play the interest in the appearance-versus-reality relationship is no less predominant. The cause of this shift at this period of his career, Anne Righter attributes, in part, to "some obscure but quite personal disgust with the London theatre and with the practice of the actor's and the dramatist's craft". Her suggestion about such kind of disgust seems fairly justified when we examine the so-called "problem plays", such as All's Well That Ends Well, Measure for Measure, and Troilus and Cressida. The intense consciousness of the function of the dramatic art surely exists in Hamlet and in fact frequent reference is made to it, but the consciousness does not undermine the impression of an artistic achievement that Hamlet makes. In Troilus and Cressida, it seems that Shakespeare's feeling toward the dramatic art is so bitter that the play fails to achieve the balance that Hamlet manages to keep.

This essay is an effort to examine Troilus and Cressida in terms of Shakespeare's intense consciousness of the dramatic art, especially, in terms of the influences of the consciousness on the structure of the play.

... thou picture of what thou seemst,
an idol of idiot-worshippers ... (V.i.6-7)

This is an example of abuse by Thersites, who bitterly rails at whomever he meets and whatever he witnesses. There are some detailed studies of his identity, classifying him as a fool, a chorus, or a buffoon like Carlo Buffone of Ben Jonson. The inquiry into his identity; the inquiry into his ancestors or his relatives is no doubt of much significance and interest, yet this is too great a subject to discuss here. Besides, so far as it is clear to us that Thersites is a kind of commentator on all his surroundings, which the critics admit without exception, further inquiry would not be necessary here.

The above-quoted abuse is levelled against Achilles, the noble and god-like hero of Homer, but curiously degraded here in Shakespeare's characterization. Evidently, Thersites means that "there is nothing more to him than one sees at first glance, just as a picture has nothing more to it."

The appearance-versus-reality theme is noticeable here. Not only Achilles
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but also Ajax is jeered at for almost the same reason. Thersites jests at Ajax in this way:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{thou sodden-witted lord! Thou hast no more brain in thy head than I have in mine elbows . . .} \\
\ldots \text{Thou scurvy-valiant ass!} \\
\ldots \text{thou thing of no bowels, Thou! (II.i.42-43,44,48)}
\end{align*}
\]

Thersites's opinion is that the brain of Achilles or Ajax is "a fusty nut with no kernel" (II.i.101). In addition, he describes Patroclus, Achilles's "male varlet" (V.i.15), as "a guild counterfeit" (II.iii.24). Emerging from such abuse is the image of something valiant or gorgeous on the surface but worthless within. Such words as "no kernel" or "counterfeit" remind us of Parolles in *All's Well That Ends Well*. In the play, he is the object of such sharp criticism as "there can be no kernel in this light nut; the soul of the man is his clothes" (II.v.43-44). A couple of times he also is described as "counterfeit" (III.vi.37, IV.ii.34,99). According to Anne Righter, the term "counterfeit" has "the double meaning of 'actor' and 'false'." Parolles is, in a sense, an "actor", a man who plays a self-appointed role in life, although the other characters are not deceived by his pretension. *All's Well That Ends Well* was probably written almost immediately after *Troilus and Cressida*, so it is not surprising that the two plays show similarities in diction and, moreover, share the negative view of acting. As the term "counterfeit" used in describing both Parolles and Patroclus suggests, Patroclus is presented as a kind of an actor. He mimics Agamemnon and Nestor in front of Achilles. As for Ajax, he can, like Parolles, be regarded as an actor in life, because he takes upon himself the grandiose role of a hero. Thersites insists that Ajax is unworthy of the name of a hero because of his utter lack of intelligence. In III.iii, Thersites reports how vain and

8) Righter, *op. cit.*, p. 175.
pretentious Ajax's behaviour is:

Thersites. A wonder!
Achilles. What?
Thersites. Ajax goes up and down the field, asking for himself.
Achilles. How so?
Thersites. He must fight singly tomorrow with Hector, and is so prophetically proud of an heroical cudgelling that he raves in saying nothing.
Achilles. How can that be?
Thersites. Why, 'a stalks up and down like a peacock—a stride and a stand; ruminates like an hostess that hath no arithmetic but her brain to set down her reckoning; bites lip with a politic regard, as who should say 'There were wit in this head, an 'twould out'—and so there is; but it lies as coldly in him as fire in a flint, which will not show without knocking. The man's undone for ever, for if Hector break not his neck i'th' combat, he'll break't himself in vainglory. He knows not me. I said 'Good morrow, Ajax', and he replies 'Thanks, Agamemnon'. What think you of this man, that takes me for the general? He's grown a very landfish, languageless, a monster. A plague of opinion!—a man may wear it on both sides, like a leather jerkin. (III.iii.242-264)

Ajax acts like a great hero, but no one but himself is deceived. Immediately after this dialogue with Achilles, Thersites mimics Ajax's superior airs with the aid of Patroclus. The mimicry, "the pageant of Ajax" is performed in the presence of Achilles, in which Thersites imitates Ajax, and Patroclus attempts to communicate with him:
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Patroclus. Jove bless great Ajax!
Thersites. Hum!
Patroclus. I come from the worthy Achilles—
Thersites. Ha!
Patroclus. Who most humbly desires you to invite
Hector to his tent—
Thersites. Hum!
Patroclus. And to procure safe-conduct from Agamemnon.
Thersites. Agamemnon?
Patroclus. Ay, my lord.
Thersites. Ha! (III.iii.279-290)

This mimicry is especially effective in that it leads the audience to accept Thersites's view that Ajax is not a great warrior but a self-conceited imitator of a hero. Ajax's valiant appearance somehow contradicts his stupidity and vanity. Thus Thersites makes Ajax look more and more deprived of his dignity in the eyes of the audience.

Patroclus functions in the same way in the devaluation of Agamemnon and Nestor as Thersites does in that of Ajax. Ulysses describes to the Greek generals Patroclus's vilifying action against Agamemnon and Nestor:

... With him [Achilles], Patroclus,
Upon a lazy bed, the livelong day
Breaks scurril jest,
And with ridiculous and awkward action,
Which, slanderer, he imitation calls,
He pageants us. Sometime, great Agamemnon,
Thy topless deputation he puts on,
And, like a strutting player whose conceit
Lies in his hamstring, and doth think it rich
To hear the wooden dialogue and sound
'Twixt his stretched footing and the scaffoldage,
Such to-be-pitied and o'er-wrested seeming
He acts thy greatness in; and, when he speaks,
'Tis like a chime a-mending; with terms unsquared,
Which, from the tongue of roaring Typhon dropped,
Would seem hyperboles . . . And in this fashion,
All our abilities, gifts, natures, shapes,
Severs and generals of grace exact,
Achievements, plots, orders, preventions,
Excitements to the field or speech for truce,
Success or loss, what is or is not, serves
As stuff for these two to make paradoxes.

(I .iii.146-161,178-184)

This long and minute description can be regarded as Ulysses's attack on Achilles and Patroclus who neglect "the specialty of rule" (I.iii.78), which belongs to Agamemnon, the leader of the Greek host, by refusing to fight and indulging in such calumnious amusement. What seems to be more important, however, is the fact that this can be understood to be Ulysses's ingeniously disguised criticism on those generals that are mimicked by Patroclus, insinuating that they look dignified and grave but in reality utterly incompetent. Patroclus's mockery can be taken as a sort of a play-within-a-play, though its information is given by Ulysses. The mockery, in a sense, strips Agamemnon and Nestor of their masks of great and honourable leaders and reveals their incompetence. Introducing the third person's—Ulysses's—viewpoint, however, Shakespeare succeeds in impressing strongly on the audience the mocker's own meanness as well. The result of the speech would be that a greater part of the audience realize the power of mockery which cheapens everything it touches. Its edge is much more sharpened by the involvement of the third person's viewpoint. By the involvement, the meanness of the mimicker himself, is
emphasized as well.

Just as Thersites undermines Ajax's value by imitating his complacent behaviour, so Patroclus does Agamemnon's and Nestor's, though in the latter case the play-within-a-play takes a more complicated form. The suggestion of these two generals' incompetence seems supported by the whole context of the play, because they entirely depend on Achilles in battle, they themselves doing nothing but make speeches and try to pull that sulky warrior into the battle-field.

So far, we have examined a few examples of Thersites's constant opprobrious speeches of the Greek warriors, and two examples of mimicry. It seems that these elements contribute much to the full disclosure of the realities of the characters discussed above, in this case, vanity, stupidity or weakness lying behind the imposing, noble or smart appearances.

The play presents false heroes, the figures who have the names of those renowned heroes of Homer, but are in reality far from being true heroes. It may be the result of Shakespeare's deliberate efforts that the figures look thoroughly spurious. Though the question "What is a hero?" is too difficult to answer definitely, it would not be irrelevant here to note that dramatic elements are inherent in the nature of heroism. This consciousness seems to have led Shakespeare to make such cynical approaches to those Greek heroes mentioned above.

Curiously enough, the image of an actor is connected with something undesirable in the three problem plays and the great tragedies. It is surmised that Shakespeare was excessively sensitive to such elements and went so far as to regard them as false and deceptive at this period of his career. Lionel Trilling quotes a notable definition of a hero in his brilliant book: "a hero is one who looks like a hero." Clearly, this remark has some truth in it. In that case, if we refuse to accept one who looks like a hero as a hero, continually cast a doubt on his authenticity and try to unmask him,

the result will be that we have no heroes. This seems to be happening in *Troilus and Cressida*. It must be because of such strong and persistent impulse to unmask, which is perceived in this play, that any figure on the stage comes to look unworthy of the name of a hero. The paradoxical disgust of this Elizabethan dramatist with the dramatic elements related to heroism, a mentality which can be called even puritanistic, seems to be an important factor in presenting the false heroes. It seems that Shakespeare was faced with a strange contradiction at that time.

II

It can easily be seen that antipathy to falsehood is working not only in the war-plot but also in the love-plot. The story of Troilus and Cressida is, needless to say, the story of falsehood on the part of the lady. The appearance-versus-reality theme is even more prominent in the love-plot. The following is Troilus's pathetic as well as philosophical speech in V.ii. where he and Ulysses witness Cressida flirting with Diomedes. She exits after imputing her falsehood to the frailty of her sex in a pair of flippant couplets.

Ulysses. All's done, my lord.
Troilus. It is.
Ulysses. Why stay we then?
Troilus. To make a recordation to my soul
Of every syllable that here was spoke.
But if I tell how these two did co-act,
Shall I not lie in publishing a truth?
Sith yet there is a credence in my heart,
An esperance so obstinately strong,
That doth invert th'attest of eyes and ears;
As if those organs had deceptive functions.
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Created only to calumniate.
Was Cressid here?  

(V.ii.115-125)

Troilus goes on to vent his anguish:

This she? No; this is Diomed’s Cressida.
If beauty have a soul, this is not she;
If souls guide vows, if vows be sanctimonies,
If sanctimony be the gods’ delight,
If there be rule in unity itself.

This is not she... This is, and is not Cressid!
Within my soul there doth conduce a fight
Of this strange nature, that a thing inseparate
Divides more wider than the sky and earth...

Cressid is mine, tied with the bonds of heaven.
Instance, O instance! strong as heaven itself:
The bonds of heaven are slipped, dissolved and loosed,
And with another knot, five-finger-tied,
The fractions of her faith, orts of her love,
The fragments, scraps, the bits and greasy relics
Of her o’ereaten faith are given to Diomed.

(V.ii.137-160)

What he is witnessing now is incompatible with the image of Cressida in his mind. What his “heart” believes to be her reality contradicts her appearance. The oaths of complete faithfulness and everlasting love that she swore(III.ii.182-195) has turned out to be without any substance. Surely Troilus lacks the sense of time. In the earlier part of this play, special attention is given to time in Ulysses’s eloquent speech. It is evident that the conception of time is organically related to the problem of appearance and reality as well as to the problem of valuation. Troilus’s
anguish comes, certainly, from his inability to see, or to accept the
overriding influence exercised by time on human feelings. Yet, in this
painful speech, clinging to the illusion of holy, everlasting power of love,
Troilus questions the very possibility of mankind's ever gaining a proper
understanding of reality, without paying much attention to the working of
time. In the war-plot, as is noted in chapter I, the authenticity of the heroes
is questioned. Here, the uncertainty of love is made explicit in the course
of probing into the nature of a woman. Ironically, Troilus's scathing
passage of indignation quoted above serves to emphasize the improbabili-
ity of such eternal love on this earth.

It has become clear to us that the two plots share the problem of reality
and appearance. It is no accident, therefore, that the act of "watching" is
specially significant in both of them.

In the war-plot, in III.iii, Achilles watches Thersites imitate Ajax.
Thersites's sarcastic action insinuates that Ajax merely pretends to be a
great hero. Also in I.iii, Achilles watches Patroclus mimic Agamemnon
and Nestor, though this information is given by Ulysses. Patroclus's
mocking gesture hints that a noble leader and a respectable orator might be
the deceptive masks behind which they are hiding. These intricately
designed plays-within-a-play involve, so to speak, triple viewpoints
respectively. In the former case, Ajax's, Thersites's and Achilles's and, in
the latter, Agamemnon's or Nestor's, Patroclus's and Achilles's. In the
former case, for example, the audience's own standpoint is nearest to
Achilles's and farthest from Ajax's. Furthermore, their viewpoint is not the
same as Achilles's. He could not be exempt from some hostile criticism
from the audience, for he shamelessly enjoys the slanderous mimicry
against his fellow warrior. It is the same with the latter case. What these
scenes clarify is a process of detachment in human psychology. Ajax is
watched and commented on by Thersites—his mimicry is a form of
commentary—and the mimicry is again watched and commented on by
Achilles. And the audience watch Achilles watch Thersites mimic Ajax.
The more viewpoints exist between the object of observation and the
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spectators in the theatre, the more are they detached from it. It seems that Shakespare is here experimenting with a device of detachment, using the complicated design of, as it were, concentric circles of viewpoints.

The similar design is used also in the love-plot, in V.ii, where that pathetic speech of Troilus’s is found. There Troilus and Ulysses in the lurking place watch the dallidance of Cressida with her Greek lover, and Thersites spies them all, unseen himself. It goes without saying that the audience observe all those figures. This scene has no mimicry like the scenes examined above (I.iii, III.iii.), yet the structure involving triple viewpoints is essentially the same. In this scene, the audience’s viewpoint will become nearest to Thersites’s, and farthest from Cressida’s or Diomedes’s. And I believe that it is no coincidence that this scene, where Troilus desperately grieves over the intricate relationship of appearance and reality, over the seeming disjunction between the two, has itself such an elaborate structure. The very structure is meant to cast light on our familiar experience, both in everyday life and in the theatre, of disillusionment. In this scene again, the spectators in the theatre, as in the scenes of the war-plot examined before, are detached from the figures on the stage. Even if the audience are ready to sympathize with the youth who is cruelly betrayed by a “daughter of the game” (IV.v.63), such emotion will hardly survive Thersites’s scurrilous remarks occasionally made on this love triangle and on some parts of Troilus’s wild lamentation. For example:

Troilus. Let it not be believed for womanhood!
Think we had mothers. Do not give advantage
To stubborn critics, apt without a theme
For depravation, to spuare the general sex
By Cressid’s rule; rather think this not Cressid.

Ulysses. What hath she done, prince, that can soil our mothers?

Troilus. Nothing at all, unless that this were she.
Thersites. Will 'a swagger himself out on's own eyes?

(V.ii.129-136)

Troilus swears exasperately to revenge himself on Diomedes:

Troilus. . . Not the dreadful spout
Which shipmen do the hurricano call,
Constringed in mass by the almighty sun,
Shall dizzy with more clamour Neptune's ear
In his descent, than shall my prompted sword
Falling on Diomed.

Thersites. He'll tickle it for his concupy.

(V.ii.171-177)

What happens in this scene is disillusionment in two different ways. Troilus is disillusioned at Cressida and the spectators in the theatre at Troilus the protagonist, not to speak of their disillusionment at Cressida and Diomedes.

We may perceive, in these scenes analyzed above, Shakespeare's repulsion toward falsehood or deception, which in fact are observed in humanity. The repulsion may be a dominant factor in leading him to choose the falsehood of Cressida as the subject of his play, and to make such sarcastic representations of the heroes of Homer. It also might have led him to construct those scenes which remarkably deepen the audience's alienation from the characters on the stage. In addition to these remarkable structural devices in the way of disillusionment, another device that prevents the audience from deep involvement in the illusion seems to be working throughout the play.
The story of faithful Troilus, false Cressida and Pandarus the pandar was quite popular in Shakespeare's time through a couple of publications such as Robert Henryson's poem *Testament of Cresseid* and so on. It seems that Shakespeare not only accepts but also emphasizes the conventionally fixed images of these figures. For example, Troilus often refers to his own simplicity and faithfulness. Judging from his speech at the outset of the play, it sounds as if he knew the painful development of his love affair; that his future lover Cressida will forsake him for a Greek:

The Greeks are strong, and skilful to their strength,  
Fierce to their skill, and to their fierceness valiant,  
But I am weaker than a woman's tear,  
Tamer than sleep, fonder than ignorance,  
Less valiant than the virgin in the night,  
And skilless as unpractised infancy.  

(I.i.7-10)

Needless to say, Troilus on the stage does not know the future course of his life. It is the dramatist and the audience that have the knowledge. Obviously, Shakespeare takes advantage of the audience's preliminary knowledge of the story. The major effect here would be that of distancing. By this speech, the audience are reminded of the hardship that is to await him. It is true that they pity Troilus, but such emotion is different from "engagement", which we usually experience when we identify ourselves with a character in a novel or on the stage. According to Maynard Mack's definition of this term, when "engagement" happens, we become the very

same person we are reading about or seeing. The audience hearing the speech above will experience the reverse of "engagement". Even if some of the audience have been willing to identify themselves with the passionate young hero, their readiness will be weakened by the unmistakable irony. This device against engagement is mainly used in the depiction of the two lovers and Pandarus the go-between.

Another notable example is found in III.ii. The following is the oaths made by Troilus, Cressida and Pandarus before the consummation of love.

Troilus:

True swains in love shall in the world to come
Approve their truths by Troilus. When their rhymes,
Full of protest, of oath, and big compare,
Want similes, truth tired with iteration
'As true as steel, as plantage to the moon,
As sun to day, as turtle to her mate,
As iron to adamant, as earth to th'centre'—
Yet, after all comparison of truth,
As truth's authentic author to be cited,
'As true as Troilus' shall crown up the verse
And sanctify the numbers.

Cressida.

Prophet may you be!

If I be false, or swerve a hair from truth,
When time is old and hath forgot itself,
When waterdrops have worn the stones of Troy,
And blind oblivion swallowed cities up,
And mighty states characterless are grated
To dusty nothing, yet let memory,
From false to false, among false maids in love,
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Upbraid my falsehood! When they've said 'as false
As air, as water, wind or sandy earth,
As fox to lamb, or wolf to heifer's calf,
Pard to the hind, or stepdame to her son'
Yea let them say to stick the heart of falsehood,
'As false as Cressid'.

_Pandarus._ Go to, a bargain made, seal it, seal it.
I'll be the witness. Here I hold your hand; here my cousin's. If ever you prove false one to another, since I have taken such pains to bring you together, let all pitiful goers-between be called to the world's end after my name—call them all Pandars: let all constant men be Troilus, all false women Cressids, and all brokers-between Pandars! Say 'amen'.

_Troilus._ Amen.
_Cressida._ Amen.
_Pandarus._ Amen. (III.ii.173-206)

Shakespeare's treatment of the three characters here is highly ironical. He deliberately makes them refer to the later age. Such words as "the world to come" and "when time is old . . . to dusty nothing" no doubt allude to the world and the time of the audience. In their time, Troy is "characterless" "grated to dusty nothing". The audience are forced to recognize the fact that what they are watching on the stage is about the event that happened hundreds years ago, that what they see is nothing but an illusion and that they themselves are nothing but the spectators of a play. On the other hand, it is true that in a way the audience's attention is attracted to the speeches. This is because through their references to the later age these speeches are indirectly addressed to the audience. Though this kind of attention can be regarded as a sort of involvement—some considerations will be given to this kind of involvement in chapter IV—it is not
"engagement" in the ordinary sense of the word which was noted before. The effect of the speeches is more complicated than that of the case quoted above(i.i.7-10), but seems basically the same. The audience are made conscious of the distance between the stage and themselves by the evocation of their memory of the unhappy ending of the love story. The words or speeches whose effects depend on such memory are frequently found throughout the play. Thus the popularity of the story seems to be fully utilized for producing the effect of detachment in the love plot. In the war plot, as has been considered in chapter I and II, play-within-a-play devices function in the similar manner.

IV

Such kind of involvement as the audience may experience when they listen to the speeches quoted before (III.ii.173-206) seems worth considerations here. It is because such kind of involvement seems to be caused by the sense of mutability, which is frequently aroused throughout the play. The concept of "time" is especially important in its relation to the concept of "appearance" as well as to that of "value" in this play. In this chapter, some efforts will be made to clarify the relation of the concept of "time" to the other important concepts. After that, the quality of the audience's involvement in those speeches will be considered.

In his speech on "Time", which is famous for its vivid imagery, Ulysses takes up as the subject time dominating all human relationships, though his argument is centered on the problem of human values. O. J. Campbell remarks that this is "one of the most memorable expressions of the Renaissance preoccupation with mutability". Ulysses tries to drive Achilles, the pride-wounded warrior, to the honourable deeds in battle:

Time hath, my lord, a wallet at his back

12) Campbell, op. cit., p. 103.
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Wherein he puts alms for oblivion,
A great-sized monster of ingratitude.
Those scraps are good deeds past, which are devoured
As fast as they are made, forgot as soon
As done. Perseverance, dear my lord,
Keeps honour bright: to have done, is to hang
Quite out of fashion, like a rusty mail
In monumental mockery. . . . Then what they do in present,
Though less than yours in past, must o'ertop yours;
For Time is like a fashionable host
That slightly shakes his parting guest by th'hand
And, with his arms outstretched as he would fly,
Grasps in the comer: welcome ever smiles,
And farewell goes out sighing. O, let not virtue seek
Remuneration for the thing it was;
For beauty, wit,
High birth, vigour of bone, desert in service
Love, friendship, charity, are subject all
To envious and calumniating Time.
One touch of nature makes the whole world kin,
That all with one consent praise new-born gawds,
Though they are made and moulded of things past,
And give to dust that is a little gilt
More laud than gilt o'er-dusted.
The present eye praises the present object:
Then marvel not, thou great and complete man,
That all the Greeks begin to worship Ajax . . . (III.iii.145-182)

Ulysses lays stress on the unreliability of the eyes. They are attracted by "dust that is a little gilt" but never pay attention to "gilt o'er-dusted". They cannot know reality from appearance because they are inevitably subject to the working of time. Ulysses introduces the topic a little earlier in this
A strange fellow here
Writes me 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;
As when his virtues, shining upon others,
Heat them and they retort that heat again
To the first giver. (iii.95-102)

Achilles agrees with him and then Ulysses continues:

... 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
Where they're extended; who, like an arch, reverberate
The voice again; or, like a gate of steel
Fronting the sun, receives and renders back
His figure and his heat... (iii.115-123)

Ulysses argues that the shape reflected in the mirror, that is, in the eyes of other people, is the reality, and that since we have no other means to see ourselves than such a mirror, we have to be contented with this way of cognition, accepting the shapes as our reality. According to him, the trouble with the mirror is that it does not show the same shape for a long time. The shape undergoes some change as time passes, if the effort to keep it unchanged is lacking on the part of the thing reflected. It does not matter whether the thing itself remains unchanged or not.

At this point we perceive that we have heard the same kind of opinion concerning the way of valuation in the Trojan debate scene. The Trojans
are discussing whether they should deliver Helen to the Greeks and put an end to the war. Hector insists on sending her back and Troilus wildly protests against him. Their argument develops into more general discussion about value:

Hector. Brother, she is not worth what she doth cost
The keeping.

Troilus. What's aught, but as 'tis valued?

Hector. But value dwells not in particular will:
It holds his estimate and dignity
As well wherein 'tis precious of itself
As in the prizer. 'Tis mad idolatry
To make the service greater than the god;
And the will dotes that is attributive
To what infectiously itself affects,
Without some image of th'affected merit.

(II.ii.51-60)

Troilus's subjectivism is opposed to Hector's conservative point of view. According to W. R. Elton, the attitudes towards philosophic value in Shakespeare's age were "in process of relativistic transition" and "Shakespearian drama reflects the conflict between traditional views, found in Aquinas, for whom value is present and bound up in the object, and the newer views of such figures as Bruno, with his aesthetic relativism, and Hobbes(b.1588), with his notion of value as relative to a market-situation." It is obvious that the opposition of the brothers reflects that of these views. Troilus continues to argue and quotes examples in order to

He maintains that he chooses things by means of his "eyes and ears". In other words, he means to say that our decisions almost always depend on appearances.

This way of valuation seems not so far from the one that Ulysses points out in the speech on "Time" as the way of the world. Neither of them pays much attention to the intrinsic value so much as to the market value. The difference is that Troilus insists on keeping the thing once chosen, even if
the chooser finds it worthless later, while Ulysses asserts that it cannot be helped that the memory of past achievements, however glorious, dies out in the minds of people, being devoured by Time.

Thus the effect of time on appearance is repeatedly considered in relation to the problem of valuation. The considerations seem to make the audience aware of the destructive power of time on appearance or illusion. By these considerations given by the characters, the audience will not only perceive such influence of time exercised in the world of the play on the stage, but also be reminded that time dominates their own lives. They may, however, be aware of such power of time in as early as 3.ii. As soon as the two lovers and Pandarus refer to the later age, the audience who know the unhappy course of the love are inevitably impressed with the sense of mutability in this world. In their age, Troy had long been "characterless" reduced to dust, and the name of Cressida had long been crowned with the disgraceful modifier, "false". By arousing the sense of mutability in the audience, the references, in a way, bridge the gulf between the two different worlds—the world of the play to which the characters belong, and the real world to which the audience belong.

The sense of mutability seems to have been considerably strong in Shakespeare's age, therefore the audience at that time might have been more deeply involved in this scene than the modern audience. Nevertheless, this kind of involvement seems different from "engagement".

V

It would not be altogether irrelevant to point out that Shakespeare at this period of his career was preoccupied with the idea of representing the experience of disillusionment on the stage and also of awakening the feeling of detachment in the audience. Certainly one can say that this interest of his is the reverse of his awareness of what the power of illusion can do in the theatre as well as in life. If his plays are considered in terms of the relation of illusion and disillusionment, either in its general sense or
in the sense of dramatic experience, many signs will be observed of his active interest in this matter. Bitter disillusionment is sometimes the subject matter of his works. Some of his sonnets take it as their subject. *Timon of Athens* presents a man's agony on his disillusionment at human nature. But in *Troilus and Cressida* the subject seems to be more closely incorporated in the structure.

In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, we can find some experiments with the presentation of the process of disillusionment, especially in the play-within-a-play, "Pyramus and Thisbe". But as a whole, the play can properly be called a study in the power of illusion, as is suggested by the fact that the magic drug over the lovers' eyes is allotted an important role. Unlike *Troilus and Cressida*, the element of illusion both in everyday life and in the theatre seems to receive sufficient support in this play. Theseus's famous speech on the improvement of a bad play by the spectators' imagination (V.i.211-212), and the very ending where Demetrius is still under the influence of the drug greatly contribute to this impression, that is, the affirmation of such an element.

In *Troilus and Cressida*, disillusionment is focused on in the love plot, and in the war plot, the heroes are presented essentially as the products of illusion. It might be that Shakespeare's disgust towards appearance, which can even be regarded as deception, is so intense that it not only leads him to choose those subjects but also determines the structure. 14)

The irritating but somehow harmonious impression of the play is mainly caused by the correspondence of those subjects to the structure. Troilus's disillusionment with Cressida can be ascribed to the working of time, since nothing can be exempt from change in this world. It is also true of the dramatic art. Any illusion produced in the theatre loses its effect once the audience leave the theatre. The audience's disillusionment with the

---

14) The criticism on artificiality of the code of chivalry and of the convention of courtly love is evident in this play. This seems to come from the same mentality of the dramatist as is pointed out here.
Disillusionment in *Troilus and Cressida*

characters on the stage—including Troilus himself—may testify to the temporality of this effect. Moreover, the audience are made conscious of the deceptiveness of appearance. They are given a penetrating insight into the ignoble realities of the heroes by means of mockery. The result is that the audience do not believe in their grand appearances but are always aware of the meanness beneath them.

It is undeniable that the religious, political, philosophical or social background such as the repercussions of Reformation, the *Fin de Siècle* pessimism, the scepticism of Montaigne, the fall of Essex, or the doubt in divinity and the decline of authority of the king, influences this play. We perceive the disparity between the picture of an ideal state depicted in the magnificent degree-speech by Ulysses and the disorder and chaos presented throughout the play. The disparity might tell us of the prevalent feelings of this age—disillusionment, or scepticism about the inherited world picture of an ordered universe. Ulysses's and Troilus's relativistic valuation may reflect also the modification made at the age of the traditional valuation, which is represented by Hector's valuation.

*Troilus and Cressida* was written at the turn of the century, which might be also the turning-point in the history of thoughts. It is the product of the disturbance and anxiety as well as of the prevailing disillusionment with more than one aspects of human activities. In addition to that, Shakespeare's personal commitment to the appearance-versus-reality problem and negative feeling toward the theatre seem to permeate this play. The commitment and the feeling are seen to exist persistently through the great tragedies until the period of romance plays. What is typical of this play is, however, its extensive experiments with disillusionment in the theatre by the use of the technique of play-within-a-play and the audience's knowledge of the story. Disillusionment is not only the subject of the play, but also the quality of the experience that the play makes the audience undergo, that is, the experience of disillusionment at the characters on the stage. If the play makes the impression of an artistic failure, the impression comes, if partly, from the fact that disillusionment
is pursued in a piece of illusion. If the success of a play depends upon the deep involvement of the audience in its world of illusion, this play may not be called successful, because feeling of detachment is too frequently and too strongly awakened. Nevertheless, the importance of this play lies in the fact that it presents one of major Shakespearean themes in the peculiar form affected by his complex feelings toward the dramatic art. This play is equally worth notice from the viewpoint of the playwright's deep consciousness of the control of the audience's engagement and detachment in the theatre.