

Performing Away: Cressida as a Performer

SHIMIZU Akiko (清水晶子)

Introduction: beholding eyes

Troilus, farewell! One eye yet looks on thee,
But with my heart the other eye doth see.

(V.ii.106-7)¹⁰

Troilus and Cressida is unique among Shakespearean plays in its relation with the sources. The possible sources are said to be Caxton, Lydgate, Chaucer, and Homer. I am not going to deal with the complicated and perhaps insoluble problem of concluding the exact sources here, but at least it could be said that when he wrote this play, Shakespeare had two main stories which would form the two subjects, or the two mainplots; the tale of Troy, and the love story of Troilus and Cressida. The former might be drawn from either Homer¹¹, Caxton, or Lydgate, or perhaps from more than two of these, and the latter from Chaucer (and Henryson)¹², though no source can be finally confirmed.

Whichever the exact source was, it seems to be granted that both of the stories were widely known to the Renaissance audience, and that will be enough for the argument I am going to present here on the relation between the play and its original narrative. The play follows the original story at least in regard to the plot: Troilus will make love to Cressida, Cressida will be sent to the Greeks and will betray him, Hector will be killed by Achilles. This was so familiar to the audience that the dramatist could even start the play from the middle without detailed explanation of the cause of the war and could end it without the description of , and yet with full suggestion of, the death of the main characters and the fall of Troy:

Prologue: ...our play

Leaps o'er the vault and firstlings of those
broils,
Beginning in the middle, starting thence away
To what may be digested in the play.

(Prologue, 26-9)

If 'Beginning in the middle' might be a kind of commonplace especially in a play on the Trojan War¹³, still the feature is worth noticing because no other Shakespearean play shares this partial presentation of a long, well-known story¹⁴. Also, as R. A. Foakes points out, though the story of the history plays might perhaps be as familiar to the audience as the story of Troy, taken together, they show the whole story and never assert in themselves that they will '[Leap] o'er the vault and firstlings of those broils'. By contrast, the prologue of this play even expressly points out its own incompleteness, which shows its clear consciousness of the fact that it is based on an established story.

The story of Troy was not only fictional but also at the same time could be regarded as historical. It was not historical in the sense the story of the Tudor royal lines was historical¹⁵. And yet, it was in a sense historical in Renaissance England, for at the time it was believed (or partly believed) that the descendants of the Trojans had laid the foundation of Britain. Therefore, just as the history plays could not show entirely false events which would contradict English history, so this story could not be changed in its general course of events. The unchangeability must have been increased for the very reason that the story could not be backed up by any real evidence. Linda Charnes turns our attention to legends' requirements for naturalization and realization;

The legendary is the site at which the

self-consciously fictional slides into the “naturalized” “real”. As that which refers to something presumed to be “reality”, the legendary elides the space that originally existed between its own constructedness and that “reality” to which it refers, thus imposing its values as originary rather than derivational.⁶⁹

It is true that the story of Troy and of its descendants making England is fictional, but, or rather, all the more for that reason, the story must be historicized and naturalized by being regarded as historical. Belief in the legend was needed to support its effectiveness as the origin of national identity. The legend of Troy could not be changed in the way you can change a mere fiction.

Most of the characters have to follow the original figures from the sources in their action, because of this prescriptive force of the sources. It is impossible for the Trojans to suddenly give Helen up to the Greeks or for Cressida to be true to Troilus, or for Hector to beat Achilles, for that would go against the original story of Troy. It is true that Shakespeare’s characters do not reach the legendary greatness of the original figures. On the contrary, Shakespeare emphasizes their foolishness or vulgarity while observing the original course of action. Thersites, an abusive railer in the Greek camp, helps the audience realize the ignominious nature of the Greek generals. The fact that the Trojans have no such railer as Thersites may be regarded as further evidence of the dramatist’s awareness of the coercion of legends: he saves the Trojans from being criticized too harshly. Still, their foolishness *is* stressed and criticised. Not one character can escape the deformation and vulgarization, which are apparently intentional.

However, no matter how deformed the characters are, still it is necessary that they should *be seen as the characters*. Troilus on the stage can be *the* Troilus, Cressida be *the* Cressida, as long as the audience *see* them *as* such. Examining the Greek word *théa*, Barbara Bowen suggests the commonness of war and theatre as that which *has to be seen*. The word means ‘a seeing’ and ‘that which is seen’, and is related both to the verb *theáomai* and *theoréo*. The former verb ‘is the normal verb for viewing “as spectators, especially in the

theatre”’, and the latter means “‘to look at, to inspect or review soldiers”’⁷⁰. She argues that ‘[the fact] that war is a spectacle in the same way a play is a spectacle — ... it must be *viewed* in order to take place — seems to be the perception behind the military uses of the term in Greek’. Since a theatrical piece ‘must be *viewed* to take place’, the characters have to retain the attention of the audience in order to *be* themselves.

So the underlying problem for the characters is, whether they are conscious of it or not, the problem of optics, of the beholding eyes⁷¹ that have a power over those who are beheld. The power relation does not only exist between the audience and the characters, but within the play, among the characters themselves. In *Troilus and Cressida*, the beholding eyes of others form and confirm the identity of the characters. The heroes have to achieve honour by being seen, as Hector’s challenge to achieve honour ‘in view of Trojans and of Greeks’ (I.iii.272) suggests.

The most striking example can be found in the words exchanged between Ulysses and Achilles in Act III. Scene iii. Hearing Ulysses say that no man can know what he owns ‘but by reflection’ (III.iii.99) from the others, Achilles answers:

The beauty that is borne here in the face
The bearer knows not, but commends itself
To others’ eyes; (III.iii.103–5)

Achilles is here saying that one cannot *know* what one has without having recourse to others’ opinion. However, Ulysses immediately stresses that what he intends is not that one *knows*, but that one *can become*, one’s self through the applause:

no man is the lord of anything, ...
Till he communicate his parts to others;
Nor doth he of himself know them for aught,
Till he behold them form’d in the applause...
(III.iii.115–9)

A man can be given a formal existence only after he is applauded. Therefore, before the applause, he does not exist as a man in this society; he has, and he is,

nothing⁽¹¹⁾. This means, in Achilles' terms, that a man cannot exist as a man unless he is seen by the evaluative eyes of others.

Female characters are also needed to be beheld and evaluated in the play. Their value is given by being desired. Troilus compares Helen to a commodity, a frequent way of referring to women in the play ('We turn not back the silks upon the merchants / When we have soil'd them...' II.ii. 70 - 1). Helen is 'a pearl / Whose price hath... / turn'd crown'd kings to merchants (II.ii.82 - 4)'. He uses the same image for Cressida:

Her bed is India; there she lies, a pearl. ...
Ourself the merchant... (I.i.100 - 3)

Here, Cressida is nothing more than what is passively beheld and evaluated by male merchants. While male characters are at once the beholder and the beheld in the play, she is stuck to the position of the beheld. She must be beheld by Troilus to be *the* Cressida, the object of Troilus' desire. Many critics have shared this point of view, whether they feel sorry for her in her position or blame her for hurting Troilus by finding another possessor, or another beholder, for herself⁽¹²⁾. However, Cressida's role in this play is apparently different from that of Helen. Helen *is* nothing more than a pearl which needs to be seen and evaluated. This 'Nell' in the play is not so much a beautiful queen who naturally charms her admirers as a 'whore' who coquets with her lover. She knows she is formed in her lovers' eyes, and, instead of trying to get free from her lover's image, she tries to retain it: She does not try to disturb the power relation between the beholder and the beheld. On the other hand, I think, Cressida does disturb the power relation in the way no other characters can, for all her coquetries which make her appear to be a sister of Helen. In this essay, I would like to show how she succeeds in *being seen as*, thus *being, the* Crissida, while escaping the full subjection to the beholding eyes.

Mimicry

In order to *be seen as*, and thus to *be* themselves, the characters in the play have to imitate those

characters of the legend of Troy. When one person has to imitate another to *be* oneself, his or her identity depends on the imitated. In this sense, it seems that the imitated, being independent, has power over the imitator who is formed through imitation. However, this power relation does not hold in mimicry, which is undoubtedly a kind of imitation.

Before going on with my argument, I would like to distinguish 'mimicry' from 'imitation'. In my argument hereafter, I would like to imply a complete copying of the model by the word 'imitation'. When someone imitates another, the imitator is doing exactly as the model does, or at least tries to do so. On the other hand, I would like to use the word 'mimicry' to refer to an imitation meant to be funny, critical, or even satirical. We can say that mimicry is, in this sense, a kind of performance. When one mimics another, the minimum requirement the mimic has to fulfil is to make the model recognizable. As long as those who see the mimicry can understand who is mimicked, it does not matter if the mimic deforms the models or exaggerates some of their particular aspects. The mimic does not have to do exactly as the model does; or rather, what he or she has to do is to go a step further and do what the model never does but is near to doing. In mimicry, the mimic has first to see the model and picks out some aspects of the model, then shows to the audience the aspects he or she has picked up with some deformation added. All that the mimics show are their own image of the model based on their limited sight. Instead of trying to show the models as they are, a mimic tries to make the audience see the models through his or her own eyes. This is why a mimic has power over the mimicked. Though physically it is the mimic who is beheld by the audience, in fact he or she guides their eyes and becomes the major beholder, reducing the model to that which is beheld. On the other hand, there is nothing the mimicked can do about it. Once the mimic presents the model's deformed image as mimicry, which is at once a kind of imitation and a kind of performance, the model cannot avoid the eyes turned on him or her self. The model cannot help being formed into the image re-presented by the mimic.

The play shows two scenes of mimicry, in both of

which the mimic is at an advantage over the one who is mimicked. Thersites makes full use of this power of the mimic when he shows 'the pageant of Ajax'(III.iii.271):

Patroclus: Jove bless great Ajax!

Thersites: Hum!

Patroclus: I come from the worthy Achilles —

Thersites: Ha? ...

Thersites: If tomorrow be a fair day, by eleven of the clock it will go one way or other.

However, he shall pay me ere he has me.

Patroclus: Your answer, sir.

Thersites: Fare ye well, with all my heart.

Achilles: Why, but he is not in this tune, is he?

Thersites: No, but out of tune thus.(III.iii. 279–99)

Perhaps Ajax is not as terrible as Thersites suggests. However, Achilles, and also the audience who see the play, cannot know the real behaviour of Ajax with regard to this matter. All they know is how foolishly he behaves when the Greek generals falsely praise him⁽¹³⁾. On the analogy of what they know about him, they may suppose that Thersites's performance has some basis in his real behaviour, though it is a little exaggerated. Thus having accepted Thersites as a mimic, his audience see Ajax through his eyes. So though Achilles can hardly believe that this is how Ajax has really behaved, he can only ask 'he is not in this tune, is he?', as if he were waiting for Thersites's affirmation that Ajax is 'in this tune'. Ajax, who is not on stage (and he is not on stage physically in this scene), cannot make the audience see what he really is. Though it is he that is seen through the eyes of a mimic, he cannot be truly beheld while the 'Ajax' created by Thersites catches everyone's eyes. And because they are living in the world where a man is 'formed' under the others' eyes, this implies that Ajax cannot help being formed as 'a monster'(III.iii.263) that Thersites shows. Since all eyes are turned to Thersites' image of Ajax, what is formed in the name of 'Ajax' is only this deformed figure. As Ulysses says, 'The present eye praises the present object' (III.iii. 180); Ajax cannot get rid of his present image created by Thersites, though it is in fact only a re-presented image of 'Ajax'.

However, the characters of the play cannot make direct use of this power of the mimic. It is because Thersites does not care if his mimicry offends his audience that he can freely re-present the deformed image of Ajax. On the other hand, it is not easy for the characters as a whole to deform their models, the characters of the deep-rooted legend. Here, we had better turn to another scene of mimicry. Ulysses' mimicry in Act One, Scene Three is far more complicated than Thersites' in that this can be called mimicry of mimicry. Ulysses describes Patroclus, who mimics the Greek generals, and he also describes Achilles, who is the audience of Patroclus' mimicry. Since here he does not perform how Patroclus actually mimicked the generals but only describes it in words, we can say that the power of Patroclus' mimicry is not so strong as we have seen in Thersites' case. However, it still includes a sense of mimicry, and the power exists. In this scene, if Ulysses only had described Patroclus' mimicry, then it would have implied that he merely imitated and reproduced the mimicry. This would put him in a delicate position in front of the very generals that are mimicked. So, he tries to make it clear that he is not in conspiracy with Patroclus, that he disagrees with Patroclus about how they should see the generals. He does not forget to blame Patroclus for imitating the models so insufficiently in his 'fusty stuff' (I.iii. 161):

[Patroclus] Breaks scurril jests,
And with ridiculous and awkward action,
Which, slanderer, he imitation calls,
He pageants us ...

... like a strutting player

[The pageant of Nestor is] done, as near as the
extremest ends

Of parallels, as like as Vulcan and his wife;

(I.iii.148–52, 167–8)

By the blame he puts on Patroclus, Ulysses shows that his description is a kind of mimicry, not imitation, of Patroclus' mimicry. Thus he invites the generals who are mimicked by Patroclus to become *his* audience and see Patroclus, who is now mimicked in turn, through his

own eyes. Moreover, Ulysses brings in Achilles, the audience of Patroclus' 'pageant', into his mimicry so as to emphasize that he is not one of the audience who laugh at the generals. Since the eyes of Patroclus' audience are to be turned to the mimicked generals, Ulysses, whose critical eyes are turned to Patroclus and his audience, cannot be one of them. Thus assuring the generals that he is discontented with Patroclus' mimicry, Ulysses seems to have successfully misled them into believing that his criticism is directed only at Patroclus and Achilles; Nestor has no doubt about Ulysses' words and willingly joins him in criticising the two:

And in the imitation of these twain,
Who, as Ulysses says, opinion crowns
With an imperial voice, many are infect.

(I.iii.185-7)

I have said that Ulysses 'misled' the generals because his criticism is in fact directed at them as well. Ulysses certainly does mimic Achilles and Patroclus, but in his mimicry he deliberately retains the debasing descriptions of the generals. Undoubtedly it would have been possible for him to have criticised the two without lengthy description of the re-produced images of the models, but he spends almost as many words on them as on the criticism of the two:

Such to-be-pitied and o'er-wrested seeming
He acts thy[Agamemnon] greatness in; and when
he speaks,
'Tis like a chime a-mending, with terms unsquar'd
Which, from the tongue of roaring Typhon
dropp'd,
Would seem hyperboles. (I.iii.157-61)

In his description, we can hardly know whether it is the model, Agamemnon, or his deformed re-production who speaks like 'a chime a-mending'. He almost even admits that, when Patroclus mimics Nestor, what make them laugh are the 'defects' on the model's part, not the deformation itself:

And then, forsooth, the faint defects of age
Must be the scene of mirth, to cough and spit,
And with a palsy fumbling on his gorget
Shake in and out the rivet: (I.iii.172-5)

No doubt, his audience would believe that this is how Nestor really acts, and that the mimic's fault lies merely in making fun of the old man's defects. Pretending that he is only critically describing how Achilles and Patroclus insult the generals, Ulysses cunningly succeeds in degrading our image of them. By describing mimicry, he succeeds both in re-producing a deformed image of the models and in showing that he is not to be blamed for the distorted imitation. In other words, he succeeds in bringing about an imitation without being completely subject to the imitated.

This seems to be a good example for the characters of the play to follow. However, they have to go one step further. The mimics can easily change their position from that of the beheld to that of beholders, for their audience are not waiting to equate them with the models. Achilles does not think that Thersites is Ajax, nor do the generals identify Ulysses as Patroclus. On the other hand, the audience of the play are ready to identify the characters as *the* characters of the famous legend. This makes it difficult for them to take a beholder's position and see the model that is in the position of the beheld. Moreover, the mimics do not have their whole existence depend on their audience. It is true that mimicry could not function as a performance without the audience, but as far as the mimic themselves are concerned, they do not have to be formed into a person by being seen by the audience, not at least through their performance. So, without anxiety, they can change their position from the beheld to a beholder in their performance. By contrast, since the play *needs to be seen* in order to function as a performance, the characters cannot give up their position as the beheld. If they are to guide the eyes of its audience, they have to do so from the position of the beheld. Unlike the mimics who can have the audience's eyes turned away from them, the characters of the play have to direct the glances of the audience while themselves remaining as the object of these very glances.

A performer

Here, we can turn our eyes to Cressida. Though all the characters more or less have to imitate their model figures existing as the audience expect, the ways they deal with the models are different. Cressida's attempt at independence from the model and the beholders is almost opposite to that of Troilus. We can see the difference as soon as they start the conversation after their first kiss:

Troilus: O Cressid, how often have I wished me thus.

Cressida: Wished, my lord? The gods grant — O my lord —

Troilus: What should they grant? What makes this pretty abrupton? What too curious dreg espies my sweet lady in he fountain of our love?

Cressida: More dregs than water, if my fears have eyes.

Troilus: Fears make devils of cherubins; they never see truly.

Cressida: Blind fear, that seeing reason leads, finds safer footing than blind reason stumbling without fear. To fear the worst oft cures the worse. (III.ii.61–71)

Though he has feared that he might not do well at the meeting ('Death, I fear me,/ Sounding destruction, or some joy too fine.../ For the capacity of my ruder powers./ ... and I do fear besides/ That I shall lose distinction in my joys, ...' III.ii.20–5), after the kiss Troilus seems to have almost forgotten his fear and becomes entirely relaxed and satisfied. The only thing that troubled him was whether or not he could win Cressida's heart, and since he has kissed her successfully, he has nothing to worry about any more. On the other hand, Cressida, who seemed to know completely how to behave herself ('Therefore this maxim out of love I teach; / "Achievement is command; ungain'd, beseech." I.ii.297–8), becomes confused and fearful. Of course, it is possible to think that her fear

derives from the fact that she has behaved against the 'maxim' by having given him a kiss. However, she could still hold him off and remain 'ungain'd'. There must be other reasons for such an intense fear as to see 'more dregs than water' in the fountain of love. Their meeting and kissing do not calm Cressida's fear as they do Troilus', but arouse fear in her. While Troilus was worrying whether he would be able to establish an amorous relationship with Cressida, Cressida worries whether she can sustain the relationship. This implies that Cressida, led by the 'seeing reason', knows 'the worst', knows that she will be handed over to the Greeks and will betray Troilus. Before the kiss, the problem was on Troilus' side; if he had failed to establish an intimate relationship with her, he would have been responsible for it and she would not be blamed for betraying him. Now it is up to her to sustain the relationship. And because she knows that she must be faithful to her lover and at the same time suspects she will become a false love, his success makes her uneasy. Once the relationship is established, there is no escape left for her; she has to do what she should not do, and will be blamed for it. It is in fact Troilus who is 'blind' and does not 'see truly', while Cressida's fear, which he brushes aside as a 'blind' 'monster' (III. ii.73), may be blind itself but is led by 'seeing reason'; it sees what he cannot, or does not want to, see. Cressida knows her fate and knows that she has to follow it.

In other words, while Troilus tries to see himself as independent, Cressida knows that she is not, at least from the expected course. Troilus speaks of himself as if he were above truth itself in the scale of trueness, as if he were the ultimate truth and the truth itself could only take after him:

Troilus shall be such to Cressid as what envy can say

worst shall be a mock for his truth, and what truth can speak

truest, not truer than Troilus. (III.ii.95–7)

Genuine and ultimate, this 'Troilus', described by Troilus himself, is a completely integrated person; there

are no splits in his identity; he is as homogenous and transparent as pure crystal. His lines are scattered with references to constancy, truth and purity:

O that I thought it could be in a woman — ...
 To keep her constancy in plight and youth, ...
 Or that persuasion could but thus convince me
 That my integrity and truth to you
 Might be affronted with the match and weight
 Of such a winnow'd purity in love — ...
 I am as true as truth's simplicity,
 And simpler than the infancy of truth.
 (III.ii.156–68)

In the last two lines, he even accepts folly if it is combined with truth. In contrast, Cressida 'speak[s] so wisely' (III.ii.150) and the wisdom makes her see herself speaking, thus dividing her into the speaker and the one who sees herself speaking:

In faith I lie —
 My thoughts were like unbridled children, grown
 Too headstrong for their mother. — See, we fools!
 Why have I blabb'd? Who shall be true to us
 When we are so unsecret to ourselves?
 (III.ii.120–4)

Her other lines are no less obsessed with the idea of deception, inconstancy, and division:

Perchance, my lord, I show more craft than love,
 And fell so roundly to a large confession
 To angle for your thoughts. (III.ii.151–3)

Of course, she is divided most hopelessly when she foresees her future self, who is false to Troilus and also to her present self who is in love with him:

Troilus: You cannot shun yourself.
 Cressida: Let me go and try.
 I have a kind of self resides with you,
 But an unkind self, that itself will leave
 To be another's fool. ...
 ... I know not what I speak. (III.ii.144–9)

Her words are rather complicated here. She tries to leave Troilus, but leaves 'a kind of self' beside him. However, since she knows she has to leave him sooner or later, this is an unnatural self, who will leave itself [i.e., herself] 'to be another's [Troilus'] fool. Nonetheless, this 'unkind self' is also a natural self, *the* expected 'Cressida' that she has to take after, because it will leave itself, and perhaps it will itself leave Troilus, 'to be another's [Diomedes'] fool'¹⁴, and thus join her in her destiny. Undoubtedly Cressida knows that she cannot but be divided at least between the self who is now talking to Troilus, and *the* 'Cressida', the model that she has to become. She knows that she cannot be pure and true as Troilus, because she is wise enough to be aware of the fact that she is destined to betray him. She is right when she says 'to be wise and love/ Exceeds man's might' (III.ii.154–5), if 'to love' means to become pure and blind like Troilus, who does not see the end of their love.

The difference between the lovers can be seen most strikingly when they refer to their own names as citations, as if they knew they were becoming legendary figures and their names would be cited again and again in the future, just as the play itself does at that very moment:

Troilus: Yet, after all comparisons of truth,
 As truth's authentic author to be cited,
 'As true as Troilus' shall crown up the verse
 And sanctify the numbers ...
 Cressida: Yea, let them say, to stick the heart of
 falsehood,
 'As false as Cressid'. (III.ii.178–80,193–4)

Characteristically, Troilus sees himself as 'truth's authentic author to be cited', the source of citation. He asserts that his value is nonderivative; his name can 'sanctify the numbers' and will confirm the truth to his followers. It is apparent that Troilus invokes his own name here so as to emphasise his originality and authorship. However, instead of confirming him as the source of citation, this only serves to turn the audience's attention to *the* 'Troilus' of the legend, who is in fact

often cited as an example of true love. Consequently, the audience are reminded that Troilus on the stage is himself one of those who are cited from the source story, for he is a character of a play based on legend. '[T]ruth's authentic author to be cited' turns out to be citational. Moreover, by indicating himself as truth's author, Troilus divides himself into the indicator and the indicated, reducing the indicated 'authentic author' to a citation in his own words⁽¹⁵⁾. Cressida, on the other hand, understands that she is not an author, but is, from the beginning, citation ('let them say ... "As false as Cressid"'). When she says, 'stick the heart of falsehood', it seems as if she caught the 'falsehood' which had been formlessly floating about, grabbed its heart and fastened it to herself: the name of Cressida embodies falsehood. Unlike Troilus who thinks his name originates truth, Cressida knows that falsehood inescapably exists before her, waiting for her to take it up, and that she has to make it present on the stage in the name of 'Cressida'. By way of prediction, Cressida is here talking not so much about what her present behaviour will bring about in the future as about what has already been decided for her to do in the future. So we can say that she 'stick[s] the heart of falsehood' in two ways: as Linda Charnes points out, to stick is at once to stab and to fix⁽¹⁶⁾; Cressida fixes falsehood to herself, making herself falsehood incarnate; at the same time, she stabs falsehood to death by being *faithful* to her destiny and *truly* predicting what is to come.

However, while imitating her model, Criseyde in Chaucer's poem⁽¹⁷⁾, in the general course of events, Cressida does not fully imitate her in her consciousness. I am not going to argue the difference between the conceptions the two heroines have of love. Though it is often said that Cressida is a cunning coquette while Criseyde is an innocent victim of her uncle's plot⁽¹⁸⁾, I do not think it is the greatest difference between them. Though Criseyde's deliberation in her love (for both Troilus and Diomedes) and Cressida's wantonness by comparison are often pointed out, in fact they share what Ann Thompson calls Criseyde's 'surprisingly practical way' of conducting the love affair⁽¹⁹⁾.

'Eke well wot I my kinge's son is he;

And sith he hath to see me such delyt,
If I would utterly his sighte flee,
Paraunter he might have me in despyt,
Through which I mighte stonde in worse plyt.
Now were I wys me hate to purchase,
Withouten need, where I may stonde in grace?'
(Book II, 102)

She is a clever woman who tries to do her best even in a trapped situation. She coolly calculates the loss and gain of this affair, at least until she accepts Troilus' love:

... 'Alas! Sin I am free,
Sholde I now love, and put in jupartye
My sikernesse, and thralen libertee?
(Book II, 111)

This practical and yet joyful attitude to love is very much like Cressida's, who knows 'Love got so sweet as when desire did sue. /... "Achievement is command; ungain'd, beseech"' (I.ii.296-8). There is even, as Thompson points out, 'a general resemblance' in the imagery they use to promise their constancy⁽²⁰⁾. Cressida imitates her model in her attitude towards love far better than some critics think she does. If they sometimes actually behave themselves differently, it is not because their basic attitudes towards love are different, but because Cressida has to keep up with the play's rapid lapse of time. In the play, time goes far swifter and things happen in quick succession, giving no time for her to stop to think; what Chaucer describes in a poem of more than a thousand stanzas, Shakespeare shows in less than a thousand lines; Cressida has to experience within a few days what Criseyde spends months to go through. She has to dash for the end in order to fulfil her destiny.

The greatest difference between them, however, lies in the fact that Cressida is fully conscious of her destiny. While Shakespeare's Cressida reminds us of her citational nature and of her destiny as soon as she accepts a kiss from Troilus, there is no such allusion in Criseyde's words. Though Chaucer's poem is itself conscious of the dark ending of the love between Troilus and Criseyde, it allows them moments of happy

ignorance. Cressida almost imitates Criseyde, but at the same time she shows her consciousness of the destiny and suggests that she has no choice but to imitate Criseyde. This is not an imitation anymore, in the sense of the word that we have seen before. Since a model does not imitate his or her own self, the one who reveals him or herself to be an imitator of the model does not imitate the model, at least during the act of revealing. So when Cressida shows herself as an imitator, she cannot be identified with Criseyde exactly because of her showing. Moreover, the coexistence of refusal and acceptance of her lovers makes it clear that she follows the former example of Criseyde but with critical distance in consciousness:

Prince Troilus, I have lov'd you night and day ...
 'Twas not my purpose thus to beg a kiss.
 I am asham'd. O heavens, what have I done?
 For this time I will take my leave ...
 (III.ii.113,136-8)

Sweet honey Greek, tempt me no more to folly. ...
 Come hither once again...
 I will not meet with you tomorrow night;
 I prithee, Diomed, visit me no more...
 You shall not go; one cannot speak a word
 But it straight starts you. (V.ii.18,49,73-4, 100-1)

Though here she is partly playing the coquette, still she really does hesitate about whether to keep the man or to hold him off. In either case, she knows she has to accept her lover but at the same time she does not want to, for the acceptance drives her further to the decided end, where she will appear 'as false as Cressid'. This hesitation enables her to show that she is forced to act, as it were, against her will; that she does not assimilate herself to Criseyde but only performs Criseyde. We can say that she shows herself as a kind of a mimic, whose intention is not a transformation into the model but a performance. While thus refusing to be identified with Criseyde, she can also satisfy the audience so as to retain their attention, by generally following the model in the action. At the very moment she admits herself to be an imitator and subject to the destiny of the model,

she achieves independence as a mimic. It is the independence of a mimic, or more precisely, of a performer who gives a performance²¹⁾.

When we think of the function of eyes, or glances, in *Troilus and Cressida*, we can find this performer-consciousness characteristic of Cressida. However, as a performer, she still has to be beheld and valued. Performers are different from either the beholders or the beheld, for they have to *be seen* but also to *direct* the beholder's way of seeing them. Always on the verge of losing the audience's attention or having the performance misconstrued, they are as helpless in this respect as those who are simply beheld. In this sense, those mimics who have no doubt about their ability to manipulate the audience's eyes, like Ulysses, or those who are not anxious about how they appear to the beholders, like Thersites, are lacking the necessary consciousness of a performer. Their ignorance of the uneasiness of the beheld, who are helplessly exposed to the beholders' eyes, disqualifies them from becoming performers. On the other hand, Cressida, who shows herself as a mimic of Criseyde, cannot fully control the eyes of the beholders, because there is no such clear physical distinction between the model and the mimic as there is between Ulysses and Patroclus, or between Thersites and Ajax. Since Criseyde never appears on the stage, Cressida's model resides, as it were, within her physical existence. She has to behold herself in order to make the audience see the model through her eyes, which, however, is impossible in the world of *Troilus and Cressida*. So even if she tries to lead the eyes of the audience, she cannot be sure if her audience see her as she hopes. Faced with this uncertainty about the audience, she leaves herself in the uncertainty and keeps worrying how she appears to others. In this sense, she is the only performer in this play: she is widely different either from Ulysses or Thersites, who can change their position from the beheld to a beholder through mimicry, to say nothing of Troilus, who tries to think of himself as a pure beholder. When the lovers think about their love, Cressida thinks about the way to hide her love from others' eyes, while Troilus never doubts his status as a beholder who estimates the value of others in the

relation:

Cressida: Then though my heart's content firm
love doth bear,
Nothing of that shall from mine eyes appear.
(I.ii.299–300)

Troilus: Sounding destruction, or some joy too
fine,
Too subtle-potent, tun'd too sharp in
sweetness
For the capacity of my ruder powers.
(III.ii.21–3)

Her consciousness as a performer affects her attitude towards language. She does not think that words can always convey the meanings intended by the speaker. In conversation, Cressida deliberately distorts the meanings of others' words and tries to find other meanings as often as possible. Though Cressida and Thersites both have bitter tongues, the natures of their bitter tongues are quite different. Thersites does not mind what others say; his railing is intended to tell others how they can be beheld by those who are not involved in their society. He flings them his sarcastic way of beholding their world, thus threatening the legitimacy of their world. However, Cressida's jests are not necessarily the means to give her thoughts from outside. Rather, she jests for the pleasure of emasculating from within the society what the other speaker is trying to say. For example, in the conversation between her and Pandarus (Act I. Scene ii.), what she says seldom has a literal meaning; she only tries to distract him from his original intention of praising Troilus and thus to avoid being confined in a pertinent conversation that has a set purpose:

Pandarus: She praised his complexion above Paris.

Cressida: Why, Paris hath colour enough.

Pandarus: So he has.

Cressida: Then Troilus should have too much..

(I.ii.99–102)

Pandarus: But to prove to you that

Helen loves Troilus—

Cressida: Troilus will stand to the proof if you'll
prove it so.

Pandarus: Troilus? Why, he esteems her no more
than I esteem an addle egg.

Cressida: If you love an addle egg as well as you
love an idle head you would eat chickens
i'th'shell. (I.ii.129–36)

Cressida immediately mistakes whatever her uncle says on purpose. As a performer, she is conscious of the possibility that any performance, physical or verbal, might convey a message that is not originally intended. Every representation is, for a performer, always on the verge of misrepresentation; words are, as it were, waiting to be twisted round. There are other characters in the play who enjoy jesting (for example, the servant in Act III. Scene i.), but it can be seen most characteristically in Cressida. In a sense, it is a way for her to find a loophole in a conversation that is intended to make her accept Troilus, that is, to push her forward towards the end. Fully conscious of her dreadful future, she creates, by multiplying the meanings of words, digression and stagnation in those conversations that help the narrative go on²²⁹. Therefore, even when she has been brought to the Greeks, she does not stop jesting;

Cressida: In kissing, do you render or receive?

Menelaus: Both take and give.

Cressida: I'll make my match to live,
The kiss you take is better than you give:
Therefore, no kiss.

Menelaus: I'll give you boot, I'll give you three for
one.

Cressida: You are an odd man : give even or give
none.

Menelaus: An odd man, lady? — Every man is
odd.

Cressida: No, Paris is not, for you know 'tis true
That you are odd, and he is even with you...

Ulysses: May I, sweet lady, beg a kiss of you?

Cressida: You may.

Ulysses: I do desire it.

Cressida: Why, beg two. (IV.v.36–48)

However, misrepresentation is not always enjoyable. We can see in her words anxiety caused by the distrust of words as well. Since she knows that representation is open to multiple interpretations and mis-interpretations, she is suffering from the anxiety that others might behold her as someone she does not intend to show. This makes her try to anticipate the others in interpreting her own words and restate them:

I love you now, but till now not so much
 But I might master it. In faith I lie—
 My thoughts were like unbridled children, grown
 Too headstrong for their mother. — See, we fools!
 (III.ii.119–22)

'Twas not my propose thus to beg a kiss.(III.ii.136)

Cressida may achieve independence from the model by showing herself as a performer, but still she cannot be free from the eyes of the audience; she has to deal with the helplessness and anxiety of the beheld.

Is and Is Not

However, a performer is not only conscious of the anxiety of the beheld but also able to make a reverse use of his or her inferiority. No matter how Cressida shows herself, those who behold her are likely to receive a message quite different from her original intention. Therefore, she tries to make the beholders realize that she is *not* what she shows, or rather, what they see. This is made possible through emphasizing the fact that she is *performing the role of* Cressida against her will, and thus showing herself as a mimic, a performer. If she is a mimic who is performing, Cressida on the stage, what is beheld both by the other characters and by the audience, is a mere performance; the Cressida who is beheld, is not the Cressida who performs. One who shows him or herself is differentiated from the shown self by the very act of showing. Here she adopts a similar strategy to Ulysses's when he mimics Patroclus's mimicry. As Ulysses can differentiate himself from either Patroclus,

who is the mimic, or the generals, who are the models for Patroclus' mimicry, so Cressida can distinguish herself not only from Criseyde but also from 'Cressida' on the stage. She is, from the very first, far before Troilus's bitter recognition, a person who 'is, and is not, Cressid' (V.ii.145)⁽²³⁾.

Such a status as performer can be maintained only in the relation between the beholders and the beheld, but is not confined in their power field. Cressida finds her place among the exchange of glances, but she slips out of their coercion to fix her to the identity of false Cressida. To show something is to be conscious of the beholding eyes and to place it so that the eyes can catch it. Something that is shown is something that is designed to be seen by certain beholders. Since those who show design their performance taking the audience's expectation into consideration, what is shown draws not so much the contours of either the designer or the material as that of the beholders. The beholders can only see the image preexisting in their mind, and those who design cannot be seen. Following Lacanian theory on 'seeing'⁽²⁴⁾, Barbara Freedman shows how theatrical behaviour can subvert the relation between the observer and the observed. She argues that theatrical behaviour, which is 'an active response to the sense that one is seen', shows to the audience that they are seeing what is made for them to see, that is, what is made *as a result of their being seen*:

When we say that something or someone is theatrical, we refer ... not only to a display but to a display of displacement... Theater's masks announce that the "I" is another; its characters assure us of their displacement, by announcing "I am already taken" as in "this seat is taken" (for a performance)... What fascinates us in theater is a look that teasingly submits to our look only to trap us in the process.⁽²⁵⁾

This is exactly what Cressida is doing through her mimicry. By showing her status as a performer, Cressida declares that it is the performed Cressida that is false; in other words, it is the beholders themselves who expect falsehood of her that are to blame for the

false 'Cressida' on the stage. It is as if she were saying, 'I will show you what you will, but then you are seeing what you expected (or what you decided), so I am not responsible for what you see.' She is not 'a reflection of what men want to see' as some feminist critics say⁽²⁶⁾. She only *shows* them that they see 'what they want to see'.

This can be seen even as early as when she mentions 'an unkind self'. In a sense, this 'self' that 'resides with you [i.e., Troilus]' is literally an unnatural self, who is not herself; it is only a *performed* figure, 'a representation of the male gaze' as Deborah Hooker says⁽²⁷⁾. However, it becomes most prominent in the scene where she is seen to betray Troilus. Here, Troilus beholds Cressida, Ulysses beholds Troilus beholding Cressida, Thersites beholds the three (or maybe four, if we take Diomedes into account), and the audience behold them all. Cressida exists at the center of these concentric circles of beholding eyes. They are placed to draw a phased enlargement of their visual field; the more the eyes are placed away from Cressida, the wider the visual field becomes, but they are all focused on the same object, Cressida⁽²⁸⁾. However, in the position that is beheld by so many eyes, surprisingly Cressida declares that her eye 'see[s]':

Troilus, farewell! One eye yet looks on thee,
But with my heart the other eye doth see.
(V.ii.106-7)

She does not tell us what 'the other eye' sees with her heart; as a performer, she only shows that she is not there as the mere beheld, saying farewell to the beholder. No matter what the beholders think about her 'real' position, they cannot seize her. They can only fill the void, or non-existence of the performer, with their own images. So, if Thersites sees a whore in Cressida, it is only what he can, or wants to, behold:

A proof of strength she could not publish more,
Unless she said 'My mind is now turn'd whore'.
(V.ii.112-3)

In her last lines, Cressida truly says, as if to her

beholders;

The error of our eye directs our mind.
What error leads must err; O, then conclude,
Minds sway'd by eyes are full of turpitude.
(V.ii.108-10)

Since beholders see only the images they had in their minds, since they can see only what is made up according to their images, those minds make a mistake when they think that what they are seeing exists outside themselves; and they are full of turpitude, for they lead themselves, not knowing that the leading eyes are no less blind than the minds that are led.

For Troilus, who believes in a one-way relation between the beholders and the beheld, Cressida has always been the beheld. Only after this scene does she appear as a performer to him. Making themselves disappear and leaving in their place performed figures opened to various interpretations, performers can show their performance to more than one beholder at the same time; each beholder can see the image he or she expected to see in the performed figure. Until now, Troilus has seen her only from his viewpoint because mostly he was alone with her (though Pandarus was also there, he works as a kind of show manager in their relationship and helps Cressida's performance); now, seeing another person (Diomedes) beholding her, he suddenly realizes that she is seen by other beholders as well, that there can be another viewpoint:

This is she?— No, this is Diomed's Cressida...
If there be rule in unity itself,
This is not she...
Cressid is mine, tied with the bonds of heaven.
(V.ii.136-41, 152)

Cressida is not 'formed' under his eyes or 'tied with' him. She exists outside the one-to-one relation between the beholder and the beheld. Troilus is forced to face a world where there is no 'rule in unity itself', where the physically (or, in his words, spaciouly) united existence of Cressida is at the same time divided between the performed figure and the performer, and

what is worse, divided into various figures according to the beholders:

a thing inseparate

Divides more wider than the sky and earth;
And yet the spacious breadth of this division
Admits no orifex for a point as subtle
As Ariachne's broken woof to enter. (V.ii.147-51)

Such a realization threatens Troilus' status as an independent valuer-beholder. If what he sees is a mere performance, and if a performer shows the image preexisting in the audience's mind, then this will imply that he has *been seen* by the performer. So he is no longer an independent valuer-beholder, who sees without being seen. Cressida's stance as a performer disturbs the binary relation between the beholder and the beheld and makes a pure beholding impossible. It also threatens the audience of the play who peacefully settle themselves in the position of beholders, though they, in a sense contrarily, face the fact that what they thought to be divided is, in fact, not; the distinction between the beholder and the beheld is lost and they are aware of themselves being seen by the showing subject. While Troilus knows that Cressida can appear as a different person from the woman in his mind, the audience find themselves being shown the very person that they expected to behold. Their experiences, though different in appearance, are two sides of the same coin; they are made to realize that they are being shown a performance and thus *being beheld as well as beholding* ⁽²⁹⁾.

Pandarus' last lines increase the uneasiness of the audience:

Good traders in the flesh, set this in your painted cloths:
As many as be here of Pandar's hall,
Your eyes, half out, weep out at Pandar's fall;
Or if you cannot weep, yet give some groans
Though not for me, yet for your aching bones.
Brethren and sisters of the hold-door trade,
Some two months hence my will shall here be made...

Till then I'll sweat and seek about for eases,
And at that time bequeath you my diseases.

(V.x.46-57)

He declares that the venereal disease prevailing through the play is now handed on to the audience. It is a matter of course that Pandarus first mentions 'eyes, half out' as the symptom of their disease³⁰. Cressida's performance makes the audience realize that they are seeing themselves being seen; their eyes are always turned back to themselves. The eyes are directed to the stage and then reflected back, bringing back with themselves the disease in the play. Or, is the disease hiding in their own eyes from the very first? Is it the audience themselves that contaminate the legendary world of Trojan war with the disease so often mentioned by railing Thersites? There is no answer to the question, but Pandarus deepens the suspicion by calling them 'Brethren and sisters of the hold-door trade'. As Kenneth Palmer says, it is difficult to imagine any such audience that is composed of 'brethren and sisters of the hold-door trade'³¹. However, maybe he, or the play, tries to suggest that the audience actually *are* the 'brethren and sisters' of those people, for the legendary characters are shown to them as whores or whoremongers because they are satisfied, if not pleased, to behold them as such. The audience are left in the destroyed world of the play, suspecting themselves of having gone along with, or been complicity in, the destruction of the high world of the well-known legend, while Cressida lives among the Greeks, having skilfully outmaneuvered Criseyde and the eyes trying to fix her to the helpless position of the beheld. Unlike Henrison, Shakespeare does not mention what will become of her after she has turned away from Troilus. She only becomes the one who 'is and is not', disappears from the stage and from the beholding eyes, leaving almost joyous words, where she beholds her represented self as subject to a predetermined nature and warns the beholders against putting too much confidence in what their eyes behold:

Ah, poor our sex! this fault in us I find:
The error of our eye directs our mind.

What error leads must err; O , then conclude,
Minds sway'd by eyes are full of turpitude.
(V.ii.108–11)

Conclusion

In the very beginning of *Troilus and Cressida*, the Prologue in armour appears on the stage to explain where 'lies the scene' in the play to the 'fair beholders'. He ends his prologue with lines that could be used in a prologue to any play but which are particularly suggestive in this play:

Like, or find fault: do as your pleasures are:
Now good, or bad, 'tis but the chance of war.
(Prologue, 30–1)

As far as it tries to function as a performance, the play 'must be viewed in order to take place', and this produces a certain power relation between the beholders and the play itself. The decision lies with the audience whether to 'like' it and keep 'view'ing it, or to 'find fault' and turn their eyes away from it; if they choose the latter, it is the end of the play. The play is, as it were, fully conscious of this power relation and here declares that it willingly gives in to the audience's liking. However, now we can understand that it is with this humble attitude that the play disguises itself and subverts the superiority of the beholders who can evaluate the play as they like.

This is the lure of a performer, or, of the theatre. By showing its consciousness of its showing, the performer makes a discrepancy between the shown image and the showing agent. This shown image is created in order to please the audience; if it indicates anything, it is not the showing agent but the sight of the audience. Before they behold what is shown to them, they have been beheld. While pleased with the image, the audience are made to realize that they are beholding themselves beheld and that they have lost sight of the showing agents, who behold them. In a sense Cressida tells the audience as the Prologue told them in the beginning of the play: 'Like, or find fault: do as your pleasures are'. She invites the audience to behold her as

they like, but this invitation has an implication beneath its generous openness that the beholders themselves have to take responsibility for the way they see her.

Thus dealing with the power relation between the beholder and the beheld, Cressida becomes a unique performer among Shakespearean characters that opposes herself against the audience. This is the game of the eyes between the beholder and the beheld, and if the performer succeeds in freeing herself from the audience's anticipation, the success can be achieved only through the audience's defeat; the pleasure of success cannot be shared by the audience. Losing the game, the audience have to take the blame and take the venereal disease back with them. As for the performer, she escapes all criticism, for she 'is and is not' what the audience see.

Notes

- (1). All citations to *Troilus and Cressida* are taken from *Troilus and Cressida* of The Arden Shakespeare, ed. Kenneth Palmer (Methuen, 1982, reprinted by Routledge, London and New York, 1991)
- (2) Kenneth Palmer says in his introduction to *Troilus and Cressida* that the dramatist 'might have used any of eight translations of the whole or part of the poem (five giving Latin verse, or Latin prose, or literal Latin translation from the French of Books I– X)' (Arden Shakespeare, p.33). As he also points out, it is possible as well that Shakespeare had read Chapman's *Seaven Bookes of the Iliades*.
- (3) Palmer suggests that since there is much evidence that Shakespeare read Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid* (some of his plays, such as *Twelfth Night* and *Henry V*, refer to Cressida's infidelity and following leprosy), which was printed with Chaucer's poem and which was often regarded as written by Chaucer, it is also likely that he had read Chaucer as well. However, he also calls our attention to the fact that it may be possible that Shakespeare was just familiar

- with the well-known type-figures. Ann Thompson makes a detailed comparison between the play and Chaucer's poem, arguing that 'there is no single serious rival to Chaucer as the major source for the love-story' (*Shakespeare's Chaucer: A Study in Literary Origins*, Liverpool Univ. Press, 1978).
- (4) Palmer points this out in the notes to the Arden Edition of the play (p.98).
- (5) R.A. Foakes deals with this 'incomplete' action of the play and says; 'Troilus and Cressida is unique in enacting only a small part of a story that was very known,...' ('*Troilus and Cressida* reconsidered', *University of Toronto Quarterly*, XXXII, Jan, 1963, p.151.)
- (6) *Ibid*, p.150
- (7) See, Foakes, pp.150-2, and , Linda Charnes, "'So Unsecret to Ourselves': Notorious Identity and the Material Subject in Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*", in *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40, Winter 1989, pp.416-8.
- (8) Charnes, p.416.
- (9) Barbara E. Bowen, *Gender in the Theatre of War*, New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc., 1993, p.8.
- (10) The word 'the eyes' (or 'the eye') I use mainly implies a gaze or a glance. However, I think it better not to use the word 'gaze' because of its Lacanian implication. For Lacan, the gaze is 'correlated with the awareness that we can never see ourselves seeing' (Barbara Freedman, *Staging the Gaze: Postmodernism, Psychoanalysis, and Shakespearean Comedy* (Cornell University Press, 1991, p.63). He says: 'What determines me, at the most profound level, in the visible, is that gaze that is outside in the scopic field, the gaze is outside, I am looked at, that is to say, I am a picture.' (Lacan, 'What Is a Picture?', in *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Alan Sheridan, New York: Norton, 1981, p.117, cited in Freedman, p.63). Though I am going to argue for a similar conception of the eyes, this 'gaze' does not refer to exactly the same thing that I would like to refer to by the word 'the eyes'. My argument is partly influenced by Lacanian critics, but I am not attempting a Lacanian interpretation myself in this essay.
- (11) Palmer explains that '[the man's parts] are as chaos, matter without shape, which only appreciative recognition can give them' (Palmer, p.210).
- (12) James O'Rourke's "'Rule in Unity' and Otherwise: Love and Sex in *Troilus and Cressida*" (in *Shakespeare Quarterly* 43, Summer 1992) and Deborah A. Hooker's 'Coming to Cressida through Irigaray' (in *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 88:4, Fall 1989) are among those few that have persuasively pointed out in Cressida not the power which merely reveals or symbolizes the disunity of the world but the potentiality of undermining the system of the world from within and hence resisting the collapsing world.
- (13) Of course, Achilles is not on stage in this scene (Act Two, Scene Three). However, since both Achilles and the audience of the play are here standing in the same position as the audience of Thersites' 'pageant', I think the audience are easily made to think that they share the knowledge with Achilles. And he certainly knows at least Ajax's foolish behaviour towards Thersites (Act Two, Scene One).
- (14) Linda Charnes ("So Unsecret to Ourselves": Notorious Identity and the Material Subject in Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40, Winter 1989, pp.421-3) refers to the same passage and points out that she is divided into two selves, that is, the 'kind of self' who resides with Troilus and the 'unkind' self who will be Diomedes' fool. For this scene, see also, Elizabeth Freund, "'Ariachne's broken woof": the rhetoric of citation in *Troilus and Cressida*', in *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory* (eds. Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman, Routledge, 1990), pp.23-7.
- (15) For the problem of original and citation that

- can be seen in Troilus' speech, see Freund, p.25.
- (16) Charnes, p.422.
- (17) Though she appears in Homer as Chryseis, she is not the love of Troilus. She is a Trojan girl who is captured by the Greeks and given to Agamemnon. The love between Troilus and Cressida is described in Benoit de Sainte-Maure's *Roman de Troie* as a minor episode, and Boccaccio picked up the story in his *Il Filostrato* (where they are called Troilo and Griseida), which may be one of the sources for Chaucer. Lydgate and Caxton also describes Cressida (as Criseida in Lydgate, and as Briseyde in Caxton), but Shakespeare seems to have depended mostly on Chaucer for his love plot. See, Geoffrey Bullough, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, VI, pp.89–97, and also, Ann Thompson, *Shakespeare's Chaucer: A Study in Literary Origins*, Liverpool UP., p.121.
- (18) For example, see Thompson, pp.126–9, 133.
- (19) Thompson, p.126. She argues that in spite of Criseyde's practical way of seeing her affair, she 'is not as calculating as Shakespeare's heroine' and has nothing similar to Cressida. I would rather think that in spite of their difference, the two heroines have much in common.
- (20) Thompson, pp.129–30
- (21) In this sense, her mimicry is more similar to Viola's disguise than to that of Portia or the Duke in *Measure for Measure*. Like Cressida, Viola often tries to make the other characters in the play (and of course, the audience) realize that she is not what she performs: 'I am not that I play.' (I.v. 152)
- However, while Cressida's performance enables her to free herself from what is performed on the stage, Viola comes to be absorbed in, or more precisely, enchanted by, Cesario, the performed figure. As the play goes on, it becomes more and more difficult for her to reveal that she is not that she plays. We can say that the two women show the negative and the positive power of performance respectively.
- (22) Deborah A. Hooker, in her 'Coming to Cressida through Irigaray', *SAQ* 88, 1989, pp.899–932, argues that in the phallogocentric world, Cressida, the feminine, is inevitably false and there is no way for her to be true within this discourse. Trying to speak what cannot be spoken in this world, Cressida 'employs one of the few strategies Irigaray recommends for disrupting the signifying order... [to] speak only in riddles, allusions, hints, parables... double the misprision to the limits of exasperation.' (pp.908–22)
- I do think there are some similarities between us in the way we see the possibility of disrupting the already existing order or power relation. However, I do not agree with her identification of Cressida with 'the feminine'; I would rather think her in theatrical terms, though I realize that she is in some sense contrasted with the male characters.
- (23) Barbara Freedman, in her study of theatricality in terms of the Lacanian gaze, argues that 'if theatricality is a showing and if showing is a staging or displacement, then what one shows can never be that which is.' (*Staging the Gaze*, p.52). The showing subject is aware of the fact that he or she is seen, and this makes the subject between the one who sees and the one who is seen ('the subject sees itself as a whole only by being placed elsewhere' p.53). Therefore, self-representation always splits the subject, and in a sense, makes him or her invisible. Though Freedman does not deal with *Troilus and Cressida*, and though I do not go into psychoanalytic studies in this thesis, nonetheless my argument on the reversal of a relation between beholders and the beheld generally draws on her idea of theatricality (which is expressed in the first two chapters of her book).
- (24) According to Freedman (*Staging the Gaze*, p.58–60), Lacan argues that there can be no *jouissance* of pure seeing, for 'the "I see" is accompanied by the "I am seen"' and the Other always shows itself in the act of seeing:
- Even the earliest moments of the mirror stage, Lacan later cautions, are infiltrated by a play

of desire and aggression which subverts any ideal unity: "For the Other, the place of discourse, always latent to the triangulation that consecrates that distance, is not yet so long as it has not spread right into the specular relation in its purest moment: in the gesture with which the child in front of the mirror, turning to the one who is holding it, appeals with its look to the witness who decants, verifying it, the recognition of the image, of the jubilant assumption, where indeed *it already was*. (Lacan, "Remarque sur le rapport de Daniel Lagache: 'Psychoanalyse et structure de la personnalité'", *Ecrits*. Paris: Seuil, 1966.)" (Freedman, p59.)

- (25) Freedman, p.71
- (26) Virginia Mason Vaughan, 'Daughters of the game: Troilus and Cressida and the Sexual Discourse of 16th-Century England' (*Women's Studies International* 13, 1990, p.209–20) p.217. See also, Carol Cook, 'Unbodied figures of desire' (*Performing Feminisms: Feminist Critical Theory and Theatre*, Ed. Sue-Ellen Case, Johns Hopkins UP., 1990, pp.177–05), p.179.
- (27) Hooker, p.922.
She explains that in this scene Cressida, realizing that 'the kind of self [which] resides with [Troilus]' is 'but an image that is man-made', tries to resist being appropriated in the phallogocentric world by asserting that she is 'alien to the homologos' and is 'unsayable and incomprehensible within the techne of speech'.
- (28) Carolyn Asp explains that in this scene 'audience is given a variety of viewpoints from which to choose, mirrors held up not to nature but to actors, reflecting subjective attitudes, relative truth' ('Transcendence Denied: The Failure of Role Assumption in *Troilus and Cressida*', *Studies in English Literature* 18, 1978, pp.257–74, p.265). However, I think that the various viewpoints exist not irrelevantly to each other and that the different attitudes are caused by the difference of the wideness of their visual field.
- (29) Even Troilus, whose existence is unknown to Cressida, is in a sense still beheld by her, for she declares, 'One eye yet looks on' him (V.ii.106).
- (30) Palmer explains that 'eyes, half out' means the 'eyes affected by venereal disease'. (Palmer, p.303)
- (31) Palmer, p.303