Finding Joy in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*

Lucie Kaempfer

Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English
University of Oxford

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT **5**

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS **7**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS **8**

INTRODUCTION **9**

EMOTION STUDIES AND MIDDLE ENGLISH LITERATURE 11
ON JOY AND HAPPINESS 20
TROILUS CRITICISM AND JOY 31
FINDING JOY IN TROILUS AND CRISEYDE 41

CHAPTER ONE THE SEMANTICS OF JOY **44**

INTRODUCTION 44
MAPPING CHAUCER'S DICTION OF JOY 47
A Middle English Lexicon 47
Chaucer's Diction of Joy 53
Collocational Behaviours 61
Lexical and Generic Tailoring 66
JOY IN CONTEXT 74
The Syntax of Joy, Between Emotion and Quality 76
Love's Bliss 84
Earthly and Heavenly Felicity 94
CONCLUSION 102

CHAPTER TWO THE CHARACTERISATION OF JOY **105**

INTRODUCTION 105
NARRATOR 110
PANDARUS 124
TROILUS 130
CRISEYDE 140

Conclusion.....150

CHAPTER THREE THE BODY OF JOY 153

Introduction 153
Writing Emotion on the Body.....156
The Heart of Emotion and the Physiology of Sexual Desire 166
The Gestural Language of Emotion 175
Tears and Laughter.....188
Conclusion.....199

CHAPTER FOUR THE GRAMMAR OF JOY 201

Introduction: The Cultural Grammar of Joy.....201
The Temporal Grammar of Joy.....205
The Poetic Grammar of Joy.....214
Rhymes 214
Imagery 222
The Figurative Grammar of Joy: Conceptual Metaphors.....227
Conclusion: Joy as Felt Value.....244

CONCLUSION 250

BIBLIOGRAPHY 254

Primary Sources 254
Secondary Literature.....255
Dictionaries.....267

APPENDICES.....268

ABSTRACT

This thesis aims at finding joy in a poem long celebrated for its vivid representation and exaltation of sorrow. Yet joy forms the climactic centre of the poem. This sensual and amorous joy has often been dismissed by critics as ironic, immoral or vain in light of the poem's Christian ending. Positive affect has therefore never been taken seriously as a crucial and shaping force in the poem. This thesis rectifies that and argues for the centrality of joy in the poem's construction of language, themes, and characters. This project also makes space for joy in the field of emotion studies, where positive affect is also glaringly absent. In medieval studies, this can be explained by the uncertainty about whether joy, in medieval culture, is a physical emotion, an affective state, a philosophical value, or a spiritual destination. The study of joy in literature therefore has to take this uncertainty into account and be ready to recalibrate the definition of what an emotion is.

In this thesis, I argue that to study joy in past literature, one needs to bring the study of emotion beyond the body and focus primarily on language and the literary medium itself. In the first chapter of this thesis, I study the lexis of joy-related words in Middle English and its use in Chaucer's corpus. This theoretical framework helps shape the contour of joy in the poem by delineating the different registers or fields of discourse to which the emotion belongs in Chaucer's writing. The second chapter of this thesis shows that characters, as well as the narratorial voice, are created through these modes of discourses and their attitude towards joy. In the third chapter, the body is explored in order to understand its use and importance in the writing of emotions in the poem. What surfaces is that Chaucer writes the body both materially and physiologically as well as metaphorically and socially. The body of joy is primarily the latter. Finally, the study of joy in *Troilus and Criseyde* ends with a

close analysis of its grammar – verbal, temporal, spatial, poetic, figurative. This grammar can be idiosyncratic at times but also belong to broader cultural and theoretical discourses. Crucially, it constructs a joy which is exterior to the body by turning it into a place.

Studying joy offers a new approach to the poem and opens a new area in the history of emotion; an area for the study of positive affectivity as distinct from embodied sorrow. Eventually, joy exceeds the very definition of emotion. My study redefines what a literary emotion is and, more specifically, how we determine and detect emotionality in Middle English writing. The poem's writing of joy is fragmented. Joy is expressed as disembodied and yet it is amorous and earthly; it is an emotion and yet it is exterior and objective. I argue that the poet exposes an earthly joy which goes beyond the humoural body and which is (a) good in itself – eventually joy is written as a value, but a felt value.

List of Abbreviations

CRH	Centre de recherches historiques
ELH	English Literary History
JIAS	Journal of the International Arthurian Society
MED	Middle English Dictionary
MLN	Modern Language Notes
OED	Oxford English Dictionary
PMLA	Publications of the Modern Language Association of America
PUF	Presses Universitaires de France
TEAMS	The Consortium for the Teaching of the Middle Ages

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor Helen Barr for the countless times she has read through drafts of this thesis and her always attentive and engaged advice. I am very grateful for her generosity and her enthusiasm which have made each supervision a source of great inspiration. During these three years at Oxford, I have received the help and guidance of many people. I would like to thank Simon Horobin, Nicholas Perkins, Marion Turner and Daniel Wakelin for their insightful comments and suggestions on parts of this thesis. For their advice and support in academia in general, I would like to thank Francis Leneghan, Daniel McCann, Denis Renevey, Mary Flannery and Hetta Howes. Thanks also go to the Berrow Foundation Scholarship for their funding, without which this thesis would not have been possible, as well as Lincoln College for its financial help and much more. Finally, I would like to thank my sister and my parents; Angéline, for going through this DPhil with me; and Piero, for his support and for all the joy.

INTRODUCTION

Was Geoffrey Chaucer a joyless author? While few would answer yes to this question, Chaucerians have rarely detected joy in his work. Critics recognize the poet's use of humour and irony, but they hardly ever approach his work for its representation of joy. This is not particularly surprising as, for all his wit, Chaucer often seems to gloss over joy. He hides it in the midst of pitiful spectacles of grief or conceals it in philosophical reflections. This thesis aims at finding joy in a poem long celebrated for its vivid representation and exaltation of suffering, a poem called by its own author a 'tragedye' (V, 1786). Joy in *Troilus and Criseyde* indeed needs to be sought out and found, buried as it is under such a high amount of palpable grief. While joy is found at the peak and centre of the poem, its climactic third book full of the ecstatic bliss of sexual union, this bliss is inescapably shaped by its impermanence, conditioned by sorrow past and future, and somehow intangible. Consequently, joy is nowhere to be found in the breadth of scholarship on the poem: critics dismiss it as ironic or do not contemplate it at all. When they do discuss joy, it is only to comment on its subsequent loss and on its obligatory ephemerality in a world dictated by Fortune. The emotional world of medieval romances is indeed one where the alternation of sadness and joy is inevitable. Chaucer is prone to including aphorisms in his works which continually place sorrow at the end of joy, as in the *Nun's Priest's Tale*: 'For evere the latter end of joye is wo' (VII, 3205). His literary world is further indebted to the philosophy of Boethius where earthly joys and pleasures are false and misleading; they do not lead to true happiness but only to loss and pain. Finally, the ubiquitous permeation of Christianity in all medieval writing only offers the possibility of one joy: the indescribable bliss of heaven, which supersedes any form of earthly joy.

But for all its frailty, joy in Chaucer is, I believe, all the more precious; its uncertainty is what makes it valuable in itself and as a subject of inquiry. Derek Brewer, as he describes the patterns and values of courtly life in his introduction to Chaucer, places joy at the centre of this tradition:

> Nothing is more typical of the courtly ideal than the praise of joy; life was so often nasty, brutish and short; youth passed soon; religion was often gloomy and repressive, but even if, as in one of Chaucer's favourite phrases, 'ever the latter end of joy is woe', then at least let the joy be gathered while it flowers.[1]

But Brewer himself does not strive to gather that joy, nor do any of the critics of Chaucer's famous courtly poem. Moreover, this flowering joy, linked to the courtly celebration of seasonal rebirth and love's blossoming, is a specific and conventional type of joy, one which represents 'especially the virtue and the reward of lovers.'[2] Here, Brewer touches upon something revelatory about the joy of medieval love narratives: it might not be an emotion at all but a virtue or a reward. Brewer does not comment further on this assertion, but it can be traced to the broader discussion of French courtly 'joy': troubadours' *joie* has to do with sexual gratification, play and reward more than with emotionality.[3] This critical tradition may have proven detrimental to a potential study of joy as part of the emotional world of this literature: courtly joy discarded as a mere textual convention. Chaucer's work, while indebted to this tradition, cannot in any way be confined to it, and his writing of joy cannot be restricted to a writing of the courtly ideal's celebration of joy as virtue and reward. Therefore, it is important to approach Chaucerian joy from the field of emotion studies. This

---

[1] Derek Brewer, *A New Introduction to Chaucer*, London, New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 1984, p.46.
[2] Brewer, *New Introduction*, p.45.
[3] On this tradition and the complex etymology of Occitan 'joy' see Moshe Lazar, 'Fin'Amor', in F.R.P. Akehurst and Judith M. Davis (eds.), *The Handbook of the Troubadours*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995, 61-100, esp. pp.77-82, and Charles Camproux, *Le 'Joy d'Amor' des Troubadours: Jeu et Joie d'Amour*, Montpellier: Causse et Castelnau, 1965.

allows us to consider joy fully, as its own critical object and to replace it in the text's emotional world, in interaction and in contrast with other emotional processes. The concept of courtly joy as virtue and reward must serve as a reminder that textual medieval joy may very well challenge the modern concept of emotion. But by placing itself in the field of emotion studies and by choosing joy as the main object for the analysis of *Troilus and Criseyde,* this project finally allows joy in the poem to be recognized and embraced.

Emotion Studies and Middle English Literature

The study of past emotions, in history and in literature, has recently become a well-developed critical field.[4] It rests on the premise that emotions are not only universal and biological, but also culturally and linguistically shaped. This thesis on joy in Chaucer is indebted to this field: at its heart lies the wish to uncover what a literary emotion is, how it is constructed, how it is detected and how it interacts with historical and cultural discourses on emotions. As students of emotions past, historians and medievalists do not have access to 'psychological emotion' but only to its mediated codifications and representations, which are part of a cultural and linguistic apparatus.[5] While this is true for all studies on past emotions, this thesis makes its main methodological approach a focus on language, lexicography, and cultural grammar.

[4] For an overview of the 'history of emotions' field's development see Barbara Rosenwein, 'Worrying about Emotions in History', in *The American Historical Review*, 107:3, 2002, 821-845; for the study of emotions in medieval literature specifically see Stephanie Downes and Rebecca McNamara, 'The History of Emotions and Medieval Literature', *Literature Compass*, 13:3, 2016, 444-56 and Sarah McNamer, 'The Literariness of Literature and the History of Emotion', *PMLA*, 130:5, 2015, 1433-42.

[5] Piroska Nagy and Damien Boquet remind us of this important peculiarity of the historical emotion in their introduction to a journal issue on the embodiment of emotions: 'Une histoire des émotions incarnées', *Médiévales*, 61, 5-24, pp.9-10.

Accordingly, it is necessary to start by questioning the use of the word emotion itself. As it is non-existent in the Middle Ages it can appear somewhat anachronistic.[6] It is generally used for its neutral and encompassing qualities,[7] though terminology has generated some debate inside the field. Sarah McNamer for example has advocated for the use of 'feeling' as a more appropriate term for medieval literary affectivity: it is a medieval term and implies a process rather than a thing.[8] An important distinction has also been made between 'affect' and 'emotion'. Affect studies are primarily interested in embodiment. As Stephanie Trigg explains, they define 'affect' as a pre-discursive and unconscious reaction, while 'emotion' would be the 'socio-linguistic fixing' of the experience of affect.[9] So while it is often taken as an umbrella term, when contrasted with affect theory '"emotion" emerges with a more specialized sense, referring to the way we experience, narrate and perform what we feel. In practice, this is how that term is used in the field named as the history of emotions.'[10] Finally, however, Trigg argues that 'affect' may have the widest scope for medieval literature scholars as it is a pre-modern term, is connected to the broad French term 'affectivité' and also reminds us of the importance of the embodied and pre-discursive aspect of emotion.[11]

---

[6] The *OED* records its first use, under the meaning of 'political agitation', in the latter half of the 16th century.

[7] The *OED* defines it as '3. a. Originally: an agitation of the mind; an excited mental state. Subsequently: any strong mental or instinctive feeling' and '3. b. As a mass noun: strong feelings, passions; instinctive feeling as distinguished from reasoning and knowledge.'

[8] Sarah McNamer, 'Feeling', in Paul Strohm (ed.), *Oxford Twenty-First Century Approaches to Literature: Middle English*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 241-57, p.247.

[9] Stephanie Trigg, 'Introduction: Emotional Histories – Beyond the Personalization of the Past and the Abstraction of Affect Theory', *Exemplaria*, 26:1, 2014, 3-15, p.6. Trigg relies on Brian Massumi, 'The Autonomy of Affect', *Cultural Critique*, 31:2, 1995, 83-109.

[10] Trigg, 'Introduction', 2014, p.7.

[11] Ibid., p.8. Steele Nowlin uses this theoretical distinction between 'affect' and 'emotion' for the study of Middle English literature and the concept of poetic invention: Steele Nowlin, *Chaucer, Gower, and the Affect of Invention,* Columbus: Ohio State Press, 2016. Antonina Harbus, on the other hand, uses the term 'affect' alongside 'emotion' for her study of the 'cognitive ecology of affect' in medieval texts (p.554). Instead of Massumi, she relies on the neuroscientist Antonio Damasio and his definition of emotion as necessarily embodied *and* part of cognitive functioning. The use of the word 'affect', or even 'affect studies' is therefore not restricted to Massumi's pre-discursive definition. See Antonina Harbus, 'Medieval English Texts and Affects: Narratives as Tools for

'Affect' – Latin *affectus* or *affectio* – was an important term in the pre-modern theorisation of emotions, along with 'passions' and 'movements of the soul'. These categories, however, do not always neatly map onto the modern concept of emotion. The medieval philosopher Thomas Aquinas writes about passions of the soul (*passiones animae*) but also bodily passions (*passiones corporalis*) by which he means needs and sensations such as hunger or thirst; concepts that we do not recognize as emotions. Therefore, as Nicholas E. Lombardo notes, it is misleading to translate the Latin *passio* as emotion.[12] Aquinas also refers to *affectiones* and *affectus* which would also enter the modern definition of emotion. He differentiates passions of the soul, which are movements of the sense appetite, and intellectual affections, which are movements of the will.[13] Modern English does not allow for such a fine distinction. Thomas Dixon deplores the tendency of modern translators to bring *affectus*, *passio*, and *motus* (referring to movements of the soul) all under the modern term 'emotion'. This is a misrepresentation of pre-modern conceptions. Dixon rather emphasises the importance given by both Augustine and Aquinas to the 'distinction between voluntary movements or affections on the one hand and unruly passions on the other.'[14] These discourses are chiefly religious and moral. In his book, Dixon traces a historical evolution of the concept of emotion, from 'passion', a religious and moral category, to 'emotion', a secular psychological one. This is perhaps the main problem with the modern use of 'emotion' to refer to medieval passions and affects: contrary to modern emotions, passions are not morally neutral. While the umbrella term 'emotion' is extremely useful, it is also important to keep in mind that medieval 'emotions' were embedded in moral discourse, inseparable from ethics.

Feeling', in Donald R. Wehrs and Thomas Blake (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Affect Studies and Textual Criticism*, Cham: Springer, 2017, 545-76.

[12] Nicholas E. Lombardo, 'Emotions and Psychological Health in Aquinas', in Elena Carrera (ed.), *Emotions and Health, 1200-1700*, Leiden: Brill, 2013, 19-46, p.26.

[13] Lombardo, 'Emotions in Aquinas', p.27.

[14] Thomas Dixon, *From Passions to Emotions: the Creation of a Secular Psychological Category*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, p.40.

The Middle English equivalents of these Latin terms can be found in Chaucer's language. As Hans-Jürgen Diller observes, the poet uses the words *mood, passioun* and *affeccioun,* though he only uses the first one twice. Chaucer's vocabulary of emotion thus seems in line with theoretical writings. But, according to Diller's study, which challenges the *MED* on a couple of instances, *passioun* in Chaucer mainly means the Passion of Christ or more generally suffering. It only means 'emotion' in *Troilus and Criseyde* and in Chaucer's translation of Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy*, the *Boece*.[15] In the poem, the term *passioun* 'invites sympathy, com-passion'.[16] The word *affeccioun* is often used to mean 'love' in Chaucer and more rarely to refer to emotion; though it can be the emotion or the sensation of love: 'th'affeccioun/Of frendes love' (*TC* III, 1590-91). The author therefore 'had little or no use for the generic sense of *affeccioun,* though it was quite current in his time.'[17] Chaucer's work thus does not show a particular interest in the terminology and category of emotion; he is much more interested in the feelings themselves. He uses the verb *felen* abundantly to express his characters' internal states; a verb which bridges the emotional and the cognitive spheres.

The field of emotion studies in the Middle Ages struggles somewhat to offer a clear terminology which is modern and comprehensive as well as relevant to medieval notions of passions and affects. The concept of emotion, as useful as it is, will be questioned in the present thesis. The study of joy in Chaucer's literature necessitates a re-examination of what an emotion is. Chaucer himself, as I have just shown, is not interested in emotion itself as a concept; his writing of joy in fact challenges it. Joy in his poetry is not necessarily embodied;

[15] Hans-Jürgen Diller, 'Chaucer's Emotion Lexicon' in *Words for Feelings: Studies in the History of the English Emotion Lexicon,* Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2014, 337-50. For example, the *MED* defines *passiones* in the following *Troilus and Criseyde* quote as 'one or all of the five sense' (5.): 'Thow moost me first transmewen in a stoon/And reve me my passiones alle,/Er thow so lightly do my wo to falle' (IV, 467-9). Diller argues, however, that Troilus speaks of emotions here, as in this dialogue, he accuses Pandarus of being incapable of feeling them – emotions that is (p.342).
[16] Diller, 'Chaucer's Emotion Lexicon', p.350.
[17] Ibid., p.350.

and embodiment is the prerequisite of all modern definitions of emotion. Chaucerian joy can be purely philosophical and objective, *exterior* as it were. So, while I use the term 'emotion' throughout this thesis for convenience and to inscribe it in the relevant field, I will challenge the appropriateness of existing concepts of emotion for the study of joy in medieval literature especially.

The study of joy even seems to have escaped the field of emotion history. Studies in medieval emotions have predominantly focused on negative emotions. One of the first collective volume published in the field was on the social and political uses of anger,[18] followed by studies on the history of tears.[19] In the introduction to a very recent volume on medieval pleasure, the editors explain that their investigation is partly motivated by the wish to dispel 'the popular stigma of a joyless era in which only violence, plague, and suffering took place.'[20] On top of this stigma, there can be observed a more general propensity to read the past in terms of trauma and violence. As Darrin McMahon notices, there is a 'negative bias' in the field, 'a tendency to accord greater prominence to the role played by negative emotions in constituting the human past.'[21] Both our individual and collective memories seem to construct themselves around pain and anxiety. Psychologists have confirmed this tendency, noting that 'information with a negative valence impacts us more strongly than does positive information'.[22] Scholars of the humanities, and in literature especially, tend to glorify and elevate negative emotionality. Melancholy has long been linked to literary genius and modern authors have exacerbated the image of the 'poète maudit' – a literary identity

[18] Barbara Rosenwein (ed.), *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.
[19] Piroska Nagy, *Le don des larmes au Moyen-Âge,* Paris: Albin Michel, 2000; Elina Gertsman, *Crying in the Middle Ages: Tears of History*, New York, London: Routledge, 2011; Thomas Dixon, *Weeping Britannia: Portrait of a Nation in Tears*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
[20] Na'ama Cohen-Hanegbi and Piroska Nagy, 'Introduction', in *Pleasure in the Middle Ages*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2018, xi-xxii, p.xii.
[21] Darrin McMahon, 'Finding Joy in the History of Emotions', in Susan J. Matt and Peter N. Stearns (eds.), *Doing Emotions History*, Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2013, 103-19, p.103.
[22] McMahon, 'Finding Joy', p.104.

constructed by violence, insanity and depression. McMahon traces the cause for this negative bias in 'the belief, nourished in Western culture at least, by centuries of Christian reflection, that pain is deep and ennobling, and that pleasure, where not sinful, is often shallow and trite.'[23] This point is especially relevant for medievalists who are often too quick to discard any representation of earthly joy or pleasure as ironic or as a pale mirror of the one true heavenly joy.

What McMahon does not consider in his article, and which I believe further contributes to the 'negative bias' in the emotion field, is the recent emphasis on embodiment. Piroska Nagy and Damien Boquet, two prominent historians of emotion in the Middle Ages have advocated for the need to study historical emotion as an embodied process.[24] In a special issue on pleasure by the journal *Mirabilia*, the prominence of embodiment results in several papers dealing with the relation of pleasure to physical suffering.[25] This embodied trend is especially visible in literary studies on emotion. In Chaucerian criticism, studies have explored bodily gestures or the emotions of shame and guilt.[26] The emotion scholars Stephanie Trigg and Rebecca McNamara have both worked on Chaucer: Trigg is interested in the author's use of facial expression and McNamara has written on the use of medical discourse in his writing of despair and the suicidal impulse.[27] Both researchers thus focus on the embodiment of emotion and do not consider joyful emotions.

---

[23] McMahon, 'Finding Joy', p.107.
[24] Damien Boquet and Piroska Nagy, 'Emotions Incarnées'.
[25] See for example, Sarah Schäfer-Althaus, 'Painful Pleasure. Saintly Torture on the Verge of Pornography', *Mirabilia*, 18:1, 2014, 151-59 and Brigit G. Ferguson, 'The Pleasure of Martyrdom', *Mirabilia*, 18:1, 2014, 116-36. As did the edited volume on medieval pleasure, this special issue derives from the 2013 IMC Leeds conference whose special topic was pleasure.
[26] Anne McTaggart, *Shame and Guilt in Chaucer*, New York, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012 and Mary Flannery, 'A Bloody Shame: Chaucer's Honourable Women', *The Review of English Studies*, 62, 2011, 337-57.
[27] Stephanie Trigg, '"Language in her Eye": The Expressive Face of Criseyde/Cressida', in A. J. Johnston, Russell West-Pavlov and Elisabeth Kempf (eds.), *Love, History and Emotion in Chaucer and Shakespeare,* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016, 94-108 and Rebecca McNamara, 'Wearing Your Heart on Your Face: Reading Lovesickness and the Suicidal Impulse in Chaucer', *Literature and Medicine*, 33:2, 2015, 258-278. Trigg also wrote on tears in Middle English literature: Stephanie Trigg, 'Langland's Tears: Poetry, Emotion and Mouvance', *Yearbook of Langland Studies*, 26, 2012, 27-48.

Furthermore, emotion studies in medieval literature have mostly focussed on religious literature and its integration of performance and embodiment. Sarah McNamer's study on affective meditations and compassion suggests that emotions in medieval literature and culture 'can indeed be willed, faked, performed through the repetition of scripted words.'[28] She builds up a case for the performative model of emotions in the Middle Ages, against the primacy of the medical understanding and its correlation of emotions with bodily humours. Her approach, which veers away from embodiment, studies how literature evokes emotions in its readers. But as the reader of affective meditations is invited to feel and co-suffer with Christ, the performed emotions are chiefly negative and embodied. Ultimately, her rejection of the medical nature of emotion in favour of its performativity is rather misleading as, in medieval writing, the two models are hardly antithetical. Daniel McCann shows how medieval theology is inseparable from medieval medicine and that both use emotions as therapeutic devices.[29] For an emotion to be used therapeutically, it has to have a physiological impact, but it also needs to be directed and controlled. Therefore, in both medical and spiritual medieval writings, emotions can be evoked and invoked – performed as it were. The prevalence of religious literature and affective piety in the study of medieval literary emotions has further deterred any interest in joy. These studies focus on compassion, co-*suffering* even, and the relation between the self, embodied emotions and spirituality.[30]

Yet, emotion studies have recently started to look into secular literature as well. Corinne Saunders has shown the key importance of emotion in reading secular narratives

---

[28] Sarah McNamer, *Affective Meditation and the Invention of Medieval Compassion*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010, p.13.

[29] Daniel McCann, 'Feeling Dredeful: Fear and Therapy in *The Scale of Perfection*', in Andreas Langlotz and Agnieszka Soltysik Monnet (eds.), *Emotion, Affect, Sentiment: The Language and Aesthetic of Feeling*, SPELL: Swiss Papers in English Language and Literature, 30, Tübingen: Narr, 2014, 89-107.

[30] See also Denis Renevey, *Language, Self and Love: Hermeneutics in the Writing of Richard Rolle and the Commentaries on the Song of Songs*, Cardiff: University Press, 2001 and Ayoush Lazikani, *Cultivating the Heart: Feeling and Emotion in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Religious Texts*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2015.

and their construction of gender and agency. She shows how Chaucer's writing of emotion as well as the medieval theoretical discourse on emotion rely on the integration of thinking and feeling, of the embodied affective and the cognitive.[31] Moreover, two recently edited volumes focus on emotions in Anglo-Saxon and Arthurian literatures.[32] These volumes showcase the different approaches that seem to shape the field of emotion studies in literature: the social and political use of emotion, the performance of emotion, the embodiment of emotion – especially medical discourse and gestures – and finally the semantics and linguistics of emotion.

There is however no study on joy or any type of positive emotion in either of these volumes. Anger, fear, grief and mourning on the other hand appear abundantly in both. So, while the bodily emphasis is an important reason why joy has mostly been excluded from emotion studies, it cannot be the only one; even in volumes which aim at expanding their methodological approaches, joy still shines by its absence. The volume on Arthurian literature does end with an epilogue on smiles in Malory's *Morte Darthur,* but what it brings forward is the inherent ambiguity of this bodily sign of emotion: 'by contrast with weeping or mourning, [smiling and laughter] are somatic signs that do not carry their immediate meanings with them.'[33] And indeed, while studies on laughter do exist, they are not studies of joy. Most of them conflate laughter with the comic mode,[34] and the few studies on laughter as a bodily gesture – most notably Albrecht Classen's survey of the use of laughter in

[31] Corinne Saunders, 'Affective Reading: Chaucer, Women, and Romance', *The Chaucer Review*, 51:1, 2016, 11-30.
[32] A. Jorgensen, F. McCormack and J. Wilcox (eds.), *Anglo-Saxon Emotions: Reading the Heart in Old English Language, Literature and Culture*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2015 and F. Brandsma, C. Larrington and C. Saunders (eds.), *Emotions in Medieval Arthurian Literature*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2015.
[33] Helen Cooper, 'Afterword: Malory's Enigmatic Smiles', in Brandsma, Larrington and Saunders (eds.), *Emotions in Arthurian Literature*, 181-188, p.181.
[34] See for example Guido Latré, Herman Braet and Werner Verbeke (eds.), *Risus Mediaevalis: Laughter in Medieval Literature and Art*, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003 and Lisa Perfetti, *Women and Laughter in Medieval Comic Literature*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003.

medieval texts and culture[35] – rapidly point out that laughter is either a very ambiguous emotional gesture or it is not an emotional gesture at all and rather a sign of hidden knowledge. While there exists no extensive study on joy in medieval literature, a small series of articles on 'positive emotions in Arthurian Romance' has recently been published.[36] Yet these are not so much about joy per se but about the narrative functioning of 'positive emotions', a term challenged by Andrew Lynch, as these essays also find 'the positive value of "negative" emotions such as anger and even sadness.'[37]

Criticism on medieval literary emotion thus contains a clear gap. The study of joy's cultural and literary history has been overlooked in a field which seems to give greater importance and value to sorrow and grief, to anger and fear as the emotions which shape human life and human past. Literary scholars have mostly focussed on the representation of emotions in and on the body and on the emotions in religious literature. My study contributes to the study of emotion in medieval secular literature and advocates for the necessity of looking beyond performance and beyond embodiment. It proposes that the study of language is the main methodology necessary to study literary emotions and, especially, to bring joy in the field of emotion study. The analysis of the language of joy in medieval discourse forces one to accept different discourses of emotion and leads to a reconsideration of the concept of emotion.

---

[35] Albrecht Classen, 'Laughter as an Expression of Human Nature in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period: Literary, Historical, Theological, Philosophical, and Psychological Reflections. Also an Introduction', in *Laughter in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times. Epistemology of a Fundamental Human Behavior, its Meaning, and Consequences*, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, 1-140.

[36] See the articles by Jeff Rider, Grigoriu Brînduşa, Gioia Paradisi and Anatole Pierre Fuksas, Carolyne Larrington and Frank Brandsma in *JIAS*, 4:1, 2016.

[37] Andrew Lynch, 'Positive Emotions in Arthurian Romance: Introduction', *JIAS*, 4:1, 2016, 53-57, p.57.

On Joy and Happiness

It is joy rather than pleasure or happiness which will be the subject of this thesis. While every aspect and term that Chaucer uses to convey positive affectivity will be surveyed and studied, this project is a search for *joy*. Contrary to *happiness*, *joy* is a medieval term.[38] Moreover, it is Chaucer's most used word to denote positive affectivity in *Troilus and Criseyde*. *Joy* in Chaucer seems able to encompass all the different forms of joy and happiness while simultaneously evoking something particular and unique, an experience like no other. It is this uniqueness and the seemingly elusive nature of joy which motivates this project. In modern minds, joy is distinct from both pleasure and happiness. Pleasure is a satisfaction of desire, a sensory gratification. Joy, while it also relies on exterior stimuli, is much more intense and it is both mental and physical, an overwhelming psycho-somatic process. Happiness, on the other hand, is often conceptualised as more lasting and less intense than both pleasure and joy to the point where it is objective rather than subjective and affective.[39] The invention of happiness appears inseparable from the philosophical quest for a long-lasting feeling of joy or pleasure which is independent from external circumstances.

As McMahon notes, happiness is linked to luck and chance. This is present in its etymology: happiness is what happens.[40] And yet philosophy has always tried to conceptualise happiness as a human accomplishment. Aristotle, one of the first and most

---

[38] Middle English did have the noun *hap,* which mostly meant luck, but could also refer to good luck especially and prosperity (*MED,* 1. (c)). It is very rare in Chaucer however.

[39] The *OED* defines *joy* as '1.a. A vivid emotion of pleasure arising from a sense of well-being or satisfaction; the feeling or state of being highly pleased or delighted', *pleasure* as '1.a. The condition or sensation induced by the experience or anticipation of what is felt to be good or desirable' as well as 'b. the indulgence of physical, esp. sexual, desires or appetites' and *happiness* as 'the quality or condition of being happy' and, more precisely, good fortune (1.a.) or contentment of mind (2.a). These definitions thus hint at the idea that while joy is undoubtedly an emotion, pleasure might be a sensation and happiness a condition.

[40] Darrin McMahon, 'From the Happiness of Virtue to the Virtue of Happiness: 400 B.C. – A.D. 1780', *Daedalus*, 133:2, 2004, 5-17, p.7.

influential philosophers of happiness, acknowledges this part of luck in *eudaimonia,* but defines it as 'the product of a life well-lived, the summation of a full, flourishing existence'. Ultimately therefore, for Aristotle, 'our behaviour is the largest single factor in determining our happiness'.[41] Happiness, in ancient Greek and Latin philosophy, is conceived as a mode of living rather than an emotion. In an attempt to rule out the role of chance in human happiness, philosophers emphasized human agency to the point where happiness became equated with virtue. For the Stoics, 'happiness is a function of the will, not of external forces'.[42] From its original conceptualisation, as McMahon demonstrates, happiness is an ethical rather than an affective state; it is the evaluation of one's life.[43] The meaning of happiness has become broader and more emotional over time, but there remains the idea that it is not a spontaneous, fleeting passion but rather a long-lasting and balanced state. Happiness also still involves a high degree of human agency: men pursue happiness, it is their inalienable right. This pursuit still often ends inwardly: true happiness is found and constructed in the self; it is closer to wisdom than it is to emotion.

Joy, on the other hand, is received, rather than produced. It is bestowed upon the self and more akin to religious grace than to philosophical self-fashioning. Contrary to happiness, not many philosophers have dealt with it. Joy is not constructed or built, and therefore can appear irrational and uncontrollable. Yet joy is also defined by moral discourse. Unlike philosophical happiness however, joy itself cannot be virtuous but its object can be ethically appraised. Joy is, as McMahon puts it, 'the original object-directed emotion'.[44] It is thanks to this quality that Aristotle creates the concept of an education based on joy: one should be taught when and in what object to rightly rejoice. The philosopher constructs the idea of an ethical joy, a joy linked to what is just: 'No man is just who does not take joy in acting justly'

[41] McMahon, 'Happiness of Virtue', p.6.
[42] Ibid., p.8.
[43] McMahon, 'Finding Joy', pp.108-9.
[44] Ibid., p.110.

(*Nicomachean Ethics*, 1099a; Aristotle uses the Ancient Greek verb *chairo*, to rejoice, to take joy in).[45] Ethical joy also appears in Cicero who, in the Stoic tradition, differentiates between *gaudium*, a reasoned and balanced joy, and *laetitia*, an excessive passion of delight.[46] Joy can be both good and bad, virtuous and sinful depending on where and how it is taken.

Boethius' sixth-century *De consolatione philosophiae* also concerns itself with joy. Its main focus however, is the philosophical concept of happiness, of the sovereign good. In Boethius' Latin, *beatitudo* and *felicitas* represent this concept of sovereign happiness, attained in the after-life and on earth in reason and contemplation.[47] On the other hand, *laetitia* and the much rarer *gaudium* are used to speak of earthly joys and pleasures, taken in material possessions, power or carnal lust and which men often mistake for the sovereign good. Boethius' philosophical doctrine is influenced by the ancient Stoic and the contemporary Neoplatonic movements; it is therefore still very much interested in the virtue of happiness rather than joy.

Joy becomes more present in the theological development of medieval Christian philosophy. Thomas Aquinas, the most influential medieval writer on the passions, brings *gaudium* to the forefront of his theological philosophy. As Potkay argues, he 'sought to reconcile Christian joy with an Aristotelian conception of human happiness.'[48] In the *Summa Theologiae,* he deals with happiness (*beatitudo*) in his treatise on the Last End. There, in a similar vein to Boethius, he explains that happiness does not consist of any earthly goods such as power, wealth or pleasure. Instead, he argues in an Aristotelian fashion, happiness

[45] Cited in Adam Potkay, *The Story of Joy: From the Bible to Late Romanticism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007*,* p.47 and 167.
[46] Potkay, *Story of Joy*, p.6.
[47] All references to the *Consolatio* are from Boethius, *Consolatio Philosophiae*, James J. O'Donnell, (ed.), Bryn Mawr: Bryn Mawr College, 1984.
[48] Potkay, *Story of Joy*, p.31.

is an operation existing in man, 'it is man's supreme perfection' (I-II, 3, 2).[49] But Aquinas has also read Augustine and, in accordance with the theologian, he acknowledges that delight (*delectatio*) is necessary for happiness (I-II, 4, 1). Here he quotes St Augustine's definition of happiness as 'joy in truth' (*beatitudo est gaudium de veritate*). Through medieval Christianisation, joy thus makes its way into the philosophy of happiness, not just as the earthly pleasures that men mistake for *beatitudo* but as an integral part of sovereign happiness itself. In Augustine's definition, happiness is no longer a rational state but an affective operation of truth and virtue. As Aquinas phrases it, delight is 'caused by the appetite being at rest in the good attained. Wherefore, since happiness is nothing else but the attainment of the Sovereign Good, it cannot be without concomitant delight' (I-II, 4, 1).

In his treatise on the passions, the philosopher also defines joy (*gaudium*) as rest: both joy and sadness belong to repose. In the case of joy, it is rest from the movement of desire. But Aquinas' most detailed account of joy (*gaudium*) does not figure in this section on the passions but in that on theological virtues and especially on charity. Charity, the love of God and the principal theological virtue, is a cause of joy. This spiritual joy cannot be full and perfect in this world: 'joy is full, when there remains nothing to be desired. But as long as we are in this world, the movement of desire does not cease in us' (II-II, 28, 1). Joy is not a virtue in itself according to Aquinas, but an act or effect of the virtue of charity.

Joy is therefore thoroughly embedded in moral discourse, be it in Classical philosophical formulations of ethical joy or in the Christian philosophy of Aquinas and his conception of joy as an effect of divine love. These elements are very important for the reading of *Troilus and Criseyde*, where Chaucer combines Boethian and Thomistic views on joy. Indeed, Chaucer relies on Boethius and his conception of earthly joys as brittle, but his writing also evokes the possibility of an earthly joy which is full and linked to virtue,

[49] All references and quotes of the *Summa* are from the following translation and edition: *The Collected Works of St. Thomas Aquinas*, Electronic Edition, Charlottesville: InteLex Corp, 1993.

spiritual in its expression and framed by philosophical discourse. Chaucer eventually surpasses the concepts of ethical and spiritual joy by making joy the cause of virtue rather than virtue the cause of joy.

Before turning to the religious and literary encoding of joy, it is necessary to note the one discourse which allows it to escape moral and ethical framing: that of medicine, where it is reduced to its physiological effects. Emotions formed an important part of medieval medicine and were thought to contribute to a general regimen of health: just as one should regulate what one eats or one's sleep patterns, the medieval patient was also asked to regulate his or her emotions.[50] Daniel McCann notes that, in medical compendia, moderate joy is often prescribed as the cure for fear: it is the 'passion most conducive to good health.'[51] Joy thus has a therapeutic function and can cure more dangerous, even life-threatening emotions such as fear or anger or the emotional diseases of melancholy or lovesickness.[52] When Chaucer writes sorrow as a physiological disease, and joy as the expansion of the heart, he temporarily brings them out of their moral shackles.

But joy is almost impossible to consider outside of moral discourses in the Middle Ages; while it is not as intrinsically linked to philosophical enterprise as happiness is, it is a key aspect of Christian theology. Both Darrin McMahon and Adam Potkay note the great frequency of the word *joy* ('chara') in the New Testament.[53] The gospels offer constant reminders to rejoice in Christ's love and in the hope and grace of salvation. It is the gift of joy rather than man-made happiness which defines the affectivity of Christianity: 'other-worldly or anticipatory joy flourishes at the cost of a worldly and self-determining

[50] On the medieval theory of the 'non-naturals', exterior elements which impact on the individual's interior organs and general health see Chester R. Burns, 'The Nonnaturals: A Paradox in Western Concept of Health', *The Journal of Medicine and Philosophy*, 1:3, 1976, 202-11.
[51] McCann, 'Fear and Therapy', p.92.
[52] On the link between pleasure, joy and health see Fernando Salmón, 'The Pleasures and Joys of the Humoral Body in Medieval Medicine', in Cohen-Hanegbi and Nagy (eds.), *Pleasure in the Middle Ages*, 39-57 and, in the same volume, Na'ama Cohen-Hanegbi, 'Bodily Pleasures: Late Medieval Medical Counsel in Context', 59-76.
[53] McMahon, 'Finding Joy', p.111 and Potkay, *Story of Joy*, p.30.

happiness'.[54] Potkay notes that the word *happiness* does not even appear in English versions of the Bible. Spiritual joy is not about self-determination and equanimity, it is joy in the future – the promised eternal joy – and in the present, in anticipation to that great reward. It is a gift, freely bestowed upon Christians. To be joyful is also a necessity: Christians should rejoice in their fellowship, in their hope and their faith. But Christianity's emphasis on the one true joy of heaven also diminishes the joys of earthly life. The worldliness of worldly joy implies its potential sinfulness: it is a gateway to carnal and impure pleasures.

Moreover, as the practice of Christianity becomes more centred on humanity and the individual relationship with God in the later Middle Ages, the feelings of compassion and sorrow become primordial. This affective devotion is, in McMahon's words a 'worship of sorrow'.[55] The humanity and suffering of Christ are emphasised. He becomes the Man of Sorrows: the noble embodiment of pain to be observed and pitied in affective meditation. Medieval affective piety produces highly emotional passion meditations which engage the readers in suffering with Christ and with His mother. These affective meditative practices also often involve an ascetic or reclusive mode of living and therefore entail the abnegation of the world's goods and joys. This spiritual attitude of sorrowing for one's sins in empathy with Christ rather precludes the biblical admonition to rejoice in the Lord's sacrifice and the gift of salvation. It promotes the idea that true joy is only found in the after-life and that it must somehow be bought on earth through sorrow and repentance. An emotional economy is thus shaped through affective piety, one which values everlasting joy at the price of human sadness.[56]

Much of the religious literature of the time is indeed centred on the glorification of sorrow. And yet, be it in passion meditations, Saints' lives or martyrdom narratives, joy is

[54] Potkay, *Story of Joy*, p.30.
[55] McMahon, 'Happiness of Virtue', p.9.
[56] This emotional economy is present in the Bible itself, where the Sermon on the Mount, exposing the Beatitudes, assert that great sadness and suffering on earth will be rewarded by great eternal bliss in heaven (Matthew 5.3-12).

always present as the greatest gift of divine love. The saints' lives of virgin martyrs from the early Middle English *Katherine Group* offer vivid and at times gruesome representations of the tortures of early Christian female martyrs. But while they undergo the worst physical pain, the virgin saints often express signs of hope, joy or even hilarity. Joy in the glory of God is the maidens' power against evil and pain. When Saint Margaret defeats, through her faith, a demon who has swallowed her whole, she is 'gomeful ant glead' (joyful and glad 34 (2)).[57] She also rejoices when she is being put to death by fire. As the heathen crowd weep in pity at this spectacle, she is described as the most joyful of maidens ('blithest' 68 (1)) and she tells the mourning crowd to stop crying and to rejoice with her, leading them to conversion. Even more powerfully perhaps, Saint Katherine laughs in the face of torture and physical pain (35 (4)), expressing the superiority of her faith and knowledge as well as the joyful assurance in future bliss, which characterises the martyrs of the *Katherine Group*.

Julian of Norwich's work represents the joy that can be found in affective piety and meditative practice. Julian subscribes to the idea of earthly suffering as a sign of compassion and love for Christ: she asks to be given a severe bodily illness. Through this illness she accesses a series of visions which she will describe and interpret in her *Shewings*. But Julian also, and perhaps above all, advocates for the necessity to rejoice in Christ and in our salvation. She explains that there are three ways of meditating on the passion. The first one focuses on compassion and hence on the sharing of sorrow, the second one looks at it as an action of love from Christ, and finally the third one consists in accepting 'the joy and the blis that make Hym to lekyn it' (ch. 23, l.826-7).[58] If Christ delights in us and in the pain he suffered to save us then we too should rejoice and be glad.

---

[57] Quotes and translations of the *Katherine Group* are from Emily Rebekah Huber and Elizabeth Robertson (eds.), *The Katherine Group (MS Bodley 34)*, Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2016.

[58] Georgia Ronan Crampton (ed.), *The Shewings of Julian of Norwich*, TEAMS Online, Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1999.

Such Christian 'worship of sorrow' thus does not erase earthly joy. Joy is celebrated in the face of sorrow: martyrdom is pain and torment in which the martyr rejoices. Yet, the main representation of joy in religious texts is found in descriptions of heaven. *Sawles Warde*, an allegorical text on the guardianship of the soul which also forms part of the *Katherine Group*, presents such a description of heaven's joy. Fear, the messenger of Death, visits the allegorical castle of the human body and offers its inhabitants a frightening reminder of death through a vivid depiction of hell. After this, and in order to prevent Despair creeping in, Love of Life, the messenger of Joy, comes in and offers a vision of heaven. The messenger describes the mirth and bliss of the company of blessed maidens residing in heaven (32 (2)). The particularity of heavenly bliss, it soon appears, is the fact that it is communal ('the imeane blisse' 34 (1)). This great communal joy is also unspeakable for human tongues:

> Se gleade ha beoth of Godd thet al is hare blisse se muchel | thet ne meihit munne, na muth ne spealie na speche. 39 (1)
> (They are so glad in God that all their bliss is so great that it may not be remembered, nor may any mouth or speech describe it.)

This joy cannot be remembered because it is not in those who experience it: it is 'in God'. Quoting Matthew's gospel (25:21), Christ addresses the company and tells them to go 'into your Lord's bliss': 'You must all go into it, and be completely suffused by it, for it cannot in any way enter into you.' (39 (9)). In *Sawles Warde,* the joy of heaven is therefore not only communal, it is exterior, a godly place one goes into rather than takes in the self or in the body.

But communal joy is not restricted to the heavenly realm nor to religious literature; joy as a social and shared emotion is an important concept in the Arthurian tradition. Antonina Harbus argues that the poem *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight,* which starts with a description of the merry Arthurian court celebrating Christmas, establishes a positive mood

from the onset. This, she explains, 'operates as a form of affective foregrounding, in that joyfulness becomes a sort of emotional resting state or norm of Arthur and his court'.[59] This 'positive emotional default' makes the protagonist Sir Gawain's emotions of anxiety, fear and shame appear more vivid and distinctive. In the most complete repository of Arthuriana in the Middle Ages, Malory's *Morte Darthur,* joy seems rather dim among the quantity of tears shed at farewells or on the bodies of wounded knights. Yet, the Arthurian society, when at peace, rests upon joyful banquets and jousts; most importantly the emotional well-being of the knights individually depends on the common well-being of all the knights and on the close-knit community of the Round Table. When Sir Lancelot is being publicly shamed and accused of adultery with Queen Guinevere, Sir Bors expresses his and his companions' loyalty to him: 'we woll take the woo with you as we have takyn the weale'.[60] Arthurian society is based on the sharing of emotion. As King Arthur himself poignantly declares at Gawain's death, the knights of the Round Table are each others' joy:

> And now ys my joy gone, for now, my nevew Sir Gawayne, I woll discover me unto you, that in youre person and in Sir Launcelot I moste had my joy and myne affyaunce. And now have I loste my joy of you bothe, wherefore all myne erthely joy ys gone from me. (p.681, ll.19-23)

The King's earthly joy does not reside in himself, not in the love of his wife or his power and success, but in his best knights. Joy, in the Arthurian world, is exterior and social, it is found in the bonds that tie together this community of knights, in honour and friendship.

Medieval literature, religious or secular, does not shy away from joy. This exposes a striking paradox of the emotion: its capacity to be vibrantly present in literature while also being repeatedly described as ineffable. Potkay explains that the inexpressibility of joy forms

---

[59] Antonina Harbus, 'Emotion and Narrative Empathy in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*', *English Studies*, 97:6, 2016, 594-607, p.599.
[60] Sir Thomas Malory, *Le Morte Darthur,* Stephen H. A. Shepherd (ed.), New-York, London: W. W. Norton & Company, p.652, l.1.

a 'commonplace of European literature',[61] an ineffability which has been traced by Martha Nussbaum to the origin of joy as the passion of infancy. The infant's most basic need is for 'the removal of painful or invasive stimuli, and for the restoration of a blissful and undisturbed condition.'[62] Joy has a story: 'for Nussbaum, joy appears as a regressive recuperation of the "blissful totality" of pre-birth experience.'[63] If the origin of all joys lie in the restoration of 'uterine totality', then joy is always a return to a pre-linguistic, sensory past. Despite its avowed ineffability, joy still appears more suited to narratives than its longer lasting, more objective counterpart, happiness. Happiness is, with death, what ends narratives; once the characters are objectively happy there is nothing left to say. Joy on the other hand is fleeting and reactive, it is often entangled with other emotions and it is experienced spontaneously and intensely.

The irrationality and inexpressibility of joy, its capacity to always be a form of remembrance as well as an anticipation makes it, paradoxically perhaps, a favoured object of the poetic and literary quest. C. S. Lewis centres his literary and spiritual autobiography around the concept of joy, of being surprised by joy – and by the Christian faith. In this book he endeavours to put words and images to an indefinable emotion. He writes joy as a sort of unsatisfied desire, which cannot be premeditated or anticipated. It is triggered by nature, by music, by literature and, eventually, it is always outside of time, never really present: 'All Joy reminds. It is never a possession, always a desire for something longer ago or further away or still "about to be".'[64] Literature is the privileged medium to articulate the intricacies of such an emotion.

Troilus and Criseyde, the primary work under consideration here, is not a religious poem exposing heavenly bliss; it is not a secular romance resting on social bonding and

---

[61] Potkay, *Story of Joy*, pp.16-17.
[62] Martha Nussbaum, *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001, p.183.
[63] Potkay, *Story of Joy*, p.15.
[64] C.S. Lewis, *Surprised by Joy*, London: Collins, 1955, p.89

merriment, nor is it a theological or philosophical treatise. *Troilus and Criseyde* is none of these things and yet its writing of joy is informed by all of these contemporary genres. While the poem is principally a love story, the author does not simply write joy as an amorous and sexual emotion. Joy in *Troilus and Criseyde* is not just lyrical and erotic, it is also shaped by social and historical forces. And while the poem is not about heavenly joy, love's joy is written as a blissful place, into which the lovers go in sexual union: 'me bistowed in so heygh a place/That thilke boundes may no blisse pace' (III, 1271-2). But joy is also framed by a Boethian discourse of philosophical happiness, making the emotion inseparable from moral language and abstraction.

Joy, in the poem, is moreover everything that makes it such a fascinating emotion even today. Like Lewis, Troilus is surprised by bliss (III, 1184) when Criseyde reciprocates his love. And as he takes her in his arms, he is as a man suddenly saved from a sure death (III, 1240-43). Joy is bestowed upon him: it is a grace and gift. Their joy is inexpressible (III, 1693-4) and a return to uterine totality: 'For out of wo in blisse now they flete;/Non swich they felten, sith they were born' (III, 1221-2). Joy is linked to honour and it brings virtue and glory to Troilus (III, 1723-5). The lovers' gladness, delight and joys are inexpressible, unique and particular, yet complex and mixed in with other emotions; and above all what they feel that night together is the great value of their love: 'That night, be-twixen dreed and sikernesse,/Felten in love the grete worthinesse' (III, 1315-6). But because this great value, this grace bestowed on Troilus is taken not in Christian divine love but in the body of his earthly beloved, it has most often been read as trite, discarded by critics in favour of the moral and Christian trajectory of the poem.

Troilus Criticism and Joy

Very few critics of the poem have focussed on emotions and fewer still on joy, which has often been dismissed as ironic or sinful. This section explores how critics of the poem have approached and considered joy, be it directly or indirectly, through their critical stance. The aforementioned distinction between joy, happiness and pleasure is important, as the few critics who have approached issues adjacent to joy have often prioritised forms of pleasure and happiness. Pleasure appears in studies on the functioning of desire and enjoyment in the poem, often related to suffering. L.O. Aranye Fradenburg has opened the way for a psychoanalytic analysis of medieval literature which puts Lacanian *jouissance* at its centre. The critic explores sacrifice as a form of enjoyment and the pleasure taken in such negative emotions as sorrow, grief, or pity. Her interpretation of the poem places enjoyment in loss and sacrifice.[65] Similarly, Holly Crocker and Tison Pugh look at the way the lover's passive condition of suffering confers pleasure on him and how Chaucer turns the lover's suffering into an exalted spectacle from which the readers derive pleasure. This reaction of pleasure, they argue, is both morally and philosophically acceptable, as Troilus' suffering deserves valorisation.[66] Pleasure, in these studies, is inseparable from suffering and from the masculine expression and experience of courtly love; it does not deal with joy in itself.

Apart from psychology and gender, Jessica Rosenfeld looks at enjoyment in Middle English poetry in terms of Aristotelian ethics. She proposes to trace the influence of Aristotle's philosophy of human perfect happiness on Middle English love poetry. She

---

[65] L.O. Aranye Fradenburg, *Sacrifice Your Love: Psychoanalysis, Historicism, Chaucer*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002, pp.86 and 228-9. Paul Megna also touches upon the negative, even dangerous, side of enjoyment and desire in his psychoanalytic study of courtly love in the poem as sadomasochism: 'Courtly ~~Love~~ Hate Is Undead: Sadomasochistic Privilege in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', in Russell Sbriglia (ed.), *Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Literature but Were Afraid to Ask Zizek*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017, 267–89.

[66] Holly A. Crocker and Tison Pugh, 'Masochism, Masculinity, and the Pleasures of Troilus', in Tison Pugh and Marcia Smith Marzec (eds.), *Men and Masculinities in Chaucer's* Troilus and Criseyde, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2008, 82-96.

argues that such poetry, of which *Troilus and Criseyde* is a prominent example, 'is interested in what it might mean to love someone as another subject who is pursuing his or her own happiness in the world, and especially what it might mean to pursue such a love toward an enjoyment that acknowledges the overlap between the philosophical pursuit of happiness and the happiness pursued by lovers.'[67] It is through a study of philosophical discourse that Rosenfeld makes space for happiness, in the same way that Chaucer makes space for earthly happiness by exploring 'the clerkly dimensions of his lovers' "felicity" as a way to think through the ethical intersections of erotic and intellectual discourses'.[68] The poem indeed uses clerkly language of happiness to embed and make sense of erotic joy, but the philosophical concept of felicity eventually falls short; love's joy surpasses it. So while Rosenfeld's focus on philosophy and discourse is what allows her to bring in positive emotionality in the first place, it also restricts her study to the concept of happiness – imperfect and human as well as the full happiness of heaven – and does not consider that *joy* might be the key here to understand Chaucer's transcending of clerkly felicity. Her focus on philosophical *philia* and friendship as frames for happiness, prevents her from accessing joy for its own sake.

John M. Hill seems to be the only scholar to explicitly study joy in the poem, and he does so mainly by exploring aesthetics and philosophy. In his book on Chaucer's Neoplatonism, he focuses on the varieties of joy presented by the author. In a primarily philosophical reading, Hill argues for the valuation of these joys as 'imperfect shadows that may eventually lead to a sense of the highest good'.[69] Again, his focus on philosophy allows for the consideration of joy but also restricts it: joy in *Troilus and Criseyde* surpasses its philosophical frame. Yet Hill recognizes the centrality of an untainted joy in the poem. He

[67] Jessica Rosenfeld, *Ethics and Enjoyment in Late Medieval Poetry: Love after Aristotle*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, p.8.
[68] Ibid., p.12.
[69] John M. Hill, *Chaucer's Neoplatonism: Varieties of Love, Friendship, and Community*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc., 2018, p.9.

argues that the aesthetic features of the consummation scene, 'that is, the informing form, as well as the beauty of extended moments remarkably full of the feelings and physical details of sexual love and joy', allow the author to write sexual joy 'as a great good in and of itself', something the majority of the poem's readers do not accept.[70] A true appreciation of joy has been thwarted by the vastly influential philosophical and religious 'Robertsonian' approach which sees earthly love and joy in the poem as vain and ironical. And while this approach has been qualified and reassessed numerous times, critics are yet to accept the joy of earthly love in the poem as good, and as a valuable subject for literary study.

D.W. Robertson can indeed largely be credited as the initiator of a trend which views the representation of earthly love in *Troilus and Criseyde* as entirely ironic. He argues that *Troilus* is a deeply Christian poem in the philosophical tradition of Boethius. In this view, the elevation of earthly love through religious imagery is in fact 'intended to suggest the values from which the hero departs, and, at the same time, to furnish opportunity for ironic humor.'[71] This trend of criticism thus leaves no space for the study of joy as a serious element in the poem. More recently, An Sonjae (Brother Anthony) interprets Troilus' bliss simply as an ironic contrast to the true heavenly bliss. The critic traces the Boethian and Dantean echoes in the poem, showing how they 'provide ironic commentary on the evolutions of what Troilus takes to be happiness.'[72] Megan Murton, on the other hand, provides a fresh reading of Boethius and Chaucer's use of the text. Against the ironic approach, she argues for the presence of ambiguities and contradictions in the *Consolation*, which create a gap between pure reasoned logic and Lady Philosophy's promotion of hopeful prayer at the end of the book. Murton shows how Chaucer exploits these contradictions on love and God and

[70] John M. Hill, 'The Countervailing Aesthetic of Joy in *Troilus and Criseyde*', *The Chaucer Review*, 39:3, 2005, 280-297, pp.293 and 285.
[71] D.W. Robertson, Jr., 'Chaucerian Tragedy', *ELH*, 19:1, 1952, 1-37, p.24.
[72] An Sonjae (Brother Anthony), 'No Greater Pain: The Ironies of Bliss in *Troilus and Criseyde*', in N. H. Kaylor and R. S. Nokes, *Global Perspectives on Medieval English Literature, Language, and Culture*, Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2007, 117-132, p.117.

how ultimately his hero does not fail to understand Boethian philosophy but rather follows it in its way to devotion. Her reading opens up the way for philosophical and religious criticism of the poem to accept Chaucer's non-ironic 'positive valuation of human love, articulated through the hopeful prayer of a lover.'[73] A Boethian reading of the poem thus does not have to discard all earthly joy, though it often has. Rosenfeld and Hill, in their studies of joy and enjoyment, open up the critical philosophical field by offering fresh and non-ironic readings of *Troilus'* Boethian material. Rosenfeld argues that the 'aristotelianizing' of Boethius in the later Middle Ages allows for philosophical happiness to be more earthly and human.[74] And Hill proposes to see the poem's passionate human love not as a wrong and misplaced joy but as 'a lesser and mutable approximation of the great Boethian good'.[75]

Philosophical approaches have also relied on the poem's historical grounding as another element which prevents readers fully accepting and appreciating its joy: we already know it will not last. The narrator often reiterates the distance that separates himself and his audience from the characters and events he is recounting. Morton W. Bloomfield explores all the different facets of this distance: temporal, spatial, aesthetic and religious.[76] He argues that the aloof position of the narrator is the aesthetic manifestation of predestination. Predestination has been a recurring theme in *Troilus* criticism; it belongs to the complex articulation of chance, necessity and human free will present in the poem and the *Consolation.* Jill Mann shows how the powerful forces of chance and destiny bring about the love affair and how human agency is minimised. However, free will always pervades in the story; for Boethius and in *Troilus and Criseyde*, destiny does not mean absolute

[73] Megan Murton, 'Praying with Boethius in *Troilus and Criseyde*', *The Chaucer Review*, 49:3, 2015, 294-319, p.312.
[74] Rosenfeld, *Ethics and Enjoyment*, p.139.
[75] Hill, 'Aesthetic of Joy', p.285.
[76] Morton W. Bloomfield, 'Distance and Predestination in *Troilus and Criseyde*', *PMLA*, 72, 1957, 14-26.

predetermination.[77] Alastair J. Minnis brings some resolution to the problem of predestination and free will by situating the poem in its distant, pagan context: Chaucer's pagan characters believe in the necessity of destiny while the narrator believes in free will.[78] This historical and philosophical approach to the poem has mostly excluded the study of joy: the notion of predestination rather leads to the poem's tragic ending and as emotions are often perceived as spontaneous, they do not fit into a discussion of free will. But this is, I believe, an unfortunate omission. The study of joy is highly appropriate in the context of chance and human agency: joy is an emotion which is often felt and written as outside of human control and agency, always a gift of chance and yet also sought after and created by the lovers' freely willed love.

While it is set in the historical past, the poem provides a vivid account of day-to-day life and interiority, so much so that early critics have called it the first psychological novel.[79] The poem has always generated a great interest in its characters and their psychological lives. But emotions themselves have only too rarely been the object of criticism in their own right. This is beginning to change, as some studies approach the poem through analysis of emotions and, invariably, the body. Indeed, the first studies in which emotions gained prominence are studies on gestures.[80] But once again, this focus on embodiment led to an insistence on negative emotions. Troilus' swoon of shock and sorrow as well as his tears

[77] Jill Mann, 'Chance and Destiny in *Troilus and Criseyde* and *The Knight's Tale*', in Jill Mann and Piero Boitani (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Chaucer*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, 93-111, p.97.
[78] Alastair J. Minnis, *Chaucer and Pagan Antiquity*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1982, p.70
[79] See Karl Young's summary of this trend, citing Kittredge and Selincourt. Karl Young, 'Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* as Romance', *Modern Language Association*, 53:1, 1938, 38-63, p.38.
[80] R. G. Benson, *Medieval Body Language: A Study of the Use of Gesture in Chaucer's Poetry*, Anglistica, 21, 1980; Barry Windeatt, 'Gesture in Chaucer', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 9, 1979, 143-161.

have generated several studies,[81] and Mary Frances Wack offers a medical reading of Troilus' sorrows as lovesickness.[82]

A different trend of criticism, much less focused on characters and their internal states, is exemplified by another very influential scholar, E. Talbot Donaldson and his New Critical approach. Donaldson pays close attention to the self-contained text and its inherent contrasts and paradoxes. In his view, the ending does not invalidate the joy of earthly love as ironic, but it creates an irresolute paradox where Chaucer's poetry exposes the 'necessity under which men lie of living in, making the best of, enjoying, and loving a world from which they must remain detached and which they must ultimately hate'.[83] This emphasis on duality and paradox is a staple in *Troilus*' criticism, whether it is to oppose two strands in the poem, as Robertson did with the apparent celebration of earthly love and its subsequent condemnation, or to bring them together in an inseparable and complex coexistence. Donald W. Rowe argues for a harmonisation of contraries in the poem. This harmonisation is made through a symbolic reading of the poem, as the critic finally regards Troilus and Criseyde's love as an imperfect mirror of divine love. Eventually, the poem achieves the 'union of human tragedy with God's comedy'.[84]

This leads us to one of the most important aspect of the poem's duality and its criticism: the generic duality between tragedy and comedy. The poem presents itself as a tragedy: 'Go, litel bok, go, litel myn tragedye' (V, 1786) and yet very soon afterwards also

---

[81] Jill Mann, 'Troilus' Swoon', *The Chaucer Review*, 14:4, 1980, 319-35; Gretchen Mieszkowski, 'Revisiting Troilus' Faint', in Pugh and Smith Marzec (eds.), *Men and Masculinities*, 43-57; Mary Carruthers, 'On Affliction and Reading, Weeping and Argument: Chaucer's Lachrymose Troilus in Context', *Representations*, 93, 2006, 1-21; Simon Meecham-Jones, '"He in Salte Teres Dreynte": Understanding Troilus's Tears', in Stephanie Downes, Andrew Lynch and Katrina O'Loughlin (eds.), *Emotions and War: Medieval to Romantic Literature*, New York, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015, 77-97.

[82] Mary Frances Wack, 'Lovesickness in *Troilus*', *Pacific Coast Philology*, 19:1/2, 1984, 55-61.

[83] E. Talbot Donaldson, 'The Ending of Chaucer's *Troilus*', in E. Talbot Donaldson, *Speaking of Chaucer*, New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1970, 84-101, p.100.

[84] Donald R. Rowe, *O Love, O Charite! Contraries Harmonized in Chaucer's Troilus*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press, 1976, p.141.

offers a conventionally Dantean comic ending through Troilus' flight to the eighth sphere. Admittedly, divine comedy and a tragic trajectory are not necessarily paradoxical. John Steadman, who traces the origins and the tradition of Troilus' final 'disembodied laughter', argues that this final laughter 'reinforces tragic (or epic) decorum, yet it also accentuates the comic element already strongly enunciated in his work.'[85] Eventually, he calls the poem an ironic tragedy, emphasizing the continuous tension between tragedy and comedy all throughout the poem.

Ironic tragedy is an epithet which would be well suited to Robertson's conception of Chaucerian tragedy and to his reading of *Troilus*. For Robertson, Chaucerian tragedy casts Troilus as a sinner: by choosing Criseyde and earthly love's pleasures he abandons reason and becomes a slave to Fortune. But a later critic argues for Troilus' blamelessness in the format of Chaucerian tragedy. Henry Ansgar Kelly describes the tragedy of *Troilus* simply as a lamentation, where the hero falls from prosperity to sadness, without being faulted for his fall.[86] In this reading, Troilus' love and joy do not have to be ironic and are, in fact, good. Ansgar Kelly insists on the importance of the joyful passages in the poem, arguing that 'the outstanding characteristic of the *Troilus* in terms of Chaucer's definition of tragedy is that the "prosperite for a tyme" takes such a long time to set forth that the readers are induced to enter into it so fully as to forget about the coming adversity.'[87] But eventually therefore, the 'memorable and totally consuming' account of the lovers' happiness only serves to make its loss more painful.[88] A tragic reading of the poem thus either sees joy as ironic or as a ploy to increase the sorrow of its inevitable loss for both the readers and protagonists. But, while it lasts, the prosperous part of the poem allows for some intense moments of joy as well as for a good dose of humour, which even drove some critics to look at the poem as a comedy.

---

[85] John Steadman, *Disembodied Laughter: Troilus and the Apotheosis Tradition: A Reexamination of Narrative and Thematic Contexts*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972, p.93.
[86] Henry Ansgar Kelly, *Chaucerian Tragedy*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2000, p.107.
[87] Ansgar Kelly, *Chaucerian Tragedy*, p.139.
[88] Ibid., p.94.

It is commonly accepted that comedy is one of the aspects Chaucer added to the poem which are absent from his direct source, Boccaccio's *Il Filostrato*. As Heffernan explains, comedy is brought in on one hand through the final divine comedy and on the other through the reworking of the character of Pandarus and 'the creation of a heroine with unique skills in coping with Fortune which contribute to her individual comedy.'[89] She is not the only critic to have argued for the link between the poem's comedy and the character of Criseyde. Alfred David explains that while the 'tragic hero is one who, like Troilus, expects the gifts of Fortune to be permanent and for whom the loss of those gifts is irretrievable', Criseyde knows of the transience of earthly goods and still enjoys them, thus not falling victim of Fortune: 'the movement of this kind of Chaucerian comedy is a going around in circles.'[90] Moreover, Criseyde further distinguishes herself from Troilus in that her laughter is neither celestial nor contemptuous, but bodily. This form of humour, also shared by Pandarus, values 'the pleasures of eating, loving, and being alive'.[91] David's reading recognises that the poem offers a form of joy which transcends and is not subjected to the tragedy of Fortune and the Christian renunciation of earthly love.

Comedy in *Troilus and Criseyde* thus seems to rely on the body; Gretchen Mieszkowski shows how Chaucer 'introduces into his scenes of romantic love an alien perspective on love's worth and meaning, the fabliau perspective: love as carnal desire.'[92] She further argues that the poet moves away from the romance tradition by allotting so much space to his consummation scene in what she calls 'a tour de force combining sensuousness and nobility.'[93] But, she argues, comedy is also mainly encompassed in the character of Pandarus, whose presence in the couple's affair destabilizes the elevation and idealisation of

[89] Carol Falvo Heffernan, *Boccaccio, Chaucer and Comedy*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2009, p.104.
[90] Alfred David, 'Chaucerian Comedy and Criseyde', in Mary Salu (ed.), *Essays on 'Troilus and Criseyde'*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1980, 90-104, p.93.
[91] Ibid., p.91.
[92] Gretchen Mieszkowski, 'Chaucerian Comedy', in Classen (ed.), *Laughter in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times*, 457-480, p.458.
[93] Mieszkowski, 'Chaucerian Comedy', p.469.

their love. While studies on comedy should not be viewed as studies on joy – joy is a serious matter in Chaucer – they make space for the consideration of carnal pleasure and bodily joy in their own right and as crucial forces of the poem.

Body and emotions have further been considered by critics approaching the poem through a feminist perspective. Troilus' swoon and his constant tears have often been read as representative of his passive and feminine character. But Jill Mann reads Troilus' passivity as 'his unreserved surrender to the force of love' which is, she argues, not presented as a sign of weakness or emasculation but of 'generous nobility'.[94] His feelings are hence celebrated and his swoon becomes part of 'the mutual surrender of each partner to the other.'[95] Mann does not deal with the lovers' joy, but by reading their emotional process of falling in love as mutual surrendering rather than as the result of Pandarus' manipulation, and by arguing for the generous and noble quality of human emotions, she allows for their desire and their pleasure to remain untainted.

Carolyn Dinshaw, another prominent feminist scholar, is less interested in sentiments but instead exposes the particular masculine mode of reading of both the poem's famous male critics, Robertson and Donaldson, and the poem's male personas, Troilus, Pandarus and the narrator. She laments their obsessive need for unity, hierarchy and order, which constrains the feminine – the text and carnal love and therefore also earthly joy. She views the Epilogue as a reductive attempt to impose closure on the narrative.[96] Her approach reaches towards a more positive reading of the poem, but it still looks at it, and its joy, in light of the dismissive ending – albeit qualified as reductive.

Some recent criticism, however, is starting to free itself from this imposition. Barry Windeatt offers a new study on love and its conventional encoding in the poem. He

---

[94] Jill Mann, *Feminizing Chaucer*, 2nd edition, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2002, p.129.
[95] Mann, 'Troilus' Swoon', p.326.
[96] Carolyn Dinshaw, 'Reading Like a Man: The Critics, the Narrator, Troilus and Pandarus', in *Chaucer's Sexual Poetics*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989, 28-64.

concludes that the religious and heavenly discourse of earthly love does not need to be read as ironical but rather as celebratory: it expresses, in contemporary idiom, the humility felt by Troilus in the face of his experience of love.[97] Moreover, Windeatt notes that while modern critics have often been quick to recognize the poem's multiplicity of perspectives, they have never regarded the ending as just 'one among that multiplicity.'[98] Similarly, Murton argues for the inadequacy of looking at the poem's narrative, complaints, letters and lyrics in light of the moral ending.[99] These new approaches allow for a critical appreciation and valuation of the representation of earthly love in the poem, and, consequently, of earthly joy.

Modern studies on the poem and its representation of love have often tended to establish a hierarchy of types of love and therefore, indirectly, of types of joy as well.[100] But, as more recent studies show, the poem rather disrupts and overturns hierarchy. C. David Benson touches on this phenomenon when he argues that *Troilus and Criseyde* represents the diversity of love rather than the opposition of two types of love, earthly and divine. The proem of the third book, he argues, is the repository of all kinds of love – natural, divine, carnal, pagan, cosmic – and its blending of literary styles as well as 'its lack of a clear hierarchical structure' emphasize this very diversity.[101] Benson advocates for a criticism which acknowledges diversity and this lack of hierarchy in all aspects of the poem. This also means going beyond the duality which is present in so many pieces of criticism.

---

[97] Barry Windeatt, '*Troilus and Criseyde:* Love in a Manner of Speaking', in Helen Cooney (ed.), *Writings on Love in the English Middle Ages*, New York, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, 81-97.
[98] Ibid., p.95.
[99] Murton, 'Praying with Boethius', p.313.
[100] Robertson of course has argued for the primacy of divine love over earthly love, but other critics have created an inverse hierarchy. Elizabeth Salter thus argues that Chaucer brings holiness to earthly love and by doing so rejects Christian doctrine. '*Troilus and Criseyde:* a Reconsideration', in John Lawlor (ed.), *Patterns of Love and Courtesy: Essays in Memory of C.S. Lewis*, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1966, 86-106.
[101] C. David Benson, *Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde*, London: Unwin Hyman, 1990, p.125.

Approaching the poem through its writing and conceptualisation of the emotion of joy allows us to go beyond binarism and beyond hierarchy. The writing of joy in the poem presents a plurality of discourses: the emotion is conceived alternatively as social, philosophical, sexual and divine. Most importantly, it shows that the poem cannot be read as contrasting earthly and heavenly joy simply because a Boethian and philosophical joy is also at play, correlated to but different from the perfect happiness of heaven. The poem rather proposes a triad of sovereign joys: earthly and sensual, philosophical and objective, heavenly and elevated – each of these diverse but united. The study of joy upsets any binary or hierarchical reading of the poem.

Finding Joy in *Troilus and Criseyde*

Studying joy is therefore, I believe, a necessary advancement of both the field of *Troilus and Criseyde* criticism and that of the history of emotion. In medieval culture and literature, there is an uncertainty about whether joy is a physical emotion, a spiritual destination or a philosophical value. This uncertainty simultaneously explains the reluctance of critics to approach it as an object of analysis and points towards the very necessity of doing so. Chaucer exploits this uncertainty in his poem, where he uses and blends varied discourses of joy and where the joy of romantic love is compared and contrasted to both philosophical felicity and heavenly bliss. Hence, the poem eventually reshapes what joy is. This thesis thus shows that, in order to find joy in literature, it is necessary to reconsider what an emotion may be and to expand its definition, beyond the body and beyond individual psychosomatism.

In order to bring the study of emotion beyond the body and make space for joy, the first thing to look at is language and the way emotion is written and narrated. This forces us to recognize the multiplicity of cultural, theoretical and social discourses that shape the

conceptualisation of emotion. The first chapter of this thesis is primarily linguistic and lexicographic; it aims at mapping Chaucer's lexis of joy and its semantics and establishes the specificity of *Troilus and Criseyde's* use of this diction. In order to do so, the available lexis of joy and happiness in Middle English first needs to be surveyed and categorised. This categorisation demonstrates that Chaucer's use of lexis challenges pre-established sense divisions; the author's literary deployment of joy-related words relies on tone, register and context to construct the words' semantics. This first chapter thus shows the contours of joy in the poem by delineating the different registers or fields of discourse to which the emotion belongs in Chaucer's writing.

This understanding is crucial for a complete appreciation of the poem's construction and especially its characterisation. In the second chapter, I argue, firstly, that characters are constructed through their use of the different emotional registers uncovered in chapter one. These registers shape their specific expressive and affective modes. Secondly, I argue that the language of joy is especially revealing for our understanding of characterisation as it is both an internal emotion and a life's goal: an end in itself, individually understood and conceptualised.

In the third chapter, the body is given pride of place although its analysis rather confirms joy's lack of embodiment. The chapter looks at the embodiment of emotions in general as comparative material for the representation of joy. What surfaces is that Chaucer writes the body both materially and physiologically as well as metaphorically and socially. The body of joy is primarily the latter. Joy does not seem to have the cultural and aesthetic bodily encoding that sorrow does; it thus stays intangible except when it is actuated as public behaviour, sexual action or embodied metaphor.

Finally, this study of joy in *Troilus and Criseyde* ends with a close analysis of the grammar – verbal, temporal, spatial, poetic, figurative – into which it is written. This grammar can be idiosyncratic at times but also belongs to broader cultural and theoretical

discourses. The poem's formal grammar appears to compromise the experience of present, embodied joy. Crucially, it constructs a joy which is exterior to the body by turning it into a place or an abstraction. The poem circumscribes its writing of joy in a philosophical and moral language of happiness as an immaterial good while simultaneously transcending and qualifying this conception by giving a place to the feeling of earthly, sensual joy in and for itself.

Studying joy offers a new approach to the poem, and opens a new area in the history of emotion; an area for the study of positive affectivity as distinct from embodied sorrow. Eventually, joy exceeds the very definition of emotion; my study hence redefines how we determine and detect emotionality in Middle English writing. Moreover, while joy has often been discarded in studies of the poem because it is perceived as ironic and it is somewhat buried under the dense and palpable deployment of sorrow, I argue that *Troilus and Criseyde* should be read as a search for what joy truly is, between philosophical happiness, heavenly bliss and human joy. Joy is difficult to find and to identify in the poem because it is fragmented and volatile. It is often disembodied and yet originates in carnal pleasure; its writing often verges on philosophical abstraction and yet it is amorous and earthly; it is an emotion and yet it is exterior and objective. I argue that the poet depicts an earthly joy which goes beyond the humoural body and which is (a) good in itself – joy is written as a value, but a felt value.

CHAPTER ONE
THE SEMANTICS OF JOY

Introduction

What is joy? In both Chaucer's English and Modern English its semantics are hard to establish. And while Chaucer's words of positive emotion may appear readily comprehensible for a modern reader, the modern concepts of joy and happiness cannot be mapped straightforwardly onto Middle English concepts. As Philippa Maddern argues, the task of the historian of emotion is first and foremost one of translation: words have 'culturally determined meaning-sets' and it is 'the translator's duty to be able to explain to the reader what set of connotations and signs comprise the meaning of the relevant term in the original text; and it is these explanations which, I believe, lie at the heart of emotions history.'[1] This is the task this first chapter aims to accomplish for Chaucer's lexicon of joy. This is an arduous task however: how does one go about defining the semantical range of joy in Middle English? One approach is to go to the Historical Thesaurus of the *OED* and its conceptual lexicon.[2] The Thesaurus classifies the content of the dictionary taxonomically and chronologically. It uses the method of the conceptual map: words are indexed under different concepts which range from the broadest – i. e. the internal world – to the narrowest – i. e. merriment. A relatively exhaustive list of concepts and lexis can thus be created with

[1] Philippa Maddern, '"It Is Full Merry in Heaven": The Pleasurable Connotations of 'Merriment' in Late Medieval England', in Cohen-Hanegbi and Nagy (eds.), *Pleasure in the Middle Ages*, 21-38, p.23.
[2] http://www.oed.com/thesaurus/

this tool. There is a range of meanings: from religious bliss to earthly prosperity, from entertainment to sensual pleasure. Chaucer's lexis can then be mapped onto it.

As useful as this tool is, the present chapter also reveals its shortcomings. When observing these words in Chaucer's corpus, where they occur and what company they keep, those conceptualisations become somewhat counterproductive. For example, when faced by the fact that neither the words *joy* nor *gladnesse* (and the adjective *glad*) appear in Chaucer's comic tales, the maps offer no satisfactory explanation.[3] The Thesaurus classifies these terms as prototypical, encompassing such varied concepts as 'delight', 'entertainment', 'rejoicing', or both religious and amorous joy: nothing that could justify their absence from the fabliaux. Conceptual mapping does not account for literary 'lexical tailoring'[4], for registers and style, genre and tone.[5] The literary nature of Chaucer's language of joy therefore challenges conceptual maps and the work of lexicography. The words of joy in Chaucer are split into different 'fields of discourse' rather than clear sense divisions.[6] And thus, *joy* does not appear in the comic tales which, on the other hand, abound with words such as *joli, mirie* or *gai*. What explains their presence in a certain literary genre and their absence in another, is not their conceptual differences but Chaucer's conscious use of registers. The study of collocational patterns also uncovers a distinction in Chaucer's use of the lexis between a diction of joy as a human and situational emotion and a diction of joy as an abstract quality or value. The first part of this chapter presents the prototypical map of Chaucer's lexis of joy. It proposes to go beyond conceptual mapping through the exposition of context-

[3] This is true of the *Miller's* and the *Reeve's Tales* which are the fabliaux I shall concentrate on. In the other comic tales – the *Shipman's, Summoner's* and *Cook's Tales* – these words are extremely rare: *gladnesse* is absent, *joy* only appears once in the *Shipman's Tale* where *glad* also appears twice.
[4] Christopher Cannon, *The Making of Chaucer's English: A Study of Words*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, p.128.
[5] The *OED* does provide usage labels such as 'colloquial' or 'literary', but these indications are nowhere close to representing the complex and blended literary use of registers that is visible in an author like Chaucer.
[6] J. D. Burnley, *A Guide to Chaucer's Language*, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994, p.167.

dependent connotations and genre specific diction. As *Troilus and Criseyde* is a blend of different literary genres and registers, its lexis of joy is especially varied and points towards the necessity for an in-depth analysis of the textual contexts where those words appear. This analysis is the object of the second part of the chapter.

This second part analyses the diction of the different fields of discourse of joy in its situational and syntactical contexts. It focuses on *Troilus* but, in order to bring out the diction's complexity it also provides intertextual comparison. It is indeed necessary to consider the work amidst Chaucer's lexical landscape; lexis acquires connotations and semantic density through the author's conscious use of it across his different texts. What emerges from this exploration is the high mutability of the representation of joy; fixed sense categories are constantly challenged. Registers are blended in single texts but also in single passages: courtly words of entertainment are subverted to refer to sexuality in the fabliaux and the religious diction of joy is used in sensual and amorous scenes. The fluidity of joy's semantics is even visible in its syntactic context: while adjectives of sorrow often form fixed epithets of characters, and thus gesture towards emotion as inherent and permanent, the adjectives of positive emotion are always used predicatively, constructing an emotion which is a product of situation and action. However, the vocabulary of joy is mostly nominal in *Troilus* and thus also posits joy as an abstract property, be it romantic, spiritual or philosophical. The second part of this chapter also establishes Chaucer's originality in the handling of this diction by offering local comparisons with his sources. The representation of joy in the poem is fluid, its lexis is carefully chosen but it is also highly ambiguous. The sense of joy is contingent rather than conceptual. Registers are mixed and lexical expectations are frustrated: sexual pleasure is posited as *hevene blisse*, and heavenly bliss as *felicite*. The diction of joy in Chaucer, and especially *Troilus and Criseyde*, transcends categories of sense, conceptual and moral hierarchies. It challenges the very concept of emotion.

Mapping Chaucer's Diction of Joy

A Middle English Lexicon

The objective of this first chapter is to map the semantic world of joy in *Troilus and Criseyde*. How does the specific diction of joy in *Troilus and Criseyde* relate to that of Chaucer's oeuvre as a whole? How does that oeuvre map onto what we can determine about the Middle English lexicon available to Chaucer? Uncovering the entire Middle English vocabulary of joy is not a simple task, and exhaustiveness is almost impossible. In order to do this, conceptual mapping is a necessary methodological tool. The linguist Malgorzata Fabiszak uses conceptual mapping in order to analyse the semantic prototypes of joy in Old and Middle English. Her study offers a great first entry into the medieval vocabulary of joy and how it has evolved according to cultural and social changes.

Fabiszak's method consists of isolating a list of chosen core words in both Old and Middle English and evaluating the use of these words through corpora analysis. Her aim is to 'arrive at a description of the semantic structure of the concept of "joy" in OE and ME periods as well as to pinpoint changes that the concept underwent over this time. The concept of "joy" is here understood as a mental representation of the meaning of a lexical field.'[7] In order to arrive at this conceptualisation, the linguist analyses the collocational patterns and the adjectival and verb phrases into which her core terms are written. This allows her to categorise the words according to their cause and expression – this categorisation eventually becomes the final product of her study. This is a useful product for the present inquiry as it

[7] Malgorzata Fabiszak, *The Concept of 'Joy' in Old and Middle English: A Semantic Analysis*, Pila: Wyzsza Szkola Biznesu, 2001, p.1.

offers a first categorised list of core words. What emerges strongly is that the primary locus of joy was religious: especially the spiritual contentment of heaven.

Fabiszak shows that in the Old English lexis, while most words belong to several categories, all can be used to express heavenly joy, except *glaednes,* a word which is much less frequent than the others. The remaining terms *bliss, blithe, dream, gefea, liss, mirth* and *wynsumnes* can all be used in religious contexts and *bliss* could even be used as a synonym for heaven.[8] The other important cause or function of joy is a social one. Joy was brought about by entertainment and relationship, especially, in the Anglo-Saxon period, that with one's Lord and fellow knights. This distinction between spiritual and secular joy is preserved in Middle English, but instead of the relationship between lord and retainers, it is now mainly the romantic relationship between a man and a woman, which procures earthly joy. Moreover, the religious predominance recedes somewhat as, in her list of Middle English words, she finds that 'only' five out of nine are used in religious contexts. These words are *blisse, blithe, gladnesse* and *mirthe*, of Old English origin, and the newly borrowed from French *joy.* The category of romantic love includes the words: *blisse, chere, delite, gainesse, joy, mirthe*.[9]

Fabiszak also notes the development of sense of these words, from Old to Middle English. The terms used to express religious joy have been kept – *blisse, blithe, mirthe*. But *gladnesse* also develops a 'religion-related sense absent from Old English data'[10]. The new literary interest in romantic, heterosexual relationship has brought about the use of new words such as *delite, chere* and *gainesse*, all of Old French origin – the language of most courtly literature on romantic love. *Joy* is quite interesting as it becomes the most common word to express positive feeling, used as much in religious, courtly or social contexts such as entertainment or family ties. *Blisse* is still the most prototypical word for heavenly joy.

[8] Fabiszak, *Concept of Joy*, p.44.
[9] Ibid., p.89-90.
[10] Ibid., p.86

'However', notes Fabiszak, 'it simultaneously comes to be used in connection with sexual pleasure and power, both of which arouse negatively coloured emotions'.[11] The linguist thus creates patterns of sense by focussing on the connections between the semantics of the lexis of joy and broader social and cultural facts. She achieves a level of generality from quite precise linguistic observations. But this wish for generalization sometimes leads to a dismissal of precise context. Her corpus is not clearly delimited, and she does not always cite where her examples come from.

Nevertheless, Fabiszak's study is useful as it offers a map of distribution of terms along with their cultural associations. The Historical Thesaurus of the *OED* offers a similar kind of map, though it is more interested in mental concepts than cultural ones. It is also much more exhaustive. The resource allows readers to look for concepts rather than single words. Each concept presents a list of terms used to refer to it. The Thesaurus also organizes the words chronologically, dating them by their first and last recorded appearance. This tool allows for the creation of a list of organized lexis, an invaluable tool for the understanding of the lexical landscape in which Chaucer is situated. In order to keep it manageable, the following list is restricted to nouns; it presents the nouns relating to joy which were available in Middle English, separated into different categories of sense. To create it, I have picked words in the Thesaurus concept 'Pleasure or Enjoyment', which is itself a subcategory of 'The Mind' and 'Emotion or Feeling'. 'Pleasure or Enjoyment' then offers its own group of subcategories, from which results the following table. This list considers only the words that are also indexed in the *MED*.[12]

[11] Fabiszak, *Concept of Joy*, p.87

[12] The Thesaurus spelling is retained in the table. Elsewhere, spelling follows *MED* conventions. Some of the categories from the Thesaurus have changed slightly since the creation of these tables, but the general principle of categorisation stays the same.

CONCEPTS	TERMS
Pleasure or Enjoyment	este
	jollity
	lust
	lustfulness
	lustihead
	lustiness
	lusting
	mirth
	pleasance
	queem
	sweetness
	volupte
	win
Contentment and Satisfaction	pleasing
	suffisance
Happiness	bliss
	blissfulness
	eadiness
	felicity
	seeliness
	sele
Joy, Gladness and Delight	blithenesse
	comfort
	deinte
	delectacioun
	delicacy
	delice
	delight
	deliting
	glad
	gladhede
	gladness
	gladship
	hight
	joy
	lightnesse
	liss
	list
	merrinesse
	mirth
	play
	will
	win
Rejoicing and Exultation	glading
	glee
	joy
	mirth
Merriment	jolinesse
	jolite
	merrinesse

This list of nouns, though possibly not entirely exhaustive, shows the important range in the semantic field of positive emotion. The categories in this table reveal a different method of conceptual mapping than that of the historical linguist Fabiszak. Whereas she formulated categories according to cause and expression, the Thesaurus attempts a classification according to different prototypes inherent to the concept of joy or 'Enjoyment'. The category 'Happiness' represents a state which is perceived as relatively long-lasting and objective whereas 'Rejoicing and Exultation' connotes a short-lived and intense emotion. The Thesaurus thus omits important distinctions in meaning such as secular or religious and public or private – distinctions inferred through context.

Both methods suggest a stability of meaning and use, which is arguably overstated. Moreover, the Thesaurus' conceptualisations are often modern ones. For example, in the category 'Happiness' – a term which did not exist in Middle English – the editors place words which connote either the perfect happiness of heaven (*edinesse* and *blisse*) or earthly prosperity (*sele* and *felicite*). What these have in common is the fact that they are states, even objective states, rather than spontaneous emotions.[13] *Joy* is excluded from this category, appearing only in 'Joy, Gladness and Delight' and 'Rejoicing and Exultation', both of which connote feelings that are much more subjective, spontaneous, and short-lived: the pleasure of *delite* and its variants, alleviation from sorrow or pain (*comfort, lightnesse, lisse*) or playful entertainment. Stretching from sensuous delight to Christian hopeful joy (*hight)*, these categories only seem to exclude the objectivity and longevity of the state of happiness, be it on earth or in heaven. And this is where, according to modern minds at least, *joy* belongs. But the *MED* defines *joy* as both 'a feeling of happiness or pleasure' (1. (a)) and a condition of life: '1. (c) live happily'. It also defines it as the objective 'place of perfect joy, heaven, paradise' (2. (b)). *Joy* in Middle English could very well express what we now

[13] *MED*: *edinesse* '1.(a) The state of the blessed in heaven' and *felicite* '1.(a) Prosperous circumstances, prosperity'

understand under the term *happiness.* Its connotational range appears much more volatile and dependent on particular context than Fabiszak and the Historical Thesaurus initially seem to suggest.

While some are more subjective than others, all the terms of the previous table are understood by the Thesaurus to be internal experiences felt by the individual. They are part of the meta-categories 'The Mind' and 'Emotion'. But other words connoting joy are found in the opposite category of 'The External World'. From this meta-category, two entries are relevant: the concept of 'Prosperity', a subcategory of 'Action or Operation', and that of 'Joy or Bliss of Heaven', a subcategory of 'The Supernatural', 'Deity' and 'Heaven'. I have thus created a separate table for those words:

CONCEPTS	TERMS
Prosperity	bon-chef
	bote
	felicite
	goder hele
	hele
	helthe
	prosperite
	thedom
	wele
	welefulnesse
	welfare
	welthe
Joy or Bliss of Heaven	bliss
	joy

None of the words from the category 'Prosperity' appeared in the previous table except for *felicite*. They form a relatively homogenous semantic type: they refer to a happiness which is objective, and which relies on factual earthly conditions of health, well-being and wealth. *Wele* and *welthe* refer to 'worldly wealth' (1. (a) and 2.(a.)) as well as happiness and prosperity, whereas *hele* and *helthe* are more concerned with health and well-being. *Thedom*

is defined as '(a) activity, vigour, growth; also, industry; (b) prosperity, success' and hence almost implies self-made happiness. However, this 'external' concept of prosperity is not solely secular, indeed the ultimate health and affluence is always spiritual. And so, *hele* and *helthe* can also mean 'salvation' (3. (a) and 2.(a)) and *wele* and *welthe* also refer to 'heavenly joy, eternal bliss' (*wele* 2. (e)) or 'a state of beatitude or blessedness' (*welthe* 3.). Conceptual mapping obscures this secular/religious overlap. It forms a separate category for the 'joy of heaven', which the editors of the Thesaurus categorise as 'external' and which only includes *blisse* and *joy*. The Thesaurus' conceptual method reveals important issues at play in the lexis of positive emotion: joy can be external and objective and therefore, perhaps, not an emotion. However, this method raises more questions than it answers and points toward the unavoidable need to look at the way these terms are written and what particular literary contexts they enter.

Chaucer's Diction of Joy

Chaucer uses most of the nouns previously listed. Some, however, are only used in their first meaning, so *hele* mostly refers to health and healing in Chaucer. Some seem to have fallen out of favour by the time of his writing such as *edinesse* which the author does not use at all and some only start to be used such as *thedom* which Chaucer only uses once to express bad luck ('yvel thedam' *Shipman's Tale* VII, 1595). Others such as *winne, queme* or *este* are absent from his vocabulary for reasons that may be geographical and dialectal. But several words have their first recorded appearance in his work, which might indicate that Chaucer himself coined and brought them into usage. In Christopher Cannon's concordance, the words *blisfulnesse, delicacie, delicat, felicite, jolinesse, lustihede, lustinesse, suffisaunce* and *welefulnesse* are all indexed as having their first recorded use in Chaucer's writing. Most of these words come from Old French (*delicat, delicacie, felicite,*

jolinesse, suffisaunce) but some have been coined from Old English morphemes to suit a particular textual context (*blisfulnesse* and *welefulnesse* for his translation of Boethius' *Consolation* and *lustinesse* for his translation of the *Roman de la Rose*).[14] Chaucer's innovations in the Middle English vocabulary of joy thus operate principally in the categories of philosophical happiness, often derived from Latin, and French courtly merriment.

Before registers can be considered though, Chaucer's main terminology of joy must be established.[15] The following tables present the frequency in which semantic tokens are used in Chaucer's entire corpus and in *Troilus and Criseyde* specifically. The vocabulary is examined prototypically; words of the same family are grouped together under one lexical unit: *glade* (v.), *glad* (adj.), *gladli* (adv.) and *gladnesse* (n.) are all comprised in the unit *glad*.

LEXIS	Chaucer's Corpus
bliss	299
glad	257
joy	232
delit	159
mirthe	116
plesaunce	99
wele	82
joli	64
lusti	61
seli	47
gay	43
prosperite	41
suffisaunce	36
solas	21
felicite	19
blithe	18

LEXIS	*Troilus and Criseyde*
joy	90
glad	78
bliss	51
plesaunce	20
delit	16
lusti	13
seli	12
mirthe	8
wele	8
felicite	5
joli	6
solas	4
suffisaunce	4
blithe	3
prosperite	2
gay	1

[14] Cannon places *lustinesse* among several other words that Chaucer creates by derivation from existing Old English morphemes, here the adjective *lusti* and the suffix *–nesse,* in order to translate French terms from the *Roman. Lustinesse* is created to translate the Old French *riant* – literally 'laughing'. Cannon, *The Making of Chaucer's English*, pp.81-84.

[15] For this reason, words only rarely used to mean joy (such as *fresh, lisse, chere* or *happy*) are omitted.

In both tables,[16] the most frequently used lexical clusters are *bliss*, *glad* and *joy*, three units which seem to form the core terminology of positive emotions in Chaucer's corpus. Chaucer's vocabulary thus appears broadly consistent with the Thesaurus table, where words of those families are well represented and belong to the more prototypical categories of 'Happiness' and 'Joy, Gladness and Delight'. Observed thus prototypically, the lexicon of joy in *Troilus and Criseyde* is not unrepresentative of Chaucer's corpus as a whole. Though the poem's strong preference for *joy* – over *glad* and *bliss* – is one striking particularity. *Plesaunce* and *delit* which belong to a more sensual realm of positive emotion are also at the top of the frequency list. In the whole corpus however, *plesaunce* is dethroned by *mirthe*. *Mirthe* expresses entertainment and merry-making and its relative rarity in *Troilus and Criseyde* seems to point towards a preference for individual rather than collective joy in the poem.[17] The category of earthly prosperity is also quite well represented through the words *wele, suffisaunce, prosperite* and the rarer *felicite*. The frequency of this last word is noteworthy, as out of a mere nineteen occurrences in total, it appears five times in *Troilus.* The terms *joli, lusti* and *gai*, words which denote a joyful behaviour but also youth, vigour and attractiveness all stand in the middle of the list; common enough but not crucial in the vocabulary of joy. *Joli* and *gai* become almost irrelevant in the poem. All in all, the semantic

[16] All word frequencies have been created by me with the concordance programme *AntConc*. The spelling used is that established by Larry D. Benson in his own concordance of Chaucer's work and which is in line with *MED* spelling conventions. The only difference is that I use the spelling *joy* rather than *joie.* My word frequencies concur most of the time with those of Benson with a few discrepancies. Most of these discrepancies can be explained by the fact that I have included in my corpus the short poems *Against Women Unconstant, Complaynt d'Amours, Merciles Beaute* and *A Balade of Complaint* which the Riverside includes as 'Poems Not Ascribed to Chaucer in the Manuscripts' (Larry D. Benson, *The Riverside Chaucer*, 3rd edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987, pp.657-60) and which Benson excludes from his concordance. Like Benson, however, I have excluded from my corpus the fragments B and C from the *Romaunt of the Rose* as they are now very commonly recognized as not being authored by Chaucer. Larry Dean Benson, *A Glossarial Concordance to the Riverside Chaucer*, vol.1, New York & London: Garland, 1993.

[17] Diller confirms that *mirthe* was mainly used for collective emotion; in his study of the word in romances he notices that mirth is 'an improbable label for an individual emotion.' *Words for Feelings*, p.287.

tokens used in Chaucer's corpus represent the same sort of variety and range observed in the Middle English lexis of joy. The principal words are the more prototypical ones, followed by terms connoting sensuality, entertainment and prosperity. This, however, is only one stage in the exploration of this lexicon, the next one looks at the different components comprised under those tokens.

Token	Components	Chaucer's Corpus	Troilus and Criseyde
	blisful	116	22
	blisfulli	3	2
	blisfulnesse	85	0
	blisse	95	27
bliss		299	51
blithe		18	3
	delicacie	3	0
	delicat	10	0
	delices	26	0
	delicious	2	1
	delit (n.)	83	8
	delite (v.)	35	7
delit		159	16
felicite		19	5
gai		43	1
	glad (adj.)	133	43
	glade (v.)	37	15
	gladli	43	2
	gladnesse	44	18
glad		257	78
	joli	43	4
	jolinesse	2	0
	jolite	19	1
joli		64	6
	joy	223	90
	joiful	8	0
	joious	1	0
joy		232	90
	lusti	53	11
	lustihede	4	0
	lustinesse	4	2
lusti		61	13
	mirie	73	7
	mirinesse	1	0
	mirthe	42	1
mirthe		116	8
plesaunce		99	20
prosperite		41	2
	seli	44	9
	selinesse	3	3
seli		47	12
solas		21	4
suffisaunce		36	4
	wele	31	8
	weleful	20	0
	welefulnesse	31	0
wele		82	8

This table presents both token words and grammatical terms and their frequency in *Troilus* and the entire corpus in a comparative, like-for-like basis. This evaluation of the grammatical use of words sheds light on the previous tables: *bliss* only overtakes *joy* as a token in the corpus because of the strong presence of the noun *blisfulnesse,* which is unique to the *Boece*. This table also reveals important differences in the use of adjectives and nouns. Most notably, whereas *blisse* and *blisful* are both used frequently, the poet barely uses the adjectives *joyful* and *joyous* and, in *Troilus, joy* is solely nominal. The contrary is true for the token *glad,* which is most often used as an adjective. However, while the noun *gladnesse* is rare in the whole corpus, it is used eighteen times in the *Troilus,* which represents forty percent of its total usage. The poem's diction favours nominal joy: the nouns *joy, blisse, gladnesse, plesaunce,* and even *felicite* are all abundant in the poem proportionate to Chaucer's general use of this lexis. This is all the more striking, as, in a narrative poem so interested in the emotional lives of its characters, one would expect a propensity for adjectives of emotion. Diller, in his study of the words *joy* and *mirthe* in some Middle English texts (though he does not use any of Chaucer's works), notices that Middle English romances[18] use these words very sparingly as 'they may prefer to express emotions by adjectives and verbs rather than nouns.'[19] Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde,* a romance in many ways, thus seems to offer a unique mode of narrating emotions. The presence of numerous lyrical monologues in *Troilus* can offer a first explanation as Diller notices a much higher use of these nouns in his sample of short lyrical poems. With the less common words, the opposite trend is seen: *lusti, mirie* and *joli* are much more frequent than their related nouns – be it in the poem or the whole corpus. Those grammatical preferences are a first indication of Chaucer's tendency to tailor his diction of joy according to texts and contexts.

[18] He uses romances dealing with the Matter of England such as *King Horn* and *Havelok the Dane,* Breton lays such as *Sir Orfeo* and *Emaré,* and tail-rhyme romances such as *The King of Tars* and *Sir Isumbras*.
[19] Diller, *Words for Feelings*, p.286.

Before turning to context, a local comparison with other authors is necessary to bring out Chaucer's particular use of the lexis. A brief look at the lexis of some of his contemporaries show that Chaucer is not merely replicating a pre-existing discourse of joy. I propose to look at Gower's *Confessio Amantis* and Thomas Usk's *Testament of Love* as controls against which Chaucer's diction can be checked. The choice of this comparative material is justified by the fact that it offers different types of text – a collection of narrative courtly poems and a prose philosophical dialogue – yet is written in a language very similar to Chaucer's. Chaucer and Gower knew each other and belonged to the same London circle. David Burnley argues indeed that both authors had a similar audience among which 'there must have been those grounded in moral philosophy, political and administrative theory, even those with a taste for classical literature.'[20] Their language is therefore also similar; it derives from French courtly literature but is also concerned with 'secular ethics' as well as 'the more affective values of Christian teaching, and of the potential conflict between the two.' Burnley differentiates them from the provincial *Gawain*-poet whose lexical usage 'has a theological and even exegetical bias', as well as the Londoner Langland who, he argues, has more in common with the *Gawain*-poet.[21] Thomas Usk was a London scrivener, involved in politics and therefore belonged to a similar circle to Chaucer and Gower. Usk's language is familiar with the ideals of courtly love while also being scholastic and heavily indebted to Boethius. And, as Shoaf describes, 'like many Christians of the Middle Ages, he feels the attraction and the ambiguity of the uneasy couple, Christianity and Philosophy.'[22] The three authors thus share a language as well as thematic and ideological concerns.

[20] Burnley, *A Guide to Chaucer's Language*, p.8.
[21] Ibid., p.9.
[22] R. Allen Shoaf, 'Introduction', in *The Testament of Love*, Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, TEAMS Online, 1998.

Gower's *Confessio Amantis*[23]



Usk's *Testament of Love*[24]



These two word clouds present very different sets of diction. This prompts the conclusion that there is no standard lexis of joy in Middle English, or rather no standard literary deployment for it. Secondly, they expose some of Chaucer's preferences as idiosyncratic. Most importantly, while *joy* is an important noun in both texts, it is not their most used word. Gower prefers the adjectives *glad* and *lusti*, indicating perhaps a more courtly discourse, which favours adjectives over nouns for the writing of emotions. The *Confessio* indeed offers an interpretation of the seven deadly sins in the courtly love tradition. Usk on the other hand prefers *blisse*, which he uses densely, especially in Book II, to express sovereign happiness, the supreme good. Usk uses many more nouns than he does adjectives, which is unsurprising considering the nature of the text as a discursive dialogue. Chaucer's use of the diction in the *Troilus* thus may appear closer to philosophical discourse than courtly and poetic narrative. In fact, Chaucer uses both types of diction and also adds a religious register through the words *blisse* and *blisful* that seems absent from his contemporaries' oeuvres. Usk recasts *blisse* as a philosophical concept of happiness and Gower only uses *blisse* nine

[23] The word cloud for Gower's *Confessio Amantis* was created with the help of the poem's concordance by J. L. Dawson and J. D. Pickles, *A Concordance to Gower's* Confessio Amantis, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1987.
[24] Tables of frequency for these word clouds are provided in appendices 1 and 2.

times, twice to explicitly refer to earthly joy.[25] Chaucer's vocabulary of joy is more prolific and varied than these two authors' and seems to bring together what in these texts appears specific to their mode of discourse – courtly narrative poetry in one case and scholastic prose in the other.

Collocational Behaviours

The collocational behaviours of words are an invaluable source to establish the sense relationships produced in one particular author's corpus. Often, specific terms find themselves in similar lexical surroundings across different texts. Examining the colligates of joy is therefore the next stage in this exploration. It allows a first entrance into context without having to lose the larger picture that comparative tables make possible. As not every word presents clear collocational patterns, I am selecting here the words that offer some significant results. First up are the terms which form the main bulk of positive emotion lexis in Chaucer: *joy, glad* and *gladnesse, blisful* and *blisse*.[26] This first table presents their collocates in the whole of Chaucer's corpus. Some words have many more collocates than appear in the table. *Blisful,* for example, collocates twice with at least forty different terms. This abundance makes these irrelevant and emphasizes in comparison the significance of *god,* for example, with which it collocates eight times.

[25] 'Worldes blisse', *Confessio,* 1.1771 and 5.3642. Gower, *Confessio Amantis*, Russell A. Peck (ed.) and Andrew Galloway (trans.), 3 vols., Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, TEAMS Online, 2004.

[26] The adjectives *joiful* and *joious* are not frequent enough to tease out meaningful patterns, nor are the adverbs *blisfulli* and *gladli*. Under the token *glad* are comprised both the adjective and the verb, as they are not always distinguishable without contextual analysis; though the adjective is much more frequent. I have not included the word *blisfulnesse* as it is only present in one text, the *Boece*.

Whole corpus' collocates of the core lexis of joy

Lexis	Collocates					
blisful	man/men (12)	god (8)	venus (6)	folk (6)	maiden (6)	
blisse	joy (15)	hevene (9)	herte (5)	love (4)		
glad	herte (16)	chere (10)	blithe (6)			
gladnesse	wo (4)	joy (3)				
joy	blisse (15)	herte (10)	solas (6)	love (6)	worldli (5)	god (5)

Starting with the nouns, *blisse* and *joy* seem to enter a clear collocational pattern: they co-occur with each other and with other synonyms. Chaucer tends to place words of positive emotion in synonymous couplets: 'To joye and blisse to al this regne aboute' (*Man of Law's Tale*, II, 735), 'And Theseus with all joye and blis' (*Knight's Tale*, I, 1685) or 'And lede his lyf in joye and in solas' (*Merchant's Tale*, IV, 1273). The word *solas,* not in the table as it is not a core term, also participates in this model: it collocates with *joy* (6), *mirthe* (2) and *blisse* (2). This common feature equates different positive emotions by bringing them together as an abstracted form of happiness. This formula often has a summarizing and concluding effect, such as in this quote from the *Franklin's Tale*: 'And thus in joye and blisse I lete hem dwelle' (V, 1099). In terms of sense relations, both *joy* and *blisse* are related to love in Chaucer's corpus. And, whereas *joy* can be qualified as *worldli* or be associated with *god*, *blisse* collocates with *hevene* four times, making it the more prototypical term for spiritual joy. *Gladnesse,* on the other hand, does not appear as a preferred term for any specific type of joy nor does it enter the synonymic pattern: it collocates with both an antonym and a synonym.

The adjective *glad* appears as a favourite for the description of emotional states; hearts and faces (*chere* mostly refers to facial expression in Chaucer) are the most common collocates of *glad*. *Blisful*, on the other hand, offers quite unique sense relations, collocating with words such as *Venus* or *maiden*. Although its main collocate is *man*, eight out of these twelve references are from the *Boece* and in fact only in those eight quotes is *man/men* the direct referent of *blisful*. The same goes for *folk*: five out of the six collocations are from the

Boece. These collocations are hence particular to the philosophical context of the translation and are in fact not at all represented in the *Canterbury Tales* where the main collocates are *maiden* (6), *moder, lif* and *god* (4 each). Therefore, outside of the context of the *Boece*, the adjective is mostly used to refer to non-*men* – women and gods, and even especially female saints. The association of *blisful* with both *maiden* and *mooder* describes the Virgin Mary. In the *Prioress's Tale*, Mary is referred to as 'Oure blisful Lady, Cristes mooder', 'blisful Queene', 'blisful Lady free' or 'blissful Mayden free' (VII, 510, 481, 532 and 664). To be full of bliss is the defining quality of the saintly mother – a quality which is reserved to such godly figures.[27] *Blisful,* contrary to *glad,* does not inhere in human feeling and situation: it belongs to a diction of value rather than one of emotion. There thus emerges an important contrast in the way these words enter Chaucer's language; a contrast between a situational language of joy and one which writes joy as an abstract quality. This contrast is only visible once context – even as broad as collocational behaviour – is observed. It is not accounted for in lexicographical categories.

In *Troilus and Criseyde*, a similar pattern arises with *glad* and *blisful*, where the latter seems inaccessible to human characters but the nouns *joy* and *blisse* do not collocate with synonyms:

Troilus and Criseyde's collocates of the core lexis of joy

Lexis	Collocates			
blisful	venus (6)	god (3)	night (2)	
blisse	love (3)	hevene (3)	herte (2)	bathe (2)
glad	herte (4)	night (3)		
gladnesse				
joy	herte (4)	feste (4)	lif (3)	nevere (3)

[27] As Diller notices, *blisful* in Middle English often refers to the 'nature of the cause' of the emotion (such as Christ or the Passion) rather than the 'state of the experiencer', referred to by *joy* and its adjectives. Diller, *Words for Feelings*, p.273 and 277.

In terms of sense relations, the *Troilus* is relatively consistent with the whole corpus. Some particularities occur though: for example, *night* appears as a collocate of both *glad* and *blisful*, restricting joy in the poem to a moment in time. It is also revealing that the adjective *blisful* is used in relation to this night of sensual delight: it associates the lovers' consummation with the diction of joy as value rather than human feeling. In the poem, *blisful* is indeed mostly used to refer to gods (Venus, but also Jove or Cupid). *Glad,* on the other hand, refers to the characters themselves and their hearts. The adjective also has the particularity of being associated with speech: words, tales or matter are said to be *glad*.[28] *Glad* is an adjective of emotion which arises from human interaction.

The nouns' collocations in the poem show more flexibility than in the corpus as a whole. *Gladnesse* presents no significant collocates at all. And *joy* and *blisse* do not collocate with each other, nor with other synonyms. Positive emotions do not appear in fixed, formulaic phrases in the poem and are hence not allowed the finality promoted by this form. This absence of startlingly re-used collocational patterns in the poem indicates a more complex and context-reliant diction of joy. In terms of sense relations, *blisse*, as in the whole corpus, is linked to spiritual and romantic notions. But the collocates of *joy* do not offer as distinctive a picture. It collocates often both with *herte* and with *feste. Joy* thus appears to be both an internal and individual emotion as well as a communal and festive one. Moreover, the list of terms with which it collocates twice offers varied qualifications of the term. *Joy* can be *worldli* and *transitorie*, associated with *fortune* or *honour*. These terms bring forth different sense relations; *joy* enters the philosophical language of earthly transience and fortune, as well as the courtly language linking amatory joy to honour and therefore value. Yet, its link with *herte* also suggests its belonging to the diction of situational emotion.

[28] Appendix 3. offers a map of the different types of subjects and objects the adjectives *blisful* and *glad* refer to in the poem.

The following table shows the collocations of some more peripheral words in Chaucer's diction of joy which offer interesting patterns and sense relations:

Whole Corpus' collocates of *gai, joli, lusti, mirie*

Lexis	Collocates			
gai	fressh (7)	joli (5)		
joli	compaignie (4)	dai (3)	gai (3)	lif (3)
lusti	folk (6)	knight (5)	yong (4)	
mirie	tale (7)	chere (5)	telle (4)	dai (4)

These words do not necessarily form a coherent group, but they all seem to be used to express a particular type of behaviour or quality. *Joli* and *lusti* both seem to belong to the vocabulary of courtly life. The collocates *compaignie* and *folk* imply a communal emotion, whereas *knight* and *yong* implies that being *lusti* is an emotion or quality characteristic of the young knighthood. These words are linked to status, and hence might belong to the diction of value rather than emotion. *Gai* also enters this register as it collocates with *joli* itself and *fressh,* which can mean new or bright.[29] *Mirie* is more situational as it refers to characters (*chere*) as well as speech, or literary production (*tale, telle*). All those words are interesting to look at together mainly because they seem to oscillate between quality and situational emotion.

This analysis of collocational behaviours in Chaucer's diction of joy offers a preliminary idea of the different semantic fields at play in this lexis. However, if we try to map those different fields onto the categories proposed by the *OED*'s Historical Thesaurus, the task no longer seems feasible. Chaucer's use of *blisse* does belong to the categories of internal 'Happiness' as well as 'Joy of Heaven', but what really characterises it is its co-relation with *joy,* as well as its association with both love and heaven. Similarly, there are no categories in the Thesaurus which would convey the courtly or communal aspects of

[29] *MED:* '1. (a) Newly, recently' and '2. (a) Brightly, gaily'.

words such as *joli* and *lusti.* Moreover, a distinction arises between a diction of emotion – human and inherent to situation – and of value – part of a moral and spiritual discourse. The stark lines of conceptual mapping thus begin to look increasingly blurred, even though Chaucer's language does not appear prototypically distinctive. Instead of clear conceptual categories what transpire here are specific registers, or 'fields of discourse' to echo J. D. Burnley.[30]

Lexical and Generic Tailoring

Cannon argues that 'lexical tailoring was inherent to all of Chaucer's writing' and one important reflection of this tailoring is the existence of 'nonce words', or words that appear in only one of his texts.[31] For example, Chaucer uses the words *blisfulnesse* and *welefulnesse* only in his translation of Boethius' *Consolation* – words that he may very well have coined himself.[32] Chaucer thus invents and chooses his lexis according to the specific text he is writing, its register and genre. For this reason, it is necessary to look at the use of the lexicon of joy across different genres present in Chaucer's corpus. This observation reveals how different textual contexts generate different semantic fields of joy.

What follows is an exploration of the lexis of joy in different groups of texts, which can be seen to represent a particular literary genre or register. For this to be as visually efficient as possible word clouds will now supplant frequency tables. The first groups of texts I wish to look at and compare are the comic tales, and the romances. Critics have commonly referred to the *Miller's, Reeve's, Shipman's, Summoner's,* and *Cook's Tales,* as

[30] Burnley, *A Guide to Chaucer's Language*, p.167.
[31] Cannon, *The Making of Chaucer's English*, pp.128 and 131.
[32] Cannon places both words' first recorded use in Chaucer, in the *Boece.* Similarly, the *MED*'s earliest quotations of the terms are from the *Boece*. Though *blisfulnesse* also appears in the very nearly contemporary *Wycliffite Bible*, dated 1382 (the *Boece* is dated 1380 in the dictionary).

fabliaux.[33] In this list I have added the *Wife of Bath's Prologue*; contrary to most prologues, the Wife of Bath tells a story, one that is very close, in terms of register, to the fabliaux. The second group, which I call the romances, comprise the courtly tales of the *Knight* and the *Squire* as well as those of the *Man of Law* and the *Clerk,* which, even though they are closer to the form of the saint's life (be it religious or secular), are similar to the others in terms of themes and style. The *Merchant's, Wife of Bath's* and *Franklin's Tales* are also in this list. Finally, I have also included in this category the poem *Anelida and Arcite*.



The Fabliaux



The Romances[34]

The primary difference shown in these clouds is that the romances offer a more abundant and varied lexis of joy. This may point towards an emotional depth in the romances absent from the fabliaux. Moreover, the vocabulary of joy in the fabliaux is very particular and non-representative of Chaucer's whole corpus. The core words *joy, glad* and *blisse* – some of the main words in the romances – are almost non-existent. It would seem that joy is not to be

[33] I have not included the *Merchant's Tale* in this list, as although it comprises some elements belonging to the fabliau genre, its lexical register is much closer to that of a romance.
[34] For the genre-specific word clouds see precise tables of frequencies in appendices 4 to 7.

found in the comic tales, or at least not the kind of joy found in the romances. This is an important trend as it indicates that joy, in Chaucer, is no laughing matter. The most prominent words in the fabliaux are adjectives which connote cheerful behaviour, communal merriment and agreeable demeanour such as *joli, gai* and *mirie*.

In the romances, the main words are the nouns *joy, blisse*, *plesaunce* and the adjective and verb *glad.* This confirms Chaucer's idiosyncratic preference for nouns of joy in his narrative romances and suggests that real emotions are at play here, rather than merely behaviours and appearances. This word cloud also presents a joy which is embedded in the discourse of love, especially sensual love. The word *plesaunce,* which collocates with *lust* five times in these texts, is one of the most frequent lexemes. *Blisse* is also quite frequent and while it always carries religious connotations, in this particular context, it firmly enters the discourse of romantic and earthly joy. It never collocates with *hevene*, only with *joy* (8) and *herte* (2). The use of *blisful* is similarly unrepresentative of its religious use in the rest of the corpus: it does not collocate with godly figures and presents no clear pattern. Words' registers change depending on context and genre. The word *lusti* is frequent as well and, co-occurring with *knight* (2) or *seson* (2), helps establish a courtly setting for the tales. The earthly and objective discourse of prosperity is also present with the words *felicite, prosperite* and *wele*. The first one is associated with the happiness of marriage three times and the second one colligates with *yere* and with variants of *livinge* twice. More than a philosophical discourse of joy *per se*, these words form part of a general reflection on earthly happiness, its causes and its duration. These first two word clouds thus offer two very different verbal emotional worlds. The romances present different registers, constructing narratives around love's sensual joy as well as the mutability of earthly happiness. The fabliaux seem to construct a joy which is communal and playful.

The next word clouds belong to single texts. This is justified by their uniqueness and their distinctive and explicit genres. The first one is the *Monk's Tale,* where the narrator

adopts a clear generic tone: ‘biwaille in manere of tragedie’ (VII, 1991). The Monk then further defines this literary genre as the portrayal of men falling from high degree to adversity because of Fortune (VII, 1992-6). The second text is that of the *Parson’s Tale,* a long religious sermon on penance written in prose. Both texts construct a specific narratorial ‘manere’ which in turn produces a specific register of emotions.



The Monk’s Tale



The Parson’s Tale

In the Monk’s tragedies, the word *blisse* is absent, confirming the registers of that term as either heavenly or amorous. Tragedy is concerned with neither: it deals with earthly happiness governed by fortune. This is predominantly expressed by the word *prosperite,* the flexible *joy* as well as *felicite* and *wele.* The other predominant semantic field is that of delight, which is here decidedly negative. *Delite* co-occurs with *glorie* (VII, 2150), signifying fame or renown, and *delicat* with *pompous* and *proud* (VII, 2471-2). These terms represent the sin of excessively delighting in earthly pleasures, which causes the characters to fall from *prosperite*. This same negative semantic field is found in high density in the religious sermon of the Parson. In the *Parson’s Tale*, *delite* – the most prominent lexeme – and *delices* collocate with variants of *flessh* four times. They represent the sin of earthly lusts and pleasures. What is different from the tragedies, however, is that *prosperite* is here contrasted by the presence of the terms *blisse* and *blisful*. In this very religious context, and

contrary to the romances, *blisse* is intrinsically linked to *hevene*, with which it collocates four times: earthly prosperity is not the ultimate goal here, heavenly bliss is.

To conclude this exploration of the different registers of joy in Chaucer's literary genres, I turn to one of his most faithful translations, that of Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy*, referred to as *Boece.* This text is a philosophical and consolatory dialogue between the exiled and despairing Boethius and the allegorical Lady Philosophy.



Boece

The distinctive feature of this text's diction of happiness is the high density of the nonce words *welefulnesse* and *blisfulnesse*. The word *prosperite* appears very sparingly and mostly in Chaucer's own gloss of Boethius' text. *Felicite* appears only twice. This text is hence the best example of 'lexical tailoring': instead of using available words connoting earthly prosperity, Chaucer chooses rare words, words he may even have coined himself, to translate the philosophical Latin concepts of *felicitas* and *beatitudo*. The two terms both colligate with qualifying adjectives, *good* (11)*, verray* (10) or *sovereyn* (7) for *blisfulnesse* and *verray* (3) or *fals* (3) for *welefulnesse*. These words thus participate in an objective discourse which defines what happiness is and what it is not, and the distinction between false and true happiness. The word *suffisaunce* is also important in this text, where it means 'contentment,

satisfaction' (3.(a)) as well as, and here the *MED* only quotes that text, 'self-sufficiency' (2.(b)). Chaucer thus uses that term to express a philosophical concept of self-sufficient happiness. Another category of words which is significant in this textual context, is that surrounding the term *delite.* This category is once again used negatively, to refer to that false happiness which men find in luxury, in fame or in the pleasures of the flesh. *Delit* and *delices* collocate with *glorie* three times. Finally*, blisse* appears once, in the plural, which is a very rare behaviour for that term in Chaucer: it is used to refer to earthly joys. Earthly joys – *laetitia* in Boethius' Latin – are further translated as *gladnesse* and the nonce word *mirinesse*.

These word clouds demonstrate the necessity to classify Chaucer's diction of joy by genre and register rather than mental concepts. The author tailors his diction to fit and to create specific discourses of joy. So the tragedies of the Monk speak of earthly prosperity and sinful pleasures and the sermon of the Parson of sinful pleasures and heavenly bliss. And the *Boece* offers a specialized vocabulary of philosophical happiness. But Chaucer also skilfully blends and superimposes registers and meanings in single texts. The romances' positive emotional diction mostly belongs to the semantic field of sensual love, yet they also use more neutral words (*glad* or *joy*), courtly terms and words of earthly prosperity. The fabliaux use playful adjectives which seem to convey a joy that is superficial in a way, depicting a general mood of cheerfulness and vivacity rather than the characters' deep emotional states. Yet, this courtly diction is subverted in the tales, used parodically and often with sexual undertones. Even in these relatively homogenous texts therefore, registers are blended and subverted. But *Troilus and Criseyde* presents something different altogether: it is a highly heterogenous text. Chaucer pays particular and careful attention to the terminology of joy in this poem – a terminology which is more varied than in any of the comparative texts:



Troilus and Criseyde

The principal term is *joy*; the most versatile word and the one which seems the least bound to one particular register. *Joy* is the most prominent word by far in the *Troilus* word cloud. And in contrast to the rest of the corpus, the term does not enter fixed couplets of synonyms in the poem, nor does it present any clear collocational patterns. The use of *blisse* is also particular in *Troilus*. One could expect it to behave as it does in the romances: linked to earthly joy and co-occurring with *love* and *herte* rather than *hevene.* However, in the poem, *blisse* co-occurs with love and heaven the same number of times, blending the two different registers. Both the ambiguity of *blisse* and the instability of *joy* testify to the poem's complex and versatile use of the vocabulary of joy. The poem also boasts a nonce word: *selinesse* which enters philosophical discourse without actually being present in the *Boece*. In the philosophical register, the word *felicite* appears densely compared to the rest of the corpus, showing a desire to incorporate a philosophical investigation of earthly happiness to the romantic poem.

This variety is in part explained by the fact that *Troilus and Criseyde* cannot be reduced to one genre. Barry Windeatt, as he sets out to survey the different genres the poem evoke, finds himself citing almost every medieval literary form. He mentions epic poetry,

which gives its more public and historic aspects to the text, as well as elements of romance in its echoes of the *Roman de la Rose* or chivalric literature and lyric in the poet's use of 'direct speech, dialogue, and song'.[35] Tragedy is an important frame for the poem as well as the philosophical treatise, with direct Boethian borrowings. But comedy is also at play: Windeatt argues that through the figure of Pandarus the poem 'draws on elements of plotting and characterisation which resemble the genres of fabliau.'[36] The poem's representation of joy mirrors this multiplicity: *Troilus and Criseyde* calls upon Boethian happiness in long philosophical monologues, it evokes the inevitable alternation of joy and sorrow, it knows of Fortune and the painful fall from prosperity, it is set in the cheerful courtly life of Troy, it exposes the fabliau mechanics used to achieve sexual joy, it ends with the joy of Christian heaven, and, in the middle of all this, it attempts to convey a glimpse of love's ecstatic joy.

Troilus and Criseyde has different levels of potential meaning, which complicate the use of lexis, as different genres, registers and senses are superimposed in one text. In this context of instability of meaning, clear sense divisions become themselves slippery. It seems, therefore, that the conceptual categories established by Fabiszak and the *OED*'s Historical Thesaurus, which I have used as rough guides for this inquiry, turn out to be ultimately misleading. By categorizing the lexis of joy into concepts, they fail to account for registers, and hence ultimately fail to provide an understanding of the conceptualisation of joy in the Middle Ages and more particularly in Middle English poetry. This is why the deployment of the diction of joy in *Troilus* is so important. Through its complexity, its mutability and its blending of registers and meanings it offers a survey of all that the emotion of joy can be. Clear sense divisions are challenged as they cannot account for the mutability of joy in a poem that is at once both a philosophical treatise and an intensely moving drama of narrative emotion as experienced by fictional characters.

---

[35] Barry Windeatt, *Troilus and Criseyde*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992, p.163.
[36] Ibid., pp.169-70.

Joy in Context

The shortcomings of conceptual mapping for the exploration of joy might be explained by the simple fact that an emotion is not a concept. Emotions can be treated conceptually, but the emotion as we experience is it is a feeling, a psychosomatic sensation which impacts on thought and behaviour. Of course, the object of our inquiry is not this psychological emotion itself but its representation in literature; a linguistic and poetic encoding of this emotion. And, in his writing, Chaucer does use philosophical discourse on emotion, where happiness becomes an abstract concept. But because this discourse is included in narrative poetry and spoken by human and feeling characters, these notions of happiness cannot be abstracted from their contexts as pre-defined mental concepts. Moreover, Chaucer also writes his characters' feelings as they occur in his narrative. This representation of emotion is not conceptual.

Sarah McNamer comments on this issue by advocating for the use of 'feeling' rather than 'emotion' in medieval literary studies:

> 'feeling' is more apt in our subfield, not only because it is an authentic Middle English term, or because it serves as a reminder of the integration of the somatic, affective, and cognitive in a pre-Cartesian universe ('to feel' can mean 'to know'; see *MED*, 'felen', v. 1), but because it embeds a grammatical doubleness. Its gerundive form gestures towards process, as well as thing, or both at once.[37]

McNamer here suggests that an emotion is better understood as both a process and a thing. This duality might explain the difficulty to map emotions into conceptual categories. The

[37] McNamer, 'Feeling', p.247.

only way to truly understand it therefore lies in context, in the way Chaucer writes this affective, somatic and cognitive process that is the emotion of joy.

Hans-Jürgen Diller argues for the vital importance of context for the study of emotion words in his aptly named chapter '*JOY* and *MIRTH* in Middle English: a plea for the consideration of genre in Historical Semantics'. He argues that historical linguists have to pay 'particular attention to the contexts in which they find the lexemes under study.' His emphasis on genre enters into this consideration as the first of four 'levels of context: (1) Genre, (2) Text type, (3) Situation (as given in text), (4) Syntactic context.' He then goes on to distinguish the first two levels: '*genre* is used for "classes of texts that are determined on the basis of external criteria relating to author's or speaker's purpose. *Text-type* refers to classes of texts that are grouped on the basis of similarities in linguistic form, irrespective of their genre classifications."'[38] Both *genre* and *text-type* impact greatly on the sort of emotion words used, as I have just demonstrated. The next two levels of context – situational and syntactical – have not yet been taken into consideration; they will be the subject of inquiry in the following paragraphs.

What this exploration will bring to the fore is that Chaucer is very conscious of registers in his use of emotional diction, but that those registers are not confined to single texts. *Troilus and Criseyde* is the prime example of Chaucer's skilled use and blending of discourses and *termes*. By *termes*, Burnley means 'words or phrases characteristic of the usage of certain professional groups, social types or categories, or of particular areas of intellectual endeavour.'[39] Chaucer uses the word himself to refer to the *termes* of philosophy (*House of Fame,* 857) or of medicine (*Physician's Tale*, VI, 311), but also of love (*Troilus*, II, 1067). Words, however, are not separated into such registers in a strict, clear-cut way: 'many words have more than one "propriety". Nor are terms narrowly restricted to use in

[38] Diller, *Words for Feelings,* p.280
[39] J. D. Burnley, 'Chaucer's *Termes*', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 7, 1977, p.55.

the contexts to which they are considered to be proper; they are often transferred in order to add subtlety to courtly casuistry or ironic impudence to *fabliau* material.'[40] Chaucer's complex use of *proprietas* is very much at play in *Troilus and Criseyde*'s use of the diction of joy. Different registers can be distinguished – courtly and social, romantic, religious and philosophical – but these fields of discourse are never strictly separated in the poem. Thus, amorous bliss inheres within the frames of both heavenly and philosophical happiness. Though this project is a search for joy*,* the following paragraphs survey every lexeme of positive emotion but *joy.* This omission is explained by the fact that the semantics of *joy* in the poem appears too volatile to be pinned down. To come to the heart of what *joy* is, it is first necessary to expose the use and meanings of its near synonyms. Joy needs to be found by confronting and contrasting its different forms in the poem: lusty entertainment, friendly merriment, erotic bliss, love's delight, and felicity.

The Syntax of Joy, Between Emotion and Quality

The frequency tables of the first part of this chapter exposed a grammatical particularity of *Troilus and Criseyde*: its tendency to use nouns over adjectives in its writing of positive emotion. This is indeed surprising as narrative romances tend to rely on adjectives and verbs to write the emotional states of their characters, as the study of Diller has demonstrated.[41] The poem also distinguishes itself from its main source in this respect as Boccaccio uses more adjectives than nouns of joy in the *Filostrato.* While Boccaccio uses the noun *gioia* more than its adjective *gioioso* (respectively eighteen and seven times) and *allegrezza* more than *allegro* (respectively six and two times), he uses the adjective *lieto* a total of fifty-five times (and *letizia* only seven), *felice* six times (and *felicita* four times, all

[40] Burnley, *A Guide to Chaucer's Language*, p.170.
[41] Diller, *Words for Feelings*, p.286.

in the Proemio and therefore not in the body of the poem itself) and *contento* twenty-five times.[42] He also uses the adjective *beata* three times, while the noun *beatitudine* is used only once in the Proemio. There is therefore a clear preference for adjectives in Boccaccio's writing of joy. While the absence of the adjective *happy* in Middle English – a Modern term which would broadly correspond to the Italian *contento* – may partly explain the disparity, the complete lack of the adjectives *joiful* and *joious* as well as *weleful* in *Troilus and Criseyde* is still striking. Especially so as it sharply contrasts with the writing of sorrow in Chaucer's poem: the adjectives *woful* and *sorwful* are both used abundantly (thirty-two and twenty-five times respectively). The poem does use the prototypical adjective of joy *glad* frequently, as well as the verb *glade.* But it comes to represent a joy which is social and communal and not the joy of love. Similarly, while *blisful* is used frequently in *Troilus,* it always refers to the blessed quality of godly figures and never describes the poem's characters. Finally, the poem also makes use, though sparingly, of the courtly adjectives *joli, lusti, meri* and *seli*. The syntactic use of the adjectives of joy is particular and seems to construct a joy which is fleeting and unfixed, interpersonal rather than internal, or alternatively to present it as a quality rather than an emotion.

The adjectives of negative emotion *woful* and *sorwful* are repeatedly used attributively with characters. The protagonist is repeatedly qualified as sorrowful, to the point where the adjective becomes part of the nominal phrase: Troilus becomes 'this woful Troilus'.[43] This creates the effect of a stock epithet, which makes the qualifier seem existential to the character. Troilus is presented as intrinsically and permanently sorrowful. Sorrow is what characterises the protagonist as well as the poem itself: the adjective *woful* defines the verses to come right from the beginning (I, 7).

---

[42] All references to *Il Filostrato* are from Giovanni Boccaccio, *Il Filostrato e il Ninfale Fiesolano*, Vincenzo Pernicone (ed.), Bari: Gius. Laterza & Figli, 1937.

[43] IV, 360, 372; V, 197. Other similar phrases occur such as 'thow woful Troilus' (I, 519), 'this sorwful Troilus' (I, 596), 'this sorwful man' (IV, 233), 'this woful wight, this Troilus' (IV, 365). The phrase 'sely Troilus' – with *seli* meaning wretched – is also repeated (I, 871; II, 683; V, 529).

The most frequent adjective of positive emotion in the poem, *glad*, offers a very different syntactic context: it is always used predicatively with characters.[44] This confirms what the collocation tables revealed: *glad* is an emotional adjective which inheres in situation. The syntactic context of *glad* is mostly predicative and mostly uses the verb 'to be'. This very simple syntax allows characters to express their present emotional states (so Pandarus: 'Now am I glad, syn that yow list to dwelle.' III, 651), or the narrator to express the emotional state of his characters (so of Troilus: 'gladder man was ther nevere in Troie.' III, 357). When it comes to the protagonist though, the syntax sometimes becomes more complex as he is made the object of the sentence. The verb *glade* is used in these instances where Troilus is told to be glad or made glad by other persons (so when Deiphebus tries to console him: 'he peyned him to glade.' II, 1574). These situations where one character makes another glad are quite common. They reveal the interpersonal emphasis of this particular emotion word. The predicative use of the adjective, always separated from the noun by at least a verb, accentuates this and the impression that *glad* – both verb and adjective – is a product of action.

Although very frequent in the poem, the adjective is conspicuously absent from the climactic love scene, where the noun *gladnesse* is used instead, and hence from the description of love's bliss. On the other hand, it is very common in scenes shared by Criseyde and Pandarus. *Glad* thus seems to represent the joy shared by two noble characters through linguistic play. One good example of this is the scene, entirely absent from Boccaccio, with Criseyde and her ladies at Pandarus' house before the consummation. The passage is full of the adjective *glad* (four occurrences) and full of social expressions of joy: they laugh, sing, play and tell tales (III, 614-5). This is, we are told, what friends do; it is 'frendes fare' (III, 605). The adverb *gladly* appears also, expressing a mood of action rather than a state. When

[44] Once again, Chaucer departs from his source here, as while Boccaccio does prefer the predicative use of adjectives of joy, he also describes Troiolo as a happy young man soon after falling in love through the nominal and attributive phrase 'il giovinetto lieto' (3.35).

the rain prevents her from leaving, Criseyde accepts to stay 'gladly with a frendes chere' (III, 642). The emphasis is on behaviour and appearance here, the joy of friends is one that is visibly, audibly shared. The literary and conceptual effect of the different syntactic contexts is very significant: they construct the state of gladness as momentary and situational while the state of sorrow is constant and intrinsic.

The relationship between Pandarus and his niece creates a situational context in the poem which boasts more adjectives of joy than is the norm. The adjective *mirie* is also used to describe their interaction (II, 149). *Mirie* often qualifies moments or faces in *Troilus and Criseyde* and it occurs mainly in situations when Pandarus is present. *Mirie* is also what characterises, in the *Canterbury Tales*, the company of pilgrims, their host and their game of storytelling: it expresses social entertainment.[45] The adjectives *joli* and *lusti* also appear during one of Pandarus' and Criseyde's playful conversations. When Pandarus brings Troilus' letter to his niece he first tells a joke (*jape* II, 1096) using the *termes* of the typical lovesick lover full of contradictions: 'I have a joly wo, a lusty sorwe' (II, 1099).[46] *Joli* and *lusti* thus seem to enter the register of love's joy only when it is parodied. They belong to a category of terms which follow a similar pattern in Chaucer's work: 'such words can often be recognised by their occurrences in courtly contexts in the *Romaunt of the Rose* and their subsequent restriction to *fabliau* tales, their use for reference to low characters, or their exploitation for literary parody.'[47] The word *joli* appears eight times in the *Miller's Tale*, where it qualifies Absolon, a character pictured as a parody of the elegant courtly lover.[48]

---

[45] In the *General Prologue,* the host is described as a 'myrie man' (I, 757), he addresses the pilgrim as 'so myrie a compaignye' (I, 764) and promises them that they will be merry during the pilgrimage (I, 782). The noun *mirthe* is also repeated in this passage (I, 759, 766, 767, 773). On mirth as an important component of the host's characterisation see Mark Allen, 'Mirth and Bourgeois Masculinity in Chaucer's Host', in Peter G. Beidler (ed.), *Masculinities in Chaucer*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1998, 9-22.

[46] The phrase 'joli wo' is a courtly commonplace, also used by Gower in his *Confessio*: 1.88, 6.84, 8.2360, and 'jolif peine' 7.1910.

[47] Burnley, *A Guide to Chaucer's Language*, p.142.

[48] I. 3316, 3339, 3348, 3355, 3371, 3671.

This image becomes all the more ironic as the courtly love convention is subverted through a rather discourteous kiss. In the fabliaux, adjectives of courtly merriment are used attributively with characters, to ironically define their appearance and demeanour rather than an internal emotion. In *Troilus* on the other hand, the ironic use of courtly adjectives is never attributive with characters but rather defines the word play and merry tales which build friendly relationships. However, these adjectives do turn into epithets when they are used in serious courtly contexts.

In less ironical contexts, these adjectives signal courtliness. For example, these words are used in correlation with the Squire, who is described as a 'lovyere and a lusty bacheler' (I, 80). In his tale, the words *lusti, jolite, jolinesse* or *lustihede* are repeated to describe courtly feasts and settings.[49] These words thus belong to a particular literary tradition and express a mode of living which is aristocratic and pleasant. In *Troilus,* while the noun *lustinesse* can mean joy – it is used by Criseyde to console her lover and bring him to gladness (III, 177) – the adjective is restricted to its courtly meaning. *Lusti* is quite frequent in the Trojan poem, where it serves setting and descriptive purposes. It is used attributively to refer to the cheerful and fine life and people of Troy. The Palladian feast takes place in the lusty springtime and is full of lusty knights (I, 157, 165) and Pandarus speaks of the lusty folk and the lusty life of Troy (I, 560; V, 393, 402).[50] In the same vein, *joli* is only used twice outside of Pandarus' and Criseyde's banter to refer to music (II, 1031) and to Troilus in the commonplace phrase 'joly Robyn' (V, 1174).[51] Both these adjectives represent a quality inherent to courtly aristocratic youth and life rather than an emotional state or a feeling.

[49] *Lusti:* V, 52, 142, 272, 389 and the nouns: V, 278, 287-8, 344.
[50] No such distinct vocabulary is seen in Boccaccio, the spring festival is gay ('gaio' I, 18) and Troy can be elegant ('graziosa' V, 34) but Chaucer is not translating directly in these instances.
[51] Windeatt traces this phrase back to *pastourelles*, courtly lyrics and the *Romaunt*, which confirms that *joli* is part of a distinctive courtly vocabulary. Barry Windeatt (ed.), *Troilus and Criseyde: A New Edition of 'The Book of Troilus'*, London, New York: Longman, 1984, p.509.

The second most frequent adjective of joy in the poem – *blisful* – works similarly as an adjective of value. It appears in the courtly context of the *Romaunt*, where Chaucer uses it mostly in relation to birds' song (*RomA* 80, 89, 496 and 500). Here the adjective, which does not directly translate any French term,[52] is used as a courtly quality of sweetness and harmony. But in the rest of the corpus, *blisful* very often refers to a spiritual quality. In the poem, it mostly functions as an epithet for gods, expressing their divine and merciful quality rather than an emotional state. It is also used in that way in the *Tales*, to refer to the Virgin Mary for example or the virgin martyr Cecilia in the *Second Nun's Tale*. She is qualified three times with the epithet: 'blisful faire mayden' (VIII, 57, 293 and 461). *Blisful* works as a stock epithet here and is part of her characterisation as a martyr, her blissfulness an anticipation of the bliss of heaven. The adjective *blisful* is in fact linked to martyrdom in Chaucer. In the *General Prologue*, the Host refers twice to Beckett as the 'blisful martyr' (I, 17, 770). To be *blisful* is therefore – albeit in the best possible way for a Christian – to be dead.[53] It is quite interesting therefore that this adjective, otherwise mostly reserved for divine figures in *Troilus*, is the one chosen to qualify the lovers' night of sexual joy (III, 1317 and 1668), where Boccaccio only uses the adjective *dolce*, sweet (3.33,1). The adjective's associations with otherworldly and martyr-like joy in Chaucer might point towards the transcendental quality of this night, while also perhaps hinting at its fatal ending. In any case, their night can be full of bliss, full of the spiritual quality of bliss, but the lovers themselves cannot be.

---

[52] Although *blisful* in line eighty translates the French verbs 'se deduit' and 's'envoise' (l.76) which imply earthly and sensuous pleasure and enjoyment. Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, Ernest Langlois (ed.), Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1914-24, vol.2, p.4.

[53] This religious use of the adjective *blisful* is interesting, as it does not coincide with the contemporary philosophical poetry and literature to which Chaucer is often compared. The adjective is completely absent from Gower's *Confessio Amantis* and relatively rare in Usk's *Testament of Love* where it takes on a more philosophical edge. In this respect, Chaucer's use of *blisful* owes more to religious and devotional language. Indeed, a similar use of the adjective to qualify God, Jesus or saints, can be found in such texts as the saints' lives of the *Katherine Group* (in the narrative of Saint Juliene, God is qualified as 'blisfule' (61.(23) and 71.(6)) or *Ancrene Wisse* (for example, Christ is referred to as 'blisfule bearn' (1.242) and 'blisfule Sune' (1. 256)). Robert Hasenfratz (ed.), *Ancrene Wisse,* Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, TEAMS Online, 2000.

Lastly, the crucial role played by the syntactic context in the diction's meaning can be observed through a study of the adjective *seli*. *Seli* can mean both happy and its contrary. It stems from the Old English *saelig* meaning blessed or fortunate. While also keeping that first meaning, in Middle English its semantics is expanded and it comes to mean virtuous or happy, innocent or simple, and even wretched or miserable.[54] In the Trojan romance it mainly means 'hapless',[55] a qualifier that the narrator gives to Troilus three times and to Criseyde once. In these situations, the adjective is always attributive; it becomes an epithet. In the only – striking – occurrence where the word means 'happy', the syntactic context is different. Troilus cries out in despair after the announcement of Criseyde's exchange, and calls on death to come and take him, because 'sely is that deth […]/That, ofte ycleped, cometh and endeth peyne' (IV, 503). Here, *seli* is not the direct attribute of death, but a predicative adjective. This is the only time in the whole corpus where the adjective is used predicatively and the only time it is used to mean 'happy' – which is pretty agonising given it describes 'death'.

In the rest of the corpus, *seli* is always attributive but its meaning may still vary. In the fabliaux it is used to qualify men, the men who get fooled. In the *Miller's Tale,* it refers five times to John the carpenter who is the victim of Nicholas' and Alison's joke.[56] In the *Reeve's Tale,* the adjective always refers to the students John and Aleyn (I, 4090, 4100, 4108) and only appears in the first part of the tale – the part where they are made fools (I, 4111). *Seli* in the fabliaux thus means 'simple', in the sense of foolish and gullible.

---

[54] *MED:* '1. (a) Spiritually favored, blessed; holy, virtuous; 2. (a) Innocent, harmless; good; (b) simple, guileless; foolish, gullible; doting; also, ignorant; (c) weak, helpless, defenseless, hapless; 3. (a) Wretched, unfortunate, miserable; pitiable; (b) humble, lowly; poor; (c) worthless, trifling, insignificant.'

[55] This is the translation that Stephen A. Barney (in W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2006) gives of the word on lines I, 871; II, 683; III, 1191; V, 529; V, 1093. It is further used to mean 'trifling' (I, 338) and 'simple' (IV, 1490). The Riverside and Barry Windeatt's edition, when they gloss the word, offer similar definitions of *seli* as either 'wretched, hapless, poor', 'insignificant', 'ignorant' or 'blessed, happy'.

[56] For a complete study of the multiple and ironical meanings of *sely* in the *Miller's Tale*, see Geoffrey Cooper, '*Sely John* in the *Legende* of the *Miller's Tale*', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 79:1, 1980, pp. 1-12.

Interestingly, in the rest of the corpus, the adjective is mainly reserved for female characters. In the *Man of Law's* and *Clerk's Tales,* for example, *seli* is used to refer to the wretched but admirable heroines: 'this sely innocent, Custance' (II, 682) and 'thilke sely povre Grisildis' (IV, 948). In this context, the adjective becomes more positive; it means hapless, but also carries connotations of innocence and worthiness. Unsurprisingly then, it is found quite densely in the *Legends of Good Women*, where it qualifies Dido, Philomena, and other 'sely wemen, ful of innocence' (III, 1254).[57] The poet also uses *seli* when his narrator in *Troilus* forgives his heroine: 'Ne me list this sely woman chyde' (V, 1093), thus linking her fate to that of the other legendary, and blameless, women whose stories he has told or will. *Seli*, when associated with women, thus seems to evoke innocence, an innocence embedded and forged in literary reputation. The term is, in the end, not an important addition to Chaucer's lexis of joy, but it provides an interesting example of the poet's complex use of vocabulary.

Adjectives of positive emotion in the poem are mostly used predicatively, forming a grammar of joy which is dependent on situation and which is mostly interpersonal – existing in moments and in conversations. The only adjectives to be used attributively are adjectives of value rather than emotion: *blisful* qualifying saintly and godly beings and *lusti* and *joli* qualifying the courtly aristocratic youth of Troy. It appears, therefore, that the grammar of joy is very different from that of sorrow in Chaucer's writing. The former is either predicative or nominal, and the latter predominantly attributive, even epithetic. Sorrow can be a fixed and defining characteristic whereas joy cannot. Joy in *Troilus and Criseyde* either exists in situations and words or is turned into a qualitative value. Sorrow on the other hand appears as the default state of the characters, and of the text.

[57] It appears eight times and is always used attributively to refer to one female character or to women more broadly (III, 1157, 1237, 1254, 1336; VII, 2339, 2346; VIII, 2532; IX, 2713).

Love's Bliss

Joy is, however, what defines the central part of *Troilus and Criseyde.* This defining joy is that of love, and of the lovers' long-awaited union. While love is a recurrent theme in Chaucer's writing, the joy of love in the poem takes up an unprecedented amount of space in the narrative and is expressed in an original manner: only in this poem is love's union recounted as a perfect blend of spiritual and sexual joy. The consummation scene indeed offers a great example of Chaucer's purposeful blending of registers. The author exploits and enhances the double meaning of words such as *plesaunce* and *blisse,* which bridge the spiritual and sensual registers. Hierarchies are overturned as sensual *delite,* mostly negatively connoted in the rest of the corpus, is taken in *hevene blisse,* and as clerkly *felicite* is brought in as an – ultimately insufficient – frame of reference for the conceptualisation of love's joy. Erotic bliss is expressed through a blend of registers in *Troilus,* but it needs to be differentiated from the conventional courtly trope of the religion of love as well as the more ironic mode of sexual *mirthe* in the fabliaux.

The word *mirthe* is one of these courtly words which are frequent in both the *Romaunt* – where it is a personified allegory – and the fabliaux – where it is used in a more playful and diverted way. In the *Miller's Tale,* it is embedded in the language of music making used to describe Nicholas' wooing of Alison (I, 3305-06). The plural connotations of the word *mirthe* – sexual, spiritual and festive[58] – allow Chaucer to use the semantic field of music and entertainment to refer euphemistically to sexual intercourse: 'Ther was the revel and the melodye;/And thus lith Alisoun and Nicholas,/In bisynesse of myrthe and of solas' (I, 3652-4). This way of writing sensual love as revelry is particular to the fabliaux;

[58] Some of *mirthe*'s definitions in the *MED*: 1. (a) The feeling of joy or state of happiness; delight, gladness. 2. (a) Eternal bliss, salvation. 3. (a) The expression or manifestation of happiness; (c) sexual dalliance, lovemaking. 5. (a) An entertainment or amusement; divertissement, distraction; occasion for mirth; story, jest; song, singing, musical performance.

mirthe is not used to describe the more 'serious' love affairs of the *Knight's Tale* or *Troilus and Criseyde.* In *Troilus*, the word *mirthe* only appears once, referring to the goddess Venus: 'O Venus ful of myrthe' (III, 715). The word is used as an epithet of praise during a prayer to the goddess of love, a context which blends the spiritual and sensual, in a more courtly and serious manner.

The book of love's joy starts with a prayer to Venus – borrowed from part of Troiolo's song that appears later in the *Filostrato*. In Chaucer, she is addressed as 'plesaunce of love' (III, 4) and the 'verray cause' of 'gladnesse' (III, 6), two phrases which do not appear in the Italian source. Both of these lexemes of positive emotion will be crucial in the writing of love's ecstatic bliss which takes up much of Book III. But while *plesaunce* connotes simultaneously sensual and spiritual gratification, as I will demonstrate, *gladnesse* appears much more neutral. Yet contrary to its adjective and verb, *gladnesse* does express the joy of love in the poem. The word does not have a direct equivalent in Boccaccio's Italian. Chaucer's use of the term is original, especially in the way he often seems to shape its semantics through its rhyme patterns. It is defined in the *MED* with no references to either sensuality or spirituality: it is a synonym for either joy, bliss, mirth or delight (1.(a)). The word is frequent in the *Troilus* (eighteen occurrences) compared to its entire use in the whole corpus (forty-four). In the *Tales*, while it appears once in the *Parson's Tale* as the 'gladnesse of herte espiritueel' (X, 1051), it is more commonly used in speeches of advice on worldly permutation. In the *Knight's Tale*, the sage Egeus, father of Theseus, knows of the world's mutability: 'As he hadde seyn it chaunge bothe up and doun,/Joye after wo, and wo after gladnesse' (I, 284-1). This sense of *gladnesse* as a typically human feeling and one which will always eventually lead to its contrary, is also found in *Troilus*. The word often appears alongside contrasting emotions, especially as its ending allows for convenient rhyming with words such as *hevynesse* or *distresse*. Gladness and sorrow become truly interdependent: *gladnesse* is the result of *distresse* (III, 1215-6), *hevynesse* turns into *gladnesse* (III, 1400),

but inevitably *hevynesse* can also come out of *gladnesse* (III, 1446-7). Here too, therefore, the term is used as a specifically human state; one which is never absolutely devoid of its antonym, be it its source or its outcome. In *Troilus and Criseyde*, however, the word takes on a less general meaning: it is undoubtedly human but also seems to be a feeling specific to lovers.

The situational context of *gladnesse* is that of love's joy. It appears at the beginning, in the narrator's plea to lovers and then only reappears twice before the third book. It is in fact almost confined to this central book (thirteen out of its eighteen occurrences). The term is thus used almost exclusively in the situation of the lovers' union. *Gladnesse* can be a momentous feeling arising from a specific situation, as when the narrator tells us that Troilus is 'in swych present gladnesse' (III, 1244). But it is often rather abstract: Criseyde contemplates granting Troilus her love, which 'were honour with pley and with gladnesse' (II, 705). Here, gladness is an abstract concept of pleasantness linked to Troilus' 'worthynesse' (II, 704). This abstraction is what allows it to represent the concept of joy's love. In contexts of prayers, it embodies the gift of Venus to earthly lovers: graced lovers 'bathen in gladnesse' (I, 22) and the goddess is the 'cause of heele and of gladnesse' (III, 6). *Gladnesse* is the subject matter of the third book – one that the narrator must tell even though he feels *distresse* about it (III, 46-8). Eventually though, as he is not a lover himself, he will leave to his readers who know the joy of love the task of judging the protagonists' gladness (III, 1312-3). *Gladnesse* is thus used as the conceptual abstraction of love's joy rather than a spontaneous feeling.

Plesaunce is directly linked to the senses and to sensual pleasure in Chaucer's corpus, but it also carries religious undertones. In *Troilus and Criseyde*, the word *plesaunce* predominantly means 'a wish, will, or desire; sexual desire' (*MED* 2.(a)) or 'a feeling of pleasure; joy, happiness, delight; sensual pleasure' (4.(a)). For this reason, the first occurrence of the word, in its primary sense of 'gratification of a deity' (1.(a)) is ambiguous.

At the very beginning of the poem, the narrator asks his readers to also pray for the lovers that are 'at ease': 'that God hem graunte ay good perseveraunce,/And sende hem might hire ladies so to plese/That it to Love be worship and plesaunce' (I, 44-6). Both the verb *plese* and the noun *plesaunce* refer here to the gratification of a deity – be it the God of love of the deified lady – as well as sexual gratification.[59]

After this first early occurrence, *plesaunce* does not reappear until the third book, where it appears seven times. The situational context of the word is that of sexual pleasure. In this central book, *plesaunce* is associated with Troilus and with burning desire (III, 425), lust and memory (III, 1544-6). The words *plesaunce* and *remembraunce* are paired through rhyming a total of eight times in the poem, keeping Troilus' love and lust alive. The word *plesaunce* is embedded in an important semantic network of the poem, one that links sexual joy simultaneously with the desire for it and the memory of it. This creates an inescapable cycle of lust, of which Troilus is the victim.[60] Retrospectively, the first mention of the word – the only time it appears in a religious context – rings as a cruel irony. Indeed, it is because of his *perseveraunce* and his obedience to Love's *plesaunce*, that Troilus becomes condemned to a tragic ending. All of these words of Old French origin are linked through rhyme to create this courtly love pattern centred around the concept of *plesaunce* as both divine and sexual gratification.

This ambiguity is exploited in the rest of the corpus as well. *Plesaunce* is very frequent in the *Clerk's Tale*, where it is mostly used to refer to the 'lust and plesaunce' (IV, 757) of Griselda's tyrant husband Walter, to which she constantly submits. In parallel, it is also sometimes used for God's *plesaunce*, in which Griselda puts all her trust and obedience: 'Lord, al lyth in youre plesaunce' (IV, 501). But, by abiding to this logic, she also puts her trust and obedience in the *plesaunce* of her husband which is depraved desire and control.

[59] Both meanings are found in the first definition of *plese* in the *MED*: '1.(a) to please or satisfy a deity' and '1.(d) to delight or attract (sb. or sth.); gratify sexually'.
[60] I talk more about this in the second chapter's section on Troilus.

In Chaucer's writing, the gratification of the god of Love or of the Christian God becomes the pleasure of Walter or Troilus. *Plesaunce* is both an internal, personal feeling of pleasure as well as a form of authority to which one can pledge allegiance. This conceptual ambiguity around this seemingly neutral term creates inescapable and dangerous patterns of lust, dependence, and destructiveness.

Delite is another word which mostly connotes sensuality. In the corpus, it is often used negatively; in the tragedies of the *Monk's Tale* and the sermon of the *Parson* especially, the word is linked to the excess of earthly pleasures and to sin. In the *Troilus*, the word is less one-dimensional. It can be used negatively, as when Criseyde claims that her reason for loving Troilus resides in his moral virtue rather than 'veyn delit' (IV, 1668) and in his ability to keep this *delite* under the control of reason (IV, 1678). However, in the context of romantic love and sexual union, it is used more positively. In the consummation scene, the word never loses its carnal and sensual aspect, but it is simultaneously elevated to a spiritual register. After a description of the body of Criseyde, the narrator writes of Troilus: 'thus in this hevene he gan hym to delite' (III, 1251). Here, the body of Criseyde becomes the place, the heaven, where the lover can experience delight. *Delite* is used as a reflexive verb; it represents action rather than a state: Troilus delights himself, it is a feeling that he can create, in his lover's presence. Fabiszak argues that there is control in delight, rather than submissiveness. She explains this concept as follows: 'The degree of submissiveness […] can be translated into linguistic terms as the degree of control enjoyed by the experiencer of the emotion.' She argues that the higher the degree of submissiveness, the more positive the emotion; '*bliss*, as a prototypical name for religion-related 'joy', marks the highest degree of submissiveness, and *delight* marks the highest degree of control'.[61]

[61] Fabiszak, *Concept of Joy*, p.94. She places *delite* at the bottom of her positive-negative hierarchy, p.86-7.

While *delite* is definitely written as a feeling over which characters have control in *Troilus and Criseyde*, it does not seem to be necessarily judged negatively. The word reappears three times as a verb in positive situations of love and union: twice as the lovers delight themselves in their own words and in birds' song (IV, 1433 and 1435) and most notably as Troilus declares: 'And ay the more that desir me biteth/To love hire best, the more me deliteth' (III, 1652). Here Troilus is submitted to the bite of desire, but his delight in love is written as an action; one which accompanies a better quality of love. As an action, delight indeed becomes a controlled, voluntary emotion; eventually, therefore, the judgement of whether it is good or bad resides in its object. So, Pandarus urges Troilus 'delyte not in wo' (I, 704), only fools do. Delight in love on the other hand is presented positively in the poem. Fabiszak places it at the very bottom of the positive-negative hierarchy because of its link to sensual and earthly pleasure and because of its low degree of submissiveness. Chaucer, while inscribing the word in exactly the same context, elevates it to the very highest feeling of the hierarchy. The sexual and controlled action of delight is taken in heavenly bliss.

Blisse, the most prototypical term when it comes to religious joy, comes to embody the joy of love in the poem.[62] Chaucer generally uses that term in secular contexts. In the romances, it is associated with love and with earthly joy in general. In the *Knight's Tale*'s happy ending the word appears in concluding and abstracting couplets or triplets: Palamon marries Emelye 'with alle blisse and melodye' (I, 3097), and then is 'lyvynge in blisse, in richesse, and in heele' (I, 3102). Bliss here is the earthly prosperity and merriment that comes with love and marriage. Marital contentment is even referred to as 'sovereyn blisse' at the end of the *Franklin's Tale* (V, 1552), linking it to the discourse of philosophical happiness. But the word is also used in its exclusively religious sense in the *Parson's Tale.* In the prose sermon, *blisse* is repeated four times, each time in the same syntactic context, followed by

[62] This in itself is particular as Chaucer's contemporary Gower, very rarely uses the term *blisse* in *Confessio Amantis* and when he does, it refers to earthly happiness ('worldes blisse' 1.1771 and 5. 3642) or heavenly bliss ('blisse of hevene' 6.874) but not to the joy of love.

the definitional of-phrase: 'the blisse of hevene' (X, 793-4, 810-11, 833-4). Strikingly, this collocation reappears in *Troilus and Criseyde* but with a different syntax, perhaps required by the use of verse: the of-phrase is cut, and the collocation is reduced to a compound, with both nouns affixed to one another: 'hevene blisse' (III, 704, 1322, 1657). This particular syntax derives from the Old English compounding technique, where new words are created through the apposition of two nouns, for example *heofon-engel* for 'angel of heaven'. Although in Middle English the two words are kept separate, they do form a single nominal entity, rather than an adjectival or genitive phrase.[63] In this way, it is neither a heavenly emotion nor a blissful place, but a compound noun of place and emotion which comes to represent the lovers' climactic night. Indeed, in the Trojan romance, the collocation of bliss with 'heaven' is used to refer to the sexual joy of love – the word heaven reappears multiple times during the consummation scene. *Blisse* is not used to refer to earthly happiness as in the romances nor to literal heaven as in the *Parson's Tale*; this is where the originality of the poem's use of *blisse* lies: it refers to love and to heaven simultaneously, so much so that they become one single noun.

The whole consummation scene is narrated through amatory-religious discourse and *blisse* opens the passage. Troilus is surprised by bliss (III, 1184). It is therefore a sudden emotion and one over which he seems to have no control. This is in line with Fabiszak's analysis of medieval bliss as an emotion with the highest degree of submissiveness: bliss is granted rather than actively sought or created and this, according to Fabiszak, confers the emotion a positive valency.[64] But in *Troilus*, while bliss comes as a surprise, this sudden feeling is immediately followed by the very much controlled action of delight. The poem brings together bliss and delight, the lowest and the highest emotions in Fabiszak's

[63] The *OED* indexes 'heaven bliss' as a compound noun, offering examples from a Middle English translation of Grosseteste' *Castle of Love* (c.1390) and the 14th century poem *Cursor Mundi.* It states, however, that in some Early Middle English uses, the form *heovene* might in fact be a genitive, as in an example from the *Ancrene Wisse* (c.1225).
[64] Fabiszak, *Concept of Joy*, p.94.

hierarchy. Notions of positive and negative valency are blurred. Moreover, after this surprise, *blisse* is not written as a spontaneous emotion any more. Rather, it is posited in analogy to heaven. The emotion is turned into a metaphorical place where the lovers float: 'in blisse now they flete' (III, 1221), an unreachable place of bliss: 'let hem in this hevene blisse dwelle/That is so heigh that al ne kan I telle' (III, 1322-3). Only this last quotation has some sort of equivalence in Chaucer's Italian source. Boccaccio mentions the lovers' indescribable 'letizia' (III, 33.8). *Letizia* does not necessarily connote heavenly joy,[65] but it is Dante's preferred word for joy in his description of heaven in the *Paradiso,* where it comes to represent eternal bliss, 'l'etterna letizia' (Canto XIX, 23).[66] Boccaccio, however, does not accentuate this religious aspect. In fact, his vocabulary of sensual joy is never conflated with the spiritual.[67] In the consummation scene, Chaucer takes from Boccaccio images of burning desire (for example: *Filostrato* III, 61-63 and *TC* III, 1650-1659), but he is the one to place this desire in a transcendental place of heavenly bliss. Another revealing fact is that Boccaccio uses the nouns *piacere* (56 times) and *diletto* (26) much more than *gioia* (18) or *letizia* (7). Chaucer does use *plesaunce* and *delite* a lot as well, but *joy* and *blisse* clearly outnumber them: Chaucer writes love's joy while Boccaccio writes love's pleasure.

What Chaucer does here is original because he goes beyond the traditional amatory-religious discourse where the 'Christian vocabulary of sacred ritual' is applied to the 'so-

[65] The Italian historical dictionary *Lessicografia dell' Accademia della Crusca* defines *letizia* as a joy taken in the present enjoyment of things which give pleasure ('che deriva per lo più dal godere presenzialmente quelle cose, che danno gusto').

[66] Beatrice, souls and angels are also repeatedly described as full of joy, 'pieni di letizia' (*Paradiso* V, 107; VI, 119; VIII, 85; XXIII, 23; XXV, 16). References to Dante's *Divina Commedia* are from Dante Alighieri, *La Commedia,* ed. Giorgio Petrocchi, Bologna: Il Mulino, 1971.

[67] It is often noted that Boccaccio writes a purely sensual and physical love affair; Robert P. apRoberts sums up: 'the distinguishing mark of love presented in the *Filostrato*, its *sine qua non*, is sensuality.' Robert P. apRoberts, 'Love in the *Filostrato*', *The Chaucer Review*, 7:1, 1972, 1-26, p.26. Benson further argues that Boccaccio 'provided Chaucer with a narrative of sensual love from which the judgements of religion and ethics are excluded.' Benson, *Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde*, p.26.

called religion of love'.[68] This definition might apply to the narrator's opening prayer for example but not to the central scene. Here, the blending of registers rather has the effect described by Alcuin Blamires as according 'a "celestial" potential in amorous love'.[69] More than that even, the repetition of the term *blisse*, its association with heaven, with an unsurpassable high place, creates a transcendent moment of eternal happiness. This is achieved by placing the word *blisse* in a situational context of high sensuality but written with the help of a spiritual vocabulary – not the vocabulary of religious ceremony or liturgy but that of personal mystic ecstasy. The syntactic context only reaffirms the interdependence of the two semantic fields: in the compound 'hevene blisse', the emotion of bliss is heaven, and heaven is the place of bliss.

But as heavenly as love's bliss is, Chaucer also brings in the very earthly and philosophical concept of *felicite* in the consummation scene:

> Felicite, which that thise clerkes wise
> Comenden so, ne may nought here suffise;
> This joie may nought written be with inke;
> This passeth al that herte may bythynke (III, 1691-4)

Felicite is intelligible, it can be put into words and concepts and in fact has been by 'wise clerks', yet it is insufficient to contain 'this joie', the particular joy of erotic love. It is the versatile word *joy* here which comes to embody the elusive quality of love's joy, encompassed in *hevene blisse*. The concept of philosophical happiness is used here in relation to love's bliss, not to equate them however, but to attest the superiority of one over the other: clerkly and earthly felicity is surpassed by the elevated and indefinable joy of love.

---

[68] Jamie C. Fumo, 'The Ends of Love: (Meta)physical Desire in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', in R. Epstein and W. Robins (eds.), *Sacred and Profane in Chaucer and Late Medieval Literature*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016, 68-90, p. 71.

[69] Alcuin Blamires, 'The "Religion of Love" in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* and Medieval Visual Art', in P. M Daly, K. J. Höltgen and W. Lottes (eds.), *Word and Visual Imagination: Studies in the Interaction of English Literature and the Visual Arts*, Erlangen: Universitätsbund Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1988, 11-31, p.25.

But by bringing felicity into the narrator's description of love's joy, Chaucer frames it in the clerkly discourse of happiness. He enables erotic joy – already envisaged in the light of heavenly joy throughout the consummation – to be seen in view of earthly felicity. Jessica Rosenfeld argues that Chaucer deliberately places 'his words in the context of moral philosophy' and that the poem is animated by the 'nexus of courtly and clerkly felicity'; what is at stake is 'not the inadequacy of clerkly language to describe erotic felicity but the knowledge that clerks and lovers share a language.'[70] While it is important to note that Chaucer places love's bliss in the context of philosophical happiness – as indeed he places sensual delight in the context of heavenly bliss – what Rosenfeld calls courtly or erotic felicity does not exist in Chaucer's construction of joy. Whereas *hevene blisse* comes to encompass erotic joy, clerkly *felicite* is a conceptual frame which cannot contain love's joy.

Again, Chaucer innovates from his Italian source. This passage has no direct equivalent in the *Filostrato* and Boccaccio only uses the word *felicita* four times, in his Proemio. While the Italian *felicita* may not carry as strong philosophical connotations as Chaucer's *felicite*, it nonetheless refers to a stable and earthly state of happiness.[71] Moreover, Boccaccio does use it in correlation with Fortune and the loss of earthly felicity in love. This appears in his Proemio, which is written in prose and offers a reflection on love in general. In the poem's vivid narration of sensual love and joy, the word does not appear. Similarly, the more religiously connoted *beatitudine* is also only used in the Proemio to refer to lovers' joy in general ('beatitudine dello amante' l.5). As Reale summarises, the Proemio's narrative voice produces a 'distant account of a courtly world in which love is the subject for debate rather than a passion experienced directly.'[72] It is this distance which allows for the use of

[70] Rosenfeld, *Ethics and Enjoyment*, p.135-6.
[71] The *Lessicografia dell' Accademia della Crusca* defines *felicita* as the perfect and sufficient good, human bliss and prosperity ('bene perfetto, e sufficiente, beatitudine umana, prosperità'). The dictionary cites the only mention of the word in Dante's *Divina Commedia*, in the *Purgatorio* where it refers to philosophical, moral happiness (Canto XVII, 133-5).
[72] Nancy M. Reale, 'Reading the Language of Love: Boccaccio's *Filostrato* as Intermediary between the *Commedia* and Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', in J. J. Paxson and C. A. Gravlee (eds.),

such abstract and conceptual terms as *felicita* and *beatitudine*. Boccaccio otherwise does not bring the philosophical nor spiritual registers of happiness into his writing of love's pleasure. Chaucer, on the other hand, by placing the lovers' delight in *hevene blisse* and by contrasting it to *felicite* somehow brings conceptual distance and reflection in the midst of his narration of the lovers' consummation.

In his writing of love's joy, Chaucer blends the registers of heavenly and sensual joy, as well as that of philosophical happiness. He overturns any potential hierarchies which would place the sovereign joy of heaven and the sovereign happiness of philosophy above the human joy of sexual love. In *Troilus and Criseyde*, Chaucer tries to find or to create a poetic language of joy which goes beyond the sensual language of delight and pleasure as well as beyond the clerkly language of felicity.

Earthly and Heavenly Felicity

Felicite is an interesting word in Chaucer's corpus; used rarely – only eighteen times in the whole corpus – it seems to take on a very special significance. It is the core term in a distinctive philosophical language of happiness in Chaucer's writing which mostly stems from Boethian concepts of the sovereign good. Other words such as *prosperite* or *suffisaunce* also participate in this discourse. But in his own translation of the *Consolation*, Chaucer prefers to coin new diction, demonstrating the very careful way he chooses vocabulary to fit specific contexts. And yet, he will choose *felicite*, a clerkly term of philosophy all throughout his corpus, to express heavenly bliss at the end of the *Troilus.* This section explores the concept of felicity in Chaucer's writing, a concept which excludes the sexual joy of love, but which appears to bridge the philosophical and religious notions of perfect happiness.

Desiring Discourse: The Literature of Love, Ovid through Chaucer, Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 1998, 165-176, p.170.

The term *prosperite* refers to earthly happiness; in Chaucer, it is used to express the tragedy of Fortune. As observed previously, it appears five times in the *Monk's Tale,* often to relate how people fall from prosperity: Adam 'was dryven out of hys hye prosperitee' (VII, 2013) and Antiochus 'fil fro heigh prosperitee' (VII, 2581). The qualifier 'high' evokes the image of the wheel of Fortune and, consequently, the inevitable fall that will follow. In *Troilus and Criseyde*, the word only appears twice: in Criseyde's Boethian discourse on false happiness and in the following Boethian sentence spoken by Troilus:

> For of fortunes sharpe adversitee
> The worste kynde of infortune is this,
> A man to han ben in prosperitee,
> And it remembren whan it passed is. (III, 1625-28)

While this phrase is inspired by Boethius, the Latin author uses the adjective *felix* and not the noun *prosperitas* (2, prosa 4, l.2).[73] Chaucer's translation thus reveals his preference for nouns in the writing of happiness as well as his own understanding of the semantics of *prosperite*: it is intrinsically linked to fortune and to earthly mutability and its connotative value seems to be bound up with its antonym.[74]

Though its first meaning is sufficiency, the word *suffisaunce* also refers to contentment or satisfaction (*MED,* 3.) and is thus included in Chaucer's vocabulary of felicity. While it is a philosophical term (it appears fourteen times in the *Boece*), Chaucer also diverts the meaning and register of the word by incorporating it into romantic courtly speech. From a technical *terme* of philosophy he makes a conventional *terme* of courtly love. As Burnley notices, *suffisaunce* 'has become one of the endearments spoken between

[73] Dante also offers a version of this sentence in the *Commedia*, where he stays closer to the Latin and translates Boethius' *felix* with the adjective *felice*: 'Nessun maggior dolore/Che recordarsi del tempo felice/Nella miseria' (*Inferno* V, 121-3). Only Chaucer therefore opts for the noun 'prosperity'.
[74] *Prosperite* and *adversite* are also linked in his *Boece*: 1, p.4, 289-91; 2, p.2, l.88; 4, p.6, 263.

lovers.'[75] It appears in this context in the *Book of the Duchess* (1037-8) as well as in *Troilus and Criseyde*: 'Welcome, my knyght, my pees, my suffisaunce!' exclaims Criseyde (III, 1309). *Suffisaunce* has ethical and philosophical implications: sufficiency cannot be found anywhere and certainly should not be sourced in one single person. It is quite telling that a term which implies the self-sufficiency of philosophical happiness is recast as a term to refer to the beloved other: the poem remodels personal *suffisaunce* as interpersonal and amorous. Later, it is earthly felicity that Criseyde calls her *suffisaunce* (V, 762-3), placing the word back into its philosophical register.

Felicite is the most important word of Chaucer's philosophical discourse of joy. It collocates several times with *clerkes* and, as William Watts argues, the terms *verray felicite parfit*, repeated together or separately, belong to a 'broader discourse about true and perfect happiness that is rooted in Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy*.'[76] *Felicite* is part of a moral discourse on where and how men find happiness. So, for example Januarie from the *Merchant's Tale* subscribes to the Epicurean philosophy which places *felicite* in delight: 'somme clerkes holden that felicitee/Stant in delit' (IV, 2021-25) and so does the Franklin: he 'heeld opinioun that pleyn delit/Was verray felicitee parfit' (I, 337-8). Even though *felicite* collocates with *delite* here, the term is strictly philosophical, and, crucially, it never refers to the joy of love.[77]

But the very first use of the term in Chaucer's corpus appears in his *ABC*, a poem inspired by Deguileville's own French *ABC*, a devotional prayer to the Virgin Mary.[78] *Félicité* is not present in the French poem, which only mentions the comfort and salvation

[75] J. D. Burnley, *Chaucer's Language and the Philosophical Tradition*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1979, p.96.
[76] William Watts, 'Verray Felicitee Parfit and the Development of Chaucer's Philosophical Language', *The Chaucer Review,* 43:3, 2009, 260-281, p.261.
[77] This is particular to Chaucer's writing as Gower does use the term *felicite* to refer to the joy of love: 'of the felicite of love and ek of all the wo' (*Confessio Amantis*, 1, 206).
[78] According to Cannon in *The Making of Chaucer's English*, p.289.

the Virgin brings humans.[79] Chaucer expands this description and qualifies Mary as 'largesse of pleyn felicite' (13). Chaucer thus first borrows the term to fit a religious context, not to express the joy of heaven itself but the abstract concept of full earthly happiness bestowed by the Virgin. The idea of fullness is important to Chaucer's understanding of *felicite* and sovereign happiness. The adjective *pleyn* also defines the *delite* that the Franklin posits as 'verray felicitee parfit'. So, while Chaucer's first coinage of the phrase 'pleyn felicite' belongs to religious discourse, his subsequent use of both lexemes is embedded in the *terme* of philosophy.

Full felicity is the main theoretical nexus of Boethius' *Consolation.* True happiness, in Boethius, 'is sufficient unto itself and leads to no further desire: it is fully made (*per-fectus*), complete and indivisible.'[80] And yet, *felicite*, which is the calque of Boethius' Latin *Felicitas*, only appears twice in the *Boece* and the adjective *pleyn* does not. Instead, Chaucer uses, or, very probably, creates the English cognates *welefulnesse* and *blisfulnesse* to translate both *felicitas* and *beatitudo.*[81] Rissanen attributes the rarity of *felicite* in the *Boece* to the poet's preference for native words and his wish to have a specialised and rare vocabulary for his translation of Boethian concepts of happiness.[82] But as Chaucer may have coined the words *welefulnesse* and *blisfulnesse* himself especially for this context that their construction is itself meaningful. They are made from the adjectives *blisful* and *weleful,* themselves created by the addition of the suffix -ful to already existing nouns. I think that the presence of this grammatical suffix in these words is not a coincidence: Chaucer appears to build, or at least choose, a specific vocabulary that carries the notion of *fullness* in its

[79] Guillaume Deguileville, *Le Pelerinage de Vie Humaine*, J. J. Stürzinger (ed.), London: Rorburghe Club, 1893, l.10900.
[80] Watts, 'Verray Felicitee Parfit', p.266.
[81] It is commonly accepted that Chaucer read Jean de Meun's French translation as he produced his own. Meun here uses the words *félicité* and *beneurté,* it is therefore unlikely that Chaucer was inspired by him in this instance. V. L. Dedeck-Hery (ed.), 'Boethius's *De Consolatione* by Jean de Meun,' *Medieval Studies*, 14, 1952, 165-275.
[82] Matti Rissanen, 'In Search of *Happiness*: *Felicitas* and *Beatitudo* in Early English Boethius Translations', *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 31, 1997, 237-248, pp.244-5.

construction. *Blisfulnesse* is not *blisse.* It is not heavenly joy nor erotic bliss, but it is the philosophical and human attainment of *divinite* (*Boece* 3, p.10, 138-42). Therefore, although Chaucer coins a new word for this philosophical concept, his choice of the root *bliss* seems entirely intentional.[83] However, *blisse* must be modified by the suffix -ful in order to convey a spiritual joy which is nonetheless earthly and philosophical.

In *Troilus and Criseyde,* both of the coined terms are absent, as they are in the rest of the corpus. *Felicite* is the main term for philosophical happiness. It appears notably in the Boethian passage on the limitations of worldly happiness uttered by Criseyde at the beginning of the third book (III, 813-833). In this passage the vocabulary is highly embedded in the philosophical tradition observed earlier as she uses expressions such as 'fals felicitee', 'veyn prosperitee', 'verray joie', 'verray weele' or 'perfit selynesse'. What is remarkable here is the use of the Old English *selinesse*, a term which appears three times in this passage but nowhere else in Chaucer's corpus. Watts explains the co-occurrence of *felicite* and *selinesse* as follows:

> Criseyde uses *felicitee* and *selynesse* together in a way that allows the older English word to serve as a gloss for the newer Latinate one: 'worldly selynesse,/Which clerkes callen fals felicitee.' It is also significant that she attributes the use of *felicitee* to clerks, and thereby suggests that it is a less common and less accessible word than the native *selynesse.*[84]

While this confirms the technical aspect of *felicite* as a *terme* of philosophy, it does not offer any explanation regarding the choice of the word *selinesse* specifically. I believe that Chaucer deliberately chooses to put this particular word, *selinesse*, in the mouth of Criseyde, his female protagonist. The word can mean happiness as well as 'simplicity, humble state'

[83] *Blisse* is the term chosen by Thomas Usk to refer to the *summum bonum* in his *Testament.* It therefore does connote sovereign happiness. But Chaucer still preferred coining his own term, perhaps because *blisse*, in his writing, also refers to sexual joy.
[84] Watts, 'Verray Felicitee Parfit', pp.270-1.

(*MED* (b)). In Criseyde's Boethian speech, which comes after Pandarus' fabricated story on Troilus' jealousy, it seems to evoke the possibility of a happiness which is innocent and good, free from bitterness and Pandarus' machinations. But it becomes particularly meaningful when linked to Chaucer's use of the adjective *seli* to refer to honourable and wretched women, and Criseyde herself, as discussed earlier. The fact that Criseyde is the only character to ever pronounce this noun in Chaucer's corpus is not a coincidence. It confirms the fact that there are connotations of literary evaluation here: *seli* and *selinesse* link together legendary women and help exonerate their literary reputation.

Criseyde will also be the only character to use the word *blisse* to refer to earthly happiness, making it collocate with *worldly*. After the news of her own forced departure Criseyde cries out:

> Endeth than love in wo? Ye, or men lieth,
> And alle worldly blisse, as thynketh me.
> The ende of blisse ay sorwe it occupieth. (IV, 834-6)

The repeated and emphasised presence of the word *blisse* in this context is surprising.[85] The syntactic context recalls other such aphoristic sentences on the mutability of human emotions such as: 'O sodeyn wo, that evere art successour/To worldly blisse' and 'wo occupieth the fyn of oure gladnesse' (*Man of Law's Tale* II, 421-2 and 424). This is not at all the usual context for *blisse* in the poem. The word is absent from Criseyde's Boethian discourse on false happiness. Yet, after she has experienced, and lost, ecstatic *blisse*, it is the term chosen in her pragmatic reflexion on the mutability of earthly happiness. Chaucer, who uses *blisse* in all its spiritual force in the consummation scene, now annihilates all of its eternal potential by qualifying it as worldly. Erotic *blisse* is brought back down to earth and becomes part of

[85] It is surprising in the poem's use of the word more than in Middle English in general. The *MED,* under heading 1.(b.) of *blisse*, offers quite a few examples of *blisse* referring to earthly joy. One telling example is the title of a thirteenth century lyric: 'Worldles blis ne last'.

worldly prosperity which always turns into its contrary. The poet enjoys subverting lexical expectations and overturning hierarchies. Finally, after having posited sexual *hevene blisse* as surpassing clerkly *felicite,* literal heavenly bliss comes expressed as *felicite.*

The word *felicite* closes the poem's trajectory of joy. During the course of the text, the concept of *felicite* is being defined and called upon by different persons: Criseyde explains how clerks call earthly happiness 'fals felicitee' (III, 814), then she herself calls *felicite* her sufficiency, and the narrator declares that the *felicite* commended by the clerks does not suffice to comprehend love's joy.[86] Finally, the last reference of the term as the 'pleyn felicite that is in hevene' appears as the sum of all those calling echoes. The 'hevenyssh melodie' is their destination. It is *pleyn*; that is, full and perfect.[87] A fullness which is heavily emphasized in the passage of the flight:

> And whan that he was slayn in this manere,
> His lighte goost **ful** blis**ful**ly is went
> Up to the holughnesse of the eighthe spere,
> In convers letyng everich element;
> And ther he saugh with **ful** avysement
> The erratik sterres, herkenyng armonye
> With sownes **ful** of hevenyssh melodie.
>
> And down from thennes faste he gan avyse
> This litel spot of erthe that with the se
> Embraced is, and **ful**ly gan despise
> This wrecched world, and held al vanite
> To respect of the **pleyn** felicite
> That is in hevene above; and at the laste,
> Ther he was slayn his lokyng down he caste, (V, 1807-20)

[86] The semantics of the term in the poem is therefore not unambiguous. Patrick J. Horner argues that 'in Chaucer's lexicon, and particularly in *Troilus and Criseyde* […], *felicite* refers to the highest happiness, far exceeding any transitory, unstable, earthly pleasures of fortune.' This straightforward definition of the term is, I believe, overstated. While Chaucer's concept of *felicite* participates in the philosophical discourse on the highest good, the term's semantics is not that strictly constrained. When Troilus speaks of his past life 'in ese and in felicite' (IV, 480), *felicite* cannot be understood as philosophy's sovereign good. Horner, 'To 'speken in amphibologies': Reading *Troilus and Criseyde*, Book V, 763', *The Chaucer Review*, 47:1, 2012, 84-94, p.92.

[87] *Plein* means full and complete in Middle English (*MED*, 1.). A note in the *Riverside Chaucer* explains, '*pleyn* derives ultimately from Latin *plenus* (full), with perhaps a shade of influence from the homophone 'pleyn' from *planus* (plain, uncomplicated)' p.1057.

I have highlighted in this passage the recurrences of the concept 'full'. First of all, the flight of Troilus' soul is described by the adverb *blisfully* – which is added from the source; Boccaccio's *Teseida* rather than *Filostrato*.[88] The use of the adverb means that Troilus himself is not qualified as full of bliss but rather the manner of his elevation is blissful. While the word evokes a religious register, the insistence on fullness recalls the Boethian philosophical concept of perfect happiness. The word *full* is repeated until the true origin of this plenitude is revealed: *pleyn felicite*. The poet chooses to circumscribe this spiritual passage in a philosophical register. Yet, it is important to remember that Chaucer's first use of the expression 'pleyn felicite' occurs in the devotional context of the *ABC.* So, while *felicite* in Chaucer mostly implies human pursuit as well as personal philosophical ideology, the particularity of 'pleyn felicite', the perfect happiness given freely by Mary and that which lies in heaven above, is that it functions outside of human agency. It is a potential and objective form of happiness, granted by the divine.

Though the phrase 'pleyn felicite' originates in a religious context, it is subsequently restricted to the *termes* of philosophy in Chaucer's corpus. In the context of the poem, the choice to portray heavenly joy not as *blisse,* not even as *joy* indeed, but as 'felicity', a form of objective contentment is surprising. Megan Murton, in her essay on *Troilus'* non-ironical use of Boethius in prayers, reads this ending as abandoning the 'devotional framework' of the end of the *Consolation* and reverting to Lady Philosophy's 'strictly rational arguments'; Troilus' flight is a 'mental transcendence'.[89] The vocabulary of the whole passage appears in fact more cognitive than emotional. It focuses on the acts of seeing and understanding, not feeling: in the eighth sphere Troilus attains 'ful avysement' – while Arcite simply admired 'ammirava' (*Teseida* 11.1, 6). This is about an enlightenment, which is not available

[88] References to the *Teseida* are from: Giovanni Boccaccio, *Teseida: delle nozze d'Emilia*, Alberto Limentani (ed.), Milano: Mondadori, 1992.
[89] Murton, 'Praying with Boethius', p.317.

on earth. Though Boethius' flight metaphors 'refer essentially to the ascent of the mind in contemplation' rather than the ascent of the soul after death, Steadman argues that, 'like the felicity of philosophers in this life, the beatitude of separated souls after death consists primarily in contemplation.'[90] But contrary to the critic, Chaucer uses the same word for both, uniting human happiness in contemplation and heavenly happiness in the same philosophical terminology. Steadman also notices the emphasis on contempt. *Despisen* stems from Latin *despicere* meaning both looking down and despise.[91] The emphasis here is hence on a new perspective: both spatial and cognitive. Yet it is also Chaucer who adds from his source the concept of happiness. In Boccaccio's *Teseida,* the Italian *felicita* or *felicitate* does not appear; it only mentions heaven and not the joy in it: 'e ogni cosa da nulla stimare/a rispetto del ciel' (*Teseida* 11.2, 5-6: 'and all of the things to despise in comparison to heaven'). The passage contains no philosophical language. Chaucer thus chooses to embed the spiritual flight in a reflection on the full happiness of heaven conceptualised through the non-emotional vocabulary of philosophy. In 'pleyn felicity', the religious and philosophical conceptions of sovereign happiness merge.

Conclusion

What about joy? While the notion of joy as an intense positive emotion permeates many of the contexts and concepts the studied lexemes belong to, the term *joy* itself has evaded this survey. *Joy* appears in almost every situational context and thus makes its contextual analysis somewhat irrelevant. It is the most frequent word for joy in the poem and it does not enter one particular register. What this section has surveyed instead are the different linguistic and conceptual forms joy takes in the poem. Love's *blisse* and *gladnesse*

[90] Steadman, *Disembodied Laughter*, pp.86-7.
[91] Ibid., p.55.

are a form of joy and so is the friendly merriment Criseyde and Pandarus share. *Felicite* and *selinesse* are adjacent to joy but may better be understood as forms of what we now call happiness. They are all different from yet somehow encompassed by *joy*. Indeed, the word is used in the consummation scene, alongside *blisse, delite* and *gladnesse* as well as in Criseyde's Boethian speech on false happiness, alongside *felicite* and *selinesse*. And yet, contrary to *blisse, gladnesse* and *felicite, joy* can be a bodily and physiological process: hearts spread and grow full of joy (II, 980 and III, 356). It can be felt; lovers feel *joy* in love's service (III, 42) and Troilus' soul feels *joy* at the promise of seeing Criseyde (III, 345). *Gladnesse* and *felicite* are never felt and *blisse* appears as the place where love and its delight are felt (III, 1220 and 1658). *Joy* is also different from friendly playfulness: while it is found in most contexts, it is not part of comedy. It does not appear in the fabliaux and is rare in the courtly and social situations of *Troilus and Criseyde. Joy* is not a laughing matter. But it can be communal and public: Troilus is the *joy* of the people of Troy (II, 643), who will commonly lose their *joy* (IV, 56). *Joy* is part of the historical and public sphere of Troy. The prominence of the word in the poem is in fact linked to its capacity to rhyme with Troy.[92] *Joy* is bound through rhyme to the place of Troy in the poem; this creates a trajectory of joy which is linked to the doomed fate of Troy.[93] *Joy* is therefore at both ends of the spectrum: bodily and private as well as exterior, public and even historical. This raises important questions on the nature of *joy* – and joy – in Chaucer's writing: is it a feeling or a concept, an emotion or a value? The rest of the thesis will try and answer these questions.

The use of the word *joy* is representative of how positive emotion is conceptualised in the poem, particularly in its ability to span across registers. Chaucer thus scrambles the work of lexicography and conceptual mapping. The poem's diction upsets our sense that joy belongs to a discrete category. It dismantles hierarchies of emotions. Different kinds of joy

[92] The words rhyme twenty-eight times with each other.
[93] The rhyme will be studied in chapter four.

coexist in the poem's emotional world. In *Troilus*, there is an erotic potential in religious joy and a celestial potential in erotic joy. The conceptual language of philosophy frames but does not contain erotic joy, while it appears as the favoured discourse for the representation of heavenly felicity. Some forms of joy thus merge but others are mutually exclusive. Troilus and Criseyde share sexual bliss, but their joy cannot be public, and they cannot experience together the social and playful emotion that characterises Pandarus' interactions.

The diction of joy in the poem is unstable. In that way, joy's instability on earth is embodied in its lexical and grammatical patterns. Words of joy do not appear in fixed collocational doublets as they do in the rest of the corpus. And, contrary to sorrow, joy is never a fixed attribute. The adjectival merriness of friendship holds in moments and in words. But joy is otherwise mostly nominal. Contrary to delight, joy is not a verb, not an action. There may be delight in joy, but joy is eventually expressed in a more abstract use of lexis. Between concept and feeling, the meaning of joy can only be found in context. Different characters and situations generate different registers and forms of joy. The poem thus explores, blends and contrasts a multiplicity of discourses on joy and happiness. *Troilus and Criseyde* is a search for joy.

CHAPTER TWO
THE CHARACTERISATION OF JOY

Introduction

Characters are essential to the study of literary emotion: they are the ones that *feel* and that make us, the readers, feel. And yet they are, in a very real way, mere paper figures, beings of words. Registers and types of discourse are therefore invaluable to characterisation also. The status of characters is often a point of fixation and fascination in literary criticism as well as in readers. Indeed, the pleasure of reading often comes from identification with the story's characters, or conversely, pleasure is had in hating the villain or trying to make sense of an ambiguous character's intentions. Characters are often spoken of as real-life persons whose actions and personality can be psychologically explained. It is therefore very hard to remind oneself of what they actually are: a linguistic construct, a mark on a page. The meaning of the word character itself embodies this contradiction: 'it means both a letter or sign, a mark of writing, and the "essential" qualities of a "person". […] The etymology of the word is suggestive: from the Greek word *kharatein,* to engrave, the word becomes a mark or sign, a person's title and hence a distinguishing mark – that which distinguishes one person from another – and from this a "fictional" person or a person on stage.'[1] The character

[1] Andrew Bennett and Nicholas Royle, *Introduction to Literature Criticism and Theory*, 4th edition, Hoboken: Taylor and Francis, 2014, p.66.

is thus intrinsic to the written word and to fiction but also evokes the essence of individuality and therefore the emotional engagement that only a 'real' person can elicit.

Characters have often been dealt with as persons and studied psychologically. In the case of *Troilus and Criseyde,* an important trend of criticism in the beginning of the twentieth century regarded the poem as the first psychological novel.[2] However, the structuralist movement of the 1960s endeavoured to render this trend obsolete. This school of thought, inspired by developments in the field of linguistic, insists that we look at characters for what they are: a product of the text. Structural analysis defines characters through semiotics and restricts them to functional roles. It rejects psychological determinism, which looks at 'psychological traits that can explain actions, behaviours.'[3] These functional roles can be diegetic or not, and therefore include narratorial figures. Characters are not persons but 'participants' of the text, defined by their textual function and analysed as signs.[4] These theories, however, do not seem to take the reader into consideration, nor the communicative aspect of the text. They do not answer to the important questions of 'What is the character for the reader?' And 'What creates emotional engagement?' – questions which this chapter will seek to answer.

Literary characters are, in a way, rhetorical devices. The classical arts of rhetoric comprise several exercises of characterisation, such as prosopopoeia, ethopoeia or the portrait.[5] At its origin, the character is a social or ethical typological trope. This leads us to an important trend of scholarship, which argues that characters in medieval literature are

---

[2] George Lyman Kittredge asserted that *Troilus and Criseyde* 'is the first novel, in the modern sense, that ever was written in the world' in Kittredge, *Chaucer and his Poetry*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1915, p.109. See also Karl Young's summary of this trend: Karl Young, '*Troilus and Criseyde* as Romance', p.38.

[3] Michael Modarelli, 'Pandarus's "Grete Emprise": Narration and Subjectivity in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde'*, *English Studies*, 89:40, 2008, 403-414, p.408.

[4] Vincent Jouve, *L'effet-personnage dans le roman*, Paris: PUF, 1992, p.9.

[5] For a study of Chaucer's characterisation as influenced by rhetoric and *ethopoeia* in particular see Henrik Specht, '"Ethopoeia" or Impersonation: A Neglected Species of Medieval Characterization', *The Chaucer Review*, 21:2, 1986, 1-15.

strictly formed through typology or moral allegory.[6] Elizabeth Fowler complicates this trend by looking at characters, not as types, but as evoking multiple social persons. By social persons she understands models or mental representations of the person shaped by social life.[7] So Chaucer's portrait of the Knight evokes alternatively the mercenary, the crusader or the ideal courtly lover. For Fowler, characters are agglomerates of social types rather than allegorical figures. A typological approach can therefore include the reader's perception of character. Similarly, a textual and rhetorical view of characters does not need to exclude the question of emotional engagement. This chapter wishes to explore how such a stylised work as *Troilus and Criseyde* manages, through characterisation, to exert an emotional hold on its readers.

The recent criticism on characters and *Troilus and Criseyde* is mixed. The attention of Chaucer to his characters' inner lives and 'psychological' depth is still acknowledged, but it is accompanied by the consideration of the characters' textual, literary or social roles. David Aers, for example, focuses on the poem's examination of the individual as conditioned by society,[8] and Sashi Nair argues – along with others – how the representation of Criseyde considers 'the effect of social constraints upon actions'[9]. Ida Gordon acknowledges the effect of realness created by the protagonists of the *Troilus*, yet she argues that characterisation is functional: the characters are 'manipulated' to accommodate thematic

[6] D. W. Robertson Jr., for example, reads the whole poem allegorically: Troilus is a type of Adam, Criseyde a type of Eve, *A Preface to Chaucer: Studies in Medieval Perspectives*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962, pp.44 and 473-503. Charles Muscatine on the other hand, while he does argue that, in *Troilus*, 'characterization is a device, not an end' and that it participates in the broader 'symbolic pattern' of the poem, also acknowledges the necessity to confront such a symbolic reading of characters to a realistic one: the poem forces us to consider both convention and realism in its characterisation. *Chaucer and the French Tradition*, p.133.

[7] Elizabeth Fowler, *Literary Character: The Human Figure in Early English Writing*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003, pp.2-3.

[8] David Aers, *Chaucer,* Brighton: Harvester, 1986 and 'Criseyde: Woman in Medieval Society', *The Chaucer Review*, 13:3, 1979, 177-200.

[9] Sashi Nair, '"O brotel wele of mannes joie unstable": Gender and Philosophy in *Troilus and Criseyde*', *Parergon*, 23:2, 2006, 35-56, p.36.

concerns.[10] Elaine Tuttle Hansen puts into contrast the allegorical or 'unnaturalistic' female figures of the dream-visions with Criseyde, 'a realistic female character'.[11] But, while commenting on the psychological vividness of Criseyde, Hansen actually emphasises her textuality and conventionality: she is the ambiguous 'beautiful Woman', her slipperiness itself becoming a 'sign'. She then argues 'Criseyde is in the psychologically realistic foreground of the poem; but her meaning and function are shaped in part by the deployment of her character against a well-developed literary tradition that offers sharply contrasting images of women.'[12] The critic brings together the reader's perception of Criseyde as a psychological and social person with a method which approaches characters as 'signs'. The two approaches are therefore not mutually exclusive.

Many critics have considered characters and language together without subscribing to a strict structuralist reading. Thus, Barry Windeatt argues that each character has its typical mode of expression[13] and David Taylor analyses Troilus' style by pointing at the conventional linguistic structures he uses, and how these structures are specific to him in the poem.[14] They do not, however, explore the extent to which the characters are products of that language. As Emma Smith argues for Shakespeare, 'we can see dramatic characters in this way as a product of the language which, strangely, they seem themselves also to produce. Rather than articulating their own words, they are articulated by them.'[15] While perhaps even more relevant in drama, this approach applies to Chaucer's characters. The

[10] Ida L. Gordon, 'Processes of Characterisation in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', in W. R. J. Barron, D. Blamires, W. Rothwell and L. Thorpe (eds.), *Studies in Medieval Literature and Languages*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1973, 117-31.
[11] Elaine Tuttle Hansen, *Chaucer and the Fictions of Gender*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992, p.141.
[12] Tuttle Hansen, *Fictions of Gender*, p.157.
[13] Windeatt, *Troilus and Criseyde*, pp.267-95.
[14] David Taylor, 'The Terms of Love: A Study of Troilus' Style', in Barney (ed.), *Troilus and Criseyde*, 2006, 503-22.
[15] Emma Smith, *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007, p.2.

psychology of his protagonists emerges through dialogues and lengthy monologues, these 'moments of supreme self-revelation'.[16]

Language and psychology are heavily co-dependent. Modes of speech assert specific affective systems which are constitutive of identities and characters. This is especially relevant with an author as interested in registers and diction as is Chaucer. The different characters can be seen to be constructed through different modes of discourse. Paul Strohm explores this in his study on attitudes towards time and narrative in the poem: 'attitudes of protagonists toward time and change remain associated with their expressed preferences and with their personal choices in matters of expressive form.'[17] The important claim that is made here is the co-dependence between expressive form and the characters' stance on such defining matters as time and change. Strohm argues that it is discourse that determines what social type a character belongs to, but he does not explore how expressive and narrative modes actually construct characters, their personality and their emotionality.

I argue that to understand characterisation in *Troilus and Criseyde,* one needs to look at ways of speaking and ways of feeling. Thus, for instance, Troilus' complaints and monologues achieve an apathetic and imaginative affectivity, while Pandarus' use of dialogue creates a mode of feeling which is action-driven and momentous. This exploration of affective and expressive attitudes will focus on joy. As a psychological emotion and a philosophical goal, it is a very useful lens from which to interrogate characterisation. Moreover, in a poem which is explicitly about sorrow, it is especially telling to observe how characters experience and conceptualise earthly joy and how inversely they are shaped by their mode of thinking and feeling joy. Before turning to the protagonists, I will first examine the narratorial presence in the poem. The narrator works as a framing device; he frames the story in a particular literary tradition as well as in a particular affectivity. Yet, he also

[16] Smith, *Introduction to Shakespeare*, p.18.
[17] Paul Strohm, *Social Chaucer*, Cambridge, Massachussetts: Harvard University Press, 1994, pp.118-9.

expresses a strong emotional engagement with the story itself and its characters. The exploration of the narrator is crucial to examine the complex construction of characters in Chaucer; between literary convention, rhetorical feature and powerful vector of emotional involvement.

Narrator

It is now commonly accepted that narrators of fiction are not simply a reflection of the poet's thoughts and ideas. However, the question of whether these narrators are indeed 'characters' is still topical. Criticism on Chaucer's dream visions has often defined their narrators as characters. Larry Sklute argues, 'Chaucer's persona in the dream visions is a consistent character. He is an anxiety-ridden, muddleheaded but well-intentioned, shy, sentimental, bedazzled poet'.[18] Many critics share this view, though with qualifications. Charles Muscatine is one of them and first traced back this specific figure to the French tradition.[19] No such consensus has been reached for the narrator of *Troilus and Criseyde*. A similar approach has been popular though: the narrator is often described as a 'persona' whose deliberate fallibility explains any dissonances in the poem.[20] The theory of the fallible narrator helps explain the problem of the inconsistency of the narrative voice, which seems to offer a multiplicity of points of view. But A. C. Spearing refutes the 'persona' theory. He argues that the first person commentaries and invocations can be attributed to the author, and that subjectivity is diffused throughout the text itself without necessarily relying on a

[18] Larry Sklute, *Virtue of Necessity*, Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1984, pp.23-4.
[19] See Muscatine, *Chaucer and the French Tradition: A Study in Style and Meaning*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957, pp.98-123.
[20] E. Talbot Donaldson is the one who invents the fallible *persona* who is Chaucer's fictional counterpart in his article 'Chaucer the Pilgrim', *PMLA*, 69, 1954, 928-36.

'subject-consciousness' or a narrator 'persona'.[21] Lawton has also argued that the narratorial voice in *Troilus and Criseyde* is not a 'persona' but a linguistic feature of rhetorical figures such as *sententia* or *exclamatio*.[22] The first-person voice is indeed rhetorical in the way it comments on and responds to the unfolding events of the narrative and acts as an intermediary between the reader and the fiction. This rhetorical narrative voice does, however, present to the reader a coherent though complex emotional stance.

The narratorial voice is especially present in intense emotional moments. Lawton notices that while the narrator's presence becomes more sporadic after the proem in Book IV, he reappears to comment on his inability to describe Criseyde's sorrow ('If I discryven wolde hire hevynesse,/It sholde make hire sorwe seme lesse' IV, 802-3), and then again in a stanza on Troilus' grief ('That swich a wo my wit kan nat diffyne' V, 271).[23] The reappearing presence of the narratorial voice in emotional situations gives the reader the sense of an emotional narrator. The protagonists' emotions are almost always accompanied by the narrator's own (often affective) attitude towards these emotions. Lawton argues that this is simply the tone of narratorial interventions, which adapts to the narrative. But the affective attitude of the narrator is more complex than that and produces the appearance of an emotional interiority. This, as I shall demonstrate, is particularly noticeable when observing moments of joy, as the first-person voice has a difficult relationship with the positive emotion of love. The affective mode of the narrator is mainly established during the different proems, where his commentaries are extended into invocations, lyrics or prayers. These passages, where the narrator invokes specific muses and deities to help him compose his story, create a frame for the poem. This literary and affective frame helps build literary posterity for the poem by placing it in tradition. However, as we shall see, this tradition is

[21] A. C. Spearing, *Textual Subjectivity: The Encoding of Subjectivity in Medieval Narratives and Lyrics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005, p.15 ff.
[22] David Lawton, *Chaucer's Narrators*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1985, p.82.
[23] Ibid., p.81.

restricted to tragic and plaintive poetics and it therefore confines the narrator to a negative affectivity, leaving – *a priori* – very little space for joy.

In the first proem, the narrator offers a statement of purpose: he will tell of Troilus' 'double sorwe' (I, 1). This statement is accompanied by a subjective commentary on his own attitude towards the story and his task as composer. He invokes the Fury Thesiphone to help him write these 'woful vers' (I, 7):

> To the clepe I, thow goddesse of torment,
> Thow cruwel Furie, sorwynge every in peyne,
> Help me, that am the sorwful instrument,
> That helpeth loveres, as I kan, to pleyne;
> For wel sit it, the sothe for to seyne,
> A woful wight to han a drery feere,
> And to a sorwful tale, a sory chere. (I, 8-14)

The narrator places himself in a specific emotional posture: in order to write a sad tale, only a sad countenance is fitting. He thus adopts the affective mode of the complaint, be it in his writing or in his 'chere'. His invocation of Thesiphone provides a classical frame for the story which is both tragic and epic. It focuses on Thesiphone as a 'goddesse of torment' (I, 8), a rather general statement for a figure whose attributes are varied and detailed. Furies are in charge of vengeance and the punishment of crimes; in Statius' *Thebaid,* Thesiphone sows dissent between brothers, and spurs on war.[24] Chaucer chooses to focus on the emotional tone that the Fury evokes: one of constant sorrowing in pain (I, 9). This is the frame for the narrator's own affective stance. He adopts a specific literary posture, one of classical complaint, and entraps himself in an obligatory writing contract. This obligation is as much – if not more – emotional than it is literary. What seems to be at play here might best be expressed through Marcel Mauss' concept of the 'obligatory expression of feelings'. By this,

[24] Robert Levine discusses in depth the resonances generated by Thesiphone in this passage, notably 'images of vengeance, sexual disorder, a sterile rather than a procreative Venus, the devil himself.' Levine, 'Restraining Ambiguities in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 87, 1986, 558-64, p. 559

the anthropologist means the precise emotional reactions that are required in certain specific contexts: an emotional script mandated by social and cultural situation.[25] For the figure of the narrator, this script is mandated by literary tradition. A tradition that is invoked and shaped through the different proems. The tone is, however, well established in the first one already, and it is not joyful.

Joy is mentioned in the first proem in hypothetical and distanced terms. The narrator expresses the wish that, by serving them and being their sorrowful instrument, he might do gladness unto lovers (I, 19). This is followed by a bidding prayer to lovers 'that bathen in gladnesse' (I, 22) to have pity on those that do not. In this first proem, therefore, joy is either potential, surrounded by sorrow ('fro wo to wele, and after out of joie' I, 4), or a momentary bath of pleasure, reserved to a few lucky ones, outside of the text. The narrator is the spokesperson of those unlucky ones. One must question, therefore, to what extent the narrator's emotional script leaves room for the expression of joy that is not conditioned by its opposite or its transitoriness. The narrator's choices of invocations appear to leave very little space for joy. After Thesiphone, he will again call upon the plaintive Furies at the beginning of Book IV. But he also invokes two of the nine mythological Muses: Clio, Muse of history, for Book II and Calliope, Muse of epic poetry, for Book III. These invocations to Muses function as authoritative guarantee. The choice of Muses confirms this stance as Clio also represents fame and Calliope eloquence. While they elicit a claim towards literary excellence and posterity, the two Muses remain strange choices for a poem which mainly deals with love. Particularly, the Muse of epic poetry seems somewhat misplaced in the book of love's joy. The Muse of love poetry, Erato, or of lyrics, Euterpe, would have appeared

[25] Marcel Mauss, 'L'expression obligatoire des sentiments (rituels oraux funéraires australiens)', *Journal de psychologie*, 18, 1921, 425-34. Mauss does not use the notion of 'script' directly. But the term 'emotion script' has been used by historians of emotions for several years. McNamer has suggested to look at medieval literary texts 'as scripts for the performance of feelings'. My use of the term, however, is less interested in performance and more in obligation. McNamer, 'Feeling', p.246.

more appropriate. But, to their flutes and cithara, the narrator prefers the more 'serious' and authoritative scrolls, stylus and laurel wreath of Clio and Calliope. The emotional script fit for literary posterity seems devoid of lightness and gladness. And yet, as I shall now show, the narrator's framing of his text also seems to emphasize and to exalt the more joyful books – the second and the third – which are the only ones being introduced by invocations to Muses.

The proem of the second book offers a different narratorial posture than the first one. While in the poem's opening the narrator expresses his own sorrow towards his tale and his compassion for lovers, in the second proem he professes a posture of emotional distance. The script changes: from the Furies' complaints to the non-emotional historical Muse. He asks for Clio's help 'to ryme wel this book' and adds, 'me nedeth here noon other art to use' (II, 10-11). Rhymes, another literary guarantee, are the only 'art' he needs. He affirms relying only on historical facts, and nothing artificial or untrue. This also means no feelings, as he states: 'of no sentement I this endite/But out of Latyn in my tonge it write' (II, 13-14). His role is that of the translator, one which shows a 'clerkly disengagement from love'.[26] While this appears extremely different from the teary posture of the first proem, both attitudes have one thing in common: they leave no space for the comic or for the joy of love. Moreover, it is significant that the narrator invokes the help of a Muse and expresses his emotional disengagement not in the first, plaintive, book, but in the second one, that which marks the start of the 'calends of hope' (II, 7).

From his 'unfelyng' posture in front of hope, the narrator moves on to actual distress in the face of joy. The proem of the third book starts with an address to Venus which skilfully blends the sexual and religious vocabularies of the joy of love. The narrator then asks for her help:

[26] Lawton, *Chaucer's Narrators*, p.79.

> Now, lady bright, for thi benignite,
> At reverence of hem that serven the,
> Whos clerc I am, so techeth me devyse
> Som joye of that is felt in thi servyse.
>
> Ye in my naked herte sentement
> Inhielde, and do me shewe of thy swetnesse.
> Caliope, thi vois be now present,
> For now is need: sestow nought my destresse,
> How I mot telle anonright the gladnesse
> Of Troilus, to Venus heryinge? (III, 39-48)

While he asks the goddess of Love to show him the sweetness and the joy of love, it is Calliope whom he invokes to be his voice. By the end of the stanza, Venus is relegated to the role of recipient. Calliope, on the other hand, is taken as witness to the narrator's distress and petitioned for help. While it is surprising that the epic Muse be invoked here instead of the erotic Muse, it can be explained by the medieval mythographic reading of the muses.

The very influential late antique writer Fulgentius 'makes them represent the nine stages in the process of learning and literary composition'; Calliope is the last stage, the 'optimae vocis'.[27] Hardman therefore sees 'evident appropriateness […] in Chaucer's invocation of Calliope in *Troilus* Book III […]. It is her beautiful, superlative voice, in other words, her eloquence, that the poet wishes to help him at this crowning point of his narrative.'[28] While I believe that the invocation of the classical Muses of history and epic tells us a lot about the narratorial voice, this reading is illuminating because it posits the joyful part of the text as its crowning point. The best voice is needed to write joy. The Muses are then dismissed at the end of Book III:

> Yee sustren nyne ek, that by Elicone
> In hil Pernaso listen for t'abide,
> That ye thus fer han deyned me to gyde –
> I kan namore, but syn ye wol wende,
> Ye heried ben for ay withouten ende! (III, 1809-13)

[27] Philippa Hardman, 'Chaucer's Muses and his "Art Poetical"', *The Review of English Studies*, 37:148, 1986, 478-494, p.479.
[28] Hardman, 'Chaucer's Muses', p.481.

The Muses guide the narrator through the emotionally ascending passages of his story. Interestingly therefore, the same literary frame which constrains the narrator in a serious and plaintive script, exalts and makes prominent the joyful parts of the poem. After the third book, the narrator returns to the Furies: 'Nyghtes doughtren thre,/That endeles compleignen evere in pyne' (IV, 22-3). He also returns to his emotional mode of compassionate sorrow, as his heart starts to bleed for Troilus' pain at Criseyde's treason (IV, 8-12). In a parallel to the first proem's weeping verses, his pen quakes from fear 'of that I moste endite' (IV, 14). The verb 'must' reveals a self-imposed obligation. The proem of the last book does not include any invocation. The narrator only mentions the Fates, the 'angry Parcas, sustren thre' (V, 3) to whom Jupiter has entrusted the fatal destiny of the protagonists' love. To the lamenting Furies are substituted the angry Parcae. On the other hand, the narratorial voice does not express any strong emotion: as the 'fatal destine' is now upon him, the only mood available to him is resignation. He addresses Troilus in these definitive words: 'far-wel al thi joie' (V, 27).

The narratorial stance that is shaped throughout the proems is not unambiguous. It goes from compassionate complaint to complete emotional disengagement and the narrator himself goes through a range of emotions from sorrow to fear, distress to resignation. However, these varying emotional modes are all part of a broader script, one that the narrator imposes on himself in the name of literary tradition, one which, for the sake of posterity, has to be tragic. This is a significant departure from Chaucer's Italian source, Boccaccio's *Il Filostrato*. The Filostrato would be the narrator, but in fact it simply refers to 'a man laid prostrate by love.'[29] He is not an actual character and may be identified with Boccaccio.[30]

[29] In Boccaccio's Italian: 'Filostrato tanto viene a dire quanto uomo vinto e abbattuto d'amore.' (p.1.)
[30] The autobiographical reading of the proem has been widespread in the poem's scholarship and Muscatine appears very assured when he states: 'Boccacio's *Filostrato* has a strongly autobiographical cast.' He affirms that the author expresses his own feelings through Troiolo's story. Muscatine, *Chaucer and the French Tradition*, p.125. For an approach which argues instead for the

The Proemio is written in the first person, the author of the poem, and offers a very personal narratorial posture: he will tell the story of Troiolo and Criseida in order to vent his own suffering in love. There is therefore no narrator or at least not one which can be separated from the author. The author's approach to happiness is also specifically revealed. He only tells about the lovers' joy in order for his readers to fully understand the depth of the subsequent sorrow: 'perché la felicità veduta d'alcuna, molto meglio si comprende quanta e quale sia la miseria sopravvenuta' ('because if one can see the happiness, one can much better understand the misery suddenly arisen.' p.8).[31] Boccaccio's mode is univocal: it is one of complaint and the description of happiness is only a means to achieve better, deeper sorrow. Chaucer's narrative voice is much less personal, but in its literary framing it offers a similarly limited space for joy. However, the narrator's personal struggle with joy inside of his own obligatory script and his particular choice of Muses seems to somehow allow and value joy.

This complex attitude towards joy surfaces in the consummation scene, a passage dreaded by the narrator and which he frequently interrupts to provide commentary. In the most intimate scene, therefore, the reader is constantly reminded of the presence of a narrative voice; it becomes so present in fact that it almost appears as a third character. He starts by disclosing his reluctance at having to tell joy: 'Though that I tarie a yer, some tyme I moot/After myn auctour, tellen hire gladnesse,/As wel as I have told hire hevynesse' (III, 1195-7). He distances himself from the scene, relying on his role, and obligation, as translator. When he finally does write joy, his focus is somehow still on sorrow. As Davenport argues, 'the very consummation is thus engineered in terms of the creation and dispersal of protest and anxiety, of guilt expiated, of pain forgiven, and these emotions seem readier to the poet's tongue than the expression of joy […] The quality of gladness [is]

presence of a narrative persona see Laura Kellogg, 'Boccaccio's Criseida and her Narrator', *Critical Matrix*, 1991, 6:1, 46-75.

[31] Translation is mine.

expressed by antithesis to prior sorrow.'[32] In terms of diction this is visible in the narrator's use of *gladnesse* in rhymes. He uses the word five times in the consummation scene and it rhymes three times with *hevynesse*, twice with *distresse* and once with *siknesse*.[33] The varied rhyming possibilities of *gladnesse* are used univocally here. This creates a textual script of emotional constraint: *gladnesse* is formally bound up to its opposite in the narrator's discourse. His script of negative affectivity is inscribed in the poem's formal structure. This rhyming pattern also expresses the worrying idea that the lovers' gladness cannot stand alone; the narrator writes it through antithesis, calling upon past and/or future sorrow. Joy appears contingent on sorrow:

> O sooth is seyd, that heled for to be
> As of fever of other gret siknesse,
> Men moste drynke, as men may ofte say,
> Ful bitter drynke; and for to han gladnesse
> Men drynken ofte peyne and gret distresse –
> I mene it here, as for this aventure,
> That thorugh a peyne hath founden al his cure.
>
> And now swetnesse semeth more swete
> That bitternesse assaied was byforn; (III, 1212-20)

In this quote, the narrator adopts a proverbial mode to express a system of feeling, which relies on the interdependence of emotions. For the narrator, joy and sorrow are inseparable. Joy should come from sorrow to be truly appreciated, to feel truly 'sweet'. There transpires a sort of general economy of emotions in the narrator's discourse: 'peynes brynge folk in hevene' (III, 1204). He thus exalts the sorrows of lovers, just as he should be telling of their happiness.

---

[32] W. A. Davenport, *Chaucer: Complaint and Narrative*, Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 1988, p.149.
[33] III, 1215, 1244, 1313, 1400, 1447.

The same emotional economy reappears later in a much more personal comment. As he recounts the consummation, the narrator moves from obligation to involvement, until he bursts out what appears to be an invocation to the night of bliss itself:

> O blisful nyght, of hem so longe isought,
> How blithe unto hem bothe two thow were!
> Why nad I swych oon with my soule ybought,
> Ye, or the leeste joie that was theere? (III, 1316-20)

This invocation is very different from those analysed previously. It presents a narrator deeply involved in his story and the happiness of his characters. But the narratorial voice also discloses envy towards the lovers' joy. The narrator's system of feeling, where negative emotions are necessary to 'buy' joy, turns into personal regret and envy; he wonders why he did not 'purchase' joy for himself. This is clearly at odds from the narrator's obligatory emotion script. Carolyn Dinshaw suggests that although he asserts his own historical distance, 'the narrator's careful pacing of the love affair's unfolding reveals a progressively escalating personal interest, a growing emotional involvement.'[34] She argues that the narrator is seduced by the text itself as well as its heroine and that he engages in vicarious erotic pleasure.[35] His growing emotional involvement in the lovers' joy is indeed undeniable. However, that he feels pleasure – albeit vicarious – is open to doubt. His distress in front of erotic joy may hide a certain fascination, but it is finally expressed in envy rather than pleasure; and it is difficult to feel joy if one is feeling envious. His envious engagement appears as the recognition of the greatness of that joy.[36] It is not jealousy, which as Criseyde explains often verges on hate or anger (III, 1037), but the desirous and perhaps slightly bitter

[34] Dinshaw, *Chaucer's Sexual Poetics*, p.41.
[35] Ibid., p.44.
[36] My reading ties in with Gretchen Mieszkowski's argument that the narratorial framing and involvment here heighten the consummation scene and makes the lovers' joy even more valuable. Mieszkowski, 'Chaucerian Comedy', pp.472-3.

feeling of a narrator who is present for and witnesses the beauty of erotic joy while also having to deprive himself and his – already scripted – story of it.

After his reluctance and his envy, the narrator expresses his sheer inability to write such joy:

> Of hire delit or joies oon the leeste
> Were impossible to my wit to seye;
> But juggeth ye that han ben at the feste
> Of swich gladnesse, if that hem liste pleye! (III, 1310-13)

This is not a straightforward inexpressibilty topos: instead of depth of feeling, what it points towards is singularity of feeling. The narrator cannot fathom such joy because it is particular to lovers, an exclusive joy: 'so perfit joie may no nygard have' (III, 1379).[37] Perhaps with a note of bitterness, he asks his luckier readers to judge the protagonists' delight. Although he has recounted it, he cannot truly access it. The word 'feast' is found in Boccaccio's Italian: 'lungo sarebbe a raccontar la festa' (III, 31), but Chaucer adds the direct address to readers. By doing so, love's *feste* becomes an exclusive social and emotional event, from which the narrator is excluded. The word *feste* is used relatively often, to refer to purely social events – such as the 'Palladiones feste' (I, 161) – as well as internal feeling – the soul of Troilus feels joy and *feste* (III, 344). Its use during the consummation scene is interesting as it bridges the gap between social and internal enjoyment. The *feste* of love is the action of the sexual encounter as well as the gladness that results from it. Chaucer adds a second mention of the word during this scene as the narrator recounts the embrace of the lovers: Criseyde 'made hym swych feste it joie was to sene' (III, 1228). According to the *MED*, *maken feste* can mean 'observe a church festival' (1. (a)), 'make merry' (4. (b)) or 'treat (someone) with due ceremony or respect, treat respectfully or in friendly fashion; pay homage, show respect, pay compliments' (5.). In a most intimate bed scene, the narrator thus surprisingly uses a

[37] The *MED* defines *nigard* as '1. (a) A stingy person, miser'.

ceremonial register, which achieves a certain distance. This use of social and formal diction may be seen to reflect the bitterness that he feels towards this distance. This ambiguity is aptly expressed in the second part of the quotation, 'it joie was to sene', a phrase which posits the narrator as a direct sensory witness of joy.

There is, in *Troilus and Criseyde*, a recurrent emphasis on the interpersonal dynamic of emotion. Emotions need an audience simply to exist. Sorrow has to be witnessed and it engenders compassion. Pandarus summarises it thus: 'For in good herte it moot som routhe impresse,/To here and see the giltles in distresse.' (II, 1371-2). This focus on hearing and seeing emotion is translated into the recurring phrase of the narratorial voice: 'it was a [emotion] to see/hear'. This is especially relevant for the emotions of sorrow and compassion. Troilus complains to Helen 'so feythfully that pite was to here' (II, 1577) or, on Pandarus' account of Troilus' pain to Criseyde: 'this accident so pitous was to here' (III, 918). Painful and plaintive emotions are heard and seen to be shared, co-felt. The idiom expresses both the witnessing characters' emotion as well as the narrator's and, consequently, the reader's. Surprisingly, it is used more often with positive than negative emotions in the poem. When Troilus is described in all his glory coming back into Troy from the battlefield, the narrator adds that 'it was an heven upon hym for to see' (II, 637); heaven a synonym for joy. The Trojan crowd then exults at the sight of the knight: 'here cometh oure joye' (II, 643). Later, as Criseyde is described playing in the garden with her nieces, the narrator says that it 'joye was to see' (II, 817). In both passages, the joy is shared and witnessed by several characters; it is a public spectacle of communal merriment. The narrator stages a scene and names the emotion it depicts. The use of the impersonal structure engages the reader to see and hear the scene themselves; joy has an audience in and outside the text.

This becomes complicated when the idiom is used in the private moment of erotic joy, with no diegetic witness: 'Criseyde, al quyt from every drede and tene, /[…] Made hym swych feste it joye was to sene' (III, 1226-8). The narrator here posits himself as the direct

sensory witness of the action and of the emotion. This breach in diegesis simultaneously involves and creates a barrier with the reader. It involves them as it engages them as spectators but, at the same time, they are suddenly reminded of the narrator's presence in a climactic moment. The narrator stages a scene of joy. By doing so he reminds the reader of the artificiality of the fiction and thus brings the reader to feel the same sort of emotional impairment he experiences. The narratorial stance thus lies somewhere between the personal and the impersonal. It creates distance while at the same time positing the narrator as a character of the plot, present to witness but not to share their joy.

The marked presence of the narrator during the consummation scene is hence ambiguous. It seems to confirm the precept that emotions need an audience to exist. The erotic joy of the lovers is particularly intimate and secretive. It exists purely in their mutual embrace and therefore cannot be public. Hill comments on this and argues that the secretive nature of their joy impedes on its ability to shine openly: '[t]he love between the two reaches an emotional, joyous sufficiency, a beautiful sufficiency and in that sense aesthetic; but as long as it remains cloistered and secret, it does not broaden out to a public and social world, openly acknowledged and shining in its beauty.'[38] The narrator, I argue, as he regularly comments upon and tries to give a sense of their unknowable yet beautiful joy acts as a witness. His presence allows joy to be seen, to be acknowledged and therefore to exists. Although it cannot be shared as sorrow is: the audience of sorrow feels compassion and therefore co-feels the same emotion; the audience of private joy feels separation and envy.[39]

[38] Hill, *Chaucer's Neoplatonism*, p.135.

[39] Jessica Rosenfeld instead argues that 'the poem asks its audience to share in its lovers' sorrows and joys, and to imagine an ethical response to their shared delight.' This sharing of joy, be it 'perfectly ethical' or 'dangerously voyeuristic', is the opposite of envy. But envy is what the narrator feels and therefore sharing becomes impossible. I argue therefore that the poem does not ask for an ethical response to its lovers' delight, but rather for one of awe. The reader can be happy for them but not with them, their bliss is presented as the ultimate intimacy and personal transcendence. Rosenfeld, *Ethics and Enjoyment*, p.151.

The narrator's emotional script of literary seriousness and sorrow leaves little room for the expression of joy but what it does on the other hand is give a sense of its greatness. What emerges from the shifting posture of the narrator is uneasiness with joy. Sorrow is the default mode of the narratorial stance. Joy thus appears as a singular and exclusive feeling, one that is out of reach from our point of entry into the story, the narrator. It is constantly surrounded and threatened by sorrow, but it is this fragile nature that the narrator recognises and exalts. His uneasiness hides fascination and, ultimately, recognition of the absolute value of joy.

The narratorial voice stands between obligation – literary and emotional – and involvement. In Boccaccio's *Filostrato*, the pathos and predominance of sorrow comes from a personal need to vent pain. In *Troilus*, the narrator creates a literary frame for the obligatory predominance of complaint. However, the narrator's anxiety and envious bitterness at his characters' joy betrays unease with the weight of literary tradition that insists on sorrow. He struggles to find a lighter place within what has already been written. He wants to share joy but is constrained. Eventually, he frees, to some extent, his characters of this weight by offering them a night of escape in ethereal bliss,[40] but he does not free himself from his obligatory emotional script. The narrator's characterisation, as this is what it is ultimately, is constructed through the creation of a fixed affective stance and his personal struggle within it. This ambiguity, one which has been used against the theory of a narrator-character, is, I believe, precisely what makes the reader feels for and with the narrator. There is just enough by way of characterisation for the reader to feel emotionally connected to the narrator but not enough to form a well-rounded fictional and psychological character, which elicits curiosity, fascination and perhaps even identification. The reader shares the unease and also

[40] I talk more about the ethereal representation of sexual bliss in chapter four's discussion of joy's temporal grammar.

the envy towards the joy of the lovers, it is through their own identification with the narrator that the reader can witness a joy which is perhaps just out of their reach too.

Pandarus

Pandarus, although he is one of the protagonists, shares with the narrator the function of mediating the story. Both the narrator and Pandarus are involved in the love story yet disengaged from it. They stand outside of the experience of love's joy: 'disengagement has been imposed on them, and the text imposes it on us; they and we are excluded from something we nonetheless admire.'[41] Complete emotional engagement in the lovers' joy is out of reach for Pandarus but he has often been noted for his vicarious, if not voyeuristic, participation.[42] Criticism on Pandarus has been nothing if not polemic and divided: interpretations range from the most positive to the utmost negative. It has been argued indeed that Pandarus is a manipulative and incestuous uncle. The scene of the morning after the consummation where Pandarus 'hath fully his entente' (III, 1582) with Criseyde has been read as a rape scene.[43] On the other hand, Pandarus has also been interpreted as the ideal friend of ancient and medieval philosophy[44] or a substitute of Boethius' Lady Philosophy[45]. Gretchen Mieszkowski, in her study on medieval go-betweens, places Pandarus at the intersection of two traditions of (mostly feminine) go-betweens: that of the fabliaux, who tends to persuade – and if that fails, trick – the young woman into sexual intercourse and the

[41] Richard Waswo, 'The Narrator of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *ELH*, 50:1, 1983, 1-25, p.11.
[42] See for example Sarah Stanbury, 'The Voyeur and the Private Life in *Troilus and Criseyde*', *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, 13, 1991, 141-58.
[43] See for example Evan Carton, 'Complicity and Responsibility in Pandarus' Bed and Chaucer's Art', *PMLA,* 94, 1979, 47-61, p.58. For a summary of the different interpretations of this scene see Gretchen Mieszkowski, 'Chaucer's Much Loved Criseyde', *Chaucer Review*, 26:2, 1991, 109-132, pp.123-25.
[44] See Robert G. Cook, 'Chaucer's Pandarus and the Medieval Ideal of Friendship', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 69:3, 1970, 407-24.
[45] See Martin Camargo, 'The Consolation of Pandarus', *The Chaucer Review*, 25:3, 1991, 214-28.

ideal, selfless go-between of the Romance tradition.[46] Barry Windeatt sees the 'essence of Pandarus' nature as a friend', an essence which is most vivid in his cheerfulness and general pleasantness.[47] Pandarus indeed brings most of the comic relief and irony in the poem, something that Chaucer has added from his source.[48]

The character of Pandarus is one of the big changes that Chaucer brings about from *Il Filostrato*. He enhances his role drastically: Pandarus speaks a total of 1805 lines, while Boccaccio's Pandaro only speaks 789.[49] However, while he speaks the most lines in the poem, his affectivity is definitely that of a secondary character. He comments on and feels for the lovers' emotions but does not seem to have feelings of his own – or they are only presented superficially. One might wonder therefore whether Pandarus is a purely functional character, what Emma Smith calls 'unreal' characters: 'characters that only serve the plot, with no psychology behind their actions.'[50] As the go-between of the story, he calls himself a 'mene' (III, 254), an intermediary. He also appears too mutable; a 'protean, mobile, shifting' figure, he adapts his character to what the situation requires.[51] One critic questions whether Pandarus even *is* a character: Modarelli argues that he is presented as one, 'yet his 'character' remains elusive because there exists no form of psychological determinism from which we can predict future actions from character.'[52] This lack of psychological determinism comes from the fact that Pandarus 'assumes a variety of conventional roles […]. He is the guide, cast variously as Dante's Vergil, the *Ami* of the *Roman,* and Boethius' Lady Philosophy. But he is also the artist, a fount of courtly rhetoric, and the architect from

[46] Gretchen Mieszkowski, *Medieval Go-betweens and Chaucer's Pandarus*, New York, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.
[47] Windeatt, *Troilus and Criseyde*, p.289.
[48] See Heffernan, *Comedy in Chaucer and Boccaccio*, pp.110 and 113.
[49] Modarelli, 'Pandarus' "Grete Emprise"', p.404.
[50] Smith, *Introduction to Shakespeare*, p.4.
[51] Windeatt, *Troilus and Criseyde*, p.290.
[52] Modarelli, 'Pandarus's "Grete Emprise"', p.409.

within of most of the plot of the love story.'[53] All these roles exceed the agency of simple protagonists. They are narratorial and authorial roles. Pandarus is not a product of narrative. Like Lady Philosophy, who functions as the agent of communication in the *Consolation*, Pandarus' mode is that of the dialogue. He is constructed through speech and action rather than psychological determinism. It is this distinctive mode of expression and feeling that makes Pandarus appear as a character. His functionality becomes his characterisation.

As Windeatt puts it, language for Pandarus is 'a means to an end'.[54] Pandarus' diction of joy thus does not necessarily always reflect his own conception of the emotion. He often speaks of emotions in impersonal and proverbial sentences which can apply to a variety of affective situations. So, when Troilus is close to despair Pandarus reminds him: 'joie is next the fyn of sorwe' (I, 952). But when Troilus is feeling utter bliss after the consummation, Pandarus warns him to be careful, 'for worldly joie halt nought but by a wir' (III, 1636). These two aphorisms present different sides of the same coin: joy and sorrow are mutable, and, in a world ruled by Fortune, one will always replace the other. Pandarus merely chooses which side of the movement to emphasize according to the situation. The contents of these aphorisms cannot therefore be taken as representative of Pandarus' opinions on worldly joy. His use of the diction of joy reveals a mode of feeling and of expression which is situational and impersonal. Pandarus uses emotions in order to drive the action and enact change.

[53] Winthrop Wetherbee, *Chaucer and the Poets: An Essay on* Troilus and Criseyde*,* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984, p.45.
[54] Windeatt, *Troilus and Criseyde*, p.289.

Pandarus' diction of joy[55]



Pandarus has a varied diction of joy, although, while he uses both the generic *joy* and the religious and amatory *blisse,* he never uses *gladnesse*. He does on the other hand use the adjective *glad* very frequently. The rest of his vocabulary is made of different words of worldly joy, such as *prosperite*, the social *feste*, and the sensual *plesaunce* and *delite.* His diction of worldly joy is practical rather than clerkly and philosophical. But what really defines his diction against the other characters' is his use of courtly and playful words of joy, otherwise very rare in the poem: *jolite*, *joli*, *mirie*, *lusti.*

Before I come to this register, I wish to explore Pandarus' aphoristic use of the diction of joy. He professes general and proverbial wisdom on sensual joy, 'in love ther come and gon plesaunce' (IV, 1099), on the more negative *delite*, 'swich is delyt of foles to bywepe' (I, 762), as well as the spiritual bliss of love, 'he/that ones may in hevene blisse be,/he feleth other weyes' (III, 1656-8). Finally, earthly happiness holds pride of place in this mode of discourse. It transpires in Pandarus' use of natural metaphors on the mutability of emotions

[55] No word cloud was used in the analysis of the narrator as while he often seems to appear as a protagonist in the poem, he still resists an analysis as a fully-fledged character; he is indeed most present in framing comments and in the rest of the story it is sometimes hard to detach his particular discourse from what is 'pure' narration. It is therefore hard to analyse specific word choices when they are not clearly embedded in a first-person speech. As I turn to the protagonists I thus also turn to a more diction-based study, a more relevant approach for characters with clearly defined first-person speeches. Frequency tables of the different word clouds can be found in the appendices to this chapter.

(I, 950-1) and in his mention of the word *prosperite*. At the height of Troilus' happiness, Pandarus warns him, in the impersonal tone of the aphorism: 'the worst kynde of infortune is this,/A man to han ben in prosperitee,/And it remembren whan it passes' (III, 1626-28). But, when the prosperity has indeed passed, and Troilus is sorrowfully remembering it, Pandarus switches to a much more personal tone. He argues that he should be content as he has had his *desir*, while himself who has never reached such delight has true reason to weep (IV, 395-99). His mode of expression, by being situational, can thus result in blatant contradiction in its content. The general truth of *prosperite* does not hold for the particularity of individual *desir* and Pandarus has to resort to personal language. This again shows how Pandarus manipulates language modes according to what the situation requires. The word *prosperite*, associated with Fortune and to the inevitable alternation of emotions, appears only twice in the poem. It is spoken once more by Criseyde in her Boethian speech. Despite this clerkly potential, Pandarus' emotional mode and diction is pragmatic, not philosophical. While it is very much concerned with earthly happiness, it does not venture into the metaphysical realm; it states general truths but does not seek answers nor try to give deeper or broader meaning to these truths.

The philosophical register of joy is not part of Pandarus' diction. His discourse, despite being aphoristic at times, is very much anchored into the present of the narration and the dialogue. What it lacks in philosophical depth, Pandarus' diction makes up in cheerful levity. His dialogue is often purpose-driven, aimed at helping Troilus achieve joy, but it also comprises a good deal of playfulness and linguistic games, especially with his niece Criseyde. He is the only one to use the courtly term *joli* and its noun *jolite* – except for one occurrence where Criseyde directly echoes his language (II, 1105). As I have shown previously, he uses this term to parody the language of the conventional lovesick courtly lover to amuse Criseyde. In Book V, as the tone is one of despair and pathos, Pandarus reminds Troilus of the 'lusty' life of the young aristocracy in Troy: 'Ris, lat us speke of lusty

life in Troie' (V, 393) and 'Go we pleye us in som lusty route/To Sarpedoun' (V, 402). While Troilus knows of only one joy, Pandarus believes that while they wait for that bliss to come back ('oure blisse' V, 396), they should enjoy another sort of earthly joy: the lusty joy of Troy, which is found in games and company and is not sexual or amorous.

The positive emotions Pandarus actually feels, rather than talks about, are very different from the protagonists'. *Joy* is never used by the narrator nor any other characters to refer to Pandarus. He speaks the word nine times but only refers to his own joy in asseverations, where joy becomes an impersonal token on which to swear (II, 140; III, 790 and 875) or when he shares in Troilus' joy (IV, 385). He speaks the word *glad* much more frequently, whether it is to tell Troilus to be glad (IV, 405 and 651) or to express his own state of gladness (III, 651 and 1620). He is also said to be glad by the narrator (I, 877; II, 597; III, 682 and IV, 809) and of course he shares glad words and tales with his niece Criseyde (II, 148, 151 and 498). Pandarus never experiences *blisse*, except in the instance where he compassionately includes himself in his friend's expectancy: 'tyme coming […] that bryngen shal oure blisse' (V, 395-6). Pandarus takes his role of go-between and of friend so seriously that Troilus' joy becomes his joy. But outside of this occurrence, *blisse* is uniquely used to refer to Troilus and Criseyde or, once or twice, to lovers in general, but not to their go-between. He does, however, convey 'an intellectual feel' for *hevene blisse*,[56] as he seems to understand the new way Troilus feels after the consummation (III, 1656). He does not feel it himself though and he warns Troilus of the temporariness of bliss. As Hill notes 'such bliss marks a distance, a separation, and a worry.'[57] Pandarus appears to understand bliss and yet is kept outside of it. *Hevene blisse* is bounded and excludes anyone who has not felt it. His own mode of feeling joy is rather represented through the adjective

[56] Hill, *Chaucer's Neoplatonism*, p.126.
[57] Ibid., p.126.

glad, a word which expresses a situational and responsive emotion, one that can be encompassed in words and conversation.

Laughter is also an important feature of Pandarus' mode of feeling. And while laughter is not verbal language, Pandarus seems to experience it as part of the making of conversation and dialogue. Pandarus' laughter is not a stand-alone expression of emotion. He laughs almost exclusively in situations involving Criseyde; he is said to make Criseyde laugh or to laugh with her (II, 1168 and 99). Often, his laughter works as an adverb, describing the mood of Pandarus' words: 'lough this Pandare and answerde' (I, 1037) or 'at which Pandare lough and seyde' (III, 629). While there is not much laughter in the *Filostrato*, Pandaro does laugh a few times, often in this same adverbial mode. The verb is used in the gerundive: 'A cui, ridendo, Pandaro rispose' (II, 32.1, also II, 21.2). This use of the verb 'ridere' places it as a descriptive of the main verb 'rispondere'. Similarly, Pandarus' laughter is a commentary on his own discourse. Pandarus is cheerful in his actions and interactions. His gladness holds in moments, in words and jokes rather than in a specific object or goal. Therefore, although he speaks often of the mutability of joy, his own mode of feeling seems to surpass or at least make light of the heaviness of earthly transience. This is especially clear when compared to Troilus' very serious and tragic mode of feeling.

Troilus

Troilus' character has been less heatedly debated than Pandarus. Critics tend to agree and cast him as a prototypical example of the loyal lovesick lover. Sadlek argues that Chaucer enhances the courtliness and the typical pusillanimity of his hero: Boccaccio's Troiolo was not 'as courtly as Chaucer wished him to be nor as "timid"'.[58] This enhanced

[58] Gregory M. Sadlek, 'Love, Labour, and Sloth in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *The Chaucer Review*, 26:4, 1992, 350-368, p.351.

timidity is one aspect of Troilus' characterisation which has issued some debate. His passivity has led critics to read him negatively as unmanly or feminized.[59] Jill Mann offers a more positive reading of Troilus' passivity: she equates it to a complete surrender to love and life, a sign of nobility and liberality.[60] Importantly, Troilus' masculinity or femininity is embedded in literary roles. The editors of a volume on masculinity in *Troilus* notice that most of the contributors apprehend the apparent contradiction of Troilus' double role as romance lover and epic hero.[61] His masculinity and his character are inextricably rooted in genre and convention – albeit diverging and conflicting ones. His mode of expression, lyrical rather than conversational, constructs this conventional identity. As Windeatt notes, 'his characteristic expression is through apostrophe, song, complaint, or prayer'.[62] While Pandarus' mode is anchored in dialogue and the narrative present, Troilus' 'preference is never for temporal narrative but for such forms as […] the complaint, which dilate and comment upon narrative significance.'[63] Strohm also notes: 'his chosen mode in love is to "langwisshe" in solitary hopelessness.'[64] Troilus' expression is plaintive and hence does not leave much space for joy. Yet it is directed towards joy, towards *hevene blisse*, the unique joy of earthly love.

[59] See for example Tuttle Hansen, *Chaucer and Fictions of Gender*, pp.149-55.
[60] Mann, *Feminizing Chaucer,* p.129. Gretchen Mieszkowski also defends Troilus from attacks against his masculinity as she reads his swoon as a sign of spiritual greatness rather than emasculation. Mieszkowski, 'Revisiting Troilus' Faint'.
[61] Pugh and Smith Marzec, 'Introduction', in *Men and Masculinities*, p.7. Similarly, Maud McInerney argues that Troilus becomes umanned through his representation in Book III 'as a man trapped between two literary modes of loving', that of the passive courtly lover and that of the predatory *amator*. Maud McInerney, '"Is this a mannes herte?": Unmanning Troilus through Ovidian Allusion', in Beidler (ed.), *Masculinities in Chaucer*, 221-36, p.221.
[62] Windeatt, *Troilus and Criseyde*, p.275.
[63] Strohm, *Social Chaucer*, pp.121-2.
[64] Ibid., p.119.

Troilus' diction of joy



Troilus' main register of joy is that of love: *joy, blisse* and the sensual words are all frequent. Yet he only uses the word *gladnesse* once, contrasting his *distresse* to Pandarus' *gladnesse* (I, 615-16). The word is in fact mostly used by the narrator and appears as an outsider's term for other people's, especially lovers', joy. The protagonist does not seem to participate in the social register of joy. As Pandarus is excluded from love's joy, it would seem that Troilus cannot experience the type of merriness Pandarus shares with Criseyde. He is not a joyful character. Tellingly, one of his two mentions of the word *feste* actually refers to the ceremony of his potential funeral (V, 304). He uses *joy* very frequently but mostly after the consummation, to refer to his past, lost joys. Troilus uses *glad* often, mostly as a verb: he expresses the wish to be gladdened (I, 538) or the impossibility for him to be gladdened (IV, 1655). One particularity of his diction is the high frequency of the adjective *blisful*, which he uses much more than the other two protagonists. This is explained by his propensity to prayers. Troilus constantly addresses blissful Venus and other Gods.[65] His use of the word of earthly happiness *wele* is interesting as it appears twice in an alliterative couplet with *welle.* This homonymous collocation expresses the conventional idea that the lady is the source of both the happiness and the woe of the lover (III, 1472 and V, 1330). This literary

[65] I, 1014; II, 1060; III, 705, 712; IV, 335; V, 582, 599, 1250.

trope reveals a mode of feeling joy which is correlated with sorrow and contingent on the loved object.

But the word also appears in its meaning of earthly well-being alongside *felicite* as Troilus repeats Pandarus' contradictory arguments on losing love's favour:

> Thow hast here made an argument for fyn,
> How that it sholde a lasse peyne be
> Criseyde to forgon, for she was myn
> And lyved in ese and in felicite.
> Whi gabbestow, that seydest unto me
> That 'hym is wors that if fro wele ythrowe,
> Than he hadde erst noon of that wele yknowe'? (IV, 477-83)

Here Troilus exposes a theoretical argument. He therefore uses a clerkly discourse of joy. But Troilus does not subscribe to logic when it comes to feelings, and theory is empty to him, mere nonsense. When he moves on to his own experience, his vocabulary becomes much more amorous and sexual: 'I, that levede yn lust and in plesaunce' (IV, 493). Troilus is very inclined towards philosophical reflexions and lyrics, but these do not deal with joy, which remains, for him, something purely amorous. Joy, in Troilus' diction, is not an abstract entity to be contemplated. It is equated to its cause and object: when Criseyde leaves, his joy leaves: 'fro hennes rood my blisse and my solas!' (V, 606). Yet, in Troilus' lyrical and imaginative mode of feeling, this specific joy is turned into an object of the mind: anticipated and remembered, it is textual rather than experienced.

Troilus' lyricism is representative of his literariness. David Taylor, among others, argues that the protagonist's way of speaking, his use of superlatives, absolute commitments and 'long internal monologues filled with invocations and complaints', are stylistic traits which are conventional of the courtly lover of French medieval literature.[66] The character of

[66] Taylor, 'The Terms of Love', p.505. Charles Muscatine has similarly argued: 'Troilus is constructed almost exclusively according to the stylistic conventions of courtly tradition', a tradition that he consistently traces back to French poetry. Muscatine, *Chaucer and the French Tradition*, p.133.

Troilus is shaped by an expressive mode which belongs to that literary tradition and is thus partly created as a literary type. His mode of feeling should also be observed through this tradition; his experience of joy particularly appears courtly and amorous rather than philosophical or social. In what follows, I argue that Troilus' linguistic and experiential relationship to joy is built on the troubadour tradition and the French concept of *joi*; a particular and literary kind of joy which is inspired by the Christian eschatological 'joy in anticipation'.[67]

In the pre-meeting time frame of the first two books, Troilus' love is experienced as sorrowful desire. The affective tone is one of anxiety and expectancy. This is palpable through the constant oscillation between hope and fear, expectant joy and languishing sorrow. This duality is the lot of the traditional courtly lover, as Troilus' Petrarchan lyric makes clear. In his song, Troilus wonders what love is and whether it is good or not, as it is full of contradictions: love is this 'swete harm so queynte' (I, 411), it is 'torment and adversite' that feel 'savory' (I, 404-5). This expressive and affective mode may best be understood through the literary concept of troubadour's *joi.* According to Adam Potkay, *joi* represents the state of the troubadour who 'reflexively desired, at least in part, the state of desire itself.'[68] Camproux has explained the etymology of the word *joi* as coming not only from the Latin *gaudium* but also from the term *joculum* and its plural *jocula* meaning respectively play and gifts or rewards.[69] *Joi* is thus inseparable from the game of courtly love. Moshe Lazar puts this concept at the centre of his study on courtly love in troubadour lyrics and proposes this definition: *joi* 'represents a movement, the activity of a soul who loves'.[70] No single term in Chaucer's English encompasses this concept but it is undeniably

[67] Potkay, *Story of Joy*, p.56.
[68] Ibid., p.56.
[69] Camproux, *Le 'Joy d'Amor' des Troubadours*, p.65.
[70] Moshe Lazar, 'Fin'Amor', p.77.

embedded in Troilus' expression and attitude, at least in the first two books.[71] *Joi* is an emotion which reaches towards future joy in plaintive desire.

The love complaint is the perfect embodiment of this concept as it is a form of lyric enjoyment of suffering. Pandarus tells Troilus: 'delyte not in wo' (I, 704), but delight in woe is the passive mode of the courtly lover. Potkay suggests of the troubadour's *joi* that 'in contrast to a happiness that involves, according to its classical definition, purposive activity and self-control, the lover is passive, acted-upon, tossed between anguish and exaltation in his joys.'[72] This is exactly the situation of Troilus in the first two books: 'so were his dayes sory outher glad' (II, 1351). The impersonal phrasing here emphasizes the lover's total lack of agency. The genre of the complaint itself produces such passivity, its rhetoric being inherently useless,[73] encouraging languor rather than action. The narrator emphasizes this aspect of complaint as, after having stated that Troilus complains 'to himself', he reiterates the obvious: 'al was for nought: she herde nat his pleynte' (I, 544). In this rhetoric, joy is the unattainable end of desire, an end so far out of sight that it becomes equated to death: 'Therto desir so brennyngly me assailleth,/That to be slayn it were a gretter joie/To me than kyng of Grece ben and Troye' (I, 607-9). This '*joi* unto death' as Potkay calls it, is an important building block in the character of Troilus.

His restless passivity regarding his own joy translates into a complete reliance on Pandarus. When Troilus does feel real moments of joy, he always owes them to Pandarus. Troilus twice feels bursts of joy as Pandarus comes with good news of Criseyde. In both

---

[71] Wimsatt argues that 'the characterization of Troilus and the presentation of his "first sorwe"' are more French than Italian and have clear parallels with Guillaume de Machaut's *dits*. Troilus is more naïve and idealistic than Troiolo for example. James Wimsatt, 'Guillaume de Machaut and Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *Medium Aevum*, 45, 1976, 277-93, p.278.

[72] Potkay, *Story of Joy*, p.69.

[73] Lee Patterson argues for the 'uselessness' of the genre of the complaint: 'What is specific to complaint is that the claim it lays upon the world is virtually always self-cancelling, and so it raises questions about writing as a pragmatic activity. Not only does the plaintive voice typically assume the uselessness of its declarations, but its uselessness is programmatic.' Lee Patterson, 'Writing Amorous Wrongs: Chaucer and the Order of Complaint', in *Acts of Recognition: Essays on Medieval Culture*, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009, 181-197, p.183.

passages, the emotion is expressed as a physical reaction: Troilus' heart is said to play (I, 1013) and then to spread so much it might break (II, 980). But each moment of sudden joy is short and not felt as an end in itself. Indeed, both passages are directly followed by a speech in the future tense and interrogatory mode: first the lover asks, 'But, deere frend, how shal my wo be lesse/Til this be doon?' (I, 1016-7) and then later:

> [...] Lo, myn herte,
> It spredeth so for joie it wol tosterte!
> But, Lord, how shal I doon? How shal I lyven?
> Whan shal I next my deere herte see?
> How shal this longe tyme awey be dryven
> Til that thow be ayein at hire fro me? (II, 979-4).

Each time, Troilus uses the same grammatical structure of 'how long…until?' The quick feelings of joy thus only trigger longing and anxiety for a better, fuller satisfaction. While the first passage follows Boccaccio quite closely, in the second, Chaucer omits a long description of Troiolo looking at Criseida from afar. It is only after this vision that the Italian lover exclaims 'Che faro dunque?' (II, 88.1). In Chaucer, Troilus does not need the vision of Criseyde to turn his joy into desire: his joy itself appears as a 'future and subjunctive event'.[74] Of course, contrary to most troubadour narratives of courtly love, Troilus will eventually reach satisfaction. In the consummation scene, Troilus is exceptionally quiet about his own joy; he only once uses the word *blisse* to express the unsurpassed place of joy he has reached (III, 1272) and the narrator tells us he is surprised by bliss (III, 1184) and alienated, incapacitated by joy (III, 1253 and 1351). The present experience of sexual joy therefore appears foreign and extraneous to his characteristic mode. Words of joy only reappear in his discourse in order to lament it in the conventional lyrics of the Aubade.

[74] Potkay, *Story of Joy*, p.58.

In the troubadour tradition, fulfilment of desire would represent the end of longing and therefore the end of the story. But Troilus' affective and expressive mode makes this impossible. As soon as joy is experienced, it is remembered:

> And in his thought gan up and down to wynde
> Hire words alle, and every countenance,
> And fermely impressen in his mynde
> The leeste point that to him was plesaunce:
> And verraylich of thilke remembraunce
> Desir al newe hym brende, and lust to brede. (III, 1541-46).

Here, past images and emotions are impressed in his mind, in what Mary Carruthers calls an 'exercise in recollection achieved by a complete imaginative recreation.'[75] This exercise allows Troilus to transcend the past and to create a 'desir al newe'. Chaucer follows Boccaccio here but strengthens the connection between memory, pleasure and desire. Where Troiolo only feels greater love (*Filostrato* III, 54), Troilus becomes trapped in longing once more. Troilus' 'imaginative recreation' transforms joy in an object of the mind but also into a new form of anticipatory emotion. However, this time, Criseyde will soon be gone forever, and desire will be vain. Yet Troilus will keep desiring and remembering his joy. This pattern is embedded in the texture of the poem as the rhyme between *plesaunce* and *remembraunce* appears for the first time in the third book and recurs, as an inescapable refrain, eight times until the end of the poem.[76]

This cycle breaks away from the troubadour tradition, where desire is unfulfilled and mutable. Pandarus then comes to embody this affective mode, which is based on the mobility of *plesaunce.* He believes that Troilus should be satisfied by the fact that he has had his

[75] Mary Carruthers, 'Virtue, Intention and the Mind's Eye in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', in Charlotte Brewer and Barry Windeatt (eds.), *Traditions and Innovations in the Study of Middle English Literature*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2013, 73-87, p.73.
[76] III, 971, 1532, 1544; IV, 419, 1642; V, 314, 564, 1608.

desire fulfilled: 'thi desir al holly hastow had' (IV, 395), and that he can now transfer his desire onto another object:

> What? God forbade alwey that ech plesaunce
> In o thyng were and in non other wight!
> If oon kan synge, an other kan wel daunce (IV, 407-9).

This speech is based on Pandarus' situational and action-driven mode of feeling, but it is also part of the courtly tradition which posits the object of desire as substitutable.[77] Pandarus makes *plesaunce* rhyme with *daunce* in an attempt to break the rhyming scheme and the cycle of pleasure and memory. He then uses the recurrent rhyme to convince Troilus that his *plesaunce* will be put 'out of remembraunce' (IV, 420). Troilus, however, does not subscribe to this system of feeling. On the contrary, his propensity for complaint points towards stasis. He retorts to Pandarus that he cannot forget his *plesaunce* (IV, 493-5) and starts a complaint about death, which is the thing he now desires most (507-8). His desire is not mutable: it is permanently fixed in one irreplaceable object or in death.

In the fifth book, in a behaviour typically appropriate to the leisurely mode of the complaint, Troilus walks around Troy, to the places where he and Criseyde have been happy to once again bring to his *remembraunce* his past *plesaunce* (V, 562-4). This passage is closely adapted from Boccaccio; Chaucer omits only the more negative aspects (Troiolo remembers also the disdain of his lady V, 55) to create a perfect image of past joy. Troilus remembers seeing his lady dance and play and laugh 'ful lustily' (V, 568). Yet these memories do not correspond to the reader's; Criseyde is never described laughing, singing, or even smiling in Troilus' presence. As Susan Schibanoff argues, 'in his "memoir" Troilus has selected places and images which reflect a unified and joyful portrayal of his past with

[77] 'The troubadour's multiple loves, all of them more or less the same, seem to stand for the mobility of desire.' Potkay, *Story of Joy*, p.58.

Criseyde. The audience is not allowed such a simplistic memory of those same events.'[78] This heightens the perception that Troilus' joy does not rely on temporal narrative and is instead the product of imagination. Pandarus, as he witnesses his friend fooling himself in useless complaint and vain hope, laughs softly in himself, 'but in his herte he thought and softe lough' (V, 1172). This laugh is emblematic of his mode of feeling joy, which corresponds to the 'libidinal economy of the troubadours' and their capacity to envisage life as play, as a cheerful game.[79] Troilus, on the other hand, is trapped in his complaints and expresses 'joi unto death': 'a libidinal fixation' which can be equated to the death drive.[80] The way Troilus feels joy, or rather thinks it, imagines and reminisces it, is what makes him an intrinsically tragic character. His linguistic and affective mode is one of stasis and endless, cyclical desire and inevitably ends in death.

As his spirit ascends towards heaven, Troilus looks down upon earth, and, for the very first time, he laughs, to himself, at the sorrow of humans: 'and in him-self he lough right at the wo/Of hem that wepten for his deethe so fast' (V, 1821-2). His laughter may finally indicate the experience of a joy which is present and embodied, an end in itself rather than turned toward more satisfaction. However, this final laughter is difficult to see as such as it arises from the sorrow of others and out of superiority. This laughter certainly does not turn Troilus into a more relatable character. As Mieszkowski points out, Troilus' laughter is 'altogether alien' and can therefore not be comic as we cannot identify with it: his spirit laughs at us.[81] As I have already argued, this laughter is embedded in cognitive rather than emotional language. It expresses Troilus' new-found knowledge and perspective on earth; it is not joyful. It does not even embody the 'pleyn felicite' (V, 1818) which lies beyond Troilus. What is at play here is emotional detachment rather than the presentation of a new,

---

[78] Susan Schibanoff, 'Prudence and Artificial Memory in Chaucer's *Troilus*', *ELH*, 42:4, 1975, 507-517, p.513.
[79] Potkay, *Story of Joy*, p.72.
[80] Ibid., pp.71-2
[81] Mieszkowski, 'Chaucerian Comedy', p.462.

better joy. As Lambert writes, this stanza offers a 'sense of a nemesis of the emotions – a lack of feeling, and unresponsiveness to love.'[82] Though he is closer to actual heaven, Troilus is now outside of love's *hevene blisse*. Like Pandarus and the narrator before him, all he can do is comment on others' emotions. His laughter is a commentary. Just as Pandarus' inward laughter comments on Troilus' hopes, which he knows to be vain, Troilus' final laughter comments on the sadness of humans, which he now knows to be vain. It is, perhaps, also a commentary on his own story.

Troilus' characterisation is literary; the conventional style of his expression almost turns him into a type, one that he may transcend in present, ecstatic joy and in apotheosis, but a type nonetheless. His characterisation often follows the *Filostrato* and even emphasizes these aspects that make him a typical, plaintive lover. It also draws directly on the French tradition of courtly emotionality. His speech modality is uniform throughout the poem and does not offer any real ambiguity. The reader feels for Troilus because of the pathos of his style and his touching idealism, but the emotional investment stops here. Joy, for Troilus, is a textual event: he writes it in anticipation in his imaginative mind and then again in the text of memory. Troilus is an easily readable text, which eventually elicits less fascination and identification than a character whose textuality is less obvious, harder to find.

Criseyde

To look at Criseyde in terms of textuality and try to make her fit into one literary tradition quickly appears impossible. The heroine has sparked more debate and attempts at interpretation than any of the male characters. She is an 'open text who is capable of

[82] Mark Lambert, 'Telling the Story in *Troilus and Criseyde'*, in Piero Boitani and Jill Mann (eds.), *The Cambridge Chaucer Companion*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 78-92, p.91

generating multiple fictions.'[83] This ambiguity is apparent in her varied scholarly appraisals: she has been interpreted as innocent and blameless or as the embodiment of feminine betrayal, naturalistic or ideal,[84] she is 'both the woman of the *fabliaux* and the lady of romance.'[85] Muscatine has powerfully argued that Criseyde cannot be looked at through only one of these roles: 'her ambiguity is her meaning'. As such, her meaning needs to be looked for in a variety of modes of characterisation. She is not only constructed through literary tradition nor is she made of only 'naturalistic materials'.[86] The enigma of her character, I argue, is best showcased through the analysis of her speech and her mode of feeling. She is not produced by just one discursive form. She is not, as Troilus himself remarks, easily readable: 'Though ther be mercy written in youre cheere,/God woot, the text ful hard is, soth, to fynde!' (III, 1356-7). The text of Chaucer's Criseyde is hard to find indeed, and it will not be found in literary tradition or in any conventional type. The fascination of Criseyde lies somewhere else, precisely in the gaps her text leaves blank.

Her affective stance is plural, and she does not seem to subscribe to one particular form of joy. Her diction of joy is extremely varied, comprising more terms and registers than the two male protagonists'.

---

[83] C. David Benson, 'The Opaque Text of Chaucer's Criseyde', in C. S. Cox and R. A. Shoaf (eds.), *Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde: Subgit to alle Poesye: Essays in Criticism*, Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1992, 17-28, p.27.

[84] Anne McTaggart argues, for example, that she is represented as guiltless in the poem, though she experiences shame, 'Shamed Guiltless: Criseyde, Dido and Chaucerian Ethics', *The Chaucer Review*, 46:4, 2012, 71-402. On the other hand, Burnley argues that her characterisation is based on a psychological type of femininity as moral weakness, David Burnley, 'Criseyde's Heart and the Weakness of Women: An Essay in Lexical Interpretation', *Studia Neophilologica*, 54:1, 1982, 15-38. For a survey of the varied critical appraisals of Criseyde see Lorraine Kochanske Stock, '"Slydynge" Critics: Changing Critical Constructions of Chaucer's Criseyde in the Past Century', in Cindy L. Vitto and Marcia Smith Marzec (eds.), *New Perspectives on Criseyde*, Asheville: Pegasus Press, 2004, 11-36.

[85] Mieszkowski, 'Chaucer's Much Loved Criseyde', p.123.

[86] Muscatine, *Chaucer and the French Tradition*, p.164.

Criseyde's diction of joy



Criseyde uses every register abundantly. She uses the philosophical *felicite* and *selinesse* as well as the more practical *wele* and *prosperite*. The religious and amorous terms are also present (*blisse, joy, solas*) as well as the more social and courtly ones (*lusti, lustinesse, feste, joli*). She even uses the sensual terms *plesaunce* and *delite* more than Troilus, whose system of feeling is amorous and sensual. However, these are mainly used in a non-reflexive way in Criseyde's speech. She is thus well versed in many different registers of joy, even when they do not define her own way of feeling. Lastly, she also uses the word *gladnesse* frequently, a word which is almost absent from Troilus' diction. This great variety of diction is a strong indicator of her multi-faceted nature. As Barry Windeatt notes, a first and important reason for Criseyde's ambiguity of character resides in modality of speech: 'to her uncle and to her lover Criseyde speaks in a different idiom. With Troilus she is measured and without levity. In Criseyde's conversations with her uncle there is often an engaging sprightliness'.[87] This flexibility of speech may recall that of her uncle but hers works differently; her affectivity is not functional and opportunistic.

With Pandarus, Criseyde is lively. They dance together, she is 'right glad' to stay at his house (III, 647), and she participates in his word games. More significantly, she laughs

[87] Windeatt, *Troilus and Criseyde*, p.287.

in his company. And while Pandarus' laughter is but a mood marker, hers is wholehearted. She laughs so hard she thinks her heart might burst, or she might die (II, 1108 and II, 1169). It is important to note that, in Boccaccio, Criseida never laughs.[88] She is only said to smile once, as she asks her cousin Pandaro why he fixedly stares at her (II, 36.1). Criseyde's laughter, on the other hand, is a marker of real emotion. Moreover, her aptitude to laugh wholly and intensely seems to convey an innocence and genuineness that is lacking in her uncle's laughter. The only time Pandarus' heart laughs it is a cynical laughter at Troilus' vain hopes (V, 1172). As Paull Baum suggests, Pandarus' laughter 'is usually pointed with malice or innuendo, but Criseyde's is nearly always genuine. With it she parries his efforts to manoeuvre her.'[89] Laughter often reveals a sort of superiority – such as in Troilus' final laugh – or even malignity in Chaucer,[90] but in Criseyde, it communicates an engaging sincerity. When she hears Pandarus' high praise of Troilus and his assurance that he would die over her, she feels joy: 'with sobre cheere hire herte lough' (II, 1592). This is perhaps not the most commendable feeling and is definitely linked with pride ('glorifie' II, 1593), but it is genuine. Criseyde is in fact the only character to wholeheartedly laugh from joy. The narrator, embedded in complaint and envy, never expresses joy. And Troilus, the perfect courtly lover, can access laughter only in his ascension towards heaven. He does not know how to laugh on earth, how to experience the comic and the simple joy of life.

Although Troilus remembers her laughing during his strolls around Troy in Book V, Criseyde is never said to laugh in Troilus' company. Her idiom with him is formed upon his; it is made of declarations of love, complaints or dawn songs. But she can also switch to a much more argumentative and practical discourse. When the news of her exchange is known,

---

[88] Boccaccio does mention her 'vaghezza e 'l piacevole riso/fuggendosi, l'aveano abbandonata' (IV, 100), a passage kept by Chaucer (IV, 865). But this cheerful disposition is never described beforehand, or at least not in the form of genuine, wholehearted laughter.

[89] Paull F. Baum, *Chaucer: A Critical Appreciation*, Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1958, p.168.

[90] Laughter will be studied more fully in the following chapter on joy and the body.

Troilus bursts out into a meditative and Boethian monologue on the problem of predestination and free will. Criseyde, instead, offers a long, reasoned and argumentative speech about possible solutions to their grief (IV, 1254-1414). This pragmatic aspect to Criseyde's affectivity has often been noted. Taylor argues that while Troilus produces lyrics on general, philosophic subjects, Criseyde rather considers practical and personal ones.[91] This is only half true as Criseyde does in fact consider philosophic subjects, as I shall go on to show, but this contrast is interesting nonetheless. During the lovers' first meeting, Troilus can barely utter any speech and then blurts out 'Mercy, mercy, swete herte' (III, 98). Criseyde, on the other hand, expresses rational thought about their happiness:

> Bysechyng hym, for Goddes love, that he
> Wolde, in honour of trouthe and gentilesse,
> As I wel mene, ek menen wel to me,
> And myn honour with wit and bisynesse
> Ay kepe; and if I may don hym gladnesse,
> From hennesforth, iwys, I nyl nought feyne.
> Now beth al hool; no lenger ye ne pleyne. (III, 162-8)

The lexis used here is very revealing; she associates the gladness she can give him with *gentilesse* and *bisinesse*, two words which belong to the public realm of courtly nobility and solicitude. She also adds to that the concepts of honour and truth. Her vision of their relationship appears to rely on honorific and public joy rather than a sensual and private one. However, only two stanzas later, Criseyde urges again Troilus to be glad, but, this time, *gladnesse* rhymes with *lustinesse* and *swetnesse* (III, 176-82). While *lustinesse* retains a courtly colouring, *swetnesse* definitely draws the tone towards pure sensuality. The transition is then completed as the rhyme slightly shifts from –esse to –isse, as *gladnesse* becomes *blisse*, in a rhyming couplet with *kisse*.

[91] Taylor, 'Terms of Love', p.508.

Choices in diction shape the identities and the evolution of characters. They are therefore also conditioned by the poetic behaviour of these words. *Gladnesse* and *plesaunce* are two lexemes which offer prolific rhyming possibilities. Yet, while *gladnesse* rhymes frequently with a variety of different words, antonyms or synonyms, *plesaunce* finds itself constricted in a repeated pattern with *remembraunce.*[92] The word *plesaunce* is mostly associated to Troilus' characterisation, and its inflexible rhyming scheme embeds him in an affectivity that is fixed, closing him in an inescapable cycle of pleasure, memory and longing. He only pronounces the word *gladnesse* once, while Criseyde says it five times. The word's rhyming flexibility allows her to enjoy a more varied and open affectivity.

Criseyde's register of joy is flexible and developmental. Her varying conception of joy can be seen through her falling in love process. She first considers the potential *gladnesse* of love in public and honorific terms: 'To graunte hym love, yet for his worthynesse/It were honour with pley and with gladnesse/In honestee with swich a lord to deele,' (II, 703-5). This public and pragmatic register then evolves into a much more negative one as she announces that she has seen in lovers 'hire dredfull joye, hire constreinte, and hire peyne' (II, 776). The antithetic *joy* of love might be constraining and painful, but it is a big leap from the emotionally neutral and pragmatic register of the previous quotation. Her niece Antigone then presents her with a new idiom of joy, one that rests on *lust* and *vertu, joy* and *seurte* (Antigone's song, II, 827-75). Until Criseyde eventually becomes curious and asks: 'is ther swych blisse among/Thise loveres?' (II, 885-6). She thus undergoes a linguistic process, an evolution in her registers of happiness, which gradually opens up the possibility of true joy in love, true bliss.

As seen from the word cloud, Criseyde is also versed in the language of sensual joy, using the words *plesaunce* and *delite* more than Troilus. However, these words almost never refer to her own pleasure, and most often to her lover's. Also, contrary to her lover, she uses

[92] See Appendix 11.

the term *delite* negatively. She affirms that she will not be false to Troilus nor 'for estat, delit, or for weddynge' (IV, 1534). In the same way, she explains that she did not fall in love with him for his 'estat roial,/Ne veyn delit' (IV, 1667-8). The collocation of *delite* with *estat* links sensual pleasure to public concerns. It posits both public status and private delight as superficial reasons for love. What did make her love him, she argues, is his capacity to keep his *delite* in check: 'resoun bridlede youre delit' (IV, 1678). In Boccaccio, it is Troiolo who says to Criseida that he did not fall in love with her because of her estate or wealth (IV, 164-66). Chaucer thus consciously decides to give this discourse where the diction of love's joy is associated with public and moral concerns to Criseyde rather than Troilus, whose diction of joy in Chaucer is exclusively private. Yet this discourse does not coincide with the falling in love process that we have been shown. Criseyde was first interested in the public and honorific aspects of a relationship with Troilus, before she indeed yielded to his unbridled desire. Her speech on joy does not correspond to her experience of it. She verbally constructs her own emotionality, in opposition to that of her lover. In her discourse, her joy in love is based on social, public and moral propriety while that of Troilus is sensual. Before they even meet, she establishes her potential enjoyment of their love as 'honour with pley and with gladnesse' (II, 704), but she expresses Troilus' joy as sensual desire: 'hath to se me swich delit' (II, 709). Later, when Criseyde is at Pandarus' house and she is informed that a lovesick Troilus is on his way; she pleads her uncle for discretion so 'that I honour may have, and he plesaunce' (III, 944). Her register changes depending on whether she refers to her own or to Troilus' joy. A discrepancy is also created between the reasoned and honourable affectivity she constructs for herself and what the narrative tells us of her experience of joy and love. This discrepancy is another important element in her famous ambiguity.

Criseyde's use of the word *plesaunce* also shows her understanding of the cyclic bond between pleasance and remembrance, but again, for her lover rather than herself. In

Book IV, she asks him that while she is absent 'no plesaunce/Of oother do me fro youre remembraunce' (IV, 1642-3). But in Book V she understands that this bond is destructive for Troilus: 'Nor other thyng nys is youre remembraunce,/As thynketh me, but only youre plesaunce' (V, 1608-9). This almost sounds like a reproach, an admonition to break the cycle of memory and pleasure. *Plesaunce* seems to be a primarily masculine feeling in *Troilus and Criseyde*: Troilus is bound to it through *remembraunce,* and Pandarus advocates for the mobility of *plesaunce.* Criseyde, on the other hand, seems to operate outside of this particular affectivity, free from the emotional constraint of the repeated rhyme.

Yet, Criseyde also experiences the memory of joy that begets desire: 'And thus she sette hire woful herte afire/Thorugh remembraunce of that she gan desire' (V, 720-21). Away in the Greek camp, reminiscing, she complains: '"Allas" quod she, "the plesance and the joie,/The which that now al torned into galle is,/Have ich had ofte withinne yonder walles!' (V, 731-3). The words *remembraunce* and *plesaunce* appear here in close proximity, but not in the literary constraint of the rhyme. Moreover, in the same passage, she then speaks a very different affective register. First of all, her memory brings her to action – impossible in Troilus' mode – as she decides to run away and go back to Troy and Troilus. She does not carry this decision through, but as we know, Criseyde's discursive mode does not always coincide with her actions. She constructs her affectivity through speech rather than experience. Her discursive use of the future tense ('I shal' V, 751) and her consciousness of being 'in the snare' of future time (V, 748) confirms that she is not, contrary to Troilus, stuck in the memory of joy. Then, in a reminiscent yet very different rhyming couplet, she says: 'And as for me, for al swich variaunce,/Felicite clepe I my suffisaunce' (V, 763-4).[93] The *variaunce* here specifically refers to the variety of human opinions, but it also evokes earthly variability. The register is quite obviously philosophical. As Burnley notes 'the language she uses echoes the philosophical themes of prudence and contentment as the guarantor of

[93] For an in-depth analysis of this passage see Horner, 'To "speken in amphibologies"'.

happiness.'[94] Instead of being trapped in the individual and emotional tidings of memory and pleasure, Criseyde acknowledges mutability and puts all her resolve and self-sufficiency not in sensual pleasure but in *felicite*, a more objective concept of earthly happiness. Criseyde says the word *suffisaunce* in two other instances, to refer to her lover Troilus, her 'owene hertes sothfast suffisaunce' (IV, 1640).[95] There is an evolution in Criseyde's idea of sufficiency: instead of a non-interchangeable individual, she now places her *suffisaunce* in the general concept of philosophical felicity, a felicity which accepts worldly variance.

Criseyde is very much aware of the mutability of earthly joy, as proves her Boethian speech in Book III. In this speech, she addresses the problem of knowledge and ignorance of joy's mutability. In both cases, earthly joy is diminished or false: one cannot have 'verray joie and selynesse' (III, 825) in ignorance but the dread of knowing one will lose it impedes joy as well. Nair sees in this the predicament of the two lovers: 'Criseyde's suggestion that he who is unaware of the mutability of good fortune is not truly happy, gestures toward Troilus […]. Criseyde, on the other hand, is always conscious of what she has to lose, and if she experiences "joie", it is a joy shadowed by the impending downturn of Fortune's wheel. Criseyde's awareness of the inevitability of change enables her pragmatism'.[96] But this does not prevent her from giving in to pleasure and bliss with Troilus, and, when it is gone, to exclaim in dismay: 'Endeth than love in wo? Ye, or men lieth,/And alle worldly blisse as thynketh me.' (IV, 834-5). By using the word *blisse* to speak of earthly joy she expresses not a pure 'Boethian pragmatism'[97] but a complex blend of registers. Although she is aware of mutability, she succumbs to the heavenly quality of love's *blisse*. The same principle allows her to associate love's *gladnesse* with *gentilesse* as easily as with *swetnesse.*

[94] Burnley, 'Criseyde's Heart', p.30.
[95] The other mention is in Book III, 1309, 'Welcome, my knyght, my pees, my suffisaunce'.
[96] Nair, 'Gender and Philosophy', pp.48-9.
[97] Nair, 'Gender and Philosophy', p.36.

Several critics have seen her 'betrayal' of Troilus in accepting Diomede's love as proof of her pragmatism or her inconsistency. What it certainly shows is that, to her, love's joy is not something as immutable as it is for Troilus. Her mode of feeling is variable and adaptable. Contrary to Pandarus' adaptability, however, hers is not opportunistic. It rather comes out of acceptance. Through the discursive construction of her own affectivity, she manages to free herself from the constricting cycle of sensual joy, while still being able to experience it and feel its elevated status. Moreover, contrary to Troilus' joy, which is mostly a product of imagination or memory, hers is a present event, and its limited duration is acknowledged. Love is to her part of the search for earthly felicity; although joy is bound to disappear, it is, by the same principle, bound to appear again, in a new form. But Criseyde disappears from the story before the reader can know if she gets a happy ending, on earth or in heaven.

The end that she sees for herself of course is remarkably clairvoyant. She imagines her literary posterity as the figure of female flimsiness and betrayal (V, 1058-1064). Yet, the narrative voice in fact professes ignorance about whether she gives Diomede her heart (V, 1050). By making this change from the story he inherited, by withholding the certainty of her betrayal, he withholds his, and ultimately our, moral condemnation of Criseyde. The narrator is partial to her and refuses to blame this 'sely womman' (V, 1093). This qualifier, as I have argued, places Criseyde in a literary lineage of innocent women. The intertextual resonances of *seli* thus add to her multi-faceted character. Far from binding her in literary tradition, it frees her from the textual posterity that she dreads and which her name already carries. Chaucer releases Criseyde from being a figure constrained by literary traditions such as conventional types, registers and rhymes. Criseyde cannot be contained by literary type, as if she were indeed 'real', and yet her changeability has led critics to doubt her

personhood.[98] Criseyde is still being 'rolled […] on many a tonge' (V, 1061), but the undying fascination she exerts comes now, thanks to Chaucer, from her ambiguity.

Conclusion

Because of its narratorial frame, the story of *Troilus and Criseyde* does not *feel* joyful. The characterisation of joy, by which I mean the way joy is portrayed through the different characters as well as how characters are constructed through their attitudes towards joy, is circumscribed in a literary tradition which is intrinsically sorrowful. The literary and authoritative guarantees that the narrator invokes frame the poem in a tradition of seriousness and tragedy. At the end of the text, he explicitly places his poem in literary tradition and posterity through the 'sixth of six topos'.[99] He sends his poem off to kiss the footprints of a list of five eminent classic authors (V, 1791), implicitly including himself as the sixth poet of that list.[100] He names his 'litel bok' a 'tragedye' and sends it off to literary fame. In this same address to his book, he also expresses his desire to be able to write comedy: 'Ther God thi makere yet, er that he dye/So sende myght to make in som comedye' (V, 1788). Here, the narrator's obligatory literary, and emotional, script and his struggle within it are explicitly revealed: he writes a tragedy for posterity but wishes he could write comedy. The generic signals in this final passage are hence conflicted. Despite its tragic frame, the poem

[98] Gretchen Mieszkowski analyses Criseyde's ambiguity and the fascination she exerts – on men – as the result of her lack of personhood. She argues that Criseyde never demonstrates any determination or purposive action, she is passive and has no idiom of her own as she simply mirrors the men around her: she is not a person. I argue instead that her ability to change and to adopt different modes of expression with different people and in different contexts is exactly what makes her into a person. Mieszkowski, 'Chaucer's Much Loved Criseyde', pp.126-30.

[99] David Wallace suggests that this literary topos 'bespeaks the highest poetic ambition.' David Wallace, *Chaucerian Polity: Absolutist Lineages and Associational Forms in England and Italy*, Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1997, p.80.

[100] On this 'self-authorizing moment' see also Elizaveta Strakhov, '"And kis the steppes where as thow seest pace": Reconstructing the Spectral Canon in Statius and Chaucer', in Isabel Davis and Catherine Nall (eds.), *Chaucer and Fame: Reputation and Reception*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2015, 57-74, p.58

is not without comedy. Chaucer's reworking of the characters of Pandarus and Criseyde brings in laughter and playfulness, the possibility to enjoy life lightly. And the poem ends in comedy – of the cosmic sort.

The apotheosis does not appear in the *Filostrato*, which keeps a very personal focus to the end, but it does in Boccaccio's epic poem, *Teseida.* This borrowing from the *Teseida* places Troilus' flight in the tradition of Dantean divine comedy.[101] Yet, while Dante's final comic vision is about joy and desire fulfilled,[102] *Troilus*' 'comic' ending is in fact not comic at all. As Richard Neuse suggests: 'The two visions, the Pilgrim's [in Dante's *Paradiso* XXXIII] and Troilus's, might well serve as symbolic epitomes, not of opposed metaphysical systems, […] but of a comic and a tragic hero's final perspectives, the one with his heaven-conquering love, the other with his greatly diminished sense of what love avails "in this wrecched world adoun."'[103] The 'comic' ending does not feel celebratory nor joyful.[104] Chaucer's divine comedy is unemotional and expressed through cognitive and philosophical language: the register of clerkly *felicite* rather than that of heavenly *blisse*. In the tangle of genres and perspectives that is the ending, emotion is not present: Troilus, contrary to Dante, is dead, beyond human emotion. And neither he nor the reader is granted access to spiritual and emotional heavenly bliss. The emotional climax of the poem is not to be found in this comic vision but in the human and awe-inspiring joy of earthly love. The narrator's wish to

[101] Troilus' apotheosis (V, 1807-27) is closely adapted from Arcita's soul ascent in *Teseida* (XI, 1-3), which is itself inspired by Dante's look back upon earth from the eighth sphere (*Paradiso* XXII, 133-8).

[102] In *Paradiso* XXXIII, Dante's vision and comprehension of the 'forma universal' appears affective: he believes he saw it because he feels joy ('mi sento ch'i' *godo*' 93). At the end of the Canto, the emphasis is on the fulfillment and turning of Dante's will and desire (*voglia, disio, velle,* 141 and 143).

[103] Richard Neuse, '*Troilus and Criseyde*: Another Dantean Reading', in Cox and Shoaf (eds.), *'Subgit to alle Poesye': Essays in Criticism*, 199-210, p.210.

[104] This goes directly against Gerald Morgan's reading which sees the ending as the positive celebration of the attainment of a higher form of joy rather than a negative rejection of the lesser earthly joy. While I also do not believe that the ending implies a complete rejection of earthly joy, lexical analysis reveals it to be cognitive and clerkly rather than celebratory and joyful and Troilus is not presented as having reached heavenly felicity, only to laugh from his new perspective at humans and earthly sorrow. Morgan, 'The Ending of *Troilus and Criseyde*', *The Modern Language Review*, 77:2, 1982, 257-271, pp. 263 and 266.

make comedy thus might allude to an alternative story, culminating in earthly joy rather than divine comedy, but one which he does not allow himself to write.

As the story ends, the narrator bids farewell to Criseyde and the embodiment of earthly joy that she represents. He also dismisses Pandarus, who, usually able to bring about action and cheerfulness through speech, is now angry and sad and finds himself at a loss for words: 'I kan namore seye' (V, 1743). The narrator ends his story with Troilus, his most tragic character, and turns to a different source in order to provide his protagonist and his story with an ending befitting his literary pretensions. The final celestial perspective, in its belittlement of earthly emotions, closes the framework which holds joy in check throughout the whole poem. Earthly joy is fleeting and cannot therefore be the basis for a lasting piece of literature, one that gets inscribed in tradition and posterity. Literary tradition weighs on the story and its characters up until the very end, a weight which does not let the narrator write his story lightly. Yet Chaucer crafts a poem which adheres to the obligatory sorrow of literary convention while also positing earthly joy at its heart.

CHAPTER THREE
THE BODY OF JOY

Introduction

While this thesis has taken a largely linguistic approach to the study of emotion, I now inevitably turn to the body. To write emotion, one has to write the body. In literature, characters blush with shame, grow pale with fear and cry from sorrow. But the writing of somatic changes often does not name the emotion it represents. This part of the thesis therefore moves away from lexicon-based analysis to look at the bodily language of emotion. While many studies on bodily language in Chaucer are in fact studies of gestures, the present chapter does not restrict itself to the study of gestures. Rather, it focuses on emotional embodiment in general and the very different ways the body is used in the writing of joy, as well as sorrow and desire. Physiology and literary convention, performative gestures and symptoms, behaviours and activities; every facet of the somatisation of emotion will be explored to find the elusive body of joy.

Existing studies on gestures are first confronted with the ambiguity of the term 'gesture' itself. What belongs or not to the category of gesture is indeed highly debatable. J. A. Burrow argues for a clear distinction between gestures, which are intentional and carry a message, and symptoms, which are involuntary. Burrow excludes such symptoms as blushing and crying from his study on gestures and looks.[1] Others before him have opted for a broader definition of gesture. Barry Windeatt, for example, looks at Chaucer's concern

[1] J. A. Burrow, *Gestures and Looks and Medieval Narrative*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 3-4.

with 'how far the whole range of outward gestures can be taken as a reflection of the character's inner state.'[2] He thus includes in his study 'gestures' such as blushing and weeping. R. G. Benson explores the relation of gestures and literary genres in Chaucer and focuses on conventionality and naturalism rather than specific types of gestures.[3] He nonetheless includes weeping and blushing as part of his investigation. This chapter will deal with both gestures and symptoms, looking at how Chaucer uses the body to narrate and to reveal emotions in his characters, be they diegetically communicative or participating in an authorial attempt to write the physiological emotional body. Whether they are concerned with non-verbal communication or the symptomatic outward appearance of emotion, studies on gestures rarely mention joy. Smiles and laughter are often uncovered as cognitive rather than emotional gestures, and joy seems to play a very small role in the complex gestural language apparent in Chaucer's writing. Yet it is important to include gestures in the study of joy. It shows how joy resists being expressed as either a passive symptom-like gesture or as a communicative, visual one. Instead, the only gestures of joy are potential and metaphorical, translated into action and behaviour. Joy therefore suggests a different type of emotional body: active and behavioural rather than passive and acted-upon by the emotion.[4]

The writing of the emotional body in Chaucer also relies on physiological and medical discourse. Emotions are an important part of any medieval medical theory. In Galen's theory of health, they are part of the non-naturals, external elements that affect the body's well-being. The non-naturals have a causal relationship with the naturals, the innate and inner elements of the human body, and therefore, attending to the non-naturals is the

[2] Windeatt, 'Gesture in Chaucer', p.151.
[3] Benson, *Medieval Body Language*.
[4] On the understanding of the body as passive in emotional processes see Palmer's discussion on the conceptualisation and metaphors of 'passion'. James M. Palmer, *Narratives of Healing: Emotion, Medicine, Metaphor, and Late-Medieval Poetry and Prose*, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2002, p.12. Patrick J. Gallagher describes the body as the 'meeting point of acting and being acted upon' in his article on Chaucer's bodily rhetoric. Gallagher, 'Chaucer and the Rhetoric of the Body', *The Chaucer Review,* 28:3, 1994, 216-36, p.218.

best way to stay healthy. The non-naturals include 'air, rest or motion, sleep or wakefulness, food and drink, excretion or retention of bodily substances and emotions.'[5] While considered an 'external' element, emotions are in direct relation with the internal humours. Cohen-Hanegbi demonstrates that both emotions and humours are categorised through their qualities – wet or dry, hot or cold.[6] Sorrow, which is defined as dry and cold, is therefore associated with the melancholic humour, which is also dry and cold. Emotions are inseparable from bodily health. As explains Simo Knuuttila, 'because of their somatic effects the emotions themselves can also be used as remedies'.[7] Thus for an excess of the melancholic humour and a sorrowful temperament, a physician would recommend activities inducing joy, which is associated with the opposite humour, the warm and wet blood. Finally, emotions also have a direct effect on the body's spirits and natural heat. In Constantine the African's Latin medical compendium, the *Liber Pantegni*, joy and anger cause a movement of the vital spirit and heat from the heart to the outer parts of the body while fear and distress effect the opposite movement, towards the heart.[8] These movements can have important consequences on the body's health and its humoural balance.

The medical discourse on emotions thus offers different, but correlated, aspects of the somatisation of emotions: they are movements in the body as well as changes in temperature or state (hot or cold, wet or dry). These are also inscribed on the visible, outer body through symptoms such as blushing, growing pale, fever and sighs or tears. While medical discourse undoubtedly informs Chaucer's writing of emotion, his bodies are also very much literary, constructed through cultural conventions and aesthetics. In this chapter,

---

[5] Burns, 'The Nonnaturals', p.203.
[6] Naama Cohen-Hanegbi, 'The Matter of Emotions: Priests and Physicians on the Movements of the Soul', *POETICA*, 72, 2009, 21-42, p.26.
[7] Simo Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, p.214.
[8] Ibid., p.214. In his description of the Physician in the *General Prologue*, Chaucer mentions Constantine as well as Haly Abbas, the Arabic author of the *Complete Book of Medical Art*, from which most of the *Pantegni* is drawn (I, 430-34).

I look at how the writing of the emotional body negotiates between physiology and literary convention. But while sorrow is conventionally inscribed on the body through visual cultural signs of emotion, joy appears to possess no such embodied signs. Moreover, joy, contrary to sorrow, is not pathologized. Consequently, it is less often written through bodily symptoms and its embodied narration is often metaphorical: the heart floats and dances in joy. The somatisation of joy is therefore very different from that of sorrow and desire: it is metaphorical and behavioural. Even though joy is carnal in the poem, it cannot be contained by and reduced to the physiological body.

Writing Emotion on the Body

In order to understand the somatisation of joy, it is necessary to explore how the grieving body is written. The sorrowful body takes much more space in Chaucer's work; it is more present and visible, more visceral and memorable than the joyful body. To illustrate this, I wish briefly to turn to Chaucer's early poem of love, loss and emotional distress, the *Book of the Duchess.* In this dream-vision, a distressed narrator finally finds sleep and, in a dream, encounters a knight who suffers from terrible grief. As he approaches him, drawn by curiosity and concern, we are offered a very detailed visual description of the unknown persona: he is alone, reclining against a tree; he is young, attractive and noble-looking, he is dressed all in black, his head is bowed and he is very pale. Phillipa Hardman argues there is a 'visionary quality to this moment of discovery'.[9] This is created through visual, recognizable signs, which the narrator decodes. He perceives that the Knight is in so great a sorrow as to make him wonder how he is still alive (467-69). The emotion can hence be read on the Knight. Hardman further argues that this figuration of the Black Knight is influenced

[9] Phillipa Hardman, 'Chaucer's Man of Sorrows: Secular Images of Pity in the *Book of the Duchess*, the *Squire's Tale,* and *Troilus and Criseyde*', in *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 93:2, 1994, 204-227, p.210.

by the pictorial and literary tradition of Christ as the Man of Sorrows. The Man of Sorrows literature and imagery fashions a Christ who demands to be looked upon and pitied, making the visual aspect of His sorrow primordial.[10] This tradition creates conventional and culturally legible somatic signs of the emotion of sorrow. Crucially, it turns sorrow into a visual spectacle, one that requests an audience. In the poem, the reliance on such visible signs construes the Knight as an incarnation of sorrow: 'For y am sorwe, and sorwe ys y' (597). This writing of emotion uses the body as an image or a text which a witness or the reader can see and interpret.

The representation of the Knight becomes symbolic. Benson argues that Chaucer's use of gestures in this particular poem is so stylized that it 'often removes them altogether from the sphere of specific action and transforms them into generalized, occasionally metaphoric expressions.'[11] But Chaucer then steps away from symbolism and metaphor to offer a medical and physiological narration of the emotional body (l488-99). Rebecca McNamara notes how Chaucer here departs from his French sources and their lyrical artifice. In order to express true feeling, he develops a new way to portray embodied emotion by using a medicalised discourse.[12] This adds a visceral quality to the poetry of emotions as McNamara points out, while also making sorrow visible and diagnosable by an external witness. Chaucer thus writes emotions as 'embodied and social processes.'[13] The narrator can read the sorrow of the Knight outside and inside. Consequently, he approaches him in the appropriate way and tries to help and heal him. In his early poem, Chaucer thus establishes a distinctive way to write emotion on the body. He uses the conventions of both visual culture and courtly, lyrical poetry in order to create a recognizable and allegorical

[10] Hardman, 'Chaucer's Man of Sorrows', p.206.
[11] Benson, *Medieval Body Language*, p.24.
[12] McNamara, 'Wearing Your Heart on your Face', pp.259-60.
[13] Ibid., p.263.

vision of a sorrowful body, but then also peels back these conventional layers to access to the visceral reality of the emotion, its humoural and physiological qualities.

Troilus and Criseyde is less symbolic in its expression of emotion. Yet, the visual quality of sorrow is present. The emotion is portrayed through a succession of somatic signs and gestures. This is most visible in the two paralleled portraits of grief that occur in the fourth book. Successively, we are shown Troilus' and Criseyde's sorrow in an impressively vivid and visual manner. After Criseyde has left for the Greek camp, Troilus rushes to his room and closes himself in, alone, in the dark. Immediately, we are asked to see Troilus, to see his sorrow. He is, the narrator tells us, 'ful lik a ded ymage, pale and wan' (IV, 235). Troilus is the image of death or the deadly vision of sorrow. While the whole passage is quite closely translated from Boccaccio's *Il Filostrato*, it is Chaucer who adds the emphasis on image here. Troiolo is simply a *thing* more dead than living ('e piu morta pare che viva cosa' IV, 20). Troilus' grief is visibly inscribed on his body, which is turned into an inanimate picture. After this trope though, the portrait of sorrow becomes more active. Troilus' grief is expressed through violent gestures and a behaviour verging on madness (IV, 236-8). Like a bull, Troilus roars, smites his breast and smashes his head against the wall (IV, 239-45), tears stream out of his eyes (IV, 247-9) and he sighs and complains constantly.

A similar, but specifically feminine version of this vision of grief is then offered to account for Criseyde's state. Her bright hue is turned pale (IV, 740), she weeps and sighs (IV, 716) and beats her white breast (IV, 752), her long blonde hair lies unbraided and dishevelled around her ears (IV, 816-7) and purple rings have formed under her eyes (IV, 869). The emotion is legible on Criseyde's body and, crucially, these somatic gestures and symptoms are explicitly presented as the true signs of emotion. Her tears give sign of her pain (IV, 710) and her paleness bears witness of her sorrow (IV, 741), her dishevelled hair is the 'verray signal of martire' (IV, 818) and her dark circles are the 'sothfast tokenyng of hire peyne' (IV, 870). There is a real emphasis on the *signs* of emotion, its visible and

physical evidence. Interestingly, this appears only in the description of Criseyde's grief. Troilus' gestures of sorrow are described but they are not explicitly referred to as tokens of his emotion, as if perhaps the readers, and Pandarus, the actual witness of the scenes, need more convincing towards Criseyde's pain than Troilus'.

The narrator compares her present deadly appearance against her former glorious beauty:

> Hire face, lik of Paradys the ymage,
> Was al ychaunged in another kynde.
> The pleye, the laughter, men was wont to fynde
> On hire, and ek hire joies everichone,
> Ben fled; and thus lith now Criseyde allone. (IV, 864-8).

The image of her beauty is framed by joyfulness. Joy appears as the characteristic emotion that defines her appearance: she is the image of Paradise, and heaven is a synonym of bliss in the poem. Once again, Chaucer is relying on Boccaccio here, but Chaucer alone describes her face as the *image* of paradise.[14] She is now the image of death: 'She was right swich to seen in hire visage/As is that wight that men on beere bynde' (IV, 863). The joy of Criseyde could be found and read on her face, by men, as a public image to be looked upon. Now she looks like a dead person that men place on a bier. As Stephanie Trigg observes, Criseyde's face has an 'active role' in the poem's narrative and Chaucer 'often invites us to look intently, with Pandarus or Troilus, on Criseyde's face, in ways that pause the narrative and problematize the very act of looking.'[15] While both the lovers' grief is written in visual terms, only Criseyde's appearance is specifically highlighted as the place of changes in affect and as the testimony for emotional interiority. Criseyde's face thus almost demands to be

[14] Criseida's face is simply said to have been made in Paradise: 'la sua faccia fatta in paradiso' (IV, 100).
[15] Trigg, '"Language in her Eye"', p.95.

publicly read as the site of beauty, joy and perfection and then as the site of sorrow and death.

The two parallel scenes form a 'set-piece description of woe', the behaviour, gestures and complaint of the lovers having more to do with 'ritualised action' than individual expression and speech.[16] The close reliance on Boccaccio for these scenes, something rather rare in emotional passages, further demonstrates the conventionality of the signs of sorrow: there is a set literary and cultural tradition of the image and somatisation of grief. Sorrow written in this way demands to be looked upon. Chaucer emphasises the visual aspect of these scenes, making their reliance on imagery explicit. The writing of the grieving body in Chaucer is formed upon available stock images of the somatisation of the emotion which exist in cultural and literary tradition. Such stock images were not available for the representation of joy, as I shall go on to discuss.

The visibility of the somatisation of sorrow also comes from the absolute necessity, in Chaucer's poetry, for it to be recognized, acknowledged, and ultimately, cured. As already touched upon in the previous chapter, emotion needs an audience. Both scenes of sorrow are staged in the same way: the suffering individual is first alone in their room, with only the reader as spectator, before Pandarus makes his entry and becomes the witness. Far from being a removed witness, he is deeply touched by the visions he sees. The somatic signs of sorrow are transferred to him. Seeing Troilus' 'pitous face' (IV, 361), Pandarus' heart becomes cold, he starts to weep as tenderly as the lover (IV, 369) and finally is himself described as 'ful ded and pale of hewe' (IV, 379). Recognizable, somatic signs of sorrow elicit pity in the onlooker. The visual emotional language at play here is similar to that created in the Man of Sorrows tradition.[17] In the *Book of the Duchess*, this even allows the

[16] Davenport, *Chaucer: Complaint and Narrative*, p.154.
[17] Crocker and Pugh analyse the power of passivity in this spectacle of suffering: passive pain moves and affects others. They also compare Chaucer's 'exaltation of the body in pain' and the 'visual sacralisation of Christ's pain'. Crocker and Pugh, 'Pleasures of Troilus', p.87

narrator to understand what is happening in the knight's inner body. In the grief scenes in *Troilus*, the visible gestures and symptoms are not explained in such medical and physiological depth. The narration only occasionally turns inward. Troilus' rage, the narrator explains, wrings and oppresses his heart and only when time has assuaged this fury somewhat, Troilus bursts into tears and into a long, solitary complaint (IV, 253-60). After this lengthy complaint, thousands of burning sighs leave his breast, mingled with new complaints until he falls into a trance incapable of feeling anything any more (IV, 336-43).

The description does not venture into actual medical discourse, it only touches upon interiority to explain the process of the lover's behaviour and gestures. The lover's sorrow is, however, presented as detrimental to his health and potentially fatal. Just as with the Black Knight's grief, the narrator expresses his incredulity about Troilus' state: 'That wonder is the body may suffise/To half this wo which that I yow devise' (IV, 258-9). He is 'neigh ded for smert' (IV, 373). Moreover, Pandarus posits himself as the physician, arguing that it is now the time for cure rather than complaint (IV, 931) and Troilus identifies Pandarus' logical discourse on the end and mutability of desire as medicine, 'lechecraft' (IV, 436). A medical scenario is hence at play here, where the sorrowful lover is a patient and Pandarus the doctor. The whole relationship between Troilus and Pandarus can in fact be interpreted in this way. Mary Frances Wack reads Troilus' emotional and physical states as symptoms of lovesickness.[18] Through this reading she argues, Pandarus becomes his physician and Criseyde his cure.[19] James Palmer similarly analyses Troilus' love, to which he refers himself as a 'wonder maladie' (I, 419) as a disease needing remedy, namely, according to Palmer, Ovidian *remedia amoris*.[20] In terms of the writing of emotions, this medical scenario

[18] Chaucer himself refers to lovesickness, which he names 'the loveris maladye/Of Hereos' (I, 1376-7) in the *Knight's Tale*. Its visual symptoms (paleness, hollow eyes, thinness) are similar to those found in *Troilus.*

[19] Wack, 'Lovesickness in *Troilus*', p.58.

[20] James Palmer, 'When *Remedia Amoris* Fails: Chaucer's Literary-Medical Exploration of Determinism, Materialism, and Free Will,' in Angela Laflen and Marcelline Block (eds.), *Gender Scripts in Medicine and Narrative*, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2010, 292-319.

is important as it presupposes the visibility of sorrow on the body. The physician needs to be able to diagnose his patient by relying on legible external symptoms.

But only Troilus' sorrow is thus pathologized. With Criseyde, Pandarus acts as an adviser, never a doctor. He never fears for her life. Instead, when he witnesses her sorrow he still worries about his patient Troilus:

> Quod Pandarus, 'Allas, whi do ye so,
> Syn wel ye woot the tyme is faste by
> That he shal come? Aris up hastily
> That he yow nat bywopen thus ne fynde,
> But ye wole have hym wood out of his mynde (IV, 913-7).

The pathologisation of sorrow is an important part of the way it is written in *Troilus*, but only as it enters the courtly love narrative of the diseased lover and the Lady as his only cure. Yet Criseyde's sorrow is no less physical or visual than Troilus'. She declares herself and her body as the visible repository of every torment:

> Whoso me seeth, he seeth sorwe al atonys –
> Peyne, torment, pleynte, wo, distresse!
> Out of my woful body harm ther noon is,
> As angwissh, languor, cruel bitternesse,
> Anoy, smert, drede, fury, and ek siknesse. (IV, 841-45)

All the sorrow of the world is contained inside her body, and anybody who sees her can see that sorrow.[21] Her body is the public receptacle of anguish and sickness and yet, it is not treated as a sick body. Criseyde experiences 'enamourment but escapes the disintegration and disorientation lovesickness brings to her admirer.'[22] On the other hand, her body

[21] As Sealy Gilles notes, this is inspired by a similar passage in Boccaccio. But in the Italian poem, Pandaro speaks it and the torments and sorrows are exterior: they are all he can see on this miserable day. Chaucer thus makes 'Criseyde's claustrophobic lament turn inward to situate the world's torments within her own "woful body".' Sealy Gilles, 'Love and Disease in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *Studies in the Ages of Chaucer*, 25, 2003, 157-197, pp.157-8.
[22] Ibid., p.189.

becomes his cure, in the act of consummation first, but also after the news of their separation, Criseyde exclaims she will search every vein in her heart to find a salve to heal Troilus' 'sore' (IV, 942-44). So while the grief of both the lovers is visually inscribed on their bodies, turning them into exemplars of sorrow, only Troilus' grief is a life-threatening disease. Criseyde's sorrow is written on her face and body as a public proof of her affect, just as her laughter and joy were publicly visible as a mark of her beauty. Her emotional body seems to always be at the sight and service of others; other men in particular. Troilus' sorrow on the other hand is marked on his body but it is pathologised and hence privatised.

There are no equivalent scenes to the portraits of grief for the representation of joy, which, it would seem, does not possess such ready stock images and somatic signs. The portrait of Criseyde's grief states that her face used to be the site of joy, therefore implying that joy used to be visible on her face. But while the image of death is described in somatic signs, we are given no details on what the face of Paradise might look like. The narrator only mentions the 'pleye', the laughter and all the joys that men could see on her. Except from the gesture of laughter, this offers little indication of the actual physical appearance of Criseyde's past joy. The image of her joy conflates with that of her beauty. Here, a comparison with the highly allegorical *Romaunt of the Rose* is informative. Benson explains that in the text 'the portrait of Sorrow includes far more physical detail than any of the others'; this confirms that sorrow is an emotion 'for which stylized gestures were widely used.'[23] This allegorical representation is in fact quite close to the portrait of Criseyde's grief: Sorrow is feminine, her clothes are torn, her face is pale, her hair is all messy around her ears and shoulders and she cries (*Romaunt*, 300ff.). The visuality of Sorrow is exacerbated as its description is an ekphrasis, its portrait being painted on a wall (301ff.).[24]

[23] Benson, *Medieval Body Language*, p.17.
[24] On this ekphrastic personification of sorrow and its construction through visible physiological symptoms and physical gestures see Mary Flannery, 'Personification and Embodied Emotional Practice in Middle English Literature', *Literature Compass*, 13:6, 2016, 351-61, pp.354-5.

The allegories of mirth and gladness, on the other hand, are not static, passive images; they are characters. Sir Mirthe is 'the fairer man I nevere sigh' (818). This is followed by a long description of his perfect physical appearance, his eyes, hair and his stature all 'so fair, so joly, and so fetys' (829). The portrait ends with his impeccable fashion sense. The portrait of Dame Gladnesse similarly offers few gestures and focuses on her general appearance. She is compared to a rose, her flesh is tender, she is small and slender, her face is beautiful, her eyes are grey and glad and described as laughing (856ff.). She dances with Sir Mirthe and they are both 'faire and bright of hewe' (855) – a quality also often attributed to Criseyde. The visual representation of gladness and mirth is therefore one of beauty rather than any particular somatic gestures. The only 'gestures' or rather actions they perform are the social and public ones of singing and dancing.

In *Troilus and Criseyde*, the only extended descriptions of joy write it as a behaviour rather than through somatic signs. After the consummation, Troilus lives his life 'in suffisaunce, in blisse and in singynges' (III, 1716). This opening phrase comes from the *Filostrato* (III, 72), but Chaucer then adds multiple details of Troilus' joyful life: he jousts, gives feasts and is constantly surrounded by the best people. Joy is therefore represented as a social behaviour, which is diametrically opposed to the individual and violent somatic behaviour of sorrow. In fact, there is no inscription on or in the body in this portrait of the joyful life. The heart is mentioned but only as the locus of cognition: Troilus thinks ('demed' III, 1727) in his heart that he is the happiest lover. What Chaucer really emphasises here is the relation between joy and honour. Troilus' behaviour in joy is so virtuous that his fame resounds all the way to the gate of heaven (III, 1725). This is paralleled at the end of Book I, when Troilus receives good news from Pandarus regarding Criseyde. His new-found hope is portrayed through his prowess in the field of war and his noble and virtuous behaviour (I,

1072-85). While there is no physical description of his joy, he is visibly ennobled:[25] 'so goodly was, and gat hym so in grace,/That ecch hym loved that loked on his face' (I, 1077-8). His graceful demeanour generates public admiration and love. Tellingly, while in the same passage after the consummation Boccaccio's Troiolo addresses a prayer to Venus and her gifts of pleasure and delight, Troilus produces instead a Boethian song on love's bond and its virtue (III, 1744-71). This allows Chaucer to keep the focus on honour and virtue, aspects which are not stressed in the Italian source.

There is no such description of Criseyde after the consummation. While her face and her body are the public and visible locus of emotion, the effects of her present joy with Troilus are not translated into public behaviour. Criseyde, it would seem, is not ennobled by love's joy the way her male lover is. Her emotional body occupies a different social space. The next morning, she does not parade around Troy but is joined by Pandarus in the bedchamber and chides him for his manipulation in the affair. She then hides her blushing face in her sheet from embarrassment (III, 1569-70). The face of Criseyde is generally admired by all as the site of beauty and joy, but as she experienced true joy in the form of carnal love, she must hide her face in shame rather than expose it to the world in glory.

The writing of joy and sorrow on the body constructs two extremely different emotions. But it also reveals the crucial role of gender in the negotiation of the body, emotion and the public sphere. Both lovers are turned into images of sorrow, as grief acts and marks itself upon their passive bodies. Yet, while Troilus' body is fatally diseased by sorrow, Criseyde's health is not considered. Her body becomes a public token of sorrow. In joy, Criseyde's face becomes a site of shame while Troilus' one of public glory and admiration. Through joy, Troilus becomes a figure of social virtue. Joy thus appears as an active behaviour and a way of life. It becomes visible by being transformed into virtue and honour

[25] On the medieval concept of love as ennobling see Stephen Jaeger, *Ennobling Love: in Search of a Lost Sensibility*, Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.

rather than being marked on the body. Joy here is a quality rather than an emotion, and a quality is much harder to write on the body.

The Heart of Emotion and the Physiology of Sexual Desire

In writing the physiology of emotions and the internal bodily changes they generate the heart holds pride of place. The heart is often regarded as the seat of emotions. While this is accepted as mostly figurative language nowadays, the medieval heart was 'host to myriad of entities that we would now divide into the categories of physical, spiritual, and psychological.'[26] Yet, Naama Cohen Anegbi explains that there was no clear consensus on where in the body emotions reside or come from. The heart is often described as the main organ of the body encompassing emotions as well as thoughts and cognition.[27] It is the locus of interiority, the secret chamber of the body. This pervasive image, found in poetic as well as scientific texts, makes it hard to disentangle the figurative from the physical. The use of the heart in the writing of emotion cannot be interpreted as either purely poetical or strictly scientific. It is both. In medical and devotional texts, Cohen-Hanegbi argues:

> The heart as a locus of emotions is a trope that sometimes derives from precise medical theory; at other times, however, it is used as a mere metaphor or image and the organ's actual biological role is irrelevant, an idiom in which the link to medicine is almost circumstantial.[28]

This section looks at how Chaucer, a poet, positions the heart between literary trope and physiological materiality. The writing of the heart in *Troilus and Criseyde* seems to enter a

[26] Heather Webb, *The Medieval Heart*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010, pp.1-2.
[27] In *Troilus and Criseyde*, the heart is most often linked to emotional processes, yet it is also often used as the locus of cognition, associated with verbs such as *thinken* (I, 1070; III, 1694; V, 453, 778, 797, 1172), *demen* (III, 1727;V, 697), *devysen* (III, 1591; V, 1321), *comprenden* (III, 1687) or *recorden* (V, 445).
[28] Cohen-Hanegbi, 'The Matter of Emotions', p.33.

physiology of sexual love which is encompassed in humoural discourse as well as conventional courtly tropes on the fire of love. Metaphor and physiology become blended in a language of embodied emotion replete with implied sexual meaning. Bodily joy is therefore framed in the writing of sexual desire, a physical longing that is so sustained that it eventually leaves little place for the embodied experience of joy itself.

Once again, I shall start by going back to the *Book of the Duchess* and its description of the Black Knight's sorrow. The heart is the main actor in the analysis of the Knight's inner body turmoil:

> Hys sorwful hert gan faste faynte,
> And his spirites wexen dede;
> The blood was fled, for pure drede,
> Doun to hys herte, to make hym warm
> For wel hyt feled the herte had harm
> To wite eke why hyt was adrad,
> By kynde, and for to make hyt glad;
> For hit ys membre principal
> Of the body [...] (488-96)

It is the heart that feels here. It is sorrowful and harmed, and, because it is the principal organ of the body, blood has to flow down to make it warm and glad. The sorrowful heart is a trope, where the medical concept of the heart as the seat of emotions becomes the image of the heart itself being sad. In the same vein, the blood is moved to the heart by dread, for it feels it was harmed. The physiological process of the movement of blood towards the heart is thus narrated through the personification of the heart and the blood, which are moved not mechanically but emotionally and wilfully. Still, this poetic use of elements in the body does not prevent an otherwise rigorous medical discourse. It is in fact part of this medical discourse. Sorrow is a cold and dry emotion, associated with the melancholic humour. It turns the Black Knight's heart cold and dry, which is why the warm and wet blood (figuratively moved by dread but also more rationally 'by kynde' (l.494), because it is the

humour's medical nature to try and balance the body)[29] flees to it to try and restore its vital warmth and wetness. Chaucer thus harmoniously blends together medical knowledge and poetic aesthetics.[30]

In *Troilus and Criseyde*, the heart is often used to write emotional moments. For this section, I am primarily interested in these movements, which, according to humoural theory, indicate positive emotion. Joy was thought to bring spirit and heat from the heart to the whole body. This also implies a dilation of the heart: 'in terms of humoural pathology, in joy the heart expanded, pouring forth great amounts of blood and humours into the face. By contrast, in sorrow, the humours drained from the face and retreated towards the heart. The distensions of the heart warmed the body, while the constrictions cooled it.'[31] The centripetal and centrifugal movements of sorrow and joy are hence also to be thought in terms of expansion and constriction, heat and cold.

Such movements are prevalent in the narration of Troilus' falling in love, a scene that Chaucer has much expanded from his Italian source. Boccaccio mentions only Troiolo's gazing at Criseida, describing her outward appearance and then writes how he leaves thoughtful and in love (I, 26-30). So while Boccaccio focuses on how pleasant the spectacle of Criseida is, Chaucer seems more interested in the effect of Criseyde's vision on Troilus' emotions and inner body. Troilus' heart is moved and changed in different ways, but

---

[29] It was indeed thought that organs and humours would 'help' each other in the body. Trevisa in *On the Properties of Things,* 1, states: 'It is propur to alle the membres of office to putte hemsilf to perile for the principal membres. […] Also a membre that is in good hele helpeth the membre that is sike and sore and drawith the matere of the evel to itself, and helpith the membre that is sike and sore.' John Trevisa, *On the Properties of Things: John Trevisa's Translation of Bartholomaeus Anglicus De proprietatibus rerum*, ed. M. C. Seymour et. al., 3 vols., Oxford: Clarendon, 1975-88, vol.1, p.169.

[30] While medical discourse is also prominent in the description of Arcite's love and sorrow in the *Knight's Tale* (Chaucer describes his 'manye/Engendred of humour malencolik' (I, 1374-5)), this quote is unique in the way that it writes the internal emotional body. Both the *Knight's Tale* and *Troilus* appear primarily interested in external symptoms of emotions.

[31] Indira Ghose, 'The Paradoxes of Early Modern Laughter: Laurent Joubert's *Traité du Ris*', in Rachel Falconer and Denis Renevey (eds.), *Medieval and Early Modern Literature, Science and Medicine*, Tübingen: Narr Verlag, 2013, 19-31, p.21. See also Salmón, 'Pleasures and Joys of the Humoral Body', p.52-3.

emotions are not explicitly named. When Troilus first catches a glance of Criseyde, his heart is said to 'wex a-fere' (I, 229). This combustion is what allows the proud knight to submit to love, but it is unclear exactly to what emotion(s) the burning heart refers. There is love there of course and desire and probably fear or excitement as well as a movement towards submission. There may also be joy, as joy is indeed associated with blood, a hot humour. But in the end, rather than specific emotions, what the image of the fiery heart seems to express is the bodily sensation of being struck by love and desire.

Desire seems to be the main encompassing emotion in this scene, and Troilus' spreading heart appears to suggest both joy and sexual arousal. Troilus is astounded by the view of Criseyde and this makes his heart expand: 'Therwith his herte gan to sprede and rise' (I, 278). Again, there is no named emotion attached to this somatic description, but the expression of a spreading heart does appear later in the poem in explicit correlation with joy. Towards the end of the second book, Troilus receives good news from Pandarus who vows to bring him to Criseyde. The lover exclaims: 'lo myn herte,/It spredeth so for joie it wol tosterte!' (II, 979-80). The choice of the verb *tosterten* is interesting. It is a rare verb in Middle English: the *MED* inventories only two occurrences of it. It means either to become estranged or, specifically of the heart, to break or to burst. The much more common verb *sterten,* however, primarily means 'to leap, jump' (1.(a)). It therefore implies upward movement, just as *risen* does in the first quote. Crucially, the verb is also used to express joy, as in this sentence from the *Romaunt of the Rose*: 'For who so sorouful is in herte,/Him luste not to play ne sterte,/Ne for to dauncen ne to synge' (344). It is hence part of a repertoire of behaviours which are rhetorically used to express joy. I shall come back to this rhetorical use of gestures, but for now I only wish to point to the ambivalence of this verb which is very material – the heart breaks – but which also possesses resonances of a more metaphorical concept of the heart jumping up for joy. This blending of the metaphorical and physiological in the writing of the heart as spreading and bursting also evokes sexual arousal.

These movements of the heart that seem to express joy are therefore encompassed in a discourse of sexual desire.

This discourse of sexual desire does not only comprise positive and expanding movements. As Troilus falls in love at the sight of Criseyde, his heart first spreads and burns before this excitation dies out: 'That sodeynly hym thoughte he felte dyen,/Right with hire look, the spirit in his heart' (I, 306-7). Rather than dilation and the pouring of spirit, it is the constriction of dying spirit and heat that Troilus feels in his heart. Troilus' physiological experience of falling in love thus involves expansion and burning followed by detumescence. The different heart movements in this scene are not to be ascribed to distinctive emotions. They rather construct an embodied emotional process, one which is told in the physiological language of sexual desire, pleasure and deflation. Chaucer thus embeds the somatic language of joy in sexual physiology.

The author is more interested in writing a physiology of sexual love[32] than strictly inscribing his writing of the heart in one medical, or poetical, tradition, where joy elicits one specific movement and sorrow another. Throughout the poem, his humoural writing of emotions is not consistent; no coherent taxonomy of emotional somatic features can be drawn.[33] For example, while he explicitly links the spreading of the heart with joy (II, 980), Chaucer also writes hearts swelling in pain and in sorrow. In the fifth book, woeful Troilus goes back to Troy after the exchange, 'with a swollen herte' (V, 201). And the lovers vent their sorrows to *unswell* their hearts: 'By lengthe of pleynte, and ebben gan the welle/Of hire teeris, and the herte unswelle' (IV, 1145-6). Complaint helps to reduce the pool of tears and the tumescence of their heart. Similarly, in Book V, Troilus' heart starts to 'unswelle'

[32] Corinne Saunders argues that in the *Knight's Tale*, Chaucer writes the 'physiology of love'. But what she refers to here is principally the medical convention of lovesickness which sees affect impact, mostly negatively, both body and brain. Saunders, 'Affective Reading', pp.20-22.

[33] Ioana Balgradean indeed argues: 'the language of the poem suggests that the emphasis lies on the *action*, on the *corporeal event.*' Its writing of emotion thus 'eludes conceptualization and withstands denomination'. Balgradean, 'The Challenge of Corporeity: Fictionalising the Emotional Body', *MAEDICA – A Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 8:1, 2013, 86-91, p.89.

through his flowing tears (V, 214). While both verbs express a similar idea of growth and dilation, this lexical choice is significant. *Spreden,* while it can signify 'swell with emotion' (*MED,* 6.(c)), rather implies a widening, an opening, even a diffusion. The verb seems to be mainly positive.[34] *Swellen* on the other hand implies growth 'by absorption of moisture' (1.(a)) and also has the medical sense of pathological, morbid swelling (4.(a)). The choice of vocabulary here allows for a humoural reading of the heart, but it also advances a figurative language where sorrow is heaped up in the breast while joy spreads and opens the heart. But both types of expansion participate in the language of sexual desire, which movement is one of constant and cyclical swelling and unswelling. Joy, while embedded in this discourse, also appears incompatible with it: it is the end of continuous movement, it makes the heart jump or break (II, 980). Desire is thus shown to be different from and more sustained than joy. Chaucer's choice of diction in his writing of the emotional heart suggests the primacy of sexual desire.

Desire is also expressed through bodily heat.[35] This burning sensation can be associated with positive feelings such as hope, pleasure or joy. Heat comes to represent the positive side of the oscillating emotions of the lovers. When Criseyde is deliberating on the news of Troilus' love for her, she stands between hope and dread: 'Than slepeth hope, and after drede awaketh./Now hoot, now cold; but thus bitwixen tweye,' (II, 810-11). In the fifth book and as he waits for Criseyde's return, Troilus' heart is hot and cold (V, 1102). This is in keeping with humoural theory and posits hope as an expectant equivalent to joy, producing bodily heat. But this is complicated in the poem as Criseyde is said to burn of both love and dread (IV, 678). This does not make sense in terms of humoural theory, but it does within the courtly convention which presents love as a contradictory emotion. Love is hope and dread, joy and sorrow, hot and cold alternately but also all at once. Troilus

[34] One meaning of the word is that of the dissemination, the diffusion of grace or divine providence (4.(a)).
[35] I, 407; II, 1337; III, 425, 1539, 1546.

expresses this best in his Petrarchan sonnet on love's dichotomies: 'For hote of cold, for cold of hote, I dye' (I, 420).

The fire of love indeed belongs to a trope of courtly literature.[36] Chaucer often follows Boccaccio in the figuration of desire as fire. In these passages, the burning of love is rather negative. It is an assailant (I, 607), which weakens the lover: 'The fyr of love […] held hym as his thral lowe in destresse,/And brende hym so in soundry wise ay newe,/That sexti tyme a day he loste his hewe' (I, 436-41). Strikingly, bodily fire is visibly somatised through paleness – a humoural symptom of sorrow or fear – rather than blushing. Troilus' ultimate goal is to make this 'hote fir to cesse' (I, 445). He tries to catch a glance of Criseyde, thinking it will be eased by it. However, the heat of desire is pernicious, as proximity to the desired object only makes it grow: 'And ay the ner he was, the more he brende' (I, 448). Chaucer borrows the image from his Italian source (*Il Filostrato*, I, 40-41), but he embodies and individualises it by commenting on Troilus' somatic changes. Fire is not just a trope here, but a physiological reality which visibly affects Troilus' body.

The embodiment of sorrow and desire is inseparable in the poem. Criseyde sets her own heart on fire through the remembrance of her past joy and the desire it begets: 'and thus she sette hire woful herte afire/Thorugh remembraunce of that she gan desire' (V, 719-20). Troilus expresses his sorrow somatically through a thousand burning sighs (IV, 337-8).[37] In his following complaint, he calls on death to extinguish his fiery sorrow: 'O deth, syn with this sorwe I am a-fyre,/Thou other do me anoon yn teris drenche,/Or with thi colde strok myn hete quenche' (IV, 509-11). Fire here figures Troilus' own perception of his distress.

[36] The image is found in the courtly poem *The Romaunt of the Rose*: 'the more thin herte brenneth in fir/The more thin herte is in desir.' (2467-8, the following lines further expand the metaphor).
[37] In medical discourse, the hot nature of sighs was explained through their main function of 'chill[ing] the high temperature of the heart, burning with vehement passion. Consequently, the air passing the respiratory organs gets warm'. Kristiina Savin, 'Sighs of Desire: Passionate Breathing in Medieval and Early Modern Literature', in Anders Cullhed, Carin Franzén, Anders Hallengren and Mats Malm (eds.), *Pangs of Love and Longing: Configurations of Desire in Premodern Literature*, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013, 157-75, p.159.

He feels a burning agony and restlessness and sees death as the only respite. A similar passage is found in Boccaccio, with death figuring a welcome refreshment from the fire burning in Troiolo's veins (IV, 61). Fire represents the sensation of the heart that despairingly and sorrowfully longs for an impossible joy.

Chaucer also sexualises the fire of love. Troilus burns 'for sharp desir of hope and of plesaunce' (III, 426) and after the consummation he expresses his hot desire as follows: 'I hadde it nevere so hote as now;/And ay the more that desir me biteth/To love hire best, the more it me deliteth' (III, 1650-2). While it is associated with delight, desire bites. *Biten* can mean 'make ardent, burns' (*MED*, 8. (b)), but its first meaning is defined as the rather violent actions of being penetrated by a weapon or hit by a blow. These actions do not conjure pleasurable sensation; they express wounding and pain. The connotations of piercing pain are absent from Boccaccio whose Troiolo simply burns more than ever (III, 62.1). Chaucer complicates the trope and expresses desire as delight and pleasure in pain. Desire is sharp and burning and yet it is also associated with hope and with growing love. The fire of love is sexual in this context and represents the semi-painful, semi-pleasurable bite of desire.

In the poem, burning hearts and bodies are simultaneously encompassed in humoural and metaphorical discourses as well as the sexual language of the body. There is therefore no strict consistency in the writing of the emotional heart and somatic changes in the poem. When writing the Black Knight, Chaucer writes the incarnation of sorrow. He innovates in this literary tradition when he introduces scientific medical discourse, but this is entirely consistent with the visible somatic signs of the Knight as well as humoural theory. In *Troilus and Criseyde*, this coherent conception of emotional somatisation is compromised. The desiring body is at once the real body of a sexual being as well as the literary body of the courtly lover.

The symbolic and scientific writing of the emotional body in the *Book of the Duchess* also constructs an objective discourse. From an outward assessment, the narrator can

objectively discern the Knight's emotional state and he can scientifically relate these symptoms to objective changes in his inner body. In *Troilus and Criseyde*, while the author still uses medical discourse knowingly, he also seems interested in the subjective sensation of the body, in how characters feel themselves feel. This is especially visible in his representation of the heart in emotional processes. During the first scene at the temple, Troilus *feels* the spirit in his heart die (I, 307). Several times, in their great sorrow, the lovers are said to feel or to think that their hearts bleed (II, 950; V, 17, 1200), weep (II, 567), grow cold (V, 535), break (III, 1475; V, 180) or die (III, 1171; IV, 705). The verb *to feel* is used most often in these phrases but the verb *to think*, implying cognition rather than sensation, is also employed. Both verbs, however, suggest subjectivity: the heart does not necessarily do those things, but the characters feel or think it does. This subjective writing of the heart is more figurative and hyperbolical. Verbs such as *weeping* and *dying* suggest a personification of the heart. Yet, others such as *bleeding* and *growing cold* can also easily be related to the humoural theory of emotions. On the other hand, the few such formulations that have to do with joy all, except that where the heart spreads for joy, explicitly advance the metaphorical representation of the heart. Pandarus feels his heart dance for joy (II, 1304) and Troilus feels his float in joy (III, 1671). Two other occurrences, which do not belong to this subjective phrasing, also transfer to the heart the behaviour of a joyful person: Troilus' heart is said to play (I, 1013) and Criseyde's to laugh (II, 1592). With joy, the writing of the heart thus seems to have little grounding in humoural theory: light and playful, it escapes its own embodiment. While the heart is used in complex ways which blend physiology and literary convention, when it comes to the explicit mention of joy, it seems to be used in its metaphorical rather than physical sense.

The heart, both physical and metaphorical, is a central aspect of Chaucer's writing of emotion. While he follows his Italian source on the conventional writing of the fire of love, passages concerned with the spreading and dilation of the heart are chiefly Chaucer's

additions. These are humoural movements of positive emotions, but in the poem, they are embedded in a discourse of sexual desire which may include but is also generally incompatible with joy. Chaucer blurs the lines between one somatic affect and the other, writing instead the physiology of sexual desire. Hearts are constantly in the throes of longing: the bite of desire, its heat, painful and pleasurable, restless and sorrowful is presented as a state of being which seems incompatible from joy. Joy is at the end of desire, but, in the poem, desire seems interminable. The duration of desire, of its heat and its bite creates a narrative sustaining which joy does not get. Joy is thus excluded from the writing of emotional physiology: its floating, figurative heart rather seems to lack substance.

The Gestural Language of Emotion

Gestures in *Troilus and Criseyde* seem to form their own, often ambiguous, language and rhetoric.[38] Once again, it appears that joy escapes this bodily language. This language is complex and negotiates performative as well as symptomatic gestures. Most of the bodily gestures in the poem participate in the vivid depiction of sorrow or in a language system which is encompassed in the courtship of the lovers and to which joy does not seem to belong. Joy comes at the end of this non-verbal communication, in the embodied communion of the two lovers.

The language of gestures can be highly ambiguous however, if not abstruse. As John P. Herman argues, 'gestures in *Troilus and Criseyde* are not always translatable into some scholarly meta-language of paraphrase that recuperates their meaning. Indeed, gesture is

[38] Outside of studies on gestures, Chaucer's construction of a 'rhetoric of the body' has been noticed; see for example, Gallagher, 'Chaucer and the Rhetoric of the Body' and Shane Maurice Collins, *The Language of the Body: An Analysis of Chaucer, Dunbar and Henryson*, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2012.

often employed in life and literature to avoid being pinned down'.[39] Yet the recognized ambiguity of gestures has not discouraged critics to try and organise them into categories. Their complex nature, however, has prevented this approach to result in one, clear system of classification. Diverse modes of categorisation can hence be found even in a single study on gesture. Benson classifies gestures formally, by distinguishing between static and dynamic gestures. He explains: 'gestures are static which describe any action normally regarded as a gesture (*i.e.* kneeling, weeping, laughing, blushing, turning pale), but describe it in such a way that it is not presented as part of the immediate action of the narrative. Gestures which either lack a finite verb or are rendered as habitual or potential action are static gestures. Often static gestures are also thoroughly conventional actions.'[40] Dynamic gestures on the other hand form part of the dramatic narrative; they are direct, finite actions. This distinction helps discern whether emotional gestures are potential and fixed or if they are active and realised. The term static, however, can be misleading as even potential gestures imply movement. Benson also uses a less formal and more contextual classification of gestures when he distinguishes between conventional gestures: literary and traditional, and naturalistic ones: personal, situational, and original.[41] Finally, he also makes use of Habicht's broader threefold category: 'expressive gestures, which translate emotions into behaviour; demonstrative gestures, which are intentional, theatrical movements or poses; and ceremonial gestures.'[42] These categories, while useful, are not to be regarded as absolute. They need to be handled carefully especially as there is no medieval metacommentary on gesture with which to compare and contrast them.[43] While I make use of them, I choose to

[39] John P. Herman, 'Gesture and Seduction in *Troilus and Criseyde*', in Cox and Shoaf (eds.), *Subgit to alle Poesye: Essays in Criticism*, 138-60, p.143.
[40] Benson, *Medieval Body Language*, p.60.
[41] Ibid., p.60.
[42] Ibid., p.10.
[43] The 13th century Italian scholar Boncompagno da Signa did however write a taxonomy of the gestures particular to lovers' courtship in his *Rota Veneris*. He identifies four gestures: the nod, the indication, the signal and the sigh. His taxonomy is therefore quite specific and interested in the body

organise my analysis of gestures in *Troilus and Criseyde* along slightly different lines. Because my focus is on emotions, it is more pertinent broadly to separate gestures as either performative or symptomatic. In this exploration I try to uncover the way gestures of positive emotion enter this language. Before I can observe the communicative aspect of gestures, it is necessary to examine their ritualistic quality in the poem and how this relates to authenticity.

Chaucer himself problematizes aspects of authenticity: his gestures are often infallible signs of interiority, yet they can also be explicitly performed. Troilus, after he has been struck by Cupid's arrow, has to feign a pleasurable countenance not to draw suspicion: 'Al feyneth he in lust that he sojorneth,/And al his chere and speche also he borneth' (I, 326-7). The *chere* can be controlled and adapted to convey feelings that are at odds with the character's interiority. Gestures therefore play a crucial role in the public life of emotions. But performance also manifests itself in the conventional use of gestures, especially those which form part of the representation of the lovesick courtly lover. There is indeed a repertoire of gestures that are repeated in order to write the emotions of love. The most common of these gestures are the following: changes in hue (especially paleness), sighs, weeping, cast down head or eyes as well as a trembling voice. These are typically representative of spontaneous symptoms of emotion, yet, because of their conventionality, they seem performed. In the description of the lovers' first meeting, all of these gestures are included in an extremely studied and stylized scene (III, 57-98). Troilus is lying in bed pretending to be sick and therefore dramatically embodying the powerlessness of the courtly lover. Criseyde comes to his bedside, in the typically courtly posture of the lady physician. The whole scene is carefully staged. This, however, need not be taken as a mark of inauthenticity. On the contrary, the author's staging of these gestures signals the force of the

---

language of courtship in very theoretical terms. Herman has discussed this taxonomy with regards to *Troilus and Criseyde*: Herman, 'Gesture and Seduction in *Troilus and Criseyde*'.

emotions they express.[44] Barry Windeatt argues that, in Chaucer, the 'augmented vehemence of feeling goes in parallel with an added solemnity, an almost ceremonial deliberateness about the order and the pace with which the gestures of emotional life are expressed.'[45] Scenes of great emotional importance are thus marked by a greater solemnity and appear almost ritualistic. The staged writing of the conventional gestures of love allows Chaucer to convey his characters' strength and dignity of feeling.

But the poem principally seems to concern itself with how gestures participate in relationships, communication and dialogues. Certain types of gestures such as looks and movements of the head may be seen to be intentional. They can be direct messages. Chaucer emphasises such facial gestures, which, as Windeatt argues, has the effect to slow down the narrative and the visualisation of his characters.[46] By zooming in on the face or the eyes, Chaucer asks his readers to look intently on his characters' expressions and to read them. Gestures begin to speak.[47] In the temple scene, before he is struck by Love's arrow, Troilus speaks of the folly of lovers and casts his brows up: a clearly intentional and meaningful gesture. The narrator does not define it as embodying a particular emotion. Instead, he glosses it: 'Ascaunces, "Loo! Is this naught wisely spoken?"' (I, 205). More than a state of mind, the gesture refers to an actual sentence that Troilus could potentially be saying or is thinking silently. This method points towards the complexity of the use of gestures in the poem. More than a single emotion, such as pride in this case, gestures embody language and communication. They might therefore be easier to translate into speech than descriptive

[44] In a similar vein, Jutta Eming writes on the theatrical and ritualized nature of emotions in Gottfried von Strassburg's *Tristan.* In this article she wishes 'to suggest "ritual" and "ritualization" as terms for describing intense emotions. Ritualized expression communicates and authenticates emotions through an ostentatious styling of the body'. Eming, 'On Stage. Ritualized Emotions and Theatricality in Isolde's Trial', *MLN*, 124:3, 2009, 555-571, pp.556-7.
[45] Windeatt, 'Gesture in Chaucer', p.154.
[46] Ibid., p.148.
[47] The short discussion which follows, on the two scenes in the temple where gestures seem to speak, is much indebted to Stephanie Trigg's detailed analysis of the same two scenes in '"Language in her Eye"', pp.97-100.

feeling. The same method is used later in the scene to describe Criseyde's countenance: 'Hire look a lite aside in swich manere,/Ascaunces, "What, may I nat stonden here?"' (I, 291-2). While Troilus' gesture and gloss are Chaucer's own addition, with this 'trope of the speaking face' as Trigg calls it, the poet follows his Italian source.[48] Chaucer keeps the trope as well as the qualifier 'deignous' (I, 290; 'sdegnosetto' in *Filostrato*, I, 28) but he adds more descriptive details. Moreover, he changes slightly the gloss from 'e non ci puo stare' (I, 28; 'One cannot stand here') to the rhetorical question: 'What, may I nat stonden here?' Interestingly, as Trigg notices, Troilus' speaking face also asks a rhetorical question, that is, a hybrid sentence which both questions and asserts. This adds dynamism and ambiguity to these gestures, even though they are explicitly glossed. These are not conventional gestures part of an existing literary tradition; they are individual and situational.

Benson qualifies both of these examples as demonstrative gestures, 'which are intentional, theatrical movements or poses.'[49] These gestures are part of the narrative: they are 'crucial to the plot' rather than simply exposing a state of mind. Troilus' lifted brow is instrumental in his transformation into a follower of Love and Criseyde's gesture, her countenance and her 'chere', are ultimately described because they are pleasing to Troilus. Her following brightening look occasions a strong emotional reaction in Troilus: he starts desiring her.[50] The use of the 'speaking face' trope is significant as it posits gestures as embodying language, communication. Head and eye movements especially appear mostly in interpersonal situations. Criseyde for example casts her eyes down twice during her first conversation with Pandarus, wondering what his news might be (II, 142) and then again when her uncle finally agrees to plainly tell her about his news (II, 253). These gestures remain ambiguous. The second one especially might be read to express either shame or

[48] Trigg, '"Language in her Eye"', p.97.
[49] Benson, *Medieval Body Language*, p.10.
[50] Trigg, '"Language in her Eye"', p.98 and 99.

satisfaction. What is clear, however, is that they form part of the dialogue, dramatizing it and emphasizing interiority and reflection.

The downcast look seems to convey feelings or states which are, if not always negative, at least introspective. But characters also sometimes, yet much more rarely, cast their eyes up, indicating perhaps more positive states. But, the two scenes that include that gesture in fact point towards quite divergent emotions. In the first one, Troilus is lovesick in bed and Pandarus tries to wake him up from his lethargy. Pandarus asks his friend to confide in him but Troilus stays silent and lays still 'as he ded were' (I, 723). Eventually, he sighs and starts up, lends his ear to Pandarus and 'up his eighen caste he' (I, 726). These all look like promising signs, at least to modern readers. But to Pandarus they look like signs of a potential frenzy: 'And up his eighen caste he, that in feere/Was Pandarus, lest that in frenesie/He sholde falle' (I, 726-8). Right after, Pandarus cries 'awake' in a desperate attempt to get him out of his mad state. No emotion is specified; only Pandarus' reaction to the gesture indicates to the reader the nature of this expression. It is also quite impossible here to isolate this particular gesture as a sign of frenzy: it is only read that way by Pandarus in light of this particular context. Moreover, at the end of his pressing speech, Pandarus finally exclaims: 'Look up, I seye, and telle me what she is' (I, 862). This phrase, taken this time from Boccaccio (though Pandaro orders Troiolo to stand up: 'Leva su', II, 17), is the final attempt to get Troilus out of his lethargy. The gesture of looking up is therefore not used consistently. It does not mean just one thing.

Later in the poem, Troilus' looking up appears in a much more positive context. Pandarus comes to Troilus with good news from his niece: he has secured her 'love of friendshipe' (II, 962) for Troilus. There follows a metaphorical description of Troilus' reaction, taken from Boccaccio:

> But right as floures, thorugh the cold of nyght
> Iclosed, stoupen on hire stalke lowe,

> Redressen hem ayein the sonne bright,
> And spreden on hire kynde cours by rowe,
> Right so gan tho his eighen up to throwe
> This Troilus, and seyde, 'O Venus deere,
> Thi might, thi grace, yheried be it here!'
>
> And to Pandare he held up bothe his hondes,
> And seyde, 'Lord, al thyn be that I have!' (II, 967-75)

The gestures frame a prayer and clearly represent Troilus' joy at the news and his gratefulness to both Pandarus and Venus. But rather than a spontaneous, expressive gesture, the whole passage is presented in a very conventional and literary way. Similar scenes of such prayerful gestures can be found in Chaucer's work.[51] In the poem itself, during the lovers' first meeting and as they finally kiss, Pandarus kneels, throws his eyes up to the sky and offers a prayer to Cupid (III, 183-4). This explicitly ceremonial gesture appears exaggerated and almost comic. Pandarus might well by playing here, but it remains that he performs this gesture to illustrate and officialise a very happy moment. Troilus' gestures are also classified by Benson as ceremonial. Ceremonial might not be the right term here, but these gestures are performed and conventional and, indeed, they are not discursive. Rather than punctuating a dialogue, they stand alone as part of a picture of revival which is visual and figurative. Yet the conventionality of this passage makes it much more powerful in terms of the emotion it represents than the previous passage, where the gesture was more dynamic and discursive.

This passage is unique in its gestural representation of the state of joy. There exists an embodied lexicon of joy, but it appears to be neither gestural nor realised. Such a lexicon is used by the narrator of the *Knight's Tale* to express Palamon's and Arcite's joy at Theseus' decision to spare their lives:

---

[51] In the *Second Nun's Tale*, the pope Urban casts his hands up 'for joye' and then prays to Christ (VIII, 189-91) and in the *Franklin's Tale,* the much less joyful Aurelius casts his hands up to the sky and kneels to say his 'orisoun' (V, 1026); neither of these scenes include mentions of the eyes.

> Who looketh lightly now but Palamoun?
> Who spryngeth up for joye but Arcite?
> Who kouthe telle, or who kouthe it endite,
> The joye that is maked in the place
> Whan Theseus hath doon so fair a grace? (1870-74)

The use of rhetorical questions generalises and universalizes these emotional behaviours. Arcite is not necessarily jumping here, rather jumping is a universal action used as a synonym for joy. It is rhetorical rather than individual and realised. Similarly, in *Troilus and Criseyde*, just before the afore-mentioned scene of joy and prayer, Pandarus announces the good news in these terms: 'And ches if thow wolt synge or daunce or lepe!' (II, 955). Again, the verbs here are synonyms for joy and they are conditional. And, again, these are not actually gestures of joy but rather actions indicative of a social behaviour. This answer is prompted by Troilus' question, termed in similar embodied representations of emotion: 'Frend, shal I now wepe or synge?' (II, 952). So, whereas the gesture used as a synonym for sorrow is the symptom-like weeping, joy is represented through the performative action of singing. This rhetorical lexicon seems to suggest an absence of gestural language for joy: the embodied expression of joy is behavioural. While sorrow is written through an abundance of vivid and embodied gestures, joy is never written through realised gestures. The only realised gesture denoting a positive emotion – upward movement of the eyes and hands – is embedded in a representation of hope and gratitude through prayer. This image of joyful prayer freezes the narrative and the dialogue. Joy thus does not form part of the poem's realised and communicative language of gesture. Moreover, the rhetorical nature of the embodied lexicon of joy and the metaphorical image of renewal in the prayer scene rather disembodies the gestures of joy, turning them into figures of speech.

This section has until now focused on gestures which, seemingly at least, can be controlled. Looks and facial expressions can be intentional and are paralinguistic gestures. But other gestures of emotion seem to be entirely spontaneous and involuntary. Changes of hue for example, ubiquitous in Chaucer's poetry, are categorised by Burrow as symptom

rather than gesture.[52] They are physiological changes. Benson still incorporates them in his study of gestures and categorises almost all of their occurrences as expressive: involuntary signs of emotion. Yet Chaucer does not only use them to reveal internal emotions to the reader. They also form part of the poem's diegetical gestural language. They are often associated with explicit gestures, accompanying and enhancing them.

Changing colour seems to be the continuous lot of the lover in Chaucer; both Troilus and Criseyde – and sometimes their go-between as well – turn pale or green or red over and over again. The emotions expressed by these changes vary and are not always divulged. There are some recurring patterns, however: a red face often reveals shame and a pale one sorrow. Lovesick Troilus loses his hue sixty times per day (I, 441). And when Pandarus tries to get the name of his love interest out of him, Troilus grows red for shame. This description is uncommonly precise and medical: the narrator explains that his blood vessel starts to bleed which occasions his change of hue (I, 865-6). Both of these examples are explicitly physiological. But the blush of shame also appears, alongside other gestures, in much more communicative scenes, such as the parallel window sightings. At the beginning of the second book, Criseyde, who now knows of Troilus' love for her, catches a glimpse of him heroically coming back from the battlefield. She hears from her window the Trojan crowd acclaim the young and noble knight. Troilus' reaction, however, is not one of pride and glory but of humble and sober shame:

> For which he wex a litel red for shame
> When he the peple upon hym cryen,
> That to byholde it was a noble game
> How sobrelich he caste down his yen. (II, 645-8)

[52] On this see also Philippa Maddern's article, in which she creates a hierarchy of the most important and trustworthy aspects of facial expression to medieval observers where the changes in facial colour come in second place, after these aspects of the face which are characteristic of a person humoural constitution and before facial expression such as tears or laughter. Maddern, 'Reading Faces: How did Late Medieval Europeans Interpret Emotions in Faces?', *Postmedieval: A Journal of Medieval Cultural Studies*, 8:1, 2017, 12-34.

Paradoxically, his spontaneous gestures of embarrassment only increase the spectacle of nobility that he embodies. But Criseyde, rather than participating in the crowd's enthusiastic pride, shares in Troilus' shame. She intently observes Troilus' 'chere' and lets this vision sinks in her heart (II, 649-50). This makes her dizzy with feelings: 'who yaf me drynke?' (II, 651). She then grows red at her own private thought (II, 652). And when she remembers that this same glorious knight's life depends on her mercy she ashamedly pulls her head down (II, 657). The two lovers thus perform the same gestures of casting their heads down and they both turn red. The gesture and the symptom are here expression of a spontaneous and involuntary feeling, one which isolates the lovers in their private, but communicative, emotion which is posited in sharp contrast to the public emotion.

Later in the book, a similar scene occurs. As Pandarus and Criseyde are together in Criseyde's palace, Troilus passes in the street right in front of them. Pandarus admonishes Criseyde not to flee inside, she obeys but she 'wex as red as rose' (II, 1256). Troilus salutes Criseyde: 'he gan hire humbly to saluwe/With dredful chere, and oft his hewes muwe;/And up his look debonairly he caste' (II, 1257-9). Benson categorises Troilus' gestures – including his change of hue – as ceremonial, while Criseyde's blushing and the entire preceding scene were qualified as expressive. This is explained by the fact that Troilus' passing under the window was planned by himself and Pandarus, his friend advising him to come by wearing his best armour and to 'hold thi governaunce' (II, 1020). His salute to her is planned and also undeniably performative. His debonair look might also be controlled and acted. But his changing hue is undoubtedly involuntary and might even express his feelings about his performance: as he tries to look noble, he cannot help but blush from embarrassment. Chaucer blends and superimposes performative gestures and physiological changes in this scene. The performative salute of Troilus is contrasted, and answered, by Criseyde's surprised and private gesture of shame – if it is shame. Indeed, the emotion is not

named here, and hence she might also very well be blushing from desire or arousal. Her colouration is compared to a rose in this passage, a flower with clear amorous symbolism. This suggests a feeling that has to do with love and desire rather than shame or propriety. It is not the first time that Criseyde blushes as a rose. When Pandarus asks her what she thought of Troilus' letter, she blushes: 'al rosy hewed tho wex she' (II, 1198). So while blushing mostly denotes shame, there is with Criseyde the possibility of a more erotic reading.[53] These two window scenes, both added by Chaucer independently from his source, are representative of the author's interests in gestures and physiological changes, and how they negotiate the private and the public, the emotional and the performative. Physiology and performance come together in the construction of a bodily language of desire. In these scenes, individual and private emotions are translated into visible signs to allow for an intimate, if not erotic, conversation between the lovers, who communicate their mutual desire through visible embodied emotions.

Gestures in *Troilus and Criseyde* shade into physiology and can therefore be spontaneous, involuntary *and* performative. They can express intimate, personal feelings *and* enter into interpersonal dynamics. The last gesture I wish to explore embodies this ambivalence well. Sighs, which form part of the gestural repertoire of sorrow and lovesickness, also appear in much more ambiguous and communicative situations. They fall in between symptom and message, a division which now appears somewhat inappropriate to Chaucer's use of gestures. Sighs seem instinctively more demonstrative and controlled than symptomatic: a sigh can be voluntary and discursive, indicating annoyance for example. In the poem though, they are often used as spontaneous expression of emotion, mainly

[53] Valerie Allen's gendered study on blushes is informative here; she argues that in Medieval culture and literature, 'feminine blushes tend to converge on moments of sexual impropriety'. Masculine blushes on the other hand belong to a 'wider, less specific range of cultural experience'. Allen, 'Waxing Red: Shame and the Body, Shame and the Soul', in Lisa Perfetti (ed.), *The Representation of Women's Emotions in Medieval and Early Modern Culture*, Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2005, 191-210, p.192.

sorrow, and even connote illness or pain. The word 'sike' is regularly used alongside the words 'soore' (III, 812, 972; IV, 716; V, 738), 'sorwful' (II, 463; V, 1354) or 'sorwfully' (III, 801, 1170). But sighs can also remain ambiguous. Criseyde often sighs during conversations or dialogues.[54] These sighs appear to add solemnity and importance to Criseyde's assertions: she pauses, gathering up responses invisible to the reader. They thus enhance the mystery of her character: her sighs add to her character's psychology but as they remain obscure, so does her interiority.

Surprisingly, perhaps, the most elaborate use of sighs occurs not in a representation of sorrow but during the very joyful occasion of the consummation scene. During their passionate night, Troilus repeatedly kisses Criseyde's eyes then holds her again, and sighs:

> Therwith he gan hire faste in armes take,
> And wel a thousand tymes gan he syke
> Naught swiche sorwfull sikes as men make
> For wo, or ells when that folk ben sike,
> But esy sykes, swiche as ben to like,
> That shewed his affeccioun withinne;
> Of swiche sikes koude he nought bilynne. (III, 1359-65)

Through the repetition of the homonyms 'sigh' and 'sick', this passage presents sighs as generally being signs of sorrow and of sickness. These particular sighs are hence unique: they are easy sighs, sighs of joy, of pleasure. Moreover, the combination of the alliteration of the soft, sibilant 's' sound and that of the hard, plosive 'k' sound produces a rhythmic halting sound – a sort of panting. This passage can thus be interpreted to figure intercourse and even probably, orgasm.[55] It is also specified that these sighs are the expression of inner affection. *Affeccioun* in this context means love, and even particularly, 'love between the

[54] II, 884-5; III, 1493; IV, 1527; V, 1006.
[55] Savin argues for 'the intimate relation between sighing and longing', Savin, 'Sighs of Desire', p.157. Yet these sighs do not appear to be of longing but rather of satisfaction. Therefore, they might be closer to the sighs of pleasure she notes in later erotic Italian literature than the sorrowful burning sighs of longing. John M. Hill also reads these sighs 'overtaking Troilus' as figuring orgasm. Hill, *Chaucer's Neoplatonism*, p.142.

sexes' (*MED,* 2.(d)).[56] This definition makes much sense: these sighs are the expression and the evidence of Troilus' love and pleasure. They are gestures of love and of lovemaking. This also explains the fact that they seem to be themselves a source of pleasure. They are 'esy sikes, swiche as ben to like', sighs to be enjoyed. Troilus cannot stop sighing – perhaps because they are an involuntary manifestation or maybe because they are too pleasurable to stop. In this passage, Chaucer follows Boccaccio quite closely. The term 'affezion' also appears in the Italian source and the author adds that the lovers' sighs renew their delight ('e dopo quei [sospiri] rinnovava il diletto', *Il Filostrato,* III, 37). 'Esy sikes' are therefore rather different from 'sikes soore'; not only do they express pleasure *and* love, but they themselves create that pleasure, they take part in the joy of lovemaking. In that way, they are closer to the other gestures of the consummation, which are gestures of affection rather than emotion such as kissing, caressing and embracing. These sighs embody the sexualized expression of joy.

The consummation scene does not offer gestures of positive emotion, such as smiling or laughing, nor does it offer descriptions of the lovers' emotional faces or bodies – no blushing or weeping although it is mentioned once at the beginning that Criseyde shakes like a leaf (III, 1200). Looks are also mentioned as Troilus gazes intently at Criseyde and cannot turn away (III, 1345-6). While explicit bodily signs of joy are mostly absent, the scene is full of amorous gestures. Benson notes the very high frequency with which the gestures of kissing and embracing are repeated during the consummation scene: this 'sudden increase in amorous gestures', he comments, 'accounts in part for the dramatic force of the lovers' union.'[57] Troilus especially proves uncharacteristically active. He first embraces Criseyde and then strokes her body, described in sensual details, he kisses her repeatedly and her eyes.

[56] The dictionary indeed indexes this particular occurrence of the word under this definition. The word is also defined as '1. That faculty of the soul concerned with emotion' and '2.(a) an emotion, a feeling; (b) desire, inclination; (c) love, charity, friendship, good will'.
[57] Benson, *Medieval Body Language*, p.94.

Criseyde is more passive although she also kisses her lover and performs the ritual gesture of giving him a heart-shaped 'broche' (III, 1372). The scene is therefore sensual and embodied but not through bodily symptoms or conventional gestures. Their joy, their pleasure and their love are expressed through bodily actions, which create those emotions as much as they express them.

Joy is not written *on* the body as sorrow is; the body makes joy. Joy is created through the body. Or at least sexual joy is, as the effects of Troilus' joy after the consummation are, as I have shown, presented in terms of honour and public behaviour. The scene of sexual joy presents something entirely different, where sexual gestures and actions come to represent and to create the emotion. In the rest of the poem, however, the gestures of joy are very limited and somehow disembodied. They are conditional and not realised or appear as a conventional frame to a prayer, embedded in metaphor. In Chaucer's writing, gestures form their own rhetoric. They are part of language and communication, especially the language of lovers' courtship and desire, which often relies on silent, paralinguistic language rather than speech. But joy is not part of this ambiguous gestural language. Joy, it would seem, is at the end of communication, as it is at the end of desire: it resides in affective communion, in the easy sighs of sexual intercourse, which are the active embodiment of love's joy.

Tears and Laughter

The previous section on gestural language leaves out tears and laughter, the emotional gestures *par excellence*, which deserve a section of their own. While they can both signify a variety of emotions – tears of joy or anger, laughter of embarrassment – they are often taken to represent opposite emotions. Tears are the embodiment of sadness and laughter that of hilarity and joy. This is true also in medieval literature, where laughter can be the signifier of joy. R. F. Yeager notices that, in the work of Chaucer's contemporary,

Gower, the verb 'to laugh' is most often paired into contrasting couplets with the verbs *louren* or *wepen*. These pairings are often employed 'structurally and rhetorically', entering repeated alliterative and rhyming structures.[58] The verbs become synonyms for joy and sorrow. A similar contrasting doublet is found in the very stylistic and conventional *Book of the Duchess*. The Black Knight expresses his sorrow with a traditional use of contraries: his song is turned to complaint and his laughter to weeping (598-600). In the same poem, Fortune is described as having one eye laughing and one weeping (633-4). This doublet creates a universal paradigm of man as either crying or laughing. But the structure barely reappears in Chaucer's later works.[59] The author then tends to pair the verb 'laugh' with near synonyms such as 'play'.[60] In *Troilus and Criseyde*, as we have seen, the contrasting pair *wepen/syngen* occurs when Troilus asks Pandarus whether he should rejoice or not from his news. Laughter is not placed in direct contrast to tears. It is much more variegated and is often not a simple sign of joy or hilarity. This section explores the type of states that laughter expresses, states that appear more cognitive than emotional. Tears can embody joy in Chaucer's writing but, as I shall show, they do not do so in *Troilus and Criseyde*.

Tears are ubiquitous in Chaucer's work; they flow from the eyes of men and women equally. While associated mainly with sadness, they are a positive sign of affect in the sense that they express the heartfelt nature of emotion.[61] Windeatt argues that Chaucer was very much concerned with 'the genuineness of weeping as an outward gesture of the inner life'.[62] Tears are hence used repeatedly and hyperbolically in order to emphasize depth and integrity

---

[58] R. F. Yeager, 'Gowerian Laughter', in Brewer and Windeatt (eds.), *Traditions and Innovations*, 144-153, p.145.
[59] The pair *lawghen/louren* appears in the *House of Fame*: 'For had he lawghed, had he loured,/He moste have ben al devoured' (409-10).
[60] Yeager counts seven such occurrences: *CT* I, 3858; VI, 967; VII, 422; *BoD* 849; *LGW* 93; *TC* 4.866; *Romaunt* 7294. 'Gowerian Laughter', p.151.
[61] Yet this does not exclude the ability to fake weeping, a question problematised by Chaucer in the *Legends of Good Women* for example when Phillis writes to Demophon: '"How coude ye wepe so by craft?" quod she./ "May there swiche teres feyned be?"' (2528-29).
[62] Windeatt, 'Gesture in Chaucer', p.154.

of feeling. When witnessed, they are an important trigger for compassion – one of the most celebrated feelings in Chaucer. In religious discourse, tears can also be very positive. They are a necessary attribute for true contrition as the Parson argues. He explains that the first condition for confession is sorrowful bitterness of which one sure sign is tears, whether they are visible or not: 'The thridde signe is how that thy shrift sholde be ful of teeris, if man may, and if man may nat wepe with his bodily eyen, lat hym wepe in herte' (X, 994). Tears can be considered a divine gift, a grace. As Kimberley Joy-Knight explains, '*gratia lacrymorum* […] was one of the highest degrees of perfection when the soul had reached an ecstatic union with God, momentarily tasting the joy of the heavens.'[63] Tears can therefore express union, mercy, grace and even joy. There are a few examples of such tears in Chaucer, mostly in religious contexts. In the *Second Nun's Tale*, as the pope Urban welcomes Valerian, sent by Cecilia to be baptised, he holds his hands up for joy and 'the teeris from his eyen leet he falle' (VIII, 190). This is followed by a prayer where he praises Cecilia in Christ's name. While the affective tone is explicitly joyful, the tears themselves accompany a prayer, signifying its sincere utterance. At the end of the *Prioress' Tale*, the Abbott sheds tears of relief as the miraculously surviving child is freed from his earthly torments (VII, 674). The whole convent then lies down and starts weeping at the child's martyrdom. Tears thus accompany spiritual feelings of gratitude and the acknowledgment of the working of divine grace.

Tears also appear in secular contexts of relief and reunion. In the *Man of Law's Tale*, Constance suffers and patiently endures years of exile and torments. At the end of the tale, her husband Alla finds her in Rome and, upon seeing her, weeps so much 'that it was routhe for to see' (II, 1052). A few lines later, Constance sheds tears as she is being reunited with

[63] Kimberley Joy-Knight, 'Si Puose Calcina A' Propi Occhi: The Importance of the Gift of Tears for Thirteenth-Century Religious Women and Their Hagiographers', in Gertsman (ed.), *Crying in the Middle Ages*, 136-155, p.139. On the medieval tradition of the gift of tears see Piroska Nagy, *Le don des larmes au Moyen Âge*.

both her husband and her father. The emotion expressed here is named 'piteous joy' by the narrator: 'Who kan the pitous joye tellen al/Bitwixe hem thre, syn they been thus ymette' (II, 1114-5). Later, as she comes back to her father in Rome after her husband has died, she falls down on her knees, weeping 'for tendrenesse in herte blithe' (II, 1154). This tale of patience and constancy in suffering thus ends in an effervescence of joyful tears. But this is a special kind of joy, which is pitiful and tender, found in reunion and justice. The words 'piteous joy' reappear at the end of another tale of womanly patience, the *Clerk's Tale*.[64] Griselda is the humble wife of the tyrannical Walter who submits her to a series of cruel tests in order to prove her wifely obedience. She patiently endures each of those tests, with a glad face, a humble heart and dry eyes. But when Walter finally decides to stop the torture and bring her children – whom she thought were dead – back to her, Griselda is overwhelmed with joy and relief:

> Whan she this herde, aswowne doun she falleth
> For pitous joye, and after hire swownynge
> She bothe hire yonge children to hire calleth,
> And in hire armes, pitously wepynge,
> Embraceth hem, and tendrely kissynge
> Ful lyk a mooder, with hire salte teeres
> She bathed bothe hire visage and hire heeres. (IV, 1079-85)

This scene of heightened pathos is created by extreme gestures of embodied emotion. Griselda passes out and then weeps profusely, her salty tears bathing her children's faces. Her joy and her tears are *pitous*, that is, 'arousing or deserving pity', 'lamentable' (*MED* 2. (a)). And indeed, the vision makes the witnessing crowd themselves cry piteous tears: 'O

[64] The phrase 'pitous joie' appears in *Troilus* in a very different context. In the fourth book, women of Troy come to Criseyde 'for pitous joie' (IV, 683), to express their joy at her forthcoming reunion with her father and their regret to see her go. The phrase is translated as 'compassionate well-wishing' in both the *Riverside* and Barney's edition. It is translated from Boccaccio's 'pietosa allegrezza' (IV, 80.6 compassionate joy). The context and connotations here are very different, it does not imply tearful relief in reunion, on the contrary it points to a disparity of feeling between the women's compassionate joy and Criseyde's 'wo and wery of that compaignie.' (IV, 707).

many a teere on many a pitous face/Doun ran of hem that stooden hire bisyde' (IV, 1104-5). This description of mirrored pity and tears intensifies the emotionality of the scene, perhaps occasioning tears – of joy or pity or even of pitiful joy – in the readers as well. Once again, this tearful scene represents the culmination of a narrative of patience and restraint of affect. Griselda's and Constance's tears are a sign of release and relief, of justice and union. Tears of joy thus do appear in Chaucer's writing but they inhere particular contexts of religious fervour and acceptance or secular pathos: they express gratitude towards mercy and grace and belong to patterns of patience, passivity and relief.

In this context, and given the copiousness of tears shed by the two lovers in our poem, one could easily expect to encounter tears within the more joyful scenes of their love: when Criseyde has mercy on Troilus, when they first meet, or when they can finally spend the night together. But in all these scenes, their eyes stay dry. When they properly meet for the first time, Troilus grows red and pale and shaky, but he does not cry. Pandarus on the other hand, as he beholds Troilus' manly sorrow, cries 'as he to water wolde' (III, 115), tears of compassion and relief at having successfully brought them together. The dry eyes of the lovers are thus emphasized by contrast. They do cry in each other's company but only from sorrow.

They weep together in anticipation of their forthcoming separation: 'The woful teeris that they leten falle/As bittre weren, out of teris kynde,/For peyne, as is ligne aloes or galle' (IV, 1135-7). This medicinal explanation of their tears emphasizes their particularity. The usually salty tears[65] are turned bitter as an embodied and external manifestation of their pain. In the previous book, when morning comes and end their night of bliss Troilus feels as though bloody tears melt from his heart (III, 1445). These inner tears are once again a somatisation of pain. The tears they shed in each other's company are the visceral

[65] Tears are indeed regularly qualified as 'salty' in the poem (I, 543; II, 1086; IV, 129, 814, 930, 1172; V, 915, 1374). And while pains and sorrows are often qualified as bitter, this is the only occurrence of bitter tears.

embodiment of their common pain and sorrow and not tears of grace, joy or relief at all. Criseyde also sheds 'a fewe brighte teris' (III, 1051) when Troilus accuses her of infidelity. Seeing his love weep occasions an intense reaction of pain in Troilus. Each tear makes 'the crampe of deth to streyne hym by the herte' (III, 1071) until he finally falls into a swoon. The vision of tears thus completely incapacitates and paralyses him. This is interesting because joy will have the exact opposite effect on him: drive him to action. This is his reaction when Criseyde forgives him and asks him in turn to forgive her:

> This Troilus, with blisse of that supprised,
> Putte al in Goddes hand, as he that mente
> Nothing but wel; and sodeynly avysed,
> He hire in armes faste to hym hente. (III, 1184-7)

With the surprise of joy Troilus takes his love in his arms and commences their sexual union. The passage brings together virtue, faith in God's will, individual purpose and action, all of which are caused by joy. This is different from the reaction caused by tears: one creates powerlessness and the other decisive action. As discussed in the previous section, while sorrow is expressed through bodily symptoms, joy is characterised by action. This contrast also allows us to question the relation between tears and passivity. The only tears of joy present in Chaucer's corpus are linked to the passive reception of mercy and grace. Tears may therefore be unfit for active lovers' joy. Yet Simon Meecham-Jones argues that the deployment of tears in *Troilus* leaves open the question of whether they are active or passive: 'it is a matter of debate', he argues, 'whether Troilus's tears represent a 'passive' (but patient) symptom of his love, or a more active expression of his desire, or even a fusion of the two.'[66] I would argue that tears are the passive and visible sign of sorrow and desire, active only in the sense that they promote pity, which in turn may bring about mercy. They are not an expression of fulfilled desire and of the lovers' joy and union.

[66] Meecham-Jones, '"He In Salte Teres Dreynte"', p.90.

Laughter appears as a more active and less symptom-like gesture, yet it also seems to be inadequate to embody the lovers' joy. Laughter is much less common in Chaucer's work and it can express a variety of states, emotional or not. Characters laugh out of joy, scorn, superiority, embarrassment, madness, mockery or contempt. For example, in the *Knight's Tale*, laughter is the gesture given to the allegory of madness ('Woodnesse, laughynge in his rage', I, 2011) rather than the courtly 'Plesaunce' or 'Bauderie' who dance and sing in Venus' temple. Yet laughter is an important part of the representation of courtly life and ideals. As Albrecht Classen explains, 'laughter represents the highest level of courtly values and joy, especially in women.'[67] The Black Knight offers the following stylistic and idealised portrait of his deceased lady Blanche: 'I sawgh hyr daunce so comlily,/Carole and synge so sweetly,/Laughe and pleye so womanly' (*Book of the Duchess*, 848-50). Laughter here is quintessentially courtly and feminine rather than emotional. Criseyde, as I have shown, cannot be reduced to this literary convention. However, in Troilus' textual construction of his past joy, she becomes the joyful lady of courtly convention: 'And yonder have I herd ful lustily/My dere herte laugh; and yonder pleye/Saugh ich hire ones ek ful blisfully' (V, 568-70). Troilus' memory of Criseyde is merged or even replaced with an idealised representation of the lady.

Courtly laughter can also be shared: 'often writers speak of laughter as a sign of that more general and diffused kind of joy that courtly society in particular valued when people met together.'[68] Here Burrow mentions as prime example for this diffused joy the scenes between Pandarus and Criseyde where they exchange merry words, joke, dance and laugh. I have already mentioned in the previous chapter how Pandarus' adverbial laughter expresses a mood rather than a deep, individually felt emotion. Laughter can therefore be a sign of, if

[67] Classen, 'Introduction', p.14.
[68] Burrow, *Gestures and Looks*, p.79.

not intense joy, interpersonal cheerfulness. But Criseyde's more embodied laughter during these scenes hints at a deeper type of interpersonal laughter.

Criseyde's laughter is so intense that it feels like her heart might break or that she might die (II, 1108 and 1169). Alfred David describes both Pandarus' and Criseyde's laughter as 'bodily laughter […] one that is not ambiguous and not intellectual.'[69] I would argue that Pandarus' is more adverbial and discursive than it is bodily, but Criseyde's laughter is indeed embodied and unambiguous. It may be connected with what Yeager calls 'pure laughters', exempt of scorn or irony. Interestingly, he argues that 'pure laughters' in Chaucer are all women's.[70] While Yeager's claim is questionable – the Host, for example, does seem to laugh heartily as I shall go on to show – it indeed appears that women laugh more and more cheerfully. The common link in medieval culture between women and carnality may further explain Criseyde's more embodied laughter. Lisa Perfetti explains that laughter and joy were associated with moist blood, and women, who were thought to be wetter than men, were hence more prone to it.[71] Laughter forms part of the portrait of the Wife of Bath in the *General Prologue*: 'in felaweshipe wel koude she laughe and carpe' (I, 473). Perfetti argues that this portrait highlights her carnality more than her joviality: 'Her laughter is also linked to her sexuality since she knows the arts of sex ('the olde daunce'), is dressed in scarlet clothing, has a red face, and is 'gat-tothed', which in medieval culture signified a large sexual appetite.'[72] But the Wife of Bath's carnal joviality needs not be seen as entirely negative. Her propensity to laughter is explained through physiological terms; she is of a sanguine complexion ('reed of hewe' I, 458). Her cheerfulness hence may be preconditioned or a symptom of her femininity, but it is also therefore natural and heartfelt. While I do not wish to propose a direct rapprochement between Criseyde and the Wife of

[69] David, 'Chaucerian Comedy', p.91.
[70] Yeager, 'Gowerian Laughter', p.151.
[71] Perfetti, *Women and Laughter*, p.5.
[72] Ibid., p.30.

Bath, and especially the sexual connotation of the latter's joviality, they might be seen to share an embodied and feminine type of laughter which thrives in company.

This interpersonal aspect of laughter is important in Chaucer. It can be a builder of community. The pilgrims of the *Canterbury Tales* laugh often, with or at each other. Albrecht Classen notes that the Host laughs after the first tale (I, 3114), 'his laughter reflects his happy mood', and it illustrates the tone he wishes to create for his game of tale telling.[73] In this framing of the *Tales*, laughter has the potential to bond a community. All the pilgrims laugh at the *Miller's Tale* for example, joining in the diegetic hilarity of the crowd at the story's foolish carpenter (I, 3855). This laughter, however, is arguably a cruel one. In fact, the pilgrims also use laughter to break up communion. The Friar, for example, laughs at the Wife of Bath out of superiority and condescension (III, 829). Laughter is often scornful in Chaucer.[74] Troilus does not laugh but he smiles out of scorn for lovers, to show he holds their craft madness (I, 194). His smile separates him from a community. Of course, there is obvious irony in this smile, as he will very soon be made the most devout of Love's servants. In fact, he then has to smile to hide his true feelings of love and sorrow: 'And ay of Loves servantz every while,/Hymself to wrye, at hem he gan to smyle' (I, 328-9). Smiling can thus be entirely unemotional, scornful and at odds with the characters' interiority. According to Paull Baum, 'for Chaucer a smile was not a politely unfinished laugh but a signal of malicious pleasure, of something withheld out of contempt or scepticism.'[75]

For Troilus, smiles are not a gesture of joy and/or belonging to love's pursuit. On the contrary, they are the sign of scorn towards love. His last smile is at Pandarus' crude joke as he brings Criseyde to Troilus' sick-bed: 'i-brought have I thi beere!' (II, 1639). The smile expresses 'dramatic irony, since the funeral bier is precisely where Troilus's story with

[73] Classen, 'Introduction', p.64.
[74] Yeager notes four occurrences of the collocation of the words laugh and scorn in Chaucer's work: *TC* I, 514; *CT* VII, 3087; VIII, 506 and *Boece* 2.m.1, 290.
[75] Baum, *Critical Appreciation*, p.169.

Criseyde will end.'[76] Troilus' smiles are hence markers of irony throughout the narrative, marking also, as Stierstorfer suggests, places of transitions, most notably from Troilus the sceptic to Troilus the lover. Because of their ironic and scornful nature, Troilus' smiles need to be connected to a very important type of laughter in medieval literature: that which signifies superior knowledge. Both Classen and Burrow mention Merlin as the medieval character to best emblematise this concept; his knowledgeable laughter even becomes prophetic.[77] In *Troilus and Criseyde*, it is perhaps Cassandra's smile (V, 1457), after Troilus has explained his dream to her, which comes closest to Merlin's prophetic laughter. It is diametrically opposed to what David calls 'bodily laughter': it is ambiguous and intellectual.[78] The best example of such a disembodied laughter is of course, Troilus' final one.

His inner laughter at humans' tears appears particularly intellectual and cold. Mary Carruthers argues that 'by the value criteria of ascetic monasticism, it is laughter that is both cold and dry.' These are the qualities of dispassionate reason and of the Stoic ideal of *apatheia*.[79] This is an interesting reading as it posits this last gesture as existing beyond the emotion of the human world, in philosophical ideal. Troilus' last cold and dry gesture comes at the end of an interminable series of hot sighs and moist tears. These are the sign of his restless sorrow and desire, which are extremely affective and embodied. His smiles and his last laughter on the other hand are cold and non-affective. The same cannot be said of Criseyde's laughter, which is very much present in human time and place. Hers is emotional and spontaneous, part of the interpersonal dynamic of emotion. It comes from the hot and moist blood of the heart and is the product of her ability to accept the transitory nature of happiness.

---

[76] Klaus Stierstorfer, 'Markers of Transition: Laughter in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *The Chaucer Review*, 34:1, 1999, 18-37, p.28.
[77] Burrow, *Gestures and Looks*, p.80, and Classen, 'Introduction', p.58.
[78] David, 'Chaucerian Comedy', p.91.
[79] Carruthers, 'On Affliction and Reading', p.13.

This laughter is appropriate in the sphere of constant dance and play, which characterises her relationship with Pandarus. But it has no place in the amorous and sensual sphere of the lovers. Troilus and Criseyde also play but laughter is not part of it. Directly after the consummation, they play and speak of 'sondry thinges' (III, 1366 and 1396), before breaking their speech with kissing, an active amorous gesture (III, 1403-4). Later they exchange words with *delite*, a term which implies sensual rather than social merriment, before they begin 'for joye the amorouse daunce' (IV, 1431). Their joyful dance is of the sexual and amorous kind. It is very different to Pandarus' and Criseyde's dance which is verbal.[80] Laughter is the embodiment of interpersonal joy in its discursive rather than sexual form. Sexual joy is about communion rather than communication as I have already argued.

Troilus' final laughter marks the transition from the world of the living and heaven. For this reason, Stierstorfer suggests, 'both the bliss of heaven and the bliss of love, it seems, require other modes of expression. Love and heaven are considered points of arrival, they are meant to form a stasis of lasting happiness, while laughter belongs to the sphere of transitory dynamics.'[81] Indeed, the lovers' 'stasis of lasting happiness' although inevitably transient, is presented as repose. It is repose from the game and the dance of desire as well as from the constant flow of tears. Tears in the poem are the gesture of both passive complaint and restless desire. While they can, in Chaucer's corpus, express joy and relief, they only do so if that emotion is pathetic or religious and entails the passive reception of grace. Laughter on the other hand appears either apathetic and intellectual or expressing the transitory and social quality of the earthly emotional realm. Both gestures therefore are unfit to embody the joy of love in *Troilus and Criseyde*, which is expressed as active and mutual, as well as restful and lasting.

---

[80] For an analysis of the dance motif in the poem see Christopher Stampone, 'Choreographing Fin'amor: Dance and the Game of Love in Geoffrey Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *The Chaucer Review*, 50:3/4, 2015, 393-419.
[81] Stierstorfer, 'Laughter in *Troilus and Criseyde*', p.32.

Conclusion

This chapter shows how difficult it is to calibrate bodily joy in the poem. The linguistic approach of the first two chapters allowed me to examine the words used to express joy. But to approach the emotion somatically proves much more arduous. In the midst of a plethora of vivid but ambiguous bodily emotional gestures and the ubiquitous embodied representation of sorrow and desire, the body of joy is hard to find. It is metaphorical, public and moral rather than individual and medical. And yet, the principal source of joy resides in the body, in carnal love.

Sorrow is written on and in the body in Chaucer's writing. It is visual and visceral, as well as highly conventional. There is a cultural, pictorial and literary tradition of the embodiment of sorrow: just like Christ as the Man of Sorrows, Troilus and Criseyde exhibit their sorrow on their bodies and demand to be seen, to be pitied. There is an exemplarity and universality to sorrow that joy does not hold. The joy that the lovers share is unique and particular to them; the narrator does not recognize and cannot know their joy. Even the sighs, which express and create that joy are unique. They are not usual sighs which are, by default, sorrowful; they are something else, active rather than symptoms or signs of emotion. In sorrow, the body is acted upon, overpowered; it turns pale, shed tears, swoons, and eventually disintegrates. With joy, the body acts.

Joy is created through the body, through active amorous gestures. The lovers' night of sexual union is spent 'in joie and bisynesse' (III, 1413). They kiss and embrace and partake in the amorous dance, a dance which is not discursive but happens in perfect union. Sexual joy is the communion of bodies and in this regard, it does not need to be visibly marked on bodies through a blush, tears or laughter. Their joy is mutual and singular, embodied but unknown to the outside world. It is not somatised conventionally and visually.

The aftermath of that joy, on the other hand, takes shape as a way of life, a behaviour, which is honorific and virtuous. Joy is then visualised as beauty and as social activity. The representation of joy in the poem is hence fractured between a cause for public virtue and the expression of sex.

But neither of these two types of joy is written primarily in and on the body. The writing of joy relies much less on physiology than sorrow. Even the heart of joy appears de-somatised: metaphorical rather than material, it dances and floats. The somatic writing of the emotions of longing and sorrow, written as a physiology of sexual love and desire compromises joy's bodily presence. Joy is at the end of the heat and the somatic movements of sorrowful desire. And while it is embodied in the brief duration of the lovers' embrace, joy, ultimately, is not the same as sexual pleasure. It is rest from the somatisation of suffering and sexual desire. Sorrow is pathologised and therefore embedded in the discourse of medicine and physiology. The writing of joy, on the other hand, always seems to turn to religious and philosophical discourse – its carnal experience translated into the language of heavenly bliss or the expression of the philosophical bond of love. These discourses frame the representation of joy in the poem and make its embodiment less palpable than and very different from that of sorrow.

CHAPTER FOUR
THE GRAMMAR OF JOY

Introduction: The Cultural Grammar of Joy

Emotion is a psycho-somatic event which often tests language. A 'literary emotion' is not the 'real', psychological emotion; it is a codification, a sign. The critic's task is to decipher this codification and its underlying rules.[1] This chapter aims at doing just that by exploring the grammar of joy in *Troilus and Criseyde*. By grammar I mean the syntax, the adverbs, verbs and tenses in which joy is written, but also, more broadly, the linguistic system of conceptual thought behind the writing of joy. In Chaucer's poem, the grammar of emotion is also figurative. Poetic imagery constructs a coherent metaphorical structure of emotions and formal constraints such as rhymes belong to a culturally recognized way to connect words through sound. They thus belong to the study of the poem's grammar of joy, a linguistic organisational system that is both idiosyncratic and cultural. Jutta Eming suggests that literary codes of emotion should not be considered as confined to a single text but rather explored as the constituent of more general discourses and generic conventions – the emotion's 'cultural semantics'.[2] This cultural semantics, is, I argue better understood as a grammar. It is built through a variety of discourses – medical, philosophical and theological – as well as cultural metaphors and public 'sensibility'.[3] This introduction very briefly

[1] Jutta Eming, 'Emotionen als Gegenstand mediävistischer Literaturwissenschaft', in *Journal of Literary Theory*, 1:2, 2008, 251-273, p.260.
[2] Ibid., p.252 and 260.
[3] Here I use 'sensibility' in the sense of 'agreed-on modes of feeling, widely shared by consensus, not by nature'. C. Stephen Jaeger, 'Emotions and Sensibilities: Some Preluding Thoughts', in C. Stephen Jaeger and Ingrid Kasten, *Codierung von Emotionen im Mittelalter*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co., 2003, VII-XII, p.VIII.

introduces some of the systems of thought available to Chaucer which form his cultural grammar of joy.

In the previous chapter, I have explored how medical discourses and humoural theory in particular inform the writing of emotion in the poem. Humoural theory describes emotions in terms of the movements of spirit and heat that they generate in the body. These movements are categorised spatially as either centrifugal for joy or centripetal for sorrow. This embodied and spatial conception does play a role in the encoding of joy in the poem, though its representation appears largely disembodied. It is necessary therefore to acknowledge other types of emotional taxonomies. The second chapter of this thesis exposes a temporal conception of emotion: joy can be anticipated and remembered, experienced as either future or past. The relevance of temporality for the understanding of emotions can be traced to philosophical enquiries. Contrary to physicians, philosophers typically have a less embodied apprehension of emotions. They are more interested in abstract concepts and in movements of the soul rather than the humours. The Stoic school offered a very influential theory of emotions which classify them as either present (pleasure and distress) or anticipated (desire and fear).[4] Each of these emotions is also thought to correspond to a specific movement: elation for pleasure, contraction for distress, reaching out for desire and leaning away for fear.[5] These movements are not necessarily embodied; they are abstract movements of the soul and its perception of time and space.

Thomas Aquinas also relies on temporality and movement in his theory of the passions, developed in the *Summa Theologiae*. In this famous compendium of theological teachings, Aquinas produces a whole section on the passions of the soul (I-II, 22 to 48). There, he classifies all emotions into two categories: concupsicible passions, which depend

[4] Augustine was the main disseminator of this taxonomy in the Middle Ages. See Peter King, 'Emotions in Medieval Thought', in Peter Goldie (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Emotion*, 167-188, pp.169-70.
[5] Simo Knuuttila, 'On the History of the Tables in Taxonomy of Emotions', *L'Atelier du CRH*, 16, 2016, 1-32, p.2.

on what we love and can be either moving or at rest, and the irascible passions, which depend on what we hate and are characterised by movement and struggle (I-II, 23). Significantly, he asserts that all passions belong to movement except for joy (*gaudium*) and sadness (*tristitia*), which belong to rest (I-II, 25, art. 1). But these 'end-point passions', as Potkay names them, do not signify long-lasting rest: 'all human passion terminates either in joy or sorrow. All earthly joys and sorrows, however, are only temporary lulls from activity: the desire and will of mortals won't repose for long.'[6] For Aquinas therefore, most emotions tend toward something and are in a way anticipated, except for joy and sorrow where movement ends – temporarily. The notion of rest is crucial in the cultural semantics of joy. However, Aquinas also presents hope and memory as causes for pleasure (*delectatio*, I-II, 32, art. 3) and desire as a cause for sorrow (I-II, 36, art. 2). So, while they are intrinsically at rest and present, joy and sorrow can be related to anticipated and past emotions. Such taxonomies cannot provide exact models for Chaucer's writing of emotions; yet they can be seen to inform it: joy is posited as the only possibility for emotional rest in the poem, but it is also anticipated and remembered and eventually exceeds the poem's earthly temporality.

Joy being an end in itself, its theorisation is not confined to treatises on the passions; it also enters larger moral and ethical considerations. For example, Aquinas deals with happiness (*beatitudo*) in his section on man's last end (I-II, 1 to 5). In this section, he explains that the object of man's last end is 'the uncreated good, namely, God' (I-II, 3, art.1), but its essence is created and existing in men. Happiness is an act of the intellect. He also insists on what *beatitudo* is not, namely all earthly goods such as honour and power. Happiness is not joy, however: while *beatitudo* is part of the philosophical discussion on men's last end, Aquinas considers joy (*gaudium*) in his section on theological virtues and, more specifically, charity. Spiritual joy, he argues, is caused by virtue and charity, it is the result of the love of God. Joy and happiness are thus part of the ethical discourses of philosophy and religion,

[6] Potkay, *Story of Joy*, p.46.

two discourses which are embedded in Chaucer's lexis and grammar of joy. The first chapter showed how the Boethian concept of full happiness and the spiritual notion of heavenly bliss help construct Chaucer's vocabulary of joy. This chapter will show how these different discourses of joy are negotiated in the grammar of the poem.

To this end, the poem's figurative encoding of the emotion must be studied. Metaphors are not only poetic and literary, they are also a product of everyday language and culture. 'Conceptual metaphors' as cognitive linguists have named them, often express one abstract or subjective concept as a more concrete one.[7] For example, the expression 'to be on cloud nine' posits the concept of joy as feeling light and being up. This expression can also be traced to the religious discourse that equates joy with heaven. 'Being overcome by joy', on the other hand, conceptualises the emotion as a force overpowering the body and the self. Existing studies on the metaphors of happiness in Modern English have demonstrated that happiness is cognitively structured as either an embodied emotion or a value – a separation correlated to the semantic differentiation between joy (emotion) and happiness (value).[8] The tension between emotion and value is present in the metaphors of joy in Chaucer's English as well. They mostly posit joy as exterior to the body and a quality rather than a somatic reaction.

Troilus and Criseyde also produces idiosyncratic and aesthetic metaphors; its grammar of joy is also a poetic grammar. Emotions are embedded in the natural imagery of the poem as well as framed by the poetic constraint of the rhyme. The formal grammar of joy produces a trajectory of joy which is independent from the characters and the plot. Natural imagery figures joy as spring: a bright promise in winter, but also inevitably temporary. Rhymes entrap joy in an inescapable bond with Troy. This leads to a semantic

[7] George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
[8] Zoltan Kövecses, 'Happiness: A Definitional Effort', *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 6:1, 1991, 29-47.

reconfiguration of joy as it becomes contingent on space and time and, like the city, inevitably doomed. The link between the emotion and the city also seems to turn joy into a public and communal emotion, one which relies on honour and reputation. Joy here becomes part of the politics of emotion.[9] In his study of anger in epic romances and feudal society, White describes joy not as a 'core emotion that medieval people were too uncouth to repress' but as a 'public marker of honour for *sires*'.[10]

All these aspects touch upon the broader cultural grammar of joy, its varied theoretical and social discourses. Instead of offering one clear notion of what joy is, however, they create uncertainty about whether joy is a physical emotion, a public marker of honour, a philosophical value, or a spiritual destination. The study of joy in literature therefore has to take this uncertainty into account and be ready to recalibrate the definition of what an emotion is, all the more so as Chaucer's poetry blends and challenges these pre-existing discourses. Joy, in the poem, is a moral value yet its carnality is also acknowledged and accepted. I argue that *Troilus and Criseyde*'s poetic representation of joy writes it as an immaterial good, while simultaneously exceeding and qualifying the abstraction of moral discourse by allowing the *feeling* of earthly joy as the poem's greatest value.

The Temporal Grammar of Joy

Troilus and Criseyde is a poem about change and mutability. As John M. Ganim puts it, 'things change. This is one of the few of its commonplaces which remains unscathed by the action of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde.*'[11] Human emotions are no exception to the rule; they are in fact the focal point of this mutability. The narrator of the poem is very clear

[9] See for example this volume on anger: Rosenwein (ed.), *Anger's Past*.
[10] S. D. White, 'The Politics of Anger', in Rosenwein (ed.), *Anger's Past*, 127-152, p.143.
[11] John M. Ganim, 'Tone and Time in Chaucer's *Troilus*', *ELH*, 43:2, 1976, 141-153, p.141.

from the beginning that his is a story about the alternation of happiness and sadness. It being a 'tragedye' (V, 1789), the movement is, alas, 'from wo to wele, and after out of joie' (I, 4). The poem's imaginative conception of emotional mutability is epitomised by Pandarus as follows:

> And next the valeye is the hil o-lofte;
> And next the derke nyght the glade morwe;
> And also joie is next the fyn of sorwe. (I, 950-52)

Here the individual is viewed as physically progressing through his own, exterior, emotions. This is an unstoppable progress, as humans cannot stop walking through life. This spatial progress is echoed by the unstoppable temporal process from day to night. The poem figures emotions as spatio-temporal phases of a larger incessant process. They belong to a specific temporal grammar. This section will explore this grammar through the study of temporal adverbs, the deployment of verb tenses and the poem's construction of emotional duration.

As the previous chapter touched upon, joy is not allowed the same embodied duration as desire and sorrowful longing. This is also explained in terms of temporality: joy is the end of the anticipatory emotion of desire, it is at rest. However, in the poem, the movements of desire and sorrow appear interminable; joy thus seems to lose its time and place. The first two books especially offer no emotional rest; they are constant anticipation and movement. In this context, joy itself becomes anticipated. As the second chapter of this thesis demonstrates, joy, in the first two books, is a future and conditional emotion. Before the consummation scene, amidst all of his longing and sorrow, Troilus accesses brief moments of somatic joy which trigger hope and desire for a fuller joy. In parallel, Criseyde slowly opens up to the possibility of love's joy under the advice of her uncle and her niece: 'Is there swych blisse?' (II, 885), she asks after Antigone has sung her the beauty and the purity of lovers' bliss. The grammar of joy in these first two books is therefore not one of present rest,

it is interrogatory and future, conditional and potential; there is no lull in emotional activity yet.

After this long and turbulent anticipation, rest will be accorded to the lovers. As Aquinas promises, all passions eventually lead to rest, be it joy or sorrow. As sorrow is not an option for rest in the poem – it is correlated with restless desire – it is joy which finally brings peace and quiet to our lovers. But this long anticipated joy comes to the lovers as if by surprise. At the beginning of Book III, emotions arrive suddenly. When Troilus finally meets Criseyde, his emotions are unexpected and uncontrollable: 'Ne myghte o word for shame to it seye,/Although men sholde smyten of his hed./But Lord, so he wex sodeynliche red.' (III, 80-3). Identical phrasing is used later to describe Criseyde's reaction at Troilus' sudden presence in Pandarus' house:

> But Lord, so she wex sodeynliche red!
> Ne though men sholde smyten of hire hed,
> She kouthe nought a word aright brynge
> So sodeynly, for his sodeyn comynge. (III, 956-9)

These passages express the kind of emotional temporality at play at the start of the lovers' union: it is rapid and unexpected. Their joy thus also comes suddenly: Troilus' heart 'wax sodeynliche […] ful of joie' (III, 356) when Pandarus promises him a more intimate meeting with Criseyde. And then, when Criseyde forgives him:

> This Troilus, with blisse of that surprised,
> Putte al in Goddes hand, as he that mente
> Nothing but wel; and sodeynly avysed,
> He hire in armes faste to hym hente (III, 1184-7).

His sudden bliss surprises Troilus. This, after two books of longing and hoping for that very joy might seem surprising indeed. But this element of suddenness conveys the notion of a joy that is never certain and that, while it was highly anticipated, cannot be premeditated.

Joy is a gift for which one has no agency; when it comes it is sudden and unforeseen. The narrator compares Troilus to a man suddenly (III, 1242) rescued from imminent death – a gift of heaven.

This emphasis on suddenness is interesting as it acutely contrasts with the claims the narrator makes about sudden love. Love it would seem, contrary to its resulting joy, should not be a sudden emotion. The narrator takes pains to explain how Criseyde's falling in love was *not* sudden. He relates her long thought processes before commenting:

> Now myghte som envious jangle thus:
> 'This was a sodeyn love; how might it be
> That she so lightly loved Troilus
> Right for the first syghte, ye, parde?' (II, 666-9).

But, he says, she did not give her love suddenly. On the contrary, Troilus obtained her love by 'process and by good servyse' (II, 678). But if a sudden love is not proper love then what should we make of Troilus' experience of love at first sight? Troilus 'wax sodeynly moost subgit unto love' (I, 321). The adverb 'suddenly' is used a total of four times during the temple scene (I, 209, 231, 274, 306). The experience of falling in love is thus very different for the male courtly lover than the lady: the man falls suddenly in love but then must prove that love through long and consistent service.[12] The courtly lady must fall in love, not suddenly at first sight, but as a result of this long process of service. But love, sudden or not, is presented as an act of free will:[13] although Troilus is struck by Cupid's arrow, he then decides to love, 'he gan fully assente' (I, 391). There is agency in the emotion of love. But while Troilus has laboured to deserve his lady's mercy and love, the hoped-for result of that

[12] Troilus being a famously passive lover, the labour of love is mostly performed by Pandarus in the poem. On aspects of labour and service in love see Sadlek, 'Love, Labour, and Sloth'.

[13] On the concept of free will in *Troilus*, see Alan T. Gaylord, 'The Lesson on the *Troilus*: Chastisement and Correction', in Mary Salu (ed.), *Essays on 'Troilus and Criseyde'*, 23-42, especially pp. 30-32; and for a discussion on love and free will in the context of lovesickness see Palmer, 'When *Remedia Amoris* Fail' and Wack, 'Lovesickness in *Troilus*'.

love, joy in union, comes as a surprise, suddenly. Joy, contrary to love, is expressed as a sudden gift for which the lovers have no agency.

This is also different from sorrow. While sorrow can be sudden (the lovers' hearts can suddenly grow cold with the blow of sad news III, 800 and V, 1659), there is a continuity to sorrow that the suddenness of joy does not allow. Firstly, the fact, observed in the first chapter, that the adjectives *sorweful* or *woful* are repeatedly used as an epithet to Troilus, constructs sorrow as his default state. Adjectives of joy, much rarer, do not behave in that way; they can only be situational, and hence temporary. Sorrow is the norm while joy is a sudden and unexpected break from that norm. Moreover, sorrow can be or can be felt as endless (II, 1083 and IV, 23). Sorrow, or desire, is described as relentlessly continuous, it lasts day and night, eve and morrow.[14] The agonising duration of sorrow is only suddenly and briefly interrupted by the surprise of joy.

Indeed, if present joy is a sudden gift, it means it is fleeting. Unlike love, which can be cultivated, and which survives absence, love's joy is contingent on time and place and cannot survive separation. Just as its sudden arrival is emphasized, so is its 'presentness', its momentariness. Troilus is said to be 'in swych present gladnesse' (III, 1244) and he addresses Criseyde thus: 'Now be ye kaught; now is ther but we tweyne!/Now yeldeth yow' (III, 1207-8). The repetition of the word 'now' emphasizes all the past anticipation: after all this wait and misery, now Troilus finally experiences joy. But it also presents the lovers' joy as existing only in the here and now. Yet, the stanzas describing the lovers' sexual bliss – from line 1184 to 1414 and then again from 1667 to 1694 – do not convey a sudden or rushed temporality; quite on the contrary. The adverb 'suddenly' does not reappear and the presentness of their joy seems slow and extended: 'For out of wo in blisse now they flete' (III, 1221). The choice of the verb 'to float' here presents a slow experience of emotion; slow yet fleeting. *Fleten* means both to float and to fleet: the verb is also defined as 'to pass

[14] 'Day and night': II, 1338, V, 131, 463, 793, 1755; 'eve and morrow': I, 487, V, 725

away, be transitory' (*MED*, 3.(b)). Their experience in bliss is floating, and volatile. The verb, which is repeated later ('he felte his herte in joie flete' III, 1671), temporarily suspends time itself. The same effect is achieved with the verb 'bathen', used three times throughout the poem in reference to lovers' bliss (I, 22; II, 849 and IV, 208).[15] To float and to bathe imply a change in element, earth or solid ground becoming air or water. These are defined in the *Boece* as 'the thinges that ben softe and fletynge' (3, p.11, 146-7). As the fluid and volatile elements, they 'departen lyghtly' (3, p.11, 147-8): they are easily divided, but also, as the first meaning of the verb *departen* suggests, they are fleeting.[16] But in the figurative fabric of the poem, floating and bathing in joy also means that the spatial and temporal progress through emotions is interrupted. Movement is not the same in air or in water: physical progress is impossible as bodies are suspended.

This is indeed, what seems to happen to time here; it is still, suspended. This is also conveyed by the contrast those stanzas offer with the first two books where emotions are in constant movement; reaching towards the future but also vacillating between hope and fear, joy and sorrow, hot and cold. The consummation scene finally writes joy as an 'end-point emotion',[17] it is the end of desire and hope and fear. Though the narrator tells the night was spent 'bitwixen drede and sikernesse' (III, 1315), it is the latter that prevails. Criseyde is soon 'quyt from every drede and tene' (III, 1226) and together they are 'in joie and suerte', and 'in quyete and in reste' (III, 1678, 1680). Joy is equated to rest, to a cessation of movement. The use of collocating doublets adds to this sense of stability. As observed in the

[15] The phrase 'bath of blisse' is quite rare in Middle English. The *MED* defines it as '4.(b) overflowing joy', although bathing rather speaks of immersion. Aside from a quote by Chaucer, the only other example indexed in this heading is that of St. Margaret's deadly bath in one the saint's lives from the *Katherine Group.* The virgin martyr is put to death in a boiling bath but, through prayer, turns it into a pleasant and mild 'beath of blisse' 59.(2). The bath of bliss, in this case is the bath of martyrdom and a conduit to an otherworldly realm. For a survey of medieval bathing and this expression in Chaucer and elsewhere, see the talk by Elizabeth Archibald, 'Baths of Bliss in the Middle Ages: Fact and Fiction', 27th February 2014, available at: https://www.dur.ac.uk/research/ils/videos1314/archibald/

[16] *MED,* '1a. (a) To take one's leave, go away, depart'; '3a. (a) To split apart, be divided.'

[17] Potkay, *Story of Joy*, p.46.

first chapter, collocating doublets are a common feature of Chaucer's poetics of emotions but are notably rare in *Troilus and Criseyde*. They often have a summarizing and stabilizing effect, appearing for example in happy endings, or wedding scenes.[18] Their presence here thus emphasizes the impression of durable finality.

The temporality of joy in the consummation is felt as durable and still. But this is the fleeting stillness of floating. The consummation scene is ethereal, out of human time. This is achieved by its emotional grammar as well as its elevated vocabulary, which equates their bliss with heaven. Sexual joy becomes 'hevene blisse' (III, 704, 1322, 1657), a compound of place and emotion that strengthens the impression of timelessness. The lovers' heavenly joy is out of time but also out of language. The narrator has to resort to inexpressibility topoi to relate their sexual joy; his ink, that is his own poetic tool and language, is insufficient to express joy (III, 1639). In another topos, he uses the subjunctive instead of the indicative: 'Of hire delit or joies oone the leeste/Were impossible to my wit to seye' (III, 1310-11). Their pleasures are grammatically removed into a conditional, subjective plane. The joy of the present is thus represented as an escape from the poem's own form and matter: it escapes, albeit briefly, poetic language as well as the generic and thematic thread of time and change. At the end of this night spent in timeless, boundless bliss, poetic convention catches up through the implacable genre of the Dawn song. The sun rises and extinguishes their unspeakable joy replacing it by the sorrowful lyricism of the alba. The 'world projected by the alba', Ganim explains, 'signals the fading of that "glimpse of heaven" which controls the center of the third book.'[19] Its poetics are 'nostalgic, bittersweet, looking back.'[20] They put present joy in the past.

[18] Such as at the end of the wedding of Arveragus and Dorigen in the *Franklin's Tale:* 'And thus in joye and blisse I lete hem dwelle' (V, 1099).
[19] Ganim, 'Tone and Time', pp.148-9.
[20] Ibid., p.149.

Troilus especially becomes trapped in the memory of his joy. As the second chapter shows, he is prone to exercises of the mind, and, in Book V, creates a fictive present joy through memory. He physically walks around Troy remembering or rather imagining Criseyde laughing and singing in specific places of the city (V, 568-581). But only the imaginary ghost of past Criseyde remains in the walls of Troy. Present Criseyde has left the city at the end of Book IV and the emotional temporality of this last book is clearly delineated: it is one of present sorrow and past joy, and of hypothetical, hoped-for future joy. For Criseyde, Troy becomes a symbol which encloses her past joys: 'the plesance and the joie;/The which that now al torned into galle is,/Have ich had ofte withinne yonder walles' (V, 731-33). The time and place markers boundary joy in every way and give it a sense of finality. Joy is in the remote past and a remote past that only existed and can only exist 'within yonder walles'.

Troilus also 'realizes that Troy exists in a present reality far removed from his previous recollections'[21] and is well aware of the temporal conditions of his own happiness:

> Fro hennes rood my blisse and my solas!
> […] And hider hom I com whan it was eve,
> And here I dwelle out cast from all joie,
> And shal, til I may sen hire eft in Troie. (V, 607-16)

Once again, the predominant space and time markers as well as the presence of all three tenses in the last sentence rigorously enclose joy in a strict spatio-temporality.[22] Troilus' use of the future also exposes the discrepancy between his assurance in a future reunion, and both the narrator's and the audience's knowledge of the contrary; a discrepancy best depicted

[21] Charles Russell Stone, '"And sodeynly he wax therwith astoned": Virgilian Emotion and Images of Troy in Chaucer's *Troilus*', *The Review of English Studies*, 64, 2013, 574-593, p.587.
[22] On these passages and their negotiation of time and place, see Stone, 'Virgilian Emotion', pp.591-2.

by this echoing verse at the beginning of the book: 'For shaltow nevere sen hire eft in Troie' (V, 28).

In his study of the poem, Barry Windeatt notices that whereas the audience knows 'the ending before the beginning', Troilus and Criseyde on the other hand 'speak in terms of stability and permanence, in a way that reflects their longing for the unchangeable. […] The imagery of reassurance and confidence which accompanies the lovers' union suggests the gaining of a security, a centre of rest and peace at the heart of the poem.'[23] But the timeless consummation scene is an escape from the poem. The lovers' feeling of their joy as still is at odds with the temporal grammar of the world in which they are written. This can be seen in the lovers' way of talking about their love and their happiness. They use adverbs expressing eternity: 'for evere in oon, as for to lyve in reste' (IV, 1602) says Troilus, 'for everemo […]/In alle joie and seurte' (II, 830-3), 'So as we shal togideres evere dwelle/That al this world ne myghte oure blisse telle' (IV, 1320-23) says Criseyde. Their grammar of joy is one of durability; they don't speak of movement, but of rest and security, not of moments, but of eternity. But in the grammar of the poem's narrative, only sorrow is durable. They believe their joy is in the present as well as in the future; but it is perhaps, as Criseyde seems to hint at, not of this world. Their bliss is not intelligible in this world whose grammar of emotions is, as she herself knows, one of mutability: 'O brotel wele of mannes joie unstable!' (III, 820). The poem thus expresses a tension in its emotional temporality. The consummation scene and the lovers' vows to each other present a grammar of joy which is still and enduring, but the time fabric of the poem is much more conflicted and mutable. This tension is visible even in the characters' grammar of joy, in their subjunctives and interrogatives, their fictive pasts and their future perfects. These complicate the aphoristic vision of emotions proposed by Pandarus. Indeed, his gnomic propositional statements – 'And next the derke nyght the glade morwe/And also joie is next the fyn of sorwe.' (I, 951-

[23] Windeatt, *Troilus and Criseyde*, pp.251-2.

2) – are contradicted by the poem's plot but, more importantly, are constantly challenged by the grammar of joy.

The Poetic Grammar of Joy

Rhymes

The poetic form, through its rules and structures, embeds emotional diction in a grammar of its own. Rhymes in particular bind words together through sound, shaping patterns and schemes. These patterns create a form of lexical organisation, which is independent from syntax. They construct their own grammar and sense relations. In the poem, both the words *sorwe* and *joy* appear in binding rhyming schemes. They are both relatively difficult words to create rhymes with and end up in inflexible rhyming couplets: *sorwe* with *morwe* and *joy* with *Troy.* Both rhymes link emotions to concepts relating to time and space. The temporal and spatial framing of emotions in *Troilus* is thus embedded in the formal fabric of the text. This section will analyse the function of these rhymes and the emotional constraint they seem to place on the characters and the plot.

Firstly, in the case of *sorwe* and *morwe*, the recurring rhyme creates a pattern where sorrow is linked to a durable and future temporality. *Morwe* means both morning and the next day in Middle English[24] and sorrow thus becomes associated with day-time and light but also, and perhaps prominently, with the future and the certainty of tomorrow. The rhyme is found consistently throughout the poem with a surge in the fatally sorrowful fifth book where it appears ten times.[25] *Sorwe* always rhymes with *morwe* and it is used as a rhyme

[24] *MED*: '1. (a) Morning, the early part of the day; also, the dawn' and '3. (a) The morrow; the next day'.
[25] I, 485, 860, 952; II, 406, 964, 1099, 1523; III, 888, 1058, 1470; IV, 98, 1309, 1445, 1616; V, 13, 295, 406, 654, 686, 723, 875, 945, 1525, 1663.

twenty-four out of ninety-five occurrences. This contrasts with *gladnesse,* which is almost always used as rhyme, with many different words.[26] The rhyming behaviour of the word *sorwe* is constrained. Only the verb *borwe* is found as a potential alternate rhyme for *sorwe*. It appears five times but only ever as a third rhyming component to the doublet *sorwe/morwe*.[27] The rhyme thus binds the two words as a rhyming unit.

In the first books, sorrow happens both eve and morrow for Troilus (I, 485-7), but in the book of the consummation, morning signifies sorrow. In the conventional words of the Dawn song, the lovers castigate the sun for ending their blissful night of love. Troilus tells the Sun: 'What, holde youre bed ther, thow, and ek thi Morwe!/I bidde God, so yeve yow bothe sorwe!' (III, 1469-70). Morrow is personified so that while He brings sorrow to the lovers, they too can wish sorrow upon Him. The fourth book then announces a much more severe separation and the lovers wish tomorrow will never come. Criseyde is still hopeful, however, and tries to find a reasonable plan for them to get back together soon. She hence proposes to look at tomorrow not as the day of their separation but that of their reunion. She uses the morrow as a time measure which is small enough, soon enough, to lessen their sorrow: 'And syn I shal no ferther out of Troie/Than I may ride ayeyn on half a morwe,/It oughte lesse causen to sorwe.' (IV, 1307-9). A tension is created here between Criseyde's hope for a future and conditional cessation of sorrow, and the implacable duration of sorrow suggested by the recurrent rhyme.

In Book V, the morrow has come, and the lovers are separated. Because sorrow is now, tomorrow is synonymous with hope. Pandarus tries to amuse Troilus and to make the time go faster until the blissful morrow: 'And dryve it forth unto that blisful morwe/That thow hire se, that cause is of thi sorwe' (V, 405-6). Tomorrow is equated with joy and Criseyde is posited as the direct cause of Troilus' sorrow; only she can quench it. The

[26] See appendix 11 for a table of the lexis' rhyming behaviour.
[27] I, 488; II, 963, 1524; V, 726, 1664.

narrator further explains how Pandarus tries to comfort his friend: 'Yevyng hym hope alwey the tenth morwe/That she shal come and stynten al his sorwe' (V, 685-6). The rhyming couplet constructs a promise: the tenth morrow will come and end all sorrow. The rhyme in fact appears several times in the context of promises. Pandarus tells Troilus he will give him his own sister to end his sorrow (I, 860-1) and Criseyde asks her uncle to go reassure Troilus that his sorrow is causeless as tomorrow shall prove (III, 888-9). The rhyme therefore acts as an ironic reminder: while it appears in passages which express a promise that tomorrow will make sorrow end, the formal grammar hints at the contrary. Poetic constraint makes *morwe* a by-word of *sorwe*, which in turn creates an emotional constraint on the poem and its characters: tomorrow will always be sorrowful.

The word *joy* is also inflexible in its rhyming behaviour. In the *Canterbury Tales*, the word is used eighty times and is only once found at the end of a line, as a rhyme to *Troy*.[28] *Troy* is one of the only words which rhyme with *joy* in Chaucer's poetry. In the context of his Trojan romance therefore, the author can much more easily use *joy* as a rhyme: out of its ninety occurrences, the word appears thirty times as a rhyme, always with *Troy*.[29] Sometimes *joy* and *Troy* are accompanied by a third rhyming word. The words rhyme with 'fro ye' (I, 5), 'acoye' (V, 782) and, most interestingly, the antonym of joy 'anoye' (IV, 1304).[30] Other '-oye' rhymes are therefore possible. In the *Canterbury Tales*, the conjugated verb *anoyen*

[28] *Joy* consistently rhymes with Troy in Chaucer's entire corpus. The rhyme reappears three times in the *Book of the Duchess* (325, 1065, 1119), twice in the *House of Fame* (157, 1471) and three times in the *Legends of Good Women* (1104, 1150, 1252). Only in the *Romaunt of the Rose* does *joy* rhyme with other words (the verbs *convoye* l.2915 and *acoye* l.3563). But these all appear in the B text which is generally accepted not to have been authored by Chaucer.

[29] I, 4, 118, 608; II, 140, 643, 749, 882; III, 356, 790, 1442, 1450, 1714; IV, 56, 90, 274, 335, 1306, 1442, 1631; V, 27, 118, 395, 427, 608, 615, 731, 781, 930, 1382, 1547.

[30] In Boccaccio's version of the poem, the Italian allows *Troia* to rhyme with both *gioia* (joy) and *noia* (boredom, care or sorrow), therefore not assigning only one emotion to the city. Moreover, this also means that *gioia* can appear in rhymes with other words: its contrary *noia* as well as *moia* or *muoia* the subjunctive of *morire* (to die). These rhyme patterns certainly do not create any positive associations for joy, but they do allow for a relative flexibility that Chaucer's rhymes do not. Chaucer could have followed his source by making Troy rhyme equally with both joy and *anoye* – although admittedly *anoyen* being a verb, it would not always end in '-oye' – but instead he constrained *Troy* and *joy* in a strict rhyming unit.

rhymes three times with *destroyen* for example,[31] and the phrase 'Seinte Loy' appears twice, rhyming with *coy* and *boy*.[32] Yet, in Chaucer's whole corpus, *joy* always rhymes with *Troy*. One could argue therefore that this rhyme is as much a product of the English language's paucity of rhymes as an authorial choice. In the end, the inflexibility of the rhyme makes the two terms by-words of each other. This is enhanced by the fact that the rhyme most often appears as the ending couplet of stanzas (twenty-three out of the thirty occurrences). This increased proximity puts more weight on the rhyme and its thematic significance. Joy becomes intrinsically linked with the fate of Troy, which the reader knows from the start; Troy is already destroyed.

The rhyme appears in the very first stanza of the *Troilus*. This first occurrence is not in the ending couplet but in the first part of the stanza as part of the threefold B rhymes. Windeatt summarises the structure of the poem's stanzas as follows: 'in the ABABBCC scheme of rhyme-royal stanza the first half of the structure works through alternation and interlinking, while the BBCC couplets tend to build a closural effect into the second half […]. The effect of closure in the stanza's final couplet is compounded in numerous instances by a tendency to devote the last line of the stanza to general or sententious reflections, exclamations, oaths, prayers, and wishes.'[33] The first stanza is a perfect example of this structure. It ends with a prayer to Thesiphone while its first five lines form the bulk of information in one long sentence:

> The double sorwe of Troilus to tellen,
> That was the kyng Priamus sone of Troye,
> In lovynge, how his aventures fellen
> For wo to wele, and after out of joie,
> My purpose is, er that I parte fro ye.
> Thesiphone, thou help me for t'endite
> Thise woful vers, that wepen as I write (I, 1-7)

[31] *Summoner's Tale* III, 1847-8, *Franklin's Tale* V, 883-4 and 875-6, those are not strictly '-oye' rhymes, however, but '-oyen', '-oyed' and '-oyeth'.
[32] *General Prologue* I, 119-20 and *Franklin's Tale* V, 1563-4.
[33] Windeatt, *Troilus and Criseyde*, p.355-6.

The subordinate clause starting in line two splits the sentence, alternating between the narrator's purpose and the details of the plot. The rhyme is used to posit the action of the whole poem: who Troilus is and the setting of the story in Troy as well as its emotional direction, 'out of joie'. But the third rhyme, composed of the two words 'fro ye', brings the readers in, involving them in the story and making them direct interlocutors to the narrator. The reader is thus, from the beginning, made the direct witness of the scene of Troy and its slipping joy. This first threefold rhyme brings together Troy and joy with the idea of parting, of separation that is impending but inevitable: the narrator will have to part from his reader, just as joy will depart from Troy.

After this first stanza, the rhyme will mostly appear as the concluding couplet. In the first book, the few occurrences of the rhyme seem to indirectly link joy with public matters. Hector tells Criseyde she can dwell with them in Troy and in joy thus officially forgiving her for her father's betrayal (I, 118-9). Then Troilus, assailed by insufferable burning desire, exclaims that death would be a greater joy to him than becoming the king of Greece or Troy (I, 608-9). In the knight's plaintive rhetoric, the joy of public glory and power becomes subordinate to personal suffering and the relief of death. In the second book, the rhyme advances a public conception of joy, linking it, through its association with the city, to honour and reputation. The rhyme appears when the Trojan crowd applauds Troilus coming back from war: 'here cometh oure joye', and next to Troilus is Hector, the 'holder up of Troye!' (II, 643-4). In this end-of-stanza exclamation, the heroes of Troy are the pride and joy of its people; joy is public and communal. A sense of pride is also at play in a more selfish expression of reputation. Criseyde considers Troilus' love for her and decides that it is indeed no wonder that such a man would 'have joy of her' as she is, as men say, the best and best looking lady of all of Troy (II, 747-9). Finally, Antigone describes the lady who composed the love song she recites to Criseyde as 'the goodlieste mayde/Of gret estat in al

the town of Troye,/And let hire lif in most honour and joye' (II, 880-2). Here joy is explicitly linked to honour, but the rhyme creates an implicit link between joy and the public domain of Troy. Troy becomes the place where joy and love are possible through public honour and reputation. Joy in these examples is depersonalised and a correlate to civic pride and public reputation.

Book III sees the most intimate and personal expression of joy take place and the rhyme in fact disappears all throughout the consummation scene. It occurs twice at the beginning of the book (III, 356-7 and 790-1) and then not again before line 1441, when the sun rises and ends the lovers' night of bliss. Criseyde accuses the night of leaving Troy so quickly, making her lose her joy (III, 1441-2) and Troilus curses the coming of the day into Troy which accuses their stolen joy (III, 1450-2). Their blissful night is stolen away from the public light of the city, and therefore also escapes the text's constraining rhyme which forces joy to be public and honorific rather than intimate and sexual. The last occurrence of the rhyme in the book sees Fortune allow the lovers to be in joy, in Troy, but only for a time: 'And thus Fortune a tyme ledde in joie/Criseyde and ek this kynges sone of Troie' (III, 1714-5).

Book IV sees the rhyme being brought into purely public events, events that will definitively compromise the lovers' joy. Antenor is taken prisoner by the Greeks, which occasions the people of Troy to lose a great part of their joy (IV, 55-6). This communal loss of joy forecasts the more private loss that Antenor's exchange will set in motion. In the lovers' speeches, the rhyme expresses their hope that they will be reunited in Troy soon.[34] Troilus makes the presence of Criseyde in Troy the condition for his well-being: 'And but ye come at day set into Troye,/Ne shal I nevere have hele, honour, ne joye.' (IV, 1441-2). Interestingly, even though he is speaking of his private joy with Criseyde, it is associated with honour and therefore public life.

[34] IV, 335-6, 1304-7, 1441-2, 1630-1.

In the fifth book, joy decidedly leaves Troy. And yet, this is the book where the rhyme is the most frequent: while the word *joy* appears relatively infrequently (eighteen occurrences), it is very often found in a rhyme with Troy (eleven times).[35] As a point of comparison, the third book contains thirty-eight occurrences of the word, but it only rhymes with Troy five times. Joy is temporarily allowed to be private and sexual, hidden from the public concerns of Troy, but in the fifth book, it is obligatorily linked to the historical and tragic fate of the city. In one of the very first stanzas, the narrator insatiably repeats the word *joy* only to emphasize its pastness. It ends with these two lines addressing his own character: 'But Troilus, now far-wel al thi joie,/For shaltow nevere sen hire eft in Troie!' (V, 27-8). A similarly agonizing repetition occurs later, when the rhyme is used as the ending couplet of two stanzas in a row, as Troilus expresses his hope to again see Criseyde in Troy (V, 608-9 and 615-5). The rhyme is thus echoed in identical phrasing and cruelly emphasises the lover's vain and pathetic hope.

This dark inevitability is further exacerbated by the fact that the rhyme is pronounced three times by Diomede,[36] the man who makes joy in Troy impossible for Troilus. Diomede promises Criseyde, 'I am, al be it yow no joie,/As gentil man as any wight in Troie' (V, 930-1). And while Criseyde is still reminiscing about the 'plesaunce and the joie' that she has had within the walls of Troy (V, 729-30), she will very soon allow herself to consider another joy, present here and now in the Greek camp. Diomede's use of the rhyme thus simultaneously opens up the possibility for joy outside of Troy while also foreclosing its presence in Troy. The very last use of the rhyme in the poem indeed leaves no hope whatsoever:

> Fortune, which that permutacioun
> Of thynges hath, as it is hire committed
> Thorugh purveyaunce and disposicioun

[35] See appendix 12.
[36] V, 118-19, 779-81, 930-31.

> Of heighe Jove, as regnes shal be flitted
> Fro folk in folk, or when they shal be smytted,
> Gan pulle awey the fetheres brighte of Troie
> Fro day to day, til they ben bare of joie. (V, 1541-7)

In this stanza, the narrator places the fate of Troy in the larger scheme of things: things change, and people and kingdoms and cities are often destroyed or exchanged as Fortune may decide. These inevitable changes and the inevitable passing of time which occasions them are highlighted through the repetition of the structure 'fro folk in folk' and 'fro day to day': substitution and alternation are constant, and both Troy and joy are part of this process. The princes and knights, which are the joy of the Trojans, are bright feathers being plucked away, killed in battle by the Greeks. While there are still more than three hundred lines left, *Troy* and *joy* will not be associated again: the city is hopelessly bare of all joy, and so too its eponymous hero.

The rhyme makes resonate the linked fatality of the emotion and the city, but it also appears to empty *joy* of its emotional meaning. Throughout the poem, the rhyme is repeatedly used in poetic formulae, becoming almost functional. It occurs in asseverations, prayers or vows: in its simplest form, 'so have I joy'. When he announces to Criseyde the presence of Troilus in his house, Pandarus swears that he is come secretly, unbeknown to anyone but him: 'save of myself, as wisly have I joye,/And by that feith I shal Priam of Troie' (III, 790-1). This instance is interesting as it brings the public and official realm into a very private situation. *Joy* here is merely a tool for asseveration rather than a private emotion. A comparable use of the word appears in prayers: 'As wolde blisful Jove, for his joie,/That I the hadde wher I wolde, in Troie!' (IV, 335-6) and 'As wolde blisful God now, for his joie,/I myghte hire sen ayein come into Troie!' (V, 608-9). In these passages, *joy* is part of a formulaic expression, one which calls upon God's joy to make Troilus' wish come true. Joy is hence turned into a value to swear upon or to pray with. And every time *joy* is

used in this more formulaic way it always rhymes with *Troy*. In these instances, the word joy is emptied out of its emotional sense.

Rhyming patterns create a semantic bond between two words. They engender new layers of meaning and new connotations for the words *joy* or *morwe*, alongside but independently from the grammar of the stanzas' overt content. The two rhymes observed in this section semantically bind together two lexically very different terms: one is an emotion term and the other a place name or a moment in time. They belong to radically different verbal paradigms. In that sense, the relationship created between these words is very different from one made through collocation. Joy typically collocates with words such as *herte*, *feste* or *honour* in the poem, words which belong to similar lexical networks. *Joy* and *Troy,* on the other hand, are not predisposed to be semantically linked, nor are *sorwe* and *morwe*, but through a repetitive use of rhyme, the terms become inseparable in the ear and the mind of the reader. Eventually, the semantic concept of joy becomes linked with the semantic concept of Troy. Insistent sound repetition works alongside the emptying of the word's conventional senses and fills it with new connotations. The semantics of joy are re-charged, rearranged; it takes on the connotations of Troy.[37] Joy comes to be associated with civic pride, but, most prominently, to doom and destruction.

Imagery

The imagery in the poem forms part of its grammar of joy because it embeds emotions in a coherent figurative structure, one which relies on the natural progress of time and space. One emotion will always eventually turn into the other just as day into night and

[37] McCall accepts that the setting of Troy and its 'atmosphere of doom' is indeed 'a fitting backdrop for the story of the doomed love of Troilus and Criseyde', but he wishes to emphasize the city as the place of pleasures and joy, especially in social occasions, in the first books. John P. McCall, 'The Trojan Scene in Chaucer's *Troilus*', *ELH*, 29:3, 1962, 263-275, p.263.

a hill into a valley (I, 950-2). The poem displays persistent references to the natural world and especially to the natural process of time through the cycle of the seasons. This imagery is so prominent as to create a 'dual time-scheme'[38]: while the action must last three years at least, the text also creates, through seasonal metaphors, 'the poetic semblance of one complete year.'[39] The poem begins in April (I, 155-7), Books II and III are filled with references to spring and natural rebirth (II, 50 and 764-6; III, 351-4) and the last two books contain winter imagery (IV, 225-7; V, 535). While some of these instances should also be taken as actual dating – the story indeed begins in the month of April – others are explicitly figurative. The poem's imagery thus frames its plot and its love story in a cyclical temporality. Many of the seasonal images of the poem are used as similes for human emotions, thus putting on the same plane internal and subjective experience with greater external and objective events. As she considers the potential ramifications, positive and negative, of a future love affair, Criseyde's shifting thoughts are compared to a changing sky in March; they can be cloudy or bright (II, 764-70). Subjective thought is compared to the variability of meteorological phenomena. The mention of the month of March here participates in the poem's metaphorical time-scheme. March's weather is still variable and undecided just as the love story is at this moment and the thoughts and emotions of the lovers. Emotional spring is just around the corner.

In the third book, when Pandarus promises Troilus an intimate encounter with Criseyde, his joy is expressed both somatically and through seasonal imagery:

> But right so as thise holtes and thise hayis,
> That han in wynter dede ben and dreye,
> Revesten hem in grene whan that May is,
> Whan every lusty liketh best to pleye;

[38] Henry W. Sams, 'The Dual Time-Scheme in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *Modern Language Notes*, 1941, 94-100.
[39] Samuel Schuman, 'The Circle of Nature: Patterns of Imagery in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *The Chaucer Review*, 10:2, 1975, 99-112, p.104.

> Right in that selve wise, soth to seye,
> Wax sodeynliche his herte ful of joie,
> That gladder was ther nevere man in Troie. (III, 351-57)

Troilus' heart is compared to the vegetation which, when spring comes, becomes green and lively again. The sap, which fills the plants in May, waking them up from their wintery state of dryness, becomes the heat or the vital spirit filling the heart in joy. The physiological process of Troilus' individual emotion is thus compared to the universal process of nature's rebirth. Similarly, during the scene preceding the consummation, the narrator explicitly links his characters' emotions to the cycle of the seasons:

> But now help God to quenchen al this sorwe!
> So hope I that he shal, for he best may.
> For I have seyn of a ful misty morwe
> Folowen ful ofte a myrie someris day;
> And after wynter foloweth grene May; (III, 1058-62)

Just as merry summer days and the green weather of May follow the misty mornings of winter, so too this sorrow will be followed by joy. Spring and joy are linked in order to express hope and a positive outlook. The narrator seems to be comforting himself and his readers, by promising the end of his characters' sorrow: just as winter, it will inevitably pass.

Grief, in the last two books, is also expressed through seasonal metaphors, but these are rarer and do not emphasize mutability. In the fifth book, Troilus' heart is simply said to grow as cold as frost, hinting at the meteorological phenomena of winter (V, 535). In the fourth book a more elaborate simile is at play, comparing Troilus to a tree in winter:

> And as in wynter leves ben biraft,
> Ech after other, til the tree be bare,
> So that ther nys but bark and braunche ilaft,
> Lith Troilus, byraft of ech welfare,
> Ibounden in the blake bark of care,
> Disposed wood out of his wit to breyde,
> So sore hym sat the chaungynge of Criseyde. (IV, 225-31)

His joys, his *welfare*,[40] are the leaves which have fallen from the tree and the bare trunk becomes the container, the bark of sorrow in which Troilus is enclosed.[41] This image has an equivalent in Dante's *Inferno*: the damned souls in Charon's boat are compared to falling leaves. In Dante, this process is said to occur in autumn and is recounted in the present tense: 'Come d'autunno si levan le foglie' (*Inferno* III, 112). Chaucer, instead, figures a tree in winter and uses the perfect tense with the past participles 'ben biraft' and 'ilaft' to express the already completed process of the fallen leaves. Troilus is the naked tree, bound in its decaying bark as in a burial shroud.[42] In the poem's imagery of natural time, joy is always presented as forming part of a process: it is a promise but also necessarily temporary. In the image of sorrow as winter, however, the mutability inherent to the seasons' cycle seems forgotten. The image of winter stands still; the tree is dead, and Troilus is destined to the same fate. This winter is where the story ends; it will not see a new rebirth, a new spring.

Alongside seasonal imagery, the cyclical succession of night and day is also frequently used figuratively. Sorrow is the 'derke nyght' and joy 'the glade morwe' (I, 951). In Book II, Troilus' new hopeful joy, expressed through a prayer to Venus and the gesture of lifting up his eyes and arms, is compared to the flowers' reopening with morning's sun as is 'kynde cours' (II, 970). The metaphorical use of day and night posits night as sorrowful and morning as glad – an association challenged by the rhyming scheme. However, in a different textual and situational context of the poem, this figuration of night and day is reversed. In the conventional poetics of the Dawn song, the morning sun is the unwelcome end of the lovers' night of sexual bliss: 'O cruel day, accusour of the joie/That nyght and love han stole and fast iwryen,/Acorsed be thi coming into Troye' (III, 1450-2). No 'glade

[40] *Welfare* is defined by the *MED* as a state of prosperity or safety as well as 'delight, joy' (1.(c)).
[41] As Troilus himself is compared to the tree, he seems to be bound to his own body as container of sorrow. James J. Paxson emphasises the 'imagery of encasement' in this passage. Paxson, 'The Semiotics of Character, Trope, and Troilus: The Figural Construction of the Self and the Discourse of Desire in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', in Paxson and Gravlee (eds.), *Desiring Discourse*, 206-226, p.212.
[42] According to the *MED,* a 'bark' can also figuratively refer to a shroud, the shroud of care (5.(b)).

morwe' here, love and joy appear as emotions which belong to the 'blake nyght', created by God to hide the world and to allow men, under the cover of darkness, to rest, while the day only breaks them with labour (III, 1429-35). In a direct inversion of the metaphorical proverb therefore, the night is 'blysful' (III, 1317) and 'glade' (III, 229 and 1646) and the day is 'cruel'. As Windeatt puts it, *Troilus* is 'a poem of the night: a poem in which a series of important scenes occur at night-time, and in which there is a keener sense of the transitions represented by dawn and dusk, so that the succession of night and day – in which night is opportunity – becomes one of the underlying structural patterns in the poem.'[43] Not only in the Dawn song rhetoric therefore, but more generally in the poem's action, night is the time of opportunity, of union and of joy while morning and day-time suggest danger, separation and sorrow.

But when the lovers are separated in Book V, and even the cover of the night cannot bring them together, night and day are both iterations of the same despair. The passage of time, from day to night and back again is continuously remarked upon, emphasising the emptiness of these endless days which do not bring the lovers closer to their reunion. Troilus feels the time is passing abnormally slowly: 'The deyes moore and lenger every nyght/Than they ben wont to be, hym thoughte tho' (V, 659-60). Both lovers pray and mourn day and night.[44] Nights are not synonymous with rest anymore but are spent sleepless and crying.[45] Troilus is in so much pain in fact, that he is in an endless night of torment:

> O sterre of which I lost have the light,
> With herte soor wel oughte I to biwaille
> That evere derk in torment, nyght by nyght,
> Toward my deth with wynd in steere I saille; (V, 638-41)

[43] Windeatt, *Troilus and Criseyde*, p. 198.
[44] V, 131, 463, 793, 1755.
[45] V, 289, 647-8, 712, 1106, 1181, 1196. There is no such repeated emphasis on the passing of time and night-time especially in the first two books, though Troilus' desire and sorrow are said to increase 'eve and morwe' (I, 487) and 'day and nyght' (II, 1338).

Darkness figuratively represents sorrow here and every night Troilus wanders aimlessly, lost without the light of his love, sailing towards his death. At the end of the poem therefore, night and day are both equally insufferable, and night is once again used figuratively as the image of sorrow, loss and eventually death.

The poem's natural figurative language at times contests the plot. The seasonal imagery creates a second, figurative time-line of the story which foreshadows its ending. And a tension arises between night as the figurative image of darkness, sorrow and despair and the actual night-time in the poem which is the time of opportunity. The figurative diction is therefore not univocal and unchallenged. The proverbial 'derke nyght and the glade morwe' become contradicted by the events. The morrow, as its rhyming behaviour intimates, will always bring sorrow. The figurative grammar of emotion posits joy as spring: it is a rebirth and a promise, but it is also necessarily temporary. Yet, when emotional winter is here after the great summer that is the third book, no more promise of spring is made. Sorrow is accorded a durability, and a finality that breaks the universal cycle of seasons.

The Figurative Grammar of Joy: Conceptual Metaphors

The figurative texture of the poem and its writing of joy is also to be found in language which is not idiosyncratic and poetic. All language can be figurative, as metaphors are an important way in which thought is linguistically formulated. 'Conceptual metaphors', as the cognitive linguists Johnson and Lakoff have named them, are 'metaphors we live by', found in everyday language.[46] The study of these metaphors helps understand the 'underlying conceptual reality' of language and lexicon.[47] As embodied and psychological processes, emotions are famously hard to describe; we rely on figurative language to

[46] Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*.
[47] Kövecses, 'Happiness', p.29.

conceptualise them.[48] Patterns of conceptual metaphors are hence a sign of how emotions are thought to be expressed, how they are cognitively structured. These structures are cultural, and cognitive linguistics is therefore a useful tool for the study of past emotions.[49]

The conceptual semantics of emotion negotiates language, culture and the body. Antonina Harbus argues that the study of conceptual language 'shows the degree to which culture and biology are integrated: how embodied experience gives rise to conceptual metaphors, that in turn are subject to cultural impact.'[50] Conceptual metaphors are based on embodied realism: 'meaning is grounded in our sensorimotor experience and this embodied meaning was extended, via imaginative mechanisms, such as conceptual metaphor, metonymy, radial categories, and various forms of conceptual blending, to shape abstract conceptualisation and reasoning.'[51] With regard to emotions, embodied realism is especially relevant for the conceptual model, still prevalent in our language, known as 'hydraulic'. In the hydraulic model, 'the emotions are like great liquids within each person, heaving and frothing, eager to be let out. The model in fact largely derives from medieval medical notions of the humours.'[52] The figure of the swelling heart for example may reproduce medical discourse on the physiology of emotions but can also be read as a metaphor constructed on bodily experience. The conceptual language of emotion is at the junction between physiology and metaphor. Its study allows me to bring into dialogue the humoural and the figurative writing of emotions.

---

[48] See Zoltan Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

[49] Both Antonina Harbus and Leslie Lockett have used conceptual metaphors in their studies on Anglo-Saxon psychologies and poetic concepts of the mind and the self. Harbus, *Cognitive Approaches to Old English Poetry,* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2012 and Lockett, *Anglo-Saxon Psychologies in the Vernacular and Latin Traditions*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011.

[50] Antonina Harbus, 'Embodied Emotion, Conceptual Metaphor, and the Aesthetics of Reading Old English Poetry', in Michael Champion and Andrew Lynch (eds.), *Understanding Emotions in Early Europe*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2015, 127-149, p.137.

[51] George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, 'Why Cognitive Linguistics Require Embodied Realism', *Cognitive Linguistics*, 13:3, 2003, 245-263, p.245.

[52] Rosenwein, 'Worrying about Emotions in History', p.834

I shall start, therefore, by exploring the use of the body in conceptual metaphors of emotion, both modern and medieval. The 'hydraulic' model can be found in Köveces' cognitive linguistic studies on emotions as the metaphor: EMOTION IS A LIQUID IN A CONTAINER. In his study of happiness in Modern English, the linguist cites *I am full of joy* or *he was overflowing with joy* as the most common examples for this metaphor.[53] The phrase 'to be full of joy' does exists in Middle English but it is strikingly rare.[54] Outside of the reference to Venus being 'ful of Mirthe' (III, 715), there are only two occurrences of this metaphor in the *Troilus*. In a letter to Criseyde, Troilus explains that their parting has turned all his joy into its contrary but that with her coming home she can change that and 'more a thousand sithe/Than evere ich hadde encressen in me joie' (V, 1381-2). Joy here is not necessarily figured as a liquid but Troilus is definitely the container of his joy, which can increase inside of him. The second occurrence posits the heart, rather than the entire body, as the container of joy: 'wax sodeynliche his herte ful of joie' (III, 356). This is Troilus' reaction to Pandarus' promise of an intimate meeting with Criseyde and is compared with nature's revival in spring (III, 351-56). The internal and physiological event of his heart filling with joy is associated with an external and inevitable event. This example shows that while joy can be a bodily phenomenon, a LIQUID IN A CONTAINER, it is nonetheless conditioned by exterior forces.

---

[53] Though he studies conceptual metaphors in Modern English, a lot of similar metaphors can be found in Middle English. His terminology is therefore very useful in order to recognize and name conceptual metaphors of joy in Chaucer's English too. Kövecses uses the term 'happiness' as an umbrella term for positive emotion; he will then separate the concepts of 'joy' and 'happiness'. Before we come to this, however, I keep his use of the term as a general synonym of 'joy' and continue to use 'joy' as the prototypical term for positive emotion in Chaucer.

[54] It appears for example in the *Merchant's Tale*, in the wedding description; the palace is full of joy and so is every man in it: 'Al ful of joye and blisse is the paleys' (IV, 1712) and 'Al ful of joye and blisse is every man' (IV, 1771). It also appears in the *Nun's Priest's Tale* where Chauntecleer affirms: 'I am so ful of joye and of solas' (VII, 3170) and 'Ful is myn herte of revel and solas' (VII, 3203). These are the only examples in the *Canterbury Tales*. It is also used once in the *Boece* where a man can be 'ful of gladnesse' (3, p.9, 152). The *MED* confirms this trend as only very few citations of positive emotion words rely on this metaphor. One exception is this quote from Charles d'Orleans' English Poems*:* 108/3222 'Myn hert even fulle is of gladnes' or Gower who describes Fortune as 'Now full of blisse and now of bale' (*Confessio Amantis* 8, 589).

The metaphor is also used sparingly for sorrow. The 'full of' construction appears twice with *sorwe* (I, 712 and III, 1381)[55] and Troilus' woe is described as being 'in his brest […] heped' (IV, 236). The metaphor is also implicit in the physiological descriptions of the swollen heart (V, 201) and the unswelling of the heart through tears and complaints (IV, 1145-6 and V, 214). These images, built metaphorically through embodied realism and physiological discourse, can be related to the concept of sorrow as a heavy heart and posit the emotion as a fluid inside the body container.

Yet neither joy nor sorrow is predominantly written as such in the poem; in fact, as I shall soon demonstrate, Chaucer's English turns the metaphor around by making the body enter the emotion. Before I come to this, however, I wish to explore other ways joy is figured in relation to the body. The emotion can be expressed as an internal, physical reaction. In most of those instances, as we have seen, the emotion is conveyed through a movement of the heart: the heart plays (I, 1013), dances (II, 1304), it spreads and rises (I, 278; II, 980). Metaphorically, this writing of the joyful heart can be linked to the conceptual language linking joy with vitality and dilation. As Salmón points out, the humoural explanation of joy as an outpouring of heat and vital spirit 'fits intuitively with the experience of the body that each individual has when he or she is happy, a feeling of expansion and irradiation of warmth.'[56] Chaucer's writing of embodied emotion is thus physiological *and* metaphorical, relying on a common phenomenological experience of the body. Both the spreading and the dancing heart can be understood as participating in the metaphorical concepts of joy as VITALITY or AGITATION[57] as well as joy as DILATION, which does not appear in Modern English and is more closely linked to humoural theory.

[55] The phrase appears with other emotions too, such as dread or anguish (IV, 155 and IV, 1645), jealousy (II, 755) or pity (IV, 731).
[56] Salmón, 'Pleasures and Joys of the Humoral Body', p.53.
[57] Kövecses, 'Happiness', p.33.

These metaphors view joy as an energised and active state. In the *Troilus*, joy is expressed rhetorically through behavioural reactions such as dancing and singing (II, 952 and 955). They express a cultural and linguistic conception of joy as energetic behaviour, as well as festive and social. The ends of the first and third books present joy as a primarily social and public vitality: Troilus plays the lion in the war field (I, 1074), he leads his life 'in blisse and in singynges' (III, 1716) and he jousts and 'maketh festeynges' (III, 1718). Troilus is also said to 'lay tho no longer down/But up anon upon his stede' (I, 1072-3), which evokes the JOY IS UP metaphor.

Vitality and upward movement present a shared grammatical axis where joy is energy, height and lightness, and sorrow is apathy, downward movement and heaviness. The metaphors JOY IS LIGHT or FEELING LIGHT are common in the poem. For example, bringing comfort is equated to making one's heart lighter: 'this Pandarus,/That bisily did al his fulle myght/Hym to conforte and make his herte light' (V, 682-4).[58] Moreover, *hevynesse* is used as a synonym for sorrow throughout the poem.[59] This grammatical axis applies to the outward as well as the inward expression of emotion. The heart can dance and rise, and the concept of dilation is transposed to Troilus' public life as he becomes generous and expansive with joy. In noting how Troilus' glory in joy reaches the skies, Brown suggests that 'the outer manifestation of inner gladness [dilates] his personal and social spaces'.[60] There is continuity between the public discourse of emotion and the physiological one as both discourses convey joy as an expanding and energetic movement.

In Kövecses' study, the vitality of joy is also found in metaphors which imply loss of control and excess. For example, in the INSANITY, RAPTURE or OPPONENT metaphors, joy overpowers the self. The opponent metaphor conveys joy as an almost violent phenomenon, and 'one that has to be kept under control', such as in the phrase *she was*

[58] Other examples: III, 1082; IV, 410; V, 634, 1118.
[59] I, 24, 655; III, 1007, 1197, 1399, 1446; IV, 105, 363, 901, 1083, 1267; V, 140, 621, 791, 1214.
[60] Peter Brown, *Chaucer and the Making of Optical Space*, Bern: Peter Lang, 2007, p.298.

overcome by joy. Rapture encompasses notions of vitality and pleasure but also 'connotes excessiveness and loss of control' such as in: *I was delirious with joy, I was drunk/dizzy with joy*.[61] These images seem to be absent from the *Troilus.* In the poem, joy is not expressed as a frantic and uncontrollable passion but as rest and quiet and as an action of the body. The body is not overpowered or acted upon by joy: it actively creates joy. But while characters do not seem to get drunk on joy, Criseyde famously equates her growing feelings of love and desire to having been given a drink: 'who yaf me drynke?' (II, 651) she asks after witnessing the ravishing vision of Troilus in all his knightly glory. Love as a potion or as drunkenness is a common cultural metaphor in the Middle Ages, but not one that Chaucer favours. While his writing of lovesickness does imply a degree of loss of control and the body being overpowered, the positive aspects of love are not written as disease or intoxication. This is not the case in the work of his contemporary Gower who expands the metaphor of love as drunkenness to the joy of love as well. In a section dedicated to love in the book on gluttony, Amans records his experience of being love drunk:

> Min herte is full of such gladnesse
> That overpasseth so mi wit,
> That I wot nevere where it sit,
> Bot am so drunken of that sihte,
> Me thenkth that for the time I mihte
> Riht sterte thurgh the hole wall;
> And thanne I mai wel, if I schal,
> Bothe singe and daunce and lepe aboute,
> And holde forth the lusti route. (6.180-188)

In this passage, Gower conceptually writes the gladness of seeing one's beloved as a LIQUID IN A CONTAINER, as RAPTURE and INSANITY, as well as VITALITY and AGITATION. The expression of joy as vitality is encompassed in the conceptual metaphors of joy as filling the body and overpowering the mind. This is very different from Chaucer's

[61] Kövecses, 'Happiness', p.36.

writing of love's joy in the *Troilus*, which never seems to overpower the characters. It has more in common with his writing of sorrow, figured as a disease overpowering minds and bodies.[62]

Joy is by no means a threat to the lives of characters and is not an overcoming force. Yet, the concept of emotion as rapture or insanity may be seen to be inflected in the trope of joy as incapacitation. Joy alienates Troilus: 'what to don, for joie unnethe he wiste' (III, 1253) or 'where his spirit was, for joie he nyste' (III, 1351). This last sentence recalls Gower's Amans who, because of gladness, does not know where his wit 'sits' (6, 182). However, Troilus does not lose his wit but his *spirit*, his soul, and, therefore, himself. Moreover, while Amans is almost driven 'thurgh the hole wall' (6. 185), Troilus is nothing if not collected. His joy can be seen as a type of rapture or insanity but not in the sense of vitality, excessiveness and loss of control. Troilus is enraptured by the grandeur and the inexpressibility of his joy: he loses not control but his sense of self. Kövecses proposes another metaphor of emotion that corresponds to this identity loss: EMOTION IS A FORCE DISLOCATING THE SELF, of which a Modern English example is *she was beside herself with joy*.[63] This distinction between insanity and dislocation of the self is important. In the poem, only joy seems to generate this form of alienation. The insanity metaphors for sorrow present the individual as losing control in fits of violent madness and posit sorrow as a bodily disease. Sorrow can kill and turn people mad whereas joy generates a state where the individual does not know where their soul is. This dislocation of self prefaces the idea of joy as an accession to a new and other-worldly realm.

---

[62] In *Troilus,* sorrow is largely expressed through the metaphors of INSANITY and OPPONENT. It is figured as an enemy to be slain (II, 1358) and grieving characters are repeatedly described as mad and out of their wits (I, 108, 499; IV, 230, 348, 357; V, 1262, 1343). The emotion overcomes the mind and the body and is thus also figured as a DEADLY DISEASE. Troilus and Criseyde are often on the brink of death because of their sorrows (III, 362; IV, 429, 432, 1419), and, as I have shown already, woeful Troilus is treated as a patient by Pandarus.

[63] In Kövecses, 'The Conceptual Structure of Happiness', in Mikko Salmela, Anne Birgitta Pessi and Heli Tissari (eds.), *Happiness: Cognition, Experience, Language*, Helsinki: Helsinki College of Advanced Studies, 2008, 131-143, p.135.

This writing of joy points towards disembodiment: Troilus' spirit perhaps leaving its bodily encasement. This brings us to the metaphors which conceptualise joy as outside of and independent from the body. One of the most important metaphors for happiness in both Modern and Middle English consists of writing it as a commodity. The metaphor JOY IS A COMMODITY is present in *Troilus* and its most straight-forward representative is the use of the verb *to have* with positive emotions.[64] Troilus also speaks of Criseyde as the one who can 'my blisse brynge' (V, 658). This metaphor conceptualises happiness as 'external from the self and that the self gets from other.'[65] As such, the self loses their joy with the loss of the other. Consequently, with the loss of Criseyde, Troilus has 'his joy forlore' (V, 23). Sorrow is also written as a commodity in the poem, but as it is not an object anyone longs to possess, the expression is used to wish ill on somebody else: 'I bidde God, so yeve yow bothe sorwe' (III, 1470). The *MED* records a similar expression with the emotion of joy, namely the exclamation 'so god yeve me joie', indexed under the same heading as the asseveration, 'so have I joie' (3. (a)). As already explored in a previous section, these expressions posit the emotion of joy as a value onto which to swear and pray.

The concept of value is crucial to understand the figurative language of joy and happiness in our poem. In his survey, Kövecses offers 'a very general distinction […] between the metaphors that deal with happiness as a *value* and those that focus on happiness as an *emotion*.'[66] Here he also proposes a semantic separation of the words *happiness* and *joy*; in Modern English, happiness often refers to the value and joy to the emotion. Such a distinction is more difficult to make in Chaucer's English. The word *happiness* did not exist, and the concept of value is inherent in many mentions of the word *joy* which comes to encompass both 'emotion' and 'value'. I will therefore keep using *joy* as the more relevant term for the study of Chaucer's language. Kövecses then groups his different metaphors in

[64] III, 1215, 1379, 1687; IV, 1306; V, 118.
[65] Kövecses, 'Happiness', p.38.
[66] Kövecses, 'Happiness', p.37.

the two categories. Joy as value is understood as something exterior to the self and that the self strives for because it is good. The commodity metaphor as well as the JOY IS UP one, which relies on a conceptual system where up is good, belong to that category. Joy as an emotion, on the other hand, is encompassed in the metaphors of vitality, rapture, opponent and body as container, among others. It is characterised as being an immediate response that can be behavioural or physiological and that is high in intensity but not durable. Thus, whereas the former is primarily conceptualised as exterior, the latter is happening inside of the individual or at least has an impact on the body. *Troilus* contains both types of metaphor, which reveals a telling friction in the poem between joy as a physiological experience and joy as a value.

A classification of the different types of conceptual metaphors is informative. I hence turn to a different article by Kövecses where he separates the metaphors of joy into three categories: those which are common metaphors of emotion, those which express happiness through evaluation and those which are phenomenological. I reproduce here his tables as a comparative tool for the metaphors present in *Troilus and Criseyde*.[67]

General emotion metaphors for happiness

HAPPINESS IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER She was *bursting* with joy.
HAPPINESS IS FIRE/HEAT *Fires* of joy were *kindled* by the birth of her son.
HAPPINESS IS A NATURAL FORCE I was *overwhelmed* by joy.
HAPPINESS IS A PHYSICAL FORCE He was *hit* by happiness.
HAPPINESS IS A SOCIAL SUPERIOR They live a life *ruled* by happiness.
HAPPINESS IS AN OPPONENT She was *seized* by joy.
HAPPINESS IS A CAPTIVE ANIMAL All joy *broke loose* as the kids opened their presents.
HAPPINESS IS INSANITY The crowd *went crazy* with joy.
HAPPINESS IS A FORCE DISLOCATING THE SELF He was *beside himself* with joy.
HAPPINESS IS A DISEASE Her good mood was *contagious*.

Metaphors providing an evaluation of happiness

[67] In these tables I keep *happiness* as it is Kövecses' term but I use *joy* when turning to the Middle English poem. Kövecses, 'The Conceptual Structure of Happiness', pp. 135-6. I have added to this list the metaphor HAPPINESS IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY, present in Kövecses 1991 article 'Happiness: A Definitional Effort'.

HAPPINESS IS LIGHT He was *beaming* with joy.
HAPPINESS IS FEELING LIGHT (not HEAVY) I was *floating*.
HAPPINESS IS UP I'm feeling *up* today.
HAPPINESS IS BEING IN HEAVEN I was in *seventh heaven*.
HAPPINESS IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY You can't *buy* happiness.

Metaphors providing the phenomenological character of happiness

HAPPINESS IS AN ANIMAL THAT LIVES WELL I was *purring* with delight.
HAPPINESS IS A PLEASURABLE PHYSICAL SENSATION I was *tickled pink*.
HAPPINESS IS BEING DRUNK It was an *intoxicating* experience
HAPPINESS IS VITALITY He was full of *pep*.
HAPPINESS IS WARMTH What she said made me feel *warm* all over.

Most of the metaphors of the first category conceptualise emotions as embodied and violent processes. A lot of these can be found in the poem to express sorrow rather than joy. The second category presents the metaphors which conceptualise happiness as a value and the last, the empiricist and sensory metaphors based on bodily experience. Happiness, in Modern English, can be conceptually expressed as an agreeable sensation and an object or an overpowering feeling to be controlled. Though the concept of value is important, most of these metaphors express happiness as an embodied emotion. Even such a concept as 'feeling light', which Kövecses posits as an evaluation, involves bodily sensation. Let us now turn back to the poem. The following table presents the main metaphors of joy in *Troilus and Criseyde* under the same headings.

General emotion metaphors for joy

JOY IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER His herte wax ful of joye (III, 356).
JOY IS A FORCE DISLOCATING THE SELF Where his spirit was, for joie he nyste (III, 1351).

Metaphors providing an evaluation of joy

JOY IS LIGHT That overspradde hire brighte thoughtes alle (II, 769).
JOY IS FEELING LIGHT For which he felte his herte in joie flete (III, 1671).
JOY IS UP And me bistowed in so heigh a place (III, 1271).
JOY IS BEING IN HEAVEN For thow shalt into hevene blisse wende (III, 704)
JOY IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY So perfit joie may no nygard have (III, 1379).

Metaphors providing the phenomenological character of joy

JOY IS VITALITY And right for joie he felte his herte daunce (II, 1304).
JOY IS DILATION Lo myn herte,/It spredeth so for joie (II, 979-80).

Chaucer's English also uses metaphors from the three categories, yet his figurative writing of joy appears less based on embodied realism and the concept of emotion as overpowering. Only two 'emotion' metaphors are present, and one of them, that of the CONTAINER, is only used twice. The second one invokes emotion not as a force overwhelming the body and the senses but as one which affects identity and self-knowledge. Troilus' dislocation of self in joy is a reaction to communion with another human being and is valuable.[68] Sorrow's insanity and illness, by contrast, always results from isolation and separation. Two phenomenological metaphors appear in the poem. And while the examples cited above are indeed expressions of bodily experience, both the vitality and the dilation metaphors have outward projections and write joy as a public value. The joyful energy of Troilus – he fights well, sings, jousts and gives feasts – becomes glory: 'swich a vois was of hym and a stevene,/Thorughout the world, of honour and largesse' (III, 1723-4). His social space is expanded, dilated and his vitality in joy turned into honour and virtue. These metaphors thus ultimately present joy as a value, a valuable feeling or a valuable public behaviour.

Finally, the 'metaphors providing an evaluation of joy' rely on the grammatical axis previously explored, where joy is up, bright and light and sorrow is down, dark and heavy. These metaphors also express joy as exterior to the body and to the self: it is a commodity, it is a 'heigh place' and, above all, it is heaven. The strong correlation of joy with heaven in the poem makes joy a value and figures it as a place. This brings us to the last and most prolific metaphor of joy in the poem: JOY IS A PLACE. This metaphor does not appear in the list, as it is impossible to place in one of these three categories. It is not

[68] As Potkay suggests, joy is not in the self, it is found in a loss of the self and/or in union. Potkay, *Story of Joy*, p.16.

phenomenological, though the bodily experience of immersion appears to play a part in it. It is not an evaluation, though it is correlated to value through its association with heaven. And finally, it is common to the conception of several emotions in Middle English, but it is not embodied nor does the notion of control enter into it.

The place metaphor for emotions can be traced back to a cultural and linguistic tradition which conjures up the figuration of joy and sorrow as heaven or hell. This is especially relevant for joy, as the word *blisse* in Old and Middle English is strongly associated with heaven.[69] The last two definitions of *blisse* in the *MED* are explicitly theological, referring to the bliss of heaven as well as 'the place of perfect bliss, heaven' (3. (d)) and 'divine glory' (4). Similarly, the second definition of *joy* in the *MED* is '(a) The perfect joy of heaven' and '(b) place of perfect joy, heaven, paradise.' Joy is not only the emotion which belongs to heaven, it is itself the place where that emotion is felt. This transpires in Middle English syntax, where emotions are places where the body and the self can be. In the poem, this syntax is predominant: a great number of the emotion words of joy and sorrow occur with the prepositions *in* or *into*.[70] This can partly be attributed to the metaphorical use of heaven and hell to express earthly emotions. Amorous and sexual joy is consistently expressed as paradisal joy.[71] Earthly love's 'hevene blisse' brings together as one concept the place and the emotion. The movement from joy to sorrow or from sorrow to joy is also figured as a passage from heaven to hell or vice versa: Troilus tells Criseyde she has brought his soul 'Fro Flegitoun, the fery flood of helle' to rest in heaven (III, 1599-1600) and inversely in the fourth book Criseyde thinks how 'fro heven into which helle/She

[69] See Fabiszak, *Concept of 'Joy'*, p.44 and the definitions under 1.b in the *Dictionary of Old English: A to H*, Online, Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project, 2016.
[70] *Gladnesse*: I, 615; III, 1244; III, 1726. *Blisse*: III, 342, 1221, 1623, 1716 and '*hevene blisse'*: III, 704, 1322, 1657. *Joy*: I, 118; II, 833; III, 1413, 1671, 1678, 1714; IV, 274, 326. *Sorwe*: I, 641; III, 873; IV, 760, 906; V, 198, 723, 875, 1196. *Wo*: I, 248; II, 62; III, 863, 1385; IV, 305, 1205, 1268; V, 1566.
[71] On Chaucer's metaphorical use of heaven see Elizabeth Archibald, 'Chaucer's Lovers in Metaphorical Heaven', in Carolyn Muessig and Ad Putter, *Envisaging Heaven in the Middle Ages*, Abingdon: Routledge, 2007, 222-236.

fallen was' (IV, 712).

While the association of earthly joy with heaven is crucial in understanding the figuration of joy as place, the conceptual metaphor is not restricted to this analogy. Rather, it forms part of the general contingency of emotion and place in *Troilus and Criseyde*.[72] The imagery and the poetics of the text represent emotions as exterior to the self, as geographical places or times of the year which characters go through: emotions are like hills and valleys, springs and winters. Moreover, joy is also contingent on the city of Troy, its space and its fate. By grammatically making joy into a place, the poem not only links it to heaven, but can also convey it as a most private and secular space, one that is accessed through earthly love: 'love […] of alle joie had opened hire the yate' (III, 469). Here, through the mention of the gate, space is not only psychological, nor is it other-worldly: it is written as an actual place in the city.[73] Similarly, the role of Pandarus in bringing Troilus and Criseyde to joy reveals the conceptualisation of joy as place: he physically brings both of them to a place where they can be together and experience joy: 'in joie and suerte Pandarus hem two/Abedde brought, whan that hem bothe leste' (III, 1678-9). In this sentence, the verb *to bring* has two complements: the lovers are simultaneously brought 'in joie and suerte' as well as 'abedde'. The concept of joy becomes equated with the physical place of the bed, making the emotion contingent on this particular, private space. The importance of architectural spaces such as the bed or the closet has often been noted in the poem's writing of sexual joy. Strohm, for example, notes the presentation of 'an extensive range of interior spaces, in which domestic architecture provides the preconditions of enjoyment.'[74]

---

[72] Annette Kern-Stähler for example argues for the correlation of mental inner spaces and architectonic inner spaces in the poem. Kern-Stähler, *A Room of One's Own: Reale and Mentale Innenräume Weiblicher Selbstbestimmung Im Spätmittelalterlichen England*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2002, p.200.

[73] As Brown notes, in the poem, 'the spaces of Troy are internalized through metaphor'. Brown, *Optical Space*, p.283

[74] Paul Strohm, 'The Space of Desire in Chaucer's and Shakespeare's Troy', in Johnston, West-Pavlov and Kempf (eds.), *Love, History and Emotion*, 46-60, p.51.

As a precondition for joy, the lovers need to be brought to privacy, to an enclosed space. The verb *to bring in/to* is indeed used several times with positive emotions and it implies that joy needs an intermediary. The lovers, it appears, cannot get to joy by themselves. In the poem, this intermediary is Pandarus to whom Troilus asks: 'how can you brynge me to blisse?' (I, 623), and who promises Troilus 'to brynge the to joye out of distresse' (III, 245). The verb *to fall in* also collocates with joy on two occasions. A more surprising verb, as joy is commonly conceived as an upward movement or state and not a downward one. And yet characters 'fallen in a newe joye' (III, 1404) or 'fellen fro wo to wele' (I, 4). Here, the verb does not connote verticality but the unexpected and uncontrollable movement well known from the phrase 'to fall in love'. Joy is a place one falls into rather than reaches out of one's own volition and agency.

Interestingly, both of these verbs are absent from the instances where sorrow is written as place. Sorrow is a place where characters are, without having been brought there or having fallen into it: there may be wilfulness in the plaintive state of sadness. Moreover, the writing of sorrow as place manages to keep the emotion embodied. Sorrow appears as a state or a somatic condition characters are in rather than a place exterior to the body. This is achieved predominantly by the fact that sorrow as place is still recognisable, visible and audible, by a third party. Pandarus tells his niece of Troilus' sorrow: 'if ich al nyght wolde hym in sorwe se' (III, 873) and Criseyde says how hard it is to witness Troilus' sorrow: 'to sen that sorwe which that he is inne' (IV 906). The place of sorrow is that of tears and complaints and sighs. People would weep if they could hear Criseyde complaint 'in hire sorwe' (V, 723) and Troilus goes home at night 'in sorwe and in sikes sore' (V, 1196). Characters are *in* sorrow as they would be *in* tears; it is a bodily condition rather than a place where one can fall, bathe or float in. Moreover, the place metaphor for sorrow is sometimes combined with much more embodied and violent metaphors such as the OPPONENT one or the DISEASE one, resulting in the following examples: 'Who shal that sorwe slen that ye

ben inne?' (IV, 760) or 'To fynde boote of wo that we ben inne' (IV, 1259, *boote* meaning remedy, *MED* 2.(a)). The place metaphor thus seems to function differently with sorrow than with joy. While it does not disembody sorrow, it places joy as exterior to the self and as a valuable and sought-after place, whether it be heaven or the private bed-chamber.

The figuration of joy as place decidedly places the emotion outside of the body but it may still be phenomenological. When Troilus' heart is said to float in joy (III, 1671) and when happy lovers bathe in gladness or in bliss (I, 22; II, 849 and IV, 208), the metaphor may be seen to conjure up the sensory experience of being immersed in water or levitating. In these instances, one could argue for an origin in embodied realism: joy feels like the pleasurable sensation of soaking in warm water or of one's body becoming weightless. But this only works for these specific examples, and I argue that the origin of the place metaphor should rather be looked for in theological and eschatological language.

An important concept for the understating of joy and happiness in the Middle Ages, especially in philosophical discourse, is that of fullness. Perfect joy is that which desires nothing more; it is at rest and it is full. In theological discourse, however, this fullness is not taken in the self. Adam Potkay studies joy in John's Gospel where 'the notion of full [or complete, finished] joy […] is crucial'.[75] But this full, Christian joy is expressed in terms of spatiality and inwardness. The fullness of joy is not about the human body being *full* of joy but rather, as Potkay formulates, about '*getting inside*'.[76] Thomas Aquinas has expressed this concept most eloquently: 'it follows that this perfectly full joy is not taken into man, but, on the contrary, man enters into it, according to Matthew 25:21: "Enter into the joy of thy Lord."' (*Summa Theologiae,* II-II, 28, 3). The repetition of the preposition *into* is telling; full joy is not *in* man, man enters *into* full joy.[77] This is not the fullness of philosophical

[75] Potkay, *Story of Joy*, p.30.
[76] Ibid., p.31.
[77] In the original Latin the preposition *in* is repeated: 'inde est quod illud gaudium omnino plenum non capitur in homine, sed potius homo intrat in ipsum, secundum illud matth. xxv, intra in gaudium

happiness. The metaphor of joy/happiness as place in fact does not appear in the *Boece* where men can be bliss*ful*. *Blisfulnesse* cannot be entered. It is often looked for in different things and emotions, it is pursued and desired, but eventually it can only be found within oneself: '"O ye mortel folk, what seeke ye thanne blisfulnesse out of yourself whiche that is put in yowrself?"' (2, p.4, 128-30). Philosophical happiness is not a state one can be in, nor a place where one loses oneself, it is a concept, a value one has to understand and find in personal contemplation. The writing of joy as place also excludes humoural discourse and the hydraulic understanding of emotion. While characters are sorrow*ful* and woe*ful*, their bodies full of that emotion, they are not joy*ful*, rather they enter the fullness of joy. Joy suffuses the body.

The same phrase from Matthew's gospel is quoted in *Sawles Warde*, an allegorical treatise on the guardianship of the soul. In a vision of heaven, Christ addresses the company of saved souls, inviting them into the bliss of the Lord:

> Forthi seide ure Lauerd to theo the Him hefden icwemet: *Intra in gaudium, et cetera*. 'Ga,' quoth He, 'into thi Lauerdes blisse.' Thu most al gan thrin, ant al beon bigotten thrin, for in the ne mei hit nanes weis neomen in. 39. 7-9
> (Because our Lord said to those who had pleased Him: *Enter into rejoicing, etc*. 'Go,' said He, 'into your Lord's bliss.' You must all go into it, and be completely suffused by it, for it cannot in any way enter into you.)

The heavenly company will be *begotten* in bliss. This verb, from the Old English *begeotan,* signifies 'drench' or 'cover with a fluid'.[78] Bliss is figured as a liquid covering people and bodies. This same verb appears earlier in the vision of heaven to describe the apostles who are simultaneously filled and covered with bliss: 'Ich iseh the apostles […], ifullet ant bigoten al of unimete blisse' (29.3). Bliss here permeates the apostles' bodies, which are

domini tui.' (II-II, 28, 3). Thomas Aquinas, *Summae theologiae secunda secundae,* Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, Electronic edition, 2010.

[78] Definitions 2. and 2.a of the *Dictionary of Old English*.

both drenched and penetrated by it. This type of language characterises Chaucer's writing of love's joy as a bath of bliss.

The place metaphor thus needs to be traced to theological literature. A parallel can also be made with the contemporary religious poem *Pearl*, where joy belongs to a specific, delineated space; that of the eternal city of Jerusalem.[79] The poem constructs bliss as the heavenly, but also physical and urban, space of New Jerusalem, a place where one is brought to by God and which is yet out of reach for the narrator. In *Troilus*, Chaucer similarly builds joy as a place, difficult to reach and architectonically delineated; it is the bed in the private chamber and it is an impassably high place. In this poem, though, it is not Christ, but Love who opens the gate of joy: 'love […] of alle joie had opened hire the yate' (III, 469). Troy of course is not the eternal city of New Jerusalem and the lovers' space of joy will soon be destroyed. However, by making joy a place, Chaucer brings it outside and beyond the human body. This representation is embedded in a religious cultural grammar, which helps make joy in *Troilus and Criseyde* an immaterial and immersive value.

But while the figurative conception of love's joy evokes theological discourse, the ending of the poem, which sees Troilus' soul rise towards heavenly felicity, does not. Troilus' apotheosis is a far cry from the immersion in the fullness of bliss of religious language:

> And whan that he was slayn in this manere,
> His lighte goost ful blisfully is went
> Up to the holughnesse of the eighthe spere,
> In convers letyng everich element;
> And ther he saugh with ful avysement
> The erratik sterres, herkenyng armonye
> With sownes ful of hevenyssh melodie.
>
> And down from thennes faste he gan avyse

[79] The place metaphor is present in the poem and joy appears as the place where the Pearl-maiden is, 'in blysse […] blythely blent' (385) and to which the narrator does not have access; he is only brought *near* bliss (286), witnessing it but not truly experiencing it. Sarah Stanbury (ed.), *Pearl*, Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, TEAMS Online, 2001.

> This litel spot of erthe that with the se
> Embraced is, and fully gan despise
> This wrecched world, and held al vanite
> To respect of the pleyn felicite
> That is in hevene above; and at the laste,
> Ther he was slayn his lokyng down he caste, (V, 1807-20)

In his ascent, Troilus does not go into joy or into felicity; *pleyn felicite* is not a place, it is itself found *in* heaven above. The repetition of lexemes implying fullness, observed in the first chapter, grounds this passage in a philosophical and cognitive discourse rather than a religious and emotional one. Fullness here refers to Troilus' new mode of understanding and to his complete 'detachment from the enclosed space of human life on earth',[80] itself embraced by the sea. It is not in any way the immersive and enfolding fullness of heavenly bliss as written in theological literature. In fact, the place where Troilus' soul goes to is not heaven above but the hollow space of the eighth sphere. His new perspective is found in hollowness, through the outward movement which detaches him from earth, and the place of joy. Heavenly felicity is not the place he reaches but a philosophical concept from which earthly emotions are devalued. It belongs to a different discursive sphere than the ethereal experience of the place of 'hevene blisse', which is not exactly earthly and not exactly an emotion.

Conclusion: Joy as Felt Value

The grammar of joy in *Troilus* takes different forms. Its formal grammar pictures it as part of the universal cyclical change of the seasons and night and day, embedding it in a time-scheme where it must inevitably pass. The poem's rhyming patterns further constrict joy by linking it with Troy and reshaping its semantics with the connotations of doom and

[80] Windeatt, *Troilus and Criseyde*, p.197.

destruction. The rhyme also demands that joy be public, turned into a communal emotion akin to civic pride. Private and sexual joy thus appears highly compromised by its poetic and conventional encoding. The temporal grammar of joy further complicates the experience of joy as it becomes hoped for and anticipated, conditional and interrogative as well as remembered and imagined. Present, intimate joy is figured as the carnal and amorous emotion-space of bliss. It has to be stolen away from the light of day, and the public life of Troy, as well as the poem's time scheme and formal texture.

The poem's grammar confirms its participation in a literary form and tradition that is intrinsically sorrowful.[81] Sorrow is the stuff of poetry. It is at least very much the stuff of this particular poem. So much so that its narrator expresses his and poetry's inability to write joy. His distress at having to tell gladness (III, 46-8) prompts W. A. Davenport to comment: 'the implication seems to be that poetry is adequate or appropriate only to sorrow; faced with gladness it acknowledges something beyond itself, outside control, and as elsewhere, not in the poet's experience.'[82] Indeed, in *Troilus*, joy felt and private is presented as an escape from the poem itself. Ultimately, joy is allowed existence by being written as exterior to the body and as a value. The timelessness of love's joy and its disembodiment put a strain on its conception as emotion; human emotions are bound to time and to the body. Joy becomes embedded in the languages of philosophy and theology, which may be seen to abstract emotion from its psychological, physiological and subjective nature. Chaucer's writing of joy thus leads one to ask: if love poetry is the language of sorrow, is philosophical abstraction that of joy? Are earthly joy and happiness necessarily linked to a philosophical – or theological – quest? The poem indeed does present a joy that tests poetry and requests the frame of objective, philosophical language. During the consummation scene, the narrator

[81] As Lee Patterson puts it, there is a 'long-standing, perhaps permanent link between poetry and loss, […] complaint is virtually coextensive with poetry, indeed writing itself'. Patterson, 'Writing Amorous Wrongs', p.181.
[82] Davenport, *Chaucer: Complaint and Narrative*, p.149.

introduces the objective concept of *felicite* in order to provide a means of comparison for what love's joy is, or rather is not:

> Felicite, which that thise clerkes wise
> Comenden so, ne may nought here suffise;
> This joie may nought written be with inke;
> This passeth al that herte may bythynke. (III, 1691-4)

Clerkly happiness, a universal philosophical concept, cannot account for the specificity of *this* joy. Here joy appears 'unthinkable' except through the discourse of philosophy,[83] and yet it also surpasses it. *This* joy, which cannot be contained in the poetic medium nor in philosophical language, is what this poem is about.

Chaucer is not only interested in the exposition of the abstract value of this joy but also in its *feeling*. The poem blurs the boundary between joy as value – abstract, exterior, objective – and emotion – psycho-somatic and subjective. Joy as value, in the poem, is *felt.* After the consummation, Troilus tells Pandarus of his glad night and his ardent delight, but eventually struggles to express how he feels: 'I not myself naught wisly what it is,/But now I feele a newe qualitee –/Yee, al another than I dide er this' (III, 1653-5). This is loosely adapted from Boccaccio: Troiolo burns more than ever, but his fire is of a new quality: 'Io ardo più che mai, e questo foco,/ch'io sento nuovo, è d'altra qualitate/che quel di prima.' (III, 62). What Troiolo feels is the fire in him. On the other hand, what Chaucer's Troilus feels is a quality. *Qualite* here might be defined as a 'state or condition; an inherent attribute' (*MED* 1.(a)) or a 'disposition or constitution of spirit' (2.(a)).[84] The only other mention of

[83] As Rosenfeld suggests, 'happiness itself becomes unthinkable except through the language uneasily shared by clerks and lovers, a language that acknowledges human love as the experience that opens ethics toward the variety, mystery, and inexorability of the fortune-tossed world.' The unthinkable joys of sex and earthly love are indeed written inside the framing discourse of philosophical happiness. But as argued in the first chapter, lovers do not share the clerkly language of happiness. Love's earthly joy creates its own language in the poem. Rosenfeld, *Ethics and Enjoyment*, p.12.

[84] *Qualite* otherwise seems to be a technical term in Chaucer's corpus. Outside *Troilus,* it only appears in the *Boece* and the *Treatise on the Astrolabe*. In these contexts it means character or

the word in *Troilus* appears in the prologue to the third book to refer to the 'covered qualitee' (the 'hidden properties') of things (III, 31),[85] and of love especially, that only Venus knows. By the end of the book therefore, Troilus does not *know* the hidden quality of love, but he might be *feeling* it.

During the consummation scene, when the narrator struggles to mediate the lovers' joys, he expresses it as felt value:

> Of hire delit or joies oon the leeste
> Were impossible to my wit to seye;
> But juggeth ye that han ben at the feste
> Of swich gladnesse, if that hem liste pleye!
> I kan namore, but thus thise ilke tweye
> That nyght, bitwixen drede and sikernesse,
> Felten in love the grete worthynesse. (III, 1310-1316)

In this stanza, joy is variegated, plural and irretrievably subjective. The only way the narrator can write Troilus' and Criseyde's joy is by turning sensual joy into value. This passage condenses two stanzas from *Il Filostrato.* In the midst of the consummation scene, Boccaccio affirms that it would be too long and impossible to tell of the feast and pleasure (the Italian 'festa' and 'diletto', III, 31.1-2) that the lovers take together in this night. After this inexpressibilty topos though, Boccaccio does not turn to his readers but instead offers a description of Troiolo and Criseida getting to bed and undressing. Criseida, wearing but her last piece of clothing, 'l'ultima vesta' (III, 31.5), asks playfully whether she should remove it herself. Troiolo answers that he would love to have her in his arms, naked. Criseida then throws away her shirt and lies in his arms. Holding each other, they feel the last value of love: 'e strignendo l'un l'altro con fervore/d'amor sentiron l'ultimo valore' (III, 32.7-8). Chaucer thus follows Boccaccio for the concept of felt value. However, he removes the

---

temperament (*MED* 1.(a) and 2.(a)), as well as 'one of the four primary qualities: heat, coldness, wetness and dryness, inherent in all things' (3.(a)). The *MED* does not refer to the *Troilus* quote, which appears unique in its use of the verb *felen* with the noun *qualite*.

[85] 'Hidden properties' is the translation Barry Windeatt gives in his edition of *Troilus*, p.251.

practical description of the lovers undressing and getting in bed together. The passage is thus more abstract but also much more concerned with emotion and the way Troilus and Criseyde *feel.* The narrator painstakingly attempts to describe what their night *felt* like, between fear and security, sexual delight and celebratory feast. Muscatine suggests that 'for Boccaccio, love's 'ultimo valore' has nothing in it so remote and elevated that it cannot dwell with the intimate and closely appreciated detail of sexual play.'[86] And Jill Mann argues that Chaucer's 'grete worthynesse'[87] has an 'emotional resonance that goes far beyond Boccaccio's notion of physical rapture'. [88]

These observations rely on context, but they are also validated by the minute changes in grammar and lexis that Chaucer's translation operates. Firstly, Boccaccio's '*ultimo* valore', the last value, expresses culmination and closure: sexual intercourse is the last of a number of steps, or degrees of love. Chaucer's 'grete' value on the other hand does not imply gradation. Secondly, the Italian lovers feel the ultimate value *of* love, whereas Troilus and Criseyde feel worthiness *in* love. In the poem therefore, sexual joy is not conceived as the last step in the graded scheme of love but rather as the emotional value reached in the high place of love. Love in Chaucer is at once the place of physical joy and of great abstract value.

The central depiction of love's *gladnesse* thus encapsulates the irreducible tensions at play in the poetic representation of joy. Chaucer writes joy as a spiritual destination and a philosophical concept, but this abstraction is also and primarily an attempt at the writing of felt emotion. This felt emotion, however, cannot be written in and on the body the same way sorrow is, because it is, contrary to sorrow, essentially good. Value, goodness cannot be written with the body, even when it originates in it. The writing of joy in *Troilus and*

---

[86] Muscatine, *Chaucer and the French Tradition*, p.127.
[87] Benson, in the *Riverside,* argues that with the noun *worthinesse,* Chaucer 'catches the etymological notion in 'valore' of worth, but adds a connotation of dignity and omits the connotation of strength.' (p.1042).
[88] Jill Mann, 'Shakespeare and Chaucer: What is Criseyde Worth?', *The Cambridge Quarterly*, XVIII:2, 1989, 109-120.

Criseyde thus exposes an earthly joy which goes beyond the humoural body and which is (a) good in itself. Even though theoretical abstraction seems to be the more appropriate language for joy as it escapes the narrator's experience and poetic language, it is in the end through the poetic medium, one that allows for ambiguity, that joy can be expressed, in love and in worthiness. While poetry appears as the medium of loss and sorrow, Chaucer pushes its boundaries and makes space for joy.

CONCLUSION

Finding joy in *Troilus and Criseyde* requires the exploration of the poem from different perspectives and the broadening of our understanding of what joy may be. The fact that joy is nowhere to be found in modern criticism on Chaucer and in emotion studies is the reflection of a general struggle to find and define the emotion, be it in history, in literary criticism, or in psychology. The elusive and imponderable nature of joy is heightened today by its opposition to the predominant discourse of happiness. Happiness has become a public injunction and a personal responsibility. As a public and objective notion, happiness has left the discourses of philosophy and morality to enter that of psychology and economics. Companies employ chief happiness officers and happiness is being measured and quantified on a national scale.[1] It is an industry.[2] It is sold as a form of self-fashioning: happiness is fitness and self-confidence, but it can also be bought one pleasure at a time. If happiness is an obligation as an employee, as a citizen and as an individual, joy might be seen on the other hand as a release. Joy cannot be obligatory because it cannot be expected, or fabricated. It cannot be bought nor quantified. It is an ego-less experience, individual but often communicative, or felt in communion. While happiness becomes an object of ubiquitous and scientific discourse, joy still tests conventional linguistic expression.

---

[1] In contemporary culture, happiness forms part of a public discourse of progress. Happiness is becoming a politic and economic measure to calculate a nation's success. See the United Nations' report on happiness as an economic paradigm: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?page=view&type=400&nr=617&menu=35

[2] For a critique of the industry of happiness see William Davies, *The Happiness Industry*, London: Verso, 2015.

This ego-less experience is what the contemporary British author Zadie Smith attempts to put into words in an essay on joy. She distinguishes joy from her daily encounters with pleasure and describes her first glimpse of what joy may be in a drug-fuelled night, in communion with hundreds of strangers:

> It included, in minor form, the great struggle that tends to precede joy, and the feeling – once one is 'in' joy – that the experiencing subject has somehow 'entered' the emotion, and disappeared. I 'have' pleasure, it is a feeling I want to experience and own. A beach holiday is a pleasure. A new dress is a pleasure. But on that dance floor I *was* joy, or some small piece of joy, with all these other hundreds of people who were also a part of joy.[3]

Taking ecstasy is comparable to joy because it allows one to access a different reality, one where the self gets lost. The discourse of joy is one of transcendence: it is accessed outside of the self, in communion and in alienation. The language of joy, be it in Smith's ecstatic incorporation of the emotion or Chaucer's immersion in sexual *hevene blisse,* reveals its part of spirituality.

The imponderable element of joy finds expression, centuries apart, through the translation of emotion into space. Joy thus appears almost universal in its conceptualisation as an out-of-body experience. Yet, it cannot be extracted from the cultural discourses that construct it. Zadie Smith's ego-less and unhealthy joy found in drugs and partying makes particular sense in opposition to a happiness culturally scripted and marketed as healthiness and self-improvement. Chaucer's writing of love's joy as a fullness one enters is formulated through theological grammar but also framed by the discourse of philosophical happiness as an immaterial value. What these discourses seem to indicate is that joy somehow exceeds the definition of emotion. The study of joy in history and in literature is crucial to understand

[3] Zadie Smith, 'Joy', *The New York Review of Books*, 60:1, 2013.

how we navigate, experientially and linguistically, such an emotion which challenges embodiment and appears to be always framed by yet exceeds moral and objective language.

This dissertation makes space for the study of joy in the history of emotions by challenging the very concept of emotion. To find joy in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, a poem which systematically constrains and compromises it, one needs to reassess and to recalibrate what an emotion is. Chaucer writes joy, but he writes it as felt value. An emotion is a psycho-somatic agitation, an 'instinctive feeling as distinguished from reasoning or knowledge.'[4] Joy in *Troilus and Criseyde* is often not psycho-somatic, yet it is felt. In Chaucer's language, where the word 'emotion' does not exist, a 'feeling' can be the sensation of an emotion but also of a value or a quality. To feel in Chaucer's English is not only sensory or emotional. Feeling bridges the emotional and the intellectual, it is an awareness.[5] In joy, Troilus feels a new quality: the access to joy is the access to a new consciousness. There is a before and an after joy. It is not an emotion but the *feeling* and the recognition of great value. If the ending offers Troilus a new cognitive and philosophical perspective, the centre of Book III offers him a new affective and human perspective.

Joy in Chaucer's language thus cannot be contained in pre-existing categories of meaning, it is shaped through the literary text: to get to the joy of *Troilus and Criseyde*, one needs to get to how the poem is made. Literary tradition, and the different forms it may take (linguistic aspects, characterisation, rhymes, invocations of the Muses or literary *topoi*), is a very important part of the way emotion is produced. This is especially relevant in this poem where Chaucer finds new ways to write love and sensuality in order to make space for joy under the weight of literary tradition and the tragic mode of his story. The study of the discourse of joy causes us to recalibrate the place of love and sex in the poem and offers a

[4] *OED*, 3. b.
[5] Some relevant definitions of 'felinge' in the *MED*: 1. (a) The act of touching. 4. The condition of being aware, consciousness. 5. (a) A feeling (of joy, sorrow etc.), an emotion; (b) capacity for emotion, emotional sensibility. 6. (a) Mental awareness (of a fact); skill or discernment (in an art); understanding (of an idea or a branch of knowledge).

new perspective on Chaucer's language. Through his use of theological grammar, the poet makes joy, rather than sensuality or pleasure, the destination of earthly love. Love, therefore, is not only written as carnal nor is it only expressed through the language of the religion of love: Chaucer's writing of love's desire and pleasure is different from his writing of love's joy, which is embedded in the discourses of heavenly bliss and philosophical felicity and turned into an affective and cognitive value. The study of joy in *Troilus and Criseyde* eventually reveals how the author pushes the boundaries of his own poetic language to accommodate for the valuation of true, earthly joy. Similarly, we, as historians of emotions, must be ready to push the boundaries of what we consider an emotion may be in order to understand its past and its literary presence. Then, perhaps we can make space for joy in our discipline.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Alighieri, Dante, *La Commedia*, Petrocchi, Giorgio (ed.), Bologna: Il Mulino, 1971.

Aquinas, Thomas, *The Collected Works of St. Thomas Aquinas*, Charlottesville: InteLex Corp, Electronic edition, 1993.

Aquinas, Thomas, *Summae theologiae secunda secundae,* Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, Electronic edition, 2010.

Benson, Larry D. (ed.), *The Riverside Chaucer*, 3rd edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Boccaccio, Giovanni, *Il Filostrato e il Ninfale Fiesolano*, Pernicone, Vincenzo (ed.), Bari: Gius. Laterza & Figli, 1937.

- *Teseida: delle Nozze d'Emilia,* Alberto Limentani (ed.), Milano: Mondadori, 1992.

Boethius, Anicius Manlius Severinus, *Consolatio Philosophiae*, O'Donnell, James J. (ed.), Bryn Mawr: Bryn Mawr College, 1984.

Chaucer, Geoffrey, *Troilus and Criseyde*, Barney, Stephen A. (ed.), New York, London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2006.

Crampton, Georgia Ronan (ed.), *The Shewings of Julian of Norwich*, Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, TEAMS Online, 1999.

De Lorris, Guillaume and de Meun, Jean, *Le Roman de la Rose*, Langlois, Ernest (ed.), 5 vols., Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1914-24.

Dedeck-Hery, V. L. (ed.), 'Boethius's *De Consolatione* by Jean de Meun', *Medieval Studies*, 14, 1952, 165-275.

Deguileville, Guillaume, *Le Pelerinage de Vie Humaine*, Stürzinger, J. J. (ed.), London: Rorburghe Club, 1893.

Gower, John, *Confessio Amantis*, Peck, Russell A. (ed.) and Galloway, Andrew (trans.), 3 vols., Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, TEAMS Online, 2004.

Hasenfratz, Robert (ed.), *Ancrene Wisse*, Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, TEAMS Online, 2000.

Huber, Emily Rebekah and Robertson, Elizabeth (eds.), *The Katherine Group (MS Bodley 34)*, Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, TEAMS Online, 2016.

Lewis, C. S., *Surprised by Joy*, London: Collins, 1955.

Malory, Thomas, *Le Morte Darthur*, Shepherd, Stephen H. A. (ed.), New York, London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2004.

Smith, Zadie, 'Joy', *The New York Review of Books*, 60:1, 2013.

Stanbury, Sarah (ed.), *Pearl*, Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, TEAMS Online, 2001.

Trevisa, John, *On the Properties of Things: John Trevisa's Translation of Bartholomaeus Anglicus De Proprietatibus Rerum*, Seymour, M. C. et. al. (eds.), 3 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975-88.

Usk, Thomas, *The Testament of Love*, Shoaf, R. Allen (ed.), Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, TEAMS Online, 1998.

Windeatt, Barry (ed.), *Troilus and Criseyde: A New Edition of 'The Book of Troilus'*, London, New York: Longman, 1984.

Secondary Literature

Aers, David, 'Criseyde: Woman in Medieval Society', *The Chaucer Review*, 13:3, 1979, 177-200.

- *Chaucer*, Brighton: Harvester, 1986.

Allen, Mark, 'Mirth and Bourgeois Masculinity in Chaucer's Host', in Beidler, Peter G. (ed.), *Masculinities in Chaucer*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1998, 9-22.

Allen, Valerie, 'Waxing Red: Shame and the Body, Shame and the Soul', in Perfetti, Lisa (ed.), *The Representation of Women's Emotions in Medieval and Early Modern Culture*, Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2005, 191-210.

Ansgar Kelly, Henry, *Chaucerian Tragedy*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2000.

apRoberts, Robert P., 'Love in the *Filostrato*', *The Chaucer Review*, 7:1, 1972, 1-26.

Archibald, Elizabeth, 'Chaucer's Lovers in Metaphorical Heaven', in Muessig, Carolyn and Putter, Ad (eds.), *Envisaging Heaven in the Middle Ages*, Abingdon: Routledge, 2007, 222-236.

- 'Baths of Bliss in the Middle Ages: Fact and Fiction', talk given on the 27th February 2014. https://www.dur.ac.uk/research/ils/videos1314/archibald/

Balgradean, Ioana, 'The Challenge of Corporeity: Fictionalising the Emotional Body', *MAEDICA – A Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 8:1, 2013, 86-91.

Baum, Paull F., *Chaucer: A Critical Appreciation,* Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1958.

Bennett, Andrew and Royle, Nicholas, *Introduction to Literature Criticism and Theory*, 4th edition, Hoboken: Taylor and Francis, 2014.

Benson, C. David, *Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde*, London: Unwin Hyman, 1990.

- 'The Opaque Text of Chaucer's Criseyde', in Cox, C. S. and Shoaf, R. A. (eds.), *Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde: Subgit to alle Poesye: Essays in Criticism*, Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1992, 17-28.

Benson, Larry Dean, *A Glossarial Concordance to the Riverside Chaucer*, 2 vols., New York, London: Garland, 1993.

Benson, Robert G., *Medieval Body Language: A Study of the Use of Gesture in Chaucer's Poetry*, Anglistica, 21, 1980.

Blamires, Alcuin, 'The "Religion of Love" in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* and Medieval Visual Art', in Daly, P. M., Höltgen, K. J., and Lottes, W. (eds.), *Word and Visual Imagination: Studies in the Interaction of English Literature and the Visual Arts,* Erlangen: Universitätsbund Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1988, 11-31.

Bloomfield, Morton W., 'Distance and Predestination in *Troilus and Criseyde*', *PMLA*, 72, 1957, 14-26.

Boquet, Damien and Nagy, Piroska, 'Une histoire des émotions incarnées', in *Médiévales*, 61, 2011, 5-24.

Brandsma, Frank, Larrington, Carolyne, and Saunders, Corinne (eds.), *Emotions in Medieval Arthurian Literature*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2015.

Brandsma, Frank, 'Blide Ende Drove: Mixed Emotions in Middle Dutch Arthurian Romance', JIAS, 4:1, 2016, 104-12.

Brewer, Derek, *A New Introduction to Chaucer,* London, New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 1984.

Brînduşa, Grigoriu, '"Tristan or Optimism": the Bright Side of Béroul', *JIAS*, 4:1, 2016, 69-80.

Brown, Peter, *Chaucer and the Making of Optical Space*, Bern: Peter Lang, 2007.

Burnley, David, 'Chaucer's *Termes*', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 7, 1977, 53-67.

- *Chaucer's Language and the Philosophical Tradition*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1979.

- ‘Criseyde’s Heart and the Weakness of Women: An Essay in Lexical Interpretation’, *Studia Neophilologica*, 54:1, 1982, 15-38.

- *A Guide to Chaucer’s Language*, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994.

Burns, Chester R., ‘The Nonnaturals: A Paradox in Western Concept of Health’, *The Journal of Medicine and Philosophy*, 1:3, 1976, 202-11.

Burrow, J. A., *Gestures and Looks and Medieval Narrative*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Camargo, Martin, ‘The Consolation of Pandarus’, *The Chaucer Review*, 25:3, 1991, 214-28.

Camproux, Charles, *Le ‘Joy d’Amor’ des Troubadours: Jeu et Joie d’Amour*, Montpellier: Causse et Castelnau, 1965.

Cannon, Christopher, *The Making of Chaucer’s English: A Study of Words*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Carruthers, Mary, ‘On Affliction and Reading, Weeping and Argument: Chaucer’s Lachrymose Troilus in Context’, *Representations*, 93, 2006, 1-21.

- ‘Virtue, Intention and the Mind’s Eye in Chaucer’s *Troilus and Criseyde*’, in Brewer, Charlotte and Windeatt, Barry (eds.), *Traditions and Innovations in the Study of Middle English Literature*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2013, 73-87.

Carton, Evan, ‘Complicity and Responsibility in Pandarus’ Bed and Chaucer’s Art’, *PMLA*, 94, 1979, 47-61.

Classen, Albrecht, ‘Laughter as an Expression of Human Nature in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period: Literary, Historical, Theological, Philosophical, and Psychological Reflections. Also an Introduction’, in Classen, Albrecht (ed.), *Laughter in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times. Epistemology of a Fundamental Human Behavior, its Meaning, and Consequences*, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, 1-140.

Cohen-Hanegbi, Na’ama, ‘The Matter of Emotions: Priests and Physicians on the Movements of the Soul’, in *POETICA*, 72, 2009, 21-42.

- ‘Bodily Pleasures: Late Medieval Medical Counsel in Context’, in Cohen-Hanegbi, Na’ama and Nagy, Piroska (eds.), *Pleasure in the Middle Ages*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2018, 59-76.

- and Nagy, Piroska, ‘Introduction’, in *Pleasure in the Middle Ages*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2018, xi-xxii.

Collins, Shane Maurice, *The Language of the Body: An Analysis of Chaucer, Dunbar and Henryson*, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2012.

Cook, Robert G., ‘Chaucer’s Pandarus and the Medieval Ideal of Friendship’, *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 69:3, 1970, 407-24.

Cooper, Geoffrey, '*Sely John* in the *Legende* of the *Miller's Tale*', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 79:1, 1980, 1-12.

Cooper, Helen, 'Afterword: Malory's Enigmatic Smiles', in Brandsma, Frank, Larrington Carolyne and Saunders, Corinne (eds.), *Emotions in Medieval Arthurian Literature*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2015, 181-188.

Crocker, Holly A. and Pugh, Tison, 'Masochism, Masculinity, and the Pleasures of Troilus', in Pugh, Tison and Smith Marzec, Marcia (eds.), *Men and Masculinities in Chaucer's* Troilus and Criseyde, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2008, 82-96.

Davenport, W. A., *Chaucer: Complaint and Narrative*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1988.

David, Alfred, 'Chaucerian Comedy and Criseyde', in Salu, Mary (ed.), *Essays on* '*Troilus and Criseyde'*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1980, 90-104.

Davies, William, *The Happiness Industry*, London: Verso, 2015.

Dawson, J. L. and Pickles, J. D., *A Concordance to Gower's* Confessio Amantis, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1987.

Diller, Hans-Jürgen, *Words for Feelings: Studies in the History of the English Emotion Lexicon*, Heidelberg: Winter, 2014.

Dinshaw, Carolyn, *Chaucer's Sexual Poetics*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

Dixon, Thomas, *From Passions to Emotions: the Creation of a Secular Psychological Category*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

- *Weeping Britannia: Portrait of a Nation in Tears*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Donaldson, E. Talbot, 'Chaucer the Pilgrim', *PMLA*, 69, 1954, 928-36.

- 'The Ending of Chaucer's *Troilus*', in Donaldson, E. Talbot, *Speaking of Chaucer*, New York, London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1970, 84-101.

Downes, Stephanie and McNamara, Rebecca, 'The History of Emotions and Medieval Literature', *Literature Compass*, 13:3, 2016, 444-56.

Eming, Jutta, 'Emotionen als Gegenstand mediävistischer Literaturwissenschaft', in *Journal of Literary Theory*, 1:2, 2008, 251-273.

- 'On Stage. Ritualized Emotions and Theatricality in Isolde's Trial', *MLN*, 124:3, 2009, 555-571.

Fabiszak, Malgorzata, *The Concept of 'Joy' in Old and Middle English: A Semantic Analysis*, Pila: Wyzsza Szkola Biznesu, 2001.

Ferguson, Brigit G., 'The Pleasure of Martyrdom', *Mirabilia*, 18:1, 2014, 116-36.

Flannery, Mary C., 'A Bloody Shame: Chaucer's Honourable Women', *The Review of English Studies*, 62, 2011, 337-57.

- 'Personification and Embodied Emotional Practice in Middle English Literature', *Literature Compass*, 13:6, 2016, 351-61.

Fowler, Elizabeth, *Literary Character: The Human Figure in Early English Writing*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Fradenburg, L. O. Aranye, *Sacrifice Your Love: Psychoanalysis, Historicism, Chaucer*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

Fumo, Jamie C., 'The Ends of Love: (Meta)physical Desire in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', in Epstein, R. and Robins, W. (eds.), *Sacred and Profane in Chaucer and Late Medieval Literature*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016, 68-90.

Gallagher, Patrick J., 'Chaucer and the Rhetoric of the Body', *The Chaucer Review*, 28:3, 1994, 216-236.

Ganim, John M., 'Tone and Time in Chaucer's *Troilus*', *ELH*, 43:2, 1976, 141-153.

Gaylord, Alan T., 'The Lesson on the *Troilus*: Chastisement and Correction', in Salu, Mary (ed.), *Essays on 'Troilus and Criseyde'*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1980, 23-42.

Gertsman, Elina (ed.), *Crying in the Middle Ages: Tears of History*, New York, London: Routledge, 2011.

Ghose, Indira, 'The Paradoxes of Early Modern Laughter: Laurent Joubert's *Traité du Ris*.', in Falconer, Rachel and Renevey, Denis (eds.), *Medieval and Early Modern Literature, Science and Medicine*, Tübingen: Narr Verlag, 2013, 19-31.

Gilles, Sealy, 'Love and Disease in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *Studies in the Ages of Chaucer*, 25, 2003, 157-197.

Gordon, Ida L., 'Processes of Characterisation in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', in Barron, W. R. J., Blamires, D., Rothwell, W. and Thorpe, L. (eds.), *Studies in Medieval Literature and Languages*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1973, 117-131.

Harbus, Antonina, *Cognitive Approaches to Old English Poetry*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2012.

- 'Embodied Emotion, Conceptual Metaphor, and the Aesthetics of Reading Old English Poetry', in Champion, Michael and Lynch, Andrew (eds.), *Understanding Emotions in Early Europe*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2015, 127-149.

- 'Emotion and Narrative Empathy in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*', *English Studies*, 97:6, 2016, 594-607.

- 'Medieval English Texts and Affects: Narratives as Tools for Feeling', in Wehrs, Donald R. and Blake, Thomas (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Affect Studies and Textual Criticism*, Cham: Springer, 2017, 545-76.

Hardman, Philippa, 'Chaucer's Muses and his "Art Poetical"', *The Review of English Studies*, 37:148, 1986, 478-494.

- 'Chaucer's Man of Sorrows: Secular Images of Pity in the *Book of the Duchess,* the *Squire's Tale,* and *Troilus and Criseyde*', in *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 93:2, 1994, 204-227.

Heffernan, Carol Falvo, *Boccaccio, Chaucer and Comedy*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2009.

Herman, John P., 'Gesture and Seduction in *Troilus and Criseyde*', in Cox, C. S. and Shoaf, R. A. (eds.), *Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde: Subgit to alle Poesye: Essays in Criticism*, Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1992, 138-60.

Hill, John M., 'The Countervailing Aesthetic of Joy in Troilus and Criseyde', *The Chaucer Review*, 39:3, 2005, 280-297.

- *Chaucer's Neoplatonism: Varieties of Love, Friendship, and Community*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc., 2018.

Horner, Patrick J., 'To "Speken in Amphibologies": Reading *Troilus and Criseyde,* Book V, 763', *The Chaucer Review*, 47:1, 2012, 84-94.

Howard, Donald R., 'Literature and Sexuality: Book III of Chaucer's *Troilus*', *The Massachusetts Review*, 8:3, 1967, 442-456.

Jaeger, C. Stephen, *Ennobling Love: in Search of a Lost Sensibility*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.

- 'Emotions and Sensibilities: Some Preluding Thoughts', in Jaeger, C. Stephen and Kasten, Ingrid (eds.), *Codierung von Emotionen im Mittelalter*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co., 2003, VII-XII.

Jorgensen, Alice, McCormack, Frances and Wilcox, Jonathan (eds.), *Anglo-Saxon Emotions: Reading the Heart in Old English Language, Literature and Culture*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2015.

Jouve, Vincent, *L'effet-personnage dans le roman,* Paris: PUF, 1992.

Joy-Knight, Kimberley, 'Si Puose Calcina A' Propi Occhi: The Importance of the Gift of Tears for Thirteenth-Century Religious Women and Their Hagiographers', in Gertsman, Elina (ed.), *Crying in the Middle Ages: Tears of History*, New York, London: Routledge, 2011, 136-155.

Kellogg, Laura, 'Boccaccio's Criseida and her Narrator', *Critical Matrix,* 1991, 6:1, 46-75.

Kern-Stähler, Annette, *A Room of One's Own: Reale and Mentale Innenräume Weiblicher Selbstbestimmung im Spätmittelalterlichen England*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2002.

King, Peter, 'Emotions in Medieval Thought', in Goldie, Peter (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Emotion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010, 167-188.

Kittredge, George Lyman, *Chaucer and his Poetry*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University

Press, 1915.

Kochanske Stock, Lorraine, '"Slydynge" Critics: Changing Critical Constructions of Chaucer's Criseyde in the Past Century', in Vitto, Cindy L. and Smith Marzec, Marcia (eds.), *New Perspectives on Criseyde*, Asheville: Pegasus Press, 2004, 11-36.

Kövecses, Zoltan, 'Happiness: A Definitional Effort', *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 6:1, 1991, 29-47.

- *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

- 'The Conceptual Structure of Happiness', in Salmela, Mikko, Pessi, Anne Birgitta and Tissari, Heli (eds.), *Happiness: Cognition, Experience, Language*, Helsinki: Helsinki College of Advanced Studies, 2008, 131-144.

Knuuttila, Simo, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

- 'On the History of the Tables in Taxonomy of Emotions', *L'Atelier du CRH*, 16, 2016, 1-36.

Lakoff, George and Johnson, Mark, *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

- 'Why Cognitive Linguistics Requires Embodied Realism', *Cognitive Linguistics*, 13:3, 2003, 245-263.

Lambert, Mark, 'Telling the Story in *Troilus and Criseyde*', in Boitani, Piero and Mann, Jill (eds.), *The Cambridge Chaucer Companion*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986, 78-92.

Larrington, Carolyne, '"Wyȝe, welcum iwys to þis place!": Emotions in the Schemas for Arrival, Return and Welcome at the Arthurian Court', *JIAS*, 4:1, 2016, 92-103.

Latré, Guido, Braet, Herman and Verbeke, Werner (eds.), *Risus Mediaevalis: Laughter in Medieval Literature and Art*, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003.

Lawton, David, *Chaucer's Narrators*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1985.

Lazar, Moshe, 'Fin'Amor', in Akehurst, F.R.P. and Davis, Judith M. (eds.), *The Handbook of the Troubadours*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995, 61- 100.

Lazikani, Ayoush, *Cultivating the Heart: Feeling and Emotion in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Religious Texts*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2015.

Levine, Robert, 'Restraining Ambiguities in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 87, 1986, 558-64.

Lockett, Leslie, *Anglo-Saxon Psychologies in the Vernacular and Latin Traditions*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011.

Lombardo, Nicholas E., 'Emotions and Psychological Health in Aquinas', in Carrera, Elena (ed.), *Emotions and Health, 1200-1700,* Leiden: Brill, 2013, 19-46.

Lynch, Andrew, 'Positive Emotions in Arthurian Romance: Introduction', *JIAS*, 4:1, 2016, 53-57.

Mann, Jill, 'Troilus' Swoon', *The Chaucer Review*, 14:4, 1980, 319-35.

- 'Shakespeare and Chaucer: What is Criseyde Worth?', *The Cambridge Quarterly*, XVIII:2, 1989, 109-120.

- *Feminizing Chaucer,* 2nd edition, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2002.

- 'Chance and Destiny in *Troilus and Criseyde* and *The Knight's Tale*', in Mann, Jill and Boitani, Piero (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Chaucer*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, 93-111.

Maddern, Philippa, 'Reading Faces: How did Late Medieval Europeans Interpret Emotions in Faces?', *Postmedieval*, 8:1, 2017, 12-34.

- '"It Is Full Merry in Heaven": The Pleasurable Connotations of "Merriment" in Late Medieval England', in Cohen-Hanegbi, Naama and Nagy, Piroska (eds.), *Pleasure in the Middle Ages*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2018, 21-38.

Massumi, Brian, 'The Autonomy of Affect', *Cultural Critique*, 31:2, 1995, 83-109.

Mauss, Marcel, 'L'expression obligatoire des sentiments (Rituels oraux funéraires australiens)', *Journal de psychologie*, 18, 1921, 425-434.

McCall, John P., 'The Trojan Scene in Chaucer's *Troilus*', *ELH*, 29:3, 1962, 263-275.

McCann, Daniel, 'Feeling Dredeful: Fear and Therapy in *The Scale of Perfection*', in Langlotz, Andreas and Soltysik Monnet, Agnieszka (eds.), *Emotion, Affect, Sentiment: The Language and Aesthetics of Feeling*, Tübingen: Narr Verlag, 89-107.

McInerney, Maud, '"Is this a mannes herte?": Unmanning Troilus through Ovidian Allusion', in Beidler, Peter G. (ed.), *Masculinities in Chaucer*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1998, 221-36.

McMahon, Darrin, 'From the Happiness of Virtue to the Virtue of Happiness: 400 B. C. – A. D. 1780', *Daedalus*, 133:2, 2004, 5-17.

- 'Finding Joy in the History of Emotions', in Matt, Susan J. and Stearns, Peter N. (eds.), *Doing Emotions History*, Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2013, 103-19.

McNamara, Rebecca F., 'Wearing your Heart on your Face: Reading Lovesickness and the Suicidal Impulse in Chaucer', *Literature and Medicine*, 33:2, 2015, 258-78.

McNamer, Sarah, 'Feeling', in Strohm, Paul (ed.), *Oxford Twenty-First Century Approaches to Literature: Middle English*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, 241-57.

- *Affective Meditation and the Invention of Medieval Compassion*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

- 'The Literariness of Literature and the History of Emotion', *PMLA*, 130:5, 2015, 1433-42.

McTaggart, Anne, *Shame and Guilt in Chaucer*, New York, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

- 'Shamed Guiltless: Criseyde, Dido and Chaucerian Ethics', *The Chaucer Review,* 46:4, 2012, 371-402.

Meecham-Jones, Simon, '"He in Salte Teres Dreynte": Understanding Troilus's Tears', in Downes, Stephanie, Lynch, Andrew and O'Loughlin, Katrina (eds.), *Emotions and War: Medieval to Romantic Literature*, New York, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015, 77-97.

Megna, Paul, 'Courtly ~~Love~~ Hate Is Undead: Sadomasochistic Privilege in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', in Sbriglia, Russell (ed.), *Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Literature but Were Afraid to Ask Zizek*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017, 267–89.

Mieszkowski, Gretchen, 'Chaucer's Much Loved Criseyde', *The Chaucer Review*, 26:2, 1991, 109-132.

- *Medieval Go-betweens and Chaucer's Pandarus*, New York, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.

- 'Revisiting Troilus' Faint', in *Men and Masculinities in Chaucer's* Troilus and Criseyde, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2008, 43-57.

- 'Chaucerian Comedy', in Classen, Albrecht (ed.), *Laughter in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times. Epistemology of a Fundamental Human Behavior, its Meaning, and Consequences*, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, 457-480.

Minnis, Alastair J., *Chaucer and Pagan Antiquity*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1982.

Modarelli, Michael, 'Pandarus's "Grete Emprise": Narration and Subjectivity in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *English Studies*, 89:40, 2008, 403-414.

Morgan, Gerald, 'The Ending of *Troilus and Criseyde*', *The Modern Language Review*, 77:2, 1982, 257-271.

Murton, Megan, 'Praying with Boethius in *Troilus and Criseyde*', *The Chaucer Review*, 49:3, 2015, 294-319.

Muscatine, Charles, *Chaucer and the French Tradition: A Study in Style and Meaning*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957.

Nagy, Piroska, *Le don des larmes au Moyen Âge. Un instrument spirituel en quête d'institution,* Paris: Albin Michel, 2000.

Nair, Sashi, '"O brotel wele of mannes joie unstable": Gender and Philosophy in *Troilus and Criseyde*', *Parergon*, 23:2, 2006, 35-56.

Neuse, Richard, '*Troilus and Criseyde*: Another Dantean Reading', in Cox, C. S. and Shoaf, R. A. (eds.), *Chaucer's* Troilus and Criseyde*: 'Subgit to alle Poesye': Essays in Criticism,* Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1992, 199-210.

Nowlin, Steele, *Chaucer, Gower, and the Affect of Invention*, Columbus: Ohio State Press, 2016.

Nussbaum, Martha, *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Palmer, James M., 'When *Remedia Amoris* Fails: Chaucer's Literary-Medical Exploration of Determinism, Materialism, and Free Will in *Troilus and Criseyde*', in Block, Marcelline and Laflen, Angela (eds.), *Gender Scripts in Medicine and Narrative*, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010, 292-319.

- *Narratives of Healing: Emotion, Medicine, Metaphor, and Late-Medieval Poetry and Prose*, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2002.

Paradisi, Gioia and Fuksas, Anatole Pierre, 'The Joy of Love in Béroul's *Tristan* and Chrétien's *Chevalier de la Charette'*, *JIAS*, 4:1, 2016, 81-91.

Patterson, Lee, 'Writing Amorous Wrongs: Chaucer and the Order of Complaint', in *Acts of Recognition: Essays on Medieval Culture*, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009, 181-197.

Paxson, James J., 'The Semiotics of Character, Trope, and Troilus: The Figural Construction of the Self and the Discourse of Desire in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', in Paxson, J.J. and Gravlee, C. A. (eds.), *Desiring Discourse: The Literature of Love, Ovid through Chaucer*, Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 1998, 206-226.

Perfetti, Lisa, *Women and Laughter in Medieval Comic Literature*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003.

Potkay, Adam, *The Story of Joy: From the Bible to Late Romanticism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Pugh, Tison and Smith Marzec, Marcia, 'Introduction', in *Men and Masculinities in Chaucer's* Troilus and Criseyde, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2008, 1-8.

Reale, Nancy M., 'Reading the Language of Love: Boccaccio's *Filostrato* as Intermediary between the *Commedia* and Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', in Paxson, J.J. and Gravlee, C. A. (eds.), *Desiring Discourse: The Literature of Love, Ovid through Chaucer*, Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 1998, 165-176.

Renevey, Denis, *Language, Self and Love: Hermeneutics in the Writing of Richard Rolle and the Commentaries on the Song of Songs*, Cardiff: University Press, 2001.

Rider, Jeff, 'Positive Emotions in the Arthurian Lais of Marie de France', *JIAS*, 4:1, 2016, 58-68.

Rissanen, Matti, 'In Search of *Happiness*: *Felicitas* and *Beatitudo* in Early English Boethius Translations', *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 31, 1997, 237-248.

Robertson, D. W., Jr., 'Chaucerian Tragedy', *ELH*, 19:1, 1952, 1-37.

- *A Preface to Chaucer: Studies in Medieval Perspectives*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Rosenfeld, Jessica, *Ethics and Enjoyment in Late Medieval Poetry: Love after Aristotle*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Rosenwein, Barbara (ed.), *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.

- 'Worrying about Emotions in History', in *The American Historical Review*, 107:3, 2002, 821-845.

Rowe, Donald R., *O Love, O Charite! Contraries Harmonized in Chaucer's Troilus*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press, 1976.

Sadlek, Gregory M., 'Love, Labour, and Sloth in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *The Chaucer Review*, 26:4, 1992, 350-368.

Salmón, Fernando, 'The Pleasures and Joys of the Humoral Body in Medieval Medicine', in Cohen-Hanegbi, Naama and Nagy, Piroska (eds.), *Pleasure in the Middle Ages*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2018, 39-57.

Salter, Elizabeth, '*Troilus and Criseyde:* a Reconsideration', in Lawlor, John (ed.), *Patterns of Love and Courtesy: Essays in Memory of C. S. Lewis*, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1966, 86-106.

Sams, Henry W., 'The Dual Time-Scheme in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *Modern Language Notes*, 1941, 94-100.

Saunders, Corinne, 'Affective Reading: Chaucer, Women, and Romance', *The Chaucer Review*, 51:1, 2016, 11-30.

Savin, Kristiina, 'Sighs of Desire: Passionate Breathing in Medieval and Early Modern Literature', in Cullhed, Anders, Franzén, Carin, Hallengren, Anders and Malm, Mats (eds.), *Pangs of Love and Longing: Configurations of Desire in Premodern Literature*, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013, 157-175.

Schäfer-Althaus, Sarah, 'Painful Pleasure. Saintly Torture on the Verge of Pornography', *Mirabilia*, 18:1, 2014, 151-59.

Schibanoff, Susan, 'Prudence and Artificial Memory in Chaucer's *Troilus*', *ELH*, 42:4, 1975, 507-517.

Schuman, Samuel, 'The Circle of Nature: Patterns of Imagery in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *The Chaucer Review*, 10:2, 1975, 99-112.

Sklute, Larry, *Virtue of Necessity*, Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1984.

Smith, Emma, *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Sonjae, An (Brother Anthony), 'No Greater Pain: The Ironies of Bliss in *Troilus and Criseyde*', in Kaylor, N. H. and Nokes, R. S. (eds.), *Global Perspectives on Medieval English Literature*, *Language, and Culture*, Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2007, 117-132.

Spearing, A. C., *Textual Subjectivity: The Encoding of Subjectivity in Medieval Narratives and Lyrics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Specht, Henrik, '"Ethopoeia" or Impersonation: A Neglected Species of Medieval Characterization', *The Chaucer Review*, 21:2, 1986, 1-15.

Stampone, Christopher, 'Choreographing Fin'amor: Dance and the Game of Love in Geoffrey Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *The Chaucer Review*, 50:3/4, 2015, 393-419.

Stanbury, Sarah, 'The Voyeur and the Private Life in *Troilus and Criseyde*', *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, 13, 1991, 141-58.

Steadman, John M., *Disembodied Laughter: Troilus and the Apotheosis Tradition: A Reexamination of Narrative and Thematic Contexts*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

Stierstorfer, Klaus, 'Markers of Transition: Laughter in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *The Chaucer Review*, 34:1, 1999, 18-37.

Stone, Charles Russel, '"And sodeynly he wax therwith astoned": Virgilian Emotion and Images of Troy in Chaucer's *Troilus*', *The Review of English Studies*, 64, 2013, 574-593.

Strakhov, Elizaveta, '"And kis the steppes where as thow seest pace": Reconstructing the Spectral Canon in Statius and Chaucer', in Navis, Isabel and Nall, Catherine (eds.), *Chaucer and Fame: Reputation and Reception*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2015, 57-74.

Strohm, Paul, *Social Chaucer*, Cambridge, Massachussetts: Harvard University Press, 1994.

- 'The Space of Desire in Chaucer's and Shakespeare's Troy', in Johnston, A. J., West-Pavlov, Russell and Kempf, Elisabeth (eds.), *Love, History and Emotion in Chaucer and Shakespeare:* Troilus and Criseyde *and* Troilus and Cressida, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016, 46-60.

Taylor, David, 'The Terms of Love: A Study of Troilus' Style', in Barney, Stephen A. (ed.), *Troilus and Criseyde*, London, New York: W. W. Norton, 2006, 503-22.

Trigg, Stephanie, 'Langland's Tears: Poetry, Emotion and Mouvance', *Yearbook of Langland Studies*, 26, 2012, 27-48.

- 'Introduction: Emotional Histories – Beyond the Personalization of the Past and the Abstraction of Affect Theory', *Exemplaria*, 26:1, 2014, 3-15.

- '"Language in her Eye": The Expressive Face of Criseyde/Cressida', in Johnston, A. J., West-Pavlov, Russell and Kempf, Elisabeth (eds.), *Love, History and Emotion in Chaucer and Shakespeare:* Troilus and Criseyde *and* Troilus and Cressida, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016, 4-108.

Tuttle Hansen, Elaine, *Chaucer and the Fictions of Gender*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Wack, Mary Frances, 'Lovesickness in *Troilus*', *Pacific Coast Philology*, 19:1/2, 1984, 55-61.

Wallace, David, *Chaucerian Polity: Absolutist Lineages and Associational Forms in England and Italy*, Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Waswo, Richard, 'The Narrator of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *ELH*, 50:1, 1983, 1-25.

Watts, William, 'Verray Felicitee Parfit and the Development of Chaucer's Philosophical Language', *The Chaucer Review*, 43:3, 2009, 260-281.

Webb, Heather, *The Medieval Heart*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

Wetherbee, Winthrop, *Chaucer and the Poets: An Essay on* Troilus and Criseyde, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984.

White, Stephen D., 'The Politics of Anger', in Rosenwein, Barbara (ed.), *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998, 127-152.

Wimsatt, James, 'Guillaume de Machaut and Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*', *Medium Aevum*, 45, 1976, 277-93.

Windeatt, Barry, 'Gesture in Chaucer', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 9, 1979, 143-161.

- *Troilus and Criseyde*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

- '*Troilus and Criseyde:* Love in a Manner of Speaking', in Cooney, Helen (ed.), *Writings on Love in the English Middle Ages*, New York, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, 81-97.

Yeager, R. F., 'Gowerian Laughter', in Brewer, Charlotte and Windeatt, Barry (eds.), *Traditions and Innovations in the Study of Medieval English Literature: The Influence of Derek Brewer*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2013, 144-153.

Young, Karl, 'Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* as Romance', *Modern Language Association*, 53:1, 1938, 38-63.

Dictionaries

Lessicografia dell' Accademia della Crusca, Firenze: Accademia della Crusca, Online edition, 2000-2004. http://www.lessicografia.it/

Dictionary of Old English: A to H, Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project, Online edition, 2016. https://www.doe.utoronto.ca/pages/index.html

Middle English Dictionary, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Online edition, 2013. https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/

Oxford English Dictionary, Oxford: Oxford University Press, Online edition, 2018. http://www.oed.com/

Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary, Oxford: Oxford University Press, Online edition, 2018. http://www.oed.com/thesaurus/

APPENDICES

1. Lexis Frequency in Gower's *Confessio Amantis*

LEXIS	Frequency
Blisse	9
Blithe	5
Delicacie	15
Delicat	10
Delice	13
Delicious	2
Delitable	1
Delite (n.)	24
Delite (v.)	6
Felicite	3
Fresh	40
Gai	5
Glad	132
Glade (v.)	26
Gladli	6
Gladnesse	7
Gladschipe	4
Joy	95
Joiful	3
Jolif	7
Lisse	5
Lusti	116
Mirie	12
Mirthe	17
Plesaunce	28
Plesant	6
Plese (v.)	34
Plesir	1
Prosperite	6

2. Lexis Frequency in Usk's *Testament of Love*

LEXIS	Frequency
Blisse	130
Blisful	8
Delicious	4
Deliciousli	1
Delitable	1
Delite	3
Glade (v.)	5
Gladnesse	19
Joy	81
Joye (v.)	4
Lusti	6
Mirthe	6
Plesaunce	12
Prosperite	7
Seli	3
Selinesse	9
Solas	2
Suffisaunce	8
Wele	5

3. The referents of *blisful* and *glad* in *Troilus and Criseyde*

Adjectives	Character	God	Time	Speech	Other
blisful		Venus (5)	nyght		song (3)
		god(s) (4)	morwe		light
		Jove	destine		cas
		Iuno	tyme		love
		Cupid			
		Lord			
glad	Troilus (6)	Jove	nyght (2)	wordes	desport
	Pandarus (5)		morwe	tales	man
	Criseyde (2)		monthes	matere	hertes
			dayes		

4. Lexis Frequency in the Romances

LEXIS	*Knight*	*Man of Law*	*Clerk*	*Squire*	*Merchant*	*Wife of Bath*	*Franklin*	*An + Ar*	TOTAL
blisful	2	5	3		3		5	2	20
blisfulli	1								1
blisse	6	6	1		9	1	5	1	29
blithe	1	2		1				1	5
delicat			2		1				3
delite	1	1	1		2	2	2	2	11
felicite	1		1		3				5
glad (adj.)	2	5	12	2	2	2	3	2	30
glade (v.)	1	2	4	2	1		1	1	11
gladli			3	3			1		6
gladnesse	2	2						1	5
gai		1		1					2
joiful			1						1
joli				1	1	1	1		4
jolinesse				1		1			2
jolite	1			2					3
joy	11	12	2	2	6	4	4	2	43
lusti	5		2	4	2	1	3	1	18
lustihede				1					1
lustinesse	1								1
mirie	4		1		8				13
mirili						1			1
mirthe		1	1		1				3
plesaunce	4	5	14	1	7	2	2	2	37
prosperite		2	4		3		2		11
seli		1	1		1				3
solas					1		2		1
suffisaunce			1						1
wele	4	1	3		2				10
weleful		1							1

5. Lexis Frequency in the Fabliaux

LEXIS	*Miller*	*Reeve*	*WoB Prologue*	*Summoner*	*Shipman*	*Cook*	TOTAL
blisful	1		1	1			3
blisse			1	1	1		3
delite			2	2			4
glad			2		2		4
gladli			2		1		3
gai	7	1	10	1			19
joli	8	4	2	1	2	1	19
jolili					1	1	2
jolite			1				1
joy			1		1		2
lusti		1	2				3
mirie	5	2	2	1	2		12
mirili			1		2		3
mirthe	1	1	1		2		5
plesaunce			1		3		4
seli	6	3	3	2	2		16
solas	3						3
suffisaunce				1			1
wele				1			1

6. Lexis Frequency in the *Parson's* and *Monk's Tales*

LEXIS	*Parson*
blisful	5
blisse	4
delicat	4
delices	8
delite	31
gai	2
gladli	8
gladnesse	1
joy	15
jolite	1
joli	1
plesaunce	1
prosperite	7
solas	2
suffisaunce	1
wele	1

LEXIS	*Monk*
blithe	1
delicat	1
delicacie	1
delite	3
felicite	1
gai	1
glad	2
joy	2
prosperite	5
wele	1

7. Lexis Frequency in the *Boece*

LEXIS	Boece
blisful	26
blisfulnesse	86
blisse	1
delicat	2
delices	15
delite	28
felicite	2
glad	6
gladly	3
gladnesse	8
joy	11
jolite	1
joiful	5
lusti	1
mirie	4
mirili	1
mirinesse	1
mirthe	2
plesaunce	1
prosperite	11
suffisaunce	17
wele	3
weleful	18
welefulnesse	31

8. Pandarus' diction:

LEXIS	Pandarus
Blisse	4
Blisful	3
Delite	3
Felicite	0
Feste	2
Glad	16
Gladnesse	0
Jolite	1
Joli	3
Joy	9
Lusti	4
Lustinesse	0
Mirie	2
Plesaunce	3
Prosperite	1
Solas	0
Wele	0

9. Troilus' diction:

LEXIS	Troilus
Blisse	5
Blisful	11
Delite	1
Felicite	1
Feste	2
Glad	6
Gladnesse	1
Jolite	0
Joli	0
Joy	18
Lusti	2
Lustinesse	0
Mirie	0
Plesaunce	4
Prosperite	0
Solas	1
Wele	4

10. Criseyde's diction:

LEXIS	Criseyde
Blisse	5
Blisful	2
Delite	4
Felicite	2
Feste	1
Glad	11
Gladnesse	5
Jolite	0
Joli	1
Joy	16
Lusti	1
Lustinesse	1
Mirie	0
Plesaunce	6
Prosperite	1
Solas	1
Wele	2

11. Rhyming patterns of some joy-related words and of *sorwe* in *Troilus and Criseyde*

Lexis	Frequency	Rhyme freq.	Rhyme 1	Rhyme 2	Rhyme 3	Rhyme 4	Rhyme 5
blisse	27	5	lisse (2)	kisse (2)	misse		
blisful	22	0					
blisfulli	2	1	lustili				
felicite	5	3	vanite	prosperite			
glad	51	0					
gladli	2	0					
gladnesse	18	16	distresse (5)	hevinesse (4)	gentilesse (3)	swetnesse (2)	sikernesse (2)
joy	90	30	Troye (30)	t'acoye	anoye		
plesaunce	20	17	remembraunce (8)	daunce (2)	governaunce (2)	suffisaunce	chaunce
selinesse	3	2	bitternesse	derknesse			
sorwe	95	24	morwe (24)	borwe (5)			

12. Rhyme joy/Troy in *Troilus and Criseyde*

	Joy	Rhyme Joy/Troy
Book I	6	3
Book II	11	4
Book III	39	5
Book IV	16	7
Book V	18	11
Total	90	30