

## 3

*Book II: The Wooing of Criseyde*

In Book II, Chaucer's art is fully realized. His characters are developed before us; and their natures, for which they are remembered throughout history, are either whole or hinted at. Notably, Criseyde, who is for the most part only physically present as a character in Book I, finds dialogue and self in Book II. Dennis Cronan points out, “It is not until Book II, when she is alone in her house with her uncle, that we are introduced to the woman behind this contradictory behavior” (37). Even more, Book II allows us to watch troubled Pandarus work his “gret emprise” on both Troilus, and, even more, Criseyde.

Arguably, one of the most significant scenes in the whole of Chaucer's poem occurs early in Book II, when Pandarus dreams of Procne and Philomela, a passage that alludes to the classical tale of Philomela's rape by Tereus. Carolyn Dinshaw looks at the subject in her chapter, “Quarrels, Rivals and Rape: Gower and Chaucer.” Dinshaw explores the notion of rape in multiple works by the two poets, and she specifically looks at each poet's use of the legend of Philomela. She claims that Gower's treatment of Philomela in his *Confessio Amantis* can be used to better understand *Troilus and Criseyde*. While Gower's use of this rape tale is part of what Dinshaw refers to as his “conservative social vision, articulated in the moral framework of *Confessio Amantis*” (119), his ending of the tale is peculiar and unusual. He describes Philomela's new life as a bird with both *expected* lamenting—“O why,/ O why ne were I fit a maide” (5.5978-79)—and *unexpected* celebration of her new disguise—“Sche makth gret joie and merthe among,/ And seith, ‘Ha, nou I am a brid,/ Ha, nou mi face mai hen hid” (5.5984-86).<sup>1</sup> Following these passages, Gower provides an apparent courtly love song which acknowledges

the paradox:

Thus medleth sche with joe wo  
And with hir sorwe merthe also,  
So that of loves maladie  
Sche makth diverse melodie,  
And seith love is a wofull blisse,  
A wisdom can noman wisse,  
A lusti fievere, a wounde softe:  
This note sche reherceth ofte  
To hem which understande hir tale. (5.5989-97)

Dinshaw says of this passage, “The conventional discourse of love here converts the experience of forcible rape into desirable, idealized, elite love” (120).

Gower’s text can be read with Pandarus’ dream of Procne and Philomela in Book II of the *Troilus* (2.63-70). Pandarus’ dream is important because, upon waking, he immediately leaves to begin wooing Criseyde for Troilus, an alarming revelation in light of what will come later in the story. As Dinshaw says, “the story of Philomela in fact lurks behind the story of Troilus and Criseyde” (120).

Also, Criseyde’s dream of the Eagle, later in Book II , becomes a more literal interpretation of what will come:

And as she slep,’ anonright tho hire mette  
How that an egle, fethered whit as bon,  
Under hire brest his longe clawes sette,

And out hire herte he rente, and that anon,  
And dide his herte into hire brest to gon--  
Of which she nought agroos, ne nothyng smerte--  
And forth he fleigh, with herte left for herte. (2.925-31)

In reference to this dream—"with herte lefte for herte (2.931)"—Dinshaw cites two other passages.

In the first, Troilus refers to Criseyde as "myn owen swete herte" (4.1449), and, in the second, Criseyde calls Troilus, "Lo, herte myn" (4.1254). Glossed with Gower's text, its "courtly birdsong's reinterpretation, and its metaphorization" (Dinshaw 121), the painless assault of the Eagle is accentuated.

Alan J. Fletcher offers a note on Criseyde's dream of the eagle in his "Lost Hearts: *Troilus and Criseyde*, Book II, lines 925-31." Fletcher finds the exchange of hearts a recurrent theme in medieval literature.<sup>2</sup> Fletcher equates the last stanza of Antigone's song to Criseyde's dream—"But I with al myn herte and al my myght,/ As I have seyd, wol love unto my laste/ My deere herte and al myn owen knyght" (2.869-871). What Fletcher claims is still unacknowledged, concerning Criseyde's dream, is the "traditional appropriateness and familiarity in the eagle's action" (163). Medieval bestiaries speak of domestic birds of prey, which are rewarded with the hearts of their kill. A fourteenth-century treatise on the Seven Deadly Sins, the *Fasciculus Morum* states, "Avis enim predalis et generosa plus preda non querit set cor mundatum" [For the noble bird of prey seeks nothing more from its prey than its clean heart].<sup>3</sup> Chaucer, however, combines this theme with the theme of lovers' exchange of hearts for a more graphically visual image, one which he later employs in Book III where Troilus is the "sperhauk."

Dennis Cronan, in his article, "Criseyde: The First Capitulation," considers one of the

most baffling scenes in the whole of the poem to be the climax of Criseyde's first interview with Pandarus (2.442-76). Cronan cites Charles Muscatine, who suggests two readings of Criseyde to which this scene has given rise: Criseyde is either “cold” and “calculating,” or completely innocent.<sup>4</sup> But Muscatine further considers Criseyde to be a mixture of both, and other scholars too continue to refer to Criseyde as ambiguous. Cronan, however, believes a close reading of this passage helps to clarify the ambiguity surrounding Criseyde. Here, she demonstrates “an ability to respond quickly and intuitively to a threat” rather than resorting to calculation, and “practices more ‘sleighe’ on herself than on Pandarus” (Cronan 37). Furthermore, underlying Pandarus’ costume-rhetorical demand that Criseyde remove her “barbe,” is his more straightforward desire to see her cast off her inhibitions and partake of her lust. Pandarus does not care about the physical look of her dress as much as he is concerned about the semiotic implications of her widow’s clothes, which, considering the rich nature of her fabrics<sup>5</sup> and the indication thus that she is a woman without a male protector, exhibit her right to claim Hector or any other knight as her guardian.

Pandarus attempts to convey both his good intentions to Criseyde and his desire to avoid injuring her, but, as Cronan points out, he goes too far and triggers Criseyde’s fear of public exposure (37). When Pandarus threatens to leave, Criseyde’s reaction is seen through Pandarus’ response to her: “Beth nought agast, ne quaketh not. Wherto?/ Ne chaungeth not for fere so youre hewe!” (2.302-3). Criseyde responds to Pandarus’s comfort by saying, ““com of, and telle me what it is!/ For both I am agast what ye wol seye,/ And ek me longeth it to wite, ywis”” (2.310-312). Pandarus now seems aware that he has overplayed his “game,” and he tells Criseyde his news. Pandarus’ oration is a lengthy reply which amplifies the physical dangers to himself and

Troilus should she deny Troilus her love. But Criseyde ignores his threats of suicide, instead asking, “what wolde ye devise?” (2.388). Pandarus eagerly responds “That ye hym love ayeyn for his lovyng” (2.391), but Criseyde bursts into tears, asking, “Allas, what sholde straunge to me doon,/ Whan he that for my beste frend I wende/ Ret me to love, and sholde it me defende?” (2.411-13). Pandarus, now afraid of his initial intentions towards his niece, sincerely threatens his exit—“By God, I shal no more come here this wyke” (2.430), but he cannot bring himself to go, and, again instead, threatens suicide, though less violently. Criseyde is then described as “wel neigh starf for feere” (2.449).

Cronan cites Chauncey Wood’s argument that Criseyde “takes her uncle at his word, and resolves to play ‘sleightly’ in order to avoid the embarrassment such a death would cause her.”<sup>6</sup> But Cronan argues that Criseyde is responding to more than a flimsy death threat, for her earlier response to his violent suicidal intentions is indifferent. Criseyde’s fear is that of abandonment by Pandarus, both physical abandonment, and, what Cronan terms, “moral desertion” when he, who should be her protector, suggests she answer Troilus’ love. Some scholars view Criseyde’s fear here as “trembling at will,” but most accept the reality of Criseyde’s fear.<sup>7</sup> Critics, however, differ as to what exactly Criseyde fears. Is it, as mentioned earlier, the death of Pandarus and/or Troilus or the damage to her reputation, whether by these protested suicides or her own scandalous affair? Criseyde is persuaded by her uncle’s sincerity either because of his wit or her own willing self-deception.

She thus reconsiders her uncle’s offer. After pondering the folly of love and the wickedness of men, her mind turns back to Pandarus himself:

‘And if this man sle here hymself— allas!—

In my presence, it wol be no solas.  
What men of hit wolde deme I kan nat seye;  
It nedeth me ful sleyghly for to pleie.'(2.459-62)

Once again Criseyde seems cold. She is concerned with public opinion and refers to her uncle as “this man.” Cronan argues, however, that line 461 actually indicates Criseyde’s fear of abandonment: “Because she cannot accept her uncle’s readiness to relinquish his position as her protector, she seizes upon his confused threat of suicide and exaggerates it, building in her imagination an impending scene of shed blood and shattered privacy” (40). From this fear, Criseyde capitulates to Pandarus, confirming, “It nedeth me ful sleyghly for to pleie.” Her use of “pleie,” Cronan suggests, is Criseyde’s attempt at self-assurance which moves her to the “game” of courtly love. Cronan views it as an unconscious move of fear, not a response to Pandarus’ attempts at manipulation, which allows her, at least, to feel she is in a position of negotiation.

Craig Berry (“The King’s Business: Negotiating Chivalry in *Troilus and Criseyde*”) follows Cronan’s discussion of Criseyde’s fear, alluding to her fear of Troilus as a lover who might, as is common, turn persecutor.<sup>8</sup> As Berry asserts, Criseyde has no way to judge the behavior of Troilus other than chivalric codes which “do not seem to have the lady’s protection in mind” and, further, seem “aimed at undermining their defenses” (254). Berry refers to an interesting account from Andreas Capellanus’s *The Art of Courtly Love* in which a gentleman puts forth arguments parallel to those made by Pandarus in Book II, when he attempts, for the first time, to convince Criseyde to love Troilus.<sup>9</sup> Criseyde is essentially trapped between two fears, and, like the noblewoman in Capellanus’ story, she gives in to these fears. Criseyde, unlike Capellanus’ noblewoman, however, does not concern herself with her own fate, but rather the

fate of others, namely Troilus. Berry suggests of Chaucer's heroine, "Criseyde is a more subtle and sophisticated courtly lady than Andreas' noblewoman, and no two-dimensional allegory of reward and punishment could win her over; but Pandarus, as a subtle and persuasive negotiator, is her equal" (256).

Berry views this somewhat differently in arguing that Criseyde proves herself rather deft at the arts of negotiation. Criseyde further proves her own skill as a negotiator in satisfying Pandarus' initial request of favoring Troilus and then moving to other matters, which allows her to seem disinterested in his intentions. She then cleverly returns to the subject of Troilus—"Kan he wel speke of love?" (2.503). Pandarus replies to her renewed inquiries by laughingly suggesting some lines later, "Ther were nevere two so wel ymet,/ Whan ye ben his al hool, as he is youre" (2.586-87). Criseyde continues the "pleye," responding, "Nay, therof spak I nought, ha hal!" (2.589). Although Criseyde matches wits with her uncle, as Berry argues, Pandarus eventually wears her down (257). Both she and Troilus desire to do the right and honorable thing, but neither really knows for sure what this is, and their actions in Book II seem overly contemplative, as the codes of chivalry send in Berry's phrasing, "competing and conflicting messages which must interpreted and reconciled" (257-258).

Laura Hodges ("Sartorial Signs in *Troilus and Criseyde*") continues to read Criseyde's garments in Book II, echoing, in many ways, Cronan's article, though, in some respects, with more detail. When Pandarus goes to Criseyde's house to solicit Criseyde's love for Troilus, he relies on costume rhetoric, inciting Criseyde to remove her "barbe" in order to participate in May's "observaunce" (2.110, 2.112). Criseyde's disgruntled reply indicates her awareness of her situation which calls for her to maintain her state of mourning, signified by her "barbe." Hodges

notes this costume was no longer fashionable in Chaucer's day and was generally associated with older women, widows, and nuns.<sup>10</sup> Criseyde's costume through Books I and II, her "samyt broun widewes weeds," therefore establishes not only her social status, but also her vulnerable position. Hodges says, and Cronan argues, "they are the visible mark that she might rightfully claim Ector's or any knight's protection" (228).

Pandarus continues his costume rhetoric towards Criseyde some lines later, saying to her, "Swych love of frendes regneth al this town;/ And were yow in that mantel evere moo" (2.379-83). Criseyde already has the protection afforded a widow, combined with that which Hector allows her, but Pandarus here asks her to cast off the one "mantel" of protection in order to assume another in the love of Troilus. Criseyde attempts to assume both mantels at the appropriate times, her widow's garments in public and Troilus' love in private, but, Hodges argues, the plot of the poem "hinges" upon Criseyde's inability to choose between the two (230).

Sarah Stanbury, in her article, "Women's Letters and Private Space in Chaucer," points out, "When we look at accounts of women who read and write letters in Chaucer's narratives, we are confronted with anxieties about public exposure and private autonomy" (272). She continues, "Descriptions detailing how women read and/or write letters in Chaucer's poetry offer rich and hitherto unexamined resources for exploring his constructions of female subjectivity and of the relationships between private actions and public surveillance" (274). Chaucer seems to use "pryvetee" as secrecy, rather than a right to privacy,<sup>11</sup> but he also seems always to be pondering definitions of its concept in his poetry. Chaucer's women choose solitude to meditate on matters of love, but even more, characters like Criseyde choose to act in private as well, most clearly expressed in both the reading and writing of letters (279).

Troilus and Criseyde write letters to each other in Book II of the poem, a book Stanbury calls, “a work so full of letters we might call it an epistolary romance” (280). Stephen Knight suggests Chaucer’s characterization of Criseyde was influenced by the burgeoning values of privacy in late fourteenth-century society, while Stanbury believes that Chaucer’s Criseyde contrasts expectations of “literacy, autonomy, and private space” (280). That Pandarus must lecture Troilus on letter writing hints that Criseyde is a better writer of love letters, despite her protestations—“God help me so, this is the firste lettre/ That evere I wroot, ye, al or any del”” (2.1213-14).

Stanbury further highlights what she terms the “spatial politics” of letter delivery in these Book II scenes. Pandarus invades Troilus’ bedchamber in an act of exposure, wrestling him out of bed, and providing an intruding light in order that he may read. Similarly invasive, yet contrastingly privatizing, Pandarus shoves Troilus’ letter into the private bosom of Criseyde. The letter becomes, as Stanbury says, “sexually annexed to her person” (281). Troilus, however, in writing this letter, seeks the company of Pandarus, while Criseyde hides in her closet, the same room from which earlier she privately gazed on Troilus’s triumphant march through the streets of Troy (2.610). This act of self-privatization by Criseyde actually constitutes an act of freedom from the world, her situation, and Pandarus, who waits outside: “And into a closet, for t’avise hire bettre,/She wente allone, and gan hire herte unfettre/ Out of desdaynes prisoun but a lite” (2.1215-17). But Criseyde’s freedom is only partially satisfactory, for, as Stanbury suggests, the weight of Pandarus’ masculine body, just outside her door, creates a compressed space, not of female choice, but rather the choice of a male who chooses to leave her alone, and a narrator who continues to voyeuristically spy on her (282). Privacy is ultimately, for Chaucer’s women, “a

territory of independent will, a thing of the body, the closet, and—as the bosom where letters are sequestered—the liberating space around the heart” (Stanbury 285), which, as in Book I and much of the rest of the poem, is the one unknown space concerning Criseyde.

Robert Kaske concerns himself with Pandarus’ continued enterprise, specifically the scene at Deiphebus’ house, in Book II, in his article, “Pandarus’ ‘Vertue of Corones Tweyne’”:

Ful softly bygynne,  
Nece, I conjure and heighly thou defende,  
On his half which that soule us alle sende,  
And in the vertu of corones tweyne,  
Sle naught this man that hath for thou this peyne! (2.1732-36)

Pandarus achieves an important goal in this scene in which Criseyde hears Troilus praised by friends over dinner before Pandarus leads her into the chamber where the sick Troilus lies, for a private introduction. These words whispered to Criseyde as she enters Troilus’ chamber, and specifically Pandarus’ reference to “corones tweyne,” continue to confound scholars. Root notes, in what is now a generally accepted interpretation, these two crowns indicate pity or mercy on Criseyde’s part.<sup>12</sup> Pandarus refers several times in the lines following this passage to the essentiality of Criseyde’s pity or mercy to save Troilus from death. Criseyde makes an earlier reference to Troilus’ illness saying, “Lo, this is he/ Which that myn uncle swerith he moot be deed,/ But I on hym have mercy and pitee” (2.653-55).<sup>13</sup>

Chaucer refers to pity, in the *Complaint Unto Pity*, as ”Humblest of herte, highest of reverence,/ Benygne flour, coroune of vertues alle” (57-58) and as “corowne of Beaute” (75) But, the crowns of pity or mercy seem justified with reference to Canticles 3.11, which refers to the

“diademate,” or double crown of mercy. This would not be the first of what Kaske describes as many “liturgical echoes” in the *Troilus*.<sup>14</sup> Kaske questions, though, why Chaucer would need to make such a detailed yet unobvious reference to a liturgical matter. However, in light of so many religious echoes throughout the poem involving Pandarus and Criseyde, such a statement by Pandarus intensifies his priestly role in the religion of love. Boccaccio’s Creseida refers to her own crown of vertue (“la corona dell’onesta mea” [2.134.5]), which she will forfeit for no one. But, as Kaske argues, Pandarus seems to persuade Criseyde by alluding to a second religious crown of pity or mercy (230-31). Kaske refers to Charles Muscatine’s article, “The Feigned Illness in Chaucer’s *Troilus and Criseyde*,” which draws comparisons between Criseyde’s visit to Troilus’ bed and the story of Amnon, son of King David, in *II Kings 13:1-14*.<sup>15</sup> Amnon, feigning illness, lures his sister into his bedchamber where he rapes her. Juxtaposed between the rendering of Canticles 3 and possibly *II Kings 13*, ambiguities abound in Criseyde’s meeting with Troilus in *Book II*. Kaske suggests Chaucer’s intention may have been to parallel his own love story with two others: one, Canticles 3, a story of divine love; the other, *II Kings 13*, a story of incestuous and base earthly lust.

Elizabeth Archibald says of the *Troilus*, “The plot held no surprises for the medieval reader or audience. Its interest lies in why the main events take place, how the main characters make up their minds—and then sometimes change them” (190). Her article, “Declarations of ‘Entente’ in *Troilus and Criseyde*,” largely explores the many passages in Book II which testify to the “slydyng” intentions of the poem’s characters, especially Pandarus. Archibald argues, “If Book I stresses Troilus’ “good entente” in love, with a hint of the difficulties in store for such devoted lovers, Book II focuses on a much more devious form of “entente,” in the person of

Pandarus”(195). Criseyde is largely the target of Pandarus’ mixed intentions. As Pandarus’s intentions become more obviously questionable, he, treating Criseyde as his confessor, argues the necessity of intention in the charge of sin: “Now have I plat to yow myn herte shryven,/ And sith ye woot that myn entente is cleene,/ Take heede therof, for I non yvel meene” (2.579-82). Pandarus’ overuse of “entente,” in a sense, wears out any legitimate meaning of the word until we reach this passage in which we are assured of its unreliability.

When Criseyde sends her letter in reply to Troilus’, the narrator assures us “Of which to telle in short is myn entente” (2.1219), but then provides only a sparse recounting of Criseyde’s intentions towards Troilus “as his suster” (2.1224), and that she “ne make hirselen bonde/ In love” (2.1223-24). Boccaccio provides Criseida’s letter in full, but Chaucer’s narrator’s brief account leaves us unsure of Criseyde’s understanding of Troilus’ letter, specifically his declaration, or her intentions in promising herself “as his suster.” As Archibald points out, “After so many lengthy and vivacious dialogues and monologues, the narrator seems to be letting us down by this brief and uninformative summary, and by denying us the apparently authoritative direct speech to which we have become so used in the course of the poem” (198).

Criseyde’s modesty in denying Troilus is unbelievable because we know the final outcome of the situation:

For pleynly hire entente, as seyde she,  
Was for to love hym unwist, if she myghe,  
And guerdoun hym with nothing but with sighte. (2.1293-95)

The narrator’s sarcastic “pleynly” invites ambiguity while “as seyde she” questions her sincerity (198). Criseyde’s lack of clarity here is contrasted by Pandarus’ rebuttal: ““It shal nought be so,/

Yif that I may; this nyce opynyoun/ Shal nought be holden fully yeres two” (2.1296-98).

Pandarus’ intentions are quite clear, as is his determination. His control of the story, at this point, is emphasized at Deiphebus’ house, when Troilus’ friends go in to see him—“And they, that nothyng knewe of his entente,/ Withouten more, to Troilus in they wente” (2.1665-66). Similarly, Criseyde goes in to Troilus “Al innocent of Pandarus entente,/ Quod tho Criseyde, “Go we, uncle deere”;/ And arm in arm inward with hym she wente” (2.1723-25). Archibald argues, “The juxtaposition here of “innocent” and “entente” further underlines the dubious nature of Pandarus’ plans, and, in confessional terms it absolves Criseyde from guilt—at this stage” (200).

Scholarship concerning Book II is more diverse than that of Book I. There are far more scenes of importance essential to the larger narrative structure of the poem. So, too, Chaucer’s ambiguities begin to work in Book II, leaving these scenes open to many interpretations. Most important to Chaucer’s art, however, is Criseyde, whose character is more fully realized in Book II. Despite this, as the poem moves to Book III, Criseyde’s complexity grows, and readers begin to understand that reading Criseyde will be far more difficult than reading any one character in Chaucer’ canon.

### **Notes**

1. John Gower, *The English Works of John Gower*, ed. G.C. Macaulay (Oxford: Early English Texts Society, 1901).
2. Fletcher notes the popularity of Criseyde’s dream with critics using psychoanalysis. For more, see Alice R. Kaminsky, *Chaucer’s Troilus and Criseyde and the Critics* (Ohio University Press, 1980) 155-56. Also, for more on the motif of exchanged hearts, see J. Leyerle, ‘The Heart and the Chain,’ in Larry Benson (ed.), *The Learned and the Lewed: Studies in Chaucer and Medieval Literature* (Cambridge, Mass., 1974) 113-45 and 138-42.
3. Fletcher’s translation is taken from S. Wenzel (ed.), *Fasciculus Morum: A Fourteenth-Century Preacher’s Handbook* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989): 40, lines 38-9.

4. Cronan refers to Charles Muscatine, *Chaucer and the French Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957) 157. Also, Root, in his *Poetry of Chaucer* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1922) 108, first provides the reading of Criseyde as cold and calculating.
5. See Chapter 2 pp. 23-25, 27-28, and 32 for Hodges discussion of the “samyt broun” of Criseyde’s widows weeds, which indicate her social status.
6. Cronan 39. See Chauncey Wood, *The Elements of Chaucer’s Troilus* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1984) 135.
7. Cronan 39-40. Cronan quotes Raymond Preston’s *Chaucer* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1969) 78.
8. Scholars in Chapter 1 of this study note the fate of Briseid, concubine of Achilles, who, after the death of Petroklaus receives only scorn from Achilles, though she is uninvolved in Petroklaus’ death.
9. Berry cites Andreas Capellanus, *The Art of Courtly Love*, trans. John Pay Parry (New York, 1969) 71-72.
10. 227; Hodges notes for definition of a “barbe” C. Willett Cunnington, Phillis Cunnington, and Charles Beard, *A Dictionary of English Costume* (London, 1960), and also, Mary G. Houston, *Medieval Costume in England and France: The 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>, and 15<sup>th</sup> Centuries* (New York, 1996) 117.
11. Stanbury notes Stephen Knight’s work *Geoffrey Chaucer* (London: Basil Blackwell, 1986) 33-34, which suggests that Chaucer viewed private acts as “inimical to the social good” (n. 17). She further notes E.D. Blodgett’s article “Chaucerian ‘Pryvetee’ in the *Canterbury Tales*,” *Speculum* 51 (1976): 477-93, which defines “pryvetee” as “outside of divine providence” (note 18).
12. Kaske mentions briefly the “R stanza” following 2.1750, which is found in a single manuscript. This stanza includes a reference to the face of Criseyde “That is sol ful of mercy and bountee” (227). For this stanza see Windeatt, ed., p. 243. See Root’s note in his edition of the *Troilus*, 456-457.
13. Kaske further notes the following lines in support: 2.361-62, 2.384-85, 2.433-34, 2.439-46, 2.487-89, 2.575-78, 2.663-65, 2.741, 2.1125-27, 2.1139, 2.1152, 2.1209, 2.1270, 2.1279-81, 2.1371-75, 2.1502, 2.1581-82, 2.1593-94, 2.1750; and 3.64, 3.108-12, 3.113-19, 3.122-23, 3.153-54, 3.168.
14. Kaske cites examples such as “the narrator’s opening adaptation of the “bidding prayer” in the Sarum use (1.29-49); Troilus’ act of contrition to the god of love (1.936-38) and his later prayer based on the Collect of the Mass (2.526-32); Pandarus’ priestly gesture when Criseyde first kisses Troilus (3.183-84); and Criseyde’s delightful version of a leveation prayer at the

moment of consummation (3.1309)" (230).

15. Charles Muscatine, "The Feigned Illness in Chaucer Troilus and Criseyde," *MLN* 63 (1948): 372-77.