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Introduction in Three Parts

I.

About four years ago, when I took a class titled “The Romance,” I noticed a reoccurring event in the literature we were reading: two characters who had once been intimately involved as either lovers or knights would meet again but fail to recognize each other. The works we read were written by Chrétien de Troyes, Marie de France, and Geoffrey Chaucer, and although the stories allowed and sometimes required the imagination to engage on these mystical journeys to make-believe lands where chivalric knights fell hopelessly in love with beautiful maidens and fought sons of the devil, suspending my disbelief for these non-recognition scenes was not as easy as indulging in the rest of the details. How in this world of perfect love, dragons, and love potions could such a tragedy happen? Poor Tristan, Troilus, and Yvain.

Following the semester I took “The Romance,” two poems continued to intrigue me: Robert Henryson’s The Testament of Cresseid [The Testament] and Chrétien de Troyes’ “The Knight with the Lion,” also titled “Yvain.” I just could not let the non-recognition scenes in these poems lie dormant. When it came time to choose a thesis topic, I could not deny myself the opportunity to investigate this itch that had followed me since “The Romance.” I was positive that here had to be an explanation; non-recognition was as much of a characteristic of Medieval Romance to me as blushing lovers and the exchange of rings. Throughout these chapters, I explore the significance of these non-recognition scenes and their importance to the world of the courtly romance.
II.

Some Terms in Brief:

*Prosopagnosia*

"Neurology’s favourite word is ‘deficit,’” wrote author Oliver Sacks in his opening line to *The Man Who Mistook His Wife for a Hat*. He continued to explain that neurology focuses on “an impairment or incapacity of neurological function: loss of speech, loss of language, loss of memory, loss of vision, loss of dexterity, loss of identity and myriad other lacks and losses of specific functions (or faculties)” (Sacks 3). The term for the loss of the faculty to recognize is *agnosia*, and in this thesis, the proper term for what I will be discussing, the loss of capability to recognize familiar faces, is *prosopagnosia*.

Although I do not go too deeply into the specifics of prosopagnosia; the term does appear in several locations, such as in the discussion of Henryson’s *The Testament*. The term is important to this thesis because it is the clinical word used when referring to an instance of failed facial recognition. Of course, there are situations in life when someone who does not suffer from any type of agnosia will not recognize someone, and I have taken this into consideration. Because of this, I primarily use the word “non-recognition” when referring to an act of failed recognition, but in the sections where I discuss prosopagnosia, I am referring to the actual disorder and its possibility of existing in the poem.

*Amor Hereos*

Researching recent criticism on Henryson’s *The Testament* and courtly love, I found an article by Carol F. Heffernan that discussed *amor hereos*, “the disease of love.”
Heffernan explains that it is the basis for the literary invention now termed "Courtly Love." The disease of love, she explains, was early-sixteenth-century Europe's popular diagnosis for the ill souls suffering from sleeplessness, confusion, hot flashes, and lack of appetite. Coincidentally, these symptoms are commonly found in tales of medieval romance, and they are important and essential to the non-recognition scene in Henryson's The Testament.

III.

The Structure of This Thesis:

The first chapter of this thesis, "Amor Hereos or Courtly Love?,” provides a brief background to the birth and existence of courtly love and suggests amor hereos as the base for the practice of courtly love. This chapter also highlights the characteristics associated with courtly love so that one may consider how non-recognition fits into these characteristics.

Between the first and second chapters and interlude "On Henryson’s Factual Tendencies,” which focuses on the writing style of Robert Henryson and discusses his inclusion of astronomy and medicine in The Testament. This section provides a background for my assertion that Henryson's use of non-recognition is cohesive with his tendency to include factual information in his text. Chapter two, “Henryson’s Testament,” which follows the interlude, is divided into three sections. The first section, "On Henryson’s Testament and Chaucer’s Troilus and Criseyde,” explains my reasons for treating Henryson’s The Testament as a continuation of Chaucer’s Troilus and Criseyde; the second section discusses lines 498-511 of The Testament and examines the possible explanations for Troilus’ mental experiences. This section also includes a
discussion of Aristotle’s theories of cognition and association, as well as scholarly suggestions of delusion and hallucination as explanations for Troilus’ mental experiences. This section introduces prosopagnosia, the current term for the neurological disorder in which a subject is unable to recognize familiar faces, as a possible reason for why Cresside cannot recognize Troilus.

In addition to Troilus’ mental reaction in the psychological passage of The Testament, Troilus also experiences a physical reaction, in which his whole body reacts to the leper Cresside. The third section discusses this physical reaction, lines 512-18 in The Testament, and illustrates how Henryson manages to adhere to the rules of courtly love, such as how a lover should blush or how a lover’s heart should palpitate in the presence of his or her beloved. A discussion of the symbolism of the ring in The Testament and the brooch in Chaucer’s Troilus and Criseyde [Troilus] is also included. This section introduces the “disease of love,” amor hereos, as a possible explanation for Troilus’ physical reactions. Besides examining the relation of amor hereos to Troilus’ failure to recognize Cresside, I also examine amor hereos’ role in the whole idea of courtly love and its association to prosopagnosia.

This thesis is built on a series of steps that progress under the assumption that the previous step is understood; as with trigonometry, in order to fully understand my assertions about The Testament, one would have to understand the basic mathematic principles that it is composed of—in the case of non-recognition in The Testament, these principles are prosopagnosia, amor hereos, and Henryson’s use of facts.

The third chapter, “Chrétien’s “The Knight With the Lion,” or ‘Yvain,’” allows me to illustrate how often and in how many ways non-recognition is used. A progressive
summary, this chapter pauses at each instance of non-recognition for discussion and observation.

The conclusion, "Recognizing Non-Recognition," reflects on the observations made throughout the thesis and avers that non-recognition should undeniably be considered a characteristic of courtly love and a possible result of amor hereos.

For several reasons, I have chosen Henryson’s Testament and Chrétien’s “Yvain” to illustrate my supposition that non-recognition is a characteristic of courtly love. First, these two works rely heavily on non-recognition to not only enhance the drama of their stories but to solidify the plot, for without non-recognition, these stories cannot resolve the conflicts. Second, in these works, Henryson and Chrétien remain loyal to the tradition of courtly love, and they fill their stories with occurrences and nuances that are characteristic of the courtly love tradition, such as lovers blushing, and an exchange of rings. This use of courtly love characteristics in both stories provides further evidence that non-recognition is part of the tradition of courtly love. And third, by examining two stories that are written at different times—The Testament circa 1470 (Duncan 128), “Yvain” circa 1180 (Chrétien xii)—in different places—The Testament in Scotland, “Yvain” in France—and in different languages that are respective of each country—I am able to show that non-recognition was a characteristic of courtly love not limited to a certain time period, location, and language; rather, non-recognition existed in the courtly love tradition wherever and whenever courtly love was employed.
Chapter I

Amor Hereos or Courtly Love?

The term “courtly love” was first used by Gaston Paris in an article written in 1883 to refer to the “amour-coutois” of twelfth-century France (Lacy 102), and since then has been used to describe the artful practice of a highly specialized love that is characterized by “humility, courtesy, adultery, and the religion of love” (Lewis 2), which came into being during the Middle Ages. It is debatable whether or not the practice actually took place in real life or if it was simply a literary convention that enabled writers to expand their imagination into a realm of make-believe lands, maidens, and Arthurian knights. Norris J. Lacy explains that courtly love affairs “may never have taken place, or, if they did, they may have never been more than literary social exercises” (102). But even if courtly love only existed in literature, courtly love had an effect on its readers and their concept of love, for at this time, the population experienced a shift in power: the grip of the Church loosened, and the power of nobles began to decrease (Ackerman 52). According to Diane Ackerman, “This new concept of love radically altered how people defined themselves and sought fulfillment,” and introduced the population to the concept of personal choice (52). At a time when France was experiencing the hardships and violence of war, the concept of “true love” came to mean something valuable and wonderful (55).

Although some scholars claim that courtly love did not exist outside of literature, real life experiences must have been a catalyst for the convention. Accompanying acts performed by the knights in love and the expectations of courtesy felt by the women in love are the physical and mental symptoms, which include blushing, confusion, nervousness, and sleeplessness. In fact, these mental and physical experiences are
characteristic of the genre just as much as "humility, courtesy, adultery, and the religion of love" (Lewis 2). Considering these mental and physical indicators of love that recur in medieval courtly love romances, Carol F. Heffernan suggests that courtly love is based on *amor heros*, "the disease of love," chronicled in the medical papers concurrent with a thriving courtly love genre. "In some sense," Heffernan notes, "the kind of love introduced into literature by the troubadours of twelfth-century Provence may be thought of as a literary variant of the medical phenomenon. It has come to be known as Courtly Love" (298).

In both literature and reality, "true love" became a form of escape from the hardships of everyday life. Ackerman explains that courtly love did exist in reality in a game form called "The Court of Love." The game was played by a group of people who gathered in a court and asked each other questions that produced "witty banter" since "no one expected solutions to these predicaments" (53). Ackerman gives an example:

In one such game, Queen Eleanor was asked to decide which she would rather have as a lover—a young man of no virtue or an old man of much virtue. She picked the old man because in courtly love virtue was paramount. (53)

The whole point of courtly love was to produce a feeling of longing and unbearable arousal; consummation was not meant to be part of the game. One practice of courtly love that produced feelings of longing was jealousy, which, according to Capellanus' *The Art of Courtly Love*, increases love in a lover. In fact, true jealousy was considered "the nurse of love" (Capellanus 153). Diane Ackerman adds, "Jealousy is depicted as noble when felt by lovers, despicable when felt by husbands" (58). Other things encouraging love include dreaming of one's beloved, one lover's anger with the
other, lovers rarely meeting, showing a pleasant manner, meditating on a lover, a. scolding from parents, and hearing the praises of one’s lover (Capellanus 153-54). On the other hand, things discouraging love include meeting a lover too often, having an unattractive appearance, losing property, being indiscreet or uncharitable, and blaspheming God. Also, if a lover makes fun of the other’s blushing, or if a lover lacks modesty or speaks foolishly, then love will be discouraged: (154-55): But the worst thing a lover can do to discourage love is to be unfaithful, since this would be evidence that a lover lacks virtue. Although a man is sometimes permitted to engage in an affair with another woman who is not his beloved, it is inexcusable for a woman to have an affair with another man who is not her beloved. Capellanus writes, “God forbid that we should ever declare that a woman who is not ashamed to wanton with two men should go unpunished” (162).

A lady’s virtue was, above all, the most important quality a woman should possess. She could be beautiful and wealthy, but a true courtly lover was attracted to her honor, faithfulness, and spirituality. Capellanus explains:

A person of good character draws the love of another person of the same kind, for a well-instructed lover, man or woman, does not reject an ugly lover if the character within is good. (35)

A virtuous woman taught virtues to her lover, enabled her lover to succeed on the battlefield, attempted to perfect his humility, and strove to maintain her lover’s honor (Ackerman 58). A knight would also present himself as a lady’s humble servant, fawn over her, and treat her with the ultimate of respect in an “attempt to perfect himself apropos of his beloved” (54). Since a lady loved a man only if he succeeded in showing gentleness and refining her reputation, women would put men through tests; thus, service
became an art form. Capellanus expands: “O what a wonderful thing is love, which makes a man shine with so many virtues and teaches everyone, no matter who he is, so many good traits of character!” (31).

Along with the practices of courtesy, gentleness, wooing, and honor, secrecy was also a necessary trait of a courtly love affair, and was also in fact the most important for maintaining the affair. Since lovers were often married to others, secrecy was necessary for a successful affair. Ackerman writes, “Wallowing in each other’s eyes, speaking through gestures, exchanging notes and signs, they learned to be a secret society complete with passwords and ceremonies and a holy crusade, a religion of two” (59). If love is made public, as Capellanus writes, it rarely endures, but if it does survive after being made public, the love felt by each lover grows.

In addition to secrecy, another trait of courtly love is the exchange of jewelry, which serves different purposes. The exchange of jewelry confirmed an affair and was symbolic of the trust and love shared between the two lovers. For instance, in Geoffrey Chaucer’s Troilus and Criseyde, a brooch given to a lady would remind her of her lover when they were separated (5. 1039-41). A brooch or ring given to a knight by his lover would be worn on the battlefield to act when his strength was weakening as a reminder of his lady’s virtue. That love aided a knight in battle was beneficial, but sometimes the love interfered with a knight’s chivalry.

The potential danger of love to a knight is seen in the affair of Sir Lancelot and Queen Guinevere, which is probably the medieval romance tradition’s most popular adulterous love affair. Their love affair illustrates how courtly love, if too intense, can interfere with a knight’s honor. In Chrétien de Troyes’ “Lancelot” or “The Knight with the Cart,” Lancelot was willing, at the command of Guinevere, to disgrace himself before
the knights and ladies gathered at a tournament. In the end, however, Guinevere tells him
to do his best in the mock battle (Chrétien 238-42). Thus, Chrétien de Troyes
demonstrates both the power of the lady in courtly love and the essential dedication of the
knight to the lady. In this scene between Lancelot and Gunievere, Chrétien also shows
how a man's heroic behavior was often in conflict with the ideals of courtly love.

In Chrétien's "Lancelot," the intensity of love that Lancelot feels for Guinevere
begins to affect him mentally and physically. Lancelot's reason falters and, on the request
of a woman he loves, he almost purposely loses a tournament, which is unacceptable and
unheard of in the code of chivalry. As love increases in characters of medieval love
romances, those characters like Lancelot not only lose reason but also begin to experience
the physical symptoms of love, which include dizziness, blushing, and sleeplessness.
Occasionally these mental and physical symptoms become so severe they result in a type
of insanity, as seen with Yvain in Chrétien's "The Knight with the Lion," or "Yvain."

When considering tales such as "Lancelot" and "Yvain," Heffernan's assertion of
a parallel existing "between the medieval poets' portrait of courtly love and the medieval
physicians' clinical description of amor hercios," or "the disease of love" (Heffernan 294),
is valid. Heffernan explains that love in itself was not a disease, but men in love could be
led to a state of sickness (299). She cites a description of the disease of love from a
document written in 1508 by Constantine the African:

[T]he operation of the mind is threefold: first, fantasy; second, rational
intellect; third, memory. And there are two parts of the brain, one the
forepart, the other the rear. And the forepart is divided into two parts....
And two ventricles change the air in the forepart; hence and in this manner
they give to the brain the animal spirit so that it produces the senses of
sight, hearing, smell, taste, and once again, fantasy. Hence it passes to the place which is the middle of the brain, which is the body. (Heffernan 296)

The top-middle ventricle of brain controls the faculty of estimation, and this area is responsible for the first symptoms of amor hereos (296). Heffernan writes, “If the lover’s desire for an unattainable object is excessive; the desire can overwhelm the faculty of estimation and an obsessive desire for sexual gratification overthrow reason” (296). When this “reason” is overthrown, the lover becomes willing to suffer the pains of longing, and since the middle brain connects to the body, and the middle brain is directly effected by desire, the body begins to experience the physical symptoms of “the disease of love.” These symptoms include sleeplessness, hot flashes, and a loss of appetite.

In Robert Henryson’s The Testament of Cresseid, Troilus experiences both mental and physical symptoms similar to those described by Heffernan. In the non-recognition scene, Henryson devotes two stanzas to the processes of Troilus’ mental and physical states, emphasizing the importance of the scene to the poem. I believe that it is not Cresseid’s leprosy in Henryson’s poem that is the punishment for her wantonness, but that Cresseid’s meeting Troilus and their failure to recognize each other is her punishment for her unfaithfulness. I also believe that this non-recognition scene is used by Henryson to do more than dramatize the plot of the poem; the two stanzas also emphasize Troilus suffering from amor hereos, as his symptoms move from the mental realm into the physical realm.

In medieval romances, non-recognition occurs so often that it could be considered a characteristic of medieval romances and an indication that a story or poem is written in the tradition of courtly love. In fact, scenes of non-recognition occur as frequently as the exchange of jewelry or rings, jealousy, and blushing by the lovers, all of which indicate a
piece is in the literary style of courtly love. This thesis will explain why the non-recognition scene, as demonstrated in Cresseid’s punishment in The Testament, should be considered also to be a characteristic of the medieval romances.

Moreover, in the courtly love tradition, non-recognition presents itself in two different manners: a character purposely attempts to conceal his or her identity to avoid recognition; or a lover, friend, or relative is not recognized when recognition should result. When recognition occurs, however, it is through such means as the recognition of jewelry in The Romance of Tristan and Iseult, of armor in Troilus and Criseyde and “The Knight with the Lion,” or of clothes in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight. This thesis focuses on the second type of non-recognition: when someone should be easily recognized and is not.

By examining the use of non-recognition and its function and effects in Robert Henryson’s The Testament and in Chrétien de Troyes’ “The Knight with the Lion,” or “Yvain,” I attempt to determine the possible causes for the general use of non-recognition scenes in medieval romances. Heffernan’s assertion that amor hereos is the base for courtly love suggests that amor hereos might be accountable for non-recognition in tales of courtly love, and that Henryson may purposely have employed this idea in The Testament. By examining non-recognition in both Henryson’s and Chrétien’s works, and by noting similarities between the two stories, I illustrate relationships between scenes of non-recognition and the practice of courtly love. In discussing the two poems, I demonstrate as well that the use of non-recognition is not simply an element of the plot, but is also a device that intensifies the drama of courtly love and chivalry. Further, I suggest it is possible that non-recognition is a symptom of amor hereos, and since amor
hereos is the base upon which courtly love was built, a non-recognition scene helps to indicate that a medieval story or poem is written within the tradition of courtly love.
Interlude

A Note On Henryson’s Factual Tendencies

Throughout *The Testament*, Henryson uses factual information to lend credibility to his poem, including his use of the then widely-popular exchange of jewelry, which Anne McKim addresses, “[T]here is ample evidence that rings, as well as brooches, were often exchanged between lovers as well as given on more formal occasions like betrothals and marriages” (McKim 450). Other factual details include but are not limited to Henryson’s precise descriptions of leprosy and astrology. In fact, Henryson has the ability to integrate his knowledge of details, fact, and science into the characteristics that were used when writing in the tradition of courtly love.

One of the best examples of Henryson’s factual and scientific knowledge is his portrayal of planets. All the planets adhere to their medieval scientific characterizations in both their physical appearance and their personality. For example, Jennifer Strauss comments on how the characterization of Mars in *The Testament* is both valid and in accordance with Mars’ astrological attributes. She writes, Henryson’s selection of detail “gives intellectual validation to a reading already strongly present in the suggestive surface of the imagery and the total quality of the language” (Strauss 9). Stearns agrees and also notes that Henryson was correct in associating Mars and Cynthia with leprosy (Stearns, *Robert Henryson*); however, Johnstone Parr points out that Stearns never provides an explanation for this statement, and fails to explain how Cynthia and Mars are linked to leprosy (Parr 487). To address these matters, Parr refers to the text of Joannes ab Ingagine, an early sixteenth-century astrologer, to assert that Henryson is correct in linking leprosy and Cynthia. Ingagine’s twenty-third “Canon” reads: “Saturne with the
Moone engendreth the fallen sicknesse, blacke chollere, leprosy and fistula" (487). The use of Saturn to inflict leprosy on Cresseid supports scholarly assumptions that Henryson’s purpose for writing *The Testament* was to punish Cresseid. In a modern study of Saturn, Liz Greene writes:

Saturn is [...] a symbol of the psychic process, natural to all human beings, by which an individual may utilize the experience of pain, restriction, and discipline as a means for greater consciousness and fulfillment. [...] Saturn is connected with the educational value of pain and with the difference between external values—those which we acquire from others—and internal values—those which we have worked to discover within ourselves. (10)

Henryson’s use of symbols such as Saturn give *The Testament* credibility and influence the reading on both symbolic and factual levels. Henryson does not simply use any planet, but instead, the planet associated with both leprosy and educational growth. Henryson’s accuracy of astrology is also observed in his description of the Sun’s being in opposition to Venus. Denton Fox mentions that Venus can never have an elongation of more than 48 degrees, which means that Venus can never actually be in opposition to the sun. He explains, “Venus in opposition to the sun suggests an impossibly great malevolence” (Fox 341). Henryson’s consistent use of factual information supports the idea that the non-recognition scene, along with Troilus’ physical and mental states, is also factual and has scientific explanation.

Still, some scholars suggest that Henryson wrote *The Testament* so Cresseid could realize her sin, and even if this were not Henryson’s only purpose, it is one. Greene
writes, human beings do not attempt “self-discovery until things become so painful that they have no other choice” (11). With these considerations, it is no wonder why Henryson used Saturn, “the lord of Karma” (11) and life-changing lessons, to inflict leprosy on Cresseid. Saturn allows Cresseid to suffer until she has no other choice but to realize her wrong, and it is Saturn’s power of reformation which also suggests that Cresseid truly realizes her unfaithfulness to Troilus. Greene writes, “Saturn is key in transformation of the self which is directly connected with the psychology of the self” (194). Since Saturn’s association is with a psychological transformation brought on by pain, Saturn is responsible for the physical punishment of leprosy and for the meeting of Cresseid and Troilus, which brings about Cresseid’s inner change. This change is evident in her lament, “Fy, fals Cresseid; O trew knicht Troylus” (l. 560). The psychological punishment of the meeting between Cresseid and Troilus has more of an effect in bringing a change in inner values than does her leprosy, and it is this meeting, between the former lovers, that is also the peak of The Testament.

In addition to astrology, Henryson demonstrates an impressive knowledge of leprosy, the disease afflicting Cresseid. Adamson suggests that Henryson could have come to his own descriptions of leprosy by observing lepers. Duncan agrees that Henryson had personal experiences with lepers that would have allowed him to derive his own perspectives and conclusions. In fact, Stearns concludes that Henryson’s details of Cresseid’s leprosy may have been formed by his own observations in the town of Dunfermline:

Leper hospitals were frequently located outside of the towns, and when the poet says that Calchas opened a secret gate and conveyed his daughter to a
village half a mile away, leaving her at the spital-house (ll. 388-91),

Henryson may be employing details which he had observed in the town of Dunfermline. (Stearns, "Robert Henryson" 266)

Stearns also notes that in 1427 the Scottish parliament declared that lepers were forbidden to beg in the town, were ordered to stay beyond the gate leading into town, and were only allowed to enter the town once per week. These rules are seen in The Testament when Cresseid and her fellow lepers are outside of town and begging Troilus for money. Stearns also observes that Cresseid’s diet of “mowlit breid, peirrier and ceder sour,” instead of her usual “waillit Wyne and Meits,” lends a “realistic force” to the Testament (266). According to Parr, who quotes Books of Paulus Aegineta, this diet is also substantiated by medical authorities: “The food should be barley bread [...] But let him abstain from wine during the whole continuance of the complaint” (491).

In addition to being accurate in his illustration of the social treatment of lepers, Henryson is correct in his descriptions of leprosy. There were four different types of leprosy at the time: leonina, alopecia, tyria, and elephantiasis, the last being the only one deemed incurable. Henryson in The Testament is assumed to be referring to elephantiasis (Stearns, "Robert Henryson” 266), and his description of elephantitis is “so accurate that the doctor, Sir J.Y. Simpson, cited it as proof that cases of Greek elephantiasis existed in Scotland just as they are known to have existed on the continent” (267). Cresseid describes her symptoms:

My cleir voice and courtlie carrolling,

Quhair I was wont with ladyis for to sing,

Is rawk as ruik, full hideous, hoir and hace;
My plesand port, all vtheris precelling,

Of lustines I was hald maist conding—

Now is deformat the figour of my face;

To luik on it na leid now lyking hes. (ll. 443-49)

Simpson writes, “The particular symptoms which he [Henryson] makes Saturn invoke upon Cresseid, to transform her into a Leper, are exactly the most marked symptoms of Greek elephantiasis” (qtd. In Stearns, “Robert Henryson” 267). This conclusion is mainly based on Henryson’s emphasis that Cresseid’s sickness was “incurabill” (268).

In support of Duncan’s and Stearns’ assertions that Henryson could have had first-hand experiences with lepers, Eugenie R. Freed explains that one of Henryson’s responsibilities as a schoolmaster (Henryson was associated with the Abbey school in Dunfermline) was to make regular visits to the leper hospital on the other end of town. Freed continues, these visitations would have allowed Henryson opportunities to interact with lepers (2). In contrast with Freed’s assertion, Parr points out that a similar description of leprosy could have been found in “almost every medical work of any importance in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries—works which include ancient classical authorities, and the eminent English physicians” (489). Freed reminds us that “Henryson was a man of great learning. He was a Master of Arts, a canon lawyer in holy order, and—both by profession and by natural inclination—a teacher,” (2), and this education would allow Henryson access to the medical papers to which Parr refers to in his article. Using all his medical sources, Parr summarizes the symptoms of leprosy:
The disease deprives one of hair, turns the color of the skin to a blackish hue, covers the body (particularly the face) with ulcerations, tubercles, or spots, alters the eyes, changes the voice, and deforms the body. (490)

If Cresseid experienced these symptoms, then there is justification for Troilus not recognizing her; had their encounter actually occurred in reality, then the deformities of leprosy would have minimized Troilus’ ability to recognize Cresseid.

The fact that Henryson describes a disease that could actually cause non-recognition should not be overlooked. Precise descriptions of leprosy, astrology, and courtly love suggest that Henryson meant The Testament to represent reality. Factual information allows events in the poem, such as contracting leprosy, to be easier understood by the imaginations of the audience, since the audience could potentially experience these events in daily life. The factual details used by Henryson in The Testament suggest that the non-recognition scene is also scientifically possible.
Chapter II

Henryson’s Testament

On Troilus and Criseyde and The Testament of Cresseid

Although some scholars would disagree, I assume Troilus and Cresseid in Henryson’s The Testament of Cresseid, circa 1470 (Duncan 128), are meant to be the same as the characters from Chaucer’s Troilus and Criseyde, circa 1380 (Benson 471). Although there are differences in some matters of plot, such as Troilus’ death and the giving of the brooch to Diomede in Troilus, these matters do not affect my argument. Further, because Henryson obviously meant to continue Chaucer’s poem, I weave the poems together to obtain fuller characterizations of both Troilus and Cresseid. When The Testament is considered a continuation of Troilus, some details that Henryson purposely repeats from Chaucer’s poem are clearly seen to emphasize the themes and rituals characteristic of courtly love.

Perhaps the most significant of these repetitions is the gift of a brooch that Troilus gives to Criseyde in Troilus, which parallels the gift of the ring that Troilus gives to Cresseid in The Testament. As Denton Fox notes, the ring Cresseid bequeaths to Troilus at the end of Henryson’s Testament may be suggested by the brooch Troilus gives Criseyde in Chaucer’s Troilus (381-82). This repetition emphasizes a common action seen in medieval romances: an exchange of jewelry, which was also common in the everyday life of medieval men and women. The symbolic significance of both the ring and the brooch will be discussed at depth in the third section of this chapter, but for now I concentrate on the role the ring and brooch play in the two plots.

Often when there is an exchange of jewelry, the jewelry will later play a role in the recognition of a lover or recognition of a fact. In Troilus, when Troilus recognizes the
brooch on Diomede's collar, the brooch initially evokes his memory of the object, then his emotions and memory of Criseyde, and then his recognition that Criseyde has been unfaithful. The brooch not only becomes the key to Troilus' knowledge of Criseyde's affair, but also symbolizes her rejection of his love, which he is not told about but discovers through the associations that the ring provokes. In The Testament, the ring does more than trigger Troilus' memory of Cresseid; when Troilus recognizes the ring, he assumes that Cresseid has died. Thus, as the poem's lover demonstrates increased longing or reaches an epiphany when seeing the ring, the audience or readers also experience that realization. In such instances, the exchange of jewelry works to influence the plot and adds to the drama of courtly love.

Along with Troilus' death, and the differences in the brooch, another difference to note is the end of Henryson's poem. Chaucer concludes his poem by saying that, "And sholden al oure herțe on heven caste" (5.1825), and that God and Christ are "best to love" (1847); however, Henryson concludes that the laws of courtly love are the rules that should be followed: "Ming not ˣour lufe with fals deceptioun" (l. 613). Chaucer, in contrast, excuses the unfaithfulness of Criseyde because Troilus and Criseyde should have been deeply in love with God and not with each other. Henryson does not forgive Cresseid for her wantonness, nor does he give her something to look forward to in death because her sin is against courtly love. David J. Parkinson writes, "Nowhere [...] is Henryson so deeply concerned with the course and consequence of punitive suffering as in The Testament" (356). Henryson makes an example of Cresseid's leprosy and poor fortune to show how lovers are expected to be faithful to each other and to be aware of their misdeeds. At the end of The Testament, Cresseid realizes her mistake and shows
her remorse: “But it is a guilt only in terms of her leaving Troilus, a sin against courtly love” (Ramson 34); brought on by her meeting with Troilus when the lovers fail to recognize each other. Until this meeting, Cresseid lamented the loss of her beauty, wealth, and honor, but after the non-recognition scene with Troilus, Cresseid admits her wrong in being unfaithful to Troilus and realizes she has been foolish in love.

Some argue that Henryson’s Testament is a moral poem asserting Christian values, but I do not agree. I believe Henryson’s Testament attempts to address Cresseid’s unfaithfulness that broke the rules of courtly love, while also implying that the practice of courtly love is not in accordance with the practice of Christianity. Unlike Chaucer’s conclusion to Troilus, in which the narrator turns to the love and honoring of the only Christian God, Henryson’s Testament emphasizes honoring the planetary Gods. Like Chaucer, Andreas Capellanus in The Art of Courtly Love had turned to a divine love instead of an earthly love to explain that all men should know the rules of courtly love; however, they should not engage in courtly love, for by not engaging in courtly love, God will love them more. Whereas Andreas Capellanus demonstrates that courtly love is a contradiction in itself, as one should only love God, Henryson writes about the experience and consequences of courtly love without turning to the divine love of God. Henryson resolves this contradiction by concentrating only on matters of courtly love, rather than including the worship of a single Christian God. I think Henryson intended to purge from the story of Troilus and Criseyde this contradiction between courtly love and Christian doctrine by focusing instead on the law of courtly love and not divine love.

Although Henryson focuses on courtly love, I do not think that Cresseid’s leprosy is bestowed upon her as a punishment for her sin against courtly love. Rather, Cresseid is
doomed with leprosy because she blames and disgraces the planetary gods for having been banished by her lovers and having lost her honor and beauty. Cresseid’s punishment for betraying and sinning against the rules of courtly love is an indirect result of blaspheming the planetary gods, since Cresseid’s real punishment for unfaithfulness comes in the form of the non-recognition scene when she and Troilus fail to recognize each other. Although leprosy is a punishment for Cresseid’s insulting and blaming the Gods of love, the non-recognition scene is a punishment for her unfaithfulness to Troilus, a scene which Cresseid must experience to understand her sin against courtly love.

If Henryson’s purpose for writing *The Testament of Cresseid* is to punish Cresseid for her sins because Chaucer failed to do so, then it is easy to agree with Tatyana Moran’s view on the non-recognition scene. Arguing that Cresseid must experience this meeting with Troilus in order to reach her epiphany and understand her sin, Moran concludes Henryson conceived *The Testament* “as a story of punishment and expiation through suffering” (11). Jane Adamson, however, with a different view on the poem’s purpose, suggests the real subject in *The Testament* is the divide between Henryson’s compassion toward Cresseid and his moral standards which cause him to believe that Cresseid needs to be punished for her sin. For Adamson then, *The Testament* is more about Henryson’s “moral confusion” than about morality itself (40).

“The question ‘why was this poem written?’ has not been asked enough,” writes Douglas Duncan. He continues:

The explanation of the moralitas that it was written for the ‘worschip and instructioun’ of ‘worthie wemen’ satisfies no one; nor can we any longer
fall back on the old answer that the poet was a censorious moralist irritated by Chaucer’s leniency on his heroine. (129)

Duncan suggests that because Henryson was at his harshest in describing leprosy and because “Henryson had certainly seen and probably known lepers.” The Testament may be Henryson’s way of questioning divine justice (130).

However, I believe one of the prime reasons Henryson wrote The Testament is so that he could return the focus of the story about Troilus and Cresseid back to courtly love from which Chaucer strayed at the end of Troilus. By so focusing, Henryson also implements common themes and characteristics detectable in the tradition of Medieval Romance, among which is the non-recognition scene.

Lines 498-511

Accompanying that question regarding what Henryson meant to accomplish with The Testament as a whole is what Henryson meant the non-recognition scene to do. The non-recognition scene occurs after Cresseid is cast out by her lover, Diomede, and after she darns the Gods and, in turn, the Gods damn her with leprosy. Wishing no one to see her in a state of leprosy, Cresseid joins the band of lepers who beg outside the gates of the village, where she later comes into contact with Troilus. When the lepers see the knights, they begin to rattle their clappers, and Troilus, in pity, heeds their call. He stops in front of Cresseid:

Than vpon him scho kest vp baith hir ene,

And with ane blenk it come into his thocht,

That he sumtime hir face befoil had sene,
Bot scho was in sic pyle'he knew hir nocht; (ll. 498-501).

Although this situation might be interpreted to be a case of partial recognition, I do not believe it is recognition at all; Troilus is simply reminded of Cresseid by the look of the leper. Scholarship written about Henryson's Testament has resolved this case of non-recognition, in numerous ways. Denton Fox refers to Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde to answer the question of why the poem includes the non-recognition scene, and he concludes that the non-recognition scene "fulfils the prophecy which Chaucer's Troilus made in his letter to Criseyde: 'I woot that whan ye next upon me se, / So lost haue I myn hele and ek myn hewe, / Criseyde shal nought konne knownen me'” (5.1402-04). Fox's theory, which ties Henryson's text back to Chaucer's, supports my decision to treat both texts as one and to reassert that Henryson intended The Testament to address and sustain the values of courtly love that are visible in Troilus.

As another explanation for the lovers not recognizing each other, Stearns offers Aristotle's "De Memoria et Reminiscentia" (which will be discussed in more detail later), and then writes, "The irony of the situation depends on the fact that recognition does not take place, but the situation depends on the fact that recognition very nearly occurs [...]. Henryson made an original and strikingly successful use of Aristotelian psychology" (Robert Henryson 105). Stearns' statement refers to the inner psychological process in Troilus after he sees the leper Cresseid's eyes. John M. Ross, who overlooked Troilus' inner psychological process, wrote:

 Something in the miserable face and form of Cresseid reminds him of his lost darling, and an agony of vague remembrance shakes his frame. He drops a purse of gold and heap of jewels at her skirt, and then rides on
without a word. When she learns the name of her generous benefactor (For she had not dared to lift her eyes), there burst from her lips a storm of self upbraiding and a passionate eulogism of her former love. (Ross 167)

In this passage, Ross quickly attributes the incident of non-recognition to the explanation he places in parentheses—"For she had not dared lift her eyes"—which dismisses any potential significance of the event and limits its importance. But when one refers to Henryson’s text, one sees that Ross’ explanation is incorrect; “Than vpon him scho kest vp baith hir ene, / And with ane blenk it come into his thocht, / That he sumtime hir face befoir had sene” (ll. 498-500). Obviously, Cresseid lifts her eyes, a fact central to the non-recognition scene, for it is Cresseid’s eyes and glance that trigger Troilus’ memory of Cresseid and produce the psychological stanza (ll. 505-11).

Jane Adamson writes extensively on this psychological stanza, and resolves Troilus’ non-recognition by concluding that the “fictional situation” of two lovers failing to recognize each other happens because of “a kind of absent-mindedness to the present in Troilus, caused by the intense emotional pressure of the past” (Adamson 17). This emotional pressure evokes a reaction in Troilus that almost contradicts the fact that Troilus “knew hir nocht."

‖it than hir luik into his mynd it brocht

The sweit visage and amorous blenking

Of fair Cresseid, sumtyme his awin darling.

Na wonder was, suppois in mynd that he

Tuik her figure sa sone, and lo, now quhy:
The Idole of ane thing in case may be
Sa deip impreit in the fantasy
That it deludis the wittis outwardly,
And sa appeiris in forme and lyke estait,
Within the mynd as it was figurait. (ll. 502-11)

Troilus' complex psychological process as described in the stanza above draws much attention from scholars and critics who, for the most part, agree with Stearns' conclusion that, in this passage, Troilus' lack of reason causes an illusion responsible for his failure to recognize Cresseid (Adamson 19). The intricate details and the use of an entire stanza to describe the inner process of Troilus places emphasis on the incident and leads one to question why the process is emphasized. Stearns cites Aristotle's psychology set forth in his De Anima and in his Parva Naturalia, specifically sections of "De Memoria et Reminiscentia," to explain that even though recognition does not take place, it "very nearly occurs" (Robert Henryson 105). Stearns summarizes the elements of Aristotle's theory of cognition in three steps: sensation, which comes from external stimuli; imagination, which stores "copies" of external sensation after it has been removed; and rational thought, which reasons between the true and the false (99). The sensation caused from Cresseid's glance reminds Troilus of the external stimulation from which his imagination recorded the image of Cresseid seen for the first time. Stearns explains that this image is recalled in Troilus through recollection, "which operates according to the laws of association" (99).

Agreeing with Stearns' suggestion of recollection, Adamson writes that Troilus might be reminded of his fair Cresseid through the eyes and glance of the leper Cresseid
because "Troilus was in the habit of recalling her image to mind very frequently"
(Adamson 21). This point is also fundamental to the next section's discussion of Troilus' physical reaction. Adamson refers to but does not cite the following passage in Aristotle's "De Memoria et Reminiscentia:"

Acts of recollection, as they occur in experience, are due to the fact that one movement has by nature another that succeeds it in regular order. If this order be necessary, whenever a subject experiences the former of two movements thus connected, it will [invariably][his brackets] experience the latter; if however, the order be not necessary, but customary, only in the majority of cases will the subject experience the latter of the two movements. But there is a fact that there are some movements, by a single experience of which persons take the impress of custom more deeply than they do by experiencing others many times; hence upon seeing some things but once we remember them better than others which we have seen frequently. (McKeon 612)

In The Testament, Cresseid's eyes provoke Troilus into a trance in which he vividly recalls Cresseid, but it was in Troilus that these memories were experienced. Troilus spent a considerable amount of time in Troilus remembering Criseyde's features:

And in his thought gan up and down to wynde
Hire wordes alle, and every countenaunce,
And fermely impressen in his mynde
The leeste point that to hym was plesaunce;
And, verraylich, of thilke remembrunce
Desir al newe hym brende, and lust to brede

·Gan more than erst, and yet took he non hede. (3.1541-47)

In Troilus’ brain, his love for Criseyde and her image are associated with desire, and this intense desire causes Troilus’ irrational behavior in *The Testament* when he encounters the leper Cresseid. Like Chaucer, Henryson refers to Troilus’ image of Cresseid in the psychological passage. By describing an impression made on the mind, Henryson creates definite allusions to Chaucer’s story, which reasserts the influence that Chaucer’s *Troilus* had on *The Testament*. And since Cresseid is a direct route into Troilus’ mind and is easily recalled at any moment, a process of association is not required for Troilus to remember his fair Cresseid’s face. Adamson writes:

> [T]he way Troilus once saw fair Cresseid made ‘so deep an impression on his mind’ that her image could never leave it, nor lose its shape, nor lose its power over him; and because of that, it could therefore spring back into his mind’s eye at any time with apparently surprising speed. (19)

Although Stearns suggests that association is responsible for Troilus’ lack of recognition, Stearns never explains how the mind functions in association, how association activates memory, or how association applies to the meeting of lovers. Rather than using association to explain Troilus’ reaction to the leper Cresseid, Stearns refers to illusion and delusion that are brought about by inner images and deep emotion to explain what is happening to Troilus in the psychological passage. Stearns proposes that what is happening in Troilus’ mind is associated with illusions attributed to Troilus’ imagination. Stearns cites the following lines of Aristotle’s “De Sōmnis” that describe Aristotle’s theory of illusion:
When under the influence of strong feelings we are easily deceived regarding our sensations, different persons in different ways, as e.g. the coward under the influence of fear and the lover under that of love have such illusions that the former owing to a trifling resemblance thinks he sees an enemy and the latter his beloved. (460b 15ff)

Of Troilus' "delusion," Stearns writes that Troilus experiences a "quasi-hallucination:"

"Troilus thinks for a moment that he actually sees his fair Cresseid. A moment later he comes to his senses and rides on" (Robert Henryson 101).

I, however, believe that at no point does Troilus think he actually "sees" his fair Cresseid. Nor do I believe that Troilus "comes to his senses" before he rides off. With my first point, Adamson agrees: "Troilus does not at any stage or in any way see the leper-figure in front of him as the earlier 'fair Cresseid' [...] Troilus is not deceived by his memory-image at any stage; he merely fails to recognize Cresseid" (Adamson 17-18).

Yet, although Troilus does not recognize Cresseid, the leper's face and glance do remind Troilus of his former lover, for "hir luik into his mynd it brocht" the "amorous blenking / Of fair Cresseid" (ll. 502-04).

Thus, the face and look of the leper woman "brocht" or evoked the image of Cresseid into Troilus' memory. Henryson's words do not imply that Troilus hallucinated Cresseid, for an hallucination is what Troilus' image of Cresseid would have to be since the leper Cresseid does not look like his "fair Cresseid." Adamson writes that when Stearns asserts that the sight of Cresseid's eyes causes Troilus to experience a quasi-hallucination, Stearns "is surely distorting Henryson's text" (Adamson 20). According to
Adamson, Henryson does not use any process of illusion or delusion, nor does he refer to any of Aristotle’s theories (20).

Stearns thus believes Cresseid is actually present for Troilus, but I believe, in contrast, that Cresseid is not present in Troilus’ reality but is present through the “idole,” or image, of Cresseid in his mind. Troilus does not necessarily think he actually sees Cresseid, but rather, Troilus gets lost in his imagination and falls into a trance remembering the Cresseid that appears in his imagination. Troilus’ flood of emotion and overwhelming physical sensation (which will be discussed in the next section) is proof that Troilus can distinguish between the two, for it is Troilus’ memory of Cresseid that causes his physical reaction, not the leper Cresseid whom his eyes see. On the outside, Troilus sees the leper Cresseid, and on the inside, Troilus sees his fair Cresseid. It is the inner image that was “Impentit so deip in the mynd” that “deludis the wittis outwardly” and causes Troilus to react the way he does. However, Adamson notes that the word “deludis” cannot mean ‘deludes’ in the ordinary sense: “To befool the mind or judgement of, so as to cause what is false to be accepted as true...” (19). In this case, the word “deludis” is actually closer to “eludes.” Adamson also inspects the word “wittis” and concludes that it must mean “not the reason, but the sensory faculties of perception” (18-19). The outward wits are seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, and touching, and the inward wits are common sense, imagination, fantasy, judgement, and memory. “Troilus’ inner wits (specifically memory and fantasy) have eluded his consciousness of the ‘outward’ wits turned to the world” (Adamson 19). It is this “mental image of a past reality” or “form” or “idole” that is so deeply imprinted in Troilus’ mind, that it is easily evoked and re-experienced.
To address my second point, which is that Troilus did not come to his senses before he rode off, I suggest that when Henryson writes, "deludis the wittis outwardly," he refers to Troilus' outward actions—the tossing of his riches, his riding off without a word, and his body's heat and dizziness—which come as a response to his memory-image. Already, here, Troilus' mental symptoms are becoming physical, expressed through action while being felt through senses. The uproar of emotion caused by his memory of Cresseid causes Troilus to toss his gold and jewels into the lap of the leper Cresseid, and that heightened state of emotion which causes his memory of Cresseid continues as he rides off: "and not ane word he spak / Pensiwe in hart, quhill he come to the toun, / And for.greit cair oft syis almaist fell doun" (ll. 523-25). Henryson thus suggests that Troilus has not yet recovered from his meeting with the leper Cresseid or, more appropriately, his memory-image of Cresseid, and Troilus has not yet come to his senses in a way that restores his mental stability.

Since romantic love affects a person both mentally and physically, starting with a physical attraction that leads to a mental reaction, Troilus' state may be more appropriately attributed to love than to Aristotelian psychology, in which delusions and illusions affect the mind and then the body. Although Troilus' reaction to the leper Cresseid is initially a mental reaction that leads to a physical reaction, Troilus' mental reaction to the leper Cresseid's eyes evokes the memory of the initial physical reaction to fair Cresseid, which he imprinted first in his heart/body and then in his mind in Troilus (1. 453-54). (These lines will be discussed in more depth in section three of this chapter, "512-18.") Since the image of Cresseid was imprinted so deeply in his mind, Troilus
could have been “meditating” on Criseyde, which is common in the case of courtly love. Capellanus describes such a meditation:

For when a man sees some woman fit for love and shaped according to his taste, he begins at once to lust after her in his heart, then the more he thinks about her the more he burns with love, until he comes to a fuller meditation [...]. [...] after he has come to this complete meditation, love cannot hold the remains [...] not every kind of meditation can be the cause of love, an excessive one is required. (29)

In this passage, Capellanus describes love as beginning with a physical reaction, “he begins at once to lust after her in his heart,” and ending in a mental reaction, “the more he burns with love, until he comes to a fuller meditation.” The word “meditate” is defined as “1. To consider or reflect at length” and “2. To engage in contemplation, especially of a spiritual or devotional nature” (OED). Since it is known that Troilus fell in love with Cresseid, the reason why he would be meditating on her image is understood. And since Henryson does imply that the nature of Troilus’ love was similar to the worship of a false God, this definition of “meditate” certainly applies. Stearns concludes that Henryson’s ‘Idole’ is the equivalent of Aristotle’s “copy” of an external object, which remains in the mind after it has been removed from the outer senses (Robert Henryson 100). Stearns writes, “‘Idole’ refers to the image of the fair Cresseid in the mind of Troilus [. . .]. When Henryson states that the ‘idole’ may be ‘deip impentit in the fantasy,’ he is emphasizing the image-storing faculty of the imagination” (100).

Perhaps in the beginning of their romance, Troilus, out of love, purposely meditated on Cresseid’s image, but the meditation became so intense that it became an
obsession, which explains the use of the word "idole." I suggest that Henryson's use of "idole" may have been meant not only to imply "image," but also to accentuate the false worship of Cresseid by Troilus. The word "Idol" is defined as "image, form, spectre, apparition," but it is also noted that in English and in Middle English, the term's only use was "image of a false God" (OED). Cresseid was a woman who was not honest with Troilus and who deceived him, even though Troilus was deeply in love with and devoted to her. This situation is fairly similar to the worship of a false god.

The notion of Cresseid's being a false god is suggested in both Henryson and Chaucer. Chaucer, in his description of Troilus' remembering Criseyde, elaborates on this idea of Criseyde as a false god. Troilus dreams of her in his waking vision and "as he sat and wook, his spirit mette / That he hire saugh, a-temple, and al the wise / Right of hire look, and gan it newe avise" (1. 362-64). This use of "temple," though it describes the setting where Troilus first gazed upon Cresseid, also associates Criseyde with a place of worship, which during Chaucer's time was associated with a Christian God. (This is indicated by Chaucer's last section in Troilus, vide infra.) Before this scene Troilus leaves the temple where he has seen Criseyde:

And after this, nat fullich al awhaped,

Out of the temple al esilich he wente,

Repentynge hym that he hadde evere ijaped

Of Loves folk [...] (1.316-19)

Symbolically, Troilus leaves the temple of the worship of one god to repent to and worship his new god, the goddess of love, which could be Criseyde, Venus, Cupid, or any god or goddess associated with love. Since Chaucer concludes Troilus with his comments
to his medieval readers that the only love is the love of the Christian God, the depiction of Troilus' loving the "idole" of Cresseid would result in Troilus' loving a human as a god. Since both Troilus and Cresseid loved each other more than they loved a god, they are both guilty of being unfaithful servants.

If Troilus is overcome with Cresseid's image so quickly because he is constantly calling Cresseid's image into mind, then Cresseid's failure to recognize or think of Troilus suggests she is not meditating on Troilus' image as he is on hers. If Cresseid had kept Troilus at the surface of her mind, any knight stopping in front of her might have triggered some sort of association that would have made her think of Troilus because, in her mind, Troilus would have been associated with a knight. Even if her sight were affected by her leprosy, she should be able to recognize Troilus by his form or by his clothes.

A study conducted at the University of Marburg, investigated the hypothesis that clothing may act as retrieval cue when recognizing a person. The experiments discovered the following:

The perception of a face is only one step in facial information processing, the last step of which is a recognition judgement or an attempt to recall the person's identity (name, attributes, life history, usual place of encounter, etc.) as part of a larger associative network. Hence, it is clear that clothes could be an important determinant of the recognition of human faces.

(Sporer 184)

The experiments consisted of exposing a group of people (the subjects) to different pictures in which the external context of the person in the picture varied. Such external
context included the background of a park, a blank wall, clothes, action (writing or digging, for example), or orientation (sitting or standing). The subjects were then given a fifteen-minute interval of writing before being asked to re-identify the persons in the pictures. This second time around, some of the people in the pictures were dressed differently, and this resulted in the subjects confusing the people in the pictures with the people they had previously seen wearing those clothes. The studies demonstrated that:

[C]hanging clothes as a contextual cue at test has reliable effects on recognizing another person [. . .] clothes not only have noticeable effects on person perception and the attribution of personality characteristics but also on our memory of other people [. . .]. (196-97)

The physical appearance of someone includes such indicators as clothing, glasses, or facial hair, which can act as an aid in recognition. When Cresseid comes into contact with Troilus near the end of *The Testament*, Troilus is dressed in his knightly attire in which Cresseid had before seen him. After Cresseid learns that the knight who had just left was Troilus, Cresseid remembers details of the past and begins to wail at her misfortune. Cresseid then does recognize and bequeath the ring, which Troilus gave her, back to Troilus in her will, and this demonstrates her competence not only in remembering but in seeing, for she is able to see the ring. When she looks at the ring, she remembers the exchange and has no difficulty identifying the object. Had Cresseid developed some form of the neurological disorder agnosia, which is an inability to recognize something, she would have been unable to recognize the ring, write a letter, or recognize Troilus.

Addressing Cresseid’s failure to recognize Troilus, Tatyana Moran refers to Stearns’ use of Aristotle’s Laws of Association: “According to these laws we should
expect Cresseid, who may have seen Troilus but imperfectly, without identifying him through eyelids swollen and inflamed by leprosy, to be at least reminded of her former lover” (11). Moran also uses the similar setting of Criseyde and Troilus’ two earlier meetings in Chaucer’s *Troilus* (2.610-50, 1247-70) to question why Cresseid does not recognize Troilus (11). She adds that Cresseid’s altered state shows not only a change in her physical appearance, but also symbolizes a complete change from the person that Cresseid used to be (12). Denton Fox also agrees that association should have taken place, even from behind-swollen eyelids or impaired sight:

> While Troilus presumably does not recognize Cresseid because of her altered appearance; Henryson does not say why Cresseid does not recognize Troilus. The explanations which have been advanced, that Troilus’ face was concealed by a helmet, or that Cresseid’s sight was impaired, will not hold water: the other leper recognizes Troilus, and there is nothing to indicate that Cresseid cannot see. (378)

Since the other lepers are able to see and recognize Troilus, Cresseid also should at least be able to “see” Troilus. And if Cresseid can see Troilus with her eyes, then her failure to recognize him might be attributed to a discrepancy within her brain, rather than within her eyes.

Based on what we know today about the brain through neuropsychology, it could be said that both Cresseid and Troilus suffer from some form of prosopagnosia. Prosopagnosia is caused primarily by destruction to the right hemisphere of the brain, but it has been known to result from destruction to the left hemisphere of the brain (Benton 176). In some cases, identification of facial expression is preserved; in others, only
identification of facial expression is lost (183). In some cases, patients are unable to recognize their spouses and children; in others they are unable to recognize animal faces (Dixon, Bub, and Arguin 362). Prosopagnosia may be relevant to The Testament because of the symptoms seen in Troilus when he meets the leper Cresseid. Cresseid’s actions also suggest prosopagnosia, perhaps even more accurately than Troilus’ reactions. For instance, in some cases, patients can decipher who is who by their clothes or by their facial features, and in the case of Cresseid, she does not even think of Troilus when she raises her eyes to him. Although she is able to write her testament and recognize the ring that Troilus gave her right after he rides off, she cannot recognize Troilus’ face. Persons capable of writing and recognizing objects, but incapable of recognizing faces, are often the focus of modern prosopagnosia investigations and experiments, and it has been found that facial agnosia, or prosopagnosia, can exist without object agnosia. Perhaps the deterioration of Cresseid’s body also caused a deterioration of her mind, which resulted in prosopagnosia.

There is no reason why Troilus cannot be moved by his memory even if he knows it is only memory and his imagination. When a person remembers a loved one and emotions are stirred inside the body, the person remembering does not experience an emotional reaction because that person thinks that the loved one is present in reality; that person experiences a reaction caused by memory, which is able to reconnect itself directly to present emotion. Thus, there is no reason why Troilus could not have simply experienced an intense memory.

I think the error of referring to Troilus’ state as “half-recognition” comes from the complexity of explaining the non-recognition scene. When Troilus sees the leper
Cresseid’s eyes, he automatically, without effort, thinks of his “fair Cresseid.” Because of the way Cresseid was remembered and “Imprentit” in Troilus’ mind and heart, Troilus is overcome with confusion and emotion, and his senses and memory affect his physical body, which cause him to turn “mony hew,” “sweit,” and “trimble.” Troilus does not “recognize” Cresseid though her eyes; he is simply reminded of his fair Cresseid’s eyes, an image in his memory or “fantasy” that he recalls frequently enough that it is easily appears without his control. Perhaps if Troilus had not fallen into such an emotional flurry, Troilus might have recognized Cresseid. But he is overtaken by his memory of her instead, which, in turn, effects his physical state and causes feelings so intense that he is unable to ignore them enough to allow his mental reasoning to decipher what is happening. As Adamson writes, “[Troilus’] mind’s eye turns inwardly, with the result that he pays attention to, and is more moved by, the remembered image than the one his senses see in the outer world” (19). How ironic it is that Troilus’ memory of fair Cresseid may be what keeps him from recognizing the leper Cresseid.

Lines 512-18

When Troilus’ whole reaction is considered essential to the non-recognition scene, the physical symptoms cannot be ignored, or compressed into a theory that deals strictly with the mind. Rather than looking to Aristotle’s theories for an answer, I suggest that, to best understand Henryson’s intent, one should look at courtly love itself and apply Heffernan’s suggestions about amor hereos.

Although Adamson and others acknowledge Troilus’ physical reaction, they deduce that it is a symptom caused by his mental reaction. And although this is partly
true, Troilus’ physical reaction is also produced from the same source as his mental reaction—his love for Cresseid. I believe Henryson means not to strictly describe a psychological process, such as delusion or hallucination, but to describe what one feels in love. Details that Henryson has included in the non-recognition scene in The Testament follow the courtly rules listed under “How Love when it is Acquired, May be Kept” (Capellanus 151). Henryson could have purposely written the non-recognition scene to adhere to the traits of courtly love as a way to contrast Troilus’ virtues with the sin of unfaithfulness that Cresseid committed, which broke the rules of courtly love.

The section that follows Troilus’ mental reaction to the leper Cresseid is as follows and must be addressed:

Ane spark of lufe than till his hart culd spring
And kendlit all his bodie in ane fyre;
With hat fewer, ane sweit and trimbling
Him tuik, quhill he was reddie to expire;
To beir his scheild his breist began to tyre;
Within ane quhyle he chângit mony hew;
And neuertheles not ane ane vther knew. (ll. 512-18)

Chaucer’s depiction of Troilus first seeing Criseyde employs the same pattern:

And of hire look in him ther gan to quyken
So gret desir and such affeccioun,
That in his herte botme gan to stiken
Of hir his fixe and depe impressioun; (1.295-99)
Chaucer later refers to the "eye" of Troilus' heart: "His herte, which that is his brestez yē,
/ Was ay on hire" (1.453-54). By using "heart" instead of "mind," Chaucer implies that the image of Criseyde imprinted inside of Troilus is so closely associated with love that Troilus remembered the image not in his mind but in his heart. This use of "heart" takes the emphasis off rational thought and reason associated with the mind, and it asserts that, for Troilus, Criseyde is linked with his heart, emotions, and uncontrollable feelings, and not with his logical mind. Since these symptoms are physical and emotional in nature, as opposed to mental in nature, I suggest that what Henryson is describing is amor hereos. If the physical symptoms of love described in medieval romances are the same as the symptoms attributed to amor hereos, then it is possible that a state of non-recognition might be a symptom of medieval love. Since Henryson had access to medical treatises, he might have employed symptoms of amor hereos in The Testament. Heffernan explains:

The heat of amor hereos—closely associated with mania—is caused by the overheating of the vital spirit by a pleasing form. This vital spirit, in turn, generates heat in the animal spirit which inflames the middle ventricle of the brain, the seat of the faculty of estimation. (297)

Heffernan not only describes the effects amor hereos has on both mental and physical states, but she also explains in a way that makes the reaction one and the same: the middle ventricle causes heat and distorts the faculty of estimation. In The Testament, Troilus experiences this heat during the non-recognition scene:

With hait fewir ane sweit and trimbling

Him tuik, quhill he was reddie to expyre;

To beir his scheild his breist began to tyre;
Within ane quhyle he changit mony hew; (ll. 514-17)

Troilus' physical reaction is a symptom of love. I suggest that "scheild" is representative of Troilus' resistance to love, and the use of "breist" refers to his heart, as to suggest that Troilus could not stop feeling love, which was a reaction to the leper Cresseid's eyes—a reaction that recalled Troilus' memory of his fair Cresseid. What Henryson describes in Troilus' psychological passage is a direct result of Troilus' amor hereos. In the following passage, Henryson shows that Cresseid is the object responsible for Troilus' amor hereos:

The idole of ane thing in cace may be

Sa deip imprentit in the fantasy

That it deludis the wittis outwardly,

And sa appeiris in forme and lyke estait,

Within the mynd as it was figurait. (ll. 507-11)

Henryson's use of "idole" refers to the image of Cresseid in Troilus that Troilus imprints into his heart and then into his mind. The following lines detail the intensity of Troilus' feelings: "And verraylich of thilke remembraunce / Desir al newe hym brende, and lust to brede / Gan more than erst," (3.1545-47). Both Chaucer and Henryson could be referring to amor hereos in their stories of Troilus and Cresseid, which causes the same physical reactions that are seen in tales of courtly love. And if Chaucer and Henryson are referring to it, then it is definitely a recurring and important element of medieval romance. As a result, it is important to acknowledge amor hereos as it seems linked to non-recognition, and therefore, crucial to the development of a theory for explaining the frequency of non-recognition scenes. Heffernan notes the similarities between the disease and characters', such as Troilus', physical reactions in courtly love:
The pleasing form of the beloved object, even after it may have left, becomes imprinted in memory to the extent that it becomes an obsessive presence. This fixation is a primary aspect of the pathology of the disease of love. (297)

This fixation described by Heffernan is also similar to Adamson’s suggestion that Cresseid could have been called into Troilus’ mind frequently (Adamson 21), and also similar to Capellanus’ notes on mediation (29), which were discussed earlier. Stearns writes that these inner images can be recalled deliberately or spontaneously, and Chaucer’s description of how Troilus remembers Criseyde in the early stage of their love shows how Troilus’ thoughts of Criseyde come quickly and continuously without control: “and yet took he non hede” (3.147). In Chaucer’s Troilus, after Troilus leaves the site where he first saw Criseyde, he returns home, “Right with hire look thorugh-shoten and thorugh darted” (1.325). Troilus clearly remembers Criseyde’s face, and he continually sees her image in his mind, or, in this case it might be more appropriate to say, he felt her image in his body. The use of “shot and darted” conveys the sense that these images are beyond Troilus’ control. Troilus is not purposely recalling her image, but the image has taken over all of his senses, and he is incapable of feeling or thinking about anything else besides Criseyde. Troilus’ lack of control over these images is a result of courtly love, a symptom of amor hereos, and this uncontrollable imaging of Criseyde is seen in Troilus early on—“So muche, day by day, his owene thought, / For lust to hire, gan quiken and encresse, / That every other charge he sette at nought” (1.442-44).

Troilus’ inability to perform his duties is a result of his mental reasoning being unbalanced by amor hereos, and in The Testament, some of Troilus’ actions might come...
as a result of this lack of reason. The lines which describe the “idole” of Cresseid deluding Troilus’ wits (ll. 506-08) do not only illustrate Henryson’s explanation of what is going on inside Troilus’ mind, but those lines can also be seen as commentary on what happens next as an outward response to his memory-image:

For knichtlie pietie and memoriaill
Of fair Cresseid, ane gyrdill can he tak,
Ane purs of gold, and mony gay iowall,
And in the skirt of Cresseid doun can swak; (ll. 518-21)

Troilus’ tossing his jewels into the lap of Cresseid is an act of complete and honorable charity performed at the height of internal confusion. Perhaps Troilus did know this leper was Cresseid, and “he knew hir nocht” refers to the leper Cresseid as opposed to his fair Cresseid. Troilus’ love is depicted as being so sincere in Troilus that it seems that no one but Cresseid could cause what happens to Troilus.

In the list of rules of courtly love cited by Capellanus in The Art of Courtly Love, I find two rules relevant to this situation:

XVI. When a lover suddenly catches sight of his beloved, his heart palpitates.

XII. A true lover does not desire to embrace in love anyone but his beloved. (185)

Even if Troilus is unaware that the leper Cresseid is his fair Cresseid, Troilus is still demonstrating the expected reaction, according to the rules of courtly love. Henryson writes, “And neuertheles not ane ane vther knew” (l. 518), and, “he knew hir nocht” (l. 501), but after these statements, Troilus’ body, mind, and heart react as though he does
know that the leper in front of him is Cresseid. The stanza following the psychological passage makes it clear that the eyes of the leper Cresseid are the cause Troilus' physical reaction, and according to Capellanus and his rules of courtly love, only a lover may cause this reaction.

Troilus' tossing alms into Cresseid's lap adheres to another code of courtly love, that "Moreover every man is bound, in time of need, to come to the aid of his beloved, both by sympathizing with her in all her troubles and by acceding to her reasonable desires" (Capellanus 151). In the non-recognition scene, Troilus inadvertently comes to the aid of Cresseid and accedes to her desires, which, at the time, are alms. This action increases love all the more, "[F]or all lovers ought to despise worldly riches and should give alms to those who have need of them. Nothing is considered more praiseworthy in a lover than to be known to be generous" (152). According to Capellanus, Troilus is considered praiseworthy and generous because he gives alms to a woman who has need of them.

If it is possible that Troilus is aware that the leper in front of him is Cresseid and Cresseid is unaware that the knight in front of her is Troilus, then the non-recognition scene between Troilus and Cresseid works as a device allowing both of them to adhere to the courtly love rule of secrecy. Since secrecy is such a vital part of courtly love, Troilus' failure to recognize Cresseid could have been a way for him to keep his love with Cresseid a secret. This adherence to secrecy is also demonstrated by the ring's role in Testament and the brooch's role in Troilus. In addition to not recognizing each other's faces, Troilus does not notice or recognize the ring that he gave to Cresseid. Only after Troilus rides off does Henryson introduce the ring, and once this is done, any of his
medieval readers familiar with other courtly love romances will have found the situation peculiar. In other stories of courtly love, lovers recognize their lovers’ jewels. In Tristan and Iseult, for example, the lovers recognize each other by a ring; this also happens in Chrétien de Troyes’ William of England. It even happens in Giovanni Boccaccio’s The Filostrato: Troilus recognizes the brooch he had given Cressida on the garment snatched from Diomede’s wounded body (487). The fact that Henryson keeps the brooch/ring in the story, but mentions it only after Troilus has failed to recognize it, might show that Henryson is purposely using the device of the ring for a certain response in his readers. It seems odd that Troilus does not notice his own ring when he meets the leper Cresseid, especially since this situation of a lover recognizing his or her lover through a ring or brooch is so popular in medieval romances.

Henryson’s purpose of having the ring go unrecognized is seen when Cresseid bequeaths the ring back to Troilus; when Troilus receives this ring, he immediately recognizes it and knows that Cresseid is dead. After Troilus finally recognizes his ring, the ring both symbolizes and verifies the death of Cresseid and the death of their love.

During their meeting, the ring is present the entire time, just as Cresseid is present in front of Troilus, and Troilus in front of Cresseid. The ring, naturally, is a form of wealth, but Cresseid does not trade it for food or medicine, and therefore, it cannot be considered a form of wealth like Troilus’ alms. The alms Troilus throws to the leper Cresseid represent money; therefore, Troilus gives her both love, which is represented by the ring, and wealth, which is represented by his donation of alms. This, in turn, implies that the ring, in terms of monetary value, is worthless to Cresseid. As a result, the ring becomes a symbol of love.
The ring also represents Troilus. As Cresseid leaves Troy, Troilus gives his ring to her as a representation of himself; the ring is supposed to be a constant reminder of their love. In Troilus, Criseyde gives the brooch away, but in The Testament, Cresseid keeps the ring until death, and then it is returned to Troilus. When Troilus’ ring is returned to him at the end of Troilus, he receives an object that represents Criseyde to Diomede, since Criseyde gave Diomede the ring so that it may remind him of her on the battlefield. Troilus’ own ring is returned to him after it has undergone the transformation of Criseyde—from his true love to her false love—and upon return of his ring, Troilus is back where he started, without Cresseid or her love.

The only time that Troilus and Cresseid are both in the presence of the ring after it is in Cresseid’s possession is when Troilus meets the leper Cresseid. Symbolically, this ring is all that is left of their love in Cresseid’s world. If the ring represents Troilus, Cresseid’s failure to recognize Troilus symbolizes Cresseid’s failure to know the real Troilus, since the real Troilus is standing right in front of her. Cresseid only sees Troilus in the ring and, in balance, Troilus only sees the Cresseid in his memory. Both fail to see each other.

Symbolically, the inability of Troilus to recognize his ring when he meets the leper Cresseid on the street signifies that Troilus has changed. If the ring symbolizes Troilus because he had given the ring to Cresseid so she might remember him, the failure of Troilus to recognize his own ring would be failure on his part to recognize himself, since the ring represents him, and since he has undergone change. Rather than being a man sick with love, Troilus has regained his knightly identity and has succeeded in
earning honor in battle. We are told that he “had striken doun / Knichtis of Grece in number meruellous; / With greit tryumphe and laude victorious. (ll. 486-88)

Perhaps, Troilus does see the brooch, and for this reason he tosses his money and jewelry into the lap of Cresseid—an act to keep their affair a secret, and to show that he still loves Cresseid. By not utilizing the brooch the same way as other romance writers, Henryson challenges the expectations of readers of The Testament, while also staying within the boundaries of Capellanus’ rules.

Since Henryson’s Testament adheres to the rules of courtly love, I believe Henryson intentionally uses the device of non-recognition to refocus Troilus on matters of courtly love. The non-recognition scene in The Testament may contradict what is expected in courtly love—if they were once so in love, they should recognize each other—but Henryson orchestrates the scene to follow the rules of courtly love. The non-recognition scene in The Testament allows the lovers to maintain secrecy and for Troilus to earn honor by donating alms and to experience the physical symptoms associated with love. The non-recognition scene also adheres to other rules: it keeps Troilus from publicly humiliating himself by loving a woman he would not marry (81); it allows Troilus to treat Cresseid as a stranger in front of his knights (152); and it allows Troilus to earn honor by not returning to an unfaithful woman (162). Because Henryson stays within the boundaries of courtly love with such strictness, I suggest the non-recognition scene is one of the characteristics of a courtly love romance, associated with amor hereos.

One reason amor hereos has been dismissed when reading courtly love romances is because the translation of the word “hereos,” has often been misread and mistranslated to mean either “eros” or “heros,” a point first suggested by John Livingston Lowes.
Heffernan writes, “Lowes proved that ‘hereos’ is the scientific term for lovesickness and that Chaucer’s description of the malady suffered by Arcite is in accord with the accounts of the medical authorities” (295). Lowes notes the lengthy but fitting passage of The Knight’s Tale:

```
His [Arcite’s] sleep, his mete, his drink is him biraft
That lene he wex, and drye as is a shaft;
His eyen howle, and grisly to biholde;
His hewe falwe, and pale as asshen colde,
And solitarie he was, and evr allone,
And willing al the night, making his mone.
And if he herde song or instrument.
Then wolde he wepe, he mighte nat be stent;
So feble eek were his spirits, and so lowe,
And chaungen so, that no man coude knowe
His speche nor his vois, though men it herde.
And in his gere, for al the worlde he ferde
Nat oonly lyk the loveres maladye
Of Hereos, but rather lyke manye
Engendred of humour malencolyk,
Biforen, in his celle fantasyk. (The Knight’s Tale 1361-76)
```

In line 1374, Chaucer clearly refers to the medical term “Hereos.” Chaucer also describes the symptoms, which are exactly the same as the symptoms associated with courtly love. Coincidentally, Arcite’s unrecognizably changed voice is similar to Cresseid’s changed
voice, which is a result and a symptom of her leprosy. Both Arcite and Cresseid undergo changes and experience similar physical symptoms that are indirectly caused by love. There are also obvious similarities between Troilus' symptoms and Arcite's symptoms.

The above edition by Skeat maintains the spelling of "Hereos," but this passage differs in the following translation by Nevill Coghill: "And so for all the world he went about / Not merely like a lover on the rack / of Eros, but more like a maniae" (Coghill 56). Coghill translates "Hereos" into "Eros," demonstrating precisely what both Heffernan and Lowes refer to in their articles.

The Riverside Chaucer edition of The Knight's Tale also maintains the spelling of "Hereos." In addition, Benson provides substantial notes on the disease. Benson writes:

Lowes [...] shows that the symptoms Chaucer adds are those of the loveris maladye of Hereos [...] a mental disease (love sickness) regularly recognized and discussed by medieval medical authorities. (831)

Not only do Benson's notes acknowledge the existence of amor hereos, but they also liken it to melancholy: "Both Boccaccio and Chaucer describe the malady as melancholic." Since Arcite's disease of love was close to a "mania," it is plausible to see amor hereos as a mental or neurological disorder. Stearns held the imagination responsible for the instance of non-recognition in The Testament and asserted that Henryson used Aristotle's theories. In contrast, I believe Henryson uses his access to medical treatises that describe amor hereos, and the treatises that describe leprosy. Henryson could have used medical treatises as an aid to confirm what he witnessed in his own observations.
Heffernan has explained that *amor hereos* affects the mind, which allows it to be classified as a psychological disorder. At the time, medical studies on the brain were not as detailed and specialized as current neuropsychological studies. For example, in the fifteenth century, there was not yet knowledge of neurotransmitters. In consideration of *The Testament*, perhaps temporary prosopagnosia is both a symptom caused by the deterioration of the body in victims of leprosy (similar to Alzheimer’s) and a symptom sometimes caused by love. The disease of love is associated not only with physical symptoms but with mental symptoms, as well. Perhaps, the brain of someone who experiences intense feelings of love in memory—so intense that they effect the outer body—also experiences some sort of temporary malfunction in the same part of the brain, or the “fore part” as Constantine de Africanus describes it (Heffernan 296). If love can cause a trance that temporarily disorients a person from his/her outer surroundings, as it did for Troilus, it could cause a person to become lost in his/her imagination and cause the person to meditate on the loved one. Perhaps an intensity of emotion causes the heat in the brain to blur the faculties necessary for recognition. Heffernan cites Arnaldus de Villanova: “Melancholy is sadness and fear and the destruction of speech; its location [. . .] is the middle cell of the head between that of reason and fantasy” (296). Arnaldus de Villanova explains melancholy causes sadness, fear, and loss of speech. If *amor hereos* affects the same region of the brain as melancholy, then it is possible that love also produces some of the same symptoms. When Troilus meets his leper Cresseid, he is unable to speak and becomes sad and entranced at the remembrance of his fair Cresseid. Perhaps Henryson implies that Troilus suffers from melancholy, which causes him to lose his ability to speak, and he becomes so sad at the memory of Cresseid that he falls into a
trance that takes over his whole body. It is this distraction that keeps him from recognizing Cresseid. This would make non-recognition a symptom of melancholy, caused by an intense overflow of emotion—at least it would in The Testament. And since Troilus clearly experiences symptoms of amor hereos, perhaps melancholy is another symptom of the "disease of love." Maybe Cresseid would have recognized Troilus if he had been able to speak, but Troilus could not utter a word because of the melancholy he was experiencing. My original research that creates the supposition that Troilus could have been suffering from melancholy caused by amor hereos is also supported by an explanatory note in the back of The Riverside Chaucer. Benson writes:

Mania is a form of madness to which amor hereos could lead; it could be fatal. The brain was thought to have three cells, or ventricles: in the front is the celle fantastic, which controls the imagination, in the middle cell judgement, and in the rear memory (cf. Bartholomaeus Anglicus 5.3, tr. Trevisa, 1:173). The humour malencolik (cf. GP I.333n), engendered in some cases by passions of the soul such as 'grete thoughtes of sorwe, and of to grete studie of drede' (in this instance love), could lead to melancholia, which affects the middle cell and deprives one of the imagination. (Benson 831-32)

The knowledge that Henryson demonstrates in The Testament of Cresseid through courtly love, astrology, and leprosy is a factor that makes me believe that the non-recognition scene, or use of prosopagnosia, in The Testament is there for more than entertainment and moral didacticism. Every aspect of The Testament works both symbolically and scientifically. Henryson's The Testament is so accurate with detail that
the non-recognition scene must also be factual in a medical way. Since every other aspect of the poem lends intellectually factual and symbolic meanings, I believe that the non-recognition scene is not only used for aesthetics and plot but also meant to illustrate the symptoms of amor hereos.

As additional evidence to support my suppositions, I draw upon Douglas Duncan who writes, “Much of the Testament [...] vividly represents a contemporary reality” (130), and I suggest that the use of non-recognition, since it is often seen in stories encompassing the tradition of courtly love, reflects an element existent in Henryson’s time. In The Testament, the device of non-recognition is more than simply a way of creating drama: non-recognition, or prosopagnosia, is a symptom of melancholy produced by amor hereos, which indicates that Troilus is experiencing symptoms of love, and as a result, non-recognition indicates that this poem is written in the tradition of courtly love.

In the next chapter, I will look at the use of non-recognition and its relationship to chivalry. By examining Chrétien de Troyes’ “The Knight with the Lion,” or “Yvain,” I will demonstrate how non-recognition is clearly linked with the courtly love tradition in both situations of love and chivalry, and how Chrétien uses it profusely in “Yvain.”
Chapter III

Chrétien’s “The Knight With the Lion,” or “Yvain”

Chrétien de Troyes’ “The Knight with the Lion,” or “Yvain,” is the story of how Yvain acquires “true chivalry” by resolving the conflict between the obligations required of “true chivalry” and the obligations required of “true love” (Hawkins 377). Through his adventures, Yvain achieves balance between love and chivalry by realizing that each depends on the other to thrive. Anne Hunsaker Hawkins addresses how the issues are raised in the romance:

This linear, evolutionary model of a hero improving himself through a series of adventures is modified by the emphasis of some critics on a conflictual rather than a developmental paradigm. [...] L.T. Topsfield [...] sees the conflict not as one between love and knighthood, but between the values of Laudine’s and Arthur’s world [...]. Norris Lacy’s interpretation combines both paradigms: Yvain’s “evolution” or “moral ascension,” Lacy argues, is a function of his ability to resolve ‘the problem the work possesses—the conflict between knightly prowess and love.’ (Hawkins 377-78)

I suggest that Topsfield’s view be considered the same as Lacy’s interpretation because Arthur’s world consists of a life in accordance with the rules of knighthood, whereas Laudine’s world consists of a life in accordance with the expectations of love. Yvain’s battle with these two conflicting worlds is the focus of Chrétien’s “Yvain,” a battle that is resolved in the non-recognition scene between Yvain and Gawain. Further, there is more within the text than the mere tale of Yvain’s quest for honor, such as the emphasis the
story places on the importance of identity and those indicators which define identity, like a scar or armor, and aid in recognition.

This chapter is a chronological summary of “Yvain” that emphasizes scenes that include non-recognition. The best way to illustrate Chrétien’s use of non-recognition is to review the plot step by step, pointing out and examining the context of each major occurrence of non-recognition. Unlike Henryson’s The Testament, Chrétien’s “Yvain” uses recognition throughout the entire story, and although these scenes occur more frequently in “Yvain,” they are not as charged as the one in The Testament. However, non-recognition is just as important to Chrétien’s “Yvain” as it is to Henryson’s Testament, proving that Henryson’s use of non-recognition is not an isolated event. By examining non-recognition and recognition in “Yvain,” I hope to take one step closer to understanding why non-recognition appears so often in medieval romances, while showing that non-recognition should be considered characteristic of the genre.

In “Yvain,” recognition and non-recognition determine Yvain’s fate. For example, Yvain’s life is saved twice only because he is recognized: Lunette recognizes him as one of King Arthur’s knights and frees him from the portcullis, and later two maids-in-waiting recognize him by his scar and free him from his madness—“From the scar she was absolutely certain of his identity” (ll. 2909-10). Coincidentally, and in keeping with the theme of love, both recognitions associate Yvain with honor and result in desire to marry him: After Lunette aids Yvain with his health, she aids him in his attainment of Laudine’s love; and after the two maids aid Yvain with his health and he battles Count Alier, the people of the town wish Yvain to marry their lady. Issues of recognition also exist within these scenes with Lunette and the two maids: Lunette give Yvain a ring that makes him invisible, which results in non-recognition, and Yvain is overly concerned that
no one recognizes him after the two maids find him in his mad, melancholic condition. Later in this chapter, Yvain’s madness will be discussed as being a direct allusion to amor hereos, which might be indirectly responsible for his and Sir Gawain’s failure to recognize each other.

The first occurrence of recognition/non-recognition in “Yvain” is found as Calogrenant is recognized by his armor (ll. 155-56), and although this instance is usually dismissed as an unimportant detail, it is actually the first of many uses of recognition in the story. After Yvain battles the knight in the Forest of Broceliande, Esclados the Red, Yvain chases him toward a castle and is caught in the portcullis. A lady, Lunette, recognizes Yvain as a knight of the round table: “I know your name well, and I recognize you clearly” (ll. 1000-01), and she assists him by healing his wounds and giving him a ring which makes him invisible to the people of the castle searching the grounds for their king’s murderer. Up until this point, Yvain’s adventure centers on chivalry and knighthood, but when he sees the knight’s widowed Lady of Landuc, Laudine, he falls in love with her on first glance. Again, Lunette assists Yvain in his quests and convinces the lady that she should love the knight who defeated and killed her husband—since he is stronger—and because they will need a new knight to guard the fountain in the forest. Convinced, Laudine marries Yvain. Yvain’s defeating Esclados the Red and marrying Laudine not only demonstrates how chivalry is important in love, but also symbolizes the extreme emotions and dangers that accompany love. The red that is part of Esclados’ name and identity also symbolizes love, and Yvain’s battle and win over Esclados the Red suggests Yvain’s present and future battle with love.

While Yvain and Laudine fall in love, Arthur and his knights depart for the forest, and when they arrive at the fountain in search of the undefeated knight, rather than
finding Esclados the Red, they find Yvain, who recognizes Sir Kay by his armor (l. 2233). At this point, King Arthur does not know that the knight guarding the fountain is Sir Yvain, and Arthur says, “Who are you? [. . .] For I should never know you by your speech, unless I saw your face or heard your name” (ll. 2248-49). After revealing his identity, Yvain leads them back to the castle for a celebration. Up to this point, much of the recognition has been based on armor and faces. However, later, after Yvain and Gawain duel, the narrator will comment, “[F]or had they conversed, their encounter would have been different [. . .]” (ll. 6105-06), placing an emphasis on the sound of a voice to assist in recognition. Thus, the many occurrences of non-recognition in “Yvain” are necessary to address identity and recognition from different angles.

The return of Arthur’s knights introduces a new component into Yvain’s world, where he found a balance between love and chivalry when he married Laudine and became the honorable knight of the fountain, which results in a struggle between obligations. Sir Gawain—the symbol of chivalry—sways Yvain into leaving his new wife—the symbol of love—to accompany him in his search for tests of strength and bravery, which will win him more honor. The conflict between Yvain’s love as a husband to Laudine and Yvain’s honor as a knight becomes the focus of “Yvain.” Laudine asks Yvain to return in two years, but Yvain forgets until Laudine’s messenger visits King Arthur’s court with a message from Laudine:

Yvain, how remiss of you. [...] She gave you leave to be away until the feat of Saint John, and you respected her so little that you never again gave mind to the agreement. When you are in love, anxiety prevents real sleep, and all night long the lover reckons and counts the days as they come and go, in this way enduring the time passing. My lady’s complain
This sends Yvain into a madness that leads him into the forest to live naked like a wild animal: “So violent a whirlwind broke loose in Yvain’s head that he went mad” (1. 2817). Yvain’s reaction and behavior emulate from his loss of Lunette and love, and although extreme, his reaction is similar to that behavior seen in those who go “mad” from love. However, with Yvain it is as if the inner torment of that pain is transformed into outward insanity and action. For example, Yvain steals a bow and arrows from a boy, “yet afterward remembered nothing he had done” (ll. 2824-25). It is possible that this madness can be considered an extreme case of amor hereos; the madness stems from love and results in Yvain’s abandoning all reason and hope. I suggest that Yvain’s amor hereos is a result of melancholy induced by Laudine’s rejection of him. The inclusion of amor hereos in “Yvain” would have been a great gesture on the part of Chrétien because the story deals with the conflict between love and knighthood. By having Yvain go mad from love, Chrétien emphasizes the risk and threat of love in the life of a knight. But even after Yvain’s madness overcomes him, he recovers after a hermit befriends him. Slowly, Yvain begins to return to a more civilized life, as he slays deer and animals every night and drops them at the hermit’s door. This action will later echo the acts performed by the lion to honor Yvain.

Shortly after Yvain is befriended by the hermit, two ladies walking in the woods find Yvain sleeping and recognize him by his scar. They then return to their queen for help. She gives them a potion and advises them to rub it only on Yvain’s temples since this is where the illness is located. But when the maidens arrive, they rub the potion over his entire body. This act, which cures Yvain, is representative of how his love-sickness,
or *amor hercios*, affected his entire body and was not isolated to infecting only his mental capacities (or incapacities). Then Yvain awakes and regains "reason and memory."

Seeing himself naked as ivory, he was deeply ashamed, and would have been more had he known what had happened to him. But he had no idea why he found himself naked. [. . .]. Disturbed and embarrassed by his nakedness, he admitted he would be undone and dead if anyone discovered and recognized him in this condition. (ll. 3009-15)

Once again, recognition is a chief concern in the story.

After recovery, what ensues is a series of adventures, in which Yvain encounters supernatural beings such as a giant keeping a town hostage and the devil's two sons. But Yvain's first adventure brings him to a snake fighting a lion. Yvain saves the lion and the lion becomes an aid in his adventures. Although scholars suggest that the lion represents chivalry, I find it appropriate to consider the lion representative of Yvain's sanity and identity. After saving the lion, Yvain acquires a new identity and becomes known as "The Knight with the Lion." Yvain's new title works to keep knights and others who know him as Yvain from realizing that Yvain is also "The Knight with the Lion." Therefore, his new name is important in assisting (or not assisting) with recognition.

Yvain's adventures cease after he must defend a maiden who has been denied equal share to her parents' estate by her sister. The situation that arises is the non-recognition scene that will set Sir Gawain against Sir Yvain in a fierce duel. To Sir Gawain, Sir Yvain is not his brotherly knight; he is the knight with the lion. Chrétien's use of narration emphasizes the significance of the non-recognition scene, as the narrator judges and interprets what it means that the two knights do not recognize each other.
But first, before battling with Sir Gawain, Yvain must save Lunette, the maiden who saved him from the portcullis and then assisted him in achieving union with her queen, Laudine. Lunette has been sentenced to death by Laudine because Laudine feels that it is Lunette’s fault that any of this happened in the first place; had Lunette not assisted Yvain, Laudine would never have experienced such pain. Yvain and his lion easily rescue Lunette, who is the only person who knows that the honorable knight who rescued her is Sir Yvain. No one else recognizes him from beneath his armor. This instance of non-recognition benefits Yvain, and it falls into his plan, which is to return after his duel with his newly earned chivalry and fame to beg Laudine for forgiveness and win her back.

This leads to the most important non-recognition scene: the battle between Yvain and Gawain. Although the scene with the lion is important to the story’s whole, the battle scene between Gawain and Yvain is more important to the concept of recognition in the story. The knights are chosen to represent the sisters in the battle over their inheritance. Having retreated to the forest with his lion, Yvain arrives at the castle fully armed to fight the knight:

The two fighters did not recognize each other, though they had loved each other always. Then did they no longer love each other? Yes, I answer you, and no as well, and I shall prove both replies correct. (ll. 6003-05)

Chrétien’s narration of the scene strives to reconcile the failed recognition by examining the concepts of Love and Hate:

In truth, Sir Gawain did love Yvain and called him his companion, and wherever he was, Yvain referred to Gawain in the same way. Even here, had he recognized him, he would have had a celebration for him and
would have laid down his life for him. [. . .]. Is that not true and perfect love? Yes, without a doubt.

Yet is Hate not equally evident too? Yes, because each would certainly have wished to smash the other’s head or shame him [. . .].

I swear it is a proven wonder that Love and mortal Hate are found together. God, how can to such contraries inhabit the same house? (ll. 6006-13, 6015-16)

Chrétién concludes, “And so Love is entirely blind and Hate sees nothing” (l. 6027-28).

Yvain and Gawain fight until they exhaust each other without knowing who the other is. When the two knights reveal their identities, Yvain realizes ultimate love and both knights desire to forfeit the win to the other. As in The Testament, had one of the unrecognized spoken, perhaps they would have recognized each other. Chrétién writes, “Each spoke not a word to the other, for had they conversed, their encounter would have been different” (ll. 6104-06). When the two knights finally speak and recognize each other, neither are willing to accept the honor of victory and each attempts to convince the king and spectators that he has been defeated. As a result, the king effects reconciliation between the two sisters over their inheritance (ll. 6362-65)

Although this non-recognition scene between Yvain and Gawain is not directly due to the suffering of amor hereos as in Robert Henryson’s The Testament of Cresseid, the non-recognition scene is linked to love, and is symbolic of the disease—Yvain represents the ideal of love in his battle with Sir Gawain, “the ideal of Arthurian orthodoxy” (Hawkins 390). In this sense, there are two worlds at odds with each other, which causes tension and results in a non-recognition scene. And although Yvain does not show signs of amor hereos, such as blushing or daydreaming, in the non-recognition
scene, Yvain does show evident signs of *amor hereos* earlier in the romance when he breaks Laudine’s vow and retreats into the woods and lives like a mad “Wild Man.” Hawkins refers to Yvain’s madness as “the pivotal episode in the poem,” and she looks at the episode in both a theological and medical sense. Hawkins concludes that a medical interpretation of Yvain’s madness is more plausible than a theological interpretation since the poem makes no significant reference to “devils, sin, or the salvation doctrines of the early church” (379). In agreement with Hawkins, and as with Cresseid’s leprosy, I disagree that Yvain’s madness stems from a moral offense. Both Yvain and Cresseid break vows they promise to their lovers, and both realize their wrong, but neither of them is doomed with a physical punishment by a higher power for breaking vows; Saturn punishes Cresseid with leprosy for blaspheming the gods.

Both Yvain and Cresseid learn their lessons in love through an indirect experience: Yvain, ultimately through his battle with the unrecognized Gawain; and Cresseid, through her encounter with the unrecognized Troilus. Although Yvain learns various virtues and earns honor through his experiences with the lion, not until Yvain and Gawain’s battle does Yvain earn complete honor and feel complete love. Thus, the non-recognition scene in “Yvain” is similar to the one in *The Testament* because both instances of non-recognition result in the realization that love is needed. And since it is initially Yvain’s love sickness, or *amor hereos*, which causes the sequence of battles and confusion to occur, perhaps, *amor hereos* can be held responsible for Yvain’s and Gawain’s failures to recognize each other. If it is understood that the reason Yvain is fighting Gawain, in the long run, is to win back Laudine, this might suggest that *amor hereos* causes non-recognition.
Chrétien’s narrator in “Yvain” comments on the strange occurrence of non-recognition when Yvain and Gawain do not recognize each other: “Love is entirely blind and Hate sees nothing,” and also explains that Gawain and Yvain love and hate each other at the same time. Sir Gawain is being driven by hate and his will to succeed and survive; and while Yvain must also be driven by hate and a will to succeed and survive, it is Yvain’s quest for honor, which will, in turn, lead to success in love, that is driving him forward. Therefore, not only does Yvain fail to recognize his opponent because of hate, but he also fails to recognize him because of love. And because of this, as in The Testament, the reason for non-recognition is love.
Conclusion

Recognizing Non-Recognition

Robert Henryson’s *The Testament of Cresseid* and Chrétien de Troyes’ “Yvain” are both written within the context of courtly love, and, as a result, they share some of the basic characteristics associated with courtly love romances. Both texts place an emphasis on chivalry and on a lady’s expectations from love, and both demonstrate how love can be lost or found by following the rules of courtly love. In addition, both poems use non-recognition to make characters realize the important role love plays in their lives. In *The Testament*, Cresseid realizes how great a love she has lost after she is told that the charitable knight she did not recognize was her beloved Troilus; in “Yvain,” Yvain remembers the intensity of love when he discovers that the knight he is battling is Sir Gawain. When Yvain recognizes Gawain, Yvain knows that, like Gawain, he, too, is a chivalric knight, and therefore, he also knows that he is deserving of Laudine’s love.

Through non-recognition, both Chrétien and Henryson make their characters aware of love, but these occurrences of non-recognition are not limited to this one interpretation and purpose.

In *The Testament*, Henryson relies on a single non-recognition scene to act as the climax of his poem and resolve the conflict between Cresseid’s unfaithfulness and the expectation of loyalty in courtly love. The non-recognition scene is dramatically and skillfully written, as is the entirety of Henryson’s *The Testament*. Henryson’s use of accurate astrology, factually precise medical descriptions of leprosy, and poetic form and content—typical of courtly love romances—lead me to believe that the non-recognition scene is not only used to create a dramatic response in the audience, but also employed as a typical device associated with courtly love romances. Since Henryson diligently used a
style of writing and content characteristic of courtly love, it is possible that non-recognition was one of these characteristics, as common to romances as the exchange of rings. Since much of Henryson’s The Testament mirrors reality at that time, it is also possible that some form of prosopagnosia existed as a symptom of leprosy. In Henryson’s time, love was popularly diagnosed as amor hereos; therefore, love was treated as a disease and its effects as symptoms. Further, writers at the time might have employed non-recognition as a way of depicting the effects of love through exaggeration. The exaggeration of the emotional, mental, and physical effects of love are, after all, the essence of courtly love.

Chrétien exaggerates the effects of love in “Yvain” in multiple ways. Yvain’s retreat into the woods and regression into an instinct-driven animal is a result of his suffering from amor hereos, as is Laudine’s impulsive decision to murder Lunette for having allowed Laudine to fall in love with Yvain. Thus, Laudine, too, suffers from a mental instability because of amor hereos. Laudine also fails to recognize Yvain in his persona of the “knight with the lion.” Perhaps she fails to recognize him because she is emotionally and mentally wrapped up in bitterness, thinking about her lost Yvain.

Although there are instances of non-recognition in “Yvain” that can be attributed to amor hereos, Chrétien uses non-recognition in more ways than this one. Identity acts as one of the themes in “Yvain,” and there are numerous instances of non-recognition, so many, in fact, that I cannot deduce a single, all-encompassing reason for them all. I suspect, however, their origin is love. In “Yvain,” Chrétien personifies Love and writes, “If Love recognized the men, he would have to prevent them from attacking and injuring each other. Therefore, Love is blind, deceived, and defeated, for though he sees them, he does not recognize the men who are his rightful subjects” (ll. 6029-32). If Love, then, is
responsible for Yvain's and Gawain's failure to recognize each other, Love could also be responsible for Troilus and Cresseid's failure to recognize each other.

Clearly, non-recognition exists in courtly love romances, and Chrétien's and Henryson's texts are only two examples in which this device occurs. The fact that non-recognition is consistent throughout the genre of medieval romance proves the importance of acknowledging the existence of both non-recognition in these romances and amor hereos as the basis for courtly love, and of considering amor hereos in its relation to non-recognition scenes in medieval romance. In The Testament, amor hereos and non-recognition seem clearly linked, as they appear to be in "Yvain," for amor hereos and non-recognition both have a significant role throughout the story.

Since courtly love is based on amor hereos, studying the disease's relationship to medieval romances may help us to understand non-recognition scenes. I hope this thesis provides the initial research and questioning that will become the catalyst of a curiosity and desire in scholars to understand the use of non-recognition and its role courtly love.
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