

PANDARUS' USE OF ARS AMATORIA AND REMEDIA AMORIS

PANDARUS' USE OF ARS AMATORIA

AND

REMEDIA AMORIS

By

DAVID JOHN KELLEY, B.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

October, 1972

MASTER OF ARTS (1972)
(English)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Pandarus' Use of Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris

AUTHOR: David John Kelley, B. A. (University of Victoria)

SUPERVISED: Dr. L. A. N. Braswell and Dr. C. D. Wood

NUMBER OF PAGES: viii, 76

PREFACE

Although most of Pandarus' direct quotations from Ovid's Remedia Amoris were identified as early as W. W. Skeat's edition of Troilus and Criseyde,¹ there has never been an attempt to examine systematically Chaucer's use of Ovid's remedies. Indeed, since Shannon's study of Chaucer's classical sources in 1929,² the influence of Remedia Amoris has been virtually ignored in discussions of Pandarus' aid to Troilus. An analysis of Pandarus' use of Remedia Amoris, however, may significantly alter judgement of several of his actions.

As recent studies of Pandarus' application of The Consolation of Philosophy have demonstrated, Chaucer's probable intent in certain passages can be assessed by contrasting Pandarus' application of Boethius with the intent of his source. The result of comparison, as I. L. Gordon and Alan T. Gaylord explain,³ is often an underscoring of the shortsightedness of Pandarus' philosophy, for his borrowings, often

¹Geoffrey Chaucer, Works, ed. W. W. Skeat (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1900), II.

²E. F. Shannon, Chaucer and the Roman Poets, Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, VII (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1929), pp. 120-68.

³I. L. Gordon, The Double Sorrow of Troilus (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970) and Alan T. Gaylord, "Uncle Pandarus as Lady Philosophy", PMSAL, LXVI (1961), 571-95.

misapplied or taken out of context, lead away from the liberation of the soul from earthly possessions towards a dependence upon fortune. To understand Pandarus fully, therefore, it is necessary to examine the sources from which his arguments are derived. A systematic examination of Remedia Amoris, a work whose intent is directly at odds with Pandarus' aim of uniting Troilus and Criseyde, may be no less revealing than comparison with Boethius.

With the increased emphasis upon the underlying Boethian philosophy of Troilus and Criseyde, there has been a tendency to equate Pandarus' practical approach to love with earthly wisdom which, in Book V, proves inadequate. Muscatine, for example, speaks of Pandarus as representative of "practical wisdom as an admirable but incomplete thing", McCall of Pandarus' "worldly wisdom", and Gill of his "natural remedies".⁴ All three critics believe that Pandarus fails in Book V partially because he has applied practical, worldly remedies to Troilus' illness when a spiritual remedy was required. The result has been the juxtaposition of Pandarus' failure through practicality with the success of spiritual aid after

⁴Charles Muscatine, Chaucer and the French Tradition (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966), p. 132; John P. McCall, "Classical Myth in Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde", Diss. Princeton, 1955, p. 181; Sister A. B. Gill, Paradoxical Patterns in Chaucer's "Troilus": An Explanation of the Falinode (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1960), p. 52.

death: "Pandarus, with his limited view of love ...has conditioned Troilus for a genuine 'cure' and for 'wending' into the true 'hevene blisse' of the palinode".⁵ Pandarus, and by implication, practicality, are viewed as inadequate in the healing of Troilus' spiritual malady.

The weakness of this approach is that in stressing the spiritual aspect of Troilus' suffering, the critics have failed to consider the existence of a practical, worldly cure for Troilus' spiritual malady. The contrast between practical and spiritual remedies may not be as easily distinguished as critics have believed, for in Remedia Amoris, Ovid outlines a worldly method of escaping from injurious love. Troilus' spiritual malady might, it seems, be cured through practical means if his worldly advisor employed Ovid's remedies. In order to discern fully the reasons for Pandarus' failure in Book V, therefore, it is necessary to determine whether it is the practice or the practitioner that fails. To assume that earthly wisdom is an incomplete thing because Pandarus cannot successfully apply it is as incorrect as assuming that Boethian philosophy offers consolation only after death because none of the characters in Troilus and Criseyde is capable of successfully applying The Consolation of Philosophy.

The neglect of Remedia Amoris may be attributed in part to the twentieth-century emasculation of Ovid into what

⁵Gill, ed. cit., p. 52.

Robertson has called a "parlour dandy" whose cynically stated remedies are as frivolous as his methods of gaining love, and are to be employed, if at all, only by a "fende". For Chaucer, however, Remedia Amoris was probably neither frivolous nor fiendish. As medieval attitudes towards Remedia Amoris, unlike those towards Ars Amatoria, have seldom been examined, I have briefly outlined in chapter I the status of Remedia Amoris in medieval science and literature, and have suggested the manner in which Chaucer would have been most likely to interpret Ovid's works.

Within chapters II and III, I have applied the medical and moral interpretations of Ovid to Pandarus' use of Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris. Chapter II is an examination of the first three books of Troilus and Criseyde, in which an Ovidian cure is desirable but not immediately necessary. In chapter III I have examined Ovidian influence in Books IV and V, in which application of Remedia Amoris is the only practical solution to Troilus' despair.

I wish to thank Dr. L. A. N. Braswell and Dr. C. D. Wood for their assistance in the preparation of this thesis.

CONTENTS

	PREFACE	iii
I		1
II		23
III		50
IV	CONCLUSION	70
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	73

ABBREVIATIONS

<u>ELH</u>	<u>ELH, a Journal of English Literary History</u>
<u>JWCI</u>	<u>Journal of the Walburg and Courtald Institute</u>
<u>MLR</u>	<u>Modern Language Review</u>
<u>MP</u>	<u>Modern Philology</u>
<u>PMSAL</u>	<u>Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters</u>

I

The attempts of many scholars to determine how Ovid was understood in the middle ages have often been based more upon twentieth-century views than those of the twelfth century. Ars Amatoria, it has been assumed by some, is essentially a "pornographic" work which "is perhaps the most immoral book ever written by a man of genius".¹ Critics have consequently assumed that medieval readers as readily recognized the immorality of Ars Amatoria, and that medieval commentators began to gloss Ovid's works as "a rationalizing effort to find justification for what men were reading for other reasons".² Born, for example, believes that:

in spite of all the attempts to prevent the reading of this poet [Ovid] whose works were most to be avoided, he was read and used. Therefore the new condition had to be faced and justified in the eyes of the Church fathers. ...Ovid was made part of a legend, and medieval vitae were written to show that he was a Christian poet ...and writing with a moral purpose.³

Discussing the influence of Ovid upon the development of courtly love, Jessie Crosland adopts a similar viewpoint when she attributes the decline of Ovid's influence in the twelfth

¹C. S. Lewis, The Allegory of Love (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936), p. 196. Lewis considers Ovid's "celebration of the flesh" to be "pornographic". S. G. Owen, "Ovid", Ency. Brit., 11th ed. (1910-11), XX, 387.

²C. H. Haskins, The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1928), p. 108.

³L. K. Born, "Ovid and Allegory", Speculum, IX (1934), 363.

century to the vogue to "moralize the classical tales and accompany the text with allegorical commentaries destined for the moral instruction of the public".⁴

All of the above views share several assumptions. First, each believes that the "immoral" Ovid was understood by such writers of pseudo-Ovidian poetry as Baudri de Bourgueil in the same manner that the twentieth century has assessed Ovid's immorality. From this assumption it follows that the church must have objected to the reading of an immoral poet,⁵ and finally that the commentators of the twelfth-century attempted a compromise by moralizing an illicitly enjoyed Ovid.

Crosland herself questions the validity of twelfth-century moralization used merely in reaction to Ovid's secular popularity when she observes that

the prurient nature of Ovid's love poetry does not seem to have shocked even the most serious authors of the Carolingian period, who frequently incorporate passages from the Ars Amatoria and the Remedia Amoris into their didactic and moral works.⁶

If serious authors as early as the ninth century utilized passages from Ovid's love books with no apparent qualms, one

⁴Jessie Crosland, "Ovid's Contribution to the Conception of Love Known as L'Amour Courtois", MLR, XLII (1947), 199.

⁵For a recent assessment of the theologians usually cited as evidence that churchmen condemned Ovid see John P. McCall, "Classical Myth in Chaucer's *Troilus*", Diss. Princeton, 1955, p. 5.

⁶Crosland, art. cit., p. 206.

may assume that a moral reading of Ovid pre-dates both the vogue of pseudo-Ovidian poetry and the supposed reaction of moralists to the resurgence of Ovid's popularity. The only alternative conclusion, that moralists were employing distinctly immoral works for ethical purposes, leads, as McCall suggests:

to the unlikely conclusion either that Christian men of letters were living a lie for a thousand years by feigning to read the classics ethically and philosophically, or that they were the dupes of a most remarkable ecclesiastical-literary hoax.⁷

The medieval Ovid, like the medieval Virgil, seems to have been moralized long before the twelfth century.

Judgement of Ovid's immorality, moreover, should be based upon medieval rather than modern standards. Dame Raison in Roman de la Rose, for example, defines one useful standard when she answers the Lover's charge that she is guilty of lewdness: "Veire dou mal seurement / Puis je bien paler proprement, / Car de nule rien je n'ai honte, / S'el n'est teus qui a pechié monte".⁸ Immorality, in other words, is to be found in the intention of the speaker rather than in the words themselves. That which offends the Lover's sensibilities may, in fact, be justified by the moral intention of the speaker. It is by this standard that one fourteenth-

⁷McCall, ed. cit., p. 5.

⁸Even of evil, then, I can properly speak, for I am not ashamed if it does not lead to sin. Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, Le Roman de la Rose, ed. E. Langlois (Paris: Société des Anciens Textes Français, 1914, 1920, 1924), vol. 3, ll. 6949-52.

century accessus ad auctores explains the value of Ars Amatoria: the author's intent is not to praise illicit love but to condemn it:

Videbatur enim in illo libro [Ars Amatoria], ab illis qui non intellexerunt, fecisse iuvenes adulteros et matronas impudicas, cuius contrarium apparet: detestatur luxuriam et amorem, et describit qualiter honeste amemus.⁹

Although the uninitiated may believe that Ovid encourages wantonness, his true intent is to encourage the reader to seek genuine love. As the reader was expected to read the accessus before the work, few, presumably, would have been unenlightened when they read Ovid. For the commentator and his audience, Ars Amatoria is an example of ironia,¹⁰ for Ovid debases love while seeming to praise it. Its seemingly prurient surface is, therefore, justified by its rhetorical advocacy of an accepted viewpoint.

The commentator's belief that Ars Amatoria is ironic is supported by Ovid's characterization of the lover, for the Ovidian lover's actions are rarely anything but comic. In Amores I, IX, for example, Ovid compares the lover to the

⁹For he seems in that book [Ars Amatoria], to those who do not understand, to have made young men adulterous and matrons lecherous, whereas on the contrary he gives the case against lechery and love, and describes the manner in which we should love virtuously. Fausto Ghisalberti, "Medieval Biographies of Ovid", JWCI, IX (1946), 57.

¹⁰Ironia is defined by Isodore of Seville as "deriding through praise". Quoted by D. W. Robertson, Jr., A Preface to Chaucer (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962), p. 288.

soldier, much to the detriment of the former. As each attribute of the soldier is demonstrated, Ovid introduces an anticlimactic comparison with the lover. Among equally demeaning parallels, one learns that a soldier defeats a sleeping foe while a lover cuckolds a sleeping husband, and that the soldier beats down gates, the lover, doors.¹¹ Lovers fare little better in Ars Amatoria. The lover is subjected to "a perpetual and sometimes humiliating metamorphosis",¹² whether meekly carrying his mistress' parasol or boldly climbing down the chimney to her chamber.¹³ The purpose of Ovid's characterization of lovers is surely not emulation but ridicule of the miles amoris.

An ironic approach was further justified by the unified reading of Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris which usually followed Ars Amatoria in the medieval canon of Ovid's nine works.¹⁴ It is probable that Chaucer has this consecutive placement of Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris in mind in describing the Wife of Bath's knowledge of the "remedies of

¹¹Publius Ovidius Naso, The Amores and Heroides, trans. Grant Showerman for the Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1914), ll. 17-26.

¹²E. K. Rand, Ovid and his Influence (London: George G. Harrup, 1926), p. 41.

¹³Publius Ovidius Naso, The Art of Love and Other Poems, trans. J. H. Mozley for the Loeb Classical Library (2nd. ed.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952), pp. 81-2. All subsequent line references are to this edition.

¹⁴Ghisalberti, art. cit., p. 36.

love ...per chance". It is probable that she acquired her accidental knowledge by reading a few pages beyond the topic of most interest to her, Ars Amatoria.¹⁵ Unlike the Wife, however, few medieval readers stumbled upon Remedia Amoris "per chance". In a thirteenth-century accessus, for example, the two works are linked, and both are said to be written against material love:

Nec enim credendum est hoc opus esse contrarium premisso operi Artis Amorie quod ipse testatur in hoc opere dicens: 'Nec te blande puer nec nostras prodimus artes.'
...Intentio sua perniciosum amorem remove. ¹⁶

In other accessus, commentators similarly link the two works by suggesting that Ovid wrote Remedia Amoris when he saw the manner in which the youth of Rome were being corrupted through misunderstanding of Ars Amatoria.¹⁷ Remedia Amoris, in effect, is viewed by the commentators as a gloss for Ars Amatoria, whether correcting incorrect interpretation of the earlier work or underscoring its irony.

The basis for a unified reading was no doubt partially a result of recognition that at least one-third of the precepts of Ars Amatoria are refuted in Remedia Amoris. Both

¹⁵Richard L. Hoffman, Ovid and the Canterbury Tales (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1966), p. 36.

¹⁶It is not to be believed that this work is contrary to the premise of the book of Ars Amatoria, as he himself has testified in this work: 'Neither thee, winsomeboy, nor my own art do I betray'... His intention is to remove pernicious love. Ghisalberti, art. cit., p. 47.

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 39-40.

works are dependent upon Lucretius' De Rerum Natura, from which many of the refuted passages are drawn. For example, in Ars Amatoria, Ovid reverses Lucretius' advice that a lover in search of a cure should "concentrate on all the faults of her whom you covet"¹⁸ into a tip for the hopeful lover:

But whosoever you are who are anxious to keep your mistress, be sure she thinks you are spellbound by her beauty. If she be in Tyrian attire, then praise her Tyrian gown; or in Coan, then find the Coan style becoming. ...Admire her arms as she dances, her voice as she sings; and find words of complaint that she has stopped. (AA, II, 295-306)

In Remedia Amoris, however, Ovid takes Lucretius' initial advice one step farther and invites the lover to invent faults if his mistress has none:

Where you can, turn to the worse your girl's attractions, and by a narrow margin criticize amiss. Call her fat, if she is full-breasted, black, if dark-complexioned; in a slender woman leanness can be made a reproach. ...May, more, whatever gift your mistress lacks, ever with coaxing words pray her to employ it. Insist that she sing, if she be without a voice; make her dance if she know not how to move her arms. (RA, 325-34)

Even Ovid's metaphors are often parallel. In Ars Amatoria love is compared to a young plant:

the tree under which you lie was once a sapling... .
See that she grows use to you: than use and wont naught is mightier: till you secure that, shun no weariness. (AA, II, 341-6)

In Remedia Amoris, the metaphor is reversed, for speaking of possible cures, Ovid suggests retreat from love as soon as

¹⁸Titus Lucretius Carus, De Rerum Natura, trans. W. H. D. Rouse for the Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1943), p. 413.

possible:

While it may be, and but moderate feeling moves your heart, if you dislike it, stay your foot upon the threshold... . The tree that gives broad shade to strollers, when first it was planted, was a tender shoot, then it could be pulled by hand from the surface earth: now it stands firm, grown by its own strength to unmeasured height. (RA, 79-88)

A medieval reader would probably have read the first instance of the metaphor ironically if he had been aware of the second which places the first in ironic perspective. Quotation of passages from Ars Amatoria alone, therefore, could have reminded a reader used to the unified view of the two works of the corresponding passage from Remedia Amoris.

That it was Ars Amatoria rather than Remedia Amoris which was ironic is further indicated by the citation of Ovid as an authority upon the cure of "heroes" love. The symptoms of the illness are similar to those presented in Ars Amatoria, and are familiar to any reader of medieval literature. The lover becomes pale, neglects food and drink, has difficulty sleeping, and can think only of the person he loves.¹⁹ "Heroes" love was defined as early as the Greek physicians,²⁰ and was incorporated into such Latin works as Lucretius' De Rerum Natura and Cicero's Tusculan Disputations,

¹⁹The most concise list of symptoms is found in T. A. Kirby, Chaucer's Troilus: A Study in Courtly Love (1940; rpt. Gloucester, Mass.: P. Smith, 1958), pp. 8-12.

²⁰J. L. Lowes, "The Loveres Maladye of Heroes", MP, XI (1913-14), 491-546.

both of which Ovid used as sources for Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris.²¹ Cicero's cure is very straightforward:

The treatment applicable to a man so victimized is to make it plain how trivial, contemptible, and absolutely insignificant is the object of his desire, and how easily it can be secured from elsewhere or in another way, or else be wholly put out of mind. Occasionally, also, he must be diverted to other interests, disquietudes, cures, occupations; finally, he is frequently curable by change of scene, as is done with sick people who are slow in making recovery. Some think, too, that an old love can be driven out by a new ...; above all, however, he must be warned of the passions of love.²²

From a medical viewpoint, the satire of Ars Amatoria serves an excellent purpose, for it indicates through Ovid's casual, cynical approach how trivial love may be, and how easily won. As I have suggested, Ovid's characterization of the lover is not likely to inspire emulation. It is Remedia Amoris, however, which is directly quoted by medical authorities. In Lilium Medicinae, Bernard of Gordon cites Ovid once in his causa and four times within his cura:

...deinde tollatur ocium: de quo Ovidius. ocia si tollas periere cupidinis actus. Deinde occupetur in aliqua actione necessaria. de quo Ovidius Dat vacuae menti quod teneatur opus. Deinde distrahatur ad longinquas regiones ut videat varia et diversa. et de hoc Ovidius. Vade per urbanae splendida castra troiae. Invenies pixides et rerum mille colores. Deinde hortetur ad diligendum multas: ut distrahatur amor unius propter amorem alterius.

²¹L. P. Wilkinson, Ovid Recalled (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), p. 136.

²²Marcus Tullius Cicero, Tusculan Disputations, trans. J. E. King for the Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1943), p. 413.

et de hoc Ouidius hortor et ut pariter binas habeatis
amicas. fortius et plures si quis amare potest.²³

With the exceptions of "actus" for "arcus", "troiae" for
"togae", "fortius et" for "fortior est", and "amare" for
"habere", the quotations are taken directly from Remedia
Amoris:²⁴

oesia si tollas, periere cupidinis arcus (RA, 139)

Da vacuae menti, quo teneatur, opus (RA, 150)

Vade per urbenae splendida castra togae (RA, 152)

Pyxidas invenies et rerum mille colores (RA, 353)²⁵

Hortor et ut pariter binas habeatis amicas
Fortior est, plures si quis habere potest (RA, 441-2).

Valescus of Taranta, like Bernard once a teacher at Montpel-
lier, similarly cites Ovid in his curatio, often employing
the same references as Bernard; for example: "Ideo decibat
Ouidius: hortor vt et pariter binas habeatis amicas. Fortior

²³First let idleness be destroyed. Concerning this Ovid
says: 'take away leisure and the actions of Cupid perish'.
Next, let him be occupied in some necessary action, concerning
which Ovid says: 'give the empty mind some business to oc-
cupy it'. Next let him be distracted to faraway regions in
order that he may see many and diverse things. And of this
Ovid says: 'frequent the camps that gleam with the city of
Troy. You will find boxes and a thousand colours of things'.
Then let him seek out many in order that the love of one will
be distracted because of another, and of this Ovid says:
'This I do advise, have two mistresses at once; he is stronger
who can love yet more'. Lowes, art. cit., p. 501.

²⁴Ibid. Lowes observes that a fifteenth-century edition
of Lilium Medicinae corrects 'togae' and 'habere' but amends
'actus' to 'artes'.

²⁵In Remedia Amoris, this line refers to the paint-box
of the lady rather than to the pleasures of travel. I am unable
to explain its relevance to the quotation it follows. Perhaps
the commentator interprets 'rerum' as nature, rendering the
phrase: 'the thousand colours of nature'.

et plures si quis habere potest".²⁶ For medical writers, Ovid was in such august company as Galen and Avicenna as an authority upon the cure of "heroes" love.

Ovid presumably had, therefore, a dual respectability as both a medical and a moral teacher. The two viewpoints, moreover, re-inforce each other. Morally, Ovid ironically illustrates the errors of material love in Ars Amatoria, and underscores the irony of the earlier work in Remedia Amoris. Medically, Ars Amatoria serves much the same function in demonstrating the irrational behavior of one stricken with "heroes" love while Remedia Amoris prescribes the correct cure for the malady.

A brief assessment of medieval French translations of Ars Amatoria indicates the way in which these viewpoints were transferred into contemporary culture. The most complete and well-written of the translations is La Clef D'Amours²⁷ which includes all three books of Ars Amatoria in a series of rules stripped of metaphor. La Clef D'Amours has usually been regarded as a straightforward example of "Ovid misunderstood",²⁸

²⁶Lowes, art. cit., p. 506.

²⁷Auguste Doutrepoint, ed., La Clef D'Amours, Bibliotheca Normannica, No. V (Halle: Max Neimeyer, 1890). All line references are to this edition.

²⁸G. Paris, "Les Anciennes Versions Françaises De L'Art D'Amour et Des Remèdes D'Amour D'Ovide", La Poésie du Moyen Age (Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1885), pp. 182-209. Paris assumes that readers in the middle ages mistakenly read Ars Amatoria as a serious didactic treatise of love, and conse-

but upon close examination, the translation appears to be as ambiguous as its Ovidian source. The author suggests an ironic approach to his subject within the first two hundred lines by describing the type of lover he wishes to instruct:

Or ne le vienge nul aprendre
 s'il n'a cuer amourens et tendre:
 traient soy en sus les gelous
 et les villains et les vilaines.
 Telz gens i perdroient lor paines;
 quer a eulz n'apartient il mie
 a savoir d'amer la mestrie. (173-80)²⁹

The precepts which follow, however, are based even more upon shallowness and insincerity than are those of Ovid. For example, instead of Ovid's advice that the lover should put his finger in his eye if real tears refuse to flow, the author of La Clef D'Amours advises:

Et se tu ne pués avoir lermes
 en poinz divisez et en termes,
 tu porras un oignon tenir
 qui tantost les fera venir. (1097-1100)³⁰

Advice, indeed, more fitting for "cuers felons et cavelous" than for "la cuer amourens et tendre". Within La Clef D'Amours,

quently he accepts La Clef D'Amours at face value. See also N. R. Shapiro and J. B. Wadsworth, The Comedy of Eros (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1971), pp. 9-11. Wadsworth seems also to view the poem as straightforward.

²⁹Well, no-one is going to learn if he does not have a tender heart: the jealous and rogues, both men and women, draw themselves down to hypocritical and deceitful hearts. Such people waste their time here; for it is not at all fitting for them to learn the art of love.

³⁰And if you are not able to cry at opportune moments ~~nor~~ at appropriate times, you will be able to hold an onion which will immediately bring [tears].

hypocrisy, failure to keep promises, and rape are all cheerfully recommended to the enterprising lover. All, obviously, are more suited to the treacherous than the sincere. The poem is, therefore, at least partially ironic. While there is no direct moral statement, the contrast between those the author claims to address and the precepts he offers could be viewed as an implied moral position. La Clef D'Amours, if it is ironic, parallels the view of Ars Amatoria described by the accessus.

Guiart's L'Art D'Amour³¹ is unambiguously moral. Guiart includes a summary of Ars Amatoria, the corrective of Remedia Amoris, and finally Christian advice to shun the machinations of the world completely. Wadsworth believes that Guiart "uses the Ovidian material ostensibly only to condemn it",³² but condemnation of the precepts of Ars Amatoria, as I have demonstrated, was the rule rather than the exception. Nowhere does Guiart condemn the precepts of Remedia Amoris. In fact, Guiart introduces his summary of Remedia Amoris by observing that Ovid's rules are "folly's cure" which can "banish love forever",³³ an excellent beginning for one who is to learn how to pursue heavenly rather than earthly goals. Guiart's use of Ovid is very similar to that of the accessus. Ars Amatoria is refuted by Remedia

³¹ Shapiro, ed. cit., pp. 45-55.

³² Ibid., p. 43.

³³ Ibid., p. 52.

Amoris, and the latter is used to lead one from carnal to charitable love.

ii

In contrast to the many examinations of the influence of Ars Amatoria upon medieval literature, the influence of Remedia Amoris has seldom been discussed. This has been so, perhaps, because Remedia Amoris is seldom directly mentioned by authors, and even less frequently by characters such as Chretien's Lancelot, Yvain, and Alexander, who are often seeking to promote rather than conclude their love affairs. Its influence, though primarily allusive, is nonetheless discernable, particularly in the commonplace metaphor of love as a wound which can be cured only by the union of the lover and his lady.

One of the infrequent direct references to Remedia Amoris occurs in Marie de France's Guigemar, in which Venus, not surprisingly, is portrayed casting Ovid's remedies into a fire of coals,³⁴ an appropriate fate for a work which claims to quench the fire of Venus. She observes that whoever seeks to master love by reading Ovid's book can expect no favour from her (242-44), and, one might add, would probably neither seek nor need any. As the lovers in Guigemar are both about to receive their cureless wounds, the reference

³⁴Marie de France, Lais, ed. A. Ewart (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), ll. 239-44.

may be intended to be humorous contrast.³⁵ After the mention of Venus casting Ovid's book into the flames, however, Remedia Amoris is not mentioned again.

Many examples of the cure metaphor depend upon extrinsic rather than intrinsic knowledge of Remedia Amoris and the medical tradition if they are to be read ironically. Compleynt D'Amours³⁶ is one such example, for the lover speaks of his lady as the sole cure of his malady with no apparent irony:

Yet alwey two thinges doon me dye,
That is to seyn, hir beautee and myn ye,

So that, algates, she is verrey rote
Of my disease, and of my deth also;
For with oon word she mighte be my bote,
If that she vouched sauf for to do so. (41-6)

A reader schooled in the medical tradition would probably doubt the judgement of a character who admits that he is the "leest recoverer of hymselfen" (3), since "heroes" lovers are, by definition,³⁷ irrational in their immoderate contemplation

³⁵At the beginning of Guigemar, Marie seems to parody the concept of the cureless wound. Guigemar is injured while hunting, and is told by a wounded hart that, with the exception of the care of a certain lady, his wound is cureless. He finds the woman, but as the wound in his thigh is healing, both he and the lady receive spiritual cureless wounds through love.

³⁶Geoffrey Chaucer, Works, ed. F. N. Robinson (2nd. ed., Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside Press, 1957), pp. 540-1. All subsequent references are to this edition.

³⁷By constant contemplation of the desired object, the lover corrupts the function of both memory and discernment. See Robertson's summary of Bernard of Gordon's De amore heroico, ed. cit., pp. 108-10.

of the one loved. The cure which the lover cannot administer to himself begins with the cessation of immoderate contemplation, and as the poem demonstrates, the narrator can think only of his mistress. If one does not apply Ovidian or medical standards, and accepts the lover's premise that there is indeed no cure for his love except his lady, he seems sufficiently rational, for there is no contradiction within the surface level of his argument. The lover does not reject a cure; he does not seem to be aware of one.

Several examples of the cure metaphor in Chretien de Troyes' works suggest more concretely a comparison with Remedia Amoris and the medical tradition. Both Launcelot in Le Chevalier de la Charette and Alixandre in Cliges acknowledge the existence of earthly remedies for love, although both subsequently reject them. Launcelot is said to endure his illness, and to understand that his preferred cure lies with his lady:

Amors mout souvant li escreive
 La plaie que faite li a.
 Onques anplaste n'i li a
 Por garison ne por santé,
 Ou'il n'a talant ne volanté
 D'anplastre querre ne de mire
 Se fu plaie ne li ampire;
 Mes celi querroir volantiers.³⁸

³⁸ Love very often afflicts the wound that it has given him. No plaster does he have for it, neither for cure nor health, for he has neither desire nor wish of a plaster or physician unless his wound grows worse; but of one he would voluntarily be cured. Chretien de Troyes, Launcelot, ed. W. Foerster (1899; rpt. Amsterdam, Rodopi, 1965), ll. 1348-55. All line references are to the Foerster editions.

Launcelot, in fact, rejects a probable cure for continued infatuation.

Alixandre's confused self-debate about the nature of his malady suggests even more definitely the existence of medical cures for love. He begins by admitting that he has become something of a madman, an observation in accord with those of medical writers, and discusses his malady:

Fos est qui sant anfermité,
 S'il ne quiert, par quoi eit santé,
 Se il la puet trover nul leu.
 Meis teus cuide feire son preu
 Et porquerre ce que il viaut,
 Qui porchace don il se diaut. (637-42)³⁹

To this point, Alixandre seems in complete accord with Guiart who observes that "Madmen who spurn their cures are fools indeed" (p. 50) and "He who succumbs to [the sinful life]/ Gains transient pleasure, but his loss is infinite" (p. 54). Alixandre employs the observation, however, towards the furtherance of his love:

Et qui ne la cuide trover,
 Por quoi iroit consoil rover?
 Il se travailleroit au vain.
 Je sand le mien mal si grevain
 Que je n'an avrai garison
 Par mecine ne par poison
 Ne par herbe ne par racine.
 A chascun mal n'a pas mecine.
 Li miens est si anracinez
 Qu'il ne puet estre mecinez. (643-53)⁴⁰

³⁹He is mad who feels afflicted, and seeks not what will bring him health, if he is able to find it anywhere. But many a one seeks to obtain his welfare and for that which he wishes, who follows that which injures him.

⁴⁰And why should one ask for advice who does not ex-

Alixandre has, it seems, come around to the lover's standard position that there is no cure for his illness, but:

Ne puet? Je cuit que j'ai manti.
 Des que primes cest mal santi,
 Se l'esasse mostrer ne dire,
 Puisse je parler au mire
 Qui del tot me poist aidier. (653-7)⁴¹

Once more he adopts an acceptable argument from an Ovidian viewpoint, but as he is in danger of convincing himself to seek aid, he dismisses the view with an abrupt comment that he does not like to discuss such matters, and rationalizes his rejection of physicians with the dubious argument that they would probably not listen to him or accept a fee if he consulted them. His true motive, however, is indicated in the conclusion to his debate:

Maiuz vuel qu'ensi toz jorz me taingne,
 Que de nelui santez me vaingne,
 Se de la ne vient la santez,
 Don venue est l'anfermantez. (869-72)⁴²

In the end, he reverts to the lover's usual belief that the only cure of his illness is his lady, but with what different

pect to gain his health? He would exert himself in vain. I feel my own illness to be so grievous that I will not be cured by medicine or by potion, herb or root. For some illnesses there is no remedy. Mine is so deep-rooted that it cannot be cured by medicine.

⁴¹Not able? I think that I have lied. When first I felt this illness, if I had dared to show it or speak of it, I might have spoken to a doctor who could have cured me completely.

⁴²But hope that thus love always holds me, that health does not come to me, if it does not come of she who is the source of the fever.

motives from those of the lover in Compleynt D'Amours! Alixandre is, above all, confused, and clearly incapable of a rational progression of thought. His response to an illness is not to seek a cure which he acknowledges to be at least partially valid, but to hope that the illness will remain within him unless it is cured by his lady. His argument, one suspects, is influenced more by his conclusion than by his propositions, and is a classic example of disraison. Since both his knowledge of an alternate cure and his inability to argue rationally are demonstrated, the reader is justified in rejecting Alixandre's identification of his cure with his lady, and in viewing him as a sufferer from "heroes" love.

Finally, the God of Love in Roman de la Rose draws upon Remedia Amoris and the medical tradition when he describes the four "solaz", hope, sweet thought, sweet speech, and sweet sight, which he claims will aid the lover. His recommendations are, as one might expect from the God of Love, antithetical to the counsels of Remedia Amoris, for he has no wish to discourage lovers. Ovid assumes that his patient is already beyond hope of winning his lady, and consequently deals only indirectly with hope. His attitude, however, may be represented by Lucretius' assessment of the vanity of hope in love:

For here lies the hope, that the fire may be extinguished from the same body that was the origin of the burning, which nature contrariwise denies out and out to be impossible; and this is the only thing, for which the more we have the more fierce burns the heart with fell craving. For food and liquid are absorbed into the body, and when once these can possess certain fixed parts, thereby the desire for water and bread is easily fulfilled. But from man's aspect and beautiful bloom, nothing comes into the body except the enjoyment of thin images; which lovesick hope often grasps at in the empty air. (iv, 1086-95)

Sweet thought is as abruptly dismissed by Ovid: "Beware of reading again the treasured letters of an alluring mistress... If you can, get rid of her picture also: Why does a mute image affect you?" (RA, 117-24), as are sweet speech: "You will gain by being tongue-tied. ...by silence you will win better revenge so that [your mistress] fades away from your regrets" (RA, 642-6), and sweet sight: "And frequent not the colonade that she frequents when walking, nor cultivate the same society. What boots it by remembrance to heat once more a cooling passion?" (RA, 627-9). The God's "solaz" are, in fact, only further aspects of the illness which he has earlier described as his service, and can give to lovers, at best, only momentary comfort. It is little wonder that the lover in Roman de la Rose, when his case seems hopeless, discovers that "Sweet Speech fails; Sweet Thought avails me not; / Sweet Sight has left me" (4117-20), for the gifts are of use only to successful lovers.

As the examples suggest, Remedia Amoris was used by medieval authors to ironically counterpoint and place in perspective the statements of lovers, but it was seldom

used straightforwardly. In most cases, the precepts of Remedia Amoris were either inverted, as in Roman de la Rose, or were suggested only to be rejected by the lover, as in Cliges.

In Troilus and Criseyde, Chaucer employs Remedia Amoris both inversely and in arguments that are rejected by the lover. Unlike the authors discussed above, however, he does not depend upon the reader's extrinsic knowledge of Ovid's remedies, but summarizes the Ovidian passages which are most important, for example:

For also suer as day comth after nyght,
The newe love, labour, or oother wo,
Or elles selde seyng of a wight,
Don olde affeccions alle over-go. (IV, 421-4)⁴³

By including such summary of Remedia Amoris at crucial points, Chaucer provides within Troilus and Criseyde itself an alternate standard by which the actions of Troilus and Pandarus may be judged. Just as the inclusion of Boethian philosophy suggests an alternate view to that of the characters by which the lover's conventional complaint against Fortune can be judged,⁴⁴ Remedia Amoris provides a standard by which Pandarus' use of the conventional metaphor of the lady as cure may be assessed. Like The Consolation of Philosophy, Remedia

⁴³For the Ovidian parallels see below, p. 55 .

⁴⁴See Gaylord, art. cit., pp. 581-2 and Gordon, ed. cit., pp. 24-60.

Amoris is often misapplied or misquoted. The misapplication and misquotation should be used by the reader to assess the weaknesses of the major characters.

In the following chapters I shall demonstrate how Remedia Amoris is introduced into the characterization of Pandarus, and the way in which it influences the reader's judgement of both *him* and Troilus.

II

Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris are particularly appropriate to Pandarus and to Troilus and Criseyde for several reasons. Ovid's cynical, exemplum-filled, and deliberately pedantic style is perfectly suited to Pandarus, who displays a similar fondness for cynical pedantry and exemplum. Part of the joke with Pandarus, as Meech observes, is

his display of wisdom for his own satisfaction as well as for the benefit of his captive auditor. He embroiders arguments even of the most obvious purport, and having won all his objectives with them, turns to lecturing Troilus on amatory principles.¹

Ovid, according to Boccaccio, is another master of embroidering the obvious, "since no youth is so mad with passion, and no woman so simple, that under the impulse of carnal appetite they are not much keener in inventing expedients to achieve their desires than [Ovid]".² Pandarus, in his quotation of the principles of Ars Amatoria, adds his own glosses to Ovid's straightforward rules, rendering the obvious yet more obvious.

Remedia Amoris, and to a lesser extent, Ars Amatoria are relevant to any discussion of Troy, for they are filled

¹Sanford B. Meech, Design in Chaucer's Troilus (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1959), p. 29. See also p. 11.

²Giovanni Boccaccio, Boccaccio on Poetry, trans. Charles G. Osgood (New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1956), p. 72.

with reference to the Trojan myth. Paris, for example, is mentioned five times, Helen twice, while minor figures including Diomede, Calchas, and Oenone are all mentioned. Of all the classical works which could have been known by Boccaccio and Chaucer, only Remedia Amoris and Tristia mention Criseis and her relationship to Calchas.³ One of Ovid's claims to be able to cure any earthly lover includes Trojan references used in his typical manner: "Give Paris to me: Menelaus will keep Helen, nor will vanquished Pergamum fall into Danaan hands" (RA, 65-66). Most of Ovid's references to Troy are negative. In the context of Remedia Amoris, Paris is simply another lover in need of a cure.

By including direct quotation from Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris, Chaucer invites comparison with Ovid's works. Within his claim to cure any lover, Ovid boasts that he could even cure Tereus and Scylla, both of whom are mentioned in Troilus and Criseyde. If one keeps Remedia Amoris in mind while reading Troilus and Criseyde, the references elicit a complex response. Upon one level they are, as McCall has demonstrated,⁴ exemplum reminding the reader of the dangers of inordinate love, and implying the danger of 'Troilus' love. In terms of Remedia Amoris, however, the mention of

³C. H. Wilkins, "Criseida", MLN, XXIV (1909), 65-7.

⁴McCall, ed. cit., pp. 230-240.

Tereus and Scylla remind the reader that even such extreme passion can be cured if it is given the proper guidance, guidance which Pandarus, at least metaphorically, claims to be providing. When Tereus is mentioned by Chaucer, the reader may compare his love with that of Troilus, and may also compare the advice of Troilus' physician with that of Ovid.

Most important, however, is the harmony of Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris, when read as a unit, with Boethius' The Consolation of Philosophy. Both works stress the importance of free will in the cure of earthly infatuation,⁵ and both appeal to reason to overcome unreasoning sorrow. Because they are dependent upon reason, many of Ovid's cures can be successful only if the lover recognizes the peril in which he may place himself: "Consider in swift thought what kind of thing it is you love, and withdraw your neck from a yoke that may one day gall" (RA, 89-90). Lady Philosophy employs the same technique in assuming the role of Lady Fortune so that Boethius can assess for himself the dangers of submitting to Fortune's rule. Both The Consolation of Philosophy and Remedia Amoris, moreover, employ a parallel metaphor of medicinal aid for the victim of Fortune, even

⁵At RA, 741ff. Ovid discusses remedies which are circumstantial rather than willed, indicating that those which precede depend upon the patient's will power. Although medical writers depend less upon will than upon external application of the remedies, cures were suggested for those who would heed reason. See Robertson's summary of Bernard of Gordon's cures, ed. cit., p. 459.

to the point of suggesting stronger medicines for deeper involvement: "More strongly will that Boy [Cupid] bend his bow-string; a wounded crowd, you will seek more potent aid" (RA, 435-6). One of the clearest instances of harmony in the use of the medicinal metaphor is Pandarus' observation upon the necessity of a willingness to be cured, taken directly from Chaucer's Boece: "For whoso list have helyng of his leche, / To hym behovyth first unwre his wownde".⁶ The Boethian statement is so similar to Ovidian thought that E. F. Shannon mistakenly identified the lines from Troilus and Criseyde with the following lines of Ars Amatoria:

The impatient spirit, as yet intractable to skill,
rejects and holds in abhorrence words of council. More
wisely shall I then approach when he suffers at last
his wound to be touched, and is fit for true admonish-
ment. (RA, 123-6)⁷

There is, of course, a great difference in tone between Ovid and Boethius, but metaphorically, both authors attempt to cure a patient who suffers from the reversal of Fortune.

As Stroud noted,⁸ Boethius makes no attempt to discuss carnal love, considering it to be merely a species of the genus "delights of the world". Ovid, on the other hand,

⁶Boece, Book I, p. 4, and Troilus and Criseyde, Book I, 857-8.

⁷E. F. Shannon, Chaucer and the Roman Poets, Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, Vol. VII (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1929), p. 125.

⁸T. A. Stroud, "Boethius' Influence on Chaucer's Troilus", MP, XLIX (1951-2), 1-9.

deals exclusively with carnal love, arriving, as I have suggested, at the same conclusions as does Boethius. By allowing Pandarus to quote both Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris, Chaucer is able to combine his Boethian philosophical approach with the detailed examination of carnal love offered by Ovid. In Book V, when Pandarus no longer plays a dominant role, the complementary Boethian and Ovidian views are synthesized in Troilus' actions. His rejection of Ovidian cures underscores his complete dependence upon Fortune, while Pandarus' ineffectual friendship indicates the uselessness of his earlier remedies.

From his first appearance Pandarus assumes the role of a doctor. The reader first sees him as a concerned friend attempting to cure Troilus of the "distresse and care" (I, 550) in which his malady has placed him. Unlike Boccaccio's Pandaro who asks only if "bitter time [has] already thus vanquished [Troilo] ",⁹ Pandarus accuses Troilus of cowardice and "foxhole conversion" to religion.¹⁰ Pandaro's question is that of a friend, with no underlying purpose. Chaucer, however, indicates that Pandarus' charges are a medicinal ploy, and outlines Pandarus' rationale:

⁹Giovanni Boccaccio, The Filostrato, trans. N. E. Griffen and A. B. Myrick (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1929), p. 163. All subsequent stanza references are to this edition.

¹⁰The phrase is that of Alan T. Gaylord, "Uncle Pandarus as Lady Philosophy", PMSAL, XLVI (1961), 595.

These wordes seyde he for the nones alle,
 That with swich thing he myght hym angry maken,
 And with an angre don his wo to falle,
 As for the tyme, and his corage awaken.
 But wel he wist, as fer as tonges spaken,
 Ther nas a man of gretter hardinesse
 Thanne he, ne more desired of worthinesse. (I, 561-7)

Medically, Pandarus' cure is sound,¹¹ and he is admirable in his willingness to risk the anger of his friend in order to cure the as yet undefined malady. The only weakness in his position at this point is his readiness to attempt a cure before he has learned the nature of the illness. It may be noted, however, that Pandarus' misinformed diagnosis results in a more accurate treatment than any of his subsequent suggestions. When Criseyde leaves Troy, and incurring the anger of his patient seems to be the only viable cure, Pandarus is not willing to return to his initial diagnosis.¹²

Once he has established the reason for Troilus' illness, Pandarus begins to shift his cure from reaction to propitiation of the disease. His initial reaction to Troilus' acknowledgement that his illness is occasioned by love differs significantly from that of Pandaro. Although Chaucer

¹¹Bernard of Gordon recommends slander of the loved one as one remedy, a method which leads obviously to the anger of the patient. The purpose is probably to distract the patient's mind from contemplation of the lady with "oother wo". While Pandarus is not yet consciously treating "heroes" love, his first advice suggests a proper medical technique.

¹²See below, p. 67.

closely follows IL Filostrato in lines 610-20, he renders Pandaro's vague offer of "consiglio o aiuto" (I, 9) distinctly physical in his suggestion that "Peraunter thow myghte after swich oon longe, / That myn avys anon may helpen us" (I, 619-20). Pandarus' re-assessed cure has little to do with counsel, but is concerned with aiding Troilus physically to consummate his love. Pandarus has shifted from a psychological to a physical cure.

It is only Troilus' disbelief in Pandarus' usefulness as a counsellor of love that prompts Pandarus' first outburst of philosophical lore. He seems to proceed "deductively and by analogy, appealing to maxims and exempla for further authority".¹³ Like Alexandre in Cliges, however, his argument is strongly influenced by his preconceived conclusion that Troilus should seek love, and, like Alexander, the first stages of his argument are antithetical to the conclusions he reaches. Comparison of Pandarus' philosophy with the comparable passages in his sources reveals the inadequacy of his logic.

In an Ovidian sense, Pandarus' argument seems initially to suggest the proper treatment of "heroes" love. Like Ovid,¹⁴ he still suffers from unfortunate love, and

¹³Gaylord, art. cit., p. 576.

¹⁴As part of his defence for writing Remedia Amoris, Ovid observes that he means Cupid no harm, and demonstrates his good faith by admitting to the god that he, for one, still loves (RA, 7-8).

consequently believes that he can steer his friend away from its more troublesome aspects: "That oon that excesse doth ful yvele fare / By good counseil kan kepe his frend therfro"

(I, 626-7). As Gaylord suggests:

'taken out of context, Pandarus' introduction to his argument would best lead to a philosophy of remedia amoris as his best 'conseil' to 'kepe his frennee' from evil excess.¹⁵ But Pandarus' remedy is yet more art, yet more poison.

Pandarus' analogies that a fool can guide a wise man (I, 630) and that

Eke whit by blak, by shame ek worthinesse,
Ech set by other, more for other semeth,
As men may se, and so the wyse it demeth.

Sith thus if two contraries is o lore,
I, that have in love so ofte assayed
Grevances, oughte konne, and wel the more,
Counseillen the of that thow art amayed (I, 641-8)

seem, if taken out of context, to promote the view that excessive love, through the example of Pandarus, is to be avoided. Since Troilus has already demonstrated the symptoms of excessive love in his "heroic" melancholy,¹⁶ one wonders what excess Pandarus wishes him to avoid. In fact, Pandarus is employing the caution implicit in Remedia Amoris in encouraging Troilus to pursue love. A reader with any knowledge of the common medical tradition of "heroes" love

¹⁵Gaylord, art. cit., p. 577.

¹⁶Cf. the summary of Troilus' symptoms in I. L. Gordon, The Double Sorrow of Troilus (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), p. 94 with the typical symptoms of lovers listed by Kirby, ed. cit., pp. 8-12.

must surely be suspicious of Pandarus' argument by this point. Chaucer further emphasizes the illogicality of Pandarus' argument by omitting Pandarus' admission that his failure in love is the result of his failure to maintain secrecy (II, 11). Pandarus, who does not seem to know the reason for his failure, seeks to prevent Troilus from making the same, unidentified errors.

Logically, Pandarus' citation of Oenone's letter continues the argument against the pursuit of love, for Apollo, according to Oenone, could not cure his own malady despite his knowledge of all herbs and medicines. McCall has shown that rather than being pitied for his inability, medieval commentators regarded Apollo's love as foolish.¹⁷ Pandarus has, therefore, supplied both an earthly example, himself, and a celestial, Apollo, of foolish lovers who cannot free themselves once they have followed love. The conclusion should be that love is to be feared rather than readily embraced, since its grasp seems interminable.

Considering his subsequent knowledge of Remedia Amoris, moreover, Pandarus' implication that a mortal cannot hope to escape love if even a god was trapped is unconvincing. Ovid rejects the use of herbs and common medicine in both the pursuit of love (AA, p. 141) and in love's cure:

¹⁷McCall, ed. cit., pp. 180-3.

If anyone thinks that the baneful herbs of Haemonia and arts of magic can avail [in love], let him take his own risk.... What availed thee the grasses of thy Phasian land, O Colchian maid, when thou wert fain to stay in thy native home? What did Persean herbs profit thee, O Circe, when a breeze that favoured them bore the Niretian barks away? (RA, 249-94)

In his boast at the beginning of Remedia Amoris, Ovid is most emphatic in stressing that even the most infatuated earthly lover can be cured by his methods.¹⁸ He does not claim to be able to cure gods, but neither Pandarus nor Troilus is super-human. Pandarus' comparison, though self-flattering, is inapplicable: human love, according to Ovid and those who cite him as an authority, is always curable. Pandarus' citation of Oenone's letter weakens rather than strengthens his position, for he initiates Troilus' cure with the belief that love is incurable. For one familiar with Remedia Amoris, Troilus' misgivings about Pandarus' ability to serve as a counsellor of love are vindicated. Pandarus' rejection of the most basic concept of Remedia Amoris, the possibility of cure, suggests that he is incapable of curing anyone.

Having sententiously worried the incurable nature of love to his own satisfaction, Pandarus assures Troilus that his advice will be sympathetic:

myn entencioun
 Nis nat to yow of reprehencioun,
 To speke as now, for no wight may byreve
 A man to love, tyl that hym list to leve. (I, 683-6)

¹⁸See above, p. 24 and RA, 55-68.

Pandaro, perhaps more modest than Pandarus, attributes the passage to the "wise of old" in their "sage discourses" (II, 12). The sage is probably Ovid, and the discourse, Remedia Amoris in which one is cautioned to attempt the cure of love only at the correct moment:

Either when 'tis new, try if you can, to assuage the fire, or when by its own force it has collapsed: when its fury is at full speed, give way to its furious speeding; impetuous force is ever hard to face.... The impatient spirit, as yet intractable to skill, rejects and holds in abhorrence words of council. More wisely then shall I approach when he suffers at last his wound to be touched, and is fit for true admonishment. (RA, 117-126)

Ovid's intent is to refrain until the correct moment arrives since treatment at the wrong time only inflames and aggravates the malady (RA, 133-4). His advice is only ironically appropriate to Pandarus' argument, for aggravation of the malady is exactly what Pandarus is seeking in encouraging Troilus to love. Within a hundred lines of his assurance of sympathy, Pandarus proposes a cure which even the most infatuated lover would enthusiastically accept. Instead of curing an undeveloped infatuation, he proposes to develop it.

Pandarus' cynical disclaimer to his suggestion that Troilus should seek a friend in his love-sickness: "If God wol, thow art nat agast of me, / Lest I wolde of thi lady the begyle" (715-6), is probably derived from the God of Love's advice to the lover in Roman de la Rose:

Se cil qui tant iert tes amis
 En bien amer son cuer a mis,
 Lors vaudra miauz la compaignie;
 Si est raison qu'il te redie
 Se s'amie est pucele ou non,
 Qui ele est e coment a nom,
 Si n'avras pas poer qu'il muse
 A t'amie ne qu'il t'encuse.¹⁹

As I have suggested,²⁰ the God's advice, like that of Pandarus, is antithetical to the cure of "heroes" love. His advice may be based upon contradiction of a passage from Ars Amatoria in which the lover is forbidden to seek any friends for precisely this reason:

Friendship is but a name, faith is an empty name. Alas, it is not safe to praise to a friend the object of your love; as soon as he believes your praises, he slips into your place no foe need a lover fear; fly those whom you deem faithful and you will be safe. Kinsman, brother -- beware of them and of thy boon companion; they will cause you real fears. (AA, I, 740-54)

Those who wish to withdraw from love, however, are advised to seek friends, as long as they will not remind the lover

¹⁹Translated by Chaucer, The Romaunt of the Rose, 2873-86:

And if his herte to love be sett,
 His compayne is myche the bett.
 For resoun wole, he shewe to thee
 All uttirly his pryvyte;
 And what she is he loveth so,
 To thee pleyedly he shal undo,
 Withoute drede of ony shame,
 Both tell hir renoun and hir name.
 And namely to thi lady der,
 In syker wise; yee, every other
 Shal helpen as his owne brother,
 In trouthe, withoute doubleness,
 And keepen cloos in sikerness.

²⁰See above, pp. 19-20.

of his lady (RA, 637-8):

And fly not intercourse, nor let your door be closed,
nor hide your tearful countenance in the darkness. Ever
have some Pylades to care for his Orestes: this too will
prove no small benefit of friendship. (RA, 587-90)

For one familiar with Arg Amatoria and Remedia Amoris,
Pandarus' discussion of friendship is wrong-headed, for he
either contradicts the former or applies the latter when it
is inapplicable. In terms of Pandarus' argument either
misuse tends to the same result, for Pandarus once more
applies an argument meant for the cure of love in order to
convince Troilus to love.

Troilus' rejection of these impressively, if incor-
rectly, stated propositions brings Pandarus momentarily to
the practical observation that death will be of little use
if the lady is not aware of Troilus' sacrifice. Once Troilus
accepts his advice for this practical reason, however, Pan-
darus resumes his philosophical discourse.

As Gaylord has demonstrated,²¹ upon Troilus' mention
of Fortune (I, 837), Pandarus assumes the role of Lady Philo-
sophy and quotes directly from Boethius. His assumed role
continues the citation of authorities opposed to the intent
of his argument, and complements his use of Remedia Amoris.
As earlier noted,²² his quotation of "Lady Philosophy's
"For whoso list have helyng of his leche" echoes the advice

²¹Gaylord, art. cit., pp. 583-6.

²²See above, p. 26.

of Ovid as well as that of Boethius. By the end of Pandarus' discussion of Fortune, he synthesizes misunderstanding of Boethian philosophy with misquotation of Remedia Amoris. As his previous success has been based upon practical rather than philosophical example, Pandarus adds a practical corollary to his short-sighted logic that since Troilus is currently at the nadir of Fortune's Wheel, he can only ascend:

And thynk wel, she of whom rist al thi wo
Hereafter may thy comfort be also.

For thilke grownd that bereth the wedes wikke
Bereth ek thise holsom herbes, as ful ofte
Next the foule nettle, rough and thikke,
The rose waxeth swoote and smothe and softe. (I, 944-9)²³

Ovid employs the same analogy to encourage the lover that a cure may be found for his unreturned love, but his identification of the rose and the rough nettle is the opposite of Pandarus':

Learn healing from him through whom ye learnt to love:
one hand alike will wound and succour. The same earth
fosters healing herbs and noxious, and oft is the nettle
nearest to the rose. (RA, 43-6)

The inaptness of his quotation of Remedia Amoris is self-evident, and the irrationality of his view of Fortune is underscored for his next two examples, for he assures Troilus: "And next the valeye is the hil o-lofte; / And next the derke nyght is the glade morwe" (I, 950-1). On the other side of

²³The parallel is noted by Shannon, ed. cit., p. 125, but he does not comment upon either the inversion or the significance of Pandarus' quotation of the metaphor.

the mountain, one may observe, there is probably another valley, while next to the "glade morwe" there is undoubtedly another "derke nyght".

Having convinced Troilus to submit to his own desires, Pandarus turns to prescribing the means of achieving happiness, including the lover's companion and physician's anathema, hope (I, 971), as well as secrecy and constancy (I, 957-8). Love, he states, should be nourished constantly or it will never thrive:

Ek wostow how it fareth of som servise,
As plaunte a tree or herbe, in sondry wyse,
And on the morwe pulle it up as blyve!
No wonder is, though it may nevere thryve. (I, 963-6)²⁴

The metaphor occurs in both Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris.²⁵

Considering his quotation of the same passage of Remedia Amoris only thirteen lines earlier, it is probable that Pandarus refers to the following lines:

While it may be, and but moderate feeling moves your heart, if you dislike it, stay your foot upon the threshold The tree that gives broad shade to strollers, when first it was planted, was a tender shoot, then it could be pulled by hand from the surface earth: now it stands firm, grown by its own strength to unmeasured height. (RA, 79-88)

²⁴Robinson follows Root, ed. cit., p. 429, in attributing the metaphor to Seneca's Ad Lucilium, Epist. 1, 2, 3 which discusses not love but education. Considering Pandarus' use of Remedia Amoris fifteen lines earlier, there is no reason to suppose that the metaphor is derived from elsewhere, particularly since Ovid's comparison of the lover with an uprooted plant closely follows the passage which Pandarus has earlier quoted.

²⁵For comparison of the plant metaphor in Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris see above, p. 7.

Troilus' misgivings about his love are exactly what Pandarus is attempting to overcome at this point, but he has no time for repentance unless it is to the God of Love. Once more Ovid's advice for those resisting love is used to advocate further involvement.

Throughout his first speech, the sources Pandarus quotes belie the intentions of his argument. His quotation of Lady Philosophy is used not to discourage but to appeal to the governance of Fortune, so that he becomes in a sense Lady Philosophy seen through the eyes of Lady Fortune. Similarly, the judgements and metaphors of Remedia Amoris, particularly the cure metaphor, are not employed to discourage love but to appeal to the practice of Ars Amatoria. In effect, Pandarus reverses the conventional reading of Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris in which the former is glossed by the latter, for he employs Remedia Amoris ironically while accepting the precepts of Ars Amatoria at face value. A reader with knowledge of either Boethius or Ovid must consequently reject Pandarus' argument. Troilus, however, has the double disadvantage of being "withouten reed and loore" and of being a lover. The former prevents him from detecting the discrepancies in Pandarus' use of his sources; the latter disposes him to accept a "cure" which increases his chances of consummation. It is little wonder that by the end of Book I, Troilus

... fareth lik a man that hurt is soore,
 And is somdeel of akyngge of his wownde
 Ylissed wel, but heeled no deel moore (I, 1087-9)

for Pandarus' proposed cure is comforting, but is in neither a Boethian nor Ovidian sense a remedy.

Pandarus employs the concepts of Remedia Amoris only once in Books II and III. His stress upon the avoidance of sloth as a necessity in the pursuit of love:

Sire, my nece wol do wel by the,
And love the best, by God, and by my trouthe,
But lak of pursuyt make it in thi slouthe. (II, 957-9)

Now help thiself, and leve it nought for slouthe! (II, 1008)

is an ironic reversal of the well-known "ocia si tollas, periere cupidinis arcus".²⁶ As with his use of Remedia Amoris in Book I, Pandarus' advice, if taken out of context, represents a correct cure for "heroes" love. As he employs it, however, the correct prescription is used for the wrong reason. For Pandarus, sloth is a means of escaping love.

With the exception of his mention of sloth, Pandarus does not borrow further concepts from Remedia Amoris until Book IV. It has, however, as has The Consolation of Philosophy, been established as a standard by which his subsequent theory and actions may be measured, particularly since he is consistent in his use of the metaphorical role of doctor administering the cure of love. Within Books II and III, the cure metaphor is juxtaposed with both speech and actions which are based upon Ars Amatoria.

Pandarus' application of Ars Amatoria begins as soon

²⁶ See above, p. 10, Robertson, ed. cit., p. 92, n. 69, and Hoffman, ed. cit., pp. 72-79.

as he has convinced Troilus to follow his advice. Unlike Pandaro who observes that Criseida can be won because she is a widow (II, 27), Pandarus' general encouragement is that there "was nevere man or womman yet bigete / That was unapt to suffren loves hete, / Celestial, or elles love of kynde" (I, 977-9). His preceeding statements, however, make it plain that celestial love is to be given little consideration. The sense of his observation echoes Ovid's encouragement to downcast lovers:

First let assurance come to your minds, that all women can be caught; spread but your nets and you will catch them. ...Come then, doubt not that you may win all women; scarce one out of many will there be to say you nay. (AA, I, 269-70, 343-4)

Both Ovid and Pandarus go on to demonstrate how her heart of hearts may be reached; Ovid theoretically, Pandarus through practical application of Ovid's theories.

Ovid's advice that the lover seek a go-between is adapted by Chaucer, for Pandarus, to a greater extent than Pandaro and conventional go-betweens, is a go-between in search of a lover.²⁷ As emissary he is not content to "speak of [Troilus], then add persuasive words, and swear that [Troilus is] dying of frantic love" (AA, I, 371-2) as is Ovid's emissary, but resorts to more philosophy to convince Criseyde to accept Troilus' friendship.

²⁷ Although go-betweens are often found in romances, none has to exert himself so hard in convincing his charge to love. Usually, the suggestion of aid is sufficient to prompt the lover to action. Certainly no other go-between has to guide the lover in the bedroom.

As Gaylord has demonstrated,²⁸ Pandarus' offer of friendship to the perpetually frightened Criseyde is shrewdly inviting in its appeal. The credit for the appeal of friendship, however, is not entirely due to Pandarus' own perceptiveness. If a woman seems reluctant, Ovid counsels, the lover should "let love find entrance veiled in friendship's name. I have seen an unwilling mistress deluded by this approach: he who had been an admirer became a lover" (AA, I, 720-2). Pandarus' offer of friendship is the first of several examples which give credence to Muscatine's observation that Pandarus has studied long and hard, and knows his theory of love.²⁹

Two of Pandarus' arguments in his first meeting with Criseyde are based ultimately³⁰ upon a passage in Book II of Ars Amatoria in which Ovid seeks to inspire lovers to build their characters on firmer foundations than physical beauty. Not surprisingly, Pandarus attempts to convince Criseyde of the opposite. Ovid's dictum: "that you may be loved, be loveable" (AA, II, 107) is cleverly, though illogically,

²⁸ Alan T. Gaylord, "Friendship in Chaucer's Troilus", Chaucer Review, III (1968-9), 246-9.

²⁹ Charles Muscatine, Chaucer and the French Tradition (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966), p. 139. Pandarus undoubtedly knows his theory: his application, however, is questionable.

³⁰ The carpe diem motif is fairly commonplace, but its use immediately after a passage which can be traced to Ars Amatoria suggests that Chaucer has in mind the corresponding passage from Ovid.

adapted by Pandarus: "certein, best is / That ye hym love
 ayeyn for his lovyng, / As love for love is skilful guer-
 donyng" (II, 990-2).³¹ In other words, if you are worthy
 to be loved, you should love. Beauty is not enough, Ovid
 observes, and illustrates his point by demonstrating the
 transitory nature of beauty:

A frail advantage is beauty; that grows less as time grows
 on, and is devoured by its own years. ...to thee, O
 handsome youth, will soon come hoary hairs, soon will come
 wrinkles to make furrows in your body. (AA, II, 113-118)

Pandarus obediently follows Ovid's example, expanding upon
 Pandaro's brief: "Lose no time, consider that old age and
 death will take away all thy beauty" (II, 54) to observe:

The kynges fool is wont to crien loude,
 Whan that hym thinketh a womman berth hire hie,
 'So longe mote ye lyve, and alle proude,
 Til crowes feet be growen under youre ye,
 And sende yow than a myrour in to pryde,
 In which that ye may se youre face a morwe!'. (II, 400-5)

Both Ovid and Pandarus agree that beauty is transitory, but
 they use the observation for opposite reasons. For Ovid, the
 fading of beauty is the basis for advice to "make thee a soul
 that will abide, and add it to thy beauty; only that endures
 to the ultimate pyre" (AA, II, 119-20). Excessive pride and
 dependence upon beauty are to be shunned. This too, could
 easily have been the king's fool's intent, for he seems more
 concerned with pride born of beauty than with unaccepted love

³¹Root objects to the comparison, originally noted by
 Skeat, on the grounds that Pandarus' statement is essentially
 the inverse of Ovid's. The inversion, if anything, increases
 the likelihood of Pandarus' borrowing.

affairs. But it is exactly this dependence upon beauty that Pandarus seeks to bolster. The consequences of reasoning like that of Pandarus have been apparent since the Duenna of Roman de la Rose first told her life story. She has lived consistently by Pandarus' advice, and accordingly has only the comfort of memory in her old age. Pandarus' appeal, as the lives of the Duenna and her literary cousin, the Wife of Bath, illustrate, is to the rule of Fortune, whereas that of Ovid cautions against such dependence.

Criseyde is more capable of dealing with Pandarus' philosophical convolutions than was Troilus. She rejects his philosophy as a "peynted process", leaving little doubt that she has divined Pandarus' immediate purpose. Once more Pandarus is required to win his point with practical rather than philosophical argument, bluntly threatening his own and Troilus' deaths if she does not accede. Once Criseyde has agreed to Troilus' "friendship", Pandarus suggests that she too may be Troilus' "leche". He has gained an unwitting ally in his cure of Troilus' illness.

Having achieved a measure of success as go-between, Pandarus faithfully suggests Ovid's next step, the sending of a letter:

...but if I were as thow,
 God help me so, as I wolde outrely,
 Of myn owen hond, write hire right now
 A lettre, in which I wold hire tellen how
 I ferde amys, and hire biseche of routhe. (II, 1003-7)

Let wax, spread on smooth tablets, attempt the crossing;
 let wax go first to show your mind. Let that carry your
 flatteries and words that play the lover; and, whoever
 you are, add earnest entreaties. Entreaty moved Achilles
 to give Hector back to Priam; a god when angry is moved
 by the voice of prayer. (AA, I, 437-42)

And, although granting that Troilus is "wys ynough" to write
 a love-letter, Pandarus, unlike Pandaro, reminds him of
 several precepts designed for the bungler:

I woot thow nyllt it dygneliche endite,
 And make it with thise argumentes tough;
 Ne scryvenyssh or craftily thow it write;
 Biblotte it with teris ek a lite; (II, 1024-7)³²

But hide your powers, nor put on a learned brow; let
 your pleading avoid troublesome words. Who save an idiot,
 would declaim to his tender sweetheart? often has a
 letter been a potent cause of hate. Your language should
 inspire trust and your words be familiar, yet coaxing
 too, so that you seem to be speaking in her presence.
 (AA, I, 462-8)

The suggestion of "biblotting" with tears is probably derived
 from Breseis' letter to Achilles in Heroides, iii, 3.³³

Pandarus is finally in his element. He no longer has to
 convince his charge to follow love: he only has to dispense
 second-hand wisdom in order to guide Troilus. His quotation
 of Ars Amatoria, at this point, unlike his previous quotations,
 seems straightforward. Inconsistency in his argument, however,
 would make little difference to Troilus, for he is so sub-
 missive that he accepts without comment Pandarus' caution
 not to employ medicinal metaphors when speaking of love (II,
 1037-9).

³²Skeat, ed. cit., pp. 471-2.

³³Ibid., p. 472.

Elements of Pandarus' carefully planned dinner party also have Ovidian precedent. In Ars Amatoria, the lover learns that "Banquets too give openings, when the tables are set; somewhat beside wine may you find there" (AA, I, 229-30). At dinner parties, an alert lover can speak to his mistress in secret language, contrive to sit next to her, and perhaps win her over (AA, I, 565-88). Pandarus' desire to bring Troilus and Criseyde together in a "certeyn place" is inspired by the same motive:

...tho that ben expert in love it seye,
 It is oon of the thynges forthereth most,
 A man to han a layser for to preye,
 And siker place his wo for to bywreye;
 For in good herte it mot som routhe impresse,
 To here and see the giltless in distresse. (II, 1367-72).

Because of Troilus' "blanche fevere" and timidness, and because Troilus would have to take an active role without Pandarus' immediate guidance,³² Pandarus is forced to modify his approach considerably. Ovid's major objective of bringing the lover and lady together is, however, accomplished. Even his modification, moreover, is inspired by Ars Amatoria. Ever the opportunist, Ovid suggests that since one has to endure paleness and thinness as a lover, one might as well put them to use: "That you may gain your desire, be pitiable... . Let every lover be pale, this is the lover's hue. Such looks

³²Ovid's advice about dinner parties is obviously intended for lovers who have the ability to actively further their own cause, like Troilo, III, 27-40. Troilus, however, depends exclusively upon Pandarus to further his affair.

become him; let fools think that such looks avail him not"
 (AA, I, 737-8, 728-30). Troilus too is cautioned not to
 shrink from pity:

Now speke, now prey, now pitously compleyne;
 Let nought for nyce shame, or drede, or slouthe!
 Somtyme a man mot telle his owen peyne.
 Bileve it, and she shal han on the routhe:
 Thow shalt be saved by thi feyth, in trouthe. (II, 1498-1503)

Pandarus even outdoes Ovid in suggesting that Troilus
 counterfeit sickness, while Troilus is content to utilize
 his symptoms of love-sickness for the purpose Ovid suggests.³⁵

Troilus' entry into Criseyde's chamber may be a
 reversal of another of Ovid's rules for enterprising lovers:³⁶

If it is denied you to go by a safe and easy road, and if
 the door be held by a fastened bolt, yet slip down head-
 long through an opening in the roof; or let the high
 window afford a secret path. She will rejoice, and know
 herself the cause of peril to you; this will be a pledge
 of your lady's sure affection. (AA, II, 243-8)

Troilus makes an ascending, and somewhat less dramatic, entry,
 if Pandarus is to be believed, through a "stewe" and a
 "trappe" after coming "thorough a goter by a pryve wente"
 (III, 787). It would be typical of Pandarus' free appli-

³⁵It may be observed that other factors are involved
 in Pandarus' advocacy of feigned sickness, most notably the
 need to keep Troilus' love secret. As Pandarus' explanation
 indicates, however, the inspiring of pity through illness is
 one of his motives.

³⁶The concealment of lovers, as Root notes, p. xxx,
 is conventional, but Chaucer's emphasis upon the ascending
 entry of Troilus suggests that he may have been parodying a
 recommended descending entry. This could account for the
 reference to Pandarus' knowing fully the "olde daunce" which
 seems at odds with his characterization as a failure in love.
 The recognized source of the passage, *Il Filocolo*, offers no
 conclusive parallel, since Florio enters in a basket of flowers.

cation of Ars Amatoria both to arrange such an entrance and to adapt Ovid's advice for an expected lover in presenting an uncalled-for guest. In the scene which follows this less than heroic entrance, both Troilus' antithesis to the Ovidian lover and Pandarus' coarseness are stressed. None of Pandarus' subsequent recommendations in the bedroom can be traced to Ars Amatoria, probably because Ovid's miles amoris needs no further incentive in making his conquest.³⁷

Having steered Troilus to the required port, Pandarus concludes his successful application of the principles of Ars Amatoria with a humble acknowledgement of his role in the winning of Criseyde: "My deere frend, if I have don for the / In any cas, ...it is me lief; / And am as glad as man may of it be" (III, 1618-20), and a warning for Troilus borrowed from Dante:

For of fortunes sharpe adversitee
The worst kind of infortune is this,
A man to han ben in prosperitee,
And is remembren, what it passed is. (III, 1625-8)³⁸

Troilus should be careful not to slip down the Wheel of Fortune which he has recently ascended. Quoting directly from Ars Amatoria,³⁹ Pandarus cautions that "As gret a crafte is

³⁷Cf. AA, I, 664-706. The Ovidian lover, like Ovid, is above all an opportunist.

³⁸Robinson, ed. cit., p. 827.

³⁹Ibid., p. 1624 also suggests comparison with Roman de la Rose, 8261-4. Since Pandarus does not quote directly Jean de Meun's expanded form, it may be suggested that Ovid's condensed phrasing is more appropriate to Pandarus' proverbial tone.

kepe wel as wyne" (III, 1634). The quotation is from a passage in which Ovid seems as reflective as Pandarus, and for the same reason. Ovid too has guided his pupil to consummation, and has further advice to offer:

It is not enough that through my strains you have won your mistress; by my art you gained her, by my art she must be kept. Nor is there less prowess in guarding what is won than in seeking. (AA, II, 11-13)

He also includes an observation upon fortune, although it is quite different from that of Pandarus: "in that [consummation] there is chance, but this task [retention] demands skill (AA, II, 14). Pandarus' view, it could be suggested, is that conquest is the work of chance, and that retention involves the continued favour of Fortune, possibly prompted by the correct actions of the lover. His thesis is disproved, however, at the beginning of Book IV, for Fortune prevents him from further instructing Troilus in the craft of love.

Throughout Books I to III, Pandarus guides Troilus towards satisfaction of his desire, a "cure" which is antithetical to the advice of Boethius and Ovid. The antithesis is stressed from Pandarus' first appearance, for he quotes directly from both The Consolation of Philosophy and Remedia Amoris, but does so in order to appeal to rather than banish earthly infatuation. In Books II and III, Pandarus frequently borrows or modifies theory and practice from Ars Amatoria in guiding Troilus to a successful union with Criseyde. He maintains, however, the cure metaphor which is central to Remedia Amoris, providing, in effect, an alternate standard

by which his actions may be judged each time he implies that he is curing Troilus' illness. With the conclusion of Book III, the inadequacy of Pandarus' alternate cure is demonstrated, for it can be successful only as long as Fortune is favourable. Once circumstance removes Criseyde, Pandarus' cure is valueless.

III

The limits of Pandarus' wisdom are made evident in Books IV and V, for although he has sufficient knowledge to guide Troilus successfully in his pursuit of Criseyde, he has no ability to aid his friend in the withdrawal from "heroes" love when circumstance necessitates such a withdrawal. Pandarus becomes, in effect, a background figure, conspicuous only in his lack of incisiveness in contrast to his earlier forcefulness. His inability is underscored by Troilus' breaking of the precepts of Remedia Amoris, of which Pandarus, on at least one occasion,¹ shows himself to be cognizant.

Chaucer's description of Pandarus' last appearances differs little from that of Boccaccio, but because of Pandarus' quotation of Remedia Amoris and The Consolation of Philosophy in Book I, and because of his constant use of the cure metaphor, the significance of his inability is considerably altered. Pandarus, it should be remembered, is a sympathetic young friend who is without the pretense to wisdom and logic which characterizes Pandarus. Pandarus' inability to help Troilus in the final books of Il Filostrato is pitiable and understandable, for it seems to be the

¹See below, p. 55 .

result of ignorance of an applicable cure. Pandarus, considering his demonstration of knowledge which could help the stricken Troilus, fails not through ignorance but through misapplication of the knowledge he possesses.

Pandarus has been carefully developed so that his failure is neither surprising nor overly sympathetic. Within Books I to III, Chaucer has emphasized his inability *either* to succeed in or withdraw from love. Pandaro suffers from a similar misfortune, but unlike Pandarus, understands that his inability is the result of his failure to keep his love secret (II, 11).² Pandarus never offers a reason for his failure, which suggests that he has never discovered a reason for his hopping "alwey byhynde". Boccaccio, moreover, mentions Pandaro's failure at only two points, his first appearance (II, 9-11) and his first visit to Troilo after the proposed exchange of Antenore for Criseida (IV, 57), scenes which in both Boccaccio and Chaucer are parallel.³ Chaucer, however, emphasizes Pandarus' inability at every opportunity. As well as expanding the two scenes in which Troilus expresses doubt about Pandarus' qualifications as amatory advisor, Chaucer

²Pandaro's belief that he understands the reason for his failure partially justifies his confidence that he can help Troilo to avoid the pitfalls of love. Pandarus does not have even this partial justification, for he does not seem to understand the reason for his failure.

³For the parallels within Troilus and Criseyde see McCall, ed. cit., p. 299-300.

allows Pandarus to condemn his own failure in his first two visits to Criseyde. Pandaro visits Criseida immediately after he has convinced Troilo to accept his aid: Pandarus, however, is forced to delay his visit for he suffers from love-sickness on May third, traditionally a cruel day for lovers.⁴ After his arrival, his observation that if the ladies are reading books of love "som good ye me leere" (II, 97) is greeted with the taunt that the mistress of this hapless lover is not present (II, 97-99). His second visit begins with no more dignity for, having confessed that he suffers from a "joly wo, a lusty sorwe", Criseyde's questioning of his success in love prompts his admission that he must "hoppe alwey byhynde" (II, 1099-1107).

In his visits to Criseyde, Pandarus bears little resemblance to the confident advisor whom the narrator assures us "wel koude ech a deel / The olde daunce, and every point therinne" (III, 694-5). This disparity between the hapless lover and the learned advisor prepares the reader for Pandarus' eventual failure, for if he cannot find either the reason for his own lack of success, or a method of withdrawing from an obviously hopeless infatuation, it seems unlikely that he can successfully accomplish both for Troilus. His mastery of the "olde daunce", as Chaucer has portrayed it, seems far from complete.

⁴John P. McCall, "Chaucer's May 3", MLN, LXXVI (1961), 201-5.

Pandarus' first appearance in Book IV is in several ways parallel to his entrance in Book I. Once more he discovers Troilus in seemingly irremedial despair, and once more seeks to give Troilus "avys" towards the cure of a desperate situation. As in the first scene between the two, Pandarus' comments seem initially to lead towards an Ovidian cure of Troilus' love-sickness.

Pandarus begins with a contemplation of Fortune's fickleness, but upon this occasion is open-minded enough to envision the descending as well as ascending motion of her wheel.⁵ Because of the cyclical motion of the wheel, he reflects, one should be grateful for what Fortune gives, but one should not expect her to bestow lasting gifts:

Ne trust no wight to fynden in Fortune
Ay proprettee; hire yiftes ben commune.

But telle me this, whi thow art now so mad
To sorwen thus? Whi listow in this wise,
Syn thi desir al holly hastow had,
So that, by right, it oughte ynough suffise? (IV, 391-6)

The observation, derived from Fortune's defence in The Consolation of Philosophy,⁶ is a partial refutation of his earlier logic that Troilus should accept the rule of Fortune since he could only rise from his low position.⁷

⁵Pandarus' awareness of the descending aspect of Fortune's Wheel may be seen as early as his advice to Troilus at III, 1625, but at that point he is still of the opinion that one can maintain one's balance at the top of the wheel.

⁶Robinson, ed. cit., p. 828.

⁷See above, p.36 .

Chaucer expands Pandaro's observation that: "If we lose this lady, many others shall we find" (IV, 48) by borrowing from Amores and Remedia Amoris. From Amores he adopts the belief that each woman has her own appeal:

If oon kan synge, an other kan wel daunce;
If this be goodly, she is glad and light;
And this is fair, and that kan good aright. (IV, 409-11)⁸

Interest in the virtues of other women would be good for Troilus since, as "Zanzis" observed: "The newe love out chaceth ofte the olde" (IV, 415). Pandaro ascribes the quotation to popular tradition (IV, 49), but it is ultimately from Remedia Amoris: "All love is vanquished by a succeeding love" (RA, 464).⁹

McCall, among others,¹⁰ condemns Pandarus for suggesting the pursuit of other women, considering it further evidence of his lechery. As I have demonstrated, however, the seeking of other mistresses was a valid cure in the medieval treatment of "heroes" love.¹¹ While it may^{be} to Pandarus' discredit that the pursuit of women is the first cure that he attempts,

⁸Skeat, ed. cit., II, 487.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰McCall, ed. cit., suggests that throughout Troilus and Criseyde Pandarus is consistently lecherous, and applies only lecherous cures; see especially p. 181, and pp. 167, 299-300. Cummings believes that Pandarus holds out to Troilus "visions of epicurean delights", The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio (New York: Haskell House, 1965), p. 117. Meech, ed. cit., p. 85 implies that Pandarus' offer of other women is essentially base.

¹¹See above, p. 10 and references cited.

and is probably the least likely to be acceptable to Troilus, the cure itself cannot be dismissed as lecherous, or, as Cummings believes, epicurean.¹²

Pandaro has no further remedies to suggest. Pandarus, however, having introduced one Ovidian cure, summarizes in a single stanza the major remedies of Remedia Amoris:

For also suer as day comth after nyght,
The newe love, labour, or oother wo,
Or elles selde seyinge of a wight,
Don olde affecciouns alle over-go.
And, for thi part, thow shalt have oon of the
T'abregge with thi bittre peynes smerte;
Absence of hire shal dryve hire out of herte. (IV, 421-7)

The summary is general, but as Kittredge noted,¹³ Pandarus' cures correspond to the following passages of Remedia Amoris: newe love (RA, 464), labour (RA, 135-200), oother wo (RA, 555-576 and 741-750),¹⁴ selde seyinge (RA, 625-42), and absence (RA, 214-39). Pandarus, it appears, knows Remedia Amoris to a degree which should enable him to apply Ovid's cures. In terms of the practice suggested in Remedia Amoris, however, Pandarus is at this point a poor doctor, for rather than waiting until his patient will listen to reason as Ovid counsels, Pandarus proposes his cures immediately.

As with Pandarus' first suggestion of a cure (I, 561

¹²Cummings, ed. cit., p. 117.

¹³G.L. Kittredge, "Chaucer's Lollus", Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, XXVIII (1917), 70. The line references in the text are my own.

¹⁴The latter reference is to the specific "wo" of poverty as useful to the cure of love. For a medieval use of the cure see De arte honeste amandi, ed. cit., p. 191.

67),¹⁵ the narrator assures the reader that Pandarus' suggestions are prompted more by concern for Troilus' woe than by rationality: "For douteles, to don his wo to falle, / He roughte nought what unthrift that he seyde" (IV, 430-1).

One should beware of accepting the narrator's judgement at face value and concluding with Cummings that Pandarus' proposed cures are "the sheerest twaddle",¹⁶ for as in the first speech, the cure dismissed by the narrator is that which could most profitably be applied. The narrator's comment, if judged by the medical tradition of Remedia Amoris, is ironic.

Not surprisingly, Troilus rejects Pandarus' indelicate statement of Ovid's cures, noting, as do the lovers in Chrétien's romances, that to his mind, his disease is incurable. Such "leechecraft", a term which could for the first time be applied correctly to Pandarus' advice is, for Troilus, to be adopted only by "fendes" (IV, 437). In his advanced state of "heroes" love, he is unwilling to "unwre his wownde" for a second time, particularly if the cure will decrease rather than increase his infatuation. Once more he attacks Pandarus' medical abilities and observes that Pandarus, for all his theoretical mastery of love's cures, has yet to cure himself. His suggestion is the reversal of that in Book I.

¹⁵See above, p. 28.

¹⁶Cummings, ed. cit., p. 117. Meech believes that Chaucer's purpose for the narrator's comment is to absolve Pandarus of any charge of baseness in his preceding suggestions, ed. cit., p. 85.

Instead of being asked to prove his ability to win love, Pandarus is now asked to demonstrate that he can cure it. This time, however, Pandarus has no examples of the blind leading the sighted or fools teaching wise men. Once his theory and abilities are questioned, he abandons his advocacy of Ovid's remedies to suggest that perhaps ravishment might be more suitable to Troilus. He has returned to the encouragement of infatuation and to the precepts of Ars Amatoria.¹⁷ Metaphorically, the doctor allows the patient to select his own cure. The quality of the new cure is indicated by Pandarus' advice to reject reason:

Devyne not in resoun ay so depe,
 Ne corteisly, but help thiself anon.
 Bet is that othere than thiselven wepe,
 And namely, syn ye two ben al on. (IV, 589-92)

Reason, a necessity in the cure of "heroes" love,¹⁸ is rejected for self-interest, one of "heroes" love's symptoms. The destructive potential of Pandarus' new cure is demonstrated by his suggestion that Troilus should act rather "Than sterve here as a gnat, withouten wounde" (IV, 595) and that, if necessary, both Pandarus and his family "Shulle in a strete as dogges liggen dede, / Thorough-girt with many a wid and

¹⁷Cf. AA, 664-706.

¹⁸For Ovid's advocacy of reason see above, pp. 25-6. Medieval medical authorities placed a similar emphasis upon the necessity of reason in the patient's treatment. Bernard, for example, divides his cures between those for rational patients and those for irrational, Lowes, art. cit., p.501.

bloody wownde" (IV, 626-7). The contrast between the theory of Remedia Amoris and Pandarus' new cure is evident. He now advocates irrational self-interest and bloodshed rather than rational withdrawal from a hopeless love.

As well as abandoning Remedia Amoris, Pandarus reverts to the view of Fortune that he expressed in Book I. Troilus is once more advised to trust in Fortune, for she "Helpeth hardy man to his enprise, / And weyveth, wrecches for hire cowardise" (IV, 601-2). Once more cowardice and sloth are viewed by Pandarus as the enemies of Fortune, and of love.

By the end of his visit, Pandarus has reversed his original position. He begins by suggesting a corrected view of Fortune and an acceptance of Remedia Amoris, but after being questioned, again offers Troilus a "cure" which even the most infatuated lover would find attractive. As a result, both the Boethian and Ovidian remedies are rejected in favour of a false cure which is the most obviously destructive yet recommended by Pandarus.

Several critics have misunderstood the significance of Pandarus' quotation from Remedia Amoris in Book IV.¹⁹ Robertson, for example, concludes that: "Troilus is no mere sinner of the flesh, and Ovid's remedies will not help him".²⁰

¹⁹See refs. in notes 10 and 17 above.

²⁰Robertson, *ed. cit.*, p. 493. The reference to the cures of Ovid does not appear in the earlier printed version, "Chaucerean Tragedy", *ELH*, XIX (1952), 1-37.

He offers, however, no supporting evidence for the statement beyond the observation that Troilus is idolatrous and submissive to Fortune. It may be observed that "heroes" love was never regarded as a specifically physical malady, as its placement among diseases of the brain in discussions of "heroes" love from Galen to Burton's The Anatomy of Melancholy indicates. Idolatry, moreover, as Robertson himself observes,²¹ is one of the symptoms of "heroes" love, as is dependence upon Fortune.²² Troilus' idolatry and subjugation to Fortune are essentially further symptoms of his "heroes" love, and Bernard's cures, which Robertson also cites,²³ are surely

²¹On ed. cit., p. 458, Robertson cites Bernard of Gordon's definition of the lover's infatuation: "Thus when anyone is overcome by love with reference to any woman, he so conceives her beauty and figure and manner that he thinks and believes that she is more beautiful, more venerable, more attractive, and more gifted in nature and conduct than any other; and thus he ardently desires her without method or measure, thinking that if he could attain his end it would be his felicity and blessedness". In noting that the abuse of beauty was often portrayed as idolatry in medieval art, Robertson cites Holcot: "'The beginning of fornication is the devising of idols'. For it is impossible for a curious and lascivious man associating with these idols not to be corrupted by them; indeed, a man diligently seeking out and considering in his thought the beauty of women so that he makes idols for himself, necessarily prepares for his own fall", p. 99. Holcot's definition does not substantially differ from Bernard's description of the lover's immoderate contemplation.

²²By definition (The Consolation of Philosophy, Book II) immoderate attachment to earthly desires and possessions leads to a dependence upon Fortune. The lover's physical desire for his lady, therefore, leads to subjugation to Fortune.

²³Robertson, ed. cit., pp. 459-60.

as valid for Troilus as for other sufferers of the same malady. Troilus because of his illness will not, or perhaps cannot, accept Ovidian cures, but his inability to accept them does not indicate that they are invalid. As most medical writers observe, the practitioner will often have to apply his cures against the wishes of the patient.²⁴ Pandarus, although he seems to know Ovid's cures, is not willing to do so. It is not the cures which will not help Troilus but the curer.

The situations in which Pandarus fails to apply Ovid's cures are presented in Book V. Pandarus, for once more of a theorist than Pandarus, indicates the real reason for the visit to Serpedone when he suggests that, to pass the time until Criseida returns, Troilus should travel to "some pleasant place afar from here" (V, 34). It is evident, however, that he does not anticipate Criseida's return, for he subsequently tells Troilus that: "I believe that the tenth day and the month and the year will pass before thou dost see her again" (V, 49). The visit, therefore, is probably a method of preparing Troilus for withdrawal from love as it is in Remedia Amoris:

²⁴Bernard recommends, for example, that if the lover is unresponsive to reason, he should be beaten, or his lady should be slandered in his presence. Such cures, obviously, must be administered to an unwilling patient.

Only go far away, though strong be the bonds that hold you, go far, and make a lengthy voyage; you will weep, and the name of your departed mistress will haunt your mind; and oft will your feet halt in mid-journey: yet the less you wish to go, the more be sure of going: persist, and compel your unwilling feet to run. (RA, 213-18)

By leaving the scene of your earlier pleasure, Ovid observes, you may flee love. That flight from love may be one of the motives for Troilo's journey is suggested in Pandaro's question: "have we come hither to escape the hot pangs of love ...?" (V, 47). The answer appears to be yes.

If flight from the hot pangs of love is Pandarus' motive, however, he applies himself very poorly. His suggestion is not to go afar, but to travel to Sarpedoun "nat hennes but a myle" for recreation. Unlike Pandaro, his motive cannot be to prepare Troilus for the suggestion that Criseyde will not return, for although he believes her return unlikely, he does not communicate his belief to Troilus. Pandaro's question is reversed by Pandarus: "Be we comen hider / To fecchen fir ...?" (V, 484-5).

Comparison of Chaucer's and Boccaccio's descriptions of Sarpedoun's entertainment indicates that Chaucer is more concerned with direct violation of Ovid's remedies. He expands Boccaccio's description of musical entertainment (V, 41), and adds dancing:

Nor in this world ther is non instrument
 Delicious, thorough wynd or touche of corde,
 As fer as any might hath evere ywent,
 That tonge telle or herte may recorde,
 That at that feste it nas wel herd acorde;
 Ne of ladys ek so fair a compaignie
 On daunce, er tho, was nevere iseye with ie. (V, 442-8)

Of such entertainment Ovid states: "Zithers and flutes and lyres enervate the mind, and voices, and arms that move to their own rhythm" (RA, 753-4). They are, in other words, to be avoided by those seeking a cure for "heroes" love.²⁵

In his description, Boccaccio also includes hunting, an activity that Ovid describes as beneficial to the withdrawal from love:

...and cultivate the pleasures of the chase: ofttimes has Venus, vanquished by Phoebus' sister, beaten a base retreat Tired out, at nightfall, sleep, not thoughts of a girl, will await you, and refresh your limbs with healthy repose. (RA, 199-206)

Chaucer, significantly, omits hunting from his description of Sarpedoun's festivity. Troilus is subjected only to activities which will intensify his illness.

Since the entertainment described by Chaucer is a stimulant to thoughts of one's mistress, it is little wonder that Troilus thinks constantly of Criseyde. His reading of Criseyde's letters "An hondred sithe atwixen noon and prime" in order to recall "hire shap, hire wommanhede" (V, 470-4) is a direct contradiction of Remedia Amoris:

Beware of reading again the treasured letters of an alluring mistress; letters read over again move even constant minds. Consign them all, though unwillingly, to the fierce flames, and say 'Let that be my passion's funeral pyre'. (RA, 717-20).

²⁵ Compare Troilus' symptoms with those of Arcite in The Knight's Tale, 1361-66, and the latter's reaction to music: "And if he herde song or instrument, / Thanne wolde he wepe, he myghte nat be stent" (1367-8). Note also that "Festes, instrumenz, caroles, daunces" are prominently displayed upon the walls of the temple of Venus (1931).

Once watchful of Troilus' every move, Pandarus virtually disappears, allowing the unguided Troilus to aggravate his illness. While he no longer directly encourages Troilus, neither does he, as does Pandaro (V, 49), seek to discourage him by revealing the unlikelihood of Criseyde's return. The answer to his earlier question: "Be we come hider / To fecchen fir...?" is, in Troilus' case, affirmative, for Troilus' desire is increased rather than decreased by his visit.

As Pandaro offers direct advice to give up hope of Criseida's return while Pandarus deceives Troilus, Troilus' wish to visit the palace of Criseyde has different significance in the two works. Troilo contradicts the advice of Pandaro; taking his friend by the hand and wearing a deceptive smile, he rides immediately to Criseida's palace upon his return to Troy. As Meech notes,²⁵ Pandaro does not seem to accompany Troilo in his subsequent visits about the town. Pandaro has attempted an Ovidian cure, but his attempt has failed.

Troilus, having no advice to contradict, rises the day after his return and asks his "owen brother deere" to accompany him to Criseyde's palace. The concept of revisiting her palace in both works is probably derived from Remedia Amoris, in which such a visit is employed as the final test

²⁶Meech, ed. cit., p. 107.

for the lover's cure:

May the gods grant you to be able to pass by the threshold of a deserted mistress, and may your feet avail for the purpose! Yes, you will be able; only let your will not fail. (RA, 785-7)

Will power, however, has never been one of Troilus' salient characteristics; the sight of Criseyde's palace only fills him with further woe. The final stages of Ovid's cure, if attempted too soon, can only lead to a relapse. Without any attempt at a cure whatever, the intended final stages can lead only to misery.

As Pandarus has nothing to suggest, Troilus visits and reflects upon each setting that can be associated with Criseyde:

Lo, yonder saugh ich last my lady daunce;
And in that temple, with hire eyen cleere,
Me kaughte first my righte lady dere.

And yonder have I herd ful lustyly
My dere herte laugh; and yonder pleye
Saugh ich hire ones ek ful blisfully.
And yonder ones to me gan she seye,
'Now goode swete, love me wel, I preye;'
And yond so goodly gan she me biholde,
That to the deth myn herte is to hire holde. (V, 565-74)

Once so ready with medicinal metaphors, Pandarus misses a perfect opportunity to quote another:

avoid places that know the secret of your unions; they hold the seeds of sorrow. 'Here was she, here she lay; in that chamber did we sleep; here did she give me wanton joys at night.' Love brought to mind is stung to life, and the wound is rent anew. (RA, 725-30)

Pandarus, one assumes, sits mutely through Troilus' rhapsody. His only active suggestion after the visit to Sarpedoun is to send more letters, a reversion to the practices of Arg

Amatoria:

The necessity of an Ovidian cure is underscored by Troilus' complaint to Cupid:

O blisful lord Cupide,

 What nede is the to seke on me victorie,
 Syn I am thyn, and holly at thi wille?
 What jole hastow thyn owen folk to spille? (V, 582-8)

This is precisely the argument that Ovid employs at the beginning of Remedia Amoris:

If any lover has delight in love, blest is his passion: let him rejoice and sail on the favouring wind. But if any endures the tyranny of an unworthy mistress, let him learn the help my art can give. Why has some lover cast the noose about his neck, and hung, a sad burden, from the lofty beam? Why has one pierced his breast with the unyielding sword? Lover of peace [Cupid], thou bearest the reproach for that murder. He who, unless he give o'er, will die of hapless love, -- let him give o'er; and thou shalt be the death of none. (RA, 13-22)

Cupid, Ovid argues, should not be the death of those who have followed him. His remedy, with Cupid's assent, is the writing of methods by which a lover, if necessary, can find relief rather than death. Troilus, however, is without guidance in Ovid's art. He reproaches Cupid for the same shortcoming as does Ovid, but his desired remedy is the return of his lady for he knows no alternative. Pandarus for his part encourages Troilus by giving him hope "alwey, the tenthe morwe / That she shal come, and stynten al his sorwe" (V, 685-6)

Cassandra's role in Troilus and Criseyde suggests that the method of cure which Pandarus initially employed, straightforwardness and provocation of anger,²⁷ could have

²⁷See above, p. 58.

been useful in the correct cure of Troilus. In Il Filostrato, Troilo himself correctly interprets his dream. Cassandra appears only to mock him for his love of an inferior woman, prompting his partially justified rebuke of her presumption (VII, 88-101).²⁸ Her visit has nothing to do with Troilo's renewed strength, for he regains his energy through adaptation to his constant suffering and through his desire to display his valour before the Greeks. (VII, 104).

Chaucer modifies both the role of Cassandra and Troilus' reaction to her visit. Cassandra is cast in her classical role of a prophetess doomed always to tell the truth but never to be believed. She places Troilus' love in the perspective of Greek myth by associating his infatuation and subservience to Fortune with the destruction of Thebes.²⁹ Her correct interpretation of Troilus' dream and her blunt, truthful statement: "This Diomede is inne, and thow art oute" (V, 1519) is the cause of Troilus' renewed energy. Significantly, Chaucer includes in the description of Troilus' reaction to her speech two of the most repeated words of the first three books, "cure" and "aventure",³⁰ as

²⁸Troilo's rebuke cannot be said to be fully justified for he misrepresents his relationship with Criseida. His rebuke is, therefore, partially dishonest.

²⁹McCall, ed. cit., pp. 347-8.

³⁰"Aventure" is used thirteen times in the first three books, "cure" eleven. In the context of Books I to III, both words are almost exclusively synonyms for Troilus' love affair. The quest for union is, for the three main characters, an "aventure", while union with Criseyde is seen as a "cure".

Cassandra becomes yet another "leche":

Cassandre goth, and he with cruel herte
 Foryat his wo, for angre of hire speche;
 And from his bed al sodeynly he sterte,
 As though al hool hym hadde ymad a leche.
 And day by day he gan enquere and seche
 A sooth of this with al his fulle cure;
 And thus he drieth forth his aventure. (V, 1534-40)

Cassandra, it seems, is the only "leche" capable of distracting Troilus from his obsession with Criseyde. It is probable that if Pandarus had similarly confronted Troilus with an honest statement of his hopeless situation, Troilus' anger could have disrupted his preoccupation with Criseyde and allowed a valid practitioner of Remedia Amoris to effect a cure. In the name of friendship, however, Pandarus rejects the technique of lessening woe with anger which he initially employed (I, 561-7), and denies Cassandra's attempted honesty just as he has denied any honest assessment of Criseyde's unlikely return throughout Book V.

Troilus' final dilemma is the logical result of his unchecked infatuation. Although he is aware of Criseyde's deception, he cannot "unloven [her] a quarter of a day" (V, 1698). As neither love nor cure is possible, all that remains for Troilus is to seek revenge upon Diomedes and death for himself.

The final statement of Pandarus is, in Ovidian terms, as futile as Troilus' unceasing infatuation, for he can only negatively comment: "I hate ywys Cryseyde; / And, God woot, I wol hate hire evermore" (V, 1732-3). The statement is

more consolidation of his friendship with Troilus than consolation, for as Ovid observes, hatred offers no comfort to lovers:

Let love fail, and vanish into tenuous air, and die by slow degrees. But to hate a woman once loved is a crime: that is the end fitting to savage minds. It is enough to be indifferent: he who ends by hating, either loves still, or will find it hard to end his misery. (RA, 653-8)

That Pandarus' final judgement should be based upon emotion underscores his failure as doctor of love. Throughout Troilus and Criseyde he has appealed constantly to emotion rather than to reason, and to the rule of Fortune rather than to personal responsibility. His hatred, indeed, is only likely to lead Troilus to further contemplation of a woman he is incapable of hating. A true physician would attempt to guide Troilus towards forgetfulness.

Pandarus' sympathy underscores another weakness in his medical guidance. The doctor of love must expect to apply strictures against the wishes of his patient. Pandarus, however, pursues a policy of supplication in the name of friendship rather than application of cures which, though disagreeable to the lover, could prevent death. The steps by which a remedial indifference could be fostered; travel, labour, and the rejection of useless memories, have not only been discarded by Pandarus, but have been contravened by Troilus with Pandarus' mute consent. Without hope, and without strong guidance from a friend who could introduce distasteful but necessary remedies, Troilus is left

with a single objective, death.

IV

CONCLUSION

Within the previous chapters I have attempted to establish the practicality of Pandarus' amatory advice by comparing his use and quotation of Remedia Amoris with Ovid's intent as understood in the middle ages. Judged by the Ovidian standard, Pandarus seems to be a failure as a practical advisor.

Ovid's recommendation is that a proper cure, immediate withdrawal from a potentially injurious love, should be suggested to the lover who is not yet completely committed. This is not, however, Pandarus' advice. Although Troilus seems cautious about pursuing love, Pandarus, through arguments based partially upon misrepresentation of Remedia Amoris, convinces Troilus that love and Fortune need only be followed to attain happiness. From the beginning, Pandarus' intent is the opposite of Ovid's, although both view themselves as the practitioners of love's cure.

Within Books II and III, Pandarus' thesis that Fortune can be successfully manipulated seems, if accepted at face value, to be proven correct, for Troilus finds happiness in his union with Criseyde. If one recalls the alternative standard established by Pandarus' quotation of Remedia Amoris in Book I, however, his guidance is shortsighted, for

his successful guidance, and thus Troilus' happiness, are dependent upon the continued favour of Fortune. For a medieval reader, Pandarus' application of the principles of Ars Amatoria in aiding Troilus would probably underscore the irrational nature of Troilus' "heroes" love, and further invite judgement of Pandarus' "cure" by the standards of Remedia Amoris, for many authorities viewed Ars Amatoria as an ironic illustration of incorrect love which could be rectified by the application of Ovid's remedies. By Ovidian standards, Pandarus does not apply a cure but an intensification of the illness.

By Book IV, Fortune has indeed turned against Troilus, and an Ovidian or Boethian cure is no longer desirable but necessary. As there is no hope of Criseyde's return, Troilus must forget his lost love. Although he demonstrates knowledge of Ovid's cures, however, Pandarus either cannot or will not apply them. His policy is constantly one of supplication, allowing Troilus to prolong his love by hoping for Criseyde's return although Pandarus secretly believes it to be unlikely. Whereas an Ovidian practitioner would be encouraging his charge to think of other pleasures as a prelude to the forgetting of a lost mistress, Pandarus allows Troilus to think constantly of his lady and consequently increase his desire. Pandarus' counsel throughout Troilus and Criseyde is, in fact, the opposite of what one would expect from one who is attempting to cure love.

One cannot, therefore, consider Pandarus to be an adequate representative of practical wisdom, for while many of his actions are based upon common sense, his viewpoint is limited to the immediate future. Literally, he can envision the descending aspect of Fortune's Wheel only after the descent has begun, and can see the dangers of love only after love has become dangerous. His practicality in love is limited to involving others in a pursuit which, to paraphrase Boccaccio, few are so simple that they cannot invent expedients to achieve their desires. His practicality fails when he is faced with the more challenging task of genuinely curing love, for he can apply practical remedies neither for himself nor for Troilus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Boccaccio, Giovanni. The Filostrato. Translated by N. E. Griffen and A. B. Myrick. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1929.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. Works. Edited by F. N. Robinson. 2nd ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside Press, 1957.
- . The Book of Troilus and Criseyde. Edited by R. K. Root. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1945.
- . Works. Edited by W. W. Skeat. 6 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, ¹⁸⁹⁴⁻⁷1894-7, II.
- Ovid, Publius Naso. The Art of Love and Other Poems. Translated by J. H. Mozley for the Loeb Classical Library. 2nd ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939; reprinted 1962.

Secondary Sources

- Born, L. K. "Ovid and Allegory", Speculum, IX (1934), 362-79.
- Boccaccio, Giovanni. Boccaccio on Poetry. Translated and edited by Charles G. Osgood. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1956.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. Tusculan Disputations. Translated by J. E. King for the Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1943.
- Crosland, Jessie. "Ovid's Contribution to the Conception of Love Known as L'Amour Courtois", MLR, XLII (1947), 199-206.
- Cummings, Hubertis M. The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio. New York: Haskell House, 1965.
- Doutrepont, Auguste, ed. La Clef D'Amours. Bibliotheca Normannica, No. V. Halle: Max Neimeyer, 1890.
- Fansler, Dean F. Chaucer and the Roman de la Rose. Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature. New York, 1914; reprinted Gloucester, Mass.: P. Smith, 1965.

- France, Marie de. Lais. Edited by A. Ewert. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.
- Gaylord, Alan T. "Friendship in Chaucer's Troilus", Chaucer Review, III (1968), 238-64.
- ". "Uncle Pandarus as Lady Philosophy", PMSAL, XIVI (1961), 571-95.
- Ghisalberti, Fausto. "Medieval Biographies of Ovid", JWCI, IX (1946), 10-59.
- Gill, Sister A. B. Paradoxical Patterns In Chaucer's Troilus: An Explanation of the Palinode. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1970.
- Haskins, C. H. The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- ". Studies in the History of Medieval Science. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Hoffman, Richard L. Ovid and the Canterbury Tales. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1966.
- Huygens, R. B. C. "Accessus ad Auctores", Latomus, XII (1953), 296-311, 460-484.
- Kirby, T. A. Chaucer's Troilus: A Study in Courtly Love. Louisiana State University Studies, XXXIX, University of Louisiana, 1940; reprinted Gloucester, Mass.: P. Smith, 1958.
- Kittredge, G. L. "Chaucer's Lollius", Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, XXVIII (1917), 47-133.
- Lewis, C. S. The Allegory of Love. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936.
- Lorris, Guillaume de and Jean de Meun. Le Roman de la Rose. Edited by E. Langois for Société des Anciens Textes Français. 7 vols. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1920-24.
- Lowes, J. L. "The Loveres Maladye of Heroes", MP, XI (1913-14), 491-546.
- Lucretius, Titus Carus. De Rerum Natura. Translated by W. H. D. Rouse for the Loeb Classical Library. 3rd. ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937; reprinted 1966.

- Meech, S. B. Design in Chaucer's Troilus. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1959.
- Muscatine, Charles. Chaucer and the French Tradition. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966.
- Ovid, Publius Naso. Heroides and Amores. Translated by Grant Showerman for the Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1925; reprinted 1963.
- Paris, Gaston. "Les Anciennes Versions Françaises de L'Art D'Amour et Des Remèdes D'Amour D'Ovide", La Poésie du Moyen Age. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1885, 182-209.
- Quain, E. A. "The Medieval Accessus ad Auctores", Traditio, III (1945), 215-64.
- Rand, E. K. Ovid and his Influence. London: George G. Harrup, 1926.
- Robertson, D. W., Jr. A Preface to Chaucer. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.
- . "Chaucerean Tragedy", ELH, XIX (1952), 1-37.
- . "Chretien's Cligés and the Ovidian Spirit", Comparative Literature, VII (1955), 32-42.
- Shapiro, Norman R. and James B. Wadsworth. The Comedy of Eros. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1971.
- Shannon, E. F. Chaucer and the Roman Poets. Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, VII. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1929.
- Slaughter, E. E. Virtue According to Love in Chaucer. New York: Bookman Associates, 1957.
- Stroud, T. A. "Boethius' Influence on Chaucer's Troilus", MP, XLIX (1951-2), 1-9.
- Troyes, Chretien de. Works. Edited by W. Foerster. 5 vols. Halle: Max Neimeyer, 1877-99; reprinted Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1966.
- Wilkins, C. H. "Criseida", MLN, XXIV (1909), 65-7.
- Wilkinson, F. P. Ovid Recalled. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955.