

The Uses of Anachronism in Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida**

Shakespeare'in *Troilus ve Cressida* Oyununda Anakronizm Kullanımı

Evrım Doğan ADANUR*

Abstract

Written at the turn of the century, *Troilus and Cressida* includes different codes of conduct in relation to those belonging to the past and the contemporary. In the play, the fading away ideals of the chivalric age are represented by the Trojan Hector and of the modern by the Greek Ulysses. William Shakespeare, by juxtaposing the medieval/feudal and the modern/capitalist in this play, employs an anachronistic approach to looking at the past and the present. In his version of the most famous story of war and valour in the Western tradition, Shakespeare problematizes the linear view of history and offers a kairotic understanding of historical difference not only by carrying contemporary forms of behavior and thought to the past but also by showing the anachronism of trying to be chivalric in the modern age. This necessary anachronism lets Shakespeare make a comment on the early modern ideology in his retelling of the seemingly Homeric tale that reached to the Renaissance in an altered form through the romance tradition.

Keywords: Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida*, anachronism, kairos

Öz

17. yüzyılın başlarında yazılan *Troilus ve Cressida* oyunu geçmiş ve şimdiki zamana ait farklı davranış ilkeleri barındırır. Oyunda şövalyelik zamanlarının kaybolan idealleri Truvalı Hector ile modern olanlar ise Yunanlı Ulysses tarafından temsil edilir. William Shakespeare, ortaçağa ait/feodal olan ile modern/kapitalist olanı birarada sunarak geçmiş ve çağdaşa anakronistik bir yaklaşım getirmektedir. Batı geleneğindeki en ünlü savaş ve kahramanlık hikayesinin kendi yorumunda Shakespeare, doğrusal tarih anlayışını problematize etmekte ve sadece çağdaşa ait olan davranış ve düşünce biçimlerini geçmişe taşıyarak değil, aynı zamanda modern zamanda kahraman olmanın anakronizmini de göstererek geçmişe kairotik bir bakış açısıyla bakmaktadır. Bu gerekli anakronizm Shakespeare'e Rönesans dönemine ortaçağ boyunca romans geleneği etkisiyle değişerek gelen sadece görünüşte Homeros'a ait olan bu hikayenin yeniden anlatımıyla erken modern çağın ideolojileri üzerine yorum yapmasına olanak vermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Shakespeare, *Troilus ve Cressida*, anakronizm, kairos

Ranging from intentional and unintentional to necessary and deliberate anachronisms, William Shakespeare employs many instances of historical inaccuracy in his plays either for the sake of dramatic effect or in his in/ability to deal with the historical past in its own terms. From the clock famously striking three in 44 BC Rome in *Julius Caesar* to medieval Hamlet's attending university of Wittenberg founded in 1502, from Cleopatra wanting to play billiards a thousand and three hundred years earlier than the first record of any cue sports to the reference of Bedlam in pre-historic Britain in *King Lear*, from the Benevolence Taxes in *Richard II* to "Duke" Theseus in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, anachronism is an integral and crucial part of the Shakespearean text. *Troilus and Cressida* is no exception. Not only in Hector's mentioning Aristotle or Thersites's double-anachronistic reference to the Neapolitan bone-ache in an ostensibly Homeric tale, while writing his version of the Trojan war, Shakespeare strips the heroic story off its epic circumstances and reads it through contemporary anxieties by offering an overview of the controversies of the rapidly changing early modern world from a feudal/chivalric to a modern/capitalist one. In a tale stemming from the antiquity and transformed, even reproduced through the romance tradition, Shakespeare brings together the old, the fading away and the new, the yet to happen by administering contemporary anxieties in the exchanges between the Trojans and the Greeks. The "chivalric" ideals of the old find their representation in Trojan Hector and the "modern" perception in Greek Ulysses. Through this "necessary anachronism" Shakespeare rewrites the Trojan story by culminating the distant

* A version of this paper is presented at the 13th ESSE Conference (22-26 August 2016, Galway, Ireland) in "Anachronism and the Medieval" seminar titled "Chronos to Kairos: Representation of History in William Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*."

* Yrd. Doç. Dr. Atılım Üniversitesi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, evrim.dogan@atilim.edu.tr

and recent past and the present offering a kairotic understanding of time over a chronological one to represent the anachronistic view of the past in the face of the contravening ideologies of the Elizabethan era.

Appeared in English in the second half of the 17th century, the word “anachronism” comes from Greek “ana+khronos”, literally against time, through which “anakhronizein” means to “refer to wrong time” (*Etymology*) or to “err in a time reference” (*Collins*). The word is also used to mean “representation of an event, person, or a thing in a historical context in which it could not have occurred or existed” or “a person or a thing that belongs or seems to belong to another time” (*Collins*). This mistake or incongruity regarding chronology may take place when someone, something, or an idea is manifested in an earlier or later time period. Anachronism can emerge as a result of historical disregard or unconsciousness with desirable or undesirable outcomes or it can arise deliberately to make a point on historical consciousness. Moreover, dealing with a past event is also determined by the approach of the author with or without a desire to represent the past faithfully. Defining anachronism as “playing fast and loose with history,” Marjorie Garber points out that “whether [such] temporal dissonances are admired or scorned, anachronisms in literature have their purposes and their effects,” (Garber, 2008, pp. 59, 60) for anachronism is what “escape[s] historical determination” but which, at the same time, “is intimately connected to it.” Therefore, for Garber, “neglecting the ahistorical” is the same thing as “neglecting the historical” (Garber, 2008, pp. 65-66). Shakespeare, according to Garber, “famously alters history from time to time” in order to make “a point about the present day” (Garber, 2008, p. 50).

Shakespeare’s approach to the past, both in his histories and historical plays always has a presentist attitude, with a deliberate view of the past from where he stands. This is what Georg Lukács calls “necessary anachronism” which he observes in Walter Scott’s *Waverley* novels that embody the social and economic formations through the passage from feudalism to capitalism. For Lukács, this anachronism is vital in portraying characters expressing feelings and thoughts more realistically and clearly than the actual people would have done since “the past portrayed is clearly recognized and experienced by contemporary writers as the *necessary prehistory* of the present” (Lukács, 1989, p. 61).

Anachronism, as a result of historical consciousness, is an early modern concept. As Erwin Panofsky lays out, Renaissance expressed itself in historical anachronism and historical sensibility for the first time with a sense that the past was different and separate from the present. Panofsky further suggests that the medieval age did not see themselves as different from the past or perceived the past as “other,” lacking, contrary to the Renaissance, “an intellectual distance between the present and the past” (Panofski, 1972, p. 28). Depicting Apollo in a medieval tunic, as Panofsky observes, is a sign of this inability to register historical alterity with the classical past. Historical difference, conjointly anachronism, is a Renaissance concept with a conscious distancing from both the antiquity and the recent past when “the classical past began to be looked upon from a fixed distance” as Peter Burke puts forward (Burke, 1997, p. 108) which was absent from medieval consciousness. Burke explains that it is the Renaissance humanists that distinguished the recent past from the antiquity no matter how they “owed more than they knew to the ‘Middle Ages’ they so frequently denounced. If they overestimated their distance from the recent past, they underestimated their distance from the remote past, the antiquity they admired so much” (Burke, 1997, p. 3). Burke elsewhere suggests that this distancing was invented in the 15th and 16th centuries creating a “Renaissance sense of the past” in which the Renaissance approach to antiquity was with a “nostalgic distance” while the approach to the medieval ages was with “ironic distance” (Burke, 2001, p. 158). Therefore, the Renaissance distinguished itself from the medieval age as its historical “other” interpreting the past as a different entity.

Shakespeare's sense of the past and the present is amalgamated in *Troilus and Cressida* in his anachronistic understanding of the past with a Renaissance historical consciousness. In the early modern era, when the feudal system began to collapse after the Wars of the Roses, the early stages of market economy introducing a different set of values was felt in the society with insistence on individual profit and property rights. Together with the changing economic system, the Elizabethans witnessed the fall of the old nobility to be replaced by the new, shrewder aristocracy whose power came directly from the Authority¹. Moreover, through the end of the 16th century, together with the newly emergent rich and new aristocracy, there appeared a mass of university educated people for whom no title or office was available. The era witnessed the disintegration of former social forms and loss of ideals belonging to the past in the face of this transformation.

These contests found their representation in different forms of art in the era, especially in drama as the most social of all forms. As Stephen Greenblatt suggests, "art is social" and "in response to the art of the past, we inevitably register, whether we wish or not, the shifts of value and interest that are produced in the struggles of social and political life" (Greenblatt, 1998, p. 14). In the Tudor era, economic shift, inflation, class hostility, together with religious and political problems that are felt by the people from different strata, led the English artists look for their subject matter in the past. As Greenblatt further states,

Instead of depicting the ordinary operation of the law, functioning to defend property, English artists most often narrate events at once more menacing and more socially prestigious, event colored by feudal fantasies in which the sixteenth century gentry dressed their craving for honor. Thus instead of the assizes and a hempen rope, we have tales of mass rebellion and knightly victories. (Greenblatt, 1998, p. 15)

Shakespeare, likewise, used a source that is important both in terms of recent and classical past in order to "make a point about the present day." Shakespeare understands that his age is fundamentally different from the previous one and anachronistically places early modern concepts in a historical setting creating a multi-temporality: what is historical in source material becomes early modern in its execution or vice versa. Still though, Shakespeare sees the past epochs as one instance that represents what is being lost. Therefore, instead of choosing a tale of valour to talk about the nostalgic epic times, he took a medieval source in order to make a point on the fading away system of beliefs and set of ideas.

The story of *Troilus and Cressida*, a tale of love and betrayal, stems more from the medieval sources despite its presumably Homeric setting. It is a medieval way of looking at the epic age with chivalric impetus through the 12th century *Roman de Troie* (c.1160) by Benoit de Sainte-Maure who altered Homer's heroic story into a chivalric romance. This romance affected other poets like Boccaccio (*Il Filostrato*, c.1340, where first Pandarus appears), Chaucer (*Troilus and Criseyde*, c.1375), whose long poem is Shakespeare's primary source, Lydgate (*Troy Book*, 1555), and Caxton (*Recuyell of the History of Troy*, tr.1471, pub,1474). During the middle ages, there was a fascination with Trojan subjects as the British traced their ancestry all the way back to a Trojan Brutus based on legend, especially through Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* (1138). According to Monmouth, who claims he is translating from an older source, claims that Brutus and his men—known as Britons—came to "Albion" to found "Troia Newydd," or New Troy, which later became London (perhaps through Lud's town).

Kenneth Muir suggests that in *Troilus and Cressida* "the age of chivalry is dead" (Muir, 2003, p. 428) and not recognizing this historical fact leaves characters, especially Hector, anachronistic. A.P. Rossiter remarks that "The *Troilus and Cressida* story is medieval and chivalric and it is that which is deflated" (Rossiter, 1976, p. 101). Moreover, R. F. Kaufmann remains that Shakespeare "reaches a point where he must actively question the reality and centrality of [the] inherited way of making sense of things" (Kaufmann, 1965, p. 139). As

Shakespeare looks at the heroic Trojan epic and chivalric medieval romances, he does not see heroism or chivalry but the death of such ideals in the face of historical and economic change. *Troilus and Cressida* is seemingly about love and war but like most of his work between 1599 and 1603, during the last years of Elizabeth's reign, Shakespeare reflects a cultural disillusionment in the face of the disintegration of former social forms. In this play, he takes this disillusionment a step further to the point of cynicism that the quintessential story of heroism is diminished to what Thersites summarizes as

...patchery, such juggling and such knavery! all the argument is a cuckold and a whore; a good quarrel to draw emulous factions and bleed to death upon. Now, the dry serpigo on the subject! and war and lechery confound all! (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 130)

War and love are perhaps the two most common themes in literature. However, such themes in Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* are reflected underlining the futility of war and love and the absurdity of high ideals like loyalty in love and heroism in action, what Northrop Frye calls "pervasive disillusionment" in the play in an environment in which "heroism degenerates into brutality and love itself reduced to [...] mechanical stimulus" (Frye, 1993, p. 85).

Shakespeare's understanding of his era in the face of passing ideals is also evident in *Hamlet*, a play he probably wrote at around the same time with *Troilus and Cressida*. "Time is out of joint" declares Hamlet seeing how the values belonging to his wronged father's time are being replaced by the modern ones and that he was "born to set it right" (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 1199). Old Hamlet who belonged to a time when heroic ideals were in effect, when kings fought at the battlefield with might of their swords, is deceitfully replaced by the insidious yet diplomatic Claudius bargaining in Elsinore. High ideals like heroism and chivalry, as Hamlet perceives it, are now thought of as belonging to the past at a time when time is "out of joint."

The love story between Troilus and Cressida and the ongoing war between the Greeks and the Trojans are the two plots in the play. Like the other two plays by Shakespeare with loving couples in the title, the social takes over the private, even more so in this play. Both love and war, by means of exchange, trade, and substitution, end with frustration, deceit, and tragedy. Throughout the play, one thing is always substituted for another thing, usually its opposite, undermining the meaning of the former: War with love, love with war, action with inaction, high ideals with cynicism, rhetoric with defamation. The main discussions on heroic or chivalric ideals are immediately followed by the cynical or frivolous comments by either Thersites or Pandarus that make them the critical voices in the play.

The play starts *in medias res* as the armed Prologue tells us summarizing the background of the events since not all "may be digested in a play" (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 78):

In Troy there lies the scene. From isles of Greece
The princes orgulous, their high blood chafed,
Have to the port of Athens sent their ships,
Fraught with the ministers and instruments
Of cruel war... (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 77)

Although we are told that we are to witness the story of the most famous war in history in its "seventh" year with Greeks coming to ransack Troy with 69 ships (as opposed to 1186 in the *Iliad*), what follows is not the story of the battle but of a lover, the Trojan Troilus, who wants to "unarm" with courtly love inclinations as there is a "cruel battle here within" (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 79) as a result of his love for Cressida whose father Calchas has defected to the Greek side. This Petrarchan scene is followed by another one in the Greek camp. While Agamemnon thinks gods are testing them seeking "to find persistive constancy in men" (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 96), the crafty Ulysses delivers his famous speech on degree and rank. There is something

terribly wrong on the Greek side as “The specialty of rule hath been neglected” (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 98):

When the general is not like the hive
 To whom the foragers shall all repair,
 What honey is expected? Degree being vizarded,
 Th' unworthiest shows as fairly in the mask.
 The heavens themselves, the planets, and this centre
 Observe degree, priority, and place,
 Infixure, course, proportion, season, form,
 Office and custom, in all line of order. (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 99)

This speech is also analysed as a proof to the much debated Elizabethan world picture, when people “knew their places,” at a time which for Greenblatt (2005), “was intensely, pervasively, visibly hierarchical: men above women, adults above children, the old above the young, the rich above the poor, the wellborn above the vulgar” (p. 76). This kind of hierarchy discussed by Ulysses especially showed itself in modes of behavior, as “[t]he social elite lived in a world of carefully calibrated gestures of respect. They demanded constant, endlessly reiterated sings of deference from those below them: bowing, kneeling, doffing hats, cringing” (p. 76). These modes of behavior were seen as the emblems of order, which for Ulysses is the backbone of ordnance:

O when degree is shaken,
 Which is the ladder to all high designs,
 Then enterprise is sick. How could communities,
 Degrees in schools, and brotherhoods in cities,
 Peaceful commerce from dividable shores,
 The primogenity and due of birth,
 Prerogative of age, crowns, sceptres, laurels,
 But by degree stand in authentic place? (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 100)

Ulysses’s speech is on the importance of the hierarchical construction of society in which it can only function like the physical universe (as it was thought to be in the medieval knowledge of cosmology) and everything should correspond to its particular degree and order. This is the Elizabethan perception and therefore is completely anachronistic in terms of offering a contemporary reason for the loss of order on the Greek camp. The loss of such hierarchy, therefore, brings utter chaos:

Take but degree away, untune that string,
 And hark what discord follows. Each thing meets
 In mere oppugnancy. (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 100)
 ...
 Then everything includes itself in power,
 Power into will, will into appetite;
 And appetite, an universal wolf,
 So doubly seconded with will and power,
 Must make perforce an universal prey,
 And last eat up himself... (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 101)

This highly rhetorical speech on degree and rank that summons everybody to act in accordance to their hierarchical places is a response to the loss of authority in the Greek camp. It is not the lengthy war but loss of “degree and rank” that is more disastrous. Achilles, too, is unarmed, lying in his tent with Patroclus, making fun of the Greek leaders with the cynic slave Thersites for whom the whole “argument” of the war “is a whore and a cuckold” (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 130).

However, despite his emphasis on hierarchy and place, Ulysses undermines his own ideas on degree and rank when Aeneas brings Hector’s challenge for a single combat. In order to lure Achilles “whom opinion crowns/the sinew and forehead of [their] host” (Shakespeare,

2003, p. 102) back to fight, the Greeks would announce the obtuse Ajax, lower in degree than Achilles, as their most valiant soldier.

Ulysses's ideas on this perfectly organized world picture are further subverted in the next act by Thersites who lays out his opinion on degree and rank as such: "Agamemnon is a fool to offer to command Achilles, Achilles is a fool to be commanded of Agamemnon, Thersites is a fool to serve such a fool, and Patroclus is a fool positive" (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 130).

This is what the great heroes of the antiquity have been reduced to with a cynical understanding of heroism and valour. Greeks are viewed as characters who have lost their greatness in times "out of joint." High ideals like honour have lost their meanings in time, in the face of social transformation. It is further emphasized by Ulysses that nothing can go beyond the force of time that devastates everything, as it has

...a wallet at his back
Wherein he puts alms of oblivion
A great-sized monster of ingratitude;
Those scraps are good deeds past, which are devoured
As fast as they are made, forgot as soon
As done (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 162)

and that

The present eye praises the present object. (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 163)

Homeric Achilles, who mythically joined the Trojan expedition for honour and glory in the expense of a happy and long life is instructed by Ulysses about how the "envious and calumniating Time" lets slip all "deeds past" into mere "oblivion." In *Troilus and Cressida*, all heroes are "fortune's fools" in the face of Saturn/Chronos devouring his children. This use of emblematic time is functional since Ulysses is raising the question of what happens when the ideals of the past are no longer valid in the present.

Still, although the Greek side succumbed to the contemporaneity of the early modern, as a member of the lost civilization, Trojan Hector, who, though knowing that the Trojan case—Helen's abduction—is wrong and that Helen is not worth the keeping, he would, after all, fight for the sake of Troy's honour. Shakespeare's representation of Troy is the closest to the characterization offered in the *Iliad*.

Hector, contrary to Ulysses, believes that

...value dwells not in particular will;
It holds his estimate and dignity
As well wherein 'tis precious of itself
As in the prize... (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 120)

As the only truly heroic character, Hector is also anachronistic as he tries hard to live up to the chivalric ideals. Denied even an honourable death, he is murdered senselessly by Achilles and his Myrmidons when he is unarmed, further making chivalric ideals void, lapsed, even absurd.

Exchange is the most important motive in the development of plot in *Troilus and Cressida*: Helen for Hecuba which proclaims the fall of Troy, Cressida for Antenor which proclaims the fall of courtly love, Ajax for Achilles which proclaims the fall of hierarchy. Shakespeare sees that the ideals regarding love have also lapsed in the face of social transformation. Cressida feels the same qualms as Juliet does, that she might lose her value if she sleeps with Troilus stepping out of her Petrarchan status. Still, she does and, unlike Juliet, immediately loses her value that actually "dwells in dignity" and becomes a part of the

exchange mechanism: “foolish Cressida” she calls herself as she “should have held off and then [Troilus] would have tarried” (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 172). As a matter of fact, Juliet sleeps with Romeo to consummate their marriage whereas Troilus does not talk of an exchange of her “love’s faithful vow” for his (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 1115). Cressida is anachronistic in this manner, who, for George Bernard Shaw is “Shakespeare’s first real woman” in a play in which he “is ready and willing to start at the twentieth century if the seventeenth will only let him” (quoted in Rattray, 1951, p. 47). Moreover, Troilus does not fight to keep his beloved in the Trojan side and, as a matter of fact, disputes much more heartily against the proposal to give Helen up to end the war which might mean his reunion with Cressida. The moment Cressida is diminished to a commodity with exchange value, she is ratified into a sexual object in the Greek camp as she kisses all the generals to live up to the character offered to her. She, therefore, is also exchanged from a love object to a sex object in a place where lechery is the new cultural capital replacing chivalric romance.

There are two endings to the play, one delivered by Troilus and one Pandarus (which some editors choose to ignore). Troilus first declares that

Hector is gone:
 Who shall tell Priam so, or Hecuba?
 Let him that will a screech-owl aye be called,
 Go in to Troy, and say there, ‘Hector’s dead.’
 There is a word will Priam turn to stone,
 Make wells and Niobes of the maids and wives,
 Cold statues of the youth, and, in a word
 Scare Troy out of itself. But, march away;
 Hector is dead; there is no more to say.
 Stay yet. You vile abominable tents,
 Thus proudly pight upon our Phrygian plains,
 Let Titan rise as early as he dare,
 I’ll through and through you! and, thou great-sized coward,
 No space of earth shall sunder our two hates.
 I’ll haunt thee like a wicked conscience still,
 That mouldeth goblins swift as frenzy’s thoughts.
 Strike a free march to Troy, with comfort go:
 Hope of revenge shall hide our inward woe. (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 231)

The death of Hector marks the ending of an era which was marked by chivalry and feudal honour. Since the unheroic death of Hector, the high ideals belonging to the past have lost their currency as well which is why avenging his brutal murder is meaningless. Therefore, Shakespeare chooses to end the play with the epilogue of Pandarus with a note on venereal disease as he talks to future “panders,” “traders in the flesh” (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 85). Consequently, Hector’s death for Troilus’s ending marks the loss of chivalry and for Pandarus’s ending signifies the loss of romantic love for the sake of crude sexuality

As A. M. Potter argues, Shakespeare was

yearning nostalgically for a perfect past which is implied by its obvious lack in the play, yet it seems to me that the undermining of so many of the central myths and beliefs of the Elizabethan/Medieval view of life suggests that Shakespeare is writing from a somewhat different position, expressing rather in dramatic form an intense awareness that not only is the present different from the past, but that the interpretation of the world inherited from the past had always been illusion. (Potter, 1988, p. 26)

In this manner, Shakespeare looks at the past with a “Renaissance sense:” at the distant past nostalgically and the recent past ironically, as a time in which high ideals are lost and the zeitgeist holds that the modern disillusionment towards war and love underlining the impossibility of finding fidelity in love and heroism in war at a time when living up to the high ideals of a former time is anachtonistic. Through the chivalric story of *Troilus and Cressida*,

the lost ideals of the distant past are osmosed through the chivalric ones which are both lost in time to be replaced by the modern.

Instead of having a unified conception of time as “one damn thing after another” in Frank Kermode’s words defining chronicity, in *Troilus and Cressida*, Shakespeare’s approach is kairotic in which “[e]nd changes all, and produces [...] *kairoi*, historical moment of intemporal significance” (Kermode, 2000, p. 47). “Simple chronicity” for Kermode represents “the emptiness of ... humanly uninteresting successiveness” whereas *kairos* is the “significant season,” “poised between beginning and end [...] that which was conceived as simply successive becomes charged with past and future: what was *chronos* becomes *kairos*” (Kermode, 2000, p. 47). *Kairos* is “a point in time filled with significance, charged with a meaning derived from its relation to the end” (Kermode, 2000, p. 47). From where he stands, Shakespeare finds an opportune time to reflect the past in the present and the present in the past pondering on the anachronism of the high ideals in a world much changed, much different from past perception. In other words, at a time when time was “out of joint,” when everything went “awry,” Shakespeare finds a kairotic moment, a decisive point in time to look at the past to show how far things have come, the end being Shakespeare’s present, reading the medieval past with an early modern consciousness.

Thus, Shakespeare reads the Trojan War anachronistically in *Troilus and Cressida* with mythological and legendary characters whose fortunes are preconceived are trying to fulfill their destinies devoid of the fundamentals of their own historical or epic contexts. In this manner, Shakespeare seeks a kairotic presence in the past, as reflected in *Troilus and Cressida*, contesting the ideologies of the past and the present. Shakespeare’s anachronism is in his representing the present (Greeks) in the past and the past (Trojans) in the present.

Works Cited

- Anachronism. (n.d.). In *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Retrieved from <http://www.dictionary.com/browse/anachronism>
- Anachronism. (n.d.). In *Collins English Dictionary - Complete & Unabridged 10th Edition*. Retrieved from <http://www.dictionary.com/browse/anachronism>
- Burke P. (1997). *The Renaissance*. New York: Macmillan.
- (2001). “The sense of anachronism from Petrarch to Poussin.” *Time in the Medieval world*. C. Humphrey and W. M. Ormrod (Eds). 157-176. Suffolk: York Medieval Press.
- Garber, M. (2008). *Profiling Shakespeare*. New York: Routledge.
- Frye, N. (1993). *The Myth of deliverance: Reflections on Shakespeare’s Problem Comedies*. Toronto: U of Toronto P.
- Greenblatt, S. (1998). “Murdering Peasants: Status, Genre, and the Representations of rebellion” *Representing the English Renaissance*. Stephen Greenblatt (Ed). 1-31. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P.
- (2005). *Will in the world: How Shakespeare became Shakespeare*. London: Pimlico.
- Kaufmann, R.J. (1965). “Ceremonies for Chaos; The status of *Troilus and Cressida*.” *ELH*, 32(2), 139–59.
- Kermode F. (2000). *The sense of an ending: Studies in the theory of fiction*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Lukács Georg (1989). *The Historical Novel*. (H. and S. Mitchell, Trans.). London: Merlin Press.
- Muir, K. (2003). “Troilus and Cressida.” *The Cambridge Shakespeare library: Shakespeare criticism* (Vol. 2). Catherine M.S. Alexander (Ed), 423–432. Cambridge UP, Cambridge.
- Panofski, E. (1972). *Studies in Iconography: Humanistic Themes in the art of the Renaissance*. Boulder, Colorado: Icon.

-
- Potter, A. M. (1988). "Troilus and Cressida: Deconstructing the Middle Ages?" *Theoria* 72, 23-35
- Rattray, R. (1951) *Bernard Shaw: A Chronicle*. Luton: Leagrave Press Ltd.
- Rossiter, A.P. (1976). "Troilus as 'Inquisition'." *Troilus and Cressida: A Selection of Critical Essays*. P. Martin (Ed). 100-121. London: Macmillan.
- Shakespeare, W. (1997). *Hamlet. The Riverside Shakespeare*. Herschel Baker, et. al. (Eds). 1183-1245. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- (2003). *Troilus and Cressida*. Anthony B. Dawson (Ed). Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

¹ The Essex incident is especially important in relation to *Troilus and Cressida* in terms of the date of production and in the ways in which Essex was famously associated with Achilles, as has already been established by various critics. What Essex represented was so important that David Bevington suggests that "After the events of early 1601, the ideals of neofeudal heroism seemed no longer available" (Introduction, *Troilus and Cressida*. London: Arden Shakespeare, 1998, p. 16)
