

## As You Like It: the Play of Analogy

by Helen M. Whall

King Henry: . . . Do you like me, Kate?

Katherine: Pardonnez-moi, I cannot tell wat is "like me."

King Henry: An angel is like you, Kate, and you are like  
an angel. (Henry V, V,2,107-10)

"As You Like It" has long been perceived as the complex title of a complex play. Efforts to press meaning from it, however, have tended to place greatest stress on the pronouns "you" and "it," the most common gloss being: "This is a comedy, the way you audiences like your plays to be." Such a reading seems to hint at more than a bit of pique, if not downright sarcasm on Shakespeare's part, rendering a surprisingly Jaques-like prelude to this ultimately joyous play, the last of Shakespeare's golden comedies. Shakespeare's comedic heroine, Rosalind, effective educator, adept riddle-resolver and eloquent Epilogue, concludes the play, however, by asking us "to like as much of the play as pleases,"<sup>1</sup> advice which surely suggests that we reconsider that title, play good grammarians, and stress the verb "like." Doing so not only sounds a golden note, it also suggests a new reading, or more accurately, a new mode of reading the play.

*Like* is a much more provocative and ambiguous word in the Renaissance than are those two relatively stable pronouns, *you* and *it*. "To like" means both "to be pleased by" and "to compare." If we accept the probability of a Shakespearean pun at work in the title "As You Like It," then we may benefit from a useful warning issued at the outset of a play much concerned with touchstones and parodies, as well as comparisons high and low. We are warned that things may be as — or according to how — we compare them. Once we have located the key word *like*, a certain emphasis falls naturally on the subordinate conjunction. As you liken it . . . so it shall be. A frightening proposition — and one explored continuously throughout the ensuing play. If it holds true, similes, metaphors, and plays themselves become not only reflections of life, but also demonstrations of the act, and the art, of perceiving life. But in Shakespeare's comedic world, such a proposition is also far from an invitation to the Hamlet-like despair of "nothing is but thinking makes it so."<sup>2</sup> *As You Like It* offers instead a liberating hope that rational thought, best displayed in the act of making careful comparisons, and thoughtful judgments, may actually lead us toward truth. If, however, we make bad analogies, our perceptions will be at best inadequate, at worst, false.

Shakespeare's concern with the "how" of how we perceive reality hardly

begins or ends with *As You Like It*, but on the threshold of *Hamlet* and *Lear*, Shakespeare does seem to connect and clarify a number of issues about perception and the art of analogy which will pass into the realm of assumption on the heath if not in Denmark. For example, in *Arden* we learn not only the lessons of logic which dictate the terms of good and bad analogies, but also the lessons of Corin-like common sense, the foremost being the utter folly of forgetting that an analogy is only an analogy. Mistake country for court, or the world for a stage, and one plays the fool indeed. Even more importantly, once we have mastered the lessons of logic and common sense, we must also recall the simultaneous nature of all Shakespeare's puns, puns which seldom give us the options of either/or. If *like* means to compare, it also means to prefer, and perhaps the most dazzling achievement of *As You Like It* is the resolution of these two meanings into one. Before we can leave the forest, and in order to like the play, we must learn that to love is to make a good analogy. Heart guides head, intuition serves logic. Actually, under Hymen's blessing those verbs themselves dissolve; heart and head unite as do man and woman in a marriage, even if, for most of us, that metaphorical union lasts no longer than will Touchstone and Audrey's literal one, just long enough to know that such a union is possible, just long enough to get us out of the forest and allow us into the community of man.

Shakespeare is himself an effective teacher; he begins his play by confronting his audience with an exercise central to that play, the unlearning of bad habits, especially the habit of lazy thought. *As You Like It* opens with a scene that works only if we assume that audiences in a theater, like men in life, usually accept as fact the insights conveyed by the well-crafted analogies of the past rather than constantly engage in careful thought. Did we not do so in life, we would make little progress, and did we not do so in the theater, we would be forever bogged down in exposition. Here, however, Shakespeare seems interested in reminding us of the price we sometimes pay for such efficiency.

Act I, scenes 1 and 2, rely on the audience's familiarity with that greatest of Renaissance analogies, the great chain of being.<sup>3</sup> The scene assumes we are comfortable with the notion of correspondences between macrocosm and microcosm, which explains the metaphysical connection between Oliver's estate and Frederick's court. Frederick has usurped his older brother's political power and, chaos has come. This is the fact we interpret from the action of the first two scenes: a brother (Oliver) treats his brother (Orlando) cruelly; the breaking of bones is now sport for ladies at court; virtue, in the persons of Rosalind and Orlando, is banished as treachery. But these inversions of order are also the comforting rumors of a cosmic hierarchy that must exist if its inversion does, an insight conveyed by the Renaissance theory of opposites.

In this topsy-turvy world, an audience can quickly identify good and

bad, right and wrong, by correlating opposites, by identifying analogous positions (dukes, brothers, cousins) and noting corresponding opposite or inverted qualities. Senior is good, Frederick is bad; Orlando is good, Oliver is bad; Rosalind is good, Celia is — ? Intuition will not entertain as rational the thought that Celia is bad. By the end of I, 2, Shakespeare has brought us up short against our own assumptions — will the fact that will not fit shatter our faith in the facts that did? Is the situation comically analogous to discovering that the earth revolves around the sun? Time and again, Shakespeare will ask us not so much to call into question the answers we have arrived at by pressing analogies, but rather to recognize the fact that we have been using analogies, not directly receiving infallible doctrines.

Celia herself shows us the correct way to analogize her moral identity when she decides to join Rosalind in exile at the end of act I. Just as the theory of opposites is derived by analogy, so too is another Renaissance principle which lives on in our own times as a popular aphorism: like draws to like. Celia's reality forces us to choose between analogies, leads us to choose the theory of sympathies as stronger, in this context, than the theory of opposites. The complexity of this dramatic instance will repeat itself many times in the play; in order to maintain our intuitive faith in a character's goodness (our "liking" of her or him) we will have to use reason to weigh, not reject, the constructs of reason. Shakespeare continually asks us to reflect upon our epistemological processes; he gives us an answer, then makes us look for the correct question. In doing so, we learn much about how we know what we know.

Whereas a great deal has been said of Rosalind's role as Orlando's teacher in Arden, it is actually Celia who, while still at court, teaches both Rosalind and us not only the necessity of acknowledging our analogies as such, but also the equal, if not greater, necessity of attending to the intuitions of an educated heart. In I, 3, Celia explicitly points out the kinship of liking and likening. She instructs her cousin Rosalind, who has just lost her heart to Orlando:

Celia: Is it possible, on such a sudden, you should fall into so strong a liking with old Sir Rowland's youngest son?

Rosalind: The Duke my father lov'd his father dearly.

Celia: Doth it therefore ensue that you should love his son dearly?  
By this kind of chase, I should hate him, for my father hated his father dearly; yet I hate not Orlando.

(I,3,26-34)

While Celia makes the argument that neither like nor dislike is necessarily inherited from age to age, she also demonstrates her skill with the Socratic method. She draws from Rosalind an interesting requalification of why she should love Orlando and why Celia should do likewise:

Rosalind: No, faith, hate him not, for my sake.

Celia: Why should I not? . . .

Rosalind: Let me love him for that, and do you love him because I do. (I,3,35-39)

Rosalind is learning to judge both men and propositions on their own merits (do they "deserve well?"), but Celia has also led her to test out, as it were, a new principle of relationship, one based on love, that highest mode of liking which renders somewhat incidental the mere correspondences of blood relationship.<sup>4</sup> She is asking Celia to love Orlando because she loves Rosalind who loves Orlando because he is, in her eyes, virtuous.

Celia tries to explain this complex relationship to her father when he banishes Rosalind:

Celia: Dear sovereign, hear me speak.

Duke Frederick: Ay, Celia, we stay'd her for your sake,  
Else had she with her father rang'd along.

Celia: I did not then entreat to have her stay,  
It was your pleasure and your own remorse.  
I was too young that time to value her,  
But now I know her. If she be a traitor,  
Why, so am I. We still have slept together,  
Rose at an instant, learn'd, play'd, eat together,  
And whereso'er we went, like Juno's swans,  
Still we went coupled and inseparable.

(I,3,66-76)

Celia asks her father to love Rosalind because of the self she sees reflected in her cousin, much as Rosalind has asked her to love Orlando. In comparing "that time" to "now" she also points out the positive aspect of change; she *has learned* to value Rosalind, *come* to know her, and in doing so has gone well beyond attending to the mere fixity of "kind," has gone beyond accepting the product of an analogy by performing the act of analogizing.

Celia demonstrates, early in this complex play, a thorough understanding of an elementary principle of logic: an analogy is as strong or as weak as are the similarities or dissimilarities of the things compared. Having grasped the implications of this simple principle, she is free to determine that although she is, in one sense, like her father, she is, in a deeper sense, more like her virtuous cousin and can, therefore, with perfect moral rectitude, go beyond the conventional expectation of a child's obedience to her father and follow Rosalind, explaining one more time the ordering power of love to her cousin:

Celia: . . . Know'st thou not the Duke  
Hath Banish'd me, his daughter?

Rosalind: That he hath not.

Celia: No, hath not? Rosalind lacks then the love  
Which teacheth thee that thou and I am one.  
Shall we be sund'ed? Shall we part, sweet girl?  
No, let my father seek another heir.

(I,33,93-99)

Celia, the skilled rhetorician and accomplished poet, uses language to search out truth rather than accept as truth thoughts of another age neatly packaged in their own rhetorical language.

A similar problem involving identification of father with offspring occurs in the de Boys family. For the family servant Adam, a sudden disjunction between the terms of a pre-formed analogy—"like father, like son"—and the facts of life causes a great deal of pain. The old man speaks to Orlando as he urges him to flee home:

. . . O unhappy youth,  
Come not within these doors! Within this roof  
The enemy of all your graces lives.  
Your brother — no, no brother, yet the son  
(Yet not the son, I will not call him son)  
Of him I was about to call his father —  
Hath heard your praises . . . (II,3,16-22)

The discontinuity which Adam perceives between generations of the de Boys family, and within one generation, forces him to reconsider the simplistic way in which he has applied the doctrine of correspondence. In choosing, as did Celia, to leave Arden with the person he best likes, Adam chooses the stronger of the two analogies: Orlando is more like Roland than is Oliver.

The pattern that emerges from the conflicts central to these opening scenes is one in which logic is reassimilated to rhetoric in order to strengthen rather than to deny the power of rhetoric. Shakespeare achieves this synthesis quietly, making full use of the intricate relationship that analogy shares with both logic and rhetoric, as a principle of ornamentation and argumentation. Reason is thus summoned up by logic to rescue man from the Procrustean confines of what has become "mere rhetoric." Yet there are instances of paradox hidden within the very situations resolved by logic which caution us to recall that logic too has its limits. We notice after the fact that Orlando's name is both an anagram for and a translation of Roland, his father's name. Having learned that we must not take at face value the formula "like father, like son" we are teased with this symbolic identification of father and son. Orlando is indeed more like Roland than is Oliver — on the surface as well as at the core.

There are many such suggestions of a design at once more complex and

more simple than that argued by man (for example, Celia's central position when she is in her father's home "naturally" gives way to Rosalind's central position in *her* father's home — Arden forest). This is an order that can be crushed by the weight of false analogy, but it is also an order that cannot be revealed by reason alone. We can see the motions of the heart, the intuition of "liking" in its most apparent sense, as that which ultimately prompts both Celia and Adam's departure. Of crucial importance, however, is Shakespeare's demonstration of the fact that reason may justify intuition, even as intuition inspires reason. Reason's primary task, at court and in Arden, is clearing away the deadwood, thinning the trees so that we might see the forest.

With the move into the forest of Arden in act II, Shakespeare confronts the audience with another analogy — that of the relationship between the world of the woods and the world of the city — and yet another lying behind that one, *viz.*, the pastoral world as a model for what one time was and what should be, that is the relationship between the ideal world and the real. But Shakespeare also tests this analogy, subjecting the pastoral convention to satiric scrutiny and thereby revealing it as what it is, a convention. Yet the result is not the discarding of the pastoral but a reaffirmation of it, stronger because it has been tested and its weaknesses as well as its strengths revealed. By the end of the play, pastoral itself is seen in a new light.

The method employed in the scrutiny is a testing of likes in both senses of the word — liking and likening. This becomes most apparent in the conversation between Corin and Touchstone, so aptly named for the testing function he serves. When Corin in his shepherd's innocence asks, "And how like you this shepherd's life, Master Touchstone?" Touchstone, very sensitive to the verb, *like*, responds:

Truly, shepherd, in respect of itself, it a good life; but in respect that it is a shepherd's life, it is naught. In respect that it is solitary, I like it very well; but in respect that it is private, it is a very vild life. Now in respect it is in the fields, it pleaseth me well; but in respect it is not in the court, it is tedious. As it is a spare life (look you) it fits my humor well; but as there is no more plenty in it, it goes much against my stomach (III,2,12-21)

Touchstone's logic may be spurious, and his rhetorical skills may include those key tools of the satirist — hyperbole and reduction — <sup>5</sup> but his response to Corin underscores a lesson in analogical thought. He tells Corin that how we like something depends not merely on what we liken it to but how we liken it. The analogy itself must be tested. He himself demonstrates the danger of the unexamined analogy by "proving" that court manners are appropriate to country ways, concluding that Corin is damn-

ed for playing bawd to his sheep.

Later in act V, his satiric function in the play fulfilled, he will abandon his stance as a fairly uncommitted relativist and draw closer to those whom he is like — those willing to marry. Jaques (in 4 51-61) introduces him to Duke Senior with this request, "Good my lord, like this fellow." When the Duke replies, "I like him very well," Touchstone plays again on the various meanings of *like*: "God 'ild you, sir, I desire you of the like," saying in effect "Like me by seeing me as like these other 'country copulatives' and treat me likewise, i.e., link us, like to like."<sup>6</sup>

But before this conclusion can be reached, other likenings must occur. Touchstone is only one agent for the testing of analogies and of analogical thought. Upon our entrance into Arden (II, 1), the first words we hear are those of Duke Senior:

Now, my co-mates and brothers in exile,  
 Hath not old custom made this life more sweet  
 Than that of painted pomp? Are not these woods  
 More free from peril than the envious court?  
 Here feel we not the penalty of Adam,  
 The seasons' difference, as the icy fang  
 And churlish chiding of the winter's wind,  
 Which when it bites and blows upon my body  
 Even till I shrink with cold, I smile and say,  
 "This is no flattery, these are counsellors  
 That feelingly persuade me what I am."  
 Sweet are the uses of adversity,  
 Which like the toad, ugly and venomous,  
 Wears yet a precious jewel in his head;  
 And this our life, exempt from public haunt,  
 Finds tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,  
 Sermons in stones, and good in everything.

(II,1,1-17)

Amiens, one of the Duke's followers, praises his ability to "translate the stubbornness of fortune / Into so quiet and so sweet a style," and the Duke is prompted to explore further the analogy he has drawn between court and country.

Come, shall we go and kill us venison?  
 And yet it irks me the poor dappled fools,  
 Being native burghers of this desert city,  
 Should in their own confines with forked heads  
 Have their round haunches gor'd. (II,1,21-25)

The Duke's new metaphor, slightly more strained than his first two in that it reverses the comparison of court to country, is crafted in an attempt to express compassion for all life. But it remains a comparison albeit one made to drive home a point. Jaques, however, takes the analogy and by ignoring the dissimilarities (which are as important to analogies as are the similarities — for without them there would be no analogy but identity) extends it to preposterous conclusions, "proving" the Duke more a usurper than his brother. His logic is as spurious as Touchstone's. Unlike the clown, however, the melancholy Jaques does not, perhaps cannot, consider how he likens things. As a result, his untested analogies master and entrap him.

This is particularly evident in Jaques' famous seven ages of man speech — "All the world's a stage." Here, Jaques again seizes upon an analogy first introduced by the Duke. But the Duke's analogy suggests that there are many dramas played out in the world, that if we are in a scene, there are many other scenes also in "this wide and universal theatre." In Jaques' hands, however, the "wide and universal theatre" is reduced to a stage. The move from theater to stage is a diminishing one and man's acts are reduced to seven. Unlike Touchstone, the relativist who would allow for almost any possibility depending upon how you like or liken it, Jaques, the reductivist, allows no possibility but what his melancholy dictates.

Shakespeare, however, immediately counters Jaques' view by presenting us with the living exceptions to Jaques' observation, thereby putting the analogy in a different context. At the conclusion of Jaques' speech, Orlando enters carrying Adam. At first they seem to be examples of two of the ages Jaques has described — Orlando, the lover who writes woeful ballads and Adam, the old man. But given our view of what has gone before and what these two have done and experienced, we recognize that they are more than that.<sup>7</sup> We are led, then, to test Jaques' analogy against the reality of the play's world, and the reality of that world to that of our own. Each comparison may convey a new insight but each must be constantly qualified as we take into account dissimilarities as well as likenesses.

Within the woods, Jaques and Touchstone serve as short-hand exempla of the extremes of the philosophical attitudes open to us, the former a rigid hierarchist, the latter a seeming relativist. For the first, truth is a constant, for the second a variable. Between these two extremes we find Celia's well-trained cousin, Rosalind, the girl-boy who time and again invites consideration of the paradox that change and permanence may be one.

In Arden, Rosalind steps stage center, a joyous personification, in her male disguise, of man's ability to see double without splitting apart. It is she who best displays the dual aspect of "liking" simultaneously. She can accept Touchstone's appraisal of Orlando's own first attempts at constructing analogies as bad art and lame verse, but once she recognizes the context of that verse, she can also discern the pearl in the oyster. Rosalind,



unlike Phebe, knows how to read, how to interpret, how, like her father, to translate. Her own most complex analogy is the alter-ego she constructs of herself in order to share Celia's lesson with Orlando.

The Rosalind-Ganymede-Rosalind role is as intricate as the play. The feisty, honest Rosalind we met in act I is the woman Orlando fell in love with and the image both he and we hold of her. Ganymede, the young man whom Rosalind becomes in Arden, is very much what that girl would be like *if* she were a boy — feisty and honest, but freer to employ these typically masculine traits when disguised as a boy. The female Rosalind, however, finds herself in great difficulty as the male Ganymede when she/he discovers Orlando in the forest. Rosalind, the lover, in an attempt to be near her beloved has Ganymede the man assume the role of yet another Rosalind. But throughout didactic comedy, exempla figures have been typically female and satiric figures typically male. Working from her masculine, satiric perspective, Ganymede designs a Rosalind who conforms to the numerous generalizations about women that have long been the social satirist's stock-in-trade: the new Rosalind is fickle, demanding, unfaithful and unreasonable. She is the true Rosalind's opposite, a false likeness. Her courtship of Orlando is a test of his ability, in the new context of Arden, to read the analogy properly and discover the true Rosalind, the particular Rosalind he has always loved.<sup>8</sup>

Throughout Ganymede's satiric encounters with Orlando, Phebe, and Silvius, Shakespeare trusts much of his comedy to the fact that his audience will, like Celia (who chides her cousin for her devilish portrayal of woman) also see double. We are in on the secret and from our privileged vantage point, can enjoy the humor of such situations as Ganymede's carefully maneuvered "wedding" to Orlando:

Rosalind: . . . Come, sister, you shall be the priest,  
and marry us. Give me your hand, Orlando.  
What do you say, sister?

Orlando: Pray thee marry us.

Celia: I cannot say the words.

Rosalind: You must begin, "Will you, Orlando" —

Celia: Go to! Will you, Orlando, have to wife this Roasлинд?

Orlando: I will.

Rosalind: Ay, but when?

Orlando: Why, now, as fast as she can marry us.

Rosalind: Then you must say, "I take thee, Rosalind, for wife."

Orlando: I take thee, Rosalind, for wife.

Rosalind: I might ask you for your commission, but I do take thee, Orlando, for my husband . . . Now tell me how long you would have her after you have possess'd her.

Orlando: For ever and a day.

Rosalind: Say 'a day,' without the 'ever.' (IV,1,124-46)

We see the reality of Rosalind's desire to marry Orlando behind the mockery of Ganymede's game. Simultaneously comic and serious, moments like this (consider also Rosalind's "counterfeit faint" in act IV, which doubles the weight of Touchstone's play with "feigning") engage Shakespeare's audience in a demonstration, rather than a rigid explanation, of man's ability to comprehend the complexity of reality, rather than "moralize" the world "into a thousand similes" (II,1,44-45) as Jaques has done.

After repeated demonstrations of our ability to see double, Shakespeare asks his audience to entertain and be entertained by an escalating series of improbable possibilities. From late in act IV through the conclusion of act V, we see emerge an image of order, of a cosmos that conform to our wishes for hierarchy and degree. This image has been chastened by satire, not dissolved; it has been made visible as an analogy — a likeness — not the thing itself, but man's best hope of marriage to "it." In order to signify this return to harmony, Shakespeare restores the tradition of allegory, the most analogical literary convention available to poet or dramatist. Oliver initiates the culminating series of wonders with the story of his conversion:

When last the young Orlando parted from you  
 He left a promise to return again  
 Within an hour, and pacing through the forest,  
 Chewing the food of sweet and bitter fancy,  
 Lo what befell! He threw his eye aside,  
 And mark what object did present itself  
 Under an old oak, whose boughs were moss'd  
     with age  
 And high top bald with dry antiquity:  
 A wretched ragged man, o'ergrown with hair,  
 Lay sleeping on his back; about his neck  
 A green and gilded snake had wreath'd itself,  
 Who with her head nimble in threats approach'd  
 The opening of his mouth; but suddenly  
 Seeing Orlando, it unlink'd itself,  
 And with indented glides did slip away  
 Into a bush, under which bush's shade  
 A lioness, with udders all drawn dry,  
 Lay couching, head on ground, with cat-like watch  
 When that the sleeping man should stir; for 'tis  
 The royal disposition of that beast  
 To prey on nothing that doth seem as dead.

This seen, Orlando did approach the man,  
And found it was his brother, his elder brother. (IV, 3, 98-120)

Oliver's tale, rich in Renaissance iconography, is as simple and complex as the play itself. It invites interpretation, but defies reduction to one reading. In the context of the play, however, some "translations" may be more fruitful than others. Among other things, the snake is temptation and treachery; it is the evil outside man, waiting to invade, it is the evil inside Oliver. The lioness (feminine, perhaps, as a Spenserian bow to Elizabeth) represents secular power, which may be abused, as it already has been by Frederick who has devoured both Oliver and Senior's land, or invoked to punish the guilty. The lioness is also Justice, which now rages at the unjust Oliver and would kill him, were it not that Mercy, or Love, "kindness, nobler even than revenge" intervenes. Read in such a way, Oliver's allegory takes its place among the many literary modes which have advanced the play's commitment to love as the highest ordering principle.

In Arden, love (often romantic, but, we are reminded, also familial and patriotic) begets love. From Orlando's kindness flow many other improbabilities such as Oliver's conversion and Celia's love at first sight. In each instance, the improbability of love is wondered at, not suppressed; accepted, not denied:

'Twas I; but 'tis not I. I do not shame  
To tell you what I was, since my conversion  
So sweetly tastes, being the thing I am. (IV, 3, 135-37)

Orlando: Is't possible that on so little acquaintance you should like her? that but seeing, you should love her? and loving, woo? and wooing, she should grant? And will you persevere to enjoy her?

Oliver: Neither call the giddiness of it in question, the poverty of her, the small acquaintance, my sudden wooing, nor her sudden consenting; but say with me, I love Aliena; say with her that she loves me; consent with both that we may enjoy each other. (V, 2, 1-9)

By this point in the play, we would have to align ourselves with such dullards as Phebe were we to insist that these actions be read as less than symbolic — although we have also been warned not to press the symbols too hard for a univocal reading, lest we be left in the woods with Jaques.

Finally, inspired by such near (but not quite) miracles and anxious to join the couples heading towards marriage, Rosalind-Ganymede takes on another role — she will play magician. She will seem to transform reality,

but will really again display the art of translation, turning the false Rosalind into the true. Before bringing the true Rosalind forth, however, Ganymede establishes the necessary context, phrased as a series of pre-conditions. The most fundamental condition to be met before the magic can be performed is "if you do love Rosalind," a direction given to Orlando, Duke Senior, and the unwitting Phebe.

The audience may also be included in this invitation to a miracle, but we are in on the trick; we have already seen the magician's mirrors, so we sit back smugly and wait while Touchstone runs through the mysteries of a "lie seven times removed." This exercise covers while Ganymede performs the symbolic magic of a costume change, but Touchstone also reminds us one more time of how unsure a grasp of reality the absolutistic man has. He concludes his speech with a note of summation which seems more serious than comic: "Your if is your only peacemaker. Much virtue in if." His insight is immediately validated by Rosalind's entrance:

Duke Senior: If there be truth in sight, you are my daughter.

Orlando: If there be truth in sight, you are my Rosalind.

Phebe: If sight and shape be true,

Why then my love adieu! (V,4,118-21)

Meanwhile, the audience is also jolted from its sense of security and forced to examine the relationship between sight and truth, for Rosalind has brought with her (or been brought by?) an unexpected guest: Hymen, the god of marriage:

Peace ho! I bar confusion,

'Tis I must make conclusion

Of these most strange events.

Here's eight that must take hands

To join in Hymen's bands,

If truth hold true contents. (V,4,125-30)

Shakespeare has turned to the essentially pastoral convention of the wedding masque in order to conclude his play about love, order, and analogical discourse, but he has done so in a way which deliberately, and confidently, asks the surprised audience to examine what they have seen. Hymen, a god whose divine and loving intervention seems the greatest improbability of all, advises those gathered to "Feed yourselves with questioning; / That reason wonder may diminish" (V,4,138-39). We are thus counselled, even at the end of the play, to continue the process of making comparisons, of searching for truth within our analogies, rather than embrace those analogies as the truth.

Exhausted though we may be by wondrous happenings, and just as we conclude the wedding song which seemed like the end of the play, the second son of old Sir Roland appears to tell us that no sooner had Duke Frederick entered these woods (where love seems contagious) than he had been converted "by an old religious man." The second Jaques reminds us of the greater world of policy and state which our characters and we have left so long ago. Nor is the young man's name gratuitously chosen, for this Jaques, in symbolic testimony to at least the poetical righteousness of thoughts on plenitude, replaces the other Jaques who, like drawing to like, seeks out that hermit.

Finally, in an epilogue which insistently reminds us, before we too return to the world, that we have seen a play, only a play, we are charged by the boy who played the girl who played the boy playing Rosalind "to like as much as pleases us." If we do so, we may, like Orlando, find something we feared we had lost. Whether late Renaissance man for whom age-old analogies of order seem threatened by new news, or late twentieth century men and women sure only of uncertainty, we are linked to each other by our likeness to Orlando as he awaits Rosalind's improbable return:

I sometimes do believe, and sometimes do not,  
As those that fear they hope, and know they fear.(V,4,3-4)

— College of the Holy Cross

## NOTES

1. All quotations from *As You Like It* are based on the text provided in *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston, 1974), 369-402.
2. See David P. Young, *The Hearts Forest: A Study of Shakespeare's Pastoral Plays* (New Haven, 1972), 58.
3. For a succinct review of analogical thought in Shakespeare's times, see W. R. Elton, "Shakespeare and the Thought of His Age," in *A New Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, eds. Kenneth Muir and S. Schoenbaum (London, 1971), 180-98.
4. For a fuller discussion of love as an ordering principle, see John Russell Brown, "Love's Order and the Judgment of *As You Like It*," in *Twentieth Century Interpretations of As You Like It*, ed. Jay L. Halio (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1968) 70-80.
5. For a helpful rhetorical analysis of Touchstone's speech to Corin, see Sister Miriam Joseph, C.S.C., *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language* (New York, 1957), 196-98.
6. When Touchstone states that he comes to "press in . . . amongst the rest of the country copulatives" (V,4,55-56), he is quite possibly playing with a rhetorical term;

"copulars" are the parts of propositions — such as the word *like* itself in certain circumstances — that connect subject and predicate.

7. See Ann Barton's introduction to *As You Like It*, in *The Riverside Shakespeare*, 367-68.

8. See Young, 64-69, for a more extended discussion of the relationship between the general and the particular in this play.