

Shakespeare's
*As You
Like It*

Late Elizabethan
Culture and Literary
Representation

MAURICE A. HUNT



SHAKESPEARE'S *AS YOU LIKE IT*

Also by Maurice A. Hunt

Shakespeare's Romance of the Word

Shakespeare's Labored Art: Stir, Work, and the Late Plays

Shakespeare's Religious Allusiveness: Its Play and Tolerance

The Winter's Tale: Critical Essays

Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare's The Tempest and Other Late Plays

Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet

Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare's Othello

SHAKESPEARE'S *AS YOU LIKE IT*
LATE ELIZABETHAN CULTURE AND
LITERARY REPRESENTATION

MAURICE A. HUNT

palgrave
macmillan



SHAKESPEARE'S AS YOU LIKE IT

Copyright © Maurice A. Hunt, 2008.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles or reviews.

First published in 2008 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN™

175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010 and
Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, England RG21 6XS
Companies and representatives throughout the world.

PALGRAVE MACMILLAN is the global academic imprint of the Palgrave Macmillan division of St. Martin's Press, LLC and of Palgrave Macmillan Ltd. Macmillan® is a registered trademark in the United States, United Kingdom and other countries. Palgrave is a registered trademark in the European Union and other countries.

ISBN-13: 978-0-230-60331-8

ISBN-10: 0-230-60331-9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available from the Library of Congress.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Design by Newgen Imaging Systems (P) Ltd., Chennai, India.

First edition: February 2008

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America.

For
Ava Elizabeth Frenzel,
May Rosalind's Virtues be Yours

PERMISSIONS

The author expresses his gratitude to the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies at Saint Louis University for permission to reprint "Wrestling for Temperance: *As You Like It* and *The Faerie Queene*, Book 2," which first appeared in *Allegorica* 16 (1995): 31–46. Chapter 2 was previously published as an article in *Modern Language Quarterly* 52 (1991). It appears in a revised form by permission of the editor and the publisher, Duke University Press. Chapter 3 first appeared as an article in *Shakespeare Yearbook* 2 (1991). It appears in a revised form by permission of the editor. Parts of Chapter 4 originally appeared in an article published in *Connotations* 7.2 (1997/98). They appear with the editor's permission.

CONTENTS

Introduction: Late Elizabethan <i>As You Like It</i>	1
One Wrestling for Temperance: <i>As You Like It</i> and <i>The Faerie Queene</i> , Book 2	7
Two <i>Kairos</i> and the Ripeness of Time in <i>As You Like It</i>	25
Three Words and Deeds in <i>As You Like It</i>	51
Four <i>As You Like It</i> and the “Warwickshire” of Shakespeare’s Mind	77
Five Becoming a Gentleman in <i>As You Like It</i>	105
Six Transvestite <i>As You Like It</i>	133
<i>Notes</i>	149
<i>Works Cited</i>	191
<i>Index</i>	203

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION: LATE ELIZABETHAN *AS YOU LIKE IT*

John Heminge and Henry Condell published *As You Like It* in the First Folio (1623), seven years after Shakespeare's death near the end of King James's twenty-two-year reign (1603–1625). No earlier quarto edition of this play had appeared. Editors of Shakespeare's *As You Like It* have dated the composition and first performance of this pastoral comedy more confidently than they have fixed those of most of the dramatist's other plays. Unknown dates either later in the year 1599 or early in 1600 almost certainly include the days for these two events. On the one hand, the title of the play does not occur in Francis Meres's listing in his *Palladis Tamia* of the plays Shakespeare had written by September 1598. Moreover, certain verses in *As You Like It*, to be discussed later in this volume, possibly depend for meaning upon Archbishop John Whitgift and Bishop Richard Bancroft's June 1, 1599 order banning the publication of satires and the public burning of specified books of verse satire three days later; and upon the new Globe Theatre, built in the Spring of 1599 and ready by June of that year (*AYLI*, 1.2.82–84, 2.7.139). On the other hand, "As you like yt, a booke' was entered in the Stationers' Register, the official record of the London Company of Stationers (booksellers and printers), on August 4, 1600, along with *Much Ado About Nothing*, *Henry V*, and Ben Jonson's *Every Man in His Humor*, all labeled as 'My lord chamberlens mens plaies' and all ordered 'to be staied' from publication until further notice."¹ Usually early modern English plays were stayed when audiences filled seats and standing room and the actors wished to preserve a lucrative monopoly in their script. This seems to have been the case with *As You Like It*.² The two possible references in the play to events occurring in 1599, taken in combination with Edmund Spenser's death in January 1599 and the many allusions in *As You Like It* to the language and images of Spenser's poetry, make late 1599 most likely the time of this comedy's composition and initial performances.³ Whatever the case, both the broader (1598–1600) and the restricted (later 1599–early 1600) source periods are late Elizabethan rather than early Jacobean.

In 1599, Queen Elizabeth I turned sixty-six years old. She would die four years later in 1603, aptly illustrating verse 10 of Psalm 90 (that the days of our lives are three-score-and-ten). The dates for *As You Like It* proposed are certainly late in the life of the queen who gives her name to a period. But what can the phrase “late Elizabethan” mean when applied to English literature of the sixteenth century? If Marian literature specifies English writing between 1553 and 1558 (the reign of Mary Tudor [Queen Mary I]), then *late* Elizabethan literature would designate the writing done in the second half of Elizabeth’s reign, that is, between 1580 or 1581 and 1603 (Queen Elizabeth ruled from 1558 to 1603). By this definition, every play and poem of Shakespeare’s performed or written during these years is late Elizabethan, as is all of Sir Philip Sidney’s important writing. When can we say Shakespeare’s late Elizabethan composition began? Arthur McGee, in *The Elizabethan Hamlet* (1987), Eric Mallin, in *Inscribing the Time: Shakespeare and the End of Elizabethan England* (1995), and James Shapiro in *A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare, 1599* (2005) have shown that interpreting certain Shakespeare plays such as *King Henry V*, *As You Like It*, *Julius Caesar*, *Hamlet*, and *Troilus and Cressida* in the light of specific events and ideas prominent in the last years of Elizabeth’s reign—prominent, that is to say, in the last few years of the sixteenth century or the first years of the seventeenth—justifies classifying them as “late Elizabethan” in a precise way.⁴ In this respect, Arthur McGee’s titling his study of *Hamlet*—*The Elizabethan Hamlet*—is honest, in the sense that his analysis of the contemporary significance of the tragedy draws upon Elizabethan ideas apparent in not only the early 1590s but also in the 1580s and even the 1570s.

My idea of late Elizabethan *As You Like It* resembles Mallin’s and Shapiro’s (but more exactly Mallin’s) in referring to events and ideas peculiar to the turn of the century, but not quite so narrowly as their conceptions (especially Shapiro’s) in that, for example, the publication in 1596 of Spenser’s magnificent second edition of *The Faerie Queene* is crucial to my claims about the contemporary perception—and reception—of the pastoral comedy. Louis Montrose, Richard Wilson, A. Stuart Daley, Marcia McDonald, and Andrew Barnaby have interpreted *As You Like It* within various late Elizabethan contexts.⁵ These contexts consist of issues such as primogeniture; the Poor Laws of 1597–1598; the art of governance, as defined by the doctrine of calling or vocation; and “the transformation of older patterns of communal organization under the pressures of forms of social mobility, [of] an emergent market economy, and [of] the paradoxically concomitant stratification of class relations.”⁶ Detected in *As You Like It* are “specific problems of [late Elizabethan] conflict over land-use rights, the enclosure of common land and its attendant violence, poverty, and vagrancy.”⁷

The various late Elizabethan readings of *As You Like It* offered in this volume might be considered complementary to Montrose's, Wilson's, and Barnaby's articles and to Shapiro's fine chapter on the comedy as a 1599 play. In this volume, I include *As You Like It* in explanatory fields similar to those constructed by the previously named Shakespeare scholars. I do so in terms of some culture-bound readings of the comedy that are relatively original. In the process, I make a distinction between a "public Shakespeare" and a "private Shakespeare." I ask my reader for the moment to tolerate this specious distinction. Considered as a rhetorical device, this distinction proves useful for several reasons. It serves first of all to emphasize in a hitherto unremarked way the presence in *As You Like It* of the playwright's public capitalization upon the late Elizabethan popularity of Edmund Spenser's published writing, notably *The Faerie Queene* (1590, 1596). Interpreting *As You Like It* in terms of selected poetry and ideas of Spenser's, especially those of book 2 of *The Faerie Queene* (The Book of Temperance), provides a context for a new understanding of the importance of allusions (allegorical and otherwise) in this comedy to Classical and Christian myth and symbol, if only because Spenser by 1599, the year of his death, had become identified in England with the memorable and complex representation of (often allegorical) myth and symbol. Shakespeare's stress in *As You Like It* upon the relevance for both Classicists and Christians of *kairos* in its temporal sense possesses a distinctly Spenserian quality. David Bevington, like others before him, has claimed that *As You Like It* "contains an unusually clear allusion to Christopher Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* ('Who ever loved that loved not at first sight?' 3.5.82), of which the first extant edition appeared in 1598."⁸ No one, to my knowledge, has claimed that the presence of Spenser in *As You Like It* may have something to do with Spenser's recent death in January 1599. After all, if Shakespeare alludes in 1599 to Marlowe's death six years earlier in 1593, the playwright's introduction into the same play of Spenser who died not years but perhaps only months earlier would not be surprising.

Thus far, I have indicated the content and sequence of this book's first and second chapters. Chapter three focuses upon a distinction between characters' words and their deeds in *As You Like It*. Shakespeare is noteworthy among early modern English dramatists for his interest throughout his career in this opposition, almost always emphasizing the expressive power of silent deeds over the untrustworthy, imprecise medium of spoken language. His representation of this early modern motif in this comedy reflects a late Elizabethan tone and set of values. My consideration of Jaques and of both the presence and restriction of satire in *As You Like It*, an often-remarked feature of the play, occurs in this chapter, specifically as an analysis of the questionable function of language divorced from deeds that ought to be the

language's referent. The critique of satire was a notable 1598–1599 London phenomenon, one so intense that it resulted in the previously mentioned prohibition against the publication of books of verse satire.

Post-Romantic authors and literary editors and critics tend to think first of the importance of a novel, play, or poem for the private life or character of the author, and secondly of its importance for his or her public persona or for society. This tendency no doubt owes much to the priority of self over society that became consistently obvious in the work of Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keats, and the other Romantic poets as well as in that of novelists such as Dickens. Shakespeare lived on the other side of the great cultural watershed called Romanticism. Details in the plays and in his known biography suggest that he was particularly careful often to remove or blur traces of his private life in his plays. Nevertheless, by making an artificial distinction with reference to *As You Like It* between “public” and “private” Shakespeares, I can better focus and explore nonpublic dimensions of the play (dimensions available to the comprehension of a limited number of playgoers). I have followed my three chapters on what I have called mainly “public” meanings in *As You Like It* with two chapters of evidence of a “private” playwright in the details of the play.

Editors and commentators have long believed that two roles in *As You Like It*—those of Old Adam and of William—involved Shakespeare himself, first as possibly the late Elizabethan actor, then as a version of his forest-of-Arden, Stratford, younger self. My treatment of these identifications is both backward- and forward-looking. In chapter four of this study, Shakespeare's treatment of himself in *As You Like It* is backward, involving re-creation of what might be called a personal “Warwickshire of the mind.” One example suffices here. After the turn of the century from 1599 to 1600 and the first decade of the seventeenth century, Shakespeare began writing essentially treeless plays. By this odd statement, I mean that the large, often lush trees sensed in the poetry of plays such as *Love's Labor's Lost*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and *As You Like It* are missing in the topography of Shakespeare's Jacobean tragedies and romances (even from the otherwise fertile isle of Prospero). This absence cannot be accounted for simply by Shakespeare's foregoing the pastoral mode; it seems instead to register the effect of having lived for more than ten or fifteen years in the urban construct called London. What this means is that “going back home” has a special meaning in *As You Like It*, one that reconstructs the impression of a many-treed forest.

Chapter five of this book reveals that Shakespeare's incorporation of a private self, or—alternately phrased—his creation of a “private” play, is forward-looking (in terms of Shakespeare's life) in the manifold depiction in *As You Like It* of what being a gentleman means. If the rustic William

seems upon initial consideration the opposite of a gentleman in *As You Like It*, Orlando and Duke Senior eventually demonstrate what Shakespeare might have thought he—a newly minted gentleman under attack in 1599 for being termed so—ought to be (or what indeed he thought he was). Several commentators, most notably James Bednarz, have explained the ramifications of Ben Jonson’s criticism of Shakespeare, expressed transparently in *Every Man Out of His Humor* (1599), for supposedly buying gentleman status for his father and himself.⁹ It is in this context that I take up again the importance of the pastoral genre for understanding *As You Like It*, this time in terms of its convention of introducing the author into the work, that is, Philisides in Sir Philip Sidney’s *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia*.

The dimension of *As You Like It* that has been most appealing to late twentieth-century and early twenty-first-century scholarly commentators pertains to Shakespeare’s interrogation of the nature, limits, and potentialities of gender made possible by the dizzying phenomenon of the boy actor playing Rosalind’s playing of Ganymede eventually counterfeiting Rosalind and onstage characters’ perceptions of this ambiguously gendered amalgam. The outpouring of critical articles and book chapters on this aspect of *As You Like It* has led me to position a relatively extended treatment of this subject as a last chapter to this book. Placing my chapter “Transvestite *As You Like It*” last in this volume suggests that the public and private Shakespeare (if such an academic division can be granted) both have a strong share in this transvestite/gendered dimension of the play.

Initially, the context for my argument in the book’s last chapter is early modern. My claims depend upon the construction of a spectrum, or grid, whereby Elizabethan and Jacobean plays containing a female character who disguises herself as a young man can be placed in relation to one another with respect to the dramatic functions made possible by this type of transvestite character. Because a boy actor plays the female who plays a young man in these plays, homoeroticism, regardless of the transvestite character’s dramatic function, invariably surfaces as a potential issue when audiences see scenes of romantic love wherein the disguised heroine flirts with her unsuspecting beloved and courts him. This surfacing is especially pronounced in *As You Like It* because of the rarity—even singularity—of the “male” heroine’s playing of “herself” and Orlando’s return of the boy actor’s flirting with and courtship of him. One might expect that *As You Like It* might join a play in this class such as John Lyly’s *Gallathea* at one end of a spectrum in which the evocation of homoeroticism and its threat to conventional heterosexual romantic and marriage relationships is the predominant, even the sole, function of the female character described as a boy. (Near the other end of the spectrum, one finds plays such as Robert Greene’s *King James IV* and Shakespeare’s *Cymbeline*, in which the transvestite heroine’s function of

educating her beloved in a nonsexual virtue supersedes, even displaces, this character type's function of interrogating the range and relative fixedness of gender). In *As You Like It*, Shakespeare makes this nonsexual, pedagogical function of the transvestite heroine a major part of Rosalind's role as Ganymede. As a result, *As You Like It*, while indeed exploring issues of homoeroticism, finds a place more toward the center of my constructed spectrum. Contrary to much of the recent published criticism on the play, the transvestite dimension of this late Elizabethan comedy is not as radically, or singularly, preoccupied with the interrogation of sexualities as many twenty-first century playgoers and readers have supposed.

This, then, outlines the sequence and general topics of the chapters of *Shakespeare's As You Like It: Late Elizabethan Culture and Literary Representation*. Shakespeare especially draws attention in *As You Like It* to feigning in various senses of the term. Near the end of Queen Elizabeth's long reign, when the sixty-plus-year-old woman had become unpopular, partly because of her insistence upon maintaining youthful portraits of her face as well as the declining status of her ideal personal symbols (such as the ermine), pretending in English life, notably the life of courtiers, seemed more so than ever to pervade manners and values, if only because—in popular perception—they did in the manners of a wrinkled, often peevish old queen.¹⁰

More than any other Shakespeare comedy, including *Twelfth Night*, *As You Like It* is a play of “if,” of pretending, of feigning. Near the close of *As You Like It*, Touchstone, comically cataloging courtesy-book challenges and replies, concludes that

[a]ll these you may avoid but the Lie Direct; and you may avoid that, too, with an “if.” I knew when seven justices could not take up a quarrel, but when the parties were met themselves, one of them thought but of an “if,” as “if you said so, then I said so,” and they shook hands and swore brothers. Your “if” is the only peacemaker; much virtue in “if” (5.4.92–98).

Commentators on *As You Like It* have often explained this panegyric to “if” in terms of the gender enfranchisement and social liberation associated with different kinds of feigning in this play. Unremarked among the virtues of “if” in *As You Like It* is the appreciation of the play made possible by a postmodern playgoer or reader's consideration of it “as if” he or she were a relatively learned late Elizabethan, familiar with the texts and contexts I bring to bear upon this comedy in the following chapters.

CHAPTER ONE
WRESTLING FOR TEMPERANCE:
AS YOU LIKE IT AND
THE FAERIE QUEENE, BOOK 2

Shakespearean scholars such as Marco Mincoff, Agnes Latham, and Edward Berry appear to have conclusively determined the extent and nature of Shakespeare's use of Thomas Lodge's *Rosalynde, or Euphues' Golden Legacy* (publ. 1590, republ. 1592, 1596, 1598) in the composition of *As You Like It*.¹ And yet commentators have not remarked one element of Lodge's text that is important for *As You Like It*, in that it links Shakespeare's play to a third text, one that was highly celebrated in the 1590s: book 2 of Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*. Critics have overlooked Shakespeare's exploration of the virtue of temperance in *As You Like It*, perhaps because they have not grasped the significance of Spenser's Book of Temperance for Shakespeare's pastoral comedy. On January 13, 1599, Edmund Spenser, he and his family having fled for their lives from rebels in Ireland, died, in London, "for lake of bread in King street," according to Ben Jonson.² The antiquarian William Camden supported Jonson's assertion, made during 1616 in one of Jonson's conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden. Yet the inference that Spenser starved to death does not square with the fact that the poet on December 30, 1598 was paid £8, or with the fact that a pension of £25 was due at Christmas. Still, the possibility that Spenser may have died of starvation, especially the rumor that in despair over the loss of all his worldly goods in the flight from Ireland Spenser in effect committed suicide by starving himself to death, added a mystique to the life and death of the writer of the Elizabethan national epic. As for Spenser's burial in Westminster Abbey—"neere *Chawcer*, at the charges of the Earl of *Essex* [who perhaps had given Spenser the £8], all Poets carrying his body to Church, and casting their doleful Verses, and Pens too into his graue"³—these details recorded by Camden indicate that Spenser had attained the status of England's premier poet. Thus the

presence of Spenser in Shakespeare's 1599–1600 play *As You Like It* is not surprising.

Shakespeare's apparent anticipation of Spenser's publication in 1596 of the second edition of *The Faerie Queene*—or (more likely) his capitalization on the continuing popularity of the 1590 first edition of the poem (books 1–3)—is only now beginning to be recognized in the growing awareness of the many Spenserian details of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.⁴ By calling Queen Elizabeth's shadow in the play, Titania, the Fairy Queen, Shakespeare provokes the comparison of his play to Spenserian texts, most notably that of *The Faerie Queene*.⁵ In 1983, James Bednarz, drawing upon an earlier analysis of Harold F. Brooks, published a seminal study of the importance of the large number of Spenserian allusions in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.⁶ These involve not only *The Faerie Queene* and Spenser's *The Shepheardes Calender*, but also other works of the poet such as the *Amoretti* and *Epithalamion* and *Mother Hubberds Tale* and *The Teares of the Muses*.⁷ Bednarz argues that Shakespeare's use of Spenser in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* reflects both the playwright's ridicule of and reverence for the poet, a paradoxical combination that entails Nick Bottom and Titania being both parodies of and serious analogues to Spenser's Prince Arthur and the poet's several simulacra of Queen Elizabeth.⁸ My belief that Shakespeare's use of Spenser's poetry in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is basically nonsatirical has been registered in my speculative argument that this play includes a serious "Spenserian" political allegory, an especially dark conceit, possibly intended for the Earls of Essex and Southampton and their coterie, on a subject officially forbidden in public discussion: the Elizabethan succession.⁹

Granted the importance in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* of certain ideas and poetry of Edmund Spenser's, as well as of the allegorical method associated with this poet's name, one more easily notices Spenserian elements in *As You Like It*, the pastoral comedy written most likely later in the year of Spenser's death and entombment. Clare Kinney has shown the degree to which not only Thomas Lodge but Shakespeare as well capitalized upon the name recognition of the Rosalind of Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* for the construction of their pastoral heroine (and for the deviations in that construction from Spenser's prototype).¹⁰ Moreover, Jean E. Howard has suggested that certain details of Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* bear directly upon Shakespeare's adoption of the name Ganymede for Rosalind in *As You Like It* and upon the nature of her love for Orlando. Pointing out that, for Shakespeare and his contemporaries, the name of Jove's cup-bearer, Ganymede, "had long-standing and unmistakable associations with homoerotic love," Howard asserts that "when the cross-dressed heroine

[known as Ganymede] commands Orlando to woo his 'Rosalind,' he woos a figure who is dressed like a man and bears a name signifying his status as a homoerotic love object."¹¹ "Long before *As You Like It* was penned," Howard continues,

pastoral had been used to depict the beauty of both male friendship and homoerotic love. Edmund Spenser, in the January Eclogue of *The Shepheardes Calender*, describes the passion of Hobbinol for Colin Clout, who in turn loves a woman named Rosalind. Commenting on this passage, E. K., the anonymous annotator of *The Shepheardes Calender*, drew on Classical precedent to defend pederastic love (love between an older man and a younger man) as less dangerous than gynerastic love (love of man for woman).¹²

Although she does not explicitly say so, Howard suggests that the name Shakespeare had given his heroine, Rosalind, caused him to think of the January Eclogue of Spenser's groundbreaking English pastoral elegy as a precedent for, or perhaps an analogue of, the representation of the homoerotic love adumbrated in *As You Like It* by the appearance of Ganymede's homoerotic passion for Orlando, and by his return of it.¹³ Howard, however, never states that the evocation of a complementary Spenserian text for certain passages in *As You Like It* soon makes playgoers and readers aware of the difference rather than the similarity of the values of the juxtaposed texts. Evoking Spenser, Shakespeare in this case shows his difference from the poet by casting a woman playing a young man as the source of the erotic feeling. As so many Shakespearean commentators have argued, Shakespeare's representation of sexual feeling in *As You Like It*, while wonderfully homoerotic in many thought-provoking ways, is ultimately heterosexual. In any case, a name of one of Thomas Lodge's characters in *Rosalynde* may have caused Shakespeare to think of Spenser as he read the popular prose romance that would become the major source of *As You Like It*. Lodge names Rosader's (Orlando's) loyal family servant not simply Adam (his name in *As You Like It*), but Adam Spencer. Lodge adapted this name from the source for his romance, *The Tale of Gamelyn*, a fourteenth-century manuscript poem not printed until 1721. In *Gamelyn*, the character in question is called "Adam the Spencer," that is to say, "Adam the Steward."¹⁴ Reading the name "Spencer" in Lodge, Shakespeare thought of Spenser, the English author who had most memorably written—in book 2 of *The Faerie Queene*—about the virtue arguably central to understanding and evaluating several midcareer plays of Shakespeare: the virtue of temperance.

Near the beginning of Lodge's pastoral romance, Shakespeare encountered several related passages recommending the virtue of temperance.

Sensing the approach of death, John of Bordeaux bestows a spiritual testament upon his sons Saladyne (Oliver) and Rosader (Orlando):

Fortune when she wils you to flie, tempers your plumes with waxe, and therefore either sit still and make no wing, or els beware the Sunne, and holde Dedalus axiome authentically (*medium tenere tutissimum*) ["It is safest to keep the mean"]... Take héede my sonnes, the meane is swéetest melodie; where strings high stretcht, either soone cracke, or quicklie growe out of time... Be valiant my sonnes, for cowardice is the enimie to honour; but not too rash, for that is an extreame. Fortitude is the meane, and that is limited within bonds, and prescribed with circumstance.¹⁵

John of Bordeaux's pious advice is not organically part of the action of *Rosalynde*, since Lodge was generally looking for opportunities to write long, rhetorical, often Euphuistic speeches; thus the complete absence of *exempla* illustrating temperance later in the romance is not surprising. (In fact, after John's choice recommendation, no one in *Rosalynde* again talks seriously about temperance).¹⁶ The relevance of temperance for the soon-to-be-composed (or simultaneously composed) *Hamlet* suggests, along with other evidence, that Shakespeare took notice of John of Bordeaux's testament. While John's speech is the kind of conventional, windy formulation of the virtue that Shakespeare would satirize in Polonius's notorious advice to Laertes (*Hamlet* 1.3.57–81), the above-quoted passage alerted the playwright to the possibility of incorporating the value of temperance in his dramatic revision of Lodge's tale. Simply cosmetic in Lodge, the passage invites comparison with Spenser's epic anatomy of temperance. Certain details of the poetry and staging of *As You Like It* that have no counterparts in Lodge's *Rosalynde* have intriguing analogues in book 2 of *The Faerie Queene*.

Initially this fact may be seen through an analysis of Shakespeare's revision of the episode in *Rosalynde* of Rosader's wrestling the Norman.¹⁷ "And the *Norman* presented himselfe as a challenger against all commers; but he looked like *Hercules* when he advaunst himselfe against *Acheloüs*," wrote Lodge. Shakespeare noticed this reference, for Rosalind, admiring Orlando just before the wrestling begins, cries, "Now Hercules be thy speed, young man!" (1.2.193–94). Nevertheless, the playwright's departures from Lodge's text are significant. Not only has Shakespeare shifted the referent of Hercules, making it apply to Orlando rather than to Charles the Wrestler; he has also substituted another Herculean myth involving wrestling for Lodge's allusion to the ancient hero grappling with a Proteus-like river god (who loses in the process a horn that later becomes the Horn of Plenty).¹⁸ When Charles asks, "Come, where is this young gallant that is so desirous to lie with his mother earth?" (1.1.183–84), he provides

the context that makes it possible for Rosalind's subsequent evocation of Hercules to crystallize one of the hero's early labors: his wrestling with the giant Antaeus, who upon being thrown to the ground gained new life from his mother Earth (Tellus, or Gaea). Both Richard Knowles and especially John Doebler have shown the appropriateness of Shakespeare's allusion to the myth of Hercules and Antaeus in the wrestling scene of *As You Like It*.¹⁹ Hercules, realizing after the repeated risings of Antaeus that the giant somehow draws his strength from the earth, finally kills him by holding him above the ground and crushing him. Doebler summarizes the stage directions for the wrestling in Shakespeare's play: "[T]he original First Folio directions provide no more than a 'Wrestle' at the beginning and three lines later a 'Shout' when Charles is thrown. The usurping Duke thereupon commands, 'No more, no more!' and a few lines later says, 'Bear him away,' after it is seen that the former champion can no longer even speak."²⁰ This critic recommends as a guideline for fleshing out these directions an account of an 1883 performance of the play:

The Sadler's Wells production has first Orlando and then Charles lifted "clear above the ground," as in Hercules' legendary defeat of the son of Earth, and then the professional flung to the ground, as implied in the comments made about the defeated Charles, when the Duke orders the speechless wrestler borne away. The only details needed to complete the traditional image of Hercules and Antaeus would be two revivals of Charles after being pinned to the earth by Orlando, before the final lifting of Charles above the ground, his subsequent exhaustion, and the flinging of him to the stage.²¹

What advantage does Shakespeare gain by alluding to the Hercules/Antaeus myth? Knowles traces Renaissance mythographers' moralizing of the ancient myth into "the victory of the rational soul over earthly or sensual appetite," represented by "Antaeus' earthly origin and the phrase 'mother earth.'"²² In the words of Doebler, "Hercules (virtue) won victory over the giant Antaeus (vice) by lifting him out of contact with his mother earth (the base passions)... The soul must wrench the body away from base desires before eternal victory can be achieved."²³ Not only Knowles but also Alice Lyle Scoufos, Russell Fraser, and Martha Ronk have described the special allegorical qualities of *As You Like It*.²⁴ These and other commentators on this pastoral comedy base their readings on the widespread and sometimes mistaken Renaissance assumption that writers employing the pastoral mode (such as Theocritus, Bion, Moschus, Virgil, Mantuan, and Sannazaro) had made this literary mode ideal for representing hidden allegorical meanings ranging from criticism of the state and religion to revelation of the details of the private lives and behavior

of contemporary individuals.²⁵ Given this symbolic emphasis, playgoers could consider Orlando's defeat of Charles as reason's victory over passion.²⁶ But which passion? The overthrow can hardly be a triumph over the passion of romantic love. "O poor Orlando! Thou art overthrown," the hero laments after his victory over the wrestler; "Or Charles or something weaker masters thee" (1.2.244–45). The "something weaker" in this case is specifically his passion for Rosalind. Struck by Rosalind's sudden melancholy, Celia advises her to "wrestle with thy affections" (1.3.20). Mastered by her passion for Orlando, Rosalind replies, "O, they take the part of a better wrestler than myself" (1.3.21).²⁷

Given these speeches, we must look elsewhere for the meaning of Orlando's victory. The moralized myth informing Orlando's wrestling with Charles implies that he has reasonably triumphed (and will triumph) over his wrath against Oliver. During their initial argument concerning Oliver's mistreatment of Orlando, Oliver retaliates by striking his complaining younger brother.²⁸ "Come, come, elder brother, you are too young in this," Orlando responds. "Wilt thou lay hands on me, villain?" (1.1.50–53), Oliver in turn asks. Editors of the play have supplied stage directions to accompany Oliver's question; these range from Orlando's collaring Oliver to his striking him to Agnes Latham's imaginative "*putting a wrestler's grip on [Oliver]*" (1.1.53).²⁹ Her suggestion invites comparison of Orlando's violent act with his subsequent wrestling with Charles. Whether collaring or putting a wrestling grip on Oliver, Orlando clearly does not answer his brother's blow by striking him with his fist; otherwise Oliver's phrase "lay hands on me" makes no sense. Dramatized here is a partial self-control, a hint of the mastery symbolized more fully in Orlando's overthrow of Charles. That triumph in turn predicts Orlando's later victory over wrath when he wrestles the lioness threatening Oliver and saves his brother's life.

Memorable sixteenth-century portrayals of wrestling to achieve temperance, à la Hercules and Antaeus, appear throughout book 2 of *The Faerie Queene*. Glossing the etymology of Guyon's name, both A. C. Hamilton and William Nelson note that, deriving from the Greek *gyon*, it means "wrestler."³⁰ For Spenser, achieving temperance involves wrestling with the passions to gain reasonable control of them.³¹ The notion that temperance is achieved by grappling with affections in order to manage them appears allegorically early in book 2 of *The Faerie Queene* in the relationship between Medina and her two sisters Elissa (Defect) and Perissa (Excess):

But stryfull minde, and diuerse qualitee
Drew them in partes, and each made others foe:
Still did they striue, and dayly disagree;

The eldest did against the youngest goe,
 And both against the middest meant to worken woe.
 (2.2.13.5–9)

Hamilton asserts that Medina is “not simply the Aristotelian mean between the two extremes but their union”—a union attained through her figurative wrestling with her sisters.³² Nevertheless, the effect of wrestling with the passions in the Book of Temperance is sometimes that of mastery rather than integration. Three memorable events create this impression. Guyon wins his physical encounter with Furor (*Faerie Queene* 2.4.6–15) only after he follows the Palmer’s reasonable advice of first wrestling with and subduing Occasion—the mother who kindles Furor’s rage (*Faerie Queene* 2.4.10–13).³³ Later, Prince Arthur wrestles another personification of the fiery temper, Pyrochles (*Faerie Queene* 2.8.49–52). His grappling with Maleger (Old Adam/Original Sin/Disease) requires him to assume Hercules’ role in wrestling the giant Antaeus (*Faerie Queene* 2.11.41–46).³⁴ Repeatedly thrown to the ground, Maleger miraculously keeps rising. Arthur “then remembred well, that had bene sayd,”

How th’Earth his mother was, and first him bore,
 Shee eke so often, as his life decayd,
 Did life with vsury to him restore,
 And reysd him vp much stronger then before,
 So soone as he vnto her wombe did fall;
 Therefore to grownd he would him cast no more,
 Ne him commit to graue terrestriall,
 But beare him farre from hope of succour vsuall.
 Tho vp he caught him twixt his puissant hands,
 And hauing scruzd out of his carrion corse
 The lothfull life, now loosd from sinfull bands,
 Vpon his shoulders carried him perforce
 About three furlongs, taking his full course,
 Vntill he came vnto a standing lake;
 Him thereinto he threw without remorse,
 Ne stird, till hope of life did him forsake;
 So end of that Carles dayes, and his owne paines did make.
 (2.11.45–46)

Noting Spenser’s allusion to the moralized Hercules/Antaeus myth, Hamilton suggests that Arthur in his aspect of Christ has mastered the Old Adam (*Faerie Queene*, 1977 ed.; 2.11.45–46n, 46.3n).³⁵

The poetic context of Orlando’s later wrestling with the lioness preparing to devour the sleeping Oliver suggests that book 2 of *The Faerie Queene* might be more than a relevant intertext for the better appreciation of certain

elements of *As You Like It*. Both Knowles and Doebler find in this episode an allusion to Hercules killing the Nemean lion.³⁶ Shakespeare symbolically portrays Orlando's overthrow of wrath (a traditional allegorical value of the lion)—not only of the anger previously figured in Oliver but also of Orlando's own wrath over his brother's ingratitude.³⁷ In the heroic fury of this fight, Orlando fulfills the potential of a familiar Renaissance name, Orlando Furioso. He also achieves the virtue of temperance in the process. Orlando's tempering his anger with a martyr-like mercy toward his defenseless brother so moves the awakened Oliver that he begs Orlando's pardon and assures the creation of a new brotherly love. Orlando's wrestling with the lioness occurs beneath "an old oak, whose boughs were mossed with age / And high top bald with dry antiquity" (4.3.105–6). The oak is an arboreal symbol throughout *As You Like It*; as a tree sacred to Jove, it typifies his venerable providence.³⁸ Lodge, in the course of *Rosalynde*, neither alludes to the myth of Hercules and the Nemean lion nor refers to the oak tree.³⁹ In the midst of Spenser's description in book 2 of *The Faerie Queene* of the natural setting of Cymochles' dissipation in the Bower of Bliss appears this noteworthy conflation of images:

And on the other syde a pleasaunt groue
 Was shott vp high, full of the stately tree,
 That dedicated is t'*Olympicke Ioue*,
 And to his sonne *Alcides*, whenas hee
 In *Nemus* gayned goodly victoree;
 Therein the mery birds of every sorte
 Chaunted alowd their chearefull harmonnee:
 And made amongst them selues a sweete consort,
 That quickned the dull spright with musicall comfort.
 (2.5.31)

Given Spenser's and Shakespeare's emphasis upon the importance of wrestling for the attainment of temperance in book 2 of *The Faerie Queene* and in *As You Like It*, one is struck by the association of Jove's tree, the oak, with the Herculean labor of wrestling the Nemean lion in the poetry of act 4 of Shakespeare's play and of Spenser's poem.⁴⁰ Certainly a person could claim that the coincidence is unremarkable, statistically improbable but still possible. Nevertheless, the congruence resembles those image clusters that Shakespeare's associative imagination subliminally assembled while he read for broader ideational reasons and then incidentally (or not so incidentally) included in his drama.⁴¹ Both Spenser's and Shakespeare's associations of the oak and of the myth of Hercules and the Nemean lion occur in similar contexts. In the four stanzas immediately preceding *Faerie Queene* 2.5.31, Spenser describes a sleeping reprobate, Cymochles

(2.5.27–30). Moreover, Cymochles is asleep in the Bower of Bliss, a natural Eden that is anything but ideal. The larger setting of Orlando's Herculean wrestling with the lioness beneath the oak tree includes the sleeping sinner Oliver, lost in the Edenic forest of Arden blighted by the flaws of the seasons, landlordism, and predatory beasts. In both of these "Edenic" contexts, a snake appears—Shakespeare's "green and gilded" serpent, wreathed about Oliver's neck, threatening the "opening of his mouth" (4.3.108–11),⁴² and Spenser's "Adder, lurking in the weedes," to which the voyeur Cymochles is compared (*Faerie Queene* 2.5.34, esp. 1–3). If Shakespeare consulted Spenser's Book of Temperance for ideas about how he might represent the attainment of temperance in *As You Like It*, his encountering in Lodge's *Rosalynde* the image of a villain asleep in a seeming natural paradise subliminally evoked the picture of Cymochles asleep in the Bower of Bliss, a trace of memory that in turn suggested the associated images of the oak, Hercules battling the Nemean lion, and the diabolical serpent.⁴³ This conflation of images, a speculative construction of Shakespeare's, incidentally—and thus ironically—draws for its power partly upon Psalm 91:13: "You shall tread upon the lion and the cobra, / The young lion and the serpent you shall trample underfoot."⁴⁴

Certainly the second book of Spenser's epic allegory is the most Shakespearean section of *The Faerie Queene*. The Book of Temperance has connections with several other Shakespeare plays. The slanderous story underlying the plot of Don John's deception of Claudio and Hero in *Much Ado About Nothing* had been told by several authors, including Spenser. In Spenser's telling of a familiar fable, Phedon and Philemon illustrate a tragic failure to achieve temperate control over envy and wrath (*Faerie Queene* 2.4.16–36).⁴⁵ John Drakakis believes that Shakespeare left a trace of his acquaintance with the version of the tale appearing in Spenser's poem; scene-headings for the early acts of *Much Ado About Nothing* "contain references to the supposed wife of Leonato: 'Innogen his wife' (I.i.) and 'His wife' (II.i.). In Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*, book 2, which contains a version of the plot of *Much Ado About Nothing*, the figure of 'Inogene' appears as the wife of Brutus, 'faire Inogene of Italy' (X.13)..."⁴⁶ Furthermore, in canto 9 of book 2 of Spenser's epic, during his reading of "*Briton monuments*" (Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*, 2.9.59.6), Guyon finds the story of "*Leyr*," "*Gonorill*," "*Regan*," and "*Cordeill*," which Spenser amply presents as a tragedy ending in Cordelia's hanging herself in prison (*Faerie Queene* 2.10.27–32). Finally, in the same canto, Spenser refers to the rule of Cymbeline with precisely the emphasis that Shakespeare would give his dramatization of this pagan king's reign in the dramatic romance of the same name—that it coincided with the Nativity of Christ (*Faerie Queene* 2.10.50–52).⁴⁷

Whatever the case, Shakespeare makes the attainment of temperance a dramatic issue in *As You Like It*, and he does so in the spirit of book 2 of *The Faerie Queene*. At the beginning of the play, Oliver's and Orlando's violent passions and their physical abuse of each other argue their need of temperance (1.1.27–80). Earlier in this chapter, I documented my claim that the effect of wrestling with the passions in book 2 of *The Faerie Queene* is *sometimes* that of mastery rather than integration. At other times in this part of Spenser's poem, the effect is that of integration. And the same is true in Shakespeare's representation of this motif in *As You Like It*. In the midst of Orlando's and Oliver's struggle, Adam tries to temper their wrath: "Sweet masters, be patient. For your father's remembrance, be at accord" (1.1.59–60).⁴⁸ Orlando, holding Oliver in some sort of grip, does not immediately respond to Adam's plea for temperate behavior. Yet we have seen that he does restrain himself from the kind of violence that most editors ascribe to Oliver in this scene. "I will no further offend you than becomes me for my good" (1.1.75–76), concludes Orlando, releasing Oliver with the considerable degree of self-restraint that has been noted. This partial victory of temperance can be attributed to Adam's moderating influence.⁴⁹ In himself, Adam combines oxymoronic extremes into a temperate composite after the fashion of characterizations in book 2 of *The Faerie Queene*. "Let me be your servant," Adam tells Orlando (about to flee to the forest of Arden):

Though I look old, yet I am strong and lusty;
 For in my youth I never did apply
 Hot and rebellious liquors in my blood,
 Nor did not with unbashful forehead woo
 The means of weakness and debility.
 Therefore my age is as a lusty winter,
 Frosty but kindly.

(2.3.48–54)

Adam's temperance by his own account results in a characterological "lusty winter," antithetical traits moderated into a composite virtue. Spenser laid the basis for this kind of poetic representation of temperance in the union of traits such as "*Praysdesire*" and "*Shamefastnes*" in the heart of the allegorized ideal knight (*Faerie Queene* 2.9.36–44).

Nevertheless, old Adam alone cannot fully inculcate temperance in Orlando. Again, *The Faerie Queene* adumbrates what will be supplied in the play. Commentators on *The Faerie Queene* often remark that, in the early cantos of book 2, Spenser portrays temperance according to Aristotelian and other Classical models, primarily so that he can ultimately underscore both their essential inadequacy and the need for a supplementary

Christian understanding and practice of the virtue.⁵⁰ Spenser predicts this melding when “goodly” Guyon and “godly” Redcrosse Knight, about to fight, recognize each other and become “at one” by plighting their right hands (*Faerie Queene* 2.1.29.1, 34.2). Later, Guyon, near death from the ordeal of withstanding the temptations of Mammon’s cave, is watched over by the Angel of Love, who tells the Palmer,

Yet will I not forgoe, ne yet forgett
The care thereof my selfe vnto the end,
But euermore him succour, and defend
Against his foe and mine. . . .
(2.8.8.3–6)

The Angel’s gracious redemption is fulfilled in Prince Arthur’s recovery of Guyon’s life by slaying Cymochles and Pyrochles, Spenser’s personifications of the concupiscent and irascible passions. Pyrochles’ boast that he can “carue with this inchaunted bround [Arthur’s stolen sword *Morddure*] / His Lords owne flesh” (2.8.22.4–5) and the bloody wound that Arthur receives in his right side during the fight (2.8.38.5–39.2) testify to Arthur’s battling in his aspect of Christ to redeem humankind, forfeit to the law of sin (2.8.28.6–29.6). Arthur’s bloody wound indicates that the life of temperance depends upon the Christ-like sacrifice of one’s own flesh. Ultimately the act reflects God’s tempering of his wrath with mercy. Wrestling Hercules-like with Antaeon Pyrochles, Arthur squeezes the life from him, after which Guyon immediately revives and thanks the “Patrone of his life” (2.8.55.4).

Commentators on *As You Like It* sometimes equate Adam with the biblical New Man of grace. Louise Schleiner asserts that appearing on Orlando’s back, Adam “is to be honored with the first food at supper in the forest in exile. Like a plate of eucharistic bread himself, this redeemer is held aloft—‘so faire, and yet so old’ (to borrow an Augustinian phrase about God from Aemilia Lanyer).”⁵¹ But by making Adam old and by dropping his surname in Lodge’s *Rosalynde* (Adam Spencer), Shakespeare suggests not the New Man of grace, but the Old Adam, the man to be superseded.⁵² Critics often note Adam’s unexplained disappearance in the middle of *As You Like It*. In this respect, he resembles the Fool in *King Lear*. In large part the Fool vanishes because Lear is no longer foolish but mad; the king can no longer respond to the mirror who gnomically tried to educate him in his own and humankind’s folly. Comparably, old Adam disappears partly because the redemption of Orlando and Oliver requires virtues stronger than prudence and reason. Old Adam’s temperance is essentially ethical rather than spiritual, a fact that qualifies him to represent a condition that—in a Christian humanist culture—generally requires transcendence. A. C. Hamilton

suggests that the standing lake into which Arthur casts the “carrion corse” of Maleger signifies baptism (*Faerie Queene*, 1977 edition; 2.11.45–46n). This editor glosses Spenser’s reference to “The lothfull life, now loosed from sinfull bands” as “the death of the old Adam in man” (*Faerie Queene*, 1977 edition; 2.11.46.3n). The Spenserian rendering helps us to understand why old Adam vanishes without a trace in Shakespeare’s play before Orlando’s salvational battle in act 4 with the lioness. Old Adam’s disappearance cues the spiritual new man that Orlando shortly will become.

During his wrestling with the lioness, Orlando receives a wound on his arm that bloodies a handkerchief, a napkin that he tells Oliver to give to Rosalind to excuse his broken appointment with her. Both Knowles and René Fortin have linked Orlando’s handkerchief, “Dyed in his blood” (4.3.155), with Christ’s redemption of humankind through martyrdom.⁵³ Knowles comments that “Oliver receives ‘fresh array’ from the patriarchal Duke, alters his whole personality, bears as a token of his savior’s sacrifice a napkin dyed with his blood, and falls immediately in love with a girl named Celia [Heaven].”⁵⁴ This positive conflation of values determines the blood of Christ as the napkin’s referent, rather than the blood of a late Elizabethan Catholic martyr such as Edmund Campion. (Late sixteenth-century English Catholics and their sympathizers occasionally were able to saturate their handkerchiefs [which consequently became saving relics] in the blood of drawn-and-quartered Jesuits.) Orlando achieves temperance with regard to wrath in *As You Like It* by wrestling with and overcoming the beast of anger,⁵⁵ yet a more comprehensive possession of the virtue (as in the case of Spenser’s Prince Arthur) requires Christ-like self-sacrifice. Orlando makes himself worthy of Rosalind’s trust and love by forgiving his vicious brother and by risking his own life to save another’s. Such a gracious act, by marvelous example, makes the attainment of personal temperance possible for the apparent reprobate Oliver.

Turning from old Adam and Orlando to other characters in *As You Like It*, we see that temperance also is bound to their character development (or to their lack thereof). Suffering from an imbalance of the four physical humors, Jaques’ intemperance issues chiefly as an antisocial melancholy (2.1.26, 41; 2.5.11–12). His “weeping and commenting / Upon the sobbing deer” (2.1.65–66) resembles the hysterical behavior of the melancholic, in Elizabethan terms a fit object of observers’ amusement.⁵⁶ “[C]ompact of jars” (2.7.5), Jaques, in Duke Senior’s words, is so inwardly discordant that the musical tempering of his nature would amount to a cosmic miracle (2.5.5–6). His uncontrollable laughter over Touchstone’s wise foolishness signals a wild swing from his saturnine melancholy. Hearing a “motley fool . . . moral on the time,” Jaques “did laugh, sans intermission, / An hour

by his dial" (2.7.29, 32–33). Within himself Jaques dramatizes the standard Elizabethan intemperance described by Spenser in the episode of Medina's castle, wherein melancholic Elissa and her sad knight Huddibras clash with maniacally mirthful Perissa and Sansloy (*Faerie Queene* 2.2.34–38). Concerning Jaques' extremes of melancholy and mirth, Rosalind characterizes his passion in a way that invites comparison with the terms of old Adam's definition of his personal temperance. "They say you are a melancholy fellow," she tells Jaques. "I am so," he foolishly boasts; "I do love it better than laughing." "Those that are in extremity of either [as Jaques has been despite his disclaimer] are abominable fellows," Rosalind judges, "and betray themselves to every modern censure worse than drunkards" (4.1.3–7). It was Adam who, among the play's characters, defined his classical temperance in terms of sobriety.

One "modern censure" of Jaques involves Duke Senior's uncontested claim that he at one time was a "libertine" (2.7.65–69, esp. 65), a debauchee who apparently contracted venereal disease. This behavior, while presumably abandoned, nevertheless exemplifies what in general disqualifies Jaques from being a moral satirist: his chronic intemperance (currently expressed in his uncontrolled swings of mood between melancholy and mirth). How can the intemperate man or woman presume to correct the excesses and defects of foolish or vicious humankind? The implied question poses a challenge for Rosalind's attempt to cure (temper) the stylized excesses of Orlando's love for her. Those excesses express themselves in poetry rather than in physical appearance and dress. Orlando does not suffer from the love melancholy that becomes recognizable in Hamlet's behavior (*Hamlet* 2.1.79–109). Rosalind notes that Orlando lacks the melancholy lover's signs—"a lean cheek," "a blue eye and sunken," "an unquestionable [i.e., an irritable] spirit," "a beard neglected," ungartered stockings, an "unbanded" bonnet [a hat lacking a band around the crown], unbuttoned sleeves, and untied shoes (3.2.356–64). "[P]oint-device" in his "accoutrements" (3.2.365), Orlando—Rosalind fears—may be more in love with himself than with her. Like oil and water refusing to mix, Jaques and Orlando part company in allegorical language reminiscent of Spenser's poetic method. When Jaques says, "Farewell, good Signor Love," Orlando retorts, "Adieu, good Monsieur Melancholy" (3.2.282–85). The dialogue projects the absence of melancholy in Orlando's love for Rosalind. Nevertheless, his passion in its excess appears so artificial and self-indulgent that it clearly invites tempering. The intemperance of his affection reveals itself primarily in his unreal idealizations of his beloved, versified after the fashion of the bastardizing of Petrarch's celebration of Laura (3.2.1–10, 84–91, 120–49). In the modified language of Aristotelian temperance, no defect strives

with the excess of Orlando's word pictures of female perfection to unite in a moderate idea.

Nevertheless, like Spenser in book 2 of *The Faerie Queene*, Shakespeare in *As You Like It* works to get his auditor or reader to understand wherein temperance consists, even though individual characters do not as a rule either fully represent or fully achieve the virtue. Repeatedly in this comedy Shakespeare shows extreme points of view and ways of life being balanced by or integrated with their opposites. The playwright commits Touchstone's role mainly to making this point. The jester compensates for the callousness of Le Beau's calling Charles' breaking of the old man's sons' bones "sport" by dryly commenting, "Thus men may grow wiser every day. It is the first time that ever I heard breaking of ribs was sport for ladies" (1.2.123–25). Touchstone's wit regularly tempers the outbreaks of other characters' foolishness. For example, he counters Orlando's sing-song deification of Rosalind in his poetry (as read to him by the subject herself) by sounding an earthy note cast in similarly trivial meter:

If a hart do lack a hind,
Let him seek out Rosalind.
If the cat will after kind,
So, be sure, will Rosalind.
(3.2.97–100)

The whole point of Touchstone's and Corin's comic badinage over the relative merits of life in the court versus life in the country (3.2.11–81) lies in Shakespeare's suggestion that the fullest experience results from a blend of both styles. By never having been in court, the shepherd, in Touchstone's "cosmopolitan" opinion, is "damned, like an ill-roasted egg, all on one side" (3.2.35–36). Supposedly having only the "wicked" manners of an unsophisticated country fellow, Corin requires the refining verbal *sprezzatura*, the cultivated wittiness, entailed in Touchstone's courtly manners.

Framing Touchstone's and Corin's debate are scenes of Orlando's naive poetry and Touchstone's above-mentioned mockery of it. The dramatic method suggests that Orlando's verse might benefit from the tempering influence of an adversarial point of view on love and women. This is precisely what Rosalind in the guise of Ganymede adopts. Her offer to physic the lovesickness of Orlando involves depicting women, including Rosalind, as giddy, selfish creatures. In her opinion, women are "changeable, longing and liking, proud, fantastical, apish, shallow, inconstant, full of tears, full of smiles; for every passion something, and for no passion truly anything" (3.2.390–93). Rosalind's feigned cynical challenging of Orlando's inflated idea of herself with images of self-serving love and of woman's

promiscuous nature ensues in a verbal wrestling match (4.1.35–183). As such, their dialogue becomes one more instance of wrestling for temperance in *As You Like It*. Through linguistic grappling, Rosalind hopes not to kill Orlando's love for her but to temper its excess.⁵⁷ Her pitting her defect against his excess might achieve the unified mean of a realistic idealism in matters of the heart.⁵⁸

Throughout the canon, "giddy" is one of Shakespeare's favorite terms for humankind's radical inconstancy of temperament. Rosalind's picture of giddy woman is a calculated exaggeration of a flaw afflicting all men and women to different degrees. Once married to Orlando, Rosalind as Ganymede tells him that

I will be more jealous of thee than a Barbary cock-pigeon over his hen, more clamorous than a parrot against rain, more new-fangled than an ape, more giddy in my desires than a monkey. I will weep for nothing, like Diana in the fountain, and I will do that when you are disposed to be merry. I will laugh like a hyena, and that when thou art inclined to sleep. (4.1.136–43)

"But will my Rosalind do so?" Orlando anxiously asks. "By my life, she will do as I do" (4.1.144–45), Rosalind quips. Her joke reminds us that, even though her remarkable self-possession and moral character would prevent her from conforming to her portrait of Orlando's giddy beloved, she herself shares in humankind's proneness to intemperance, to the imbalance of humors that the latter part of her warning delineates.

As regards her affection for Orlando, Rosalind illustrates a time-worn adage that the physician cannot heal herself. Depressed by her cousin's melancholy, Celia, hearing that Rosalind mourns the exile of her father, argues, "I could have taught my love to take thy father for mine. So wouldst thou, if the truth of thy love to me were so righteously tempered as mine is to thee" (1.2.9–12). Celia's phrase "so righteously tempered" posits the goal of Rosalind's wrestling with her excessive passions, specifically with her love for Orlando. That even she feels the rush of her sudden affection for Orlando to be intemperate is revealed in remarks such as her reply to Celia's "Come, come, wrestle with thy affections": "O, they take the part of a better wrestler than myself" (1.3.20–22). This conversation with Celia could be said to function as a healthful wrestling match for Rosalind, in the sense that it helps her emotionally as a kind of restorative. Nevertheless, as late as act 4, Rosalind appears never to have truly reduced her passion for Orlando to a moderate love:

O coz, coz, coz, my pretty little coz, that thou didst know how many fathom deep I am in love. But it cannot be sounded. My affection hath an unknown bottom, like the Bay of Portugal.... [T]hat same wicked

bastard of Venus, that was begot of thought, conceived of spleen, and born of madness, that blind rascally boy that abuses everyone's eyes because his own are out, let him be judge how deep I am in love. I'll tell thee, Aliena, I cannot be out of the sight of Orlando. I'll go find a shadow and sigh till he come.(4.1.188–91, 194–200)

While Rosalind's confession reflects her honest, appealing character, the untempered feeling portrayed therein is predominantly disruptive, preoccupying her daily routine.

Thus Rosalind's lack of absolute success in tempering Orlando's love is not surprising. When she sees Orlando's bandaged arm, she exclaims, "O my dear Orlando, how it grieves me to see thee wear thy heart in a scarf!" "It is my arm," her lover dully replies. "I thought thy heart had been wounded with the claws of a lion," she jests in return. "Wounded it is, but with the eyes of a lady" (5.2.19–24), Orlando significantly replies. The disturbing misunderstanding of figurative meaning that has marked his understanding of Petrarchan conceits all along remains to the end,⁵⁹ suggesting that Rosalind's tempering of his love has not been completely successful.⁶⁰ Nevertheless, Orlando's praiseworthy victory in tempering his wrath for Oliver and forgiving his brother makes gauging the degree of doctor Rosalind's cure an essentially moot point. (One could argue that, if Rosalind's cure were completely successful, she and Orlando would have ended up with a very dull marriage.) The greater love in offering to lay down his life for his brother qualifies Orlando to be Rosalind's husband.

One senses that marriage will moderate the extent of Rosalind's unfathomed passion. The memorable feat of tempering in the play concerns neither Orlando's nor Rosalind's individual love but the general concord—the corporate marriage—of act 5, scene 4. Promising "to make all this matter even" (5.4.18), Rosalind draws upon her magical powers to evoke the god of marriage, Hymen.⁶¹ The god Hymen's first words indicate that his role involves moderating discord:

Then is there mirth in heaven,
When earthly things made even
Atone together.
(5.4.103–5)

The reduction through marriage of eight mainly unfulfilled and confused persons to four relatively satisfied couples illustrates Hymen's ability to "atone"—that is to say, to make irregularity (the odd) whole ("one").⁶² This benign reduction amounts to an act of temperance. Marriage promises most certainly to temper not only Rosalind and Orlando's union (the focus of the play, in this respect) but also that of Oliver and Celia. The

remarkable thoroughness of Oliver's conversion from vice to virtue bodes well for his treatment of Celia; marriage serves as guarantor that Celia and Oliver's passionate mutual love at first sight will not be incontinent, but continent (5.2.28–39). Thus Hymen's words of blessing on Oliver and Celia—"You and you are heart in heart" (5.4.127)—convey the idea of mutuality in marriage wherein one partner as a rule does abuse the other through intemperate words or deeds. The promise of temperate marriage is less pronounced in Silvius and Phoebe's wedding, for Silvius' remark that "to have her and death were both one thing" (5.4.17) sounds ominous. Yet his remark can be taken to reflect a new degree of knowledge of Phoebe that could make him more resistant to her manipulation. In this promising vein, Phoebe keeps her word to accept Silvius when she finds that Rosalind can never be her husband. "I will not eat my word," Phoebe asserts (5.4.144). "Now thou art mine," she exclaims, "Thy faith my fancy to thee doth combine" (5.4.144–45). By these ambiguous words, she seems to signify that a new realization of and respect for the faithfulness of Silvius' love for her finally unites her love to the shepherd. Rather than being taken as a negative remark about Touchstone and Audrey's marriage, Hymen's benediction—"You and you are sure together / As the winter to foul weather" (5.4.130–31)—can be taken positively in the sense that marriage will interjoin Touchstone and Audrey as completely as foul weather—in England, at least—inevitably informs the winter months. Playgoers equate Audrey with foul weather rather than winter in this union because she is "foul," homely, a fact confirmed by Touchstone's reference to her as "ill-favoured" in his reply to Duke Senior that Audrey is "[a] poor virgin, sir, an ill-favoured thing, sir, but mine own" (5.4.56–57). Touchstone's seriousness in marrying Audrey in act 5 becomes authentic by this interpretation of his reply: "Rich honesty dwells like a miser, sir," Touchstone tells Rosalind's father, "in a poor house, as your pearl in your foul oyster" (5.4.58–60). In effect, Touchstone has just said that Audrey is his pearl of great price.

Duke Senior's final benison seems indirectly to admit the relative temperance inherent in the marriages of the play's four couples. The assembled characters "[s]hall share the good of our returned fortune," he exclaims, "[a]ccording to the measure of their states" (5.4.169–70). "Play, music," he commands, "and you brides and bridegrooms all, / With measure heaped in joy, to th' measures fall" (5.4.173–74). Duke Senior's insistence at the end of *As You Like It* on measured rewards, especially on measured happiness, accords with the play's positive valuation of temperance—a virtue made more precious by the energy expended in wrestling to achieve it. Late Elizabethan playgoers who had read book 2 of Spenser's *Faerie Queene* were in the best position to notice and respond to this focus of Shakespeare's in *As You Like It*.

The wrestling match between Charles and Orlando introduced into *As You Like It* certain Classical ideas analogous to major concepts of book 2 of *The Faerie Queene*. Analogy in this case took informed playgoers back a few years into the sixteenth century. And yet, as I shall argue in chapter three, Jaques' verse satire and Rosalind's satire on romantic lovers and marriage under the guise of Ganymede more precisely fit the context of 1599, when Ben Jonson and other English dramatists and poets reveled in the genre of satire. I shall have more to say of Jonson and the end-of-the-century popularity of satire, but for now I want to suggest that Shakespeare mediates between romance and satire by having *As You Like It* be the mediation between these two literary extremes. That is to say that, in the broadest sense of the term, Shakespeare in *As You Like It* "tempers" romance and satire, using a breeched hero to heal the breach between Jonsonian satire and Spenserian and/or Sidneyan romance.

CHAPTER TWO

KAIROS AND THE RIPENESS OF TIME IN *AS YOU LIKE IT*

In many respects, *As You Like It* is Shakespeare's most symbolic, mythic play from c. 1595 until the late romances: *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*; *Cymbeline*; and *The Tempest*. Each of these Jacobean dramatic romances includes at least one theophany, or appearance, of a Classical deity, respectively Diana, Jupiter, and Iris, Ceres, and Juno (all three played by Prospero's magical spirits). With the exceptions of *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*, with their ghosts and *Macbeth's* witches, the only Shakespeare play between *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and the later Jacobean romances to stage the appearance of an unequivocally supernatural being involved in the plot is *As You Like It*, in which the playwright introduces onstage the Roman god of marriage, Hymen. Hymen's appearance and the god's words and deeds in *As You Like It*—as I claim at length near the end of this chapter—are unequivocally supernatural, despite occasional theatrical claims to the contrary. Rather than the appearance of the deities of the court masque, the epiphany of the Graces dancing on Mount Acidale in book 6, canto 10 of Spenser's *Faerie Queene* constitutes the late Elizabethan intertext for understanding the metaphysical status of Hymen in *As You Like It*.¹ Given this Spenserian context, one is not surprised to find that a contemporary dimension of time, associated with certain idealistic writing of Spenser and poets like him, a dimension hitherto not fully explored in the commentary on *As You Like It*, invests otherworldly Hymen, as well as the lives of Rosalind, Orlando, and the other characters of this comedy, with the rich meaning that accrues to them.

Not every series of critical articles on a single Shakespearean motif cumulatively deepens our understanding of a series of Shakespeare's plays. Such an effect, however, does come from a string of critics' explorations of the motif of time in *As You Like It*. In a now-classic essay, Jay Halio first defined a contrast in the play between the time-consciousness of the court and the regenerative timelessness of the forest of Arden illustrative

of a previous generation's gracious way of life. Taking issue with Halio, Rawdon Wilson then argued that the dialectic of *As You Like It* concerns not time-consciousness and timelessness but rather the objective process of either public or natural time and the subjective, private time-sense of characters such as Rosalind and Orlando. For Wilson, the comedy reveals a constant play between the objectivity of time (as the correlative of motion) and its relativity (as the correlative of a knowing mind). Wilson, writes Donn Taylor, "holds that the chief characters' perception of the objective, threatening time of Frederick's court undergoes gradual change to 'a sense of interior time which becomes possible in Arden' and which 'can exist, as a particular reflection of consciousness, only when objective time loses its importance and is no longer marked.'"² Taylor then redefines Wilson's objective time in *As You Like It*, stressing the ability of characters to seize the opportune moment, the *kairos* of Classical art as modified by Medieval thought.³

Of particular interest to Taylor is the concept of physical ripeness, and the question of whether Rosalind and Orlando seize moments opportune for their growth as lovers worthy of one another. "Most of the characters seize their Occasion," Taylor concludes, "complete their growth to maturity, and are joined in good Fortune through the multiple marriage which concludes the play."⁴ Taylor's idea of *kairos*, however, is incomplete. By focusing exclusively upon the Greek and Roman notion of the opportune moment, brought by Occasion, he overlooks the greater importance of Judeo-Christian *kairos* for *As You Like It*. According to Gary F. Waller, "The New Testament writers transform the Jewish concept of a time of opportunity to *the* time, the *kairos*, the advent of Jesus of Nazareth in whom the time is fulfilled. The commencement of a new *aion* or era was proclaimed, in which men were called to live eschatologically, in a new pattern of living in which the quality of eternal life is revealed in time."⁵ In Frank Kermode's opinion,

It is the New Testament that lays the foundation for both the modern sense of epoch . . . and the modern distinction between times: the coming of God's time (*kairos*), the fulfilling of the time (*kairos*—Mark 1.15), the signs of the times (Matt. 16.2, 3) as against passing time, *chronos*. The notion of fulfillment is essential; the *kairos* transforms the past, validates Old Testament types and the prophecies, establishes concord with origins as well as ends.⁶

Many Elizabethans, regardless of denominational affiliation, believed that, by seizing moments latent with spiritual, even incarnational, significance, individuals—both in life and in literature—could redeem time lost or misspent to the salvation of themselves and their society.⁷

Shakespeare repeatedly represents this version of providential *kairos* in *As You Like It*. By seizing certain propitious moments, Orlando re-creates heroic

events in Hercules' and Aeneas's lives so that (in a sense to be explained later) the Heroic Age returns. The spiritual dimension of these *kairoi* becomes apparent in the fulfillment of time that the equivalent of Judeo-Christian Providence effects in the play. The *kairoi* of moments from a Classical age conclude in the masque of Hymen with an epiphany of the Garden of Eden. The reenactment of time in the play progresses to a point at which the audience realizes that a moment of innocence has been miraculously recovered. In this respect, time's movement in *As You Like It* also begs comparison with the impression of the backward movement of time in *Hamlet* (which I introduce and describe at a more appropriate place in this chapter), primarily because this apparent movement in the great tragedy seems to forecast another biblical event, that of approaching Apocalypse. The turn-of-the-century date of both *As You Like It* and *Hamlet*, their late Elizabethan status, justifies comparison of the two plays in this respect, for 1598 to 1602 was a period of intense speculation about the precise form fulfilled time would take, if only because 1600 was thought of as a likely apocalyptic year.

Shakespeare's idea of ripeness, of maturity in time—both spiritual and intellectual—is more complex than Taylor's notion of physical perfection as amounting to ripeness in *As You Like It*. The twenty-five-year-old country bumpkin William may, as Touchstone admits, be physically ripe, but—as his ignorance of Latin suggests—he scarcely can be said to have attained intellectual distinction. In *As You Like It*, Shakespeare plays off different kinds of ripeness within the same character and among characters. A question gradually posed in the play is whether the characters' acts of seizing opportune moments coincide with a time of most significant personal ripeness: that of fulfilled spiritual or intellectual growth. For Rosalind and Orlando, the question concerns the degree to which their individual ripening as lovers coincides with the final spiritual *kairos* of the play: their re-creation of Adam and Eve's marriage.⁸

Whatever fulfillment the characters of *As You Like It* achieve must occur at moments within certain unalterable time frames. The first moment involves the principle of primogeniture, of the inheritance rights of the eldest among sons, always ahead of his brothers because he is born first in time. "I know you are my eldest brother," Orlando tells Oliver at the play's beginning, "and in the gentle condition of blood you should so know me. The courtesy of nations allows you my better, in that you are the first-born; but that same tradition takes not away my blood, were there twenty brothers betwixt us" (1.1.41–46). Cruelly kept a virtual peasant by his brother, Orlando certainly has a complaint; yet playgoers should notice that he is not challenging Oliver's superior legal rights but his older brother's inhumane, legally irremediable treatment of him. A satiric remark of Touchstone's suggests

that Orlando would do wrong by trying forcibly to overthrow Oliver or to deprive him of his rights by primogeniture. Touchstone refers to Celia's father, the younger brother who has wrongfully deposed the elder brother, Duke Senior, as "old Frederick" (1.2.76). The incongruous adjective amounts to Touchstone's barbed comment on the violation of primogeniture—that is, on the "elder" position that Frederick has unjustly seized. By making the court usurper the younger brother, Shakespeare throws his audience's sympathy behind Duke Senior and behind the principle of the first-born's rights. While he obviously was interested in portraying abuses of privileges granted by the principle of primogeniture, Shakespeare, in his depiction of the two Dukes and their relationship, implies that the principle nevertheless deserves respect.⁹ The playwright was, after all, the eldest of John Shakespeare's four sons. Orlando must overcome Oliver within the framework fixed by a rule based on his inferiority in time, the time of birth order.

In the very first episode of *As You Like It*, intricate play on the word *boy* suggests that Orlando has already attained not only a certain physical maturity but a spiritual ripeness as well. Challenged by Orlando's claims that his brother has reduced him to the status of a peasant, Oliver strikes Orlando and attempts to remind him of his inferior place as youngest brother by exclaiming, "What, boy!" (1.1.49). Orlando, grasping his assailant, resents Oliver's insult more than the blow: "Come, come, elder brother, you are too young in this" (1.1.50–51). Orlando implies that, while Oliver may be the eldest brother, he is the younger in strength and skill in fisticuffs. When frightened Oliver asks, "Wilt thou lay hands on me, villain?" (1.1.52), Orlando replies, "I am no villein. I am the youngest son of Sir Rowland de Boys. He was my father, and he is thrice a villain that says such a father begot villeins" (1.1.53–55). Within the context of Oliver's insult "What, boy!" the father's name, by linguistic association, pointedly links Orlando to the patriarch.¹⁰ The phrase "Sir Rowland of the Boys" suggests a special boyishness, a perpetual youthfulness that still exists in the strength of the respectful son.¹¹ Concerning Oliver's abusiveness, Orlando exclaims, "The spirit of my father grows strong in me, and I will no longer endure it" (1.1.65–66). The spirit of the deceased, paternal boy lives in the boy devoted to his memory—his youngest son. Unintentionally, Oliver has been the catalyst for the spiritual recovery of a dead father's youth within a loving, neglected son.

Appearing at the moment he is beckoned to come, Charles the Wrestler comes to tell Oliver that Orlando's tender age predicts the youth's fatal defeat in the wrestling of the next day. Unexpectedly provided with the means of getting rid of Orlando, Oliver slanders his brother, so that Charles determines to kill him during their bout. Smugly, Oliver concludes the scene by echoing the insulting word that precipitated Orlando's

anger: "Nothing remains but that I kindle the boy thither, which now I'll go about" (1.1.160–61). Ironically, Oliver has identified his brother by the surname linking him with his father, the old/young boyishness that will triumph over Charles.

Just as in *The Merchant of Venice* Bassanio wins Portia's love in a relatively brief passage of time, so Orlando wins an admiring lady's heart quickly. Unlike Bassanio, however, Orlando *consciously* does not undergo a trial to win the woman's love. When he wrestles Charles, he has no knowledge of Rosalind's affection. In fact, his aim in wrestling seems to be only to reassure himself privately of his worth, a reassurance that at the time can have no material advantage. Thus, regarded from Orlando's perspective, his seizure of Opportunity's forelock appears inconsequential, virtually worthless. Nevertheless, Orlando's seizing the moment coincides with (perhaps precipitates) spiritual *kairos*: Orlando's strength while wrestling is not only that of the deceased Rowland; it is also that of Hercules. John Doebler has demonstrated that Charles's invitation, "Come, where is this young gallant that is so desirous to lie with his mother earth?" (1.2.183–84), evokes the myth of Hercules wrestling with the giant Antaeus.¹² The figure of Hercules is not Charles, however. As the match begins, an admiring Rosalind shouts, "Now Hercules be thy speed, young man!" (1.2.193–94). At the moment of grappling, Hercules' strength joins with that of Sir Rowland de Boys within Orlando, making possible an apparent physical impossibility: his defeat of the previously invincible Charles. For a moment, the heroic past intersects with Frederick's court; the spirit of Hercules providentially returns to defeat an incarnation of Antaeus.¹³

As interpreted by Renaissance humanists, the myth of Hercules and Antaeus signifies reason's overthrow of the passions, associated with the base earth. Renewed each time he falls upon his mother Earth, Antaeus is defeated when Hercules lifts him off the ground, squeezing the life from him. Shakespeare's reprising of this myth in *As You Like It* implies symbolically that Orlando has reasonably triumphed not over his passions for Rosalind (which scarcely exist at this instant) but over his angry desire for revenge against Oliver. While collaring his brother, Orlando does not harm him. It is his virtuous self-control, figured in the wrestling, that justifies Rosalind's love. This recovery of a moment from the Heroic Age invites comparison with variations of the temporal phenomenon presented early in the play. Like the former Sir Rowland, Orlando's servant, old Adam, possesses a boyish spirit. "[A]lmost fourscore" (2.4.72), he maintains that

Though I look old, yet I am strong and lusty,
For in my youth I never did apply
Hot and rebellious liquors in my blood,

Nor did not with unbashful forehead woo
 The means of weakness and debility.
 Therefore my age is as a lusty winter,
 Frosty but kindly.

(2.4.48–54)

In his spirit, Adam is not vicious or cynical, that is to say, “old.” Deeply moved by Adam’s charitable offer of service, Orlando exclaims: “O good old man, how well in thee appears / The constant service of the antique world, / Where service sweat for duty, not for meed!” (2.4.57–59). Orlando believes that, in Adam, he has witnessed the sudden showing forth of a Classical virtue in a faithless modern world. Even as Duke Senior believes that the Edenic life can be recovered in the forest of Arden, so Orlando thinks that virtues of an age past can suddenly reappear in a good man such as Adam. Both Duke Senior and Orlando do not believe that the world’s aging necessarily entails the absolute loss of a previous time and the virtues associated with it.

Nevertheless, while Adam’s spirit may be young, he shows unmistakable signs of his advanced age. He himself supplies the first piece of evidence as he and Orlando flee the court:

At seventeen years, many their fortunes seek,
 But at fourscore, it is too late a week.
 Yet fortune cannot recompense me better
 Than to die well, and not my master’s debtor.

(2.3.74–77)

Adam’s spirit is not so young that it can silence the natural pessimism of old age. His old body, momentarily overruling his spirit, persuades him that he is too aged to enjoy a new, beneficial fortune. Dramatic events soon contradict his weary conviction that the *ars moriendi bene*, the art of dying well (in no man’s debt), can be his only recompense. The duty of the ancient world may appear in Adam’s behavior, but he does not powerfully realize a heroic epiphany, as Orlando does—an epiphany that supersedes his pessimism.

Likewise, Duke Senior does not recover the Golden Age by leading the pastoral life. In his eloquent, idealized portrait of this way of life (2.1.1–17), he seems to have attained the timelessness of the Golden Age. In the forest of Arden, Duke Senior claims that

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.”

(2.1.5–11)

The Golden Age was a timeless realm, a perpetual spring of happiness and innocence and leisure. It was during the subsequent Silver Age that the god Jupiter shortened the Spring and divided it into the four seasons. Duke Senior says he does not feel “[t]he seasons’ difference,” the growth, lapse, and progression of each of the four seasons—as though all were a perpetual spring or summer in the forest of Arden. But he *does* obviously feel in Arden the pain of the winter’s wind, which he rationalizes as a benign influence like a harsh counselor’s good advice. In a related vein, Charles the Wrestler characterizes the Duke and his courtiers’ life in exile as one in which they “fleet the time carelessly, as they did in the golden world” (1.1.112–13). But, as previously mentioned, time did not “fleet,” pass swiftly, during the Golden Age. It stood still. Swiftly experiencing time seems to be a dominant temporal experience of the fallen world, of everyday ordinary life and its pressures. Andrew Marvell in his celebrated poem, “To his coy Mistress,” wishes that he and his shy mistress “[h]ad but world enough, and time” for coy wooing and love, a long time imaginatively equivalent to Classical or biblical ages, but “at [his] back [he] always hear[s] / Time’s winged chariot hurrying near” (1, 21–22).¹⁴ Feeling “fleeting” time in the iron age of seventeenth-century England, Marvell urges not simply *carpe diem*, seizing the opportune present moment for love making, but also the romantic act that will make “our sun . . . run” rather than “[s]tand still”—pass meaningfully, perhaps even faster than the impression of its everyday swift revolution.

A place of great antiquity, the forest of Arden in Duke Senior’s imagination neither registers a perpetual Spring nor measures a “fleeting” time. Instead, it is a place where time seems to pass slowly. At least, it seems to do so for pastoral exiles such as Duke Senior and Jaques. They only seem to lead the life of leisure associated with the mythical Golden Age. The “custom” that has made Duke Senior’s life in the woods “more sweet / Than that of painted pomp” is “old” (2.1.2–3); the root of the oak under which Jaques lies is “antic” [“antique”] (2.1.31). The regular appearance of “the winter’s wind” that “feelingly persuade[s]” Duke Senior of his mortality depends upon the temporal revolution of the seasons, whose “difference” (decorous natural working) Duke Senior does not appear to want to rush (2.1.7, 11, 6). At no moment does Rosalind’s father appear to wish to seize in a traditional sense an irrecoverable experience or value from the passage of time, understandably so perhaps since the human instinct to do so is usually associated with the perception of a disturbing accelerating time in the passage of life (a perception the Duke seems to lack).

An epiphany of time, of *kairos* in the spiritual, divine sense, occurs in the forest of Arden when Orlando carries Adam, faint from hunger, on his back to the Duke's banquet. A reenactment of Aeneas piously bearing his father, Anchises, appears onstage; a moment from the story of Troy, as told by Virgil, lives again.¹⁵ Orlando's surprising reference to himself as a "doe" and to Adam as his "faun" ["fawn"] needing sustenance underscores the special relationship between heroic deeds and time (2.7.127–29). Rather than suggesting something unorthodox about Orlando's sexuality, his likening himself to a doe reflects the strength of his desire to succor Adam, a desire stereotyped as maternal. More important, by likening Adam to a fawn, Orlando stresses the youthful spirit of Adam. In the case of Adam, the playgoer has the impression of time running backward in Orlando's metaphor, as it will soon seem to do in the recovery—the seizing—of a heroic moment when the image of a pious "son" carrying a reverend "father" to safety, away from death by burning, appears onstage.¹⁶

In Orlando's speaking picture of filial piety, the Heroic Age providentially returns for an instant for those with eyes and ears to perceive it. A Judeo-Christian dimension within this heroic moment suddenly appears when Adam trusts that "[H]e that doth the ravens feed, / Yea providentially caters for the sparrow" will comfort him in a wilderness (2.3.44–45). Heard here is a Judeo-Christian conflation of texts: Psalm 147:9, Luke 12:24, and Job 38:41 (on God's feeding ravens); Matthew 10:29 and Luke 12:6 (on God's concern for the sparrows). Dropped manna, however, does not succor Adam; Orlando's charitable deeds do instead. The Judeo-Christian coloring that Adam's faith acquires invests Orlando's charity with a Judeo-Christian virtue in addition to a Classical virtue. Absent from Duke Senior's philosophy of pastoral life is the importance of well-doing in the Sidneyan sense of active deeds of charity that issue from right thinking. Physics—noble, compassionate doing—must complement Duke Senior's Edenic metaphysics, his passive meditation, for his philosophy to have worth. Orlando's charitable deed, his bearing of Adam on his back, represents his seizing the opportune moment for his and Adam's personal advantage (*kairos* in the Classical sense), an act apparently eliciting and justifying the sudden epiphany of Judeo-Christian time (*kairos* in the religious sense). This epiphany confirms the inner ripeness of both Orlando's filial piety and his charity, virtues that complement the earlier expression of his physical ripeness, his Herculean strength.

Shakespeare takes pains in *As You Like It* to sketch life devoid of special recoveries or manifestations of time at any perceived speed. As Jaques reports, Touchstone, contemplating his portable sundial in the forest, says:

"It is ten o'clock.

Thus may we see," quoth he, "how the world wags.

'Tis but an hour ago since it was nine,
 And after one hour more 'twill be eleven.
 And so from hour to hour, we ripe and ripe,
 And then from hour to hour, we rot and rot;
 And thereby hangs a tale."

(2.7.22–28)

Whatever wisdom Jaques hears in Touchstone's meditation pertains to satire on contemporary life; he refers to Touchstone's moralizing of "*the time*" (2.7.29, my italics) rather than to his moralizing on time as a meta-physical subject. The playgoer, however, appreciates Touchstone's anatomy of time as philosophical speculation.¹⁷ Jaques' conclusion, "'And thereby hangs a tale,'" heard in the context of his earlier utterance "'how the world wags,'" creates a pun—*tale/tail*—that evokes a four-legged creature—a dog, presumably.¹⁸ Considering the bleakness of life as lived in the time of Touchstone's depiction, the playgoer finds this metaphoric slanting downward toward animal life appropriate. A dog, in comparison to humankind, presumably experiences time as a valueless and unvalued process of physical ripening and rotting. Shakespeare stylistically strengthens playgoers' impression of time drained of enriching value through Touchstone's thrice-repeated "'and,'" a conjunction beginning four successive verses and creating a paratactic syntax relatively rare in the Shakespeare of 1599/1600. By Touchstone's account, existence in the "wagging" world consists of a relatively slow movement of time, of a fixed sequence of ripening and rotting moments, none of which is more or less important than any other, none of which is subordinate to a central moment realizing a meaningful design or life goal.¹⁹

Conspicuously absent from Touchstone's portrait of time's depressing progress is any mention of cresting, the moment of fullest ripeness, the moment celebrated in several Shakespearean Sonnets, such as 5, 6, and 15, as the instant when the flower and the Young Man "hold in perfection." And yet it is precisely this moment and its value that Touchstone's account of time implicitly (and almost certainly unintentionally) emphasizes. The jester's portrait of time suggests that a capitalized-upon moment of full ripeness—whatever that may mean—lends value to an otherwise physical existence that, in its biological flowing and ebbing, does not differ materially from that of a dog. Considered in a wider sense, this moment may occur in a life at times other than those of singular physical, intellectual, or spiritual cresting. Without seized, epiphanic moments of fulfillment, the tale that hangs from Touchstone's re-creation of time could be the tale of Oliver, hirsute and forlorn in the forest, never rescued by Orlando or else killed by the serpent and lioness threatening him.²⁰ Quite simply, it could be the tale of a vicious man who dies in despair after a period of

both physical and spiritual rotting in a forest without any seized moments essential to the realization of a spiritual self.

Wanting to hear social satire in Touchstone's musings, Jaques overlooks in the jester's meditation a complex suggestion that affects him along with the rest of humankind. Struck "that fools should be so deep-contemplative," Jaques states that he "did laugh sans intermission / An hour by his dial" (2.7.31–33). In other words, Jaques wastes his time by demonstrating that he has not seized the moment to fathom the implications of Touchstone's speech. Because his laughter is egoistically scornful, Jaques's overlooking the burden of Touchstone's remarks reflects a degree of poetic justice. Touchstone himself obviously believes that the forest offers no moment of ripeness worth seizing.²¹ Interjected between scenes in which Orlando succors Adam and himself (2.6; 2.7.88–135, 167–73), Touchstone's meditation on time is framed by the actions necessary for Orlando's seizing the moment for his own and Adam's preservation.

The pessimism of Touchstone's version of time's progress recurs in Jaques' portrait of humankind's seven ages, of an account of courtly or civilized time that complements Touchstone's pastoral analysis of the subject. Like Touchstone, Jaques does not imply that the good things in life can be seized at opportune instants. In fact, his account of the seven ages reflects neither a ripening nor a rotting process; it leads neither toward nor away from a moment of fulfilled being. His word pictures, for the most part, express his cynical outlook on life: the infant mewls and pukes in the nurse's arms; the schoolboy whines, "creeping like a snail / Unwillingly to school"; the lover sighs "like furnace, with a woeful ballad / Made to his mistress' eyebrow" (2.7.14–45, 148–49). In Jaques' view, neither education nor love ripens scholar and lover. "Seeking the bubble reputation / Even in the cannon's mouth" (2.7.152–53), the soldier of the fourth age illustrates Jaques' belief that the chief moment seized in life often proves fatal because it is pursued recklessly. With no personally meaningful crest of inner ripeness, humankind's life slips into one of words, not deeds, into a language most likely unappreciated and then lost to the speaker altogether. The corpulent justice's "wise saws and modern instances" (2.7.156) surely fall on bored ears; and the sixth age, that of "the lean and slippered pantaloon," turns toward a "childish treble," in which the aged man—clownish in the overtones of "pantaloon"—"pipes / And whistles in his sound" (2.7.157, 162–63). The emptiness of the seventh age, humankind's final days, resounds in Jaques' image of "second childishness and mere oblivion, / Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything" (2.7.165–66). Rather than impel humankind upward to ripeness and a redemptive moment and then downward naturally, consolingly, to death, time, according to Jaques, moves

in a depressing circle from first to second childhood without providing occasions for special instants of personal triumph. Even though his portrait lacks Touchstone's suggestions of bestial life (such as the wagging tail), Jaques' tracing of time's course reduces humankind's dignity at least as much as Touchstone's does.²²

Touchstone's and Jaques' meditations on time are largely designed to raise the question of whether Rosalind and Orlando will recognize an opportune moment of ripeness in their romantic love and be able to seize it in betrothal and marriage. To do so, they must overcome a built-in challenge, the protracted period usually required for romantic love to ripen into permanent affection. While Rosalind falls "into so strong a liking with old Rowland's youngest son . . . on . . . a sudden" (1.3.25–27), it will take time for her "liking" to mature. Shakespeare elsewhere in *As You Like It* implies that both learning the worth of someone and acquiring the intellectual capacity to accomplish complex tasks usually take a considerable part of a life span. Pleading with her father to rescind Rosalind's exile, Celia argues that over time she has come to know the worth of her cousin. As Rosalind's girlish playmate, she "was too young that time to value her, / But now [she] know[s] her" (1.3.69–70). Later, during Touchstone's and William's dialogue, the jester sarcastically terms William's age of twenty-five years "ripe" (5.1.20). A raw youth, fostered by an uncultivated life spent in the forest, William, although polite and apparently warm-hearted, lacks intellectual ripeness. If William is the playwright's comic alter ego, as several critics have proposed,²³ then the point about the lengthy time needed for ripening is even more complex. At twenty-five, the thirty-four- or thirty-five-year-old creator of *As You Like It* was most likely writing aesthetically immature works such as the *Henry VI* trilogy, which he himself almost certainly recognized as unripe compared to intervening plays such as *The Merchant of Venice* and *Henry V*. Regarded in this context, the memorable, exquisite artistry of *As You Like It* suggestively reflects a certain *kairos* in Shakespeare's personal life, a ripe flowering: the result of his seizure in 1599 of a moment, or moments, for the creation of a work expressive of important meditations on time and how and when it possibly operates beneficially for certain men and women, including playwrights.

Shakespeare metaphorically establishes the forest as a place of ripening for Orlando and his love by having Celia tell Rosalind that she "found him under a tree, like a dropped acorn" (3.2.226–27). Throughout the pastoral scenes of *As You Like It*, Shakespeare counterpoints the lovers' eagerness to fulfill or memorialize their love instantaneously with references to the time required for its growth. Orlando expresses his desire for Rosalind in inflated, adolescent poetry in which his impatience colors his view of

humankind's relatively "brief" life span. One of his written "civil sayings" (3.2.123), proposed for hanging on a bough, chronicles

...how brief the life of man
Runs his erring pilgrimage,
That the stretching of a span
Buckles in his sum of age.
(3.2.124–27)

Carving his love thoughts into trees and hanging sheets of poetry from their boughs, Orlando seeks to seize a moment (though not in a particularly significant way) to protect his romantic passion from time's ravages. By turning the leaves (*silvae*) of the forest into the leaves (*silvae*) of the book of Nature, Orlando illustrates the pastoral lover's impulse to make the quality of his love permanent. And yet the puerility of his sentiments suggests that the eventual loss of their record through the decay of tree bark and leaves might be appropriate. Objecting to the "false gallop" of Orlando's discovered verses, Touchstone quips that the tree bearing them "yields bad fruit" (3.2.109, 112). In one sense, Orlando's poetry is rotten before ripe.

That Touchstone thinks Orlando's verses "rotten" is confirmed by Rosalind's immediate allusion to the medlar tree, fascinating to Renaissance poets. Answering Touchstone tit for tat in defense of her lover, she declares, "[Y]ou'll be rotten ere you be half-ripe, and that's the right virtue of the medlar" (3.2.115–16). Touchstone's wise foolishness is generally rotten in the sense that it resembles the cynical commentary of an old man. And yet linking Orlando to the medlar is apt; like the medlar, rotting before it mellow, his imagination may in time ripen into a finer expression of romantic love than his bad poetry promises. Mainly, however, Oliver illustrates the truth of Rosalind's assertion that, in some respects, people occasionally rot before they ripen. Oliver's reformation is meaningful because he has been an egregious villain; paradoxically, his spiritual ripening develops out of, in fact gains significance from, his prior moral rottenness. To Rosalind's claim that time can rot before it ripens, Touchstone replies, "You have said; but whether wisely or no, let the forest judge" (3.2.117–18). The forest judges in Rosalind's favor by presenting Oliver asleep beneath an oak tree, in despair and ready for his sudden ethical ripening. On occasion, rottenness does possess a "right virtue." Earlier, when Adam offers Orlando gold and service, the depressed young man exclaims, "But, poor old man, thou prun'st a rotten tree, / That cannot so much as a blossom yield, / In lieu of all thy pains and husbandry" (2.3.64–66). But after a period of dark, inner rottenness caused prematurely by Oliver's neglect and abuse, Orlando romantically blooms under Rosalind's cultivation. The positive effect upon characters of the inversion, so to say, of time's natural progress

suggests that further remarkable warping of the medium may occur in Arden.

While Orlando wastes his time in the forest by rhapsodizing Rosalind, she resolves to seize the moment. She determines to test Orlando—to physic him, actually—to see if his clichéd poetry proceeds from a form of self-love—from his being in love with love. In effect, Rosalind seeks—prematurely, we learn later—to discover whether time has ripened Orlando into a mature, clear-sighted lover. By playing the role of shrew under her disguise as Ganymede, she hopes to purge him homeopathically of any egoism concerning his love for her.²⁴ When Rosalind argues that “[m]en have died from time to time, and worms have eaten them, but not for love” (4.1.97–98), her cynicism is carefully calculated to counteract Orlando’s foolish belief that Petrarchan lovers expire from unrequited passion for their mistresses. Yet by naming Hero and Leander and Troilus and Cressida as legendary couples who died not for love, as poets feign, but (in the cases of the men) ignominiously, from a swimmer’s cramp and a “Grecian club” (4.1.90), Rosalind hits upon an important truth. Neither Leander nor Troilus managed to seize a moment opportune for consummating his love so as to avoid personal tragedy. Certainly Rosalind, optimistic and life-loving, does not want to die in a tragic manner similar to those of the lovers described by Marlowe and Chaucer. She knows that she and Orlando must be alert in order to recognize the time to crown their love prosperously, so that they do not likewise end up the subjects of future poets’ tragic verse. But crowning their love prosperously will not, by itself, perpetuate them. Begetting a child through the agency of marriage will do so, in keeping with an argument of Shakespeare’s early Sonnets, in the sense that wedded Rosalind and Orlando will have tapped into a temporal cycle made visible by the annual rotation of the four seasons with its adumbrated potential through the series of one child eventually begetting another of nullifying the finality of individual death. Crowning a moment of romantic love prosperously, seizing it, with the consequence of marriage with a consequent child and the tapping into a temporal seasonal cycle of potential perpetuity, is what real-life equivalents of Hero and Leander (and what Christopher Marlowe) could not or did not do.

In act 2, scene 4, Orlando appears unable to use time to his advantage; he has missed his first appointment with his physician, Ganymede, who, naturally enough, interprets his absence as a sign of weak love for Rosalind (3.4.1–29). Apparently, Orlando is not Rosalind’s true lover, or his sighs and groans would have marked time until the moment of his meeting with “Rosalind” (3.2.293–97). Perhaps the lover is too green for Rosalind to seize the moment for refining his affection. Still, it is in her sanguine nature to take the opportunity to try to educate others. Rather than scorn the pageant

of Silvius's painful love for Phoebe and her proud rejection of him, Rosalind determines to "prove a busy actor in their play" (3.4.54). She berates Phoebe for her pride and ingratitude, attempting to correct her vices through direct, personal criticisms. Her near insults conclude with a *carpe diem*:

But, mistress, know yourself; down on your knees
 And thank heaven, fasting, for a good man's love;
 For I must tell you friendly in your ear,
 Sell when you can. You are not for all markets.
 (3.5.58–61)

Like Orlando, however, Phoebe is not ready to hear and understand Rosalind's blunt wisdom. Rosalind may be, once again, prematurely attempting to seize a moment. Inwardly unripe, Phoebe vainly falls in love with Ganymede's feminine face, a mirror image of the beauty she cherishes in herself.

When Orlando does appear for his session of therapy, he states that he has come "within an hour" of the time appointed (4.1.38–39). As Rosalind herself has pointed out, there is no clock in the forest to synchronize its inhabitants' subjective perceptions of time's pace (3.2.298–320). Driven by passion, Rosalind, however, internally computes time more exactly than Orlando does: "Break an hour's promise in love! He that will divide a minute into a thousand parts and break but a part of the thousand part of a minute in the affairs of love, it may be said of him that Cupid hath clapped him o'th' shoulder, but I'll warrant him heart-whole" (4.1.40–44). While Rosalind's unreasonably exacting reprimand is primarily part of her physic of confronting Orlando with exaggerated versions of his love conceits in order to refine or purge them, it also expresses her genuine impatience that her love is still unfulfilled. In her memorable account of time's various paces, she characterizes herself as the young maid with whom it "trots hard."²⁵ Time in this respect passes "fleetingly" for her. Earlier, she jokes that if the interval between her betrothal and wedding "be but a se'nnight, time's pace is so hard that it seems the length of seven year" (3.2.305–6). Rosalind's unfeigned desire to hasten time makes her feel the truth of her claim that true lovers painstakingly, almost unnaturally, compute the time until their next meeting.

When Orlando promises to return in two hours at two o'clock, Rosalind, who has chided him for being an hour late for his first appointment, emphasizes that she will think him a "break-promise" if he comes "one minute behind [his] hour" (4.1.176, 174–75). Orlando does break his promise when seizing a spiritually redemptive moment takes precedence over courting her. Hastening toward the Duke's banquet, he discovers a ragged Oliver sleeping beneath an oak tree, threatened by a serpent and a

lioness. (Shakespeare accentuates time's ravages on the outcast Oliver by making the oak partly rotten with age; its "high top" is "bald with dry antiquity" [4.3.106] even as Oliver is "o'ergrown with hair" [4.3.107]). After twice resolving to leave his betraying brother to his death, Orlando turns back to battle and kill the lioness, thus saving Oliver's life. Orlando courageously seizes an opportune moment in the passage of time's natural ripening and rotting to express his brotherly love. In doing so, he momentarily recovers the Heroic Age; his fight reprises Hercules' slaying of the Nemean lion.²⁶ The epiphanies of *kairos* in *As You Like It* outline a progression in Orlando's case from the expression of ripened physical strength, through an act of filial piety, to an ultimate deed of brotherly love. In each instance, mythic allusion indicates that Orlando has recovered a moment of the antique time. Traditionally, the lion is a figure of wrath; the playgoer understands that Orlando has triumphed over anger (both his own and Oliver's) through the heroic fury of his fight.²⁷ In this sense, he realizes the heroic potential of the Renaissance name—Orlando Furioso.²⁸

And yet *kairos* in this instance is also predictably Judeo-Christian. Orlando fails to keep the romantic lover's excruciatingly precise time because a greater love, that of a forgiving brother for his reprobate kinsman, compels him to seize the moment. This fulfilled moment, which prompts Oliver's spiritual transformation, redeems the rottenness of time, symbolized by Oliver's timeworn appearance and the oak's dead boughs. The fact that time, in the course of Nature, rots all creatures, including humankind, argues for the necessity, even the duty, of capitalizing upon the rare opportune moments when a massive difference involving love and charity might be made. In a moment, even now, Orlando crystallizes Oliver's latent virtue—and his own, as he comes to learn. Contrary to the spirit of Rosalind's claim that no lover ever died for love, Orlando almost loses his life for love—not the romantic love that she characterizes but brotherly love, a more idealized affection in both the Classical and the Judeo-Christian senses of the phrase.

Shakespeare has taken pains to suggest that providence has a special interest in Orlando and Rosalind's love and marriage,²⁹ in the institution that can sanctify the creative means of tapping into the potential perpetuity of the seasonal cycle of generation(s). In response to Celia's comment about finding Orlando under a tree like a fallen acorn, Rosalind says, "It may well be called Jove's tree when it drops forth such fruit" (3.2.228–29). Orlando's decisive manifestation of character takes place beneath another oak, an ancient one but nevertheless Jove's tree.³⁰ The counterpoint of arboreal imagery stresses two extremes of time, that of budding, the precursor to ripening, and that of the ravages of age. But the coincidence of trees suggests that Jove may have a hand in guiding the action. This

possibility should not surprise playgoers; as Ganymede, Rosalind is Jove's faithful servant, and the god—so to say—rewards her with happiness.

Orlando's expressions of filial piety and brotherly love complement his physical strength and conclusively demonstrate the ripeness of his spiritual character. At play's end, Rosalind accepts a suitor whose selfless love has been proved by his rescue of Oliver and by his dutiful sending of the bloody handkerchief as an explanation of his failure to keep his lover's appointment. But has Orlando ripened as a romantic lover—one worthy of the more mature Rosalind? In the scene in which Rosalind describes the "pair of stairs" that "incontinent" Oliver and Celia will climb to marriage (5.2.1–39), Orlando indicates that the sport of imagining Ganymede as Rosalind is wearing thin. Oliver's and Celia's prospect of fulfilled happiness makes Orlando's loneliness and his unrealized love bitter. "I can live no longer by thinking" (5.2.48), he sadly tells Rosalind, suggesting that he, unlike Jaques, is ready to involve himself actively in life. Has Rosalind's homeopathic physic purged Orlando's romantic love of its impurities? She tests him to see if his artificial, Petrarchan way of conceiving his love has vanished. "O, my dear Orlando," she cries, "how it grieves me to see thee wear thy heart in a scarf." "It is my arm," he replies. "I thought thy heart had been wounded with the claws of a lion," she jokes, coining the homonymic pun of *heart/hart*. "Wounded it is," Orlando answers, "but with the eyes of a lady" (5.2.19–24). While Shakespeare has presented the metaphorical truth of this reply of Orlando, most notably in the lacerating effect of Ganymede's eyes upon Phoebe's sensibility, Orlando appears to be too invested in an imaginative reality. He believes that, figuratively speaking, he suffers from the lover's bleeding heart.³¹ Rosalind's therapy has not helped him to disengage himself somewhat from the metaphoric dimension of what amounts to a metaphoric way of understanding the nature of romantic love. One could thus say that Orlando remains romantically unripe (or perhaps romantically overripe).³² Orlando's frustrating overinvestment in an imaginative reality concerning romantic love reaches its pitch in his pronouncement that he "can live no longer by thinking." Only the real physical possession of Rosalind in marriage can properly educate Orlando. Only it can be the *kairos* toward which he and Rosalind tend.

The pastoral phase of *As You Like It* begins in the wintry season of adversity that, although sweet for Duke Senior, includes churlish winds and cold weather. It ends in act 5, scene 3, in the springtime of the two Pages' song, "It was a lover and his lass" (5.3.15). By moving from winter to spring, pastoral time in the play promises rebirth and happiness. These goods, however, come only to the character who can seize the day. The Pages' spring lyric is a *carpe diem* of love. Lying "[b]etween the acres of the rye," the "pretty country-folks" of the song sing, "How that a life was but

a flower, / In spring-time" (5.3.21, 23, 29–30). The Pages directly advise their listeners "therefore [to] take the present time...for love is crownèd with the prime, / In spring-time" (5.3.33, 35). As a pleasant flower, "Rosa-linda," Rosalind herself is perhaps about to fade, to decline from the "prime" of her physical beauty. The song's burden justifies her seizing the moment to orchestrate her appearance and thus her own and the other lovers' fulfillment. Still, doing so in lovers' springtime is premature when considered from the perspective of late summer or of early autumn, the season symbolic of humankind's inner, nonphysical ripeness. It is no accident that the imagery of springtime in Prospero's masque of Ceres in *The Tempest* is at first relatively colorless and barren but gradually becomes richer as Iris moves toward the fulfillment promised by August's sicklemen and the blessing "Spring come to you at the farthest / In the very end of harvest!" (*The Tempest*, 4.1.114–15). The tension within the Pages' song in *As You Like It* underscores Rosalind's haste to wed an Orlando who, by being too naively invested in an imaginative reality, has not intellectually ripened to the degree she has. After all, the cornfield of the song is "green" (5.3.17) rather than golden. Still, life is but a flower, "crownèd with the prime" (5.3.35)—where "prime" ambiguously connotes the second, spiritually unripe canonical hour as well as the crown of natural time and ripeness, before the pattern of inevitable decay sets in.³³ Love may be crowned with the prime, but as regards the development of the lover's mind, or intellect, that crowning usually does not appear in the springtime of Nature. Still, whatever the case, marrying, whether in the springtime or summer of life (when generation is possible), becomes the sanctified institution—as previously mentioned—for begetting the child who begins the series of generations of children who introduce the original couple into the potentially perpetual cycle of the seasons, both human and natural, with the aged grandparent seeing his or her rebirth in the new grandchild.

By announcing that she can "do strange things," having since the age of three "conversed with a magician, most profound in his art" (5.2.57, 58–59), Rosalind begins to coordinate the time of her own and others' happiness. Since the god Hymen mystically appears at Rosalind's command, we retrospectively believe her claim to magical power.³⁴ Having been a child prodigy, a very young learner of difficult magical arts, Rosalind contradicts Jaques' portrait of the barren, painful first and second ages of humankind. Ripe in a profoundly intellectual sense from a tender age, she mysteriously challenges the assumption that mental ripening necessarily, always, entails long years of lean and wasteful learning. While in *As You Like It* the showings forth of Hercules and Aeneas are figurative—avataristic, in fact—that of Hymen, the Classical god of marriage, is real, as I argue in later paragraphs of this chapter. In this respect, a moment from antiquity manifests

itself. Thus far, my focus in *As You Like It* has mainly been on the appearance of Classical moments and heroic deeds, in which a Judeo-Christian dimension has been detectable.³⁵ At times, however, unadulterated Christian allusions appear in the play. For example, the bloody handkerchief that represents Orlando's apology possesses Christian value when considered in the light of his martyr-like brotherly love and of his victory over a deadly sin.³⁶ Consistent with these and with other Christian allusions, time in *As You Like It* in a sense never calculated or controlled by the lovers appears to run backward from the present age so as to recover spiritually key moments in the story of Genesis and the Garden of Eden. The point may be put another way. One has the impression that time at the end of the play, having recovered redemptive moments of the Classical, the Heroic Age, has reached the age of Genesis and the Garden of Eden.

As the play unfolds, allusions to Old Testament events come progressively earlier in the chronology of the Jews' history. Jaques' exclamation—"I'll go sleep if I can. If I cannot, I'll rail against all the firstborn of Egypt" (2.5.56–57)—gives way to his remark "There is sure another flood toward, and these couples are coming to the ark" (5.4.35–36). As it reveals itself, time appears to deliver the characters of *As You Like It* to a paradisiacal locus near the beginning of early modern European religious history. Rosalind and Orlando recapture an Edenic experience of Adam and Eve.³⁷ Providentially time appears to roll backward as it dramatically runs forward; events in the play evocative of those described in Exodus give place to those based on a story in Genesis. In this respect, Shakespeare creates in *As You Like It* the same impression about time that he creates in *Hamlet*, the tragedy composed shortly after—or perhaps at the same time as—he wrote (or was writing) this late Elizabethan pastoral comedy.

There is a paradoxical "forward backward" movement of time in *Hamlet*, a movement enriching (and enriched by) this pivotal tragedy's numerous allusions to the Apocalypse.³⁸ Throughout *Hamlet*, the Prince and other characters, such as Polonius (2.2.382–85) and Osric (5.2.184–87), suggest that the society of Denmark is regressing to childhood. Allusive passages such as those describing the success of child actors and the "juvenile" audience tastes they satisfy extend the impression to include London and England (2.2.330–67). This impression that time runs backward as it moves forward in Denmark includes the regressive trajectory of Hamlet's mind, moving back through the times of Cain's murder of Abel and through those of Alexander and Caesar (5.1.75–77, 203–16). The most influential Tudor writer on the Apocalypse, John Bale, had claimed that childish regression was typical of a king (such as Henry VIII) and of his society in the final decades before the advent of the Apocalypse, which many Elizabethan writers predicted would occur on or shortly after the year 1600.³⁹ Bale, in *The*

Image of Bothe Churches (publ. 1547, 1550, 1551), had followed a popular tradition of dividing history into seven ages beginning with the death of Christ and located Doomsday in the short seventh age (the forty-two-month period of the Last Days suggested in the Book of Revelation).⁴⁰ The concept of seven apocalyptic ages also corresponded to the conceit of the seven ages of humankind, with the last Doomsday period matching the seventh, senile old age of a person—Jaques' word picture in *As You Like It* of "second childishness and mere oblivion, / Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything" (2.7.165–66). Shakespeare does not create a network of apocalyptic allusions in *As You Like It*. But he does provoke in this late Elizabethan comedy an impression within playgoers that time in the play runs backward as it runs forward, similar to a corresponding impression within the audience of *Hamlet*. One of the major differences between these impressions involves the unequivocal possibility in *As You Like It* that an unorthodox operation of time yields positive supernatural results.

Playgoers of course are not meant to think—nor do they think—that onstage time literally has run backward during the course of *As You Like It*. It seems discernibly to do so, however, so much so that playgoers accept the possibility that the god Hymen enters the play world. An unorthodox operation of time provides the opportunity for an unorthodox refiguration of space. At least Shakespeare creates the impression that this is happening onstage. The appearance of the Classical god implies that Shakespeare, so to say, metaphorically conceives of a metaphysical space close to the play's world and capable of penetrating it. Such a penetration is consistent with—and, in fact, a property of—the mode of allegory. As previously mentioned, Alice Lyle Scoufos has memorably interpreted allegorically the green world of *As You Like It*. The symbolic properties of Shakespeare's pastoral, according to Scoufos, link it to the Paradiso Terrestre as defined by Dante, Jacopo Sannazaro, and Sir Philip Sidney.⁴¹ In the final cantos of the *Purgatorio*, Virgil leaves Dante the pilgrim "at the outer limits of Eden—the post-lapsarian Eden that is still beautiful except for the giant Tree of Knowledge that stands tall, dry, and sere in the center of the garden. It is dead and wintry, much like the giant tree, 'bald with drie antiquitie,' that Oliver describes for Rosalind and Celia in *As You Like It*."⁴² For Alice Lyle Scoufos, Orlando's forgiveness of his brother and his victory over the symbolic snake and lioness make the garden and tree spiritually bloom again. "Archetypal images pull the pastoral setting suddenly into the mystical realm."⁴³ I would put the point differently. The mystical realm, shaping itself in the form of archetypal images, at moments suddenly intersects with, or intrudes upon, the pastoral setting of *As You Like It*.

How that happens is nicely illuminated by a famous passage in book 6 of Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, a passage that is not so much an

analogue to the epiphany of Hymen in *As You Like It* as an intertext (see this chapter, note 1). No doubt some readers will reject my assertion about a mystical realm intersecting with Shakespeare's forest of Arden, if for no other reason than the anachronistic phrasing of the notion that the god Hymen has traveled through the equivalent of a time warp to enter Arden. Certainly Shakespeare and Spenser would not have grasped, or very likely tolerated, the concept of either a time warp or a space warp. I should say that I am only using a twentieth-first-century temporal phrase as a convenient metaphor for expressing the nature of Hymen's sudden entry into the play's world. Sometimes a director of *As You Like It*, so as not to perplex postmodern playgoers unduly, indicates through the doubling of roles and visible bits of a previous costume that one of Duke Senior's foresters, or Corin, or Charles the Wrestler, or else some other relatively minor character in the play performs the role of Hymen,⁴⁴ by implication under the clever offstage casting and direction of resourceful Rosalind. (But where, one might legitimately ask, in the forest of Arden might Rosalind find a costume of the Roman god Hymen!) This director's decision, however, does not accord with the markedly symbolic overall character of *As You Like It*, in which a supernatural dimension of time and history materializes. Alternatively, commentators such as Brian Gibbons sometimes suggest that Hymen "is an evident metaphor for Christian marriage, devised to evade Elizabethan censorship [law forbidding] the presentation of a marriage service in a play."⁴⁵ Working against this interpretation are two facts: Hymen does not enact even the metaphoric equivalent of the language of the marriage service as it was known to late Elizabethan Protestants;⁴⁶ and Shakespeare elsewhere—e. g., Friar Francis's attempt to wed Hero and Claudio in *Much Ado About Nothing* (4.1.1–40)—shows no reluctance to stage a Christian marriage (or at least the first part of it).

What we see in the last act of *As You Like It* is indeed the god Hymen, in epiphany.⁴⁷ The obvious contemporary analogue for understanding this experience in *As You Like It* is the sudden showing forth of a god or goddess in a court masque, specifically a betrothal masque (like the Masque of Ceres in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and certain masques of Ben Jonson performed before King James and Queen Anna). Edmund Spenser, however, provides a distinctly late Elizabethan intertext for this epiphany of *As You Like It*: the showing forth of the Graces dancing on Mount Acidale in Colin Clout's and Calidore's vision in book 6, canto 10 of the 1596 edition of *The Faerie Queene* (6.10.5–30).⁴⁸ Extended analysis of this episode in Spenser's epic romance accentuates the fullness of meaning in the timeless moment of epiphany that Shakespeare makes us contemplate in Hymen's entry into Arden. And it does so in terms of the same context, that of pastoral space, that the playwright in his comedy employs.

The impression that *As You Like It* is the most “Spenserian” play in the Shakespeare canon between *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and *The Tempest*⁴⁹ recommends Colin Clout’s vision of the Graces as an intertext for better understanding Hymen’s epiphany. In this respect, Shakespeare in 1599/1600 could be said to be looking back as much to the relatively recent momentous 1596 appearance of the enlarged *Faerie Queene* (in fact, doubled in length) and to the dramatic method of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, as he was looking ahead some eight or nine years to a genre, the court masque (which would be in vogue with a King, a Queen, and with their courtiers who at the very end of the sixteenth century had not yet been named to ascend the royal throne of England). The epiphanies of the Graces and of Hymen share several features besides the pastoral context of divine showing forth. Both employ number symbolism to suggest the emergence of order from disorder: in this case, the even rather than the odd—four and eight respectively instead of three and one (the numerically odd, single person). In Colin Clout’s vision, the three dancing Graces, themselves surrounded by “An hundred naked maidens lilly white” (6.10.11.8), revolve about a fourth maid, worthy to be a fourth Grace (6.10.25.6–7), who can be said to complete the odd number of Classical Graces (by making them an even number, four). Likewise, by matching the odd single characters, Rosalind, Orlando, Celia, Oliver, Phoebe, Silvius, Audrey, and Touchstone, with their complementary mate, Hymen creates an even number eight, in four matched couples. Thus he illustrates literally his pronouncement, “Then is there mirth in heaven / When earthly things made even / Atone together” (5.4.103–5). Matching the couples Rosalind/Orlando, Celia/Oliver, Phoebe/Silvius, Audrey/Touchstone, Hymen ensures that no odd individual in groups of three, five, or seven is left. “[M]ade even” in this sense, the couples “atone together”: achieve a state of “at-oneness” (the condition—unequivocally in the cases of Rosalind and Orlando and Celia and Oliver—of being at one with oneself because each of the four is “at one” with a mate and “at one” in a large configuration of four couples). Even Duke Senior, whom Hymen has cued to give Rosalind to Orlando by placing her hand in Orlando’s, is “at one” in the sense that he—not the god—is the body that physically joins together two lovers who will become one flesh through marriage.

Furthermore, both Spenser’s and Shakespeare’s epiphanies are about the giving and receiving of gifts. Spenser reminds his readers that the Classical Graces are “[t]hose three [who] to men all gifts of grace do graunt” (6.10.15.4). Spenser soon specifies these gifts as those “[w]hich decke the body or adorne the mynde” to make the bearer gracious in the broadest sense of the term (10.23.2–3). These are the Graces who endow Spenser’s beloved, Elizabeth Boyle, the fourth “Grace,” with heavenly gifts

of beauty and gracious virtue. In fact, one could say that this maiden in effect becomes a Grace through the unprecedented immediacy and power of the bestowal of these gifts. Spenser's vision underscores the truth that to give gracious gifts is better than to receive them by describing the Graces in a visual configuration in which "two of them still forward seem'd to bee, / But one still towards shew'd her selfe afore" (6.10.24.7–8)—that is to say, in "their traditional order, as in Botticelli's *Primavera* . . . [wherein] one Grace has her back to us, facing the other two who come towards us, as [the word] forward suggests."⁵⁰ This visual tableau reinforces the idea of Colin's (Spenser's) conclusion to this stanza: "[t]hat good should from vs goe, then come in greater store" (6.10.24.9). Shakespeare also associates gracious giving with the epiphany of the deity of *As You Like It*. Hymen is the intermediary of heaven's gift of Rosalind to her father, Duke Senior ("Good Duke, receive thy daughter; / Hymen from heaven brought her" [5.4.106–7]). Shakespeare continues this emphasis upon gracious giving when Rosalind says first to her father, "To you I give myself, for I am yours," and then to Orlando, "To you I give myself, for I am yours" (5.4.111–12).⁵¹ "[B]arring confusion" (5.4.120), Hymen gives a specific blessing over Orlando and Rosalind ("You and you no cross shall part" [5.4.126]), and then over Celia and Oliver ("You and you are heart in heart" [127]), after he has directed them to clasp their beloved's hands (5.4.123–25). (The god's blessing is much less explicit in the case of Phoebe and Silvius and especially in that of Audrey and Touchstone).⁵² Hymen's gracious gift, in the final analysis, is wedding—marriage—"great Juno's crown, [the] blessed bond of board and bed" (5.4.136–37), by implication the gift of "people[ing]" (5.4.138) the towns, of insuring the continuity of society itself.⁵³

Editor Alan Brissenden glosses the phrase "Juno's crown" as "the greatest glory of Juno, protector of women and goddess of marriage."⁵⁴ The word "crown" echoes its sounding in the play's memorable song, where "life [is] but a flower," and "love is crownèd with the prime" (5.3.29, 35). By means of this subtle echo, Shakespeare indicates that the future time of marriage's full ripeness (when it is "crowned," so to say; when it royally wears a "crown") supersedes the relatively early physical prime, or "crown," of natural time—the time after which the lover as organism begins to decline physically, into a later age of spiritual mutual love, a later age in which the imagination can nevertheless richly compensate for time's ravaging hand. Shakespeare would soon express this temporal distinction in slightly different terms when, in *Twelfth Night*, he would have Viola/Cesario respond to Orsino's chauvinistic pronouncement that, in matters of love, "women are as roses, whose fair flower / Being once displayed, doth fall that very hour," by exclaiming, "And so they are. Alas that they are so, / To die even

when they to perfection grow!" (2.4.40–41). Adumbrated in the haunting latter verse of Viola/Cesario's is the complex notion of two nonsimultaneous moments in the life of most loving women (and men), the moment when she physically blossoms like a rose in her perfect beauty, and a later, perhaps aged, moment when she has grown beyond her physical lapses into a perfection of wisdom, or of spirituality, or of a related inner virtue. Shakespeare introduces this complex and paradoxical idea of two competing times of a lover's life in *As You Like It*, without the poignant overtones of potential tragedy in Viola/Cesario's later concise formulation of it. Still, as has been twice previously mentioned, it is the appearance of the child in the married couple's life, at whatever moment the child appears, that introduces the wedded couple into the potential cyclical perpetuity of the seasons of humankind made possible by the child's children's children.

Finally, the epiphanies of book 6, canto 10 of *The Faerie Queene* and *As You Like It* both call special attention to the very phenomenon of divine epiphany; that is to say, they both make the metaphysical status of epiphany a subject in itself. Spenser provides a lengthy allegorical "reading" of the Graces first seen simply as "a troupe of Ladies" (6.10.10.7) circled by many maidens, all of them moving rhythmically to Colin's shepherd's pipe. Remarkably, the poet does so twice, first in his own narrative voice (6.10.15–16) and then in Colin Clout's (21–27). Colin's symbolic interpretation of the divine Graces and of their heavenly virtues stresses, in his telling Calidore that they are evoked with difficulty and can vanish easily, the very phenomenon of epiphany itself. The astute reader applies Colin's message to Colin's alter-ego Spenser, who has himself decoded the allegory in this episode. In this process, the imaginative poet's ability to conjure divine epiphanies becomes one of the subjects of the episode. What, then, is the metaphysical status of the epiphany, if it can be conjured by a mortal artist and by his literary shadow? Is the epiphany real, or is it a shadow of the real? Shakespeare begs the same question during Hymen's appearance in *As You Like It*. The fact that directors through the years have felt compelled to call attention to a cast member's playing the role of Hymen testifies to the pressure that Hymen's appearance places on playgoers to decide whether the character is just an onstage actor or actually a god. My claim that Hymen is meant to be known as a god and not as a dressed-up mortal resident of the forest of Arden stems mainly from the logic of my argument in this chapter: that a play suggesting that moments from other times occasionally intersect with and appear in the present entails the possibility of the god Hymen appearing so as to bless Rosalind's and Celia's marriages.⁵⁵

Alice Lyle Scoufos's allegorical reading of the pastoral of *As You Like It* suggests that Shakespeare and Spenser occasionally shared a common

methodology and teleology. Shakespeare's manipulation of time appears less idiosyncratic when considered in relation to Spenser's in *The Faerie Queene*. In book 1, the saints living in the New Jerusalem that the Redcross Knight mystically sees from the Mount of Contemplation were once breathing men and women. A timeless moment is suddenly thrust into the chronological time of the Redcross Knight's holy pilgrimage. More to the point, Christ manifests himself in the person of Prince Arthur (1.7.29–8.28). Arthur's diamond shield, "perfect pure and cleene" (1.7.33.5), reveals a reality behind appearance and enables him to overthrow any enemy. His shield represents the perfection of faith (Eph. 6:16), making possible Christ/Arthur's triumphant crucifixion of his own flesh in the person of Orgoglio. Rather than say that Arthur is a type of Christ, readers can just as plausibly claim that the timeless fact of Christ's crucifixion and redemption manifests itself in a moment of a historical narrative concerned with two knights named Arthur and Redcross. Both Spenser and Shakespeare depict in a pastoral realm the intersection of the timeless with chronological, natural time.

It is as though key moments and personages in humankind's Classical and Christian past continue to exist in an unperceived dimension, alongside the appearing and vanishing instants of a sometimes fleeting, sometimes plodding, ongoing present, yet capable of penetrating the present and of exiting from it. When privileged characters such as Orlando and Rosalind, in the course of their ripening, charitably or bravely seize a propitious moment, profound spiritual events evocative of the past manifest themselves. In the epiphanies of these pregnant moments, the time of past ages can be said to be momentarily recovered. By creating these impressions, Shakespeare's play is late Elizabethan, a cousin of *The Faerie Queene*, a work removed from a postmodern sensibility. Superseding characterizations of time in *As You Like It* as the valueless vehicle for ripening and then rotting, and as the force that humans make stand still, go fast, or slow, depending upon their needs and vocations, are the alternative ideal representations of time and of a supernatural operation of time that late Elizabethan audiences were attuned to perceive and appreciate, especially so as the apocalyptic year 1600 drew near.⁵⁶ Robert Watson is typical of the majority of commentators on *As You Like It* who dismiss more than overlook these contemporary representations of time in the play, when he pronounces that "[t]ime [in this comedy] proves no more definite than space" and "[that] time... actually depends upon human subjectives" for not just its meaning but its very existence in a nature whose significance is constructed by, and limited by, the makeup of the human mind.⁵⁷ While there is some truth to this claim, it certainly does not constitute the whole truth about Shakespeare's late Elizabethan dramaturgy.

In *As You Like It*, Shakespeare gives a unique twist to the Renaissance commonplace of the recovery of a Golden Age in pastoral surroundings. By seizing opportune moments in a modern romance, Orlando and Rosalind recover the benefits of certain *kairoi* of humankind's history: a pattern of living that rewards filial piety, the heroic labor of controlling wrath, and the Judeo-Christian forgiveness of a Cain-like brother with the divine gift of a long-desired complementary self—the gift, that is, of divinely married love. With the theophany of Hymen, we have the impression that we are near the source of this history, for the Classical god reprises God's giving of Eve to Adam. Providence rewards Rosalind's magical seizing of the moment with an unanticipated *kairos* (in the Judeo-Christian sense): a spiritual epiphany of the creation and bestowal of Eve. Addressing Duke Senior, the god of marriage offers Rosalind as Orlando's helpmate:

Hymen from heaven brought her,
 Yea, brought her hither,
 That thou mightst join her hand with his
 Whose heart within his bosom is.

(5.4.107–10)

God took a rib from Adam's side to make him a companion who might remedy his loneliness; Hymen, through the agency of Rosalind's father, joins to Orlando the woman whose heart, in a way he has not understood, has been passionately beating in his breast.⁵⁸ Shakespeare plays an Aristophanic variation upon a biblical theme. Whereas God divided a whole (Adam) into two complementary beings, Shakespeare's Hymen ritualistically reincorporates man and woman into the single physical whole they yearn to be. Whereas God took Adam's rib to make Eve, Shakespeare depicts Rosalind's heart displaced within Orlando. In keeping with the generally greater complexity of character of his romantic heroines, Shakespeare makes woman rather than man the source of humankind's life.⁵⁹

Hymen's song thus suggests that time has carried the lovers back to the mysterious origin of romantic married love. Granted the solemn, mystical atmosphere of the final scene of *As You Like It*, one could easily overlook the imperfections of the Rosalind and especially of the Orlando who enact Eve's and Adam's roles. Obviously they are not the mother and father of humankind. Providential time in the play is such that, through spiritual *kairoi*, it allows imperfect yet privileged mortals to approximate archetypal personae in rituals of mythic proportions. Time will not stand still for them after their marriage, as it supposedly did in the Golden Age. Orlando's imagination as a lover may remain unripe, but his Christian charity qualifies him to enjoy in his reunion with Rosalind a special blessing of the prelapsarian Adam. Rosalind may be knowledgeable of promiscuous wives' methods of

hoodwinking their husbands, but her general virtue, seen, for example, in her unselfish attempt to reform Silvius and Phoebe's romance, marks her as deserving prelapsarian Eve's blessing of a helpmate. In *As You Like It*, this double perspective on dramatic character is not as pronounced as it is in a later play such as *The Winter's Tale*. Perdita, by her expressed discomfort with fulfilling her mythological role, never lets us forget that a hesitant, frightened girl brought up by homely shepherds is the Roman goddess Flora (*WT* 4.4.5–14, 16–24, 443–52). And yet so magnificently does she play Flora in the enriching context of an idealizing pastoral world that, for an instant, she becomes Flora herself in her lover's eyes. At least the lyric rapture of Florizel's spoken hymn of love (*WT* 4.4.135–46), prompted by his vision of her, suggests as much. In *The Winter's Tale*, Apollo's providence does not work through a pattern of spiritual *kairoi* of the kind found in *As You Like It*, and playgoers never sense that a mythic past returns through epiphanies in the great pastoral scene of the late romance. Still, the later play instructs us in the alternate awareness of character that we ought to maintain through the epilogue of the earlier comedy.

Divided between most of the major characters, the pattern of progressively earlier biblical allusions in *As You Like It* is Shakespeare's (or the play's) as much as (or more so than) a character's. It represents the playwright's idea that, under providential control, the fruits not only of heroic moments of the Classical Age, but also those of redemptive Judeo-Christian time as well can be recovered. Shakespeare implies that the coincidence of Rosalind's praiseworthy seizing of the moment and of a primal Judeo-Christian *kairos* is no accident, but is rather the gift of a shadowy providence ruling the comedy's world. The fact that this providence is sometimes that of Jove, sometimes that of Hymen, and, finally, sometimes that of the Judeo-Christian deity suggests that the ages form a seamless web, a single time in which privileged men and women, like Orlando and Rosalind, are rewarded for their heroic deeds and Christian attitudes with an approximation of the first, the paradisiacal moment of married joy. After all, that is most likely, as the title of *As You Like It* implies, as human-kind both then and now would like it.

CHAPTER THREE

WORDS AND DEEDS IN *AS YOU LIKE IT*

“Notoriously *As You Like It* is a comedy of words and not actions,” Raymond Waddington has judged, joining a long-standing camp of critics who have noted that much is said but little performed in Shakespeare’s pastoral comedy.¹ Nevertheless (as is generally true in Shakespeare’s plays), characters’ deeds play as crucial a role as words in creating the relatively joyous end of this pastoral comedy; in fact, during the masque of Hymen, words and deeds achieve a familiar early modern English equilibrium—one that contemporary texts indicate was highly prized. “That which we thinke let vs speake, and that which we speake let vs thinke; let our speeche accorde with our life,” Thomas Nashe wrote in *The Anatomie of Absurditie* (1589). According to Thomas McAlindon, Nashe’s pronouncement

is characteristic of its age not only in its refusal to separate eloquence from virtue, but also in its appeal to what Nashe’s contemporaries accepted as the fundamental norm, both rhetorical and moral, for all good speech: there must be a harmony between thought and word, between word and deed. The sign, the sensible impression of such harmony was decorum, or what the Elizabethans . . . variously referred to as comeliness. . . .²

A dialectic of words and deeds informs *As You Like It*, but not as a phenomenon represented in condensed balanced form from act 1 onward. As he would do in *All’s Well That Ends Well*,³ Shakespeare in *As You Like It* first systematically demonstrates the inadequacies and failures of speakers, and of speech itself, before dramatizing remarkably expressive deeds that, on occasion, compensate for failed words by essentially conveying what words cannot do (or do not do). Describing this process in detail becomes worthwhile because the remarkable originality of Shakespeare’s treatment, remarkable when judged even against versions of the dialectic of words and deeds represented in *Love’s Labor’s Lost* and *All’s Well That Ends Well*, has not been recognized. Shakespeare eventually appears to rectify a disequilibrium

of words and deeds in *As You Like It* in the balanced verbal and physical communication of the play's culminating image—that of recovered paradise. The rapid, visible aging of Queen Elizabeth in the last years of her life intensified public anxieties about the possibility of unruly succession and civil wars, reminiscent of the Wars of the Roses, and so stimulated the appetite for decorum, balance, and stability in art. Viewed in a late Elizabethan context of social anxiety, *As You Like It* in its play-ending harmonies seems nostalgically out of place.

These social anxieties, notably in their relation to language, are apparent in *Hamlet*. Textual passages near the end of the contemporary late Elizabethan play *Hamlet* assist in placing the relationship between words and deeds staged in *As You Like It*, both within the Shakespeare canon and culturally at the turn of the century. The Danish courtier Osric's dramatic function in *Hamlet* is simply to inform the Prince of the proposed duel with Laertes and invite him to participate in it. And yet Hamlet and Horatio's dialogue with Osric accounts for over a hundred lines in both quarto and folio texts of the play (113 in that of editor David Bevington in *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*). Shakespeare's demonstration in Osric's diction of an absolute corruption of words accounts for the episode's length. This verbal corruption, in fact, is the episode's theme, or burden. When Osric blows hard in describing newly come-to-court Laertes as—"an absolute gentleman, full of most excellent differences, of very soft society and great showing. Indeed, to speak feelingly of him, he is the card or calendar of gentry, for you shall find in him the continent of what part a gentleman would see"—Hamlet mocks his puffy, overgrown but lifeless diction:

Sir, his definement suffers no perdition in you, though I know to divide him inventorially would dozy th'arithmetic of memory, and yet but yaw neither in respect of his quick sail. But, in the verity of extolment, I take him to be a soul of great article, and his infusion of such dearth and rareness as, to make true diction of him, his semblable is his mirror and who else would trace him his umbrage, nothing more. (5.2.107–20)

Hamlet's mention of "true diction" causes auditors to realize that they are hearing diction of the falsest kind. Osric never catches on that Hamlet is making fun of him and his manner of speech. In the talk about the duel, auditors hear such monstrous words as "concernancy" and such silly phrases as "in his meed he's unfellowed" (5.2.122–42). "A did comply with his dug before 'a sucked it" (5.2.186–87), Hamlet scornfully concludes after Osric exits.

The Prince's subsequent remarks have always seemed to apply as much (or more) to late Elizabethan London of 1599–1600 as to an imagined Denmark: "Thus has he—and many more of the same breed that I know

the drossy age dotes on—only got the tune of the time, and, out of an habit of encounter, a kind of yeasty collection, which carries them through and through the most fanned and winnowed opinions; and do but blow them to their trial, the bubbles are out” (5.2.187–93).⁴ David Bevington helpfully glosses this judgment of Hamlet’s:

Thus has he—and many like him of the sort our frivolous age dotes on—acquired the trendy manner of speech of the time, and, out of habitual conversation with courtiers of their own kind, have collected together a kind of frothy medley of current phrases, which enables such gallants to hold their own among persons of the most select and well-sifted views; and yet do but test them by merely blowing upon them, and their bubbles burst.⁵

Bevington might have further termed “degenerate” the “trendy manner of speech of the time” heard in Osric. Hamlet has voiced earlier the notion of social inferiors aping the corrupt speech of better classes. When the Gravedigger informs Hamlet that his grave is for “One that was a woman, sir, but rest her soul, she’s dead,” the Prince complains: “How absolute the knave is! We must speak by the card, or equivocation will undo us. By the Lord, Horatio, this three years I have took note of it: the age is grown so picked that the toe of the peasant comes so near the heel of the courtier he galls his kibe [his chilblains on his heels]” (5.1.135–41). Ironically, Prince Hamlet feels no sympathy here for the Gravedigger’s attempt to be precise in verbal meaning, not fully cognizant (as he is in listening to Osric) that “equivocation” (ambiguity in the use of words) may undo not simply a speaker but also a society. Hamlet may advise First Player to “[s]uit the action to the word, the word to the action” (3.2.17–18). But he not only never reveals in the remainder of the tragedy his ability to achieve this suiting; he also never appears to perform actions balancing, or compensating for, the torrent of often ineffectual words that come from his heart. A reciprocal dialectic of words and deeds is one more phenomenon that appears out of joint in Hamlet’s Denmark.

Earlier Shakespeare had depicted a more promising dialectic of words and deeds in *Love’s Labor’s Lost* (c. 1592–95, rev. 1597), and he had done so even though he vigorously satirizes in this play overly abstract or pompous language such as that heard in Osric’s utterances. This mouth-filling pretentious language is typically heard coming from Don Armado and Holofernes, yet it also includes some of the artificial conceits of the poetry of Berowne, Longaville, Dumaine, and the King of Navarre. The Princess of France and her ladies distrust the authenticity of their suitors’ hyperbolic love talk, but they offer the men hope by setting them the task of performing (silent) benevolent deeds after which the women will consider betrothal. The Princess tells Navarre to adopt a monkish life in a hermitage, while Rosaline directs

Berowne for a year to try to make the “speechless sick” and dying laugh at his witty language (*Love's Labor's Lost*, 5.2.841). If they do not laugh, Rosaline urges Berowne to reform his language (5.2.848–59). My point is that in the earlier comedy the possibility exists that deeds might reform problematic language,⁶ whereas that is not the case in the later Elizabethan play *Hamlet*—whose initial script Roslyn Knutson dates 1599–1600.⁷

Margreta de Grazia's important essay titled “Shakespeare's View of Language: An Historical Perspective” helps us understand that 1599–1600 can be regarded as pivotal years in England in the transition away from a reliance upon words only (or mainly) for meaning to a new Stuart valuing of expressive things and deeds. “In the sixteenth century,” de Grazia asserts, “it was assumed that defects in man brought about confused speech; in the seventeenth century, it became widely held that confused speech brings on many of the defects in man.”⁸ According to de Grazia, Elizabethans generally believed that language was adequate to reflect meaning relatively accurately, and that when it did not, a moral or ethical failing in humankind was usually the cause. Although de Grazia does not do so, one could perhaps use passages from *Hamlet* to illustrate her claim. She asserts that Elizabethans generally believed that charity and moral reform could remedy this situation, restoring the expressive power of language. But with Sir Francis Bacon and the seventeenth century, early modern English writers, according to de Grazia, began often to locate the disjunction between language and meaning not so much in speakers as in the ambiguous nature and limitations of language as a vehicle adequate to register the laws of Nature. Bacon and certain New Scientists began to substitute the nonverbal data of inductive experimentation for ordinary language as the medium for communication. The Royal Society would eventually recommend objects, things, as expressive counters more accurate than words, an idea that Jonathan Swift would satirize in *Gulliver's Travels*. While de Grazia's overall argument broadly appears valid, she is mistaken in her belief that Shakespeare throughout his career remained an Elizabethan in the terms of her argument. She believes that King Lear's and Coriolanus's failures of language arise out of their own pride, rather than out of any defects inherent in the linguistic medium. But I have shown elsewhere that the verbal discourse of Shakespeare's Jacobean dramatic romance *Cymbeline* reflects Baconian assumptions about language, in its method of trial statement and restatement until a speaker hears an approximation of his or her intended meaning. This method, more pronounced than that seen in other Shakespeare plays, becomes necessary—this play makes clear—not so much because of defects in speakers as of defects in the medium of language itself.⁹ As a result of problems in language itself, things (*res*) such as flowers in Arviragus's elegy over the body of Imogen in

Cymbeline (4.2.220–31) communicate essences such as the beauty of her face and veins and the sweetness of her breath better than any words can. What happens in Arviragus's elegy can be also seen in Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*, where Perdita's distribution of flowers becomes a superior way of communicating virtues (4.4.71–146).

My point is that, contrary to de Grazia's claim, Shakespeare in several Jacobean plays reflects the seventeenth-century belief that "confused [or defective] speech . . . brings on many of the defects in man," and that language itself can be held mainly responsible for a failure to communicate meaning adequately. One 1599–1600 Shakespeare play, his great tragedy *Hamlet*, does not point ahead, as another of his 1599–1600 plays—*As You Like It*—does, toward the seventeenth-century expressive possibilities of deeds. (Ophelia's assigning symbolic meaning to the flowers and herbs she madly distributes [*Hamlet*, 4.5.179–89] does not make them significant expressive alternatives for nonmetaphoric language to the degree, or in the same positive way, that Arviragus's and Perdita's similar symbolic assignments do. Moreover, no deed in the last act of *Hamlet*, notably during the duel and poisoning of the final episode, dramatically functions as an expressive alternative to the opaque, puffy speech of the play.) In pointing ahead eventually toward the expressive possibilities of deeds in certain seventeenth-century plays of Shakespeare, *As You Like It* at the turn of the century amounts to a hinge in a grand cultural shift of responsibility from humankind to language for lapses in communication and meaning. This pastoral comedy amounts to a figurative hinge by showing the human responsibility for failed verbal and written meaning at the same time that it, more significantly, suggests that failures of meaning arise from certain limitations within language itself. In late Elizabethan *As You Like It*, an "Elizabethan" balance of words and deeds appears at the end of the play, but it is hard won, the momentary result of a sustained problematic relationship between these two phenomena throughout the play. But we should now turn to the beginning of *As You Like It* to see how a distinctive relationship between words and deeds evolves.

In the first scene of this pastoral comedy, vicious language ignites the smoldering animosity between Oliver and Orlando. As Oliver enters, Orlando predicts as much: "Go apart, Adam, and thou shalt hear how he will shake me up" (1.1.25–26). Violent deeds and verbal insults alternate during the brothers' clash, mutually escalating to produce the characters' ominous divorce. When Orlando claims that his father's blood is shared by the brothers, Oliver apparently strikes him, exclaiming, "What, boy!" Putting a wrestler's grip on Oliver, Orlando grimly quips, "Come, come, elder brother, you are too young in this" (1.1.49–51). "Wilt thou lay hands on me, villain?" horrified Oliver exclaims. Orlando's response reveals,

despite the physical violence, that it is a vicious word that wounds him most: "I am no villain. I am the youngest son of Sir Rowland de Boys. He was my father, and he is thrice a villain that says such a father begot villains. Wert thou not my brother, I would not take this hand from thy throat till this other hand pulled out thy tongue for saying so. Thou hast railed on thyself" (1.1.52–58). The hand at the throat—a violent deed—has reacted angrily to the corrupt word; it would tear out an offending tongue. Orlando underscores the fact that, self-destructively, Oliver's vicious language has killed Oliver's honor. As he does at the beginning of *All's Well* (1.1.61–72, 1.2.24–67), Shakespeare measures the decline of speech in *As You Like It* against the recollected gracious language of a dead patriarch. "Is 'old dog' my reward?" Adam asks Oliver when the latter character calls him a cur; "[m]ost true," he sadly concludes, "I have lost my teeth in your service. God be with my old master, he would not have spoke such a word" (1.1.78–80). Sir Rowland de Boys never uttered cheap insults, and so his spirit powerfully lives on in Adam's memory—a silent, eloquent testimonial of grace.

Constructed to suggest that fallen language quickly results in violent deeds, which in turn prompt more intolerable insults, the opening episode of *As You Like It* poses a not entirely rhetorical question. How will language be able to triumph in this comedy by effecting the relatively harmonious ending of this dramatic genre? How will hostile brothers and logorrhetic lovers be able to weld their words and deeds into a creative complementary whole, wherein a redemptive deed crowns a promise? Fallen language, highlighted by Shakespeare early in the play—not simply fallen speakers—indicate that the challenge for characters is greater than might be supposed.

In the first place, Touchstone's wise foolishness stresses the unreliability of words as the guarantors of abstractions such as honor and truth. If spoken oaths, intensely charged signifiers of intangible realities, are found lacking, normal language most likely cannot be a trustworthy pledge of truth. When Celia asks Touchstone if her father has commanded the jester to bring her to him, he replies, "No by mine honour, but I was bid to come for you" (1.2.56–57). Picking on Touchstone's phrase "by mine honour," Rosalind asks, "Where learned you that oath, fool?" "Of a certain knight," Touchstone jokes, "that swore 'by his honour' they were good pancakes, and swore 'by his honour' the mustard was naught. Now I'll stand to it the pancakes were naught and the mustard was good, and yet was not the knight forsworn" (1.2.58–63). When asked to prove this dizzy paradox, the jester replies, "stroke your chins, and swear by your beards that I am a knave" (1.2.67–68). "By our beards—if we had them—thou art" (1.2.69), Celia playfully responds. "By my knavery—if I had it—then I were,"

Touchstone crows: “[B]ut if you swear by that that is not, you are not forsworn. No more was this knight, swearing by his honour, for he never had any; or if he had, he had sworn it away before he saw those pancakes or that mustard” (1.2.70–74).¹⁰ Touchstone emphasizes the fact that even the most socially hallowed words often mislead auditors, signifying illusions as realities. As supposedly ultimate linguistic guarantors of nonlinguistic meaning, oaths as a medium are as untrustworthy as the speakers who mouth them.

When Celia asks Touchstone to identify the duplicitous knight of the pancakes, he replies, “One that old Frederick, your father, loves” (1.2.76). Celia’s testy rejoinder reveals that nonverbal qualities such as love can validate the existence of abstractions such as honor, which disconnected words themselves cannot guarantee: “My father’s love is enough to honour him enough; speak no more of him: you’ll be whipped for taxation one of these days” (1.2.77–79). Orlando would have silenced Oliver’s railing tongue; Celia follows suit by wishing to silence the truth of Touchstone’s insight into the untrustworthiness of language. Instead of falling silent, the jester, however, laments that words (at least in the court) no longer reflect and pertinently comment upon deeds: “The more pity that fools may not speak wisely what wise men do foolishly” (1.2.80–81). Humorously yet problematically swearing by the kind of oath recently devalued, Celia approves Touchstone’s saying as an authoritative utterance: “By my troth, thou sayest true; for since the little wit that fools have was silenced, the little foolery that wise men have makes a great show” (1.2.82–84).

In the next court episode, Rosalind’s and Celia’s witty talk with Monsieur Le Beau, Shakespeare stresses a speaker’s ability to twist the meaning of overly serviceable words practically any way he or she would.¹¹ When Celia asks Le Beau for court news, he answers, “Fair princess, you have lost much good sport” (1.2.91). Filled with Touchstone’s spirit of wisefoolishness, Celia and Rosalind dazzle Le Beau with a blaze of jests:

Celia: Sport? Of what colour?

Le Beau: What colour, madam? How shall I answer you?

Ros: As wit and fortune will.

Touch: Or as the destinies decrees.

Celia: Well said. That was laid on with a trowel.

Touch: Nay, if I keep not my rank—

Ros: Thou loosest thy old smell.

(1.2.92–98)

Celia’s phrase “Well said” is ironic; Touchstone’s alliterative rejoinder “Or as the destinies decrees,” considered as a blunt cliché, virtually acquires the status of a deed—a physical blow (“That was laid on with

a trowel"). Pestered by this wordplay, Le Beau remains understandably befuddled: "You amaze me, ladies. I would have told you of good wrestling, which you have lost sight of" (1.2.99–100).

Feigning contrition, Rosalind presses Le Beau to tell them "the manner of the wrestling" (1.2.101). He states that he will tell them only the beginning of the wrestling, for the final bouts will be staged before them presently. Unable to smother their disruptive wit, Celia and Rosalind again frustrate Le Beau's delivery:

Celia: Well, the beginning that is dead and buried.

Le Beau: There comes an old man, and his three sons—

Celia: I could match this beginning with an old tale.

Le Beau: Three proper young men, of excellent growth and presence.

Ros: With bills on their necks: "Be it known unto all men by these presents"—

(1.2.111–14)

Celia mocks the clichéd story-book-like beginning of Le Beau's utterance "There comes an old man, and his three sons" by punning on the word "tale"/"tail" in her response: "I could match this beginning with an old 'tail'/'tale.'" By this pun, she facetiously implies that the bulk—the "body"—of Le Beau's tale, in its value, will amount to no more than the body of an animal, such as a dog. Mocking the predictability and formulaic nature of Le Beau's story, Rosalind likewise suggests that his words, in their dullness, might acquire a physical form in the perhaps hackneyed advertisement of the staging of a play, a message that in her phrase "'by these presents'" quibbles upon—in G. Blakemore Evans's words—"this present document (with obvious pun on *presence*)."¹² Later, Celia confirms playgoers' impression of spoken puns as trivial, detracting utterances when she proposes that she and Rosalind turn "jests out of service, let us talk in good earnest" (1.3.24–25). Her distinction between kinds of speech implicitly categorizes the punning jest as talk in bad earnest.

Le Beau ends the women's jests at his expense by describing Charles the Wrestler's maiming of the old man's sons and the father's weeping over their broken bodies. When asked by Touchstone, after a stunned silence, to describe the sport that the ladies missed, Le Beau replies, "Why, this that I speak of" (1.2.123). "Thus men may grow wiser every day," Touchstone asserts: "It is the first time that ever I heard breaking of ribs was sport for ladies" (1.2.123–25). Both Alexander Leggatt and Mark Bracher have argued that the puns and verbal witplay of *As You Like It* are, for the most part, liberating because they are mind-expanding in coinage and comprehension (catalysts for a plurality of mental perspectives).¹³ Nevertheless, Celia's and especially Rosalind's subversive wordplay is sometimes a restrictive

force, measurable in destructive potential to a place between the witplay of the courtiers of *Love's Labor's Lost* and the affected, opaque diction of Osric, Polonius, and Hamlet on occasion (but somewhat closer in bite to Hamlet's). Evidence for my claim appears in Rosalind's grossly insensitive quip—disjointed from the poignant reality of the moment—upon Le Beau's report that Charles the Wrestler has killed the three sons of an old man by fatally breaking the ribs of each in turn (1.2.112–15). “But is there any else longs to see this broken music in his sides” (1.2.127–28), she callously jests. Alan Brissenden explains the cruel pun embedded in Rosalind's flippant question: “broken music: Music played by a combination of different kinds of instruments; Rosalind is making a pun comparing the fractured bones of the young man with the broken ribs of a smashed instrument such as a lute.”¹⁴ Shakespeare makes Rosalind appear more blamable for this lapse in good taste by introducing just before it Touchstone's pronouncement that this is the first time that he has heard that rib-breaking was—to use Le Beau's word—“sport” fit for ladies.¹⁵ The callousness of Rosalind's joke about the rib-breaking suggests early in the play that she may lack something belonging to a lady. An auditor senses that Rosalind ultimately may have to rely on deeds rather than words to demonstrate otherwise.

Regarded in light of Shakespeare's portrayal of the fallenness of speakers but especially of the imperfections of language itself in the opening scenes of *As You Like It*, Orlando's winning Rosalind's love through a deed rather than through words is dramatically apt. He overthrows Charles and wins Rosalind's heart in the same moment. The primacy of deeds over words is emphasized by Charles's speechlessness after Orlando throws him to the earth (1.2.202–4). Romantic love, the quality crystallized in Orlando and Rosalind by this deed, also makes them speechless. After Rosalind gives her champion a chain from her neck, Orlando asks himself, “Can I not say, ‘I thank you?’” (1.2.233). Struck by Rosalind's beauty, he compares himself to “a mere lifeless block” (1.2.235). Also rapt by love, Rosalind imagines that she hears Orlando speak to the young women: “He calls us back. My pride fell with my fortunes, / I'll ask him what he would.—Did you call, sir?” (1.2.236–37). To the lover's rarefied hearing, the silent call of the beloved is a word heard in the mind's ear. Returning to Orlando, she finds a young man who cannot heave his heart into his mouth. “What passion hangs these weights upon my tongue?” he asks after the ladies have left; “I cannot speak to her, yet she urg'd conference” (1.2.242–43). Later, muteness afflicts Rosalind.

Celia: Why, cousin, why Rosalind—Cupid have mercy, not a word?

Ros: Not one to throw at a dog.

Celia: No, thy words are too precious to be cast away upon curs. Throw some of them at me. Come, lame me with reasons.

(1.3.1–6)

Rosalind's quip "Not one to throw at a dog" provokes recollection of the insult—"old dog"—that Oliver threw at Adam (1.1.77–80). Unfortunately, love can figuratively lame a speaker as effectively as malice can.¹⁶

Shakespeare thus takes pains to depict the court of *As You Like It* as echoing with vicious, disruptive, or inadequate speech—even as pervaded by frustrating silence. His association of the court with various linguistic imperfections culminates in Frederick's tyrannical banishment of Rosalind. When she claims in self-defense that her thoughts have never slandered him, Frederick angrily exclaims,

Thus do all traitors.
If their purgation did consist in words,
They are innocent as grace itself.
Let it suffice thee that I trust thee not.
(1.3.50–53)

Like Leontes later during the trial scene of *The Winter's Tale* (3.2.1–123), Frederick dismisses any eloquent, gracious plea of Rosalind as the expected, damning rhetoric of a traitor; the secretly guilty innocent, according to this mistaken stereotype, are always silent in their self-defense. Nothing within language itself can correct or overcome this expressive problem. Accompanying Frederick's linguistic prejudices is a misguided conviction of the expressive power of Rosalind's silence. "She is too subtle for thee," he tells Celia, "and her smoothness, / Her very silence, and her patience / Speak to the people, and they pity her" (1.3.75–77). These fantasied silent words of Rosalind, in Frederick's opinion, deprive Celia of an essential word: "Thou art a fool. She robs thee of thy name" (1.3.78). Ironically, Celia's father's notion of "speaking" silence mutes his daughter. "Then open not thy lips," he commands; "Firm and irrevocable is my doom / Which I have passed on her. She is banished" (1.3.81–83). Like King Lear and Leontes, Duke Frederick possesses a grandiose idea of his disenfranchising word, which quickly becomes equivalent to a destructive deed:

You, niece, provide yourself.
If you outstay the time, upon mine honour
And in the greatness of my word, you die.
(1.3.86–88)

The court phase of *As You Like It* concludes with the triumph of a terrible deed—Frederick's banishment of Rosalind (and of his own daughter and happiness)—a "triumph" accentuating the various failures of spoken words. For those playgoers familiar with Shakespeare's renovating pastoral

dramaturgy, the playwright poses the question of whether language in the forest of Arden can rectify earlier disasters brought on and exacerbated by speech.¹⁷

If Rosalind's and Celia's adopted pastoral names are any indication, the answer to this question appears promising. Before they leave for Arden, the young women rebaptize themselves Aliena and Ganymede, names that match their conceptions of their new personas ("Stranger" and "Cupbearer of Jove"). Celia's name captures her dispossessed state, while Rosalind's reflects her comparably greater optimism. She will have "no worse a name that Jove's own page" (1.3.123). Despite her negative formulation "no worse a name," Rosalind's utterance expresses her sanguine spirit and her hope that providence protects her as she seeks her father in Arden.

In the forest of Arden, Duke Senior believes that Nature "speaks" for his moral betterment, mainly through "things" (*res*) more persuasive than words (*verba*). "Here feel we not the penalty of Adam," he exclaims,

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."
(2.1.5–11)

The "chiding" speech of the winter wind prompts a salutary aphorism from the knowing Duke. It is in this sense that he finds "tongues in trees, books in the running brooks, / Sermons in stones, and good in everything" (2.1.16–17). The unconventional language of Nature makes Duke Senior more poetically eloquent in conventional language. "Happy is your grace," Amiens concludes, "That can translate the stubbornness of fortune / Into so quiet and so sweet a style" (2.1.18–20). By being able to translate recalcitrant Fortune into a quiet, sweet style, Duke Senior seems to find words adequate to his vision of pastoral exile, as the poetic quality of his memorable speech testifies. The pastoral notion of bookish, even tongued trees is as old as Virgil's *Ecloques*; the Latin pun on the word *silva* (leaf of a tree/leaf of a book) makes possible the Classical idea of the erudite leaves of trees, which can further be imagined as fluttering tongues speaking a profoundly spiritual language.¹⁸

Granted the expressive possibilities of the pastoral forest, Orlando enlists Nature in creating physical (and so presumably more permanent) words expressive of his love for Rosalind. Wishing to memorialize his

beloved's beauty and virtue in a medium more stable than spoken words, Orlando carves love poems into the barks of trees:

O Rosalind, these trees shall be my books,
 And in their barks my thoughts I'll character,
 That every eye which in this forest looks
 Shall see thy virtue witnessed everywhere.
 Run, run, Orlando; carve on every tree
 The fair, the chaste, the unexpressive she.
 (3.2.5–10)

Having hung his written verses praising Rosalind as Cynthia, the moon goddess of Chastity, upon a tree's bough, Orlando, as pastoral lover, creates the leaf of a book among the leaves of the forest. As a result, he conveys his fervid opinion that Nature celebrates Rosalind spontaneously, through its sprays and blossoms (of which she is one of the most beautiful). On the poetic leaf, the full moon can "survey / With . . . chaste eye" its "huntress' name" (3.2.2–3, 4). In this sense, Chastity, Cynthia, can read herself, in a mirror reflex. This self-reflexive activity, a remarkable way of knowing, contrasts with Jaques' egotistical reading of the cipher of a fool in his face mirrored by a brook. Reading Orlando's various inscriptions of the name "Rosalind" ("pleasant rose") thus amounts to a scanning—tautological, in Orlando's idea of Rosalind's own reading of it—of the name and essence of Chastity. Or so love-struck Orlando thinks. The physical words that Orlando carves in the *silvae*, the forest, enshrine the special naming of his pastoral verse, rendering more permanent and substantial his spoken hymn of praise. By his carving and attachment of poetry to boughs, Orlando transforms words into deeds according to the conventions of Renaissance literary pastoral.

Nevertheless, Shakespeare takes pains to emphasize that the language of pastoral may not be that special in its expressive power after all. In First Lord's hearing, the language of Arden is heard in "the brook that brawls along this wood" (2.1.32). The word "brawl" conveys an unpleasant noisiness of Nature, while the "groans" (2.1.36) that a wounded deer makes at the stream's edge hardly amount to the edifying language that Duke Senior has in mind.¹⁹ Still, these sounds provoke melancholy Jaques to moralize the spectacle of the bleeding hart "into a thousand similes" (2.1.45). While Nature does not speak eloquently to First Lord, it provides for Jaques the source of poetic speech presumably unheard at court. Jaques interprets the tableau of the stricken deer so that the animal, weeping into the brook, in First Lord's report of the melancholy man's words, "'mak'st a testament / As worldlings do, giving thy sum of more / To that which had too much'" (2.1.47–49). Empathetic, Jaques, his words reported by

First Lord, becomes the supposedly moral voice of essentially mute, amoral Nature:

“’Tis right,” quoth he, “thus misery doth part
 The flux of company.” Anon a careless herd
 Full of pasture jumps along by him
 And never stays to greet him. “Ay,” quoth Jaques,
 “Sweep on, you fat and greasy citizens,
 ’Tis just the fashion. Wherefore do you look
 Upon that poor and broken bankrupt there?”
 (2.1.51–57)

Jaques provides the counterpoint to Duke Senior’s characterization of Nature’s tongues; a moral interloper in the forest must, like a ventriloquist, give Nature a voice, if it is to have one. In its mawkishness and improbability, Jaques’ use of Nature to create verbal satire appears limited, slightly ridiculous.²⁰ Playgoers tend to adopt Duke Senior’s attitude toward it. Rosalind’s father loves to “cope” Jaques “in these sullen fits, / for then he’s full of matter” (2.1.67–68)—matter for scornful laughter.²¹

Before he meets Touchstone and becomes enamored of wise foolishness, Jaques’ railing is, by his own admission, an alternative to preferred sleep (2.5.56–57). Despite his occasional projections of a railing voice into Nature, Jaques generally works either to stifle words or to prolong silences. Concerning Duke Senior, he for example asserts, “I have been all this day to avoid him. He is too disputable for my company. I think of as many matters as he, but I give heaven thanks, and make no boast of them” (2.5.30–33). Such linguistic repression encourages auditors, both onstage and off, to devalue Jaques’ words when he commands center-stage for their expression.

Like Jaques’ satire using the terms of pastoral Nature, Orlando’s romantic word-deeds are, in the final analysis, inadequate. After all, the bark and especially the leaves enshrining his poetry will decay much sooner than brass and stone will erode. Orlando claims that the “she” whose name he runs to “carve on every tree” is “unexpressive.” As a rule, editors of *As You Like It*, such as Agnes Latham, gloss Orlando’s word “unexpressive” as meaning “inexpressible.”²² Certainly the term has this overtone. But it also ironically suggests both the questionable quality of Orlando’s verse and the final status of his pastoral methods of celebrating Rosalind’s excellence. Judged according to the criteria of prosody and inspirational effect, Orlando’s vegetable poems are unexpressive of Rosalind’s virtue. Celia, finding one of Orlando’s “natural” poems, reads aloud:

“Tongues I’ll hang on every tree,

 But upon the fairest boughs,

Or at every sentence end,
 Will I 'Rosalinda' write,
 Teaching all that read to know
 The quintessence of every sprite
 Heaven would in little show."
 (3.2.124, 130–35)

Shakespeare casts doubt upon Orlando's naturally fused poetic words through Touchstone's and Rosalind's criticisms of them. Hearing Rosalind read a discovered poem, Touchstone comments, "This is the very false gallop of verses. Why do you infect yourself with them?" (3.2.109–10). In reply to her command, "Peace, you dull fool, I found them on a tree," Touchstone jokes, "Truly, the tree yields bad fruit" (3.2.111–12). Nevertheless, Rosalind herself admits the poetry's mediocrity; the "natural bloom" that Celia reads is a "tedious homily of love" that would make Cupid's "parishioner" weary (3.2.150–51), and some of the poems have "in them more feet than the verses would bear"—a fact that makes them "lame" (3.2.160–61, 163).²³ Playgoers realize that, if the love-struck subject of the poetry criticizes it, Shakespeare expects no great admiration from his audience.

Through the dramatic technique of analogous action, the playwright stresses Rosalind's and the audience's doubts about the genuineness of Orlando's impulse to make Nature poetically proclaim his beloved's beauty and virtue. When Touchstone, tongue in cheek, tells Audrey, "Truly, I would the gods had made thee poetical" (3.3.12–13), she exclaims, "I do not know what 'poetical' is. Is it honest in deed and word? Is it a true thing?" (3.3.14–15). Touchstone's answer alludes to an old Platonic argument: "No, truly; for the truest poetry is the most feigning, and lovers are given to poetry; and what they swear in poetry may be said as lovers they do feign" (3.3.16–18). Regarded as dramatic commentary on Orlando's pastoral expression, Touchstone's judgment stresses its potential untrustworthiness—both as word and as pastoral deed (to answer Audrey's two-fold question). If Audrey as poetess swears to Touchstone that she is honest, she feigns, giving the lie in both senses of the word to the lascivious jester, even as Orlando to a much lesser but quite real degree may with mostly good intentions do to Rosalind.

Not only Orlando but also Rosalind fails to find superior expressive mediums in the world of pastoral. When she learns that the author of the woodland verses is Orlando, she breathlessly asks Celia a series of questions about him, demanding that she "answer . . . in one word" (3.2.216). "You must borrow me Gargantua's mouth first," Celia quips; "[t]is a word too great for any mouth of this age's size" (3.2.217–18). In Celia's witticism, Shakespeare implicitly emphasizes a diminishment of expressive possibilities

in the modern, unheroic age. "To say ay or no to these particulars is more than to answer in a catechism" (3.2.218–20), Celia concludes. When Rosalind wittily and repeatedly interrupts Celia's account of her discovery of Orlando, the exasperated narrator commands: "Cry 'holla' to thy tongue, I prithee; it curvets unseasonably" (3.2.236–37). When Celia says Orlando is "furnished like a hunter," Rosalind cannot resist punning, "O ominous—he comes to kill my heart [hart]!" (3.2.237–38). "I would sing my song without a burden," Celia replies; "Thou bringest me out of tune" (3.2.239–40). "Do you now know I am a woman?" Rosalind retorts; "When I think, I must speak" (3.2.241–42). This episode thus accentuates two extremes of Rosalind's speech: the Gargantuan single word covering Orlando (never forthcoming) and the too many words that destroy Celia's narrative. Clearly, romantic passion causes Rosalind to lose control of her speech.²⁴ Later, when she impatiently puts words into Celia's and Orlando's mouths in order to re-create the marriage service in a woodland setting, Rosalind reveals the linguistic totalitarianism that romantic passion induces; everyone onstage but Rosalind realizes that the "wedding" is a dangerous charade, irreligious in its omission of a father to give away the bride.

Thus, by the midpoint of *As You Like It*, Shakespeare in several ways calls into question the assumption that pastoral might offer opportunities for unconventional expression, ones preferable to fallen everyday speech. Still, Duke Senior's and Jaques' debate over the satiric potential of wise-foolishness dominates the latter part of act 2, and playgoers may wonder whether the words of a modified satire might possess genuinely reformative power. When Jaques, converted by Touchstone's example to satiric wise-foolishness, exclaims, "I must have liberty / Withal, as large a charter as the wind, / To blow on whom I please, for so fools have" (2.7.47–49), he uses a metaphor that begs comparison with the chiding speech of the winter's wind, Duke Senior's pastoral educator. Like the Duke's winter wind, Jaques imagines that he would "feelingly persuade" auditors of their foolishness through public satire. His notion of the therapeutic value of biting, satirical words involves their composing portraits of vanity or vice so compelling that an auditor secretly realizes they contain an embarrassing mirror image of him-or herself. Presumably amending conduct as a result of the perceived match, the reformed auditor in Jaques' opinion illustrates the melancholic's idea of medicinal satire:

Invest me in my motley. Give me leave
To speak my mind, and I will through and through
Cleanse the foul body of th'infected world,
If they will patiently receive my medicine.

(2.7.58–61)

Duke Senior, however, recharacterizes Jaques' proposed cleansing as the disgorging of verbal poison, of "all th'embossèd sores and headed evils" that Jaques as a libertine has contracted (2.7.67).²⁵ Jaques' defense consists of his claim that his satire will not be Aristophanic; it will not name individuals:

What woman in the city do I name
 When that I say the city-woman bears
 The cost of princes on unworthy shoulders?
 Who can come in and say that I mean her
 When such a one as she, such is her neighbour?
 (2.7.74–78)

Nonspecific satirical speech, in Jaques' opinion, works more effectively than direct personal invective (an idea relevant after the 1599 ban on verse satire). He continues:

Or what is he of basest function,
 That says his bravery is not on my cost,
 Thinking that I mean him, but therein suits
 His folly to the mettle of my speech?
 (2.7.79–82)

Public satire sets a trap for the unwary, prompting them into self-betraying utterances reflective of their vices:

There then, how then, what then, let me see wherein
 My tongue hath wronged him. If it do him right,
 Then he hath wronged himself. If he be free,
 Why then my taxing like a wild goose flies,
 Unclaimed of any man. But who comes here?
 (2.7.83–87)

Jaques' satirical speech would operate on auditors like a corrosive chemical paper, turning color only if its object possesses complementary bitter qualities.

Significantly, Jaques does not directly address and refute Duke Senior's charge that his criticism would be disgorged libertinism; instead, he rationalizes the detective power of his proposed satire as well as its harmlessness for the innocent. Shakespeare, in *As You Like It*, never illustrates the truth of Jaques' rationalization by staging a scene in which the satirist reforms a fool through invective that the guiltless ignore. Shakespeare appears to dismiss Jaques' satiric perspective when the solitary man asks Orlando, "Will you sit down with me, and we two will rail against our mistress the

world, and all our misery?" and Rosalind's beloved replies, "I will chide no breather in the world but myself, against whom I know the most faults" (3.2.268–72). In *An Autobiography* (1883), the Victorian novelist Anthony Trollope shrewdly observes that "[t]he satirist who writes nothing but satire should write but little, or it will seem that his satire springs rather from his own caustic nature than from the sins of the world in which he lives."²⁶ Orlando's humility tips the scales against Jaques' satiric habit of mind. Orlando's getting the better of Jaques by setting him up to see the foolish cipher of melancholy speculation—his face in a brook—encourages playgoers to believe that Shakespeare does not intend Jaques' commentary to be authoritative.²⁷

The most subtle hint that Shakespeare stands behind Duke Senior's skepticism concerning Jaques' theory of satire lies in the event that interrupts Jaques' rebuttal before it gains full strength. Jaques' question "But who comes here?" (2.7.87) refers to Orlando, breaking into the debate in order to demand food for Adam and himself. "When Orlando enters, desperate with hunger, Jaques has only 'reason' to offer as a cure," John Russell Brown notes, adding that "there may be a pun on reason/raisin" here and that "such a pun would tend to emphasize the single word, the rational purgative which is Jaques' only medicine."²⁸ Shakespeare displaces the unresolved debate about the efficacy of satiric words by presenting a stage image of a powerfully expressive deed—one of unreasoning loyalty so strong that Orlando stands ready to fight to secure food for his benefactor Adam. This expressive deed quickly becomes a nonverbal speaking picture, an image similar to those named by Sir Philip Sidney as material for literary speaking pictures, when Orlando reenters bearing old Adam on his back.²⁹ The evocation of Aeneas bearing his father Anchises signifies the heroism of the deed.³⁰ This onstage deed "speaks" filial piety better than any words could. Sidney believed that literary speaking pictures possess *enargeia*, a vividness striking the imagination and moving the will to imitate actively the contemplated image.³¹ By his dramatic version of a speaking picture, Shakespeare suggests that heroic deeds, represented on the stage, can more effectively move the wills of spectators to perform laudable deeds than Jaques' public satire loosely based on the Juvenalian model does.³²

A second implicit undercutting of the authority of Jaques' theory of public satire consists of his resorting to a deed and to a direct, personal warning (as opposed to oblique, public invective) at a crucial moment in Touchstone's and Audrey's "romance." When Sir Oliver Martext asks Touchstone to produce a witness to his clandestine, woodland wedding, Jaques cannot resist stepping forth from his hiding place. In other words, he uncharacteristically chooses to immerse himself in the flux of experience rather than to remain

a detached, satirical observer of humankind's romantic follies. His sharp, personal rebuke of Touchstone does not fit his model of impersonal public satire: "And will you, being a man of good breeding, be married under a bush, like a beggar? Get you to church, and have a good priest that can tell you what marriage is. This fellow [Martext] will but join you together as they join wainscot; then one of you will prove a shrunk panel and, like green timber, warp, warp" (3.3.75–80). No longer admiring the fool's wise-foolishness, Jaques plainly, prosaically, reprimands Touchstone in a personally untypical fashion. Ironically, the wise fool has shaken Jaques from the wisefoolish satire that Jaques enthusiastically proposed to practice.

While Shakespeare endorses expressive deeds over satiric words in pastoral episodes of *As You Like It*, he may nevertheless validate words in his presentation of Rosalind's verbal physicing of lovesick Orlando. Through a strategy of verbal chiding, she attempts to purge his romantic passion of impurities. Whatever control love-shaken Rosalind gains over her own verbal excesses derives mainly from this strategy, which appears partially scripted on her part. Her deepest fear as she comes to know Orlando is that he, like Orsino in *Twelfth Night*, may be in love not with her but with the self-flattering idea of being in love. Orlando's excessively stylized poetry suggests as much to Rosalind: "There is a man haunts the forest that abuses our young plants with carving 'Rosalind' on their barks; hangs odes upon hawthorns and elegies on brambles; all, forsooth, deifying the name of Rosalind. If I could meet that fancy-monger, I would give him some good counsel, for he seems to have the quotidian of love upon him" (3.2.342–49). Having read Orlando's lame, hyperbolic verse, Rosalind fears that the man she loves may be a "fancy-monger"—an abuser of the imagination. Moreover, she detects in him no outward signs of love melancholy, such as "a lean cheek," "a blue eye and sunken," "a beard neglected," "ungartered" hose, a "bonnet unbanded," a "sleeve unbuttoned," or a "shoe untied" (3.2.356–58, 361–62). She did overhear Orlando confidently bid adieu to Monsieur Melancholy at the end of his talk with Jaques. D. A. Beecher has speculated that "erotic melancholy was destined to lose its credibility as a motivational force in theatrical love plots at the same general moment in medical history that the system of humoral medicine upon which it was based itself came under professional attack." "But it is more probable," Beecher concludes, "that the entire sequence of pathological causation lost its viability through literary over-exposure and metamorphoses, through the creation of increasingly urbane, witty, and skeptical heroines, and through the recovery of a possible reinterpretation of the entire paradigm."³³ The symbolic parting of Love from Melancholy in the 1599–1600 comedy *As You Like It* (3.2.282–85) suggests that the "entire sequence of [the] pathological causation" of love melancholy was beginning to lose its viability near the end of Queen

Elizabeth's lifetime. Aging into her sixties, the queen had finally physically disqualified herself from being the royal object of courtiers' love and of the melancholy that conventionally accompanied love while it was alive.

Not detecting any of the popular signs of love passion, Rosalind worries that the man she loves may be an egoist: "you are rather point-device in your accoutrements, as loving yourself than seeming the lover of any other" (3.2.364–66). Thus she determines to physic a man who may be sick of self-love and a diseased imagination (3.2.385, 400–3). Rosalind's method of chiding seems to lay her open to Duke Senior's criticism of Jaques' satiric forays—that the verbal physician of a subject discloses more a vice of the corrosive speaker than a fault of the subject. In her case, however, the vice is feigned, and her method entails an aim gentler than Jaques'. By acting the role of a "moonish youth," "changeable, longing and liking, proud, fantastical, apish, shallow, inconstant, full of tears, full of smiles" (3.2.389–92), the Rosalind of Ganymede's portrayal epitomizes self-conceit, which is fully developed in her picture in act 4 of the maritally unfaithful Rosalind, the woman who cynically argues that no man ever died for love (4.1.86–98). Her feigned words, however, fail to shake Orlando's fantastic idealization of her, a result that makes her success impossible to gauge. Later, Oliver's report of Orlando's heroic risking of his life to save his treacherous brother renders moot the question of Orlando's self-love; the remarkable virtue of his selfless act eclipses, even excuses, any taint of self-love in his character.

In addition to a possible self-love within Orlando, Rosalind's verbal homeopathy is designed to correct her lover's Petrarchan flights of fancy by grounding them in vividly described realities of love and married life.³⁴ Her overstatement, even her misrepresentation of these realities, is necessary to bring Orlando to a balanced view of his mistress. Orlando's most serious imaginative failing involves his literalizing conceits, his habit of thinking that certain metaphors, such as the Petrarchan lover's "death," are categorically and always true.³⁵ When Rosalind, in her final session of therapy, encounters Orlando after he has been wounded in rescuing Oliver, she exclaims, "O, my dear Orlando, how it grieves me to see thee wear thy heart in a scarf!" (5.2.19–20). Rosalind jests that the "hart" should be wounded by its natural enemy, the lioness. When Orlando dully says, "It is my arm," she interprets her pun for him: "I thought thy heart had been wounded with the claws of a lion" (5.2.21–23). "Wounded it is," Orlando earnestly corrects her, "but with the eyes of a lady" (5.2.24). Rosalind breaks off her therapy at this point, and within moments Orlando tells her he can no longer keep up the game of imagining Ganymede as Rosalind. Thus Rosalind receives a husband apparently ignorant of the different reality signified by metaphoric words. As regards its two aims, Rosalind's

verbal homeopathy has either failed or been rendered inconsequential.³⁶ The ending of *As You Like It*, however, will suggest that deeds—marriage consummation and conjugal life—can cure language.

Rosalind's linguistic physic has amounted to a direct, personal test of Orlando as future husband. We see this directness of Rosalind's again when she resolves to prove "a busy actor" (3.4.54) in the love pageant of Silvius and scornful Phoebe. Instinctively Rosalind prefers the example of reformatory deeds and unveiled, personal rebuke over a detached role and oblique, public satire.³⁷ Stepping forward from her vantage point on Silvius and Phoebe's debate on love, she directly castigates Phoebe for her pitiless treatment of her lover:

Who might be your mother,
That you insult, exult, and all at once,
Over the wretched? What though you have no beauty—
As, by my faith, I see no more in you
Than without candle may go dark to bed—
Must you be therefore proud and pitiless?
(3.5.36–41)

Like Jaques with Touchstone and Audrey, Rosalind gives unequivocally practical and moral advice:

But, mistress, know yourself; down on your knees
And thank heaven, fasting, for a good man's love;
For I must tell you friendly in your ear,
Sell when you can. You are not for all markets.
Cry the man mercy, love him, take his offer;
Foul is most foul, being foul to be a scoffer.
(3.5.58–63)

The thought of Rosalind's final verse resembles Duke Senior's reason for dismissing Jaques' program of satire; it is as reprehensible for an ill-favored person to scoff at offered love as it is for a libertine to castigate others for the vices that he has practiced. In both cases, verbal scoffing comes off as an expression of hypocrisy.

Rosalind's direct rebuke thus contains powerful lessons. Consequently, it is not surprising that Phoebe falls in love with the speaker. Suddenly infused by love, the no-longer-scornful shepherdess experiences the truth of feigning poetry. "Dead shepherd," she asserts, alluding to Christopher Marlowe and his poem *Hero and Leander* (1598), "now I find thy saw of might: / 'Who ever loved that loved not at first sight?'" (3.5.82–83). When Silvius renews his plea that Phoebe pity him, a new attitude on her part becomes apparent: "I am sorry for thee, gentle Silvius" (3.5.86). Rosalind's

essentially nonsatiric, harsh personal words have caused Phoebe to experience a truth about love celebrated in contemporary literature. (Rosalind and Orlando have appeared genuinely to fall in love at first sight, as will Celia and Oliver.) Rosalind's harsh words appear to have reformed the shepherdess's scornful attitude toward her lover; they have moved Phoebe to a kind of gentler speech, a credit to her better self.

Phoebe's new love, nevertheless, reveals gross impurities. "Silvius, the time was that I hated thee," she admits,

And yet it is not that I bear thee love,
But since that thou canst talk of love so well,
Thy company, which erst was irksome to me,
I will endure; and I'll employ thee, too.
(3.5.93–97)

Phoebe cunningly employs Silvius by making him the unwitting bearer of her love letters to Ganymede. This sneaking behavior complements the vanity implied in her attraction to Ganymede; she responds to "his" feminine features because they constitute a mirror of her vain opinion of the beauty of her own face (3.5.121–27). These dramatic facts suggest that the reformation wrought within her by Rosalind's words was only momentary. Sir Oliver Martext's reaction to Jaques' rebuke of his and Touchstone's "wedding" suggests that harsh, personal criticism is on occasion ineffective. Smarting under Jaques' command to Touchstone, "Get you to church, and have a good priest that can tell you what marriage is" (3.3.76–77), Sir Oliver grumbles, "'Tis no matter. Ne'er a fantastical knave of them all shall flout me out of my calling" (3.3.96–97). To the degree that Ganymede's portrait of scornful Rosalind warps the truth (not only about Orlando's beloved but also about womankind), Rosalind deserves the punishment of becoming cruel Phoebe's love object. In the final analysis, the speech of the woodland episodes, whether Orlando's love poetry, Rosalind's verbal homeopathy, or characters' direct, caustic advice, fails to work the expressive magic associated with the Renaissance subgenre of pastoral, especially in Shakespeare's adaptation of it.

Ironically, the bumpkin William exemplifies the most pristine use of language in the forest of Arden (or in the court, for that matter). William's answers to Touchstone's progressively more hostile and allusive speech are simple straightforward, pious, and charitable. After supplying Touchstone with facts about his age and identity, William answers the jester's query "Wast born i' th' forest here?" with the reply "Ay, sir, I thank God" (5.1.22–23):

Touch: Thank God—a good answer. Art rich?
William: Faith, sir, so-so.

Touch: so-so is good, very good, very excellent good.
And yet it is not, it is but so-so.

(5.1.24–27).

When Touchstone continues by judging that William “sa[ith] well” (5.1.29), he alludes sarcastically to the rustic’s literal-mindedness. And yet even Touchstone’s increasingly violent threats regarding William’s presence and his status as Audrey’s former suitor cannot shake William’s charitable disposition. Threatened by Touchstone with death in “a hundred and fifty ways,” William exits good-naturedly, exclaiming “God rest you merry, sir” (5.1.55, 58). If William, who says that his place of birth is in the forest of Arden, represents William Shakespeare’s comic alter ego in the play, playgoers’ inferences about the source of good language could become ambiguous, even a bit troubling.³⁸ The implication would be that formal education and the arts of culture are not necessary causes for the birth of good language, and that rude Nature by itself may be sufficient for its life.

Essentially William dramatizes a version of Celia’s notion of an ideal uttered response to life. When Rosalind begs her to answer all her huddled questions about Orlando in one word, Celia jokes, “You must borrow me Gargantua’s mouth first, ’tis a word too great for any mouth of this age’s size. To say ay or no to these particulars is more than to answer in a catechism” (3.2.217–20). William in effect says “ay” and “no” in his unequivocal, genial language. Heard within the context of her remark about catechism, Celia’s “ay” and “no” allude to biblical speech. King Lear judges that, as spoken by Goneril, “[A]y and no . . . was no good divinity” (*King Lear*, 4.6.99–100). In his madness, Lear denies the truth of a New Testament passage found in James 5:12—“But above all, my brethren, do not swear, either by heaven or by earth or with any other oath. But let your ‘Yes’ be ‘Yes,’ and *your* ‘No,’ ‘No,’ lest you fall into judgment.”³⁹ Celia less distinctly, but nevertheless certainly, refers to this biblical passage in her joke about “ay,” “no,” and catechism—a joke that gets seriously staged in the rustic William’s “divinely” declarative speech.⁴⁰

Still, none of the major characters of *As You Like It* is able to find biblical language analogous to William’s that solves problems and works happiness in the forest of Arden. The expressive power of Orlando’s “speaking” act, his bearing Adam to the Duke’s banquet, suggests that deeds—not words—can resolve characters’ difficulties and can fashion reconciliations and marriages.⁴¹ A redemptive deed, Orlando’s rescuing Oliver from a serpent and a lioness, supersedes his keeping his word—his promise to meet Rosalind at two o’clock. Wreathed about

sleeping Oliver's neck, the serpent threatens the opening of his mouth (4.3.108–11). Understood iconographically, the serpent's action figures the punishment for envy, especially verbal slander that grows out of jealousy.⁴² Envious of his virtuous brother's popularity, Oliver slanders Orlando by lying to Charles the Wrestler about Orlando's character. Seeing Orlando, the serpent unlinks itself and crawls away. In a symbolic reading, the image of virtuous Orlando "speaks" to the retreating serpent, even as it has powerfully spoken to playgoers in his heroic bearing of Adam; a nonverbal form of communication rectifies the consequence of ruinous speech—slander. More important, Orlando's deed of battling and killing the lioness communicates to Oliver his martyr-like love for his brother, compelling Oliver to beg Orlando's pardon and ensuring the brothers' reunion. Symbolically, the anger between them has been killed in the form of the lioness, a Renaissance figure of wrath.⁴³ Concerning Orlando's wrestling with the lioness, one critic has noted that, "since the action itself surely evokes Hercules' triumph over the Nemean lion, it is suggestive that Alciati allegorizes this labor as the power of eloquence. The once tongue-tied Herculean Orlando affirms the truth of his love with an action that speaks more eloquently than words."⁴⁴

Orlando's deed of wrestling the lioness complements his deed of wrestling Charles; whereas the first act won Rosalind's heart, the second unites him with a changed brother. In accordance with Shakespeare's emphasis upon the expressive power of deeds compared to that of words, an act of Rosalind's, her sudden paleness and fainting at the news of Orlando's wound, conveys her love for him in a way she cannot control (4.3.158–83). Where love is concerned, deeds are more truthful communicators than words. This is the case even when the deed involves the action of the blood's flowing to and from the skin. When Orlando attempted to cheer up famished Adam, he concluded his long exhortation with the exclamation, "Well said. Thou lookest cheerly" (2.6.12–13). Since Adam has said nothing, playgoers are understandably puzzled by Orlando's utterance. Alan Brissenden, G. Blakemore Evans, and Agnes Latham—among other editors of *As You Like It*—gloss Orlando's statement as meaning "Well done."⁴⁵ Adam's well-doing apparently consists of his mustering a reddish color in his pale cheeks. In this respect, Adam's blood silently speaks to Orlando, who translates its message into an optimistic statement. Blood speaks again in the play in the form of Orlando's bloodied handkerchief, which causes Rosalind to faint. This blood, described by Oliver as flowing from the lioness's claws and as seen on the handkerchief, proclaims Orlando's love for Rosalind and for his fellow humankind conclusively, inalterably, more forcefully than words can. A deed, the sending of the bloodied handkerchief, provides the proof of Orlando's selfless love that

Rosalind has sought through verbal testing. That Orlando's deed of sending the bloodied handkerchief as an excuse for his broken promise proves the authenticity of his love for Rosalind is suggested in a pun by the heroine herself. "If you do love Rosalind so near the heart as your gesture cries it out, when your brother marries Aliena shall you marry her" (5.2.59–62), she states. The gesture in this case is his sending the handkerchief, spotted with evidence from "near the heart" of his courage and magnanimity. While Rosalind's statement takes a conditional form ("If") ("much virtue in 'if'" [5.4.98]),⁴⁶ her utterance in fact is a declaration of her settled mind and marital intentions. In early modern Europe, a bloodied cloth was the bride's proof to her husband of her prenuptial chastity.⁴⁷ In the comic world of *As You Like It*, it is Orlando's gift of love.

Realizing that Orlando, despite his imaginative failures, is worthy, Rosalind turns to a deed to unite lover and beloved. "Believe then, if you please, that I can *do* strange things" (5.2.56–57, italics mine), she exclaims when she promises to unite the play's couples, including herself and Orlando. She asserts that she can perform magical deeds, having "conversed with a magician, most profound in his art, and yet not damnable" (5.2.58–59), since she was three years old. Her deed of conjuring the god Hymen to betroth the play's couples is a supernatural act that confirms her claims.⁴⁸

At the conclusion of *As You Like It*, Rosalind performs the marriage of words to deeds, a wedding that the play has, in so many ways, required. "I have promised to make all this matter even" (5.4.18), she begins:

Keep your word, O Duke, to give your daughter.
 You yours, Orlando, to receive his daughter.
 Keep you your word, Phoebe, that you'll marry me,
 Or else refusing me to wed this shepherd.
 Keep your word, Silvius, that you'll marry her
 If she refuse me; and from hence I go
 To make these doubts all even.

(5.4.19–25)

Rosalind makes "these doubts all even" by producing Hymen (and herself), acting so that characters can fulfill their words of promise in deeds of betrothal. Rosalind's spectacular deed of magic validates her stated claim to have conversed as a child with a sorcerer. Hymen bestows Rosalind upon Duke Senior, with the plea that he give her to Orlando (5.4.109–10). Proper bestowal and sanctified giving away are themselves the deeds that ratify marriage. They charge Rosalind's easy producing of herself in her own identity with value. Even Oliver, the elder brother, asked Orlando for permission to

marry Celia (5.2.8–15). And it is Hymen rather than Rosalind who ends all strife through his symbolic pairing of lovers' hands:

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 holds true contents.
 (5.4.120–25)

The genuine “if” that is the play’s only peacemaker is Hymen: “Peace ho! I bar confusion.” If the deity Hymen genuinely exists (as chapter two argues that he does), peace between mates becomes possible. Hymen’s ceremonial deed of placing hands in hands—at least in the cases of Orlando and Rosalind and Oliver and Celia—receives his divine blessing in these words:

(*To Orlando and Rosalind*)
 You and you no cross shall part.
 (*To Oliver and Celia*)
 You and you are heart in heart.
 (5.4.126–27)

Word and deed in *As You Like It* have at last become an expressive unity with no conflict or superiority entailed.

“In dramatizing the cultural bankruptcy of both Ovidian/Petrarchan idolatry and satire at the turn of the [sixteenth to] the seventeenth century,” Grace Tiffany asserts that Shakespeare in *As You Like It* “involved himself in social currents that extended beyond the theater world.” “It is likely,” she claims, “that at this moment in the reign of a visibly ageing queen, the once potent image of a celestial virgin beauty had lost much of its political power.” *As You Like It*, Tiffany concludes, “discloses the intrinsic instability of the symbol that had legitimized Elizabeth’s role for four decades.”⁴⁹ Rosalind’s attractive mockery of Orlando’s Ovidian/Petrarchan word pictures of her reveals this late Elizabethan unsettlement. Yet if *As You Like It* is late Elizabethan in this respect, it appears more typically Elizabethan in its representation of a dialectic between words and deeds. At least it does so when the play is considered in terms of the regularity of Shakespeare’s incorporation of versions of this dialectic in works as early in his career as *Love’s Labor’s Lost*, which in a likely first form was written probably in the late 1580s or early 1590s. Among the several possibilities for interpreting the title *As You Like It* is the suggestion that the playwright is giving

late Elizabethan playgoers dramatic fare that they have previously liked. Among the play's previously liked elements, I conjecture that a contemporary dialectic of words versus deeds finds a place.

While this dialectic of words versus deeds may have especially appealed to Shakespeare, it was also a preoccupation of his age. The Humanism of the earlier sixteenth century centering in the work of men such as John Cheke, Erasmus, Roger Ascham, and William Lyly (the grandfather of the Elizabethan writer and dramatist John Lyly) had in so many ways established the power of written and verbal rhetoric for the educational formation of an English nation and its literary art, notably as a reciprocating catalyst to virtuous action. Nevertheless, in *Euphues, or the Anatomy of Wit* (1578) and his eight known plays (1584–1590), John Lyly shows, often excessively so, the fireworks of rhetorical expression not simply neutralizing but paralyzing characters' deeds. This is never the case in any of Shakespeare's plays. In fact, as one reads through Shakespeare's plays of the 1590s and early 1600s, one gathers the impression that this playwright gives less value to words and greater importance to deeds in the dialectic of words versus deeds. This opinion owes much to a late Elizabethan play such as *As You Like It*, in which a shift of emphasis within the dialectic is pronounced so as to accentuate finally the expressive power of deeds compared to that of words. In his plays usually dated after 1603, the year in which Queen Elizabeth died, Shakespeare appears less interested, for whatever reason, in staging a dialectic of words versus deeds (*King Lear* and an *All's Well That Ends Well* dated c.1603–1605 are the exceptions). Perhaps a Jacobean skeptical distance from the Tudor relative confidence in the power of rhetoric in a reciprocating manner to prompt or influence action had something to do with Shakespeare's late-play relative lack of interest. A concurrent cultural shift in blame for problems in the expression of meaning from corrupt speakers to defective language may likely also have played a role in Shakespeare's change of focus. Whatever the case, these general impressions warrant the conclusion that the discernible skewing toward the expressive force of deeds in a dialectic of words versus deeds apparent in *As You Like It* can be thought of as a late Elizabethan phenomenon within the larger field of Elizabethan and Jacobean aesthetics.

CHAPTER FOUR
AS YOU LIKE IT
AND THE "WARWICKSHIRE"
OF SHAKESPEARE'S MIND

Until now, the chapters of this volume have treated certain late Elizabethan topics of interest in *As You Like It* that possess meanings accessible to a literate playgoer. I have called such generally accessible meanings public, for want of a better term. In this and the following chapter, I describe some private meanings of the play—meanings, that is to say, referring to a hypothesized private life of the late Elizabethan dramatist William Shakespeare and sometimes not accessible to the majority of literate playgoers. Much of this chapter is admittedly speculative, and I hereby give my reader notice of that fact. *As You Like It* is a pastoral comedy, and pastoral for Shakespeare and his contemporaries had become a literary mode known for the usually veiled depiction of autobiographical events in the author's life, notably his or her artistic life. Paul Alpers in his definitive *What is Pastoral?* provides the best account of how this happened, by explaining in depth first the third-century BC Sicilian poet Theocritus's self-representation in his *Idylls*, and then Virgil's in his *Eclogues*.¹ Typically, for Elizabethan readers, a character such as Colin Clout in Spenser's collection of pastoral eclogues titled *The Shepheardes Calender* (1579) or Philisides in Sir Philip Sidney's highly popular pastoral romance, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia* (1593), would act out aspects of the author's career, sometimes including its birth and usually in interaction with other characters adumbrating individuals important in the author's life. Regarding the autobiographical dimension of early modern English literary pastoral, James Bednarz notes that

[t]he standard technique of self-portraiture in the Renaissance was to follow [Iacobo] Sannazaro's example in *Arcadia* [1501] by depicting oneself as a mournful lover, often the victim of cross-wooing. Indeed, the attraction of pastoral self-reference was so strong that even Anthony Munday became 'shepherd Tonie' in *England's Helicon* (1600). What is more, the great English examples—Philisides in the *Arcadia* and Colin Clout in *The*

Shepherd's Calendar and Book Six of *The Fairy Queen*—involved cameo appearances hidden in tangled plots. These characters were planted in self-reflexive episodes for readers in the know who were meant to be surprised by the sudden emergence of truth in feigning.²

In *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, Philisides, the anagram of Philip Sidney's name, focuses and names a *philos*—a philosophical wisdom—emerging from this character.

That the forest of Ardennes in Lodge's *Rosalynde*, a territory straddling the boundaries of modern France, Belgium, and Luxembourg, becomes the forest of Arden in Shakespeare's *As You Like It* (this being, in fact, the name of his mother's family) is enough to suggest that this pastoral location provides an English Midlands setting for the playwright's introduction of an alter ego and for the exploration of certain issues of importance in Shakespeare's past and present life. Shakespeare's dramatic method in this case potentially involves nostalgia, of what I call a "Warwickshire of the mind" informing the pastoral art of the forest of Arden in *As You Like It*. Understanding nostalgia involves a grasp of the distance nostalgia bridges—the distance, in this case, between London and the felt presence of Shakespeare's "native country" in his late Elizabethan pastoral comedy. That distance, the length that Rosalind could be said to travel from the treacherous court of Duke Frederick to the forest of Arden, was considerable.

"He was wont to go to his native country once a year," the seventeenth-century biographer John Aubrey pronounced concerning the playwright Shakespeare's relationship with his native place, the Midlands town Stratford-upon-Avon.³ No one can gauge the accuracy of the gossipy Aubrey's anecdotes; but considered in light of a sixteenth-century English traveler's difficulty in negotiating the nearly one-hundred miles between Shakespeare's rural home and the largest city of early modern Europe, Aubrey's claim may very well be true. Russell Fraser has memorably taken us hand-in-hand with Shakespeare on an imaginative Elizabethan journey from Stratford over the muddy, sometimes flooded, highwayman-threatened roads that Shakespeare probably took to Newgate.⁴ This trip one-way took at least three or four days, sometimes more—especially if the traveler, unable to hire horses between inns, had to walk. Yet, as Fraser remarks, "at three pence a mile [riding a horse probably] wasn't an option available to the young [as opposed to the prosperous] Shakespeare."⁵ In any case, walking was the standard method of travel for London players on provincial tour. The journey most likely took Shakespeare initially east through Compton Wynyates to Banbury, past "stone farmhouses, grayish brown . . . dark against the fields"⁶—poor pelting villages—through Buckinghamshire and through the hamlet of Grendon Underwood. John Aubrey, getting his Shakespeare plays wrong, proclaimed that "the humour of the constable in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* [*Much*

Ado About Nothing], he happened to take at Grendon in Bucks...which is the road from London to Stratford, and there was living that constable about 1642, when I first came to Oxford: Mr. Josias Howe is of that parish, and knew him."⁷ From there, a bemuddled, tired Shakespeare passed over the Chiltern Hills, through the Vale of Aylesbury, to Uxbridge, twelve miles northwest of London Wall, where the Banbury road joined the Oxford road. From there he walked through Southall and Acton, along the edge of today's Hyde Park and the sixteenth-century Tyburn gallows, through St. Giles in the Fields, to the vicinity of Gray's Inn and Holburn Bars.

Russell Fraser's imaginative reconstruction of Shakespeare's journey makes Aubrey's report of Shakespeare's single annual visit to Stratford believable. No record or report of Shakespeare's presence in 1596 at his son Hamnet's interment exists. Given knowledge of the multi-day ardors of the journey, one would not be surprised to learn of evidence of Shakespeare's absence at his son's burial. Fellow dramatist Ben Jonson loved his little son Benjamin dearly, at least his extant poem on the child's death says so; yet he was not present at the boy's burial ceremony. Moreover, Shakespeare's inclination to visit his "native country"—to use Aubrey's quaint phrase—may have been darkly colored by any one or more of the plausible reasons for his original leaving Stratford for London. These hypothesized reasons include John Shakespeare's apparent financial debts and the loss of young William's patrimony as eldest son (the mortgaging of the land and property that had been bequeathed to his mother, Mary Arden); the probable lack of living space (and livelihood) in the Henley Street home for a newly married minor with a child, and then twins; and the legal prosecution of the Catholic-hating Sir Thomas Lucy for Shakespeare's joining in the deer poaching on Lucy's ground (the Shakespeares may have been a family of recusants).

Despite the possible dark hue of Shakespeare's recollections of his later youth in Stratford, the place of his birth was probably never far from the playwright's thoughts in London. His brother Edmund followed him there to the trade of actor, to be buried in Southwark Cathedral near the Globe Theater, apparently at Shakespeare's considerable expense; and Richard Field, the Stratford tanner's son and three years Shakespeare's senior, in London printed Shakespeare's carefully prepared narrative poems, *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*. Field, in fact, at one time lived "on Wood Street in Cripplegate ward, just around the corner from Shakespeare."⁸ Still, Richard Field and Edmund Shakespeare, to say nothing of the likely London visits of other unidentifiable Stratford neighbors, could not have helped Shakespeare home during those moments that most men and women endure, when they wish for whatever current reason that light or time could instantaneously convey them

back to the countryside, to the town, to the house where they first lived, where they first met and knew the world, typically on their safe, fresh terms—terms later to be known as naive (yet valued pleurably all the same). Like most men and women, Shakespeare at these moments of longing could return only vicariously, but in his case through his art. The sometimes fanciful way in which he did so constitutes what could be called a Warwickshire of his mind.⁹ Yet none of these ways was less nostalgic than the path through the pastoral forest of Arden of *As You Like It*, through a conventional pastoral landscape of early modern English autobiography.

Long before Shakespeare was born, the Warwickshire forest of Arden was so dense that it has been said that at one time, long before, a squirrel could journey from Stratford to the vicinity of modern-day Birmingham without once touching the ground. In Shakespeare's time, it stretched mainly north of the town of Stratford.¹⁰ But, as Anne Barton has demonstrated, it had degenerated to a ghost of its former self, its great trees so felled and cleared to create cornfields and grazing spaces—even ground for iron mines—that a map of Warwickshire in Michael Drayton's *Poly-Olbion* (1612) designated the area of "The old forrest of Arden" simply "Woodland."¹¹ Hunters, gatherers, masterless men and women, and cottage industries populated this rapidly thinning woodland more densely than has been commonly recognized, a fact justifying Shakespeare's locating there in *As You Like It* a cast of characters ranging from exiled courtiers to simple country folk such as William and his love Audrey. Chapter two of this study has shown that *As You Like It* partly concerns the problematical process of personal ripening under the influence of time and love, and of learning how to recognize *kairos*, the moment for realizing one's ripened being. Touchstone's complaints about rotting in the forest of Arden and Jaques' portrait of humankind waxing and waning through the seven ages of life are only two of several contexts in the play that focus the issue of a personal ripeness of the playwright and its relationship to Shakespeare's seizing an opportune moment for creating a wider, richer life. Orlando seizes that moment when he chooses love over hate and intervenes to save sleeping Oliver from the lioness and serpent threatening him. Any comparable opportune moment that young Shakespeare seized for the determination of his later life could not have been so fantastic or dramatically dangerous.

My argument about the autobiographical burden of pastoral in *As You Like It* precludes a full exploration of these ideas here, but reference to them becomes necessary for gaining perspective upon the significance of Shakespeare's imaginative journey home in creating William, a comic younger self. Jaques has earlier persuaded Touchstone against being married to Audrey irregularly by the priest Sir Oliver Martext, and Touchstone

begins act 5 by protesting, "A most wicked Sir Oliver, Audrey, a most vile Martext. But, Audrey, there is a youth here in the forest lays claim to you" (5.1.5-7):

Audrey: Ay, I know who 'tis. He hath no interest in me in the world. Here comes the man you mean.

Enter William

Touchstone: It is meat and drink to me to see a clown. By my troth, we that have good wits have much to answer for. We shall be flouting; we cannot hold.

William: Good ev'n, Audrey.

Audrey: God ye good ev'n, William.

William: (*to Touchstone*) And good ev'n to you, sir.

Touchstone: Good ev'n, gentle friend. Cover thy head, cover thy head. Nay, prithee, be covered. How old are you, friend?

William: Five-and-twenty, sir.

Touchstone: A ripe age. Is thy name William?

William: William, sir.

Touchstone: A fair name. Wast born i'th' forest here?

William: Ay, sir, I thank God.

Touchstone: Thank God—a good answer. Art rich?

William: Faith, sir, so-so.

Touchstone: So-so is good, very good, very excellent good. And yet it is not, it is but so-so. Art thou wise?

William: Ay, sir, I have a pretty wit.

Touchstone: Why, thou sayst well. I do now remember a saying: "The fool doth think he is wise, but the wise man knows himself to be a fool." The heathen philosopher, when he had a desire to eat a grape, would open his lips when he put it into his mouth, meaning thereby that grapes were made to eat, and lips to open. You do love this maid?

William: I do, sir.

Touchstone: Give me your hand. Art thou learned?

William: No, sir.

Touchstone: Then learn of me: to have is to have. For it is a figure in rhetoric that drink, being poured out of a cup into a glass, by filling the one doth empty the other. For all your writers do consent that *ipse* is he. Now you are not *ipse*, for I am he.

William: Which he, sir?

Touchstone: He, sir, that must marry this woman. Therefore, you clown, abandon—which is in the vulgar, leave—the society—which in the boorish is company—of this female—which in the common is woman; which together is, abandon the society of this female, or, clown, thou perishest; or, to thy better understanding, diest; or, to wit, I kill thee, make thee away, translate thy life into death, thy liberty into bondage. I will deal in poison with thee, or in bastinado, or in steel. I will bandy with thee in faction, I will o'errun thee with policy. I will kill thee a hundred and fifty ways. Therefore tremble, and depart.

Audrey: Do, good William.

William: God rest you merry, sir.
(5.1.8–58)

“Wast born i'th' forest here?” Touchstone asks and William replies affirmatively. Like his namesake, William Shakespeare was born in the vicinity of the forest of Arden. By 1599—the date usually assigned to *As You Like It*—William Shakespeare, again like his namesake in the play—was said to have “a pretty wit.” Francis Meres had essentially said so in print in 1598, terming Shakespeare an English Ovid: “As the soule of *Euphorbus* was thought to live in *Pythagoras*: so the sweete wittie soule of *Ouid* lives in mellifluous & hony-tongued *Shakespeare*, witness his *Venus* and *Adonis*, his *Lucrece*, his sugred Sonnets among his private friends, &c.”¹² “Art thou learned?” Touchstone asks and receives a negative answer. In Shakespeare’s *2 Henry IV* (1597–98), a play contemporaneous with *As You Like It*, Shallow asks Silence, “I dare say my cousin William is become a good scholar. He is at Oxford still, is he not?” (3.2.9–11). Warwickshire-like recollections are drenched in nostalgia in *2 Henry IV*, and Shallow’s question receives a positive reply. Ironically, Shakespeare never went to Oxford University, nor to Cambridge either. John Shakespeare had not acquired the status of gentleman when Shakespeare was university-age; more to the point, his father’s financial distress apparently precluded the possibility that young William might have received formal higher education. That Oxford University, relatively close to Stratford-upon-Avon, was beyond his grasp may have briefly embittered the future playwright. But anger does not enter into Shallow’s evocation of “William” at Oxford; instead, one senses wishful thinking in keeping with the nostalgia of the scene. Nostalgia, however, does not lend a gauzy tinge to late Elizabethan Shakespeare’s creation of a comic alter ego in *As You Like It*, and the charge of “small Latin” that Ben Jonson would later level against Shakespeare was perhaps characterizing the playwright from one end of the 1590s to the other. Shakespeare deprives his William of any formal education, certainly that of the town grammar school that the playwright attended. “For all your writers do consent that *ipse* is he,” Touchstone sarcastically lectures William. “Now you are not *ipse* [the successful lover of this woman], for I am he.” “Which he, sir?” William thickly replies. This William’s Latin is not simply “less,” but nonexistent.¹³

A second Shakespeare play roughly contemporary with *As You Like It*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (1597–1601) further establishes the late-1590s autobiographical dimension of the character William by introducing a third namesake. Set in and about Windsor, the play nevertheless evokes Stratford and the forest of Arden. Eric Sams and others have heard “the

dozen white luses" (pikes) that Slender mentions in Shallow's coat of arms, the fish that Sir High Evans calls "the dozen white louses" (1.1.14–16), as a satiric allusion to the coat of arms of Sir Thomas Lucy, a notorious Warwickshire persecutor of Catholics and, according to a legend mentioned by Nicholas Rowe in 1709, the nemesis of the young William Shakespeare caught poaching deer and rabbits on his estate.¹⁴ Just as in *As You Like It*, a sacred oak and a forest are important in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. In the scene devoted to the third William in *The Merry Wives*, Shakespeare comically suggests the limits that a rural, unlettered life sets to anything other than the student's most elementary knowledge of Latin. In act 4, scene 1, the Welsh parson, Hugh Evans, grills Mrs. Page's young son William at his mother's insistence, but the language drill is soon humorously interrupted and finally derailed by Mistress Quickly's mistaken obscene interpretations. To his credit, William struggles to proceed despite Evans's twisted English and Quickly's "moral" commentary on the lesson:

Mrs. Page: Come on, sirrah, hold up your head. Answer your master. Be not afraid.

Evans: William, how many numbers is in nouns?

William: Two.

Quickly: Truly, I thought there had been one number more, because they say "Od's nouns" ["wounds"].

Evans: Peace your tattlings!—What is "fair," William?

William: *Pulcher*.

Quickly: Polecats? There are fairer things than polecats, sure.

Evans: You are a very simplicity 'oman. I pray you, peace.—What is *lapis*, William?

William: A stone.

Evans: And what is "a stone," William?

William: A pebble.

Evans: No, it is *lapis*. I pray you, remember in your prain.

William: *Lapis*.

Evans: That is a good William. What is he, William, that does lend articles?

William: Articles are borrowed of the pronoun, and be thus declined, *singulariter, nominativo, hic, haec, hoc*.

Evans: *Nominativo, hig, hag, hog*. Pray you, mark: *genitivo, huius*. Well, what is your accusative case?

William: *Accusativo, hinc*.

Evans: I pray you, have your remembrance, child. *Accusativo, hung, hang, hog*.

Quickly: "Hang-hog" is Latin for bacon, I warrant you.

Evans: Leave your prabbles, 'oman—What is the focative case, William?

William: O—*vocativo*, O.

Evans: Remember, William, focative is *caret*.

Quickly: And that's a good root.

Evans: 'Oman, forbear.

Mrs. Page: [to Mistress Quickly] Peace!

Evans: What is your genitive case plural, William?

William: Genitive case?

Evans: Ay.

William: *Genitivo—horum, harum, horum.*

Quickly: Vengeance of Jenny's case! Fie on her! Never name her, child, if she be a whore.

Evans: For shame, 'oman!

Quickly: You do ill to teach the child such words. He teaches him to hick and to hack, which they'll do fast enough of themselves, and to call "whorum." Fie upon you!

Evans: 'Oman, art thou lunatics? Hast thou no understandings for thy cases and the numbers of the genders? Thou art as foolish Christian creatures as I would desires.

Mrs. Page: [*to Mistress Quickly*] Prithee, hold thy peace.

Evans: Show me now, William, some declensions of your pronouns.

William: Forsooth, I have forgot.

Evans: It is *qui, quae, quod*. If you forget your *qui's*, your *quae's*, and your *quod's* you must be preeches [breeched, whipped on the buttocks]. Go your ways and play, go.

(4.1.19–74)

Poor William is caught between two forces. Hugh Evans's tonally distorted English pronunciation of Latin and his insistence that William get the numbers of Latin correct when Evans cannot correctly get the numbers of English grammar unfairly tax the boy. Evans's telling Mistress Quickly that she is "as foolish Christian creatures as I would desires" because she has "no understandings" of Latin "cases and the numbers of the genders" (italics mine) exemplifies William's burden. So too does Sir Hugh's deadening circular logic in leading William from "*lapis*" through "stone" and "pebble" back to "*lapis*" again. Given Evans's butchering of English, William's mistaken pronouncing "*hinc*" rather than "*hunc*" an accusative form of a specific demonstrative pronoun is not surprising. The other force retarding William is Mistress Quickly's bawdy running commentary, unintentionally ribald intrusions that cause William's mind at last to go blank so that to Sir Hugh's question he sadly says, "Forsooth, I have forgot."

The Merry Wives of Windsor is a play partly about how the knowledge of evil vilely misconstrues reality (one recalls Frank Ford's jealous idea of his wife's adultery and Falstaff's conviction that the wives will reciprocate his lust), and about how the knowledge of evil poisons its bearer and redounds to his or her discredit (one recalls Falstaff burnt and pinched by the fairies). "*Honi soit qui mal y pense*" (5.5.68): "Evil to him who evil thinks." Shakespeare wrote *The Merry Wives* very likely to commemorate the installation of Knights of the Order of the Garter, and the quotation in the comedy—by Mistress Quickly, of all people—of the Order's motto makes Shakespeare's comedy a Garter play.¹⁵ The playwright has writ the Order's

motto large, throughout the play's characterizations and dramaturgy—even to the scene of young William's short-circuited attempt to parse his Latin. Assaulted by an adult harangue involving coarse sexual euphemisms, William not surprisingly has trouble with his declension of pronouns.

All this is to say that late Elizabethan Shakespeare in a matter of a few years introduced his younger Stratford self into three different plays, two of which suggested that his native country and its folk checked, or retarded, his understanding of Latin. But the tone is light, even self-mocking. Why would Shakespeare distort a re-creation of himself in a plain, naked manner at the other extreme from aggrandizing nostalgic recollection? What positive value in *As You Like It* could a mocking imaginative return to his native country and an unnostalgically seen self have? After all, Touchstone insults William by calling his age of twenty-five "ripe." William may have a pretty wit, but an uncultivated life in Arden has never ripened it, as Oxford would have done (the university town through which William Shakespeare likely passed a number of times on the road to and from Stratford and London). Twenty-five was an age at which most Englishmen who had attended Oxford or Cambridge had matriculated B.A. or M.A and were involved in one profession or another. At age twenty-five, the thirty-four- or thirty-five-year-old creator of *As You Like It* was writing—by the standards set by other Elizabethan dramatists—aesthetically mature (that is to say, ripe) works such as the plays of the *Henry VI* trilogy. And yet an older Shakespeare himself may have privately, in his own mind, deemed the artistry of this trilogy unripe compared to the complex dramaturgy of later plays such as *Henry V*, *Hamlet*, and *King Lear*. Judged in hindsight, from the perspective offered by a 1599–1600 play such as *As You Like It*, the artistry of earlier plays such as *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *3 Henry VI* may have seemed generally green to Shakespeare, even though it does not to us (and most likely did not to these earlier plays' audiences). Whatever the case, in a late Elizabethan play in which ripeness is much, if not all, of what matters in life, William, perhaps like his namesake before he emigrated to London, is unripe—a self-deprecating foil accentuating the noble ripeness not so much acquired as seized by a character such as Orlando in *As You Like It*. It is not clear that the William of *As You Like It* has seized anything of value, not even the Audrey he momentarily holds.

Shakespeare's Warwickshire of the mind in *As You Like It* deeply concerns the question of artistic ripeness in the context of the poet's origins and death. Interestingly, the verbally facetious jester Touchstone, not William, associates himself with the poet in the forest of Arden. "I am here with thee and thy goats," Touchstone tells Audrey in act 3, "as the most capricious poet honest Ovid was among the Goths" (3.3.5–6). Ovid

ended his life among the Goths, whereas Shakespeare may have felt he started his among their "barbarous" English counterparts only to escape their country. Shakespeare's allusion to Ovid may be more critical than complimentary of one of his favorite poets. Alan Brissenden has nicely remarked that the "capricious" Ovid was the lascivious Ovid ("capricious" derived from *caper*: male goat, the animal symbolic of lust).¹⁶ Ovid was the "author of *The Art of Love* and the lover of the Emperor's daughter Julia, the advocate of sexual liberty in Rome."¹⁷ It is hard to imagine a sexually opportunistic Ovid as "honest," but one could say the poet was honest in his forthright, dangerous advocacy of Roman freedom of manners, notably those of sexual behavior. Because of his presumptuous liaison with Julia, Ovid was exiled to a "barbarous" province, one where by definition the inhabitants could not read Latin and so could neither appreciate the Roman poet's verses nor understand his daily utterances. Thinking of Ovid's "crime" and fate possibly caused Shakespeare to think not—in this case—of himself but of his dead rival poet Christopher Marlowe. David Riggs has asserted that "Marlowe fashioned his own career after the example of Ovid, the 'teacher of desire,' and suffered a similar fate."¹⁸ Even as Ovid tested the repressive instincts of Augustus Caesar by his erotic art and behavior,¹⁹ Marlowe challenged the Elizabethan establishment by his erotic art, fashioned in a translation of Ovid's *Art of Loving* and the Roman poet's elegies, and by his apparently homosexual lifestyle. Augustus silenced Ovid by removing him to a place where the ears of his hearers were effectively deaf and their eyes blind to his work, and where his tongue was effectively removed. David Riggs notes that "[s]ix years after Marlowe's death [in 1599], when his [Ovidian] *Elegies* had appeared in print, Archbishop Whitgift ordered all copies to 'be presently brought to the Bishop of London to be burned' in St. Paul's Churchyard."²⁰

Twice in *As You Like It* Shakespeare clearly alludes to his former rival, Christopher Marlowe.²¹ Creating a couplet containing a popular verse (I.176) from Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* (publ. 1598)), and paying tribute to Marlowe by naming him in terms of his well-known poem, "The Passionate Shepherd," Phoebe—concerning her passion for Ganymede—exclaims in *As You Like It*, "Dead shepherd, now I find thy saw of might: / 'Who ever lov'd that lov'd not at first sight?'" (3.5.82–83). "When a man's verses cannot be understood, nor a man's good wit seconded with the forward child, understanding," Touchstone tells Audrey, "it strikes a man more dead than a great reckoning in a little room" (3.3.9–12). By confining Ovid to the "little room" of a barbarous city, Augustus tried to strike dead Ovid's art.²² For decades, Shakespeare scholars have recognized an allusion in Touchstone's final phrases to Marlowe's death by stabbing in a small room in a likely alehouse in Deptford, purportedly over "the

reckoning," the bill.²³ Shakespeare's phrasing "a little room" in this context refers to Marlowe's play *The Jew of Malta*, and to Barabas's memorable portrayal of his mass of gold as "infinite riches in a little room" (1.1.37),²⁴ confirming the contemporary auditor's inclination to think of Marlowe's art at this dramatic moment. Shakespeare's quoting two well-known verses of Marlowe's in *As You Like It* represents a symbolic, perhaps affectionate, preservation of the art of a gifted poet whom a zealous authority had attempted to erase for posterity. Shakespeare may have wondered, who would preserve his art? Would a compassionate writer someday choose to play the role of a compassionate Shakespeare to his own Marlowe threatened with double extinction?

Shakespeare thus focuses on Marlowe's art preserved by memory and on his premature death in 1593, when he was twenty-nine. Exile among the barbarous Goths may have precluded Ovid's full ripening as a poet; conversely, an origin among goatherds and peasants might seem to threaten the full flowering of the English Ovid, William Shakespeare. In a play about ripening, the force of the allusions is clear: Marlowe may have written single lines or passages of memorable poetry, but his early death precluded his ripening into the rare poetic dramatist that Shakespeare may have hoped he himself could become (and was in the process of becoming). In the brief span of his life, was Marlowe able to seize creatively the opportune moment for insuring a lasting reputation for literary greatness? Shakespeare's seizing a moment to enshrine one of Marlowe's memorable verses in *As You Like It* suggests that he perhaps thought Marlowe had that greatness. But only if the medium of enshrinement—Shakespeare's pastoral comedy—somehow materially survived the ravages of time. Touchstone's allusion to details of Marlowe's death appears only seconds after (only three lines after, in fact) his reference to himself in Arden as "honest Ovid among the Goths." This proximity is not accidental when considered in the larger context of Shakespeare's return to Warwickshire in the person of the bumpkin William. Touchstone can be thought of ever so briefly as an intermediate form of Shakespeare between William and the author of *As You Like It*. Touchstone's verbal facetiousness, his verbal wit, is a trait he shares with Shakespeare as characterized by his contemporaries. Touchstone's urbane mastery of wit and paradox in his debate with Corin over the virtues of court and rural country requires considerable sophistication and some learning. If "a man's good wit [is not] seconded with the forward child, understanding, it strikes a man more dead than a great reckoning in a little room," Touchstone has said. The intellectual understanding that an education at Pembroke College, Cambridge, had developed had "seconded" Marlowe's "good wit"—but he was dead.²⁵ Touchstone may be witty and trenchant in his social commentary. But he is not a university man; nor is

he a poet. He is simply a jester, a professional joker. The lack of enriched understanding that Marlowe possessed might strike William Shakespeare *more* dead, in the sense that his dramatic and nondramatic poetry might not be quoted by after-ages to the degree that prematurely dead Marlowe's apparently would be. Shakespeare may have thought so, even though he may have privately also thought his artistry superior to Marlowe's.

In *Twelfth Night*, Shakespeare would imply through certain speeches of Viola that the moment of intellectual or spiritual ripening in a lifetime rarely, if ever, coincides with the earlier moment of physical ripening, of the closest a person will ever come to the peak of physical perfection. When Orsino proclaims that "women are as roses, whose fair flower / Being once displayed, doth fall that very hour," Viola, disguised as Cesario, exclaims, "And so they are. Alas that they are so, / To die even when they to perfection grow" (2.4.38–41). Viola suggests that the nonphysical personal moment of "perfection," of ripened spiritual or intellectual fullness, is one in a later time past the instant of maximum physical ripeness. Strange as the thought may seem to us, Shakespeare in 1599 or 1600 may have possibly believed that, even though Marlowe had died at the relatively young age of twenty nine, his university education had played its role in ripening his intellect and artistic capacity to an age beyond its counterpart in the life of the former Stratford grammar school student.

At this point, my reader might object that in 1598 or 1599 Shakespeare had demonstrated to everyone (including himself) that he had acquired as much (or more) mastery of Classical ideas and rhetorical tropes as Marlowe ever did. After all, Meres had complimented Shakespeare lavishly. One might argue that Shakespeare's attitude in *As You Like It* to the re-creation of a Warwickshire self is tongue-in-cheek, completely self-confident in its evocation of a younger self that the playwright felt no longer resembled him in the slightest. The re-creation in this reading would reassuringly allow him to measure the immense distance that he had professionally traveled. One may grant these arguments and still maintain that the re-creation of young William by its very process precipitated an old anxiety within Shakespeare about whether his humble origins might someday, somehow, become the obstacle to enduring artistic greatness.

I have argued in chapter three that certain failures and inadequacies of language, especially courtly language, in *As You Like It* provide opportunities for various kinds of impiety and that, conversely, pious deeds replace this speech as an expressive medium. William's answers to Touchstone's progressively hostile and abusive speech are straightforward, pious, and charitable. The play's William answers the jester's query "Wast born i'th' forest here?" with the reply "Ay, sir, I thank God." "Thank God—a good answer. Art rich?" Touchstone continues; "Faith, sir, so-so" is William's reply (5.1.22–25).

William's utterance "Faith," coming soon after his "I thank God," reinforces auditors' impression of his piety. Touchstone's increasingly violent threats regarding William's presence and his status as Audrey's lover cannot shake William's charitable disposition. Threatened by Touchstone with death "a hundred and fifty ways," William exits good-naturedly, exclaiming "God rest you merry, sir." Touchstone's Ovid is "honest Ovid . . . among the Goths"; the poet-playwright whom Francis Meres would term the English Ovid was "honest" because of his simple origins.

At least the logic of Shakespeare's late Elizabethan figurative journey home and re-creation of a comic self suggests so. Obedient, hat-in-hand, William often replies "Ay, sir" (5.1.23, 28) or "No, sir" (5.1.38). Essentially William dramatizes a version of Celia's humorous notion of an ideal response to life. When Rosalind begs her to answer all of her huddled questions about Orlando in one word, Celia jokes, "You must borrow me Gargantua's mouth first, 'tis a word too great for any mouth of this age's size. To say ay and no to these particulars is more than to answer in a catechism" (3.2.205–07). Editor Alan Brissenden rightly explains that Celia means that "answer[ing] 'yes' and 'no' to all these questions [of Rosalind] is impossible, since it would be beyond all the answers needed for the series of religious questions set down in the [Church of England] Book of Common Prayer."²⁶ William in effect says "ay" and "no" in his unequivocal genial speech. Heard within the context of her remark about catechism, Celia's "ay" and "no" allude to simple, direct spiritual speech. Shakespeare's *King Lear* judges that his two selfish daughters' "say[ing] ay and no to everything that I said ay and no to was no good divinity" (*King Lear*, 4.6.98–100). In his madness and disgust over Regan's and Goneril's flattering agreement with everything Lear said, the former king sharpens the desperation of his predicament by alluding to the truth of an injunction found in James 5:12—"But above all, my brethren, do not swear, either by heaven or by earth or with any other oath. But let your 'Yes' be 'Yes,' and *your* 'No,' 'No,' lest you fall into judgment."²⁷ Celia less distinctly but nonetheless certainly refers to this biblical passage and to the catechism of the English Book of Common Prayer in her joke about "ay" and "no"—a joke that gets lightly staged in the rustic William's "divinely" declarative speech.²⁸ If Shakespeare's Warwickshire of the mind anxiously includes his lack of higher education and its potential troubling significance for his art, in *As You Like It* it also includes his rediscovery of a native goodness, of a piety perhaps not appreciated by a late Elizabethan court and London.

Shakespeare in *As You Like It* compensates his alter ego's lack of education with an unspoiled, natural piety in William's character. And yet it is this education that another of his simulacra in the play—Orlando—desperately

desires. William Shakespeare was the eldest of John Shakespeare's four sons. The Elizabethan laws based upon the principle of primogeniture, the right of the elder or eldest son to inherit the bulk of the property of his father, effectively disenfranchised Gilbert (1566–1612), Richard (1574–1613), and Edmund Shakespeare (1580–1607).²⁹ (Orlando alludes to the principle of primogeniture when he tells Oliver, “The courtesy of nations allows you my better, in that you are the first born” [1.1.43–44]). Assuming that Shakespeare during the composition of a play personally identified at one moment with one character and at other moments with another, even an adversary of the first, is not implausible. Interestingly, Shakespeare in the plot dynamics of *As You Like It* inherited from Lodge's *Rosalynde* corresponds to the eldest brother, Oliver, entitled not only to inherit most of his deceased father Sir Rowland de Boys's estate but also, by Sir Rowland's written “testament” (1.1.68), directed to act as the lawful administrator of the 1,000 crowns bequeathed to the youngest brother, Orlando, and to insure the quality of the latter character's education. Oliver admits that his younger brother is paradoxically “never schooled and yet learned” (1.1.155–56). Orlando's mysterious learnedness can occasionally be heard in the elegant, Euphuistic balance of his speech. Concerning his wrestling Charles, Orlando tells Rosalind, “But let your fair eyes and gentle wishes go with me to my trial, wherein if I be foiled, there is but one shamed that was never gracious, if killed, but one dead that is willing to be so. I shall do my friends no wrong, for I have none to lament me; the world no injury, for in it I have nothing. Only in the world I fill up a place which may be better supplied when it is empty” (1.2.170–77). Lyly's Euphues could scarcely improve upon the artificial, pleasant balance of these rhetorical periods.

Also testifying to Orlando's learnedness is the love poetry laced with Petrarchan conceits dedicated to Rosalind that he later writes in the forest of Arden (esp. 3.2.1–10, 120–49). Admittedly, this poetry is generally bad. The point here is that its imagery testifies to an acquaintance with Classical mythology and popular Renaissance poetry. Given this understanding of poetic conceits revealed in this poetry, an auditor might think that Orlando has had at least the equivalent of Shakespeare's education, that found in a King Edward grammar school. (And so perhaps the badness of the verse is, in one sense, to be considered a comment on the limits of that education). But Oliver says that his brother has “never” been “schooled.” Orlando's poetry, referencing “Helen's cheek, but not her heart, / Cleopatra's majesty, / Atalanta's better part, [and] / Sad Lucretia's modesty” (3.2.140–43), reveals a broad knowledge of Classical mythology, including even that of the ancient moon goddess's three faces as Diana, Proserpina, and Luna (3.2.2). Given the relatively sophisticated knowledge informing these and other of Orlando's poetic allusions, he seems to be referring—at least in

the playgoer's mind—to a formal university curriculum when he complains that Oliver bars him from education.

Still, "sophisticated" may be too complimentary a term for Orlando's Petrarchanism. He evidences a disturbing failure to grasp the fact that Petrarch's love woes are figurative. The following dialogue clinches this judgment:

Rosalind: O my dear Orlando, how it grieves me to see thee wear thy heart
in a scarf.

Orlando: It is my arm.

Rosalind: I thought thy heart had been wounded with the claws of a lion.

Orlando: Wounded it is, but with the eyes of a lady.

(5.2.19–23)

Rosalind is not so overcome by the shock of Oliver's report of Orlando's wounding and the sight of his torn arm in a sling that she cannot tease Orlando about his unhelpful insistence upon the physicality of the "wounds" of Petrarchan love. Rosalind gives him the chance to renounce his tedious understanding of Petrarchanism by telling him that she thought a lion's claws had torn his "heart"/ "hart." Orlando, not surprisingly ignores the pun, flatly replying that his heart has been wounded by Rosalind's eyes. He never gives any indication in the remainder of the play that Petrarchan conceits offer the metaphorical opportunity to explain more powerfully the spiritual dimension of romantic love. Later, in *The Tempest*, Shakespeare would suggest that Miranda's tutoring of savage Caliban, administered almost hourly until he tried to rape her (*Tempest*, 1.2.347–65), had left him a metaphoric idiot. When Caliban wonders whether the drunken butler Stephano has not "dropped from heaven," the latter character replies "Out o'th' moon . . . I was the man i'th' moon when time was" (2.2.135–37). "I have seen thee in her, and I do adore thee," Caliban murmurs; "My mistress showed me thee, and thy dog, and thy bush" (2.2.138–39). A little learning has introduced Caliban to metaphor (here that of the iconography of the Man in the Moon), but his education has not progressed to the point where he understands that metaphor possesses a figurative truth. This is not to conflate Caliban and Orlando. Rosalind's beloved stands immeasurably above Prospero's bestial slave. The comparison does, however, suggest that a certain lack of understanding of the potentiality of metaphoric language to open up spiritual dimensions of qualities such as romantic love can send him a short way toward Caliban's limitations.

Duke Senior may claim that his forest life in Arden "[f]inds . . . books in the running brooks [and] [s]ermons in stones" (2.1.16–17), but Orlando in Arden never reveals that Nature by itself is an educator. The bookish learning he shows derives from texts and passages taught in either Tudor

grammar schools or in one of the two English universities. Since—by Orlando's account—the middle de Boys brother, Jaques, “keeps at school” (“maintains at university”) (1.1.5), playgoers assume that Sir Rowland intended Orlando to receive not only grammar schooling but also a university education. By having Orlando say that “report speaks goldenly of [Jaques] profit” (1.1.5–6), Shakespeare suggests that Orlando yearns for the French equivalent of an Oxford or Cambridge education, and that it would mean as much as, or more than, his overdue 1,000 crowns. (Jaques de Boys reaps the equivalent of a “golden” profit, a profit of intellectual gold, the profit that English MAs such as Marlowe, Robert Greene, and Thomas Nashe had hoped—futilely, they discovered—might translate into financial gold).

But Oliver unjustly deposes Orlando to a peasant's rank. Orlando complains that, a gentleman by birth, he is “stall[ed]” like an “ox,” that is, maintained less well than Oliver's horses are (1.1.9–12). He complains in balanced rhetorical clauses that Oliver “lets me feed with his hinds, bars me the place of his brother, and as much as in him lies, mines my gentility with my education” (1.1.17–19). Paradoxically, “Peace” (“Oliver” in a masculine form) becomes in *As You Like It* the name of the treacherous, homicidal eldest brother of Shakespeare's source story, the brother who corresponds to himself in William Shakespeare's family romance. Oliver's name initially begs the question of whether this eldest brother will ever be at peace with himself (a question answered affirmatively by his later moral conversion and the beneficial effect upon him of heavenly Celia's love). Still, Oliver's name invites comparison of Orlando's brother with the play's other Oliver, Oliver Martext, designated “Sir Oliver Martext” in the List of *Dramatis Personae* first constructed by Nicholas Rowe for his 1709 edition of the play (and subsequently adopted by almost all editors).³⁰ In making the vicar Oliver Martext a gentleman—a “Sir”—Rowe was responding to Touchstone's calling this Oliver “Sir Oliver” on four different occasions in the play (3.3.37–38, 3.3.58, 5.1.5–6). Ann Jennalie Cook has concluded that “Sir Rowland de Boys' title is not even hereditary—a point underscored by the fact that the bumbling curate is *Sir* Oliver, while Orlando's brother [Oliver] is not.”³¹ Cook implies that Shakespeare gave his ignorant clergyman Oliver gentleman's status to suggest that the other Oliver, who is never called “Sir Oliver” by anyone in the play, does not inherit his father Sir Rowland's title. This inference is questionable, since it is Touchstone (not exactly Shakespeare) who calls Martext “Sir Oliver.” (The same Touchstone who calls the young First and Second Pages “gentlemen” in act 5, scene 3 [5.3.39]). Cook's inference becomes invalid once one realizes that “Sir” in the sixteenth century was an honorific title for priests independent of their social status, which in some cases never

reached gentry level. The curate whom Feste impersonates in *Twelfth Night* is repeatedly called "Sir Topas" (4.2.2).³² Still, despite recent critical commentary otherwise, Shakespeare gives playgoers little reason to think that Orlando *necessarily* will add the inherited title of gentleman to the education and 1,000 crowns he seems likely never to receive.

A more personal reason may underlie Oliver de Boys' loss—or absence—of gentle title (if the perception of that loss, or absence, is calculated by Shakespeare). As eldest son, Shakespeare until 1596 had little cause to think he would inherit the title of gentleman from his father. (And in the years 1599–1600 he had some reason to think he might completely lose that title, as shall be explained in the next chapter). William Shakespeare had, beginning with adolescence, ample reason to think his father would never maintain the material wealth that was a principal requirement for armigerous status. In 1576, when Shakespeare was twelve, his father began to slide into financial distress. C. L. Barber and Richard P. Wheeler have concisely illustrated this slide. John Shakespeare

borrows £40 in 1578 on the security of his wife's inheritance, allegedly fails to repay it on time in 1580, and never recovers the disputed house and land, despite repeated legal efforts. Other property which came to him by Mary Arden is rented or sold in the late 1570s. In 1580 failure to appear in court results in a £20 fine. Another £20 fine was imposed on John Shakespeare when a hatmaker for whom he had stood surety failed to appear in court. Two other forfeits of £10 each for those for whom he had stood surety, a tinker and his brother Henry, suggest bad judgment and generosity—or need for ready cash, since by standing surety one could collect a small fee, as for a bail bond now.³³

By the early 1580s, certainly before his eldest son's marriage to Anne Hathaway, debt-ridden John Shakespeare had lost whatever wealth his eldest son William might receive. (The Henley Street property would remain his widow's.) When in *As You Like It* William answers Touchstone's question about whether he is rich, by saying "so-so," twenty-five-year-old William Shakespeare in 1589 might likely have replied in more impoverished terms. For by then, he knew that he had lost his patrimony and, as an upstart actor/playwright, he may have not yet written the plays, or parts of plays, that could command meaningful remuneration. Still, Shakespeare's awareness of the poverty of university-educated, productive London poet/playwrights such as Robert Greene, Thomas Nashe, and even Marlowe at times would very likely have prevented him from thinking, as Orlando does, that advanced schooling necessarily brings with it a "golden profit." When in 1596 Shakespeare began the process of purchasing a coat of arms and thus gentleman status for his aged father, he could be said to

have reversed primogeniture, in the sense that in this case the eldest son bequeathed a kind of wealth to his father. I say a kind of wealth, for the title and coat of arms were unendowed, that is to say, unmonied.³⁴ (Still, Shakespeare probably gave his aging father some of his playhouse earnings.) Unlike Oliver vis-à-vis Orlando in *As You Like It*, Shakespeare knew of no paternal wealth that he could (or would) receive to administer potentially to his younger brothers.

Samuel Schoenbaum claims that very little is known about Gilbert Shakespeare, the brother closest to Shakespeare in age. He notes that a Gilbert Shakespeare “was described in the *Coram Rege* roll of 1597 as a haberdasher of St. Bridget’s Parish, London.”³⁵ This may, or may not, be Shakespeare’s brother. Absolutely nothing is known about Richard Shakespeare, other than that he was christened in Trinity Church, Stratford, on March 11, 1574 and died in 1613. He almost certainly was named after Shakespeare’s grandfather, the Snitterfield farmer Richard Shakespeare. Not surprisingly, Shakespeare mentions neither of these already deceased brothers in his own will. Edmund, the younger brother most distant from Shakespeare in age (by 16 years), died in 1607, in London. Scholars would learn from the records of two burials that Edmund was an actor by trade. The first is the August 12, 1607 burial at St. Giles, Cripplegate of an infant, Edward [probably Edmund], “son of Edward Shackspeere, Player: base-born’—that is born out of wedlock.”³⁶ Edmund Shakespeare himself quickly followed his illegitimate son, being buried on December 31, 1607 in the chancel of St. Saviour’s Church in Southwark, a location close to the Globe Theater. The parish register of St. Savior’s also reveals the payment of 20 shillings for a “forenoon knell of the great bell.”³⁷ Shakespeare scholars have always assumed that Shakespeare paid for this expensive interment, which was probably under a flat stone in the church floor. An actor such as Edmund could never command such a prestigious place of burial; only a gentleman such as his elder brother could have arranged a costly service and burial. But whether William Shakespeare did so out of love is uncertain, for we have no evidence of Shakespeare’s feelings for Edmund on this sad occasion—or on any occasion—or for either of his other brothers.³⁸ (Many commentators on his plays would note that Shakespeare changed the name of the illegitimate brother from Plexirtus to Edmund in that section of Sir Philip Sidney’s *Arcadia* [Book 2, Chapter 10]³⁹ supplying part of the fable of his *King Lear*.)⁴⁰ Edmund means “worldly,” which well describes this character in Sidney’s romance and Shakespeare’s tragedy. The name may also have described the Elizabethan life of the brother bearing it. Shakespeare could possibly have provided an expensive memorial to Edmund, one out of all keeping for a low-class actor,

out of guilt of some kind, or even out of fellow feeling, for a brother with a child born irregularly. (Shakespeare's elder daughter Susanna was born about six months after his marriage to Anne Hathaway.) No record exists of any kind of payment by Shakespeare for the keeping of his illegitimate nephew (although Shakespeare—as mentioned above—may have paid or helped to pay for the child's burial).

Given the near certainty that Shakespeare had no wealth of John Shakespeare's to inherit or to administer to his younger three brothers, an analyst might dismiss potential autobiographical overtones in Oliver's initial characterization in *As You Like It*. He or she might be additionally encouraged to do so by the relevance of allusions in the play to the biblical parable of the lost son (Luke 15:11–32). This parable becomes a dramatic subtext when Orlando, complaining of his poverty, sarcastically asks Oliver, "Shall I keep your hogs, and eat husks with them? What prodigal portion have I spent, that I should come to such penury?" (1.1.35–37). Orlando ironically compares himself to the younger of the two sons in the parable, who has begged his patrimony from his father and so wasted it with "prodigal living" in a "far country" (Luke 15.13) that he is reduced to being a swineherd, who "would gladly have filled his stomach with the pods [husks] that the swine ate" (Luke 15:16).⁴¹ (Shakespeare read "husks" in either the Geneva or Rheims Bible.)⁴² Primarily, allusion to the parable serves to define Orlando's character by calling attention to what he is not—a wastrel son and brother. Secondarily, this allusion provokes the playgoer's or reader's recollection of an alternative rationale in the New Testament for a father's bequeathing his goods to an elder and a younger son. Historical interpretation of the parable depends upon the knowledge that "Jewish civil law allotted a double portion of a family's inheritance to the oldest brother, along with the responsibility for the mother and unmarried sisters. Younger heirs received a single portion."⁴³ Strictly speaking, one must say the younger brother in the parable refers to a Jewish canon law when he asks for the [single] portion of his inheritance. Many among Shakespeare's playgoers, however, and many Elizabethans in general would likely have remained ignorant of this allusion. Elizabethans, like twenty-first century Christians, would have of course interpreted the parable of the lost son spiritually, as a lesson in the New Testament truth that saving one lost sheep, or soul, is as or more important than preserving the ninety-nine in the fold. But after reflecting upon the spiritual truth of this parable, some Elizabethans would likely have been inclined to apply the contemporary English principle of primogeniture to issues of patrimony in the parable. Momentarily considering the parable in a secular context, some of Shakespeare's playgoers would probably have regarded the father's bequeathing a portion of his wealth to the younger son, apparently with no prospect of his own imminent

or approaching death, as generous and exceptional. They also would have been initially disposed to sympathize with the complaints of the elder brother—that his father forgives the wastrel son, lavishly dresses the beggar, puts a ring on his finger, and feeds him the finest food. They would likely have done so not just because of the father's apparent disrespect of the elder son's faithful service and husbandry, but more crucially because the father has given away, and prematurely at that, some of the wealth assumed due to the first-born son (Luke 15:22–30).

The father's response to the elder son's complaints—"Son, you are always with me, and all that I have is yours" (Luke 15:31)—seems to allude, strictly speaking again, to the remaining double portion of the father's triply divided wealth that remains for the elder brother. But this would be an interpretation beyond the ken of most of Shakespeare's playgoing public. More important, in its quantitative coldness, the interpretation involving portions violates a felt message of the parable. Shakespeare probably understood the father's response in the same spirit as modern readers of the Bible do. Like the heavenly father, the father of parable extends an expansive love indiscriminately to the "undeserving" son who returns to him as well as to the "deserving" son who has never left him. This unstinting, mysteriously renewable, never exhausted love can be glimpsed in Shakespeare in its secular counterpart in *Romeo and Juliet*, when Juliet tells her beloved that "[m]y bounty is as boundless as the sea, / My love as deep; the more I give to thee, / The more I have, for both are infinite" (*Romeo and Juliet*, 2.2.133–35). In the parable of the lost son, the playwright found an egalitarian alternative precedent for the paternal distribution of wealth by the father of two (or more) sons, one that Shakespeare's status as privileged eldest brother might color negatively. Nevertheless, the likelihood that the playwright found this parable strongly appealing is indicated by the frequency of its appearance in his plays (it is the most often-cited parable in the canon), to say nothing of the attractiveness at times of Shakespearean prodigals such as Prince Hal in *King Henry IV, Part One* and the later Mark Antony in *Antony and Cleopatra*. The general conformity of Shakespeare's life to the trajectory of that of the younger son in the parable, a movement from a secure home to a far country of Babylonian luxury (London) and back to acceptance at home again, suggests that the playwright might have seen aspects of himself in the younger rather than in the elder son of the parable. Shakespeare's Sonnets, after all, do register guilt and loathing over an adulterous affair with a dark-complected lady in the sin-soaked liberties of a far city.

Moreover, identifying with the younger son of the parable may have satisfied, among other things, a personal fantasy of Shakespeare's of getting the love and the riches of a father who in reality had little to give

of either, of getting them when the son's own behavior (in an adulterous affair?) had left something morally, or ethically, to be desired in him. In this possible fantasy of guilt and redemption, the father does not even require the younger son to work as a hired servant (as per the son's offer) in order to receive the good things of the son's former life. They are simply given to him, with no strings attached either of penance or of indentured work. Luke's parable of the lost son is told essentially from the son's point of view. Readers of the Bible never know if the elder son accepts the father's invitation to give up his anger. Like most readers, Shakespeare probably was not much interested in imagining the elder brother's final response, or his future for that matter.⁴⁴

In general, certain details of the characterization of the younger brother Orlando correspond better than aspects of the portrait of Oliver do to known and likely features of Shakespeare's early life. Orlando complains that, under Oliver, he gains "nothing...but growth, for the which his animals on his dunghills are as much bound to him as I" (1.1.13-15). A record exists of John Shakespeare's being fined for creating a dunghill in front of his house. Young Shakespeare could have drawn upon personal experience for the indignity involved in living close to, even on, dunghills. Moreover, when Old Adam—the role in the play assigned by tradition to Shakespeare—calls the house in which Orlando lives a "butchery" (a slaughterhouse) (2.3.28), the term may have had a personal relevance for Shakespeare. John Shakespeare may have also been a butcher as well as a glover, selling the meat of the animals whose hides he worked, perhaps at times giving the Henley Street property the odor of the slaughterhouse. Oliver admits that Orlando is "gentle; never schooled, and yet learned; full of noble device; of all sorts enchantingly beloved" (1.1.155-57). In his *Timber, or Discoveries* (publ. 1641), Shakespeare's colleague Ben Jonson confesses that he "lov'd the man [Shakespeare], and [did] honour his memory (on this side Idolatry) as much as any." "Hee was (indeed) honest," Jonson asserts, "and of an open, and free nature: had an excellent *Phantasie*; brave notions, and gentle expressions."⁴⁵ Jonson's praise of Shakespeare generally resembles Oliver's of Orlando: "Yet he's gentle; never schooled, and yet learned; full of noble device; of all sorts enchantingly beloved; and, indeed, so much in the heart of the world...that I am altogether misprized" (1.1.155-59). This resemblance suggests that Shakespeare, at the risk of appearing immodest, may have been aware that he enjoyed the reputation for being gentle and beloved and registered it in *As You Like It* during a growing identification with his characterization of Orlando.

These and other dramatic details provoke the thought that Shakespeare's identification with the younger brother Orlando may have been stronger

than previously supposed. Despite his eldest status, young Stratford Shakespeare may have felt forever diminished by the forfeiture of his opportunity for higher education. He may have resented living around dunghills in a rural environment, perhaps at times feeling like one of the farm animals about him in the country town—a culturally limited place where he perhaps believed that he, like them, had the opportunity to grow in only one depressing sense—physically. In this speculative identification with Orlando, Shakespeare confers gentle status upon himself, a gentle birth that he may have longed for—and eventually purchased for his father and himself just before, while, or just after he wrote *As You Like It*. The next chapter will take up at greater length this hypothesized importance of gentle status for Shakespeare during a broader treatment of the various ways that *As You Like It* foregrounds the gentleman and gentlewoman. For now, it is enough to notice that, in this presumed identification of Shakespeare with Orlando, Oliver assumes the place not so much of himself as eldest brother as the fantasy image of a depriving, unfair John Shakespeare. Shakespeare in *As You Like It* creates an ideal image of the father in the absent, deceased Sir Rowland de Boys, who is aristocratic, materially bountiful and generous, especially to the young man raised amid dunghills who, without his patrimony, has no promising future at all. The pronounced ideality of the absent father testifies in this play to the bad father buried in Oliver's characterization.⁴⁶

Barber and Wheeler, in emphasizing that John Shakespeare was never absolutely bankrupt (or “broken,” as Elizabethans would say), speculate that minimal solvency was “quite possibly thanks to help from his successful son, who joined in the long, heartbreaking legal struggle to recover his mother's inheritance.”⁴⁷ They point out that the eldest son was “in the later 1590s still involved in legal action in Chancery.”⁴⁸ But Shakespeare never recovered Mary Arden's property. One can assume that, by 1599, the likely date of *As You Like It*, he had realistically given up hope of obtaining vestiges of his original patrimony. Jonathan Bate has suggested that Shakespeare wrote much of himself into his character Philip Faulconbridge of *The Life and Death of King John* (c.1594–1596).⁴⁹ In this Elizabethan history play, Philip, the eldest son of old Sir Robert Faulconbridge, bears a striking resemblance to deceased King Richard I, Richard the Lion-Hearted. This facial resemblance tells everyone that he is a bastard, and that his legitimate younger brother Robert Faulconbridge may succeed in his claim to dispossess Philip of the land (worth £500 per annum) due to him under the principle of primogeniture (*King John*, 1.1.50–110). Philip's mother, Queen Eleanor, asks the bastard whether he would rather be a Faulconbridge and resemble spindly, homely Sir Philip and, through legal appeal, inherit landed wealth;

or be "the reputed son of Coeur-de-lion, / Lord of thy presence, and no land beside" (1.1.136–37). Philip Faulconbridge's surprising choice—to be a landless son of an absent ideal father—perhaps reveals Shakespeare's ultimate attitude toward trying to regain the family property due to him through the principle of primogeniture. Philip—perhaps as Shakespeare did—effectively gives up his effort to wrest away the wealth due to him by primogeniture, choosing to be landless and to win a material fortune through his courage and wit (1.1.138–54)—in Shakespeare's case as an actor/dramatist in London. Like the bastard Faulconbridge, Shakespeare may have consciously chosen to be a soldier of fortune (albeit a dramatic one), the son of a heroic father of mythical fortune, fighting for supremacy in the fields of battle occupied by rival repertoire acting companies. In this scenario, richly suggested by Jonathan Bate, Shakespeare shifts his identity, not from eldest son to younger brother, but from (bogus) eldest son to a basically fatherless *tertium quid*, the creation of a mythic godlike father (to the male equivalent of Athena delivered parthenogenetically from the forehead of the god Jove). In this respect, not simply the bastard Faulconbridge but also Bolingbroke in *Richard II* (with dead Gaunt the absent ideal father), Edgar, and a number of other Shakespeare sons could be incorporated into Bate's generalization.

Nevertheless, the ending of *As You Like It* endorses the code of primogeniture by showing *both* Oliver *and* Orlando as well as Duke Senior enjoying essentially its benefits. The usurping younger brother Duke Frederick, converted to an abstemious spiritual life in the forest of Arden by an old religious man, bequeaths his crown (and thus all the material riches pertaining to it) to the elder brother, Duke Senior (5.4.154–58). Duke Frederick, by also restoring "all their lands . . . to them again / That were with him exiled" (5.4.159–60), gives Oliver back the inherited property of Sir Rowland de Boys. But Oliver, smitten with love for Celia and wishing to live with her as an idealized pastoral shepherd does with his shepherdess (5.2.11–12), has previously "estate[d]" on Orlando "[his] father's house and all the revenue that was old Sir Rowland's" (5.2.10–11).⁵⁰ Orlando, however, about to marry rich Duke Senior's daughter, will hardly need that wealth. And when Duke Senior exclaims, after hearing of Duke Frederick's conversion and restoration of the exiles' property, that the second brother, Jaques de Boys, by bringing this news, "offer'st fairly to thy brothers' wedding; / To one [Oliver] his lands withheld, and to the other [Orlando] / A land itself at large, a potent dukedom [inherited by marrying Rosalind]" (5.4.162–64), he assumes—as playgoers do—that Oliver will never live with Celia in the woods as artificial shepherd and shepherdess (Celia will never stand to be separated from her beloved Rosalind), but that instead the rehabilitated eldest brother will live richly within the courtly pale. This

summary stresses an elaborate fantasy of wealth acquired, reacquired, and shared to insure an end of a comedy as Elizabethans would like it. Equally likely, it is an ending as a once materially deprived but now prospering eldest son—a London playwright—may have liked it. Whether the overplus of pleasure—“overkill” is perhaps a better term—in the neat resolutions of *As You Like It* betrays a Shakespearean skepticism about the realistic chances of ever attaining material wealth and happy romantic love and marriage proves difficult to substantiate. It simply may be that this pastoral comedy satisfied old personal needs of Shakespeare as an eldest and as a fantasy younger brother.

And what of Rosalind? Are there suggestions in *As You Like It* that she plays a role in a pastoral authorial autobiography? An answer involves resonances of possible details of Shakespeare's own marriage heard in *As You Like It*. Oliver Martext, whose surname alludes to the notorious biblical ignorance of Elizabethan Protestant ministers, is a “vicar of the next village” found by Touchstone to perform his marriage ceremony with Audrey (3.3.37–40, esp. 38). Touchstone does not care whether this priest marries him under a tree of the forest, or in the vicar's chapel (3.3.59–60), for he soon reveals to the satirist Jaques, who stumbles upon the trio, that an unlearned minister is not likely to marry him well, thus providing untrustworthy Touchstone with “a good excuse for me hereafter to leave my wife” (3.3.83–84). Uncharacteristically shocked, Jaques, who apparently respects the formal religious ceremony of marriage, advises Touchstone and Audrey to get themselves “to church, and have a good priest that can tell you what marriage is” bind them together (3.3.76–78). “This fellow,” Jaques impressively concludes, “will but join you together as they join wainscot; then one of you will prove a shrunk panel and, like green timber, warp, warp” (3.3.78–80). The deleterious effects of a marriage conducted in a woody “desert” decorously manifest themselves in the faulty timber, or wood, of a couple so sadly joined.

An odd earnestness appears in the play's implicit warning against an irregular marriage in the forest of Arden and Jaques' blunt admonition that all the details of a proper church marriage occur. In biblical and/or theological ignorance, the priest who possibly married Shakespeare and Anne Hathaway may have resembled vicar Oliver Martext. Shortly after the record of Shakespeare's marriage license, dated November 27, 1582, was duly noted in the Episcopal Register of the diocese of Worcester, people in subsequent years would shake their heads over the union's apparent irregularities. Banns were only asked once, rather than the normal three times on successive Sundays in Trinity Cathedral Church, Stratford; the bondsmen were allies of Anne's family (the Shakespeares were not represented as bondsmen). Anne and William's daughter Susanna was baptized on May 26, 1583, only

six months after the record of the marriage license.⁵¹ Samuel Schoenbaum, among others, has explained that most of these "irregularities" were dictated by nineteen-year-old Shakespeare's licensee status as a minor (Anne was twenty-six).⁵² Still, the fact that Anne was pregnant at the time of marriage constitutes an irregularity (which would persist even if the couple and others considered them to have had a betrothal handfast). So does the marriage license record listing the bride as "Annam Whately de Temple Grafton." "The name Whateley slightly resembles Hathaway, or Hathwey, and a William Whateley, vicar of Crowle, was before the Consistory Court [of Worcester] the same day as plaintiff in a tithe dispute" that the Register clerk recorded Shakespeare's marriage license.⁵³ Temple Grafton poses a stronger irregularity, one pointing toward the equivalent of an Oliver Martext marrying William and Anne. Anne Hathaway unquestionably came from Shottery, a village about a mile from Stratford. Temple Grafton was a hamlet five miles west of Stratford, in the midst of woods merging to the north into what remained of the forest of Arden. There is no record of William and Anne's marriage occurring in Stratford. Evidence exists that Shakespeare's family, including both his mother and father (but especially John), may have been recusants, or Catholic sympathizers. In 1583, the priest in Temple Grafton was

old John Frith, [who] was regarded as "unsound of religion"—he was a Catholic—but tolerated because of his advanced age ("he can neither preach nor read well," according to a Puritan survey made in 1586; "his chiefest trade is to cure hawks that are hurt or diseased, for which many do usually repair to him"). He would make Temple Grafton a good choice for a Catholic couple; elsewhere in Warwickshire the rites of the old Faith were suppressed.⁵⁴

If he later had some regrets about being married by an ignorant old priest in a forest setting, Shakespeare may have projected them into a partly autobiographical episode in the pastoral play *As You Like It*, a scene involving, in this case, a vicar who ignorantly "mars" his scriptural text. One could construe a message of act 3, scene 3 of *As You Like It* to consist of a nostalgic wish for a more proper marriage—one perhaps in which his favorite child, Susanna, had not been born only six months after the wedding.

"Lauded as witty beyond her sex" (i.e., more facetious than conventional manners deemed a woman ought to be),⁵⁵ Susanna Shakespeare has traditionally been thought to have resembled her witty father. Shakespeare's contemporaries implied that his clever, punning wit in his casual conversation as well as in his playscripts was a dominant character trait. John Aubrey reports that the playwright was "of a very ready [quick] and pleasant [facetious] smooth wit,"⁵⁶ while Francis Meres in 1598 claimed that

the “sweet, witty soul of Ovid lives in mellifluous and honey-tongued Shakespeare.”⁵⁷ Susanna Shakespeare could later—apparently unlike her sister Judith—sign her name on legal documents. She was sufficiently intelligent to attract the affection and become the wife of the university-educated Stratford physician Dr. John Hall. And she—rather than her mother—inherited the bulk of William Shakespeare’s estate. These and other details have earned Susanna the reputation of being Shakespeare’s favorite child (after the death in 1596 of his son, his favorite daughter). When Susanna’s father composed *As You Like It* in some part of either 1599 or 1600, his daughter was aged sixteen or seventeen—close (most likely) to the age of the young male actor who would impersonate Rosalind. This coincidence would have encouraged Shakespeare to think of his daughter as he wrote. When Orlando asks Rosalind-as-Ganymede if she is “native” of the forest of Arden, she replies affirmatively: “As the coney [rabbit] that you see dwell where she is kindled [born]” (3.2.324–26). Judged in the context of my argument, this lie of Rosalind’s may contain grains of autobiographical truth.

Rosalind may be partly modeled on a jesting teenaged daughter, whose witplay her father appreciated during his visits to his Stratford home. Rosalind’s speech is more verbally witty than any other transvestite heroine of Shakespeare’s, than either Julia’s of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Portia’s of *The Merchant of Venice*, Viola’s of *Twelfth Night*, Helena’s of *All’s Well That’s End*, or Imogen’s of *Cymbeline*. The emphasis in this claim falls on the idea of *verbal* wit, that is to say, facetious, punning wit. Portia may give Bassanio subtle hints as to which casket contains her portrait (the words ending verses of her song sung while he contemplates his choice rhyme with lead), and she does outwit Shylock in the courtroom. But her wit there is not essentially facetious, punning; in fact, Portia’s wit in the courtroom is presumably Doctor Bellario’s, that of her lawyer cousin who secretly provides her with the legal “notes” insuring her victory (*The Merchant of Venice*, 3.4.45–54). Rather than being the source of verbal wit in *Twelfth Night*, Viola is its victim, so to say, in her run-in with the facetious Feste in act 3, scene 1 of *Twelfth Night* (3.1.1–68). In fact, one might claim that only one female character in all of Shakespeare is more verbally facetious than Rosalind is in *As You Like It*. Only smart-mouthed Beatrice in *Much Ado About Nothing* rivals facetious Rosalind.⁵⁸

This chapter suggests a complex autobiographical psychodrama at the beginning of *As You Like It*, one appropriate for the mode of literary pastoral, one that competes with (rather than complements) the comparatively straightforward authorial overtones of rustic William’s characterization in the forest of Arden. This hypothetical psychodrama, triggered by certain plot dynamics of Thomas Lodge’s *Rosalynde*, predicates some

splits in Shakespeare's psyche concerning a son's entitlement and his affective relationship with his father. The soon-to-be-written, perhaps simultaneously written, play *Hamlet* confirms certain aspects of the postulated psychodrama of act 1 of *As You Like It* in the tragedy's idealization of a dead father, as well as in the displacement of self involved in Shakespeare's likely playing the part of the ghost of a father conversing with a living son. The ambivalence of love and dislike evidenced in the dialogue of father and son called by the same name, Hamlet, draws attention to similar ambivalences in *As You Like It* between Orlando, Oliver, and Sir Rowland de Boys—ambivalences likely registered in William Shakespeare's family romance.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER FIVE

BECOMING A GENTLEMAN IN *AS YOU LIKE IT*

“Gentle,” “gentleness,” “gentleman”—these words reverberate from one end of *As You Like It* to the other, so much so (and in so many different contexts) that an auditor justifiably wonders whether analysis of acts and scenes might yield any systematic meaning involving these words. We saw in chapter four that a Warwickshire of Shakespeare’s mind detectable in *As You Like It* involved speculation about the playwright’s aspirations for gentle status as reflected in certain aspects of his portrayals of Orlando and Oliver. We shall see in better detail in this chapter that Shakespeare’s purchase of a coat of arms provides a bridge between autobiographical interpretations in the previous chapter and their completion in what it means to become a gentleman in *As You Like It*, the subject of the following pages. The late Elizabethan context in this case appears to be intensely personal for Shakespeare, not simply a matter of some special English social event, or events, involving moral gentility in the years 1598 and 1599. Still, Hamlet complains in a 1599 or 1600 play that “the age is grown so picked that the toe of the peasant comes so near the heel of the courtier he galls his kibe” (5.1.139–41), that the latest Elizabethan times have grown so mannered that lower classes ape their betters, making them uncomfortable in fact. Hamlet would likely have included artisans and tradesmen such as cobblers, or cordwainers, in his complaint that lower classes closely mime gentle behavior. After all, the Gravedigger, who provokes Hamlet’s complaint, is hardly a peasant. It may be no accident that Thomas Dekker’s *The Shoemaker’s Holiday, A Pleasant Comedy of the Gentle Craft* is a 1599 play. The drama celebrates the ability of a sanguine shoemaker to play—in fact, to be—a gentleman, practicing a “gentle craft” in manners as well as trade. “Prince am I none, yet am I princely born” (3.2.169–70, 3.3.20, 5.4.17), the pedigreeless Simon Eyre repeatedly, and somewhat shockingly, boasts.¹ In another 1599 play, *The Life of King Henry the Fifth*, Shakespeare’s monarch, as part of his moving St. Crispian Day’s speech to his troops before

the Battle of Agincourt, claims that the soldier who sheds his blood that day with King Henry “[s]hall be [his] brother.” “[B]e he ne’er so vile, / This day shall gentle his condition” (4.3.62–63). What Hamlet would reject, King Henry appears to embrace. And yet he does not actually seem to be proposing the elevation of peasants to the rank of gentlemen. David Bevington interprets Henry V’s phrase “gentle his condition” as meaning that the king will raise the blood-shedding soldier’s “social status to the equivalent of a gentleman’s in that he is the [king’s] ‘brother.’”² The key word here is “equivalent.” Bevington plausibly suggests that King Henry speaks figuratively about radically expanding the franchise of gentleman status. Nevertheless, King Henry’s remark in its spirit is suggestive when considered in the context of Hamlet’s complaint and Dekker’s play. Just how liberal, or permissive, in 1599 was Shakespeare prepared to be with regard to gentle status?

The result of a late Elizabethan middle- and even lower-class aping of a gentleman’s manners in some quarters may have been a stiffening rather than relaxation of the social prerequisites necessary to claim gentility. In other words, the traditional differences between late Elizabethan gentlemen and the lower classes may have been more desirable in 1599 than in the 1580s and 1590s to ensconced as well as newly minted gentlemen,³ with the result that practicing exactly the manners of a gentleman may have been important (especially to recently arrived gentlemen). This hypothetical reaction, if it occurred, may have attracted the attention of Shakespeare. His purchase of gentleman status in 1596 and public criticism of it in the remaining years of the sixteenth century, particularly that of Ben Jonson in a 1599 play, *Every Man Out of His Humour*, placed Shakespeare outside the traditional, historical pale of the gentleman and help us understand Shakespeare’s preoccupation with his own idea of authentic gentility in *As You Like It*.

The challenge, to repeat myself, lies in discovering in *As You Like It* systematic meaning in the repeated words “gentle,” “gentleness,” and “gentleman.” Encountering the court jester Touchstone and Audrey alone late in *As You Like It*, a young page of Duke Senior’s exclaims, “Well met, honest gentleman” (5.3.6). Given the fool’s motley dress, observers of this meeting might judge the adjective more suitable than the noun for Touchstone; court jesters enjoyed a privilege of cracking bitterly truthful jests that normally would entail physical punishment for courtier jokesters. If the intentionally foolish Touchstone is a gentleman, he is so, in First Page’s possibly tongue-in-cheek greeting, only because serious gentlemen can be fools. Flattered, Touchstone invites the two pages to sing for him and Audrey. He is not so flattered by their rendition of the *carpe diem* song, “It was a lover and his lass,” that he can refrain from concluding, “Truly,

young gentlemen, though there was no great matter in the ditty, yet the note was very untunable" (5.3.39–41). It is hard to know what to make of Touchstone's calling the two boys gentlemen. Has he caught on to the fact that their greeting of him was tongue-in-cheek, and is he thus sporting with them as he believes that they have done with him? Is he so flattered by their calling him a gentleman that he validates it by paying a compliment to their gentle powers of perception and discrimination? Or is this too subtle? Is Shakespeare through these characters cynically suggesting that, publicly used, the term gentleman means little because it is applied promiscuously?

When the shepherdess Phoebe wants the naive, rather dense, shepherd Silvius to bear her secret love letter to Rosalind-as-Ganymede, she butters up the rustic by responding to his plea "Sweet Phoebe, pity me," "Why I am sorry for thee, gentle Silvius" (3.5.85–86). Can a lower-class shepherd, judged by late Elizabethan cultural criteria, be considered gentle? Silvius, after all, is no disguised aristocrat, as is the shepherd Musidorus in Sir Philip Sidney's *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*. When Phoebe complains to Ganymede that "he" has done her "much ungentleness, / To show [Silvius] the letter that I writ to you" (5.2.72–73), Rosalind retorts: "It is my study / To seem despiteful and ungentle to you" (5.2.74–75). Shakespeare, through Rosalind, labels her campaign to physic Phoebe of her pride by stinging verbal criticism of her—a method similar to Petruchio's homeopathic purging of waspish Kate's humor in *The Taming of the Shrew*—as "ungentle," that is, as a method not worthy of a gentleman or—in this case—a gentlewoman. The effectiveness of Rosalind's calculatedly rude (ungentle) behavior complements the impression that applications of forms of the word "gentle" in *As You Like It* are generally not significant or systematically deployed.

Such a conclusion, however, would be mistaken. In order to grasp how mistaken such a judgment would be, one might begin by understanding how the terms of Shakespeare's debate in *As You Like It* with his fellow playwright Ben Jonson over who is a gentleman have never been fully defined. Part of the autobiographical dimension of this pastoral comedy involves the complex issue of Shakespeare's purchase of gentleman status for his father and thus for himself as the eldest son. In 1596, Shakespeare successfully brought to completion his father's attempt to acquire a heraldic coat of arms and the gentleman status this entailed. Shakespeare's coat of arms was based on an old sketch filed by his father before he apparently fell on financial hard times. The contemporary description of the sketch reads "Gould. On A Bend Sables, a Speare of the first steeled argent. And for his Crest or Cognizance a falcon, his wings displayed Argent. Standing on a wrethe of his Coullors. Suppourting a Speare Gould. Steeled as aforesaid

sett upon a helmett with mantelles and tasselles.’⁴ Shakespeare himself probably wrote the motto for this design, positioned beneath it, *Non Sans Droict* (“Not Without Right”). The Elizabethan copyist does not appear to realize that, rather than supporting a gold spear, the falcon’s lifted leg and gripping claw shake it—giving witty point to the playwright’s surname. The bright gold of the original Shakespeare coat of arms tends to mute its silver colors, partly because the gold is practically yellow.

It is this vivid yellow coloring that has made Shakespeare scholars confident that Ben Jonson in his 1599 comedy, *Every Man Out of His Humour*, was sharply criticizing his colleague Shakespeare for crassly presuming to believe that he merited gentleman status. Jonson’s comedy includes a country bumpkin named Sogliardo, who Jonson describes in his pre-play portrait hall of characters as “so enamoured of the name of a gentleman that [he] will have it though he buys it.”⁵ Entering with a sketch (or “tricking”) of the arms given by the Heralds’ office, Sogliardo tells Carlo and Puntarvolo, “I thank God I can write myself gentleman now. Here’s my patent [*Showing* {the sketch} *to them*]. It cost me thirty pound, by this breath” (3.1.213–15).⁶ Sogliardo’s crest features “a boar without a head, rampant” (3.1.220–21); in the upper third of this coat of arms appears the boar’s head, drawn above “a *chevron* engrailed checky, or [gold], *vert* [green], and *ermine*s [white]”—a scheme that prompts Carlo to joke, “Slud, it’s a hog’s cheek and puddings in a pewter field,” and then Puntarvolo to add, “Let the word [the motto] be *Not without mustard*” (3.1.235–36, 241, 244). Sogliardo’s companions suggest that gluttony in addition to social presumption is among this clown’s faults.

The combination of the bright yellow coloring of Shakespeare’s coat of arms along with the similarity of the phrasing of its motto—“Not Without Right”—increases the likelihood that Jonson in the motto “*Not without mustard*” is mocking his fellow dramatist’s coat of arms as well as his motives in spending money to acquire one. Given the late Elizabethan increase in the “sale” of coats of arms that Lawrence Stone documented and illustrated, one might conclude that Jonson had a point.⁷ Ralph Brooke, York Herald from 1593, mentions Shakespeare’s name fourth in a list of twenty-three in his complaint that Sir William Dethick had abused his office as Garter King-of-Arms in improperly conferring armigerous status.⁸ Henry Peacham in *The Complete Gentleman* (1622) registers a sixteenth-century opinion when he argues that “stage players,” along with “fencers, jugglers, dancers, mountebanks, bearwards, and the like,” could under no circumstances become gentlemen because “their bodies are spent with labor and travail.”⁹ Shakespeare’s claim to gentleman status derived from his father John Shakespeare’s claim, which was partly grounded in Dethick’s recording the almost certainly erroneous

belief that “the petitioner’s ancestor . . . did ‘faithful and valiant service’ to King Henry VII.”¹⁰ In 1599, according to James Bednarz, “the issue of [Shakespeare’s] gentility had become potentially embarrassing when he attempted to upgrade his shield by placing the Arden pattern of his mother’s more prestigious side of the family on its sinister side and moving the Shakespeare crest to its dexter half.”¹¹ Bednarz argues that “Jonson could have known of these affairs of the College of Arms through his friendship with William Camden, the Clarenceux King-of-Arms, who assisted Sir William Dethick . . . in drawing up the grant for the impalement [for the upgraded shield], which was not issued.”¹² No stronger evidence that *As You Like It* is a mid- or later-1599 or early-1600 play exists than the following allusion in it to Jonson’s caricature of armigerous Shakespeare.

When early in the play Touchstone tells Celia, “by mine honour, but I was bid to come for you,” Rosalind replies, “Where learned you that oath, fool?” This dialogue then ensues:

Touchstone: Of a certain knight that swore “by his honour” they were good pancakes, and swore “by his honour” the mustard was naught. Now I’ll stand to it the pancakes were naught and the mustard was good, and yet was not the knight forsworn.

Celia: How prove you that in the great heap of your knowledge?

Rosalind: Ay, marry, now unmuzzle your wisdom.

Touchstone: Stand you both forth now: stroke your chins, and swear by your beards that I am a knave.

Celia: By our beards—if we had them—thou art.

Touchstone: By my knavery—if I had it—then I were; but if you swear by that that is not, you are not forsworn. No more was this knight, swearing by his honour, for he never had any; or if he had, he had sworn it away before ever he saw those pancakes or that mustard.

(1.2.56–74)

Juliet Dusinberre, with reference to this dialogue, has explained that “[t]he Elizabethans ate pancakes stuffed with powdered beef (like a modern fritter)—hence the mustard [spread on them].”¹³ The word “mustard” in this dialogue evokes the bright yellow coloring of Shakespeare’s coat of arms and its motto, “Not Without Right,” parodied in Puntarvolo’s motto “*Not without mustard.*” In *Every Man Out of His Humour*, in the dialogue occurring immediately after the spoof of Sogliardo’s coat of arms, Fastidius tells Carlo, “Entreat your poor friend”—Sogliardo—“to walk off a little, signior. I will salute the knight [Puntarvolo]” (3.1.247–48). In Touchstone’s wise foolishness, Shakespeare extends Puntarvolo’s knighthood to Jonson. For it was actually Jonson who swore through his knight Puntarvolo that “the mustard was naught,” that Shakespeare’s yellow coat of arms and its motto were nothing, that they were ridiculous.¹⁴ Yet, through Touchstone,

Shakespeare asserts that “the mustard was good”—that the bright yellow coat of arms and its motto possess merit. Shakespeare suggests that Jonson swore by his own honor as the equivalent of his knight Puntarvolo’s—that he thought he was right, in other words, to criticize Shakespeare’s coat of arms and his motives for wanting one. But such swearing carries no truth; for Jonson, Shakespeare implies, like vainglorious Puntarvolo, lacks honor—and so is no true knight, nor gentleman for that matter.¹⁵ In fact, Ben Jonson in England could never legally become a gentleman (to say nothing of a knight): he had been indicted for manslaughter in autumn 1598 for fatally stabbing fellow actor Gabriel Spencer in a duel and so was a branded felon (having escaped the gallows only by reciting neck verse, only by translating at sight a passage from a Latin Bible).¹⁶ If Jonson was sharp with Shakespeare, Shakespeare could be sharper still with him. The disclaimer that Shakespeare put in Touchstone’s mouth, that “knightly” Jonson had no honor to swear by, must indeed have particularly stung the bricklayer turned scholar and poet with the brand of a felon on his thumb.¹⁷

Shakespeare indicates in two turn-of-the-century plays, one of which is *As You Like It*, that other criteria exist, in addition to that involving honesty, that implicitly distinguish him from ungentle Ben Jonson. One strain of critical commentary on this comedy associates Jonson with Jaques, in that Jonson successfully adapted the late Elizabethan verse satire of Juvenalian variety (popularized from 1597 to 1599 by Joseph Hall, John Marston, William Rankins, and Everard Guilpin)¹⁸ to the stage in *Every Man Out of His Humour* (1599), *Cynthia’s Revels* (1600), and *Poetaster* (1601),¹⁹ and in that Shakespeare characterizes Jaques as a verse satirist. In First Lord’s words, Jaques “most invectively . . . pierceth through / The body of the country, city, court” (2.1.58–59).²⁰ Making this association more likely is Jaques’ essential sharing of his name with Ajax of the other midcareer Shakespeare play containing passages evocative of the English verse satire of the end of the sixteenth century, *Troilus and Cressida* (c.1601).²¹ Pronounced virtually identically (“Jākes”-“A-jākes”), the names of the melancholic of one play and of the Homeric warrior of the other approximate the Elizabethan name for an outhouse, a privy (a jakes). Besides slow-wittedness, a propensity for sudden wrath and physical violence marks Ajax’s behavior (e.g., *Troilus and Cressida*, 2.3.201–2, 204–5, 216, 220), a trait that has (among other reasons) caused some commentators on this generically ambiguous play of Shakespeare’s to claim that the ancient warrior represents a satire on physically quarrelsome Ben Jonson.²² By two homonymic names, Shakespeare suggests what Jonson may be full of (or redolent of).

Shakespeare in *As You Like It* resolves the question of whether a gentleman can practice Jonsonian satire, in either verbal or written forms, when, in response to Jaques’ textbook argument that the satirist’s anatomies of

humankind's folly wound only the guilty and not the innocent, and that the satirist deserves the freedom to attack all kinds of people (2.7.47–61), the gentleman Duke Senior sharply describes what Jaques would do (were he an official satirist):

Most mischievous foul sin in chiding sin;
 For thou thyself hast been a libertine,
 As sensual as the brutish sting itself,
 And all th'embossèd sores and headed evils
 That thou with licence of free foot hast caught
 Wouldst thou disgorge into the general world.
 (2.7.64–69)

Jaques never refutes this accusation nor even addresses it, choosing instead to rationalize the value of verbal satire by claiming, as non-Aristophanic ancient satirists did, that no one can accuse the satirist of venomous personal attacks because the satirist attacks only vicious character types, not named known vicious individuals (2.7.70–87). Shakespeare thus gives playgoers and readers the impression that Duke Senior's characterization of Jaques as a libertine is true. More important, Duke Senior (and Shakespeare) negatively depicts satire as the translated spite of illness, as an infectious disease such as syphilis caught by the libertine-turned-satirist. By implication, satire amounts to a reprehensible redirection of the satirist's loathing and anger for having contracted disease from his lifestyle onto London character types, who can be perceived in his poetic creations as possessing his own and others' vices. This rejection of satire must have nettled Ben Jonson, partly (or perhaps especially) because as a young man he apparently had led a sensual life involving drinking, roistering, and brawling surrounding the theater. If the satirist is a gentleman (as the felon Jonson never could be), he is likely a degenerate one.

Gentle Orlando supplies the Shakespearean gentleman's response to Jaques' invitation to join him in "rail[ing] against our mistress the world, and all our misery" (3.2.269–70), to engage in verbal satire, in other words, when he says, "I will chide no breather in the world but myself, against whom I know most faults" (3.2.271–72). Condensed in his answer is a characteristic Shakespearean modesty, in this context the modesty of a gentleman, who assumes that becoming the satirist of others' faults requires that he have none. (Nevertheless, the playwright evidently lapsed from the personal practice of this admirable doctrine when he stung Jonson via Touchstone's remarks about a knight, mustard, pancakes, and the absence of honor in the knight).²³ James Cleland, in *Hero-paideia: or, The Institution of a Young Noble Man* (1607), would argue that the "general foundatiō of [a gentleman's] good behaiour, in conuersation is, that [he]

take diligently heede, not to make [himself a] slau[e] or subiect vnto any certaine particular humors, which is a token of selfe loue."²⁴ If a gentleman does not enslave himself to a humor, he would not addict himself to satire, since Shakespeare in *As You Like It* in the character of Jaques suggests that it derives from a psychological, or physiological, humor (or its affection). Gentle Will Shakespeare briefly engaged in the late Elizabethan enthusiasm of satire by dramatizing it, only to reject it, or to show how foolish characters looked practicing it, or to suggest that it amounted to a useless way of relating to the world. Relating to the world is the key idea here. For in *As You Like It*, Shakespeare indicates that satirists are passive, uninvolved in society or in the betterment of it. Jaques says, "Will you sit down with me" (3.2.268) and satirize the passing fools of society. Appropriately, the passivity of the satirist is underscored when Jaques' theoretical defense of the satirist's innocence in attacking character types rather than named individuals gets broken off by the entry of Orlando, his sword drawn, seeking food for old Adam. Considered in retrospect, this interruption recommends an active involvement in life, the doing of deeds for the betterment of others, rather than the still-born passivity of verse satire. Reconsidered in the context of the argument of this chapter, the interruption distinguishes what an authentic gentleman does from what he does not do—charitably help others in need, regardless of their social rank, rather than, from a distance, criticize the foibles of countrymen with no active effort made to help them reform.

Jonson's inability to control the hostile impulses of his violent temper ensured that he would never become a gentleman in Elizabethan (or Jacobean) London. In *As You Like It*, Shakespeare implies that his own ability to do so helps him to become a genuine gentleman.²⁵ As the country bumpkin William of *As You Like It*, Shakespeare appears to accept Jonson's characterization of him as a clownish rustic such as Jonson's Sogliardo. And yet there is a large difference: William is no upstart, no ambitious social climber. More important, he does not adhere to, nor does he want to practice, a physically violent social code of behavior that, in some Elizabethans' minds, was a trait of the gentleman.²⁶ Sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century manuals on a gentleman's conduct typically include a section on single combats, or single duels. In Chapter 27 of *The Institution of a Young Noble Man*, James Cleland advises the gentleman to go "by degrees in reuenging [his] quarrel," but once in that quarrel to arrange the duel without a second so that in the violent bout his "courage and . . . discretion" appear greater.²⁷ In *The Blazon of Gentrie* (1586), John Ferne's directives to "Gentlemen and the Noble" for recognizing the situations in which they may bear arms in single combat and the appropriate protocols for dueling, including the place and time of combat and

the selection of weapons and armors, run to forty pages.²⁸ They include such nice distinctions as the various kinds of “iniurie[s] of wordes” justifying the bloody duel versus those “iniurie[s] of Fact” that warrant the challenge to combat.²⁹ Queen Elizabeth’s government had sanctioned the institution of increasingly popular codes of formal dueling between gentlemen, even single combat often ending in death, because the codes essentially terminated never-ending Montague-and-Capulet style feuds between quarreling noblemen and their retainers.³⁰ In the second half of the sixteenth century, Ruth Kelso notes that Englishmen and women believed that “[i]t was less evil for two men to risk their lives than for the whole state to be in peril. Without the duel the friends, relatives, and clients of one who receives injury fly to arms and civil war results.”³¹

It is the elaborate code of Elizabethan single combat that Touchstone alludes to in his dialogue with William. Competing with William for a female, Audrey, Touchstone in his mood turns hostile:

Therefore, you clown, abandon—which is in the vulgar, leave—the society—which in the boorish is company—of this female—which in the common is woman; which together is, abandon the society of this female, or, clown, thou perishest; or, to thy better understanding, diest; or, to wit, I kill thee, make thee away, translate thy life into death, thy liberty into bondage. I will deal in poison with thee, or in bastinado, or in steel. I will bandy with thee in faction, I will o’errun thee with policy. I will kill thee a hundred and fifty ways. (5.1.45–55)

Sometimes commentators on *As You Like It* interpret this passage as Shakespeare’s parody of those who (like Jonson, again?) snobbishly practice progressive levels of “refined” diction, believing that it must be translated or glossed for plainer folk. Such a reading, however, only applies to the first half of Touchstone’s diatribe. In the latter half, the jester’s hostile feelings get the better of him as twice he comically progresses first from a plain meaning “I kill thee” to its more abstract expressions—“make thee away, translate thy life into death, thy liberty into bondage”—and then from the relatively concrete “I will deal in poison with thee, or in bastinado, or in steel,” to the more abstract, nevertheless lethal, restatements “I will bandy with thee in faction, I will o’errun thee with policy.” Admittedly, few playgoers expect Touchstone to follow through on his threats. Yet there is a serious point here—a criticism of the gradations and variety of violent behavior available to the gentleman in his supposedly necessary retaliations to perceived affronts. At this point, my reader might object that the jester Touchstone is not, nor will he ever be, a gentleman. His foolish profession precludes it, even as Shakespeare’s socially marginal profession of actor-playwright might. While he may be no gentleman,

Touchstone nevertheless shows that he understands the stereotypic traits of a late Elizabethan gentleman. Referring to Touchstone near the end of the play as “the motley-minded gentleman,” who has sworn that he once “hath been a courtier” (5.4.40–41), Jaques prompts Touchstone to agree:

If any man doubt that, let him put me to my purgation. I have trod a measure [a stately court dance], I have flattered a lady, I have been politic with my friend, smooth [fair speaking, flattering] with mine enemy, I have undone [ruined, by not paying them] three tailors, I have had four quarrels, and like to have fought one. (5.4.42–46)

Emphasis falls here upon the *stereotypic* nature of Touchstone’s understanding of the behavior of a gentleman. Part of this knowledge, he goes on to show, involves codified gradations of response to mutual insults between two gentlemen, steps that ascend toward physical violence from the Retort Courteous, through the Quip Modest, the Reply Churlish, the Reproof Valiant, and the Countercheck Quarrelsome, to the Lie Circumstantial and—finally—the Lie Direct (5.4.66–78). Touchstone’s degrees of response would perhaps have not seemed ridiculous to the English reader of this passage of George Pettie’s Elizabethan translation of Stefano Guazzo’s popular conduct book, *The Civile Conversation* (1576; 1581, 1586): “the unnoble or yeomen . . . [ought to know] the seven degrees of superioritie, [which are] particularly set downe of Gentlemen over the baser sorte, who by all reason ought to submitte themselves to their will and pleasure.”³²

A review of sixteenth-century manuals for gentlemen’s behavior reveals that the silliness of Touchstone’s taxonomy is not that far from reality, or, at least, from a stereotype of “gentle” behavior.³³ Anthony Esler in fact quotes Touchstone’s codified guide to quarreling as illustrative of “the artificiality of the courtly Italianate conception of honor” in many Elizabethan conduct books, “with [that conception’s] emphasis on the formal duel as the supreme test of an honorable man.”³⁴ Touchstone’s comic progression from the verbal retort through insult and the giving of the lie to the violent duel uncannily gained serious life fourteen years later when King James, in an effort Queen Elizabeth never officially made, in 1613 issued a “proclamation against ‘the bloodie exercise of the duelloe’” that included a proposal of “a scale of degrees of satisfaction for insults from the first crude word to the giving of the lie; so as to break the chain reaction that led inescapably to the duel.”³⁵ By this proclamation, James was taking to its logical conclusion the intention that partly informed Elizabethan codifications of the duel: the elimination of long-running blood feuds and the many deaths among retainers of enraged gentlemen.

The Shakespearean tragic analogue to Touchstone’s comic codification of “gentle” behavior appears simultaneously with or just after *As You*

Like It, when, before the play-ending duel in *Hamlet*, the Prince addresses Laertes: “Give me your pardon, sir. I have done you wrong, / But pardon’t as you are a gentleman” (5.2.224–25). “I am satisfied in nature,” the “gentleman” Laertes replies:

Whose motive in this case should stir me most
To my revenge. But in my terms of honor
I stand aloof, and will no reconciliation
Till by some elder masters of known honor
I have a voice and precedent of peace
To keep my name ungor'd.

(5.2.242–48)

In other words, certain authorities who understand the gradation of insults that apply to gentlemen will inform the gentleman Laertes whether Hamlet’s murder of his father, Polonius, allows him to accept the murderer’s request for pardon, or whether the deed—despite Hamlet’s begging of pardon—requires him to respond violently, physically.³⁶ Few Elizabethan courtiers or higher-class playgoers would have considered a mark of a gentleman the “Italianate” or “Machiavellian” policy of Laertes in poisoning the tip of his supposedly blunted rapier. Laertes himself renames, and by doing so undermines, this act of policy when he says later that he is “justly killed with mine own treachery” (5.2.310). If a gentleman can cut his imagined enemy’s throat, is he able in good conscience—as Laertes says he is—to cut it “i’th’ church” (4.7.126)? Could such potential willingness be the behavior of an Elizabethan gentleman? Even though the deed is “almost against [his] conscience” (5.2.299, my italics), is a gentleman able (and willing)—as Laertes apparently is before Claudius commands him otherwise—to kill his partner in an apparently innocent duel with a sudden stab while the other is wiping his perspiring face with a handkerchief given him by his mother (5.2.289–99)? Does not such a potential deed appear cowardly? Respective likely negative and then positive answers to these latter two questions render doubtful Osric’s claim that Laertes is “an absolute [a perfect] gentleman” (5.2.107), and even the claim that he is essentially a gentleman.

Shakespeare’s implicit criticism in *Hamlet* of the stereotypic traits of a gentleman strengthen the inclination to detect a similar, but nontragic critique of the conventional traits of the gentleman constructed in *As You Like It*. Confronted with the threatening bluster of Jaques’ gentleman, Touchstone, William turns the other cheek, so to say. Rather than responding with hostile words or deeds to Touchstone’s threats to abandon Audrey, William, smiling (I would say) simply replies, “God rest you merry, sir” (5.1.58), and departs. In other words, William practices the

courtesy, remarkable to urban Elizabethans subscribing to commonplace ideas about country folk, that has marked his behavior throughout his brief appearance in the play. William took off his hat, courteously greeting Touchstone before the fool could acknowledge him: "And good ev'n to you, sir" (5.1.15). Touchstone's word "gentle" in his reply—"Good ev'n, gentle friend. Cover thy head, cover thy head"—acknowledges William's initial courtesy, by suggesting (despite appearances otherwise) that he is a gentleman. But playgoers quickly learn from the ensuing dialogue that Touchstone's address "gentle friend" must have been meant as sarcasm. And yet, as Shakespeare's audience soon learns and Touchstone apparently does not, a gentleness associated with stereotypic assumptions about court manners paradoxically emanates from country William. This aspect of Shakespeare's portrait of his alter ego suggests that he took seriously his contemporaries' praise of his "gentle" nature.³⁷ Only gentlemen and their betters in Elizabethan England were entitled, technically speaking, to wear swords in the course of everyday life.³⁸ In his last will and testament, the retired playwright, who still had his sword, bequeathed it to Thomas Combe, the nephew of Shakespeare's friend, the usurer John Combe. Despite this relic of a potentially aggressive Shakespeare, the playwright of *As You Like It* intimates that an authentic gentleman forbears retaliatory physical violence, practicing the softest refined manners instead.

This intimation is consistent with certain details of Shakespeare's *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (c.1590–1594). The outlaws of acts 4 and 5 of this play, some of whom are gentlemen (4.1.44), live in the forest because they have committed various crimes, including murder (4.1.51). Third Outlaw, because he is the character who identifies some of the gang as gentlemen, is apparently a gentleman. His gentle status reveals itself in his awareness that the "wild faction" needs a "king"—another, more self-governed, gentleman to rule them—and that Valentine qualifies for the role (4.1.37). Faced with the choice of becoming the outlaws' captain or suffering instant death (the fatal threat is made by First and Second Outlaws, who are apparently members of the nongentle segment of the band!), Valentine not surprisingly agrees to rule. Later, he complains to himself, "They love me well, yet I have much to do / To keep them from uncivil outrages" (5.4.16–17). Yet Valentine does restrain the gentlemen in the band, as well as the commoners, from acts of violence, notably because, as First Outlaw tells captured, frightened Silvia, "He bears an honorable mind" (5.3.13). In keeping with this emphasis, Valentine effectively threatens violence against Proteus, about to rape Silvia, but he does not inflict it (5.4.55–82). Ann Jennalie Cook, in describing the gentility of Valentine, the outlaws, and their relationship, thinks that Shakespeare is satirizing an Elizabethan ideal of the gentleman.³⁹ Camille Wells Slight, however, persuasively argues

that Valentine's interaction with the outlaws, besides possessing some satiric elements, has a serious burden involving a gentleman's liberation from the practice of physical violence, and that the interaction is part of a scenic design that shows Valentine's growth into understanding the character of a genuinely worthy because imperfect Renaissance gentleman.⁴⁰ Valentine does ask the Duke of Milan at play's end to forgive the outlaws and recall them from exile. "They are reformed," Valentine asserts, "civil full of good, / And fit for great employment" (5.4.156–57). The same might be said of Valentine himself.

The ability to refrain from forms of physical violence enters into any consideration of whether Orlando in *As You Like It* is an Elizabethan gentleman. Framing this issue as a possibility rather than as a certainty may seem odd, for Shakespeare in the opening dialogue of *As You Like It* appears to establish as a certainty Orlando's identity as a gentleman. Even though he is a younger son, Orlando bears the gentleman Sir Rowland de Boy's blood in his veins. Orlando's untutored, depressed condition cannot wash away this status. "I know you are my eldest brother," Orlando states, "and in the gentle condition of blood you should so know me" (1.1.41–43). "The courtesy of nations allows you my better," Orlando admits, "in that you are the first-born; but the same tradition takes not away my blood, were there twenty brothers betwixt us. I have as much of my father in me as you, albeit I confess your coming before me is nearer to his reverence" (1.1.43–48). When Orlando refers to "the gentle condition of [his] blood" and goes on to say that birth order has no bearing upon that blood's quality, he is referring to the Elizabethan assumption that the blood of sons of gentlemen is superior in purity and virtue to the blood of nongentlemen.⁴¹ When Orlando tells Oliver that he has "as much" of Sir Rowland de Boys in him as his brother has, he means that he has the same quantity and quality of gentle blood in him, the blood, according to doctrine at least, that animates him and that makes manifest the courtly and heroic traits of a gentleman.

This is more than "gentle" Shakespeare could say for himself, or his brothers. While John Shakespeare might, by a stretch of criteria, have qualified for the coat of arms of a gentleman by his attaining several progressively more prominent offices in Stratford, his loss of them and of the personal wealth associated with these offices insured that his own unaided efforts at becoming a gentleman would fail. The blood of a gentleman had not flowed in the veins of the infant William Shakespeare; John Shakespeare's father was a Snitterfield farmer. The immediately previous chapter reveals the strong possibility that Shakespeare interjected some of his own perceived character traits, along with certain of his own likely frustrations and fantasies, into his portrayal of Orlando. One fantasy may have been

expressed by Orlando's claim that Oliver has "trained [him] like a peasant, obscuring and hiding from [him] all gentleman-like qualities" (1.1.64–65). Shakespeare may have felt that his father had trained him like a butcher or a leather-worker, hiding from him, and obscuring from others' view, his gentleman-like qualities (those that he fantasized he naturally possessed or was born with). Sir Rowland left his son at least 1000 crowns; John Shakespeare could bequeath the eldest son William next to nothing when he reached the age of majority. Shakespeare must have wished from time to time that he had been born a gentleman, rather than being reduced later in life to purchasing that status—and thus suffering the public ridicule of others, such as Ben Jonson, who alluded to him as an undeserving social climber.⁴²

Considered in retrospect, after a playgoer or reader is familiar with *As You Like It*, the physical violence that Orlando inflicts upon Oliver at the beginning of the play undercuts his gentle status, primarily in terms of the previously described dynamics of act 5, scene 1. Touchstone's unwarranted baiting of William and his magnanimous response to it imply that a gentleman, when not lethally threatened, graciously refrains from such behavior. In the only source of the text of *As You Like It*, that of the 1623 First Folio, this dialogue appears after Orlando tells Oliver that the principle of primogeniture "takes not away my blood, were there twenty brothers betwixt vs: I haue as much of my father in mee, as you, albeit I confesse your coming before me is nearer to his reuerence":

Oli: What Boy.

Orl: Come, come elder brother, you are too yong in this.

Oli: Wilt thou lay hands on me, villaine?⁴³

(1.1.50–56)

Richard Knowles, in his New Shakespeare Variorum edition of the play, notes that Samuel Johnson, in Johnson's and George Steevens's 1773 edition of the playwright's works, was the first editor to supply a stage direction for Oliver's "What Boy": "*menacing [Orlando] with his hand.*" Editor Howard Staunton, in his text of *As You Like It* published in 1859, substituted "*Strikes at him*" for Johnson's stage direction.⁴⁴ Modern editors have made this more menacing gesture explicitly physical in its violence: Agnes Latham prints "*striking [Orlando]*" as the actor playing Oliver's direction for his utterance "What, boy!"; G. Blakemore Evans adds "*Strikes him*"; Stephen Greenblatt prints "*assailing him*"; and David Bevington includes "*He strikes Orlando.*"⁴⁵ Editor Alan Brissenden is atypical in his 1998 Oxford Shakespeare text of the play in reverting to a version of Johnson's original stage direction for Oliver's ejaculation (Brissenden prints "*threatening him*" [1.1.49]). But is any stage direction appropriate

for this utterance of Oliver's? Knowles comments that "editors do not agree on why Orlando's words [in his preceding speech] excite Oliver's anger."⁴⁶ The answer may be that they do not, at least in provoking Oliver to hostile physical behavior.

William Charles Macready in 1842 was the first of those director/producers of *As You Like It* to make Orlando rather than Oliver responsible for the physical violence in this episode by adding the promptbook direction "seizes [Oliver]" to accompany Orlando's "Come, come, elder brother, you are too young in this" (1.1.50–51).⁴⁷ That Orlando, hearing Oliver's exclamation, "What, boy!" (1.1.49), lays his hands upon Oliver, specifically by seizing him by the throat, is clear from the language of the Folio. Oliver protests: "Wilt thou lay hands upon me, villain?" (1.1.52). Angrily Orlando asserts, "I am no villein. I am the youngest son of Sir Rowland de Boys. He was my father, and he is thrice a villain that says such a father begot villeins. Wert thou not my brother, I would not take this hand from thy throat till this other hand pulled out thy tongue for saying so" (1.1.53–58). In the theater, auditors would likely hear the words "villain" ("a wicked man") / "villain" (a "peasant") pronounced similarly. And indeed, all four appearances of "villain"/"villein" in this passage are spelt "villaine" in the 1623 Folio text. As early as 1765, Samuel Johnson in his edition of *As You Like It* noted that "[t]he word *villain* is used by the elder brother, in its present meaning, for a *wicked* or *bloody man*; by *Orlando*, in its original significance, for a *fellow of base extraction*."⁴⁸ Both informed late Elizabethan playgoers and Jacobean readers of the Folio would have been aware that Orlando (and Shakespeare) is sensitive to a social class insult in Oliver's terming his brother a "villain."

Editors through the centuries, virtually without exception, have added a stage direction of "*collaring [Oliver]*" (Johnson, ed. 1773), or some phrase indicating seizure by the throat, either just before or just after Orlando's "Come, come...you are too young in this." But Orlando may roughly grab Oliver at any near moment before he says, "I would not take this hand from thy throat..." (1.1.56–57); in fact (in my reading), Orlando seizes Oliver at the end of his complaint that he has as much gentle blood in himself as Oliver does (1.1.41–48), thus justifying Oliver's exclamation "What, boy!" Editors sometimes interpret Orlando's enraged utterance "you are too young in this" to mean that eldest brother Oliver shows the immaturity of a younger (youngest) brother in physically menacing or striking Orlando. But if such were Orlando's intended meaning, he would presumably want to show, by refraining from violence, that he is not immature in this sense. Instead, Orlando's "you are too young in this" more likely refers to Oliver's insult "boy" in his utterance "What, boy!" By having physically gripped Oliver for some moments, Orlando appears to

be telling Oliver that he is truly the boy by not possessing mature strength to resist Orlando's painful collaring of him.

My point in belaboring the possibility that Orlando, not Oliver, initiates the physical violence of the play involves its serving to pose the dramatic question of whether Orlando's propensity for violence will interfere with his ability to become a Shakespearean gentleman. Orlando's attack on his brother is certainly understandable, considered in light of Oliver's degradation of his brother. But a major message of act 5, scene 1 of the play is that a true gentleman on most occasions of insult resists the impulse to retaliate violently. Touchstone's insults are as, or even more, intense than Oliver's, and yet gentle William does not attack his detractor—either physically or verbally. Oliver draws no weapon; nor does he lethally threaten Orlando. A nongentle savagery latent in Orlando can be heard in his impulse, obviously not carried out, to tear Oliver's tongue from his mouth. Old Adam supplies an authoritative "gentle" attitude toward enduring the slings and arrows of insult when he tells pinioned Oliver and gripping Orlando, "Sweet masters, be patient. For your father's remembrance, be at accord" (1.1.59–60). Orlando, however, ignores this appeal. "Let me go, I say" (1.1.61), Oliver tells his brother. "I will not till I please," Orlando snarls, maintaining a suffocating grip on the eldest brother's throat. He releases it only after he demands that Oliver "allow me such exercises [employment] as may become a gentleman, or give me the poor allottery my father left me by testament" (1.1.67–69). Orlando takes his hand from Oliver's throat only after the eldest brother says, presumably with a wheeze, "You shall have some part of your will" (1.1.73).

Editor Alan Brissenden notes that, in this utterance, "You shall have some part of your will," Oliver "puns contemptuously on (a) their father's bequest [and] (b) Orlando's wish."⁴⁹ This pun makes Oliver's answer ambiguous, to the extent that auditors suspect that he never plans to give Orlando any part of the 1,000-crown "allottery" due him (1.1.2, 82–83). And, indeed, Oliver immediately incites Charles the Wrestler to attempt the killing of Orlando and then, when that fails, to plan to burn his brother in his lodging. But before Adam tells Orlando of this heinous plot involving fire, Orlando seems to validate heroically his capacity for physical violence in this triumphant wrestling with Charles, an event that the play likens to Hercules' victory over the giant Antaeus, which Renaissance Humanists interpreted allegorically as the rational soul's mastery of the passions. Orlando's victory not only rids the court, permanently it appears, of a sadist prone to kill his opponents; it also symbolically registers and predicts Orlando's achievement of temperance in the form of self-control, as chapter one of the present study explains. In *The Book of The Courtier* (1528), Baldassare Castiglione had for Renaissance European readers, including Elizabethans, argued by means

of several interlocutors that the courtier, with few exceptions, needs to be “a gentleman borne and of good house” and that one ought to know that, regardless of a gentleman’s parents’ status, the virtue of temperance is central to his efficacious character.⁵⁰ According to Castiglione, in the courtier’s honesty may be seen “the temperance of his mind.”⁵¹ Castiglione’s interlocutor Lord Gasper Pallavicin elaborates this idea when he says, “Therefore the surest way in the world, is, for a man in his living and conversation to governe himselfe always with a certaine honest meane, which (no doubt) is a great and most sure shield against envie.”⁵² Furthermore, in the dialogue, Lord Octavian Fregoso asserts that “of thinges which we call good, some there bee that simply and of themselves are alwaies good, as temperance, valiant courage, health, and all vertues that bring quietnesse to mens mindes.” This speaker concludes that, for the gentleman courtier, “temperance free from all disquieting, is like the Captaine that without resistance overcommeth and raigneth,” and that “of temperance arise many other vertues: for when a minde is in tune with this harmony, by the meane of reason he easily receiveth afterwarde true manlinesse, which maketh him bold and safe from all daunger, and (in a manner) above worldye passions.”⁵³ Over forty editions of *The Book of The Courtier* appeared in Italy in the sixteenth century. It was translated into English by Sir Thomas Hoby and published in London in 1561, proving so popular that it was reprinted in England in 1577, 1588, and 1603. James Cleland in *The Institution of the Young Noble Man* echoes Castiglione when he devotes Chapter 16 to the centrality of the virtue of temperance in the gentleman’s life: “Al is pleasant, agreeable, and in good order where [temperance] gouerneth: she is the pillar of force, the buckler against al excesse, & carnal pleasure; leader of the eies, the rasar of euil thoughts and the rod of dissolutnes.”⁵⁴

Still, despite the contemporary possibility of reading temperate self-control in Orlando’s wrestling and overthrow of Charles, one nevertheless can be constructively critical of Orlando’s impulse to wrestle Charles. Regarded from one perspective, his desire to grapple with Charles is desperate, suicidal—all or nothing. Hardly, in other words, the resolve of a rational man, especially a rational gentleman. Melancholy Orlando tells Rosalind and Celia, just before the match,

If I be foiled, there is but one shamed that was never gracious, if killed, but one dead that is willing to be so. I shall do my friends no wrong, for I have none to lament me; the world no injury, for in it I have nothing. Only in the world I fill up a place which may be better supplied when I have made it empty. (1.2.171–77)

This is the language of despair, of self-pity; it is not the language of a gentleman by any definition of the term.

This judgment qualifies the heroism of Orlando's victory over Charles, maintaining in the play the tension between Orlando's gentle nature and his propensity for physical violence. Cynthia Marshall has noted that "[t]he cultural construction of violence is another of [*As You Like It's*] preoccupations": besides the staged wrestling match "and Duke Frederick's apparent cruelty to Oliver in [act] 3, [scene] 1," overtones of violence reverberate in "Jaques's concern about hunting" (i.e., about the Duke and his courtiers' possibly unnatural killing of deer in Arden [2.1.45–63]).⁵⁵ In twentieth-century productions of the play, Frederick's expressions of cruelty in the short act 3, scene 1 have ranged from Oliver's being flung to center-stage, then dragged offstage halfway through the eighteen-line scene; to his being struck repeatedly, as he sweats and bleeds, by enraged Frederick; and to his being "drowned in a little tin bath as [Frederick] interrogates him about his brother."⁵⁶ Directors and producers of the play have underscored the likelihood that Jaques may be right in criticizing the courtiers' killing of deer in Arden by staging the equally short act 4, scene 2, the conclusion of the deer hunt, in a way that emphasizes the violence of hunting. In Peter Stein's 1977 Berlin production, "the slaughtered hart was skinned whereupon the men fell into a wild hunting dance," while in John Dexter's 1979 London National Theatre production, "the gutted stag's entrails, 'formalised as a red garland,' were draped in the on-stage tree, and 'the victorious William was smeared' with blood and crowned with the deer's antlers."⁵⁷ Two other productions—those of David Jones (1967) and of Lucy Bailey (1998)—also incorporated into act 4, scene 2 the early modern European custom of deer hunters smearing parts of their body, often their faces, with the blood of a fresh kill.⁵⁸ The staging of graphic suggestions of the violence of killing a hart in the play works to call attention to the question posed by Orlando and Rosalind of whether, according to the Petrarchan code, the beloved can kill a lover's heart.⁵⁹ It also reinforces an atmosphere of intermittent violence in *As You Like It*, tacitly forming the question of the role violence plays in the achievement of the objectives of a good (ethical, ethically fulfilled) life, especially that of a gentleman.

Shakespeare stresses a moral problem posed by the practice of physical violence for "gentle" men and women when Le Beau interrupts Rosalind's and Celia's joking about the formulaic tale he appears to be about to tell about the "good wrestling" that the ladies have "lost sight of" by telling them that the tale consists of Charles's brutally killing successively the three sons of an old man (1.2.112–19). Touchstone—not Rosalind—provides the moral commentary on this violence when he says (in response to Le Beau's earlier claim that the ladies "have lost much good sport" [1.2.91]), "it is the first time that ever I heard breaking of ribs was sport for ladies" (1.2.123–24). Auditors generally agree with Touchstone's judgment. But Shakespeare

suggests that the world often overlooks the immorality of socially sanctioned violence (Charles wrestles for the entertainment of a community), by having Le Beau call Charles's homicidal grappling "good" wrestling, "sport" fit for the amusement of ladies; and by having Rosalind, of all people, insensitively make a joke about it when she puns, "But is there any else longs to see the broken music in [one of the dead son's] sides?" (1.2.127–28).⁶⁰ Read retrospectively back into Orlando's physical assault upon Oliver, Le Beau's and Rosalind's making light of Charles's killing of an old man's three sons gives a gratuitous coloring to this assault.

Orlando's apparent inclination to resolve certain problems by resorting to physical violence manifests itself when, "*with sword drawn*," he interrupts Duke Senior's and Jaques' debate about the value of satire and exclaims, menacingly, "Forbear, and eat no more!" (2.7.88). In David Jones's Stratford production, "Orlando did not just burst threateningly onto the scene . . . but took a forester hostage, holding a knife to his throat."⁶¹ Unshaken by the sight of hostile Orlando and his threatening speech, Duke Senior precisely focuses the issue at hand. "What would you have?" (2.7.101) he asks. "Your gentleness shall force / More than your force move us to gentleness" (2.7.101–2), Duke Senior explains in a memorable antimetabole. Orlando apparently has not realized that he has had a choice as to his behavior. Famished, desperate in self-exile, he could have shown the manners of a gentleman, courteously requesting food of another gentleman. Duke Senior's rhetorical trope implies that he ought to show he is a gentleman by refraining from the threat of physical violence. Orlando excuses his behavior when he responds to Duke Senior's calm utterance, "Sit down and feed, and welcome to our table":

Speak you so gently? Pardon me, I pray you.
I thought that all things had been savage here,
And therefore put I on the countenance
Of stern commandment.

(2.7.105–9)

Orlando's reasons for behaving in a hostile fashion are very likely true. But playgoers have seen and heard enough of him in the play to believe that he readily performed his savage interruption of Duke Senior's and Jaques' conversation. What is most significant in his response to Duke Senior's invitation is his implied realization (or admission) that gentle speech defines a gentleman as much as (or more than) violent action.

Walking through the forest, coming upon the hirsute Oliver sleeping under a tree threatened by a hungry crouching lioness, Orlando is tempted to let the beast do its bloody work (4.3.101–21). Considered symbolically, the lioness is a metaphor for wrath,⁶² in this case the wrath of Orlando

against Oliver—the anger he showed when in act 1 he almost choked his eldest brother to death. What Shakespeare symbolically gives playgoers, then, is Orlando's triumph over his wrath, his wrestling successfully for a second time in the play with an earthly passion. "Twice did he turn his back, and purposed [leaving me to the lioness]," Oliver concludes:

But kindness, nobler ever than revenge,
 And nature, stronger than his just occasion,
 Made him give battle to the lioness,
 Who quickly fell before him.

(4.3.128–32)

Orlando's repeated inclination to leave Oliver to this particular death reprises in a different form the homicidal intensity of his angry throttling of his brother earlier in the play. By directing his temperamental readiness to act violently upon the lioness rather than upon his brother, Orlando typologically gets the better of this readiness and his proneness to unjustifiable violence. More important, by diverting his hostility away from Oliver toward the lioness, Orlando becomes a gentleman in Shakespearean terms. Rather than allowing vain retaliation directed toward the perceived insults of another, a true gentleman's physical aggression is channeled into either nonhomicidal sports or the equivalent of Herculean deeds for the betterment of another, even a former enemy, or of a community. Orlando, by turning from Oliver to battle the lioness, acts out the gentle truth likewise dramatized by the playwright's alter ego—Prospero—in the first twenty-five verses of the last act of *The Tempest*: that when the choice posed is between them, virtue (kindness, forgiveness) is preferable to vengeance. Such, in essence, was country William's choice in the forest of Arden. This staging indicates that inheriting the blood of a gentleman is not a necessary prerequisite for choosing rightly. The prerequisite can be temperamental, as no-gentleman-born Shakespeare may have preferred to believe.

Orlando's gentle qualities are not so obscured that they escape Celia's detection. Meeting Orlando just before he wrestles Charles, Rosalind and Celia apparently have no knowledge of his identity. Rather than naming Orlando, Rosalind addresses him simply as "Young man" and "young sir," while Celia does so as "Young gentleman" (1.2.153, 165, 158). Kept as a peasant, Orlando cannot wear the clothes of a gentleman. His gentle nature is apparent to Celia, at least. Celia's detection of a gentleman in Orlando evokes the previously mentioned Elizabethan assumption that gentlemen inherit their gentleness from their father's blood, in this case focusing the belief that the mere appearance of a gentleman can do so. After Orlando defeats Charles, Rosalind addresses the victor as a "Gentleman" (1.2.229) as she gives him a precious chain from her neck. But she, at least, may do

so because she has just heard Orlando identify himself to Duke Frederick as “the youngest son of Sir Rowland de Boys” (1.2.205–6). Playgoers cannot be certain that Rosalind would have resembled Celia in perceiving the gentle qualities of a handsome stranger. This uncertainty introduces into the scene the Elizabethan debate over whether gentleness was essentially, or most meaningfully, an inherited and lineal condition or an acquired condition established by one’s choices and actions.

All this is to say that Shakespeare suggests that Orlando, in the course of *As You Like It*, will need to make unequivocally obvious to Rosalind the intangible gentle qualities that he fears are obscured by Oliver’s degradation of him. At least he will need to do so for the sake of playgoers who want to believe he is worthy of her love. But first Orlando demonstrates his gentle nature through a series of selfless deeds of charity, all of which focus on the needs of old Adam. First, he bears the old man on his back when, faint with age and hunger, Adam can trek no longer through the forest of Arden. When seen within the context of verbal allusions to the Troy story in *As You Like it*, this deed appears heroic, since it resembles that of Aeneas carrying his aged father, Anchises, out of the burning city. Next, he risks his safety in seeking food for elderly Adam. (Orlando selflessly tells Adam, “If this uncouth forest yield anything savage I will either be food for it or bring it food for thee” [2.6.6–7]). Finally, he graciously, and modestly, insists that Adam be brought to the exiles’ feast and fed before he—or anyone else—eats any food:

Then but forbear your food a little while
Whiles, like a doe, I go to find my faun
And give it food. There is an old poor man
Who after me hath many a weary step
Limped in pure love. Till he be first sufficed,
Oppressed with two weak evils, age and hunger,
I will not touch a bit.

(2.7.127–33)

Shakespeare redefines a gentleman’s heroism to include acts of compassion and decency, acts not really commonplace but within the scope of Elizabethans below the rank of gentility. In his chapter focused on “*How a Noble man should shew himselfe liberall*,” that is say, be generous to others, James Cleland in his early Jacobean conduct book never uses forms of the word “charity,” choosing instead to term extreme liberality “prodigality,” a trait that Cleland cautions against as much as he recommends.⁶³ Shakespeare reinforces audiences’ and readers’ developing impression that authentic gentlemen in *As You Like It* are unconventional by having, for instance, Orlando in the above-quoted speech refer to himself as a doe and

ancient Adam as a fawn. Maternal succor is the image created in auditors' minds by these references, hardly the image that the conventional gentleman of Elizabethan handbooks would want associated with himself. Compounded with this image are other elements of Orlando's remarkable speech, such as the more than compensatory reward of loving service and of ministering to the weak and old before providing for one's own needs, that form the character of an unconventional gentleman. Gentlemen such as Osric and Laertes in *Hamlet* would, most likely, resist a formulation of the Elizabethan gentleman that included virtues capable of being practiced by the lower, even lowest, social classes.

The recipient of Orlando's gentility shows that he knows the youngest brother possesses the virtue of gentleness before he becomes its beneficiary in the forest of Arden, as though he for a long time has enjoyed Orlando's ministry. "O my gentle master" (2.3.2), Adam exclaims, on his first meeting Orlando in act 2. "[W]herefore are you gentle, strong, and valiant" (2.3.6), he asks him, when in his opinion the young man's graces win him enemies. "Your virtues, gentle master, / Are sanctified and holy traitors to you" (2.3.12–13), Adam concludes. Gentle Adam aptly acknowledges the gentle man who will soon both relieve and nourish him. Shakespeare expands the number of contexts and provenances in which a gentleman appears or can be bred beyond those typically identified in Elizabethan codifications of the gentleman's life. When Orlando, sword drawn, commands Duke Senior to refrain from eating, Rosalind's father asks,

Art thou thus boldened, man, by thy distress?
Or else a rude despiser of good manners,
That in civility thou seem'st so empty?
(2.7.91–93)

Replying that "[t]he thorny point / Of bare distress" accounts for his hostile behavior (2.7.94–95), Orlando protests, "Yet am I inland bred, / And know some nurture" (2.7.96–97). By saying that he is "inland bred," Orlando is simply saying that he is not outlandish—a young man whose rudeness derives from the unrefined behavior of outlanders, persons living on the margins of civilization. But the phrase "inland bred" incidentally also locates the heart of Britain, the Midlands containing Stratford-upon-Avon and the forest of Arden. Gentlemen born and living in London or its environs would have considered the English Midlands forest of Arden an unlikely nurse of gentle manners. Even perhaps outlandish. And yet gentle Shakespeare learned his manners there, as apparently his fictional counterpart, William of *As You Like It*, did. Duke Senior obviously is a gentleman, as his kind, civil response to initially rude Orlando reveals. "Speak you so gently?"

Orlando asks Rosalind's father; "Pardon me, I pray you, I thought that all things had been savage here" (2.7.106–7). Orlando's remark indicates that he would find the notion of a Midlands-bred forest gentleman surprising. "Gentle speech" in *As You Like It* is not simply kind and courteous. It also eschews the "Pedantike or . . . inkehorne" words that James Cleland cautions a gentleman from using,⁶⁴ terms heard in the *faux* gentleman Osric's utterances in *Hamlet*. Courtly Duke Senior, playgoers know, is not a native of the woods. And while one might attribute the relative civility of Corin and Silvius to pastoral convention, the latter code does not apply to—and thus cannot account for—William's gentle speech and good manners in act 5, scene 1. A receptive individual might possibly learn and practice gentle qualities in places remote from the conventional spheres of the gentle life. *As You Like It*, in manifold ways, suggests so.

Shakespeare, in Orlando's very next utterance, completes his portrait in *As You Like It* of a late Elizabethan gentleman. Still unaware that Duke Senior is a gentleman, Orlando eventually feels compelled to base his appeal for food on the articulation of the gentle traits that he hopes his interlocutor possesses. "But whate'er you are," he tells Duke Senior,

That in this desert inaccessible,
Under the shade of melancholy boughs,
Lose and neglect the creeping hours of time,
If ever you have looked on better days,
If ever been where bells have knolled to church,
If ever sat at any good man's feast,
If ever from your eyelids wiped a tear,
And know what 'tis to pity, and be pitied,
Let gentleness my strong enforcement be.
In the which hope I blush, and hide my sword.
(2.7.109–19)

Orlando assumes that the behavior and the experience that he describes help fashion "gentleness." If Duke Senior has participated in institutionalized religious life, if he has known the festivity of a good society, if he is capable of pitying the unfortunate, and—lastly—if he has been able to accept and to value the pity of another when he himself has been unfortunate, then Orlando knows that he can sheath his sword because his auditor knows wherein consists true gentleness. Then Orlando can "[l]et gentleness my strong enforcement be," simply because he knows that his auditor must be an authentic gentleman. Orlando's conclusion expresses a paradox—that the practice of unforceful (unaggressive) gentle behavior can constitute a strong enforcement, a compulsion stronger than the hostile behavior of a gentleman such as Laertes in *Hamlet* (who rather than be knolled devoutly

to church, could instead cut his enemy's throat in its sanctified precinct). Once more, Shakespeare suggests that the practice of generally Christian virtues and of convivial sociability makes a gentleman. In a rather singular manner, Shakespeare identifies the gentleman by his understanding of the value of certain virtues often associated with the passive, feminine individual, rather than by the codes of haughty, easily insulted gentlemen such as Edward de Vere, the Earl of Oxford; Sir Philip Sidney; and characters in Shakespeare's plays such as Laertes, Hotspur, and Tybalt. Duke Senior's echoing of Orlando's signature traits of gentleness emphasizes their importance at the same time that the following reproduction confirms that he too is a gentleman:

True it is that we have seen better days,
 And have with holy bell been knolled to church,
 And sat at good men's feasts, and wiped our eyes
 Of drops that sacred pity hath engendered.
 And therefore sit you down in gentleness,
 And take upon command what help we have
 That to your wanting may be ministered.
 (2.7.120–26)

When reformed Oliver tells Rosalind and Celia that, once Orlando—wounded by the lion in rescuing him—had introduced him to “the gentle Duke / Who [gave Oliver] fresh array, and entertainment, / Committing him unto [his] brother's love” (4.3.143–45), the word “gentle” identifies the active charity of Duke Senior as the trait that makes Rosalind's father, at this moment, a gentleman. It of course complements the greater “gentle” deed of rescuing Oliver that the gentleman Orlando performs. Oliver's word “entertainment” does not carry its modern meaning of “amusement” but connotes instead Duke Senior's nameless acts of accommodating Oliver in his civilized camp. Duke Senior's gentle charity acquires a Christian coloring in his admonition of brotherly love, and in his giving of “fresh array”—new, special clothing. Repeatedly throughout his career Shakespeare uses the giving of “fresh array” to symbolize the abandonment of an old self for a new self, of the imperfect or vice-ridden Old Man for a New Man. The playwright does so when in *The Merchant of Venice* Lancelot Gobbo plans to abandon Shylock and life under the Old Law for service under Bassanio, who “indeed gives rare new liveries” (2.2.104–5),⁶⁵ and thus eventually for service to the New Law of love established by society forming around Portia's marriage; and when in *The Tempest* Gonzalo remarks that, washed ashore on Prospero's island, where Alonzo and his courtiers will undergo spiritual regeneration, “our garments seem now as fresh as when we were at Tunis at the marriage of [Alonzo's] daughter” (2.1.98–100). Shakespeare

suggests through this collocation that the classless charity of a gentleman can forge a radical new spiritual identity.

Rosalind, other the other hand, manifests an unorthodox version of the gentle involvement in bettering the lives of others. That Rosalind and Celia show themselves gentlewomen in more than the sense of their aristocratic origins is beyond question. That their gentility has an aristocratic basis is clear enough. Orlando refers to the cousins' "gentle wishes" accompanying him to his match with Charles the Wrestler (1.2.171); Celia encourages her "[g]entle cousin" to thank Orlando and to encourage him to perseverance in adversity (1.2.223); Le Beau laments that Duke Frederick has "ta'en displeasure against his gentle niece" Rosalind (1.2.263); and so on throughout the play.⁶⁶ Phoebe interrupts this dramatic insistence that Rosalind is conventionally gentle by angrily telling Ganymede that "his" disclosing to Silvius the love letter she wrote and sent to Ganymede manifests "much ungentleness" (5.2.72). "It is my study," Rosalind-as-Ganymede tells Phoebe, "[t]o seem spiteful and ungentle to you" (5.2.74–75). Rosalind's ungentle treatment of Phoebe—her saucy, harshly critical words about the shepherdess's homely face and bearing and about her rudeness shown to her swain Silvius—is a calculated homeopathic method designed to physic Phoebe by humbling the vain shepherdess and by getting her to return Silvius's affection. When Corin first tells Rosalind that, in the affair between Silvius and Phoebe, she "will see a pageant truly played / Between the pale complexion of true love / And the red glow of scorn and proud disdain" (3.4.47–48), she immediately resolves to "prove a busy actor in their play" (3.4.54). Rosalind, in other words, plans to ally herself with Duke Senior and Orlando, and not with passive, uninvolved Jaques, in performing charitable deeds for the benefit of another—in this case Silvius (and eventually Phoebe). In other words, she plans unintentionally to show that she is a gentlewoman by nature, in behavior, in addition to being gentle by birth and entitlement. "Shepherdess, look on [Silvius] better," Rosalind tells Phoebe, "And be not proud. Though all the world could see / None could be so abused in sight as he" (3.5.78–80).

Whether Rosalind is successful in the unorthodox methods of her attempt to reform Phoebe is debatable.⁶⁷ That issue, however, in no way affects Rosalind's definition of herself in the process as a gentlewoman in the play's active terms. If we do not recognize an ethical dimension of her scoffing, her criticism of Phoebe might be confused with the detached railing of the late Elizabethan verse satirist against vain woman's pride in her physical beauty. Claiming that Phoebe's face is less than beautiful, Rosalind tells her, "Foul is most foul, being foul to be a scoffer" (3.5.63). Her judgment represents a version of Orlando's notion that disengaged verbal detractors of others need to be free of faults (otherwise they are hypocrites). According

to Rosalind, the ill-favored cannot find fault with the faces of lovers, for their own constitute apt subjects for their own kind of detraction. Rosalind escapes this censure, even though she herself may not be markedly beautiful, because her satire has a charitable purpose and beneficial objects outside herself: the easing of Silvius's pain and the fulfillment of his affection, and (possibly) the reformation of Phoebe's cold, prideful image of herself.

In the final analysis, the ability of Rosalind, Orlando, Duke Senior, and other characters of *As You Like It* to become gentle persons and to extend the benefits of their gentleness to others depends upon the gentility of the god apparently ruling the play's comic world. Hearing Celia read aloud sheets of Orlando's purple love poetry for Rosalind, which she has found tied to branches of trees so as to be "leaves" of the forest, Rosalind exclaims, "O most gentle Jupiter! What tedious homily of love have you wearied your parishioners withal, and never cried 'Have patience, good people'" (3.2.150–53). The god Jupiter is a gentleman in Rosalind's estimation; in fact, he is "most" (very) gentle. This reading, however, must reject a notorious editorial emendation of Rosalind's speech. In 1863 James Spedding, in the Cambridge edition of Shakespeare, emended the word "Jupiter" in Rosalind's utterance to "pulpiter" ("O most gentle pulpiter"), a change adopted subsequently by many editors of *As You Like It*.⁶⁸ In 1883, however, Grant White defended the Folio phrase "O most gentle Iupiter" by noting the phrase "heavenly synod" in Orlando's verses, "Thus Rosalind of many parts / By heavenly synod was devised / Of many faces, eyes, and hearts / To have the touches dearest prized" (3.2.144–47), which are read aloud just before Rosalind's exclamation.⁶⁹ In 1956, C. J. Sisson developed this line of thought: "The verses read by Celia are full of references to Heaven, Nature, 'heavenly synod,' and end up with [a rhyming couplet beginning] 'Heaven would'" [3.2.148]. In Sisson's opinion, "'Rosalind's comment, 'O most gentle Jupiter' is delightfully apt. 'Here is indeed a voice from Heaven, and all speaking gently about love.'" ⁷⁰ Sisson's argument carries weight. Hearing Celia read Orlando's concluding verses, "Heaven would that she these gifts should have / And I to live and die her slave" (3.2.148–49), Rosalind thinks immediately of the giver of heaven's gifts to lovely women, the god Jupiter. Rosalind will soon joke that the verses of this poetry have "in them more feet than the verses should bear" (3.2.159–61), and that the meter is defective (163–65). But her beloved Orlando's effusive poetic praise initially so flatters her that she, comically, thanks the divine author of it, suggesting that his generous, consummate gift reveals his gentleness. Shakespeare however lends serious authority to Rosalind's facetious suggestions by showing Hymen entering the forest of Arden to bless the marriage of the couples matched in this special realm. Once again, in his providence, the god Jupiter

manifests his gentleness through a magnificent gift, Hymen—and through him the divine marriage blessing associated with this deity.

Louis Montrose has argued that Elizabethan literary pastoral celebrated the realm of the gentleman, of readers and playgoers capable of understanding and endorsing the conduct of represented gentlemen and the English class hierarchy of “gentlemen, citizens, yeomen artificers, and laborers.”⁷¹ By being capable of creating a sophisticated pastoralism in *As You Like It*, Shakespeare showed that he understood thoroughly a literary mode attractive to gentlemen, indeed a mode about the gentleman. This audience, however, was small. Peter Laslett has estimated that “[a]bout a twenty-fifth, at most a twentieth, of all the people alive in the England of the Tudors and the Stuarts . . . belonged to the gentry and to those above them in the social hierarchy.”⁷² By writing a sophisticated literary pastoral, Shakespeare was showing that he was a gentleman, educated to the degree that he qualified for this class. The elite nature of his grasp of the conventions of a literary mode of the gentleman marks his distance from his pastoral alter ego in *As You Like It*: William of the forest of Arden.

And yet Shakespeare in his craft was a worker, a “wright,” a playwright in a laboring class that included the wheelwright. He was an artisan, in short.⁷³ Thomas Smith in his *De Republica Anglorum* (1583) concluded, somewhat facetiously, that “who[ever] can live idly and without manual labour, and will beare the port, charge, and countenance of a gentleman, he shall be called master . . . and shall be taken for a gentleman.”⁷⁴ Idleness, *otium*, was a necessary condition of the Elizabethan shepherd gentleman of literary pastoral. Judged by this criterion, the playwright Shakespeare was no gentleman, a conclusion consistent with his comprehensive redefinition of gentleness in *As You Like It* to include serving one’s servant and disenfranchised wage laborers such as Corin of the forest of Arden. *As You Like It* implicitly poses a central social question of Shakespeare’s age. When Adam delved and Eve span, who was then the gentleman? Apparently everyone and no one at the beginning of biblical history. As one of Thomas Smith’s lower-register “simple gentlemen,” the actor Shakespeare, unlike Sir Philip Sidney and other born gentlemen, knew enough first-hand of social injustice and the greasier side of London existence to understand that being a gentleman depended finally upon an enlightened state of mind and heart.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER SIX

TRANSVESTITE *AS YOU LIKE IT*

The transvestite role of Rosalind as Ganymede and the ways in which it has made possible the exploration of male and female sexuality as well as androgyny in *As You Like It*, most notably as these ways reaffirm or undercut Elizabethan patriarchy, have recently prompted a spate of critical articles and book chapters on this subject. This approach to the play through transvestite gendering easily qualifies as the most popular among late twentieth- and twenty-first-century commentators on *As You Like It*. My contribution to the subject is limited to providing an Elizabethan context involving literary transvestism that no one has constructed and applied to the analysis of gender, gender relations, and marriage in the play. The value of this contribution lies in making possible a clearer assessment of the degree to which *As You Like It* is “about” the destabilizing of gender through the foregrounding of homoerotic attraction. The assessment of this degree is gauged by means of a new grid involving the Elizabethan literary character of a woman cross-dressed as a boy, specifically of an onstage boy playing a woman playing a boy.

A mainly Elizabethan but partly Jacobean paradigm for understanding various meanings made possible by different prose and dramatic representations of transvestism, wherein female characters disguise themselves as boys or men, consists of a special spectrum. At one end of this hypothetical spectrum are women disguised as men whose transvestite roles primarily involve the teaching, or revelation, of ideational nonsexual virtues that eclipse, or neutralize, the transvestite’s complex sexual provocation of other characters and, presumably, readers or playgoers. At the other extreme of this spectrum are female transvestites whose role in their literary works is either chiefly or solely the complex sexual provocation of other characters and certain readers or members of the theater audience. Obviously this second case is more common in drama, where the transvestite is seen rather than having to be imagined. In this instance, the playwright, say, appears

to have designed his drama and the transvestite's role in it to preclude, or negate, the presentation of virtues or intellectual ideas through the hybrid role. At least playgoers can gather this much from the dialogue of a play, even though they may be stimulated sexually by the sight of a transvestite figure and his/her dialogue in plays at both ends of and all along this imaginary spectrum. In between are plays whose transvestite women create effects upon both onstage characters and playgoers that are *understood* to be mixed, partly ideational and partly provocatively sexual, with the latter progressively less so as the chiefly ideational extreme is approached. There are no satisfactory terms for the antithetical ends of this articulated spectrum. In what follows, I call them "ideational" and "sexual," with the understanding that a transvestite's effect on other characters and playgoers can be both ideational and provocatively sexual at the same time, and that a transvestite character at any point on the above-described spectrum can sexually titillate playgoers. My use of these terms for the extremes of my spectrum thus has to do with a relative weight, or emphasis, in the transvestite's role in a specific Elizabethan or Jacobean play.

The predominantly ideational effect of Elizabethan literary transvestite women, usually involving symbolic allusions to the finer virtues made possible by faith and patient suffering, can be clearly seen in a prose romance such as Sir Philip Sidney's *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia* or in a play such as Shakespeare's *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* or *Cymbeline*. The predominately sexual, titillating effect appears in a radical form in John Lyly's *Gallathea*. Preliminary accounts of certain transvestite women in these works can establish the new model I am proposing for the analysis of transvestite characterization in Elizabethan works by defining its extremes and the position of some works between these extremes. Subsequently placing *As You Like It* in this construction makes possible a clearer understanding of the play's interrogation of gender and sexuality, both orthodox and unorthodox, simply because that interrogation is seen more clearly as competing with certain primarily ideational functions of literary transvestism.

Shakespeare's Julia disguised as the male page Sebastian in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* does not work to make her role a site for the exploration of gender or sexuality. This assertion contradicts Bruce Smith's claim, made in *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England: A Cultural Poetics*, that "Julia in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and Portia and Nerissa in *The Merchant of Venice* give us the same kind of bawdy banter [as the dialogue does surrounding the transvestite page Bartholomew in the Induction of *The Taming of the Shrew*] when they assume disguises as men—and go off to turn catastrophe into comedy."¹ The bawdy talk in the case of *The*

Two Gentlemen, which involves the breeches Julia must wear in disguise, consists of only six verses:

Lucetta: You must needs have them with a codpiece, madam.

Julia: Out, out, Lucetta! That will be ill favored.

Lucetta: A round hose [padded breeches], madam, now's not worth a pin,
Unless you have a codpiece to stick pins on.

Julia: Lucetta, as thou lov'st me, let me have
What thou think'st meet and is most mannerly.

(2.7.53–58)

The bawdy banter that Smith attributes to Julia is actually Lucetta's.² Admittedly, Julia may wittily equate the codpiece with the courtier's nose (a common Elizabethan joke) when she replies that wearing one would be "ill favored" (would create a disfigured face [a disfigured "favor"]). But this joke involving a pun is so faint, if it is a pun, that editors do not register it, preferring to gloss Julia's "ill favored" as "unsightly."³ Lucetta initiates and essentially speaks the bawdy talk here. Julia's possible pun on "ill favored" does not diminish the strength of her protest against association with graphic sexuality. By the word "mannerly (2.7.58)," Julia implies that she hopes that what is most fashionable also reflects good manners—good behavior. (Julia is not creating a pun in her word "mannerly" involving the meaning of a codpiece a "manly man" would wear). Nowhere else in the dialogue of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* do sexual innuendoes attach to Julia's transvestism. Instead, her disguise as Sebastian makes possible a self-abasing, spiritual pilgrimage of unconditional love for Proteus, a pilgrimage in which she loses her everyday identity to find a better self through love refined by adversity, a love the example of which, once known, plays its role in rehabilitating Proteus. I have elsewhere developed this interpretation of the redemptive effect of Julia's transvestism in terms of biblical parables of loss and rediscovery as well as the terms of Counter-Reformation Catholic values found in *Two Gentlemen*.⁴ For now, it is enough to claim that the memorable source of this ideational transvestism relatively unconcerned with the exploration of gender and sexuality, for Elizabethans at least, were romances such as Sir Philip Sidney's *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia* (1590).

In order to get near to his beloved Philoclea, who is sequestered by her father Basilius because of an ominous oracle, Pyrocles in Sidney's popular pastoral prose romance disguises himself as an Amazon-like young woman, Zelmane. Pyrocles adopts this name for his transvestite disguise, readers later learn, out of respectful memory of his former beloved Zelmane. She, while dying, inspired Pyrocles and his friend Musidorus to pledge the performance of good works that would atone for her father's evil deeds and for her unintentional deathly effect upon Palladius and upon his mother

Andromana.⁵ In keeping with the original Zelmane's moral force, the transvestite Amazonian Pyrocles not only performs a number of heroic deeds in Arcadia, but he also inspires his beloved Philoclea to imitate "her" "doings, speeches, and fashions . . . as a pattern of worthy proceeding"⁶

Then grew on [followed] that not only [Philoclea] did imitate the soberness of [Zelmane's] countenance, the gracefulness of her speech, but even their particular gestures; so that as Zelmane did often eye her, she would often eye Zelmane; and as Zelmane's eyes would deliver a submissive but vehement desire in their look, she, though as yet she had not the desire in her, yet should her eyes answer in like piercing kindness of a look.⁷

The last half of this passage suggests that, despite the ennobling effect of Pyrocles as Zelmane (what I have called transvestism's ideational effect), his transvestism stimulates homoerotic desire in Philoclea. This stimulation moves *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia* off the ideational end of the spectrum of transvestite effect part way, but not too far, toward the midpoint. Sidney takes pains in the episode in which he introduces the transvestite Pyrocles to point out also the potentially destabilizing effect of his transformation on his own male gender.⁸ "And see how extremely every way you can endanger your mind," Musidorus tells his friend Pyrocles with regard to his female metamorphosis,

for to take this womanish habit, without you frame your behavior accordingly, is wholly vain; your behavior can never come kindly [naturally] from you but as the mind is proportioned to it: so that you must resolve, if you will play your part to any purpose, whatsoever peevish imperfections are in that sex, to soften your heart to receive them—the very first down-step to wickedness.⁹

While Pyrocles's transvestism never takes a "down-step to wickedness," there is just enough validity within Sidney's patriarchal narrative to make Elizabethan male readers of this romance think that becoming Zelmane on occasion "effeminates" Pyrocles.

Two stage historical romances, Robert Greene's *The Scottish History of James the Fourth* (c. 1590; publ. 1598) and Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* (c. 1608–1610), include transvestite heroines, Queen Dorothea as a Squire and Imogen as a male page Fidele, whose effect on male characters resembles that of the original transvestite Zelmane in Sidney's text and of Julia in *The Two Gentlemen*. Greene's Dorothea disguises herself as a sword-bearing squire in order to flee the court safely when she discovers that her husband, King James, has commissioned her murder so that he may freely lust after Lady Ida (3.3.89–135).¹⁰ Wounded in a sword-fight with the villain Jaques (4.4.53–55), she is rescued by old Sir Cuthbert

Anderson, whose wife, Lady Anderson, homoerotically falls in love with the “squire” (now wearing a nightgown), as “he” heals under her care (5.1.1–70). Lady Anderson’s exclamation—“Deceitful beauty, hast thou scorned me so?” (5.5.46)—uttered almost simultaneously with Dorothea’s self-discovery registers both the beautiful man that she has loved and the beautiful queen who now makes that feminine man an illusion. Meanwhile, rumor informs the King of England of James’s part in the presumed death of the king’s daughter Dorothea, and he invades Scotland. Shaken, James prays for the miraculous restoration of his wife to end the slaughter of his blameless subjects. Dorothea anticipates Julia’s revelation in Shakespeare’s *The Two Gentlemen*—the epiphany of chaste, constant womanhood concealed within a male identity—when she discloses herself to her husband, to her father, and to startled onlookers onstage. Throughout her ordeal, Dorothea has prayed for James’s recovery, never losing her self-sacrificial love for him. Both Greene and Shakespeare devote their characterization of a transvestite heroine who suffers painful adversity (Greene’s literally so by her wounding) to her becoming the vehicle for rehabilitating a deeply flawed, even criminal, male character through the conventional patriarchal terms of womanhood.

The idea seems to be that if a woman loves a man so much as to suffer in her disguised state the hardships and danger pertaining to men, then she must love him genuinely and be full of virtue. He concludes that he must be worth a great deal or have a great potential for worth, if such a worthy being can endure a gender transformation for his sake. And so he reforms himself, or at least promises reformation. “But constancy, obedience, and my love, / In that my husband is my lord and chief;” Dorothea says, concerning the husband who would have had her murdered, “These call me to compassion of his estate” (5.5.68–70). The intellectual effect (or function) of the transvestite heroine in Sidney’s, Greene’s, and Shakespeare’s early work involves the revelation of an ultraconventional patriarchal image of womanhood that works reformation in a male, a man who has seriously erred but finally been forgiven.

If the morally uplifting effect of transvestite Zelmane on Pyrocles in Sidney’s *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia* can be taken to represent a conservative extreme of a model for understanding one kind of early modern English literary transvestism (female to male to female), Shakespeare’s portrayal of the transvestite Julia in *The Two Gentlemen* would be plotted close to this extreme. Farther to the left, toward the middle of this spectrum, wherein a predominantly sexual effect would identify the other extreme, would appear Robert Greene’s transvestite Dorothea. The strong homoerotic effect of Dorothea as the squire upon Lady Anderson places this representation of the literary type under discussion closer to the middle of

the spectrum, but not precisely at it; for Dorothea's transvestite role mainly concerns her reformation of King James (and perhaps of Greene's male playgoers). Shakespeare's creation in *Cymbeline* of the transvestite Imogen closely resembles Greene's in its proportion of the mixture of minor homoerotic and of major ideational redemptive effects upon male characters. Analysis of Imogen's role places this early Jacobean depiction of transvestism at a spot on the conservative right half of this hypothesized spectrum, between the representations of transvestite Julia and of Dorothea (but closer to the right toward Julia).

While Imogen does not adopt her disguise as the male page Fidele because she learns that her husband has commissioned her murder, she retains it in despair after learning that Posthumus has done so. Her pseudonym indicates that her transvestite experience involves faith, specifically her wifely faith in Posthumus. In Wales, after proving himself the best woodsman during the deer hunt, Guiderius becomes the lord of a feast at which Arviragus and Belarius play the roles of cook and servant respectively. Imogen as Fidele acts the part of their "huswife" (even though she appears to be a boy), dutifully cutting their root diet into letters for an alphabet soup (4.2.46–52). Imogen's culinary/educational activity not only suggests the nonprimitive nurture that she would extend to her undereducated brothers but also constitutes the faithful service by which she will come to embody faithfulness. By her singular housewifery, Imogen reaffirms her wifely faith, which her husband Posthumus has questioned. That the reaffirmation of Imogen's faith in Wales refers to her marriage is suggested by Guiderius's allusion to the goddess Juno. Struck by the fanciful nature of Fidele's culinary art, he exclaims:

But his neat cookery! He cut our roots in characters
And sauced our broths as Juno had been sick
And he her dieter.

(4.2.50–52)

The seventeenth-century Juno was primarily regarded as the goddess of marriage, as her role in Prospero's masque in *The Tempest* reveals. Guiderius's remark applies not so much to the local incident but, metaphorically, to transvestite Imogen's service as a whole. Through her faithful Welsh service, Imogen, in his opinion, cures the goddess of marriage—that is to say, she restores health to a languishing marriage (her own). When the Roman Lucius later discovers her complete devotion to the dead "valiant Briton" who she supposes was Posthumus her husband, he says, upon learning that her assumed name is Fidele, "Thou dost approve thyself the very same; / Thy name well fits thy faith, thy faith thy name" (4.2.372, 383–84).

Transvestite Imogen thus extends a line of characterization from Sidney (and from authors of dramatic romances of the 1570s and 1580s)¹¹ through Greene and Shakespeare's own transvestite Julia, to playwrights of the Jacobean period. Like Zelmane, Dorothea, and Julia, Imogen reforms an erring male character (thus canceling out his vices or crimes) by revealing that, as a transvestite, she has suffered mightily only to maintain—in orthodox early modern English patriarchal code—a chaste, obedient love for him. Like Greene, Shakespeare implies that only the phenomenon of transvestite concealment, suffering, and revelation can work this miracle. Bruce Smith has identified the homoerotic strain of Imogen's transvestism as the sexual indeterminacy created by Guiderius's, Arviragus's, and Belarius's different perceptions of the boy/girl found in their cave.¹² For Belarius, the creature is a barely sexed "angel"—"Or, if not, / An earthly paragon!" "Behold divineness," the old man exclaims, "No elder than a boy!" (3.6.42–44). This boy, however, soon seems female in Guiderius's eyes: "Were you a woman, youth, / I should woo hard but be your groom in honesty" (3.6.68–69). The homoerotic—not to say incestuous, in parts—feeling made possible by this kind of transvestism in *Cymbeline* condenses most intensely in this verse. Imogen/Fidele's sexual indeterminacy lingers when Arviragus consequently says, "I'll make it my comfort / He is a man; I'll love him as my brother" (3.6.70–71). "For all that," Smith concludes, "the two princes and their foster-father treat 'Fidele' as if he were a girl. 'Pray be not sick,' Belarius pleads, 'For you must be our housewife.' . . . As in Shakespeare's earlier plays, the magic that turns tragedy into comedy involves retreat to a liminal landscape where social identities, and sexual identities, dissolve in the half-light."¹³ Shakespeare's focus upon Imogen/Fidele's sexual indeterminacy and upon the homoerotic feeling that it briefly makes possible, shockingly so, in her brothers amounts however to a brief, momentary feature of *Cymbeline*, overshadowed by transvestite Imogen's reformatory function for her marriage and for Posthumus's character.

Before turning to a play that can represent the other extreme of this paradigm for plotting and gauging early modern English transvestite characterization, I want to acknowledge the fact that in later Elizabethan literature, serious meaning other than that involving suffering and male redemption combines with homoerotic titillation in portrayals of transvestite heroines. In book 3 of *The Faerie Queene*, the lesbian attraction that the amalgam of female Britomart and manly knight provokes in Malecasta, a desire apparently returned for a moment by Britomart, constitutes one strand of Edmund Spenser's subversive criticism of the reputed ermine purity of Queen Elizabeth's chastity.¹⁴ Nevertheless, the female transvestism working male reformation—rather than allegorical

satire—is arguably the most prevalent serious ideational function of this character type of a disguised woman playing a boy or man. John Lyly's *Gallathea* (c. 1583–1585, publ. 1592) can represent that early modern English literature, almost all of which is drama, wherein a female transvestite's effect upon other characters is wholly, or almost completely, homoerotic.

In this comedy, performed by the Children of Paul's, two shepherds named Tityrus and Melebeus have secretly dressed their daughters, Gallathea and Phyllida, as young boys, in order to save them from being candidates for virgin sacrifice made every five years to the angry god Neptune, who sends a sea monster (symbolic of the tidal bore of the Humber river) to devour a maiden tied to a tree. Only each girl and her father know that each young man is a girl. Both Gallathea and Phyllida are uncomfortable and anxious in their male disguises. Encountering one another, each becomes homoerotically attracted to “a pretty boy and a fair” (2.1.19).¹⁵ When the goddess Diana and her nymphs Telusa and Eurota, ignorant of Gallathea's gender, question her/him about the whereabouts of a deer they pursue, a sexually jealous Gallathea says concerning the boy Phyllida, “I know not how it cometh to pass, but yonder boy is in mine eye too beautiful. I pray gods the ladies think him not their dear [deer]” (2.1.44–46). Cupid's account of the mischief he plans to stir up among Diana's nymphs by striking them with the fire of his torch and his inflaming arrows also neatly describes Gallathea's and Phyllida's homoerotic predicament: “I will make their pains my pastimes,” Cupid vows, “and so confound their loves in their own sex that they shall dote on their desires, delight in their affections, and practice only impossibilities” (2.2.6–9). And indeed, this prose can stand for the scenario of homoeroticism that transvestite Gallathea and Phyllida enact during the remainder of Lyly's short play (notably in 2.4, 2.5, and 3.2).¹⁶ The young women's suspicion that the beloved of each might be a woman grows by act 5 to near certainty. But it is not so strong that it dissolves the homosexual titillation of a speech such as Phyllida's proposal to Gallathea that, “[s]eeing we are both boys, and both lovers [of each other], that our affection may have some show, and seem as it were love, let me call thee mistress” (4.4.15–17).¹⁷ Such is the case until act 5, scene 3, when Neptune's reason prevails over his anger, and he tells quarrelsome Venus and Diana that he will discontinue his periodic requirement of virgin sacrifice if the goddesses reconcile themselves in harmony. When Gallathea and Phyllida learn from their relieved fathers that the beloved of each is a girl, they grieve, but not so much that they want to give up their erotic love for each other (5.3.126–30). Venus proposes to metamorphose one of the two young women into a man, so that they might marry. When both

girls and their fathers agree to this transformation, Venus says, "Neither of them shall know whose lot it shall be [to be the man] till they come to the church door" (5.3.173–75). This last minute sex change presumably increases the young women's sexual excitement concerning the intercourse of the wedding night. The overtones of hermaphroditism in this sexual metamorphosis are consistent with the emphasis upon the hermaphrodite in Elizabethan writing of the late 1580s and early 1590s.¹⁸ In this case, the overtones fittingly conclude the impressions of sexual indeterminacy created throughout *Gallathea* by female transvestism, impressions reinforcing Lyly's signature rendering of a universe in perpetual Ovidian flux.¹⁹ The fact that in this play prepubescent children, chorister's boys, speak about matters of adult sexual desire, especially homoerotic desire, doubtlessly compounded for some male playgoers the sexual titillation and fantasies arising from Elizabethan performances of *Gallathea*.²⁰

The homoerotic effects of Gallathea's and Phyllida's transvestism overshadow, perhaps overwhelm, any serious ideational significance communicated by their roles.²¹ Allegorical meanings unfold in Lyly's comedies, intended for a sophisticated court audience including the queen. *Gallathea*, however, has proved difficult to decode.²² Queen Elizabeth, the English Diana known for her mystical chastity, attempted to enforce a life of sexual chastity upon her maids of honor and generally upon her court. Lyly's *Gallathea* stresses the goddess Diana's authority (complimenting Elizabeth), but the play also shows her in act 5 achieving a stalemate with the goddess of love, Venus: the god Neptune will abolish the ritual of virgin sacrifice on the condition that Diana release her captive, Cupid (5.3.67–80). Chastity—symbolized by Diana's nymphs—may not be "within the level of [Cupid's] bow," but Venus argues that "beauty [will continue to be] a fair mark to hit" (5.3.83–84). Lyly's play celebrates the manifold power of erotic love among nymphs and mortals, at the expense of values codified in Elizabeth's cult of chastity.²³ One can say that Gallathea's and Phyllida's insistence upon their romantic love for each other, sparked by transvestism, shows this power of love and thus participates in a dramatic allegory about life at court. In this view, their transvestism has a significance beyond that of the exploration of homoerotic desire for its own sake. And yet one must also say that the pleasure of that exploration of their desire tends to supersede, or displace, the allegorical significance of Gallathea's and Phyllida's characterizations.

The effect of gender transvestism in many early modern English plays would place them near Lyly's *Gallathea* at the far left end of the spectrum constructed in previous paragraphs.²⁴ This would be the case with the female transvestite's role in Thomas Heywood's *The Four Prentices of*

London (c. 1592–1594).²⁵ Michael Shapiro, in Appendix B of *Gender in Play on the Shakespearean Stage: Boy Heroines and Female Pages*, has provided a chronological listing from the 1570s and 1580s up to 1642 of all extant English plays containing heroines in male disguise, along with their authors and acting companies.²⁶ By c. 1600, only fifteen extant plays of this kind existed, including *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *As You Like It*. By 1616, the year of Shakespeare's death, the number had swelled to forty-five; by 1642, the year of the English theaters' closing, to eighty-one. With the help of Shapiro's listing, one can plot on the previously described grid early modern English plays, such as *As You Like It*, that include a boy actor playing a female character who then disguises herself as a boy or man.

In *As You Like It*, Shakespeare takes this disguise pattern one step further, by showing a boy actor playing a female character, Rosalind, who then disguises herself as a young man, Ganymede, who then plays a woman by impersonating Rosalind for Orlando. This dizzying melding of gender has prompted the many critical claims of the last two or three decades to the effect that no other play of Shakespeare's so completely destabilizes the cultural fixedness of gender, foregrounding in the process the potentially subversive presence of homoerotic affection in patriarchal societies.²⁷ In this respect, *As You Like It* would initially appear near *Gallathea* at the left end of the grid constructed in this chapter. And yet further analysis of Shakespeare's play would move it to the right on the grid, closer to its midpoint; for, like the transvestite heroines of Greene's *James IV* and of Shakespeare's own *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Twelfth Night*, and *Cymbeline*, Rosalind as Ganymede plays the role of reformer of her male lover's manners. This reformatory function moreover necessarily reinforces the heterosexual dimension of the play's affective relationships between characters. Recent criticism that gives the impression that the transvestite dimension of *As You Like It* is wholly about the exploration of sexual preference, or that the play categorically focuses upon homoerotic attraction, requires revision.

Late Elizabethan playgoers knew that Ganymede, Jove's cupbearer, was the popular iconograph of homosexual love, for this boy snatched by an eagle from earth to replace Hebe in Jove's affections became the memorable male object of the god's desire.²⁸ By adopting this name along with her male disguise (1.3.124), Rosalind (and Shakespeare) introduce firmly, unequivocally, the issue of homoerotic love into *As You Like It*. The fact that Shakespeare took his cue from his source, Thomas Lodge's *Rosalynde*, has little bearing upon the strength of this introduced element. Aware of this element, playgoers legitimately hear characters in act 1 of the play describing a distinct same-sex affection between Celia and Rosalind. Their "loves / Are

dearer than the natural bonds of sisters" (1.3.260–61), Le Beau insists. "We have still slept together," Celia tells her beloved cousin:

Rose at an instant, learned, played, eat together,
 And whereso'er we went, like Juno's swans
 Still we went coupled and inseparable.
 (1.3.71–74)

This love, Celia tells Rosalind, "teacheth thee that thou and I am one" (1.3.96). The homoerotic feeling latent in these and other utterances of Celia can explain her later repeated claims that no truth resides in Orlando's love for Rosalind (3.4.1–41).

This suggestion of homoerotic feeling (at least on Celia's part) gives way to the possibility of Orlando's and Phoebe's homosexual feeling for the same-sex component of the male/female character Ganymede. "The boy is fair," Oliver says, "Of female favour, and bestows himself / Like a ripe sister" (4.3.86–88). Ganymede's "female favour" prompts both Orlando and Phoebe to call him a "pretty youth" (3.2.321, 3.5.114). It is Ganymede's woman's face that evidently prompts Phoebe's homoerotic passion. In the view of the shepherdess:

There was a pretty redness in his lip,
 A little riper and more lusty red
 Than that mixed in his cheek. 'Twas just the difference
 Betwixt the constant red and mingled damask.
 (3.5.121–24)

It is this female face that Phoebe would kiss. "Dear shepherd, now I find thy saw of might: / 'Who ever loved that loved not at first sight?'" (3.5.82–83), she concludes concerning Ganymede. By quoting well-known verses from Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*, a copy of which she apparently has read in her sheepcote, Phoebe endorses the homoerotic overtones of a famous Elizabethan poem of heterosexual passion.

Despite Jean Howard's claim to the contrary, Rosalind does not appear to return Phoebe's homoerotic love. "Overtly, Rosalind scorns Phoebe and directs her to love Silvius," Howard asserts, "but she also takes care to tell Phoebe where she lives"—"If you will know my house, / 'Tis at the tuft of olives, here hard by" (3.5.75–76)—and encourages her attentions even as she denies them."²⁹ Rosalind's telling Phoebe where she lives is not, however, evidence of her homoerotic attraction to the shepherdess. She tells her where she lives because she wants her to visit her so that she can continue to "sauce her with bitter words" (3.5.70) about her pride and plain appearance so that she eventually will modestly accept her lover, Silvius. "I pray you do

not fall in love with me" (3.5.73), Rosalind in fact pointedly tells Phoebe; "'Od's my will," Rosalind says later, "[h]er love is not the hare that I do hunt" (4.3.18–19). That hare, of course, is Orlando's love.

But Rosalind's becoming Ganymede may interfere with capturing his undivided love. For playgoers see onstage the boy actor playing Rosalind playing Ganymede playing Rosalind again wooing Orlando, and Orlando returning the young man's love. Once women after the Restoration began playing female roles in the theater, an early modern English visual spectacle was lost whose effect, notably so in *As You Like It*, proves virtually impossible to overestimate: that of a young man and an older man onstage making erotic love to one another. Since Elizabethan playgoers almost certainly knew the identity of, and probably the name of, the boy or young man playing Rosalind, they could not blind themselves to traces of male features and gestures apparent in Rosalind, especially once she was garbed as Ganymede. The epilogue of *As You Like It* provides the only moment in the Shakespeare canon when the playwright explicitly has the repertorial boy actor who has played a woman (still dressed as the woman) call attention to himself. "If I were a woman," he tells the men in the Globe audience, "I would kiss as many of you as had beards that pleased me, complexions that liked me, and breaths that I defied not" (Epilogue, 16–19). Many commentators on the play have taken the homosexual overtones in this proposed kiss as authorizing the finding of similar overtones in earlier love banter between Ganymede and Orlando (4.1.35–200, 5.2.13–115).³⁰ Playgoers' perception of the overtones gives special force, when considered retrospectively, to verses such as this parody of Touchstone's concerning Orlando's florid love poetry: "He that sweetest rose will find / Must find love's prick and Rosalind" (3.2.106–7). Love's prick indeed can be found beneath the clothing of Elizabethan Rosalind, notably so when "she" is Ganymede.

Competing with the homosexual connotations of Rosalind's "Ganymede" are details of her self-disguise that identify her as the transvestite squire of early modern European prose and dramatic romance. Rosalind's disguise includes "a gallant curtal-axe upon [her] thigh, / A boar-spear in [her] hand" (1.3.116–17). A curtal axe was "a short broad cutting sword, a cutlass."³¹ In 1599, this substantial weapon would have seemed a throwback to an earlier age of knighthood; the rapier, as evidenced by the duel in *Hamlet*, was displacing the heavier sword as the courtly weapon of choice. Late Elizabethan playgoers familiar with prose and dramatic romances such as Sidney's *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, *Clyomon and Clamydes* (1576 Stationers' Register), and *King James the Fourth* would be inclined to think of Ganymede armed in this heavy fashion as the squire-like female transvestite who reforms the vices, or manners, of a beloved male unaware

of her identity. Playgoers who thought of Rosalind/Ganymede in this context would not be surprised by her attempts to reform Orlando's manners as a lover (the subject of chapter three of this volume). In fact, they likely expected such an attempt, alert to its beginning in the latter part of act 3, scene 2 (3.2.341–414). That Rosalind is unsuccessful, or only partially successful, in her effort to reform Orlando's naïve Petrarchan manner of loving, in which he believes that certain conceits have a special kind of reality, in no way detracts from literate playgoers' identification of Rosalind as the squire-like transvestite of early modern romance.³²

The tendency of late Elizabethan playgoers to evaluate Rosalind's transvestite role in terms of the conventional framework described in the preceding paragraph would cause them to move *As You Like It* away from *Gallathea* toward the middle of the paradigm that has been the subject of this chapter (were such a paradigm and task presented to them). They would be inclined to do so because this framework and the meanings that it generates tend to supersede the homoerotic feeling stimulated by the female character's transvestism. Reinforcing the evidence for repositioning *As You Like It* among early modern English plays containing a female transvestite is a stress upon heterosexuality in the play-ending endorsement of patriarchal values of gender that qualifies, even undercuts, the emphasis upon homoerotic feeling. Recently, Robin Headlam Wells has argued, with reference to the cross dressing and boy-playing-a-girl-playing-a-boy dynamics of *Twelfth Night*, that Stephen Greenblatt, Peter Stallybrass, Laura Levine, Marjorie Garber, and Shakespeare commentators influenced by them have mistakenly interpreted early modern English Puritan diatribes against cross-dressing in the theater and forced postmodern theories about the indeterminacy and instability of gender back upon Shakespeare's age, which—Wells shows—was consistently definite about gender difference and thus less anxious about and more endorsing of heterosexual relations in complex cross-dressing comedies such as *As You Like It* than has recently been supposed.³³

The evidence for the last of these claims is considerable. Orlando's and Rosalind's announced desire for each other is always conventionally heterosexual. Their falling in love is apparently at first sight (1.3.25–35). Rosalind's gift of a chain is conventionally romantic, as is Orlando's love poetry celebrating her. (It is overly, problematically, conventional in fact.) Despite the possible trace of homoerotic feeling in her friendship with Rosalind, Celia compulsively, immediately, falls in love with Oliver, basically at first sight. The lover in the third of Jaques' notorious seven ages of humankind is a comically presented heterosexual lover, "[s]ighing like furnace, with a woeful ballad / Made to his mistress' eyebrow" (2.7.147–49). Finally, Rosalind repeatedly discloses to auditors the conventionally loving

woman beneath Ganymede's disguise. "Dost thou think," she asks Celia, "though I am caparisoned like man, I have a doublet and hose in my disposition?" (3.2.188–90). When she learns Orlando is in the forest, she exclaims, "Alas the day, what shall I do with my doublet and hose!" (3.2.211–12). When Celia rebukes her for asking an unanswerable number of questions at once about her beloved Orlando, Rosalind protests, "Do you not know I am a woman? When I think, I must speak" (3.2.241–42). And when Oliver, struck by Ganymede's fainting upon hearing of Orlando's wound, tells "him" to "take a good heart, and counterfeit to be a man," Rosalind responds, "So I do; but, i'faith, I should have been a woman by right" (5.1.174–77).

The sustained emphasis in *As You Like It* upon heterosexual attraction and upon the fixity of traditional gender plays a major role in the establishment, at the play's end, of a patriarchal society dependent upon traditional marriage and upon the control it exerts over unorthodox feeling and behavior.³⁴ This is not by any means to deny the play's complex, significant evocation of homoerotic feeling and its deconstruction of bipolar gender. It is to admit, however, that Shakespeare places this evocation in a larger, prescriptive context, one that makes transvestite *As You Like It* less the radical play that some recent critics have constructed. Lyly's *Gallathea* remains decidedly more subversive concerning sexuality than Shakespeare's late Elizabethan pastoral comedy.

My analysis of the female transvestite in early modern English drama in this chapter reveals that no one can claim that what I have called the ideational function of this character became progressively more prominent during the fifty-year period from, say, 1580 to 1630 and that it gradually occluded the sexually provocative effects of this figure; or, on the other hand, that during this time the sexual provocative effects became more salient on the stage at the expense of the character's ideational function. One way or the other, no neat development, or evolution, emerges. The ideational function of the female transvestite is as prominent in *Cymbeline* as it is in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, staged most likely at least sixteen or seventeen or more years earlier.

Still, my analysis is useful in plotting *As You Like It* as a late Elizabethan female transvestite play, in relation to similar plays by both Shakespeare and other English playwrights coming before and after it. It allows us to say that, in 1599 or so, Shakespeare in *As You Like It* interpreted the ideational function of the female transvestite to promote certain virtues in conventional marriage and to make its virtues dramatically possible, and that he did so at the expense of the provocatively sexual effects of this character. It is tempting to speculate that, after the death of his son Hamnet in 1596, Shakespeare especially valued his marriage to Anne. But there is no basis for such speculation. Marriages in Shakespeare plays usually dated

1598, 1599, or 1600 lack either the blessing, prospect of happiness, or divine solemnity that weddings do in *As You Like It*. Beatrice and Benedict in *Much Ado* seem happiest with wittily taking their partner down a peg; King Henry V seems interested as much in the political power he will gain by marrying Katherine of France as he does in her person; and callous Gertrude and criminal Claudius, both fated for death, are the happily married couple of *Hamlet*. Nevertheless, being able to fix Shakespeare's revaluation of the ideational function of the female transvestite character in 1599 or 1600 in relation to its provocatively sexual effects allows us to define better the mix and operation of these two components in this figure in other early modern English plays.

This page intentionally left blank

NOTES

Introduction: Late Elizabethan *As You Like It*

All quotations of *As You Like It* are taken from The Oxford Shakespeare text, ed. Alan Brissenden (1993; Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998). This is the Oxford World's Classics paperback edition of the play. Quotations from and citations of other Shakespeare plays and sonnets come from *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington, 5th edition (New York: Pearson/Longman, 2004).

1. David Bevington, "Appendix I: Canon, Dates, and Early Texts," *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington, 5th edition (New York: Pearson/Longman, 2004) A1–A22, esp. A6.
2. Mary Hamer, "Shakespeare's Rosalind and Her Public Image," *Theatre Research International* 11.2 (1986): 105–18, esp. 107–8.
3. An argument for a first performance of *As You Like It* (on February 20, 1599, Shrove Tuesday, before Queen Elizabeth at Richmond Palace) has been made by Juliet Dusinberre, "Pancakes and a Date for *As You Like It*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 54 (2003): 371–405.
4. Arthur McGee, *The Elizabethan Hamlet* (New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1987); Eric S. Mallin, *Inscribing the Time: Shakespeare and the End of Elizabethan England* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1995); James Shapiro, *A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare, 1599* (New York: HarperCollins, 2005).
5. Louis Adrian Montrose, "'The Place of a Brother' in *As You Like It*: Social Process and Comic Form," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 32 (1981): 28–54; Richard Wilson, "'Like the old Robin Hood': *As You Like It* and the Enclosure Riots," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 43 (1992): 1–19; A. Stuart Daley, "Calling and Commonwealth in *As You Like It*: A Late Elizabethan Political Play," *The Upstart Crow: A Shakespeare Journal* 14 (1994): 28–46; Marcia McDonald, "The Elizabethan Poor Laws and the Stage in the Late 1590s," *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 7 (1995): 121–44, esp. 128–32; and Andrew Barnaby, "The Political Conscious of *As You Like It*," *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 36 (1996): 373–95. Also see Robert B. Schwartz, "Puritans, Libertines and the Green World of Utopia in *As You Like It*," *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch (Weimar)* 123 (1987): 66–73.
6. Barnaby 374.
7. Barnaby 374.
8. Bevington A6.
9. James P. Bednarz, *Shakespeare and the Poets' War* (New York: Columbia UP, 2001) 24, 113–14.

10. The decline of Queen Elizabeth's influence and the widening gap between her official ideal political symbolism and her rapidly aging body and elderly character are well described in the 1599–1600 period of *As You Like It*'s provenance by Louise Schleiner, "Voice, Ideology, and Gendered Subjects: The Case of *As You Like It* and *Two Gentlemen*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 50 (1999): 285–309, esp. 287, 308.

**One: Wrestling for Temperance: *As You Like It*
and *The Faerie Queene*, Book 2**

1. Marco Mincoff, "What Shakespeare Did to *Rosalynde*," *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch (Weimar)* 96 (1960): 78–89; William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, ed. Agnes Latham, The Arden Shakespeare (London: Methuen, 1975) xxxv–xliv; Edward Berry, "Rosalynde and Rosalind," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 31 (1980): 42–52. Also see Albert H. Tolman, "Shakespeare's Manipulation of His Sources in *As You Like It*," *Modern Language Notes* 37 (1922): 65–76; Kenneth Muir, *Shakespeare's Sources* (London: Methuen, 1957) 1:55–66; and Robert B. Pierce, "The Moral Languages of *Rosalynde* and *As You Like It*," *Studies in Philology* 68 (1971): 167–76.
2. David Riggs, *Ben Jonson: A Life* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1989) 257.
3. Edmund Spenser, *Spenser: The Faerie Queene*, ed. A. C. Hamilton; text ed. Hiroshi Yamashita and Toshiyuki Suzuki, Longman Annotated Poets, 2nd edition (Harlow, UK: Longman, 2001) xvii. All quotations of and references to *The Faerie Queene* come from this edition, except for three glosses identified as appearing only in Hamilton's first, 1977 edition of this volume.
4. Usually dated c.1595, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* could have been written at any time between then and 1597 or 1598. "Other than Francis Meres's listing of the play in 1598 in his *Palladis Tamia*, external clues as to [its] date are elusive," David Bevington claims (Shakespeare, *The Complete Works* A4). The second and third contemporary datings of this comedy are its entry in the Stationers' Register on October 8, 1600 and Thomas Creed's printing of the First Quarto text in the same year. The London printer Richard Field, a Stratford native three years older than Shakespeare and the printer of both of Shakespeare's narrative poems—*Venus and Adonis* (1593) and *The Rape of Lucrece* (1594)—also published both the 1590 and the 1596 editions of *The Faerie Queene*. These coincidences point toward the possibility that Shakespeare in late 1595 or early 1596 was aware of the approaching publication of the second edition of Spenser's epic, and that he may have even seen the manuscript text of it. For Spenser's likely London awareness of Shakespeare in late 1598 and 1599, see James Shapiro, *A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare, 1599* (New York: HarperCollins, 2005) 58–59, 61–62.
5. In this respect, see Robert L. Reid, "The Fairy Queen: Gloriana or Titania?" *The Upstart Crow: A Shakespeare Journal* 13 (1993): 16–33.
6. James Bednarz, "Imitations of Spenser in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*," *Renaissance Drama* n.s. 14 (1983): 79–102; Harold F. Brooks, "Introduction," *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. Harold F. Brooks, The Arden Shakespeare (London: Methuen, 1979) xxi–cxliii, esp. xxxiv–xxxix, lvii–lxii.

7. See esp. Bednarz 80–83, 90–92. The importance of Spenser's writings for Christopher Marlowe's idea of a literary career and for his works, and indirectly for the late Elizabethan age in general, has been meticulously documented by Patrick Cheney, *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession: Ovid, Spenser, Counter-Nationhood* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1997).
8. Bednarz 97–99. Bednarz speculates that Shakespeare's indirect complimenting of William Cecil, Lord Burghley, through the possibility that Cecil's granddaughter, Lady Elizabeth Vere, may have been the bride in the aristocratic wedding alluded to at the conclusion of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, would be consistent with the playwright's purported ridiculing of Spenser's poetry in this comedy (80–84, 93–95). Ample evidence exists of Spenser's sharp literary satire of Burghley's traits and of Burghley's program as Elizabeth's treasurer, criticism traditionally assumed to have provoked Burghley's dislike of the poet as well as his thwarting of Spenser's pleas for generous royal patronage. Spenser appears to have recognized Burghley's dislike of him in *The Faerie Queene* 6.12.41. I explore this issue involving Lord Burghley and speculate on its consequences for Spenser's career in "Hellish Work in *The Faerie Queene*," *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 41 (2001): 91–108.
9. Maurice Hunt, "A Speculative Political Allegory in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*," *Comparative Drama* 34 (2000–2001): 423–53, esp. 425, 434–36, 439, 446, 447–48. The aristocrat whose patronage Shakespeare invoked in his two narrative poems of the mid-1590s, the Earl of Southampton, was especially fond of *The Faerie Queene*. See Charlotte C. Stopes, *The Life of Henry, Third Earl of Southampton, Shakespeare's Patron* (1922; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1969) 42.
10. Clare R. Kinney, "Feigning Female Fainting: Spenser, Lodge, Shakespeare, and Rosalind," *Modern Philology* 95 (1998): 291–315, esp. 295, 304, 309.
11. Jean E. Howard, "Introduction," *As You Like It, The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: Norton, 1997) 1591–99, esp. 1596.
12. Howard 1596.
13. James Shapiro, however, in noting the literary precedents for Rosalind's name in *As You Like It*, remarks that
 Rosalind had also been the name of the heartless lover (and despiser of bad poetry) in Edmund Spenser's poetry. Spenser's autobiographical double, Colin Clout, had complained in *The Shepheardes Calender* (1579) about how his beloved Rosalind "laughs [at] the songs, that Colin Clout doth make" ("January," 66) and is still nursing his wounds over a decade later in *Colin Clout's Come Home Again*. (215)
 Spenser's scenario of Rosalind despising and laughing at her lover's bad poetry is precisely Shakespeare's scenario in *As You Like It*.
14. Keir Elam, "'As They Did in the Golden World': Romantic Rapture and Semantic Rupture in *As You Like It*," *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* 18 (1991): 217–32, esp. 222.
15. Thomas Lodge, *Rosalynde, or Euphues' Golden Legacy, Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, Volume II: The Comedies, 1597–1603*, ed. Geoffrey

Bullough (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1958) 158–256, esp. 162. All further references to *Rosalynde* are to the Bullough text.

16. The key to my claim is the word “seriously.” Only two passages later in *Rosalynde* remotely bear on the question of temperance, and they are rhetorical decoration, not an essential part of the fable. In the first excerpt, Rosader tells Rosalynde (disguised as the shepherd Ganimedee) that love is “either extreame or meane, according to the minde of the partie that entertaines it: for as the weedes growe longer untouchte than the pretie flowers, and the flint lies safe in the quarrie when the Emeraulde is *suffering* the Lapadaries toole: so meane men are freed from *Venus* injuries, when kings are envyroned with a laborynth of her cares” (209). Whereas Rosader’s initial juxtaposition of “extreame or meane” suggests that he plans to describe temperance in relation to romantic love, his subsequent use of “meane” clearly reveals that he intends the word to signify “base” or “low-born.” In retrospect, we realize that “meane” does not refer to the idea of the temperate median. In the second passage, near the end of the romance, the shepherd Montanus tells Gerismond (Duke Senior) of the hopelessness of his love for Phoebe: “my thoughts are above my reason, and my desires more than my fortunes, yet neither greater than my loves. But daring with *Phaeton*, I fall with *Icarus*, and seeking to passe the meane, I dye for being so meane, my nights sleepes are waking slumbers, as full of sorrowes as they be farre from rest” (248–49). Montanus’s phrase “and seeking to passe the meane,” coming from a minor character at the end of *Rosalynde*, scarcely makes the romance a serious exploration of the disastrous effects of intemperate love. In fact, it is anything but that in the easy rewards of Rosader’s and Rosalynde’s stock Petrarchan idealizing of one another.
17. *Rosalynde* 168–71.
18. Physical wrestling as the means by which Hercules overcomes Achelous is apparent in Thomas Bulfinch’s telling of this myth (*Bulfinch’s Mythology* [1834; rpt. New York: Harper & Row, 1970], 177–79).
19. Richard Knowles, “Myth and Type in *As You Like It*,” *ELH* 33 (1966) 1–22, esp. 3–5; John Doebler, “Orlando: Athlete of Virtue,” *Shakespeare Survey* 26 (1973): 111–17. Knowles remarks that “the parallel is not with Hercules’ defeat of Achelous, rival for his wife, since Rosalind’s hand is not at stake here; rather, since Charles has already mortally wounded three contenders, the obvious allusion is to Hercules’ defeat of the man-killing Antaeus” (4). Also see Mark Bracher, “Contrary Notions of Identity in *As You Like It*,” *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 24 (1984): 225–40, 232.
20. Doebler 113–14.
21. Doebler 114.
22. Knowles 4.
23. Doebler 112.
24. Alice Lyle Scoufos, “The *Paradiso Terrestre* and the Testing of Love in *As You Like It*,” *Shakespeare Studies* 14 (1981): 215–27; Russell Fraser, “Shakespeare’s Book of Genesis,” *Comparative Drama* 25 (1991): 121–28 (rpt. in Fraser’s *Shakespeare: The Later Years* [New York: Columbia UP, 1992] 81–88); and Martha Ronk, “Locating the Visual in *As You Like It*,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 52 (2001): 255–76, esp. 256–59, 269–75.

25. See Donald M. Friedman, *Marvell's Pastoral Art* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1970) 6–7; Louis A. Montrose, “Of Gentlemen and Shepherds: The Politics of Elizabethan Pastoral Form,” *ELH* 50 (1983): 415–59, esp. 435, 438, 440; Richard Rambuss, *Spenser's Secret Career*, Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993) 51; Paul Alpers, *What Is Pastoral?* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996) 174–78; Linda Woodbridge, “Country Matters: *As You Like It* and the Pastoral-Bashing Impulse,” *Re-Visions of Shakespeare: Essays in Honor of Robert Ornstein*, ed. Evelyn Gajowski (Newark: U of Delaware P, 2004) 189–214, esp. 195–97; and Marjorie Garber, *Shakespeare After All* (2004; New York: Anchor, 2005) 438.
26. In *The Arte of Rhetorique* (1553; rpt. London: John Kyngston, 1584), Thomas Wilson wrote, “What other thyng are the wonderfull labours of Hercules, but that reason should withstand affection” (199).
27. An alternative analysis of Orlando’s wrestling with Charles is developed by Cynthia Marshall, “Wrestling as Play and Game in *As You Like It*,” *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 33 (1993): 265–87, esp. 268–73. Instead of Renaissance emblematic values, Marshall emphasizes Roland Barthes’ theorizing about wrestling to formulate her thesis:
- Situated on the structural boundaries of differentiating fight, sport, and theater, the match offers a conspicuous avowal of physical presence and conflict, even as it calls into question our modes for recognizing and understanding them. . . . My point is that the wrestling match offers the play’s earliest and most spectacular challenge to the modes of bodily interaction presupposed by mimetic theater. (265–66, 282)
- My interest in the wrestling match, on the other hand, lies in the way it introduces into the play certain Classical (or heroic) ideas analogous to major concepts in book 2 of *The Faerie Queene*.
28. Because the First Folio text of *As You Like It* generally lacks stage directions for physical violence, some directors have preferred to have Orlando strike the first blow, an action arguably consistent with the suddenness of his falling in love and his precipitate descent with a naked sword upon Duke Senior and his courtiers. Nevertheless, most editors and critics have read Oliver’s “What, boy!” (1.1.49) as an ejaculation accompanying some form of manual violence done on Orlando. (Latham inserts “[striking him]” [1.1.52]; *As You Like It* 5). See William Kerrigan, “Female Friends and Fraternal Enemies in *As You Like It*,” *Desire in the Renaissance: Psychoanalysis and Literature*, ed. Valeria Finucci and Regina Schwartz (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1994) 184–203, esp. 185.
29. Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, ed. Agnes Latham 5.
30. *The Faerie Queene*, book 2, Proem 5.8n; William Nelson, *The Poetry of Edmund Spenser: A Study* (New York: Columbia UP, 1963) 180. Both Nelson and A. C. Hamilton refer to *The Golden Legend* of St. George as a possible source of the idea: “George may be said of gera: that is holy, and of gyon that is a wresteler, that is an holy wresteler. For he wrasted with the dragon” (qtd. by Nelson 180).
31. See Susan Snyder, “Guyon the Wrestler,” *Renaissance News* 14 (1961): 249–52.

32. *The Faerie Queene* 2.2.14.4n. Hamilton cites Nelson's suggestion that Medina's name derives from the Latin *medens*: healer. The notion that temperance proceeds from the achieved union rather than from the effacement of the passions is conveyed in *The Faerie Queene* by an epic simile:

As a tall ship tossed in troublous seas,
Whom raging windes threatning to make the pray
Of the rough rockes, doe diuersly disease,
Meetes two contrarie billowes by the way,
That her on either side doe sore assay,
And boast to swallow her in greedy graue;
Shee scorning both their spights, does make wide way,
And with her brest breaking the fomy waue,
Does ride on both their backs, and faire her selfe doth saue.

(2.2.24)

33. Interestingly, Guyon's wrestling with Furor appears in the context of the plot analogue of Shakespeare's *Much Ado About Nothing*: Spenser's story of Phedon and Philemon (*The Faerie Queene*, 2.4.16–36). Guyon's victory over Furor frees Phedon from his personified wrath, whom he in his intemperate passion confronted and whose captive he became (*The Faerie Queene* 2.4.32–33).
34. Harry Berger, Jr., in *The Allegorical Temper: Vision and Reality in Book II of Spenser's "Faerie Queene"* (New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1957), associates Maleger with Antaeus by judging that the former character is "literally the son of Mother Earth" (85).
35. A final reminder in book 2 of *The Faerie Queene* of the importance of wrestling for the attainment of temperance occurs through parody. In the fountain symbolic of the passionate heart that Guyon encounters in the Bower of Bliss, he sees "Two naked Damzelles... Which therein, bathing, seemed to contend, / And wrestle wantonly...":

Sometimes the one would lift the other quight
About the waters, and then downe againe
Her plong, as ouer maystered by might,
Where both awhile would couered remaine,
And each the other from to rise restraine.

(2.12.63.6–64.5)

Contrary to the dynamics of the Hercules/Antaeus myth, neither female wrestler rises from the grappling's medium (water for lust rather than earth for the passions in general).

36. Knowles 5–6; Doebler 114–15. Knowles remarks that "In Lodge a 'boare speare'...kills the lion, whose dying roar wakes Saladyne...; in the play Orlando, not out hunting but on his way to dally with Ganymede, evidently strangles the lioness in barehanded wrestling whose 'hurtling' awakens Oliver" (5).
37. For the lion as a personification of wrath, see *The Faerie Queene* 1.4.33; Knowles 6; and Raymond Waddington, "Moralizing the Spectacle: Dramatic Emblems in *As You Like It*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33 (1982): 155–63, esp. 160–61. For a Freudian allegorical reading of Orlando's defeat of the lioness and the serpent in Oliver's dream-like narrative, one involving the male fear of

cuckoldry, see Cynthia Lewis, "Horns, the Dream-work, and Female Potency in *As You Like It*," *South Atlantic Review* 66.4 (2001): 45–69, esp. 57–59.

38. Alluding to Spenser, Homer, Virgil, and the Old Testament, René Fortin establishes the divinity of the oak trees mentioned in *As You Like It* in "Tongues in Trees': Symbolic Patterns in *As You Like It*," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 14 (1972–73): 569–82, esp. 573–77. Also see Jeanne Addison Roberts, "Shakespeare's Forests and Trees," *Southern Humanities Review* 11 (1977): 108–25, esp. 117–23.
39. After the early allusion to Hercules and Achelous, Lodge refers to Hercules only once more (and he does so in passing): "But as *Ne Hercules quidem contra duos* ['Not even Hercules can win against two'], so Rosader could not resist a multitude" (222).
40. Knowles refers to this stanza of *The Faerie Queene* (2.5.31) during his analysis of *As You Like It*. But he does so with relation to act 3 (rather than 4) of *As You Like It* and for purposes different from mine:

When Celia reports finding [Orlando] under a tree "like a dropped acorn" (3.2.248), Rosalind, knowing that the oak was sacred to Jove, answers, "It may well be called Jove's tree when it drops forth such fruit" (3.2.250–51). What she may mean is that Jove's tree ought to produce a man like Hercules, who was in fact the "scion of the seed of Jove." (8)

In support of this reading, Knowles points out that "Spenser (*FQ.II.v.31*) makes the oak the tree of both Jove and his son" (8). Knowles does not mention the allusion in the Spenserian stanza to the myth of Hercules' battle with the Nemean lion, a reference in conjunction with the mention of Jove's oak that makes the stanza's chief application *As You Like It* 4.3.99–132 rather than certain passages in act 3, scene 2 of Shakespeare's play.
41. The associative, often subliminal, working of Shakespeare's imagination in creating poetic imagery and image clusters is charted by Edward A. Armstrong, *Shakespeare's Imagination: A Study of the Psychology of Association and Inspiration* (1946; rpt. Lincoln, U of Nebraska P, 1963). While Armstrong concentrates on Shakespeare's Lockean poetic borrowing from his own verse and prose, one can nevertheless assume that the playwright transferred and similarly recombined poetic details of the authors he read.
42. The snake is absent from the source episode in Lodge's *Rosalynde* (215–18).
43. The Februarie Eclogue of *The Shepheardes Calender*, by further imaginative association, may have contributed a final image to the Spenserian atmosphere surrounding the poetic details of Oliver's story of Orlando's saving of his life. The "goodly Oake" in Thenot's fable of the "aged Tree" and "a bragging breere" (lines 102–3, 115) appears decrepit: "His bared boughes were beaten with stormes, / His toppe was bald, and wasted with wormes" (112–13). Qtd. from *The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser*, ed. William A. Oram et al. (New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1989) 43, 44. Shakespeare's Oliver sleeps "Under an old oak, whose boughs were mossed with age / And high top bald with dry antiquity" (4.3.105–6).
44. *Holy Bible: New King James Version* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1990) 851.

45. See Abbie Findlay Potts, "Spenserian 'Courtesy' and 'Temperance' in *Much Ado About Nothing*," *Shakespeare Association Bulletin* 17 (1942): 103–11, 126–33.
46. John Drakakis, "Trust and Transgression: The Discursive Practices of *Much Ado About Nothing*," *Post-Structuralist Readings of English Poetry*, ed. Richard Machin and Christopher Norris (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987) 59–84, esp. 64.
47. The importance of the Nativity for the design of Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* has been shown by, among others, Emrys Jones, "Stuart *Cymbeline*," *Essays in Criticism* 11 (1961): 84–99; and Robin Moffet, "*Cymbeline* and the Nativity," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 13 (1962): 207–18.
48. Spenser's Medina tells the warring knights in her castle, "And were there rightfull cause of difference, / Yet were not better, fayre it to accord, / Then with bloodguiltinesse to heape offence" (*The Faerie Queene* 2.2.30.1–3). In the 1590s, the word "accord" could denote an "[a]greement or harmonious correspondence of things or their properties" (*O.E.D.* 4), a tempered mix, in other words.
49. In this respect, Adam's role resembles that of the sober, aged Palmer vis-à-vis passionate Guyon. On several occasions, Spenser illustrates the Palmer's temperate effect on the knight: "His race with reason, and with words his will, / From fowle intemperance he ofte did stay, / And suffred not in wrath his hasty steps to stray" (*The Faerie Queene* 2.1.34.7–9).
50. See, for example, Berger 41–88.
51. Louise Schleiner, "Voice, Ideology, and Gendered Subjects: The Case of *As You Like It* and *Two Gentlemen*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 50 (1999): 285–309, esp. 285.
52. Christian allusions in *As You Like It* are recorded by Michael Taylor, "*As You Like It*: The Penalty of Adam," *Critical Quarterly* 15 (1973): 76–80, esp. 78–79; and by A. Stuart Daley, "To Moralize a Spectacle: *As You Like It*, Act 2, Scene 1," *Philological Quarterly* 65 (1986): 147–70.
53. Knowles 13; Fortin 580.
54. Knowles 13.
55. By driving away merely by his presence the serpent threatening sleeping Oliver, Orlando signifies his mastery over jealousy, or envy, a deadly sin traditionally symbolized in the setting of a garden with a central tree. By controlling both the lion and the serpent, Orlando becomes the equivalent of the virtuous referent of the previously mentioned Psalm 91:13: "You shall tread upon the lion and the cobra, / The young lion and the serpent you shall trample underfoot."
56. The maudlin, self-pitying elements in Jaques' moralization of the deer are identified by Judy Z. Kronenfeld, "Shakespeare's Jaques and the Pastoral Cult of Solitude," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 18 (1976): 451–73, esp. 457–59.
57. As part of his analysis of the androgynous dimension of the cross-dressed Rosalind's character, Robert Kimbrough notes that Marsilio Ficino, in his *Commentaries on Plato's "Symposium"*, makes the comically well-rounded androgyne...a symbol of justice: "Courage in man because of their strength and bravery is called Masculine. Temperance is called Feminine because of a certain relaxed and cooler

nature of Woman's passion and her gentle disposition. Justice is called Bi-Sexual; feminine inasmuch as because of its inherent innocence it does no one any wrong, but masculine inasmuch as it allows no harm to be brought to others, and with more severe censure frowns upon unjust men." (*Shakespeare and the Art of Humankindness* [Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities P, 1990] 108)

Given this Neoplatonic conception, literate members of original audiences of *As You Like It* may have more readily perceived the value of temperance in Rosalind's androgynous character.

58. Nowhere in Lodge's romance does Rosalynde (or anyone else) state or imply that she maintains her male disguise in order to temper the excesses of Rosader's passion. Rosalynde perpetuates her deceit and proposes that Rosader imagine Ganymede his mistress and woo "her" because she vainly wants to hear her lover's poetic praise of herself for as long as possible. She also suspects that Venus and Cupid are unwholesome deities and that love might ruin her if professed openly. For alternative interpretations of Rosalind's therapeutic purposes, both homeopathic, with regard to Orlando, see R. Chris Hassel, Jr., *Faith and Folly in Shakespeare's Romantic Comedies* (Athens: U of Georgia P, 1980) 136; and Ruth Nevo, *Comic Transformations in Shakespeare* (London: Methuen, 1980) 193.
59. The lameness of Orlando's love poetry is described well by Peter Erickson, "Sexual Politics and the Social Structure in *As You Like It*," *Massachusetts Review* 23 (1982): 65–83, esp. 68–69.
60. D. J. Palmer and Dale Priest also find Rosalind's cure of Orlando's lovesickness unsuccessful. See "Art and Nature in *As You Like It*," *Philological Quarterly* 49 (1970): 30–40, esp. 37–38; and "Oratio and Negotium: Manipulative Modes in *As You Like It*," *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 28 (1988): 273–86, esp. 279–80. For the contrary view—that Rosalind's physic precipitates the ideal quality of Orlando's love—see James Black, "The Marriage-Music of Arden," *English Studies in Canada* 6 (1980): 385–97, esp. 393–95.
61. For the basis of Rosalind's magic, see Albert Cirillo, "*As You Like It*: Pastoralism Gone Awry," *ELH* 38 (1971): 19–39, esp. 34–37.
62. The presence of odd and even number symbolism in *As You Like It* has been documented by Margie Burns, "Odd and Even in *As You Like It*," *Allegorica* 5.1 (1980) 119–40.

Two: *Kairos* and the Ripeness of Time in *As You Like It*

1. In the previous chapter's application of Spenser's treatment of the virtue of temperance in book 2 of *The Faerie Queene* to elements of *As You Like It*, I justifiably could term the relationship as one of analogue to the play, or, in the case of the remarkable echo in the play of the specific language of Spenser, as one of influence. But in the relevance for *As You Like It* of Spenser's representation of the Graces dancing on Mount Acidale (a later subject of this chapter), the relationship is more properly between two intertexts rather than between an analogue and its referent text. In 1966, Julia Kristeva coined the term "intertextuality"; in 1969, she began developing a critical theory based

upon it. Almost immediately, the theory reflected the thinking of Michael Riffaterre, Michel Foucault, and especially Roland Barthes. Kristeva and subsequent intertextualists argued that any literary text is a mosaic of mostly silent quotation of and allusion to other texts, not all of which are literary. Subscribing to Barthes' "death of the author" and to the speciousness of authorial intention and agency, intertextualists claimed that analysis properly concerns only the allusive dialogue (or "play of language") among texts themselves (see Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein, "Figures in the Corpus: Theories of Influence and Intertextuality," *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*, ed. Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein [Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991] 3–36). Intertextuality encompasses "unconscious, socially prompted types of text formation" (Clayton and Rothstein 3); it concerns the "impersonal field of crossing texts" (4); and it assumes that texts interact with and can [even should] be read in terms of each other (19). According to Kristeva, "any text is the absorption and transformation of another," and she notes that "Bakhtin considers... the text as an absorption of and a reply to another text" (Clayton and Rothstein 20). In the words of Robert Alter, "intertextuality is something that can be talked about when two or more texts are set side by side... without regard to authorial intention" (*The Pleasures of Reading in an Ideological Age* [New York: Simon & Schuster, 1989] 114). Susan Stanford Friedman points out that "Kristeva suggests that the reading of texts is the interpretation of their translinguistic doubleness, the infinite regress of tracing the other words in the word, the cultural texts in the literary text" ("Weavings: Intertextuality and the (Re)Birth of the Author," Clayton and Rothstein 146–80, esp. 147). For more on the theory of intertextuality, see John Frow, *Marxism and Literary History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1986); Jeanine Parisier Plottel and Hanna Charney, *Intertextuality: New Perspectives in Criticism* (New York: New York Literary Forum, 1978); and the bibliographies in the Clayton and Rothstein volume.

American intertextualists—unlike their British and continental counterparts—as a rule took the lead in checking the "endless play of signification among intertexts" (Clayton and Rothstein 23) by introducing notions of agency and even of influence into the theory of intertextuality and by restricting the play between texts to only two or three. A primary catalyst for this American adaptation was Jonathan Culler's *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1981). An example of the American variety of intertextuality relevant for my use of Spenser and for *As You Like It* is Andrew D. Weiner's "Sidney/Spenser/Shakespeare: Influence/Intertextuality/Intention" (Clayton and Rothstein 245–70). "Demonstrating Sir Philip Sidney's, Spenser's, and Shakespeare's participation in the King Lear story," Weiner judges that "[t]here is nothing in Sidney's poetics that precludes one text from existing in a complementary relationship to another since all texts are mere means to the discovery of the 'idea or fore-conceit' that lies behind them" (261). Another American example of intertextual criticism, this time involving texts of Shakespeare and Sir Philip Sidney, is Maurice Hunt's "*The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and the School of Night: An Intertextual Nexus," *Essays in Literature* 23 (1996): 3–20.

I have positioned my present analysis of the mutual relationship of certain texts in *The Faerie Queene* and specific passages in *As You Like It* between

the European and American intertextualists' camps, drawing upon both but leaning more decisively toward the American enclave (as I am interested in dialogic intertextuality and as I preclude the possibility of a perpetual circularity of intertextual codes, or of the infinite regress of linguistic allusion, as well as that of a whole literary masterpiece composed exclusively of a mass of always already read silent quotation). Spenser's and Shakespeare's respective originality deserves its due credit.

2. Jay L. Halio, "'No Clock in the Forest': Time in *As You Like It*," *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 2 (1962): 197–207; Rawdon Wilson, "The Way to Arden: Attitudes toward Time in *As You Like It*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 26 (1975): 16–24, esp. 17; Donn Ervin Taylor, "'Try in Time in Despite of a Fall': Time and Occasion in *As You Like It*," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 24 (1982): 121–36, esp. 121–22.
3. Taylor cites Erwin Panofsky, who claims that "shortly after the eleventh century, the image of Kairos merged with the feminine image of Fortune to become the 'Fortune of Time'" (123).
4. Donn Taylor 127.
5. Gary F. Waller, *The Strong Necessity of Time: The Philosophy of Time in Shakespeare and Elizabethan Literature* (The Hague: Mouton, 1976) 17.
6. Frank Kermode, *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction* (London: Oxford UP, 1966) 48. Kermode asserts that "the divine plot is the pattern of *kairoi* in relation to the End" (47).
7. Waller charts the transformation of this Christian idea into the secular notion that an individual can seize the moment for his or her personal, especially commercial, advantage—a change that occurred during Shakespeare's lifetime (24–25, 32–34).
8. Accounts of time in *As You Like It* outside the Halio-Wilson-Taylor line of argument and different from my reading of the play are given by Frederick Turner, *Shakespeare and the Nature of Time* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1971) 28–44; Ricardo J. Quinones, *The Renaissance Discovery of Time* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1972) 422–26; and Hallett Smith, *Shakespeare's Romances: A Study of Some Ways of the Imagination* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1972) 92–93. All of these studies disprove Helen Gardner's claim that Shakespeare's "comedies are dominated by a sense of place rather than of time" (See "*As You Like It*," *More Talking of Shakespeare*, ed. John Garrett [New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1959] 17–32, esp. 22). A more recent article that seeks to "approach the ways in which time [works] in . . . *As You Like It*. . . as a variegated phenomenon that functions at many levels, revealing attitudes that are characteristic of Shakespeare's dramatic presentation and Renaissance ideas" is Bart Westerwheel, "The Dialogic Imagination: The European Discovery of Time and Shakespeare's Mature Comedies," *Renaissance Culture in Context: Theory and Practice*, ed. Jean R. Brink and William F. Gentrup (Aldershot, UK: Scolar P, 1993) 54–74, esp. 55, 66–71. Westerwheel mainly uses Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of the chronotope in measuring "the chronotopes of the individual characters [of *As You Like It*] against the pastoral ideal" (66).
9. The abuse of primogeniture by elder brothers in late sixteenth-century England is described with reference to Elizabethan texts and the makeup of Shakespeare's audience by Louis Adrian Montrose, "'The Place of a Brother'

- in *As You Like It: Social Process and Comic Form*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 32 (1981): 28–54, esp. 31–37.
10. Montrose notes that Sir Rowland's "surname is a play on 'woods' [Bois] and 'boys'" (43 n.35).
 11. "Orlando is in fact an anagram for Rowland," Thomas Kelly remarks; it makes "clear that the virtues of the antique world still live in Orlando" ("Shakespeare's Romantic Heroes: Orlando Reconsidered," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 24 [1973]: 12–24, esp. 15).
 12. John Doebler, "Orlando: Athlete of Virtue," *Shakespeare Survey* 26 (1973): 111–17. Also see Richard Knowles, "Myth and Type in *As You Like It*," *ELH* 33 (1966): 1–22, esp. 4–5; and Mark Bracher, "Contrary Notions of Identity in *As You Like It*," *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 24 (1984): 225–40, esp. 232.
 13. A second Herculean overtone, that of the tongue-tied, modest victor, is identified in this passage by Jeffrey Shulman, "*The Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye* and the Tongue-tied Orlando," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 31 (1980): 390.
 14. Andrew Marvell, "*To his coy Mistress*," Andrew Marvell, ed. Frank Kermode and Keith Walker, *The Oxford Authors* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990) 24–25.
 15. Orlando and Adam's emblematic re-creation of this moment is confirmed by John Doebler, *Shakespeare's Speaking Pictures* (Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1974) 33–34 and pl. 4; Raymond Waddington, "Moralizing the Spectacle: Dramatic Emblems in *As You Like It*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33 (1982): 155–63, esp. 156–57; Barbara J. Bono, "Mixed Gender, Mixed Genre in Shakespeare's *As You Like It*," *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History, and Interpretation*, ed. Barbara K. Lewalski, *Harvard English Studies* 14 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1986) 189–212, esp. 198; and by Marjorie Garber, *Shakespeare After All* (2004; New York: Anchor, 2005) 441. Both Doebler and Waddington cite Geoffrey Whitney's emblem *Pietas filiorum in parentes* in *A Choice of Emblems* (1586) as a possible source of Shakespeare's conception. See also Peter Erickson, "Sexual Politics and the Social Structure in *As You Like It*," *Massachusetts Review* 23 (1982): 65–83, esp. 75.
 16. "Indeed, if we recall that [Orlando's] exile to Arden has come about because Oliver '... means / To burn the lodging where you use to lie,' the Virgilian backdrop becomes appropriate in more ways than one" (Waddington 157).
 17. In a picture and poem in Whitney's *A Choice of Emblems*, E. Michael Thron, in "Jaques: Emblems and Morals," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 30 (1979): 84–89, esp. 86, finds an emblem analogous to Touchstone's portrayal of time.
 18. For other readings of this pun (and of Touchstone's meditation in general), see Helge Kökeritz, *Shakespeare's Pronunciation* (New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1958) 58–59, 117, 141, 149; and Jenijoy La Belle, "Touchstone's Dial: Horology or Urology?" *English Language Notes* 24 (1987): 19–25. Kökeritz hears Touchstone making a sexually obscene joke, punning upon *hour/whore, ripe (ripen/search)* and *tale/tail* (sexual organ), while La Belle argues that Touchstone is not meditating on time so much as on his own sexuality, with *dial* meaning "penis" and *poke* "codpiece."
 19. Harold Jenkins in "*As You Like It*," *Shakespeare Survey* 8 (1955): 40–51, esp. 49, notes that Touchstone "dares to speak in Arcadia, where one can never grow old, of Time's inevitable processes of maturity and decay. By this the ideal life

- of the banished Duke is mocked, and since Touchstone's words are repeated by Jaques with delight and uproarious laughter, the mockery is double."
20. Cf. C. L. Barber, who argues, in *Shakespeare's Festive Comedy: A Study of Dramatic Form and Its Relation to Social Custom* (1959; rpt. Cleveland: World, 1963) 226, that the tale that "hangs" for the telling is that of Jaques' seven ages of humankind.
 21. John Russell Brown, in *Shakespeare and His Comedies* (1962; rpt. London: Methuen, 1968) 152, describes the moment at which Touchstone comes closest to altering the regularity of time's hours: "The first time we see [Audrey and Touchstone] together, he is offering to 'fetch up' her goats and is already impatient of Time, questioning '[A]m I the man yet? [D]oth my simple feature content you?'" (3.3.1-3).
 22. Both Turner (32-38) and Quinones (422-23) analyze the defects of Jaques' view of time as delineated in his portrait of humankind's seven ages.
 23. See William Jones, "William Shakespeare as William in *As You Like It*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 11 (1960): 228-31; Howard Cole, "The Moral Vision of *As You Like It*," *College Literature* 3 (1976): 17-32, esp. 26-27; Jonathan Bate, *The Genius of Shakespeare* (New York: Oxford UP, 1998) 7-8; and James P. Bednarz, *Shakespeare and the Poets' War* (New York: Columbia UP, 2001) 117-27.
 24. For an analysis of Rosalind's homeopathy, see R. Chris Hassel, Jr., *Faith and Folly in Shakespeare's Romantic Comedies* (Athens: U of Georgia P, 1980) 136; Ruth Nevo, *Comic Transformations in Shakespeare* (London: Methuen, 1980) 193; and Maurice Hunt, "Homeopathy in Shakespearean Comedy and Romance," *Ball State University Forum* 29.3 (1988): 45-57, esp. 50-52.
 25. In *The Heart's Forest: A Study of Shakespeare's Pastoral Plays* (New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1972), David P. Young defines the relativity of Rosalind's account, arguing that the passage is part of the play's larger presentation of the truth of subjectivity (58).
 26. Both Knowles (5-6) and Doebler ("Athlete of Virtue" 114-15) note allusions to Hercules' killing the Nemean lion and strangling the serpent sent by Hera in details of Orlando's victory over the lioness and snake.
 27. On the lioness as a type of both Oliver's and Orlando's wrath (and on the symbolic importance of Orlando's triumph over anger), see Montrose 44; and William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, ed. Agnes Latham, The Arden Shakespeare (London: Methuen, 1975) xliii.
 28. Alice Lyle Scoufos, in "The *Paradiso Terrestre* and the Testing of Love in *As You Like It*," *Shakespeare Studies* 14 (1981): 215-27, esp. 217-18, 219, describes the relevance of Robert Greene's *Orlando Furioso* for Shakespeare's characterization of Orlando.
 29. Sylvan Barnet describes the Christian Providence of *As You Like It* in "'Strange Events': Improbability in *As You Like It*," *Shakespeare Studies* 4 (1968): 119-31, esp. 121-22, 127-29.
 30. Alluding to Spenser, Homer, Virgil, and the Old Testament, René Fortin establishes the divinity of the oak trees mentioned in *As You Like It*, in "'Tongues in Trees': Symbolic Patterns in *As You Like It*," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 14 (1972-73): 569-82, esp. 573-77. Also see Jeanne Addison Roberts, "Shakespeare's Forests and Trees," *Southern Humanities Review* 11 (1977): 108-25, esp. 117-23.

31. Admittedly, the passion of romantic love, according to the Renaissance Galenic theory of the humours, could so strike at the lover's heart and body that death was an imagined possibility. But as Lily B. Campbell clearly implies in her summary of this view, such a death was an imagined rarity. *Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes: Slaves of Passion* (1930; rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1968) 63–83. As Rosalind has noted, Orlando in his neat dress shows no signs of “adust” love melancholy, the extreme form of a disease that might result in death. Shakespeare's focus is on Orlando's naïve investment in the reality of an often-invoked metaphorical dimension (or status) of medical theory that was only on rare occasions thought (usually by doctors and not by writers) to be fatal.
32. D. J. Palmer also finds Rosalind's cure of Orlando's lovesickness unsuccessful. See “Art and Nature in *As You Like It*,” *Philological Quarterly* 49 (1970): 30–40, esp. 37–38. For the contrary view—that Rosalind's physic proves the ideal quality of Orlando's love—see Edward I. Berry, “Rosalynde and Rosalind,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 31 (1980): 42–52, esp. 49–50; and James Black, “The Marriage-Music of Arden,” *English Studies in Canada* 6 (1980): 385–97, esp. 393–95. For the argument—unconvincing in my opinion—that Rosalind's attempt to physic Orlando is a moot point, because “Orlando comes to know [early on] that ‘Ganymede’ is Rosalind pretending to be a man playing a woman; and we know he knows she knows he knows it,” see James Shapiro, *A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare, 1599* (New York: HarperCollins, 2005) 212–14, esp. 212.
33. For the precedent of “prime” referring to the moment of full ripeness, see Sonnet 12.1–3: “When I do count the clock that tells the time, / And see the brave day sunk in hideous night; / When I behold the violet past prime.”
34. Juliet Dusinberre, in “As *Who Liked It?*” *Shakespeare Survey* 46 (1994): 9–21, esp. 16, asserts that “[t]his dominant heroine”—Rosalind—“with, in the end, magical skills, creates the parameters within which the danger of Shakespeare's play can be recovered, because she is so closely identified with [Queen] Elizabeth I, a relationship pointed by the covert presence in the text of the Queen's godson,” Sir John Harington. In this respect, also see Leah Marcus, “Shakespeare's Comic Heroines, Elizabeth I, and the Political Uses of Androgyny,” *Women in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Literary and Historical Perspectives*, ed. Mary Beth Rose (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP, 1986) 135–53, esp. 143, 149. Margaret Boerner Beckman locates the source of Rosalind's magical power in her marvelously inclusive character, which is able to control the “natural harmony of opposed forces that constitutes man's ‘possible perfection.’” See “The Figure of Rosalind in *As You Like It*,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 29 (1978): 44–51, esp. 49.
35. Christian allusions in *As You Like It* are recorded by Fortin 575–81; Hassel 110–48; Knowles 9–19; Edward A. Armstrong, *Shakespeare's Imagination* (1946; rpt. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1963) 125–28; Michael Taylor, “*As You Like It*: The Penalty of Adam,” *Critical Quarterly* 15 (1973): 76–80, esp. 78–79; and by A. Stuart Daley “To Moralize a Spectacle: *As You Like It*, Act 2, Scene 1,” *Philological Quarterly* 65 (1986): 147–70.
36. The association of Orlando's bloody redemption of his brother with Christ's redemption of humankind is explored by Fortin 580 and by Knowles 13.

37. Knowles remarks that “the golden age was commonly taken as the gentile corruption of the Genesis story of paradise by English Renaissance writers such as Arthur Golding and Sir Walter Raleigh” (10).
38. Maurice Hunt, “‘Forward Backward’ Time and the Apocalypse in *Hamlet*,” *Comparative Drama* 38 (2005): 379–99. For the extent of Shakespeare’s apocalyptic allusions in *Hamlet*, see David Kaula, “*Hamlet* and the Image of Both Churches,” *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 24 (1984): 241–55; Arthur McGee, *The Elizabethan Hamlet* (New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1987) 50, 115; Linda Kay Hoff, *Hamlet’s Choice: Hamlet—A Reformation Allegory*, *Studies in Renaissance Literature* 2 (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990); Hiroshi Ozawa, “‘I Must Be Cruel Only to Be Kind’: Apocalyptic Repercussions in *Hamlet*,” *Hamlet and Japan*, ed. Yoshiko Uéno (New York: AMS Press, 1995) 87–101; and Margreta de Grazia, “Weeping for Hecuba,” *Historicism, Psychoanalysis, and Early Modern Culture*, ed. Carla Mazzio and Douglas Trevor (New York: Routledge, 2000) 350–75, esp. 359.
39. Bernard Capp, “The Political Dimension of Apocalyptic Thought,” *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance Thought and Literature*, ed. C. A. Patrides and Joseph Wittreich (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1984) 93–124, esp. 95. For the frequency of the prediction of the year 1600 (or shortly thereafter) as the time of Apocalypse, and for the names of Elizabethan authors who made this prediction, with the titles of their works in which they make the forecast, see Hunt, “‘Forward Backward’ Time and the Apocalypse in *Hamlet*” 385–86.
40. Katharine R. Frith, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1530–1645* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1979) 38–39, 41. Because the Book of Revelation includes mention of seven churches, seven angels, seven seals, and seven trumpets, seven became a popular apocalyptic number. John Foxe, in his late work *Eicasmí* (publ. 1587), “found [that] the seven trumpets [of Revelation] clearly contained seven successive and not simultaneous times. He noted the idea of the world-week and the elaboration into seven millennia” (Frith 93). The doctrine of the seven seals, for Shakespeare’s contemporaries, plausibly dovetailed with the notion of seven historical epochs of apocalyptic time, with each age breaking one of the seven seals (Frith 92).
41. Scoufos 215–27.
42. Scoufos 216.
43. Scoufos 221.
44. Alan Brissenden, arguing that “the text does nothing to suggest that [Hymen] is anything other than a god,” adds that “if it has to be another character, then Corin would be closest to the source, as Lodge’s Coridon dresses up and sings a song” (William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, ed. Alan Brissenden, *The Oxford Shakespeare, Oxford World’s Classics* [1993; Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998] 19). Because the role of old Adam is often doubled with that of William, I would not include him in any listing of cast members available for playing Hymen. For an exhaustive listing of the names of characters in *As You Like It* who have played Hymen in film versions and major productions of the comedy, see Cynthia Marshall, *As You Like It, Shakespeare in Production* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004) 238–39.
45. Brian Gibbons, “Amorous Fictions and *As You Like It*,” *Fanned and Winnowed Opinions: Shakespearean Essays Presented to Harold Jenkins*, ed. John W. Mahon

- and Thomas A. Pendleton (London: Methuen, 1987) 52–78, esp. 76. In Gibbons's reading, introducing the god Hymen into the forest of Arden is simply Shakespeare's way of solving a technical problem that he would prefer to stage otherwise.
46. For the claim that Hymen in *As You Like It* performs the only completed marriage ceremony shown on the Shakespeare stage, see Ann Jennalie Cook, *Making a Match: Courtship in Shakespeare and His Society* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1991) 223. Agreeing with Cook is William Kerrigan, "Female Friends and Fraternal Enemies in *As You Like It*," *Desire in the Renaissance: Psychoanalysis and Literature*, ed. Valeria Finucci and Regina Schwartz (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1994) 184–203, esp. 193. Cook judges that Hymen's wedding ceremony is "wholly pagan" (223).
 47. The supernatural identity of Hymen is well conveyed in "the 1978 BBC film version [of the play], [wherein] the scene of the Duke and company dissolves into a vision of Hymen—a key figure dressed in gossamer . . . a laurel wreath about his temples" (Marshall 238; Marshall quotes J. C. Bulman, "*As You Like It* and the Perils of Pastoral," *Shakespeare on Television: An Anthology of Essays and Reviews*, ed. J. C. Bulman and H. R. Coursen [Hanover, NH: UP of New England, 1988] 174–79, esp. 177).
 48. References to and quotations from *The Faerie Queene* derive from Edmund Spenser, *Spenser: The Faerie Queene*, ed. A. C. Hamilton; text ed. Hiroshi Yamashita and Toshiyuki Suzuki, Longman Annotated Poets, 2nd edition (Harlow, UK: Longman, 2001).
 49. This claim cannot be made for *Much Ado About Nothing*. Admittedly, Shakespeare likely read, or re-read, Spenser's version of the source story of *Much Ado About Nothing* (c.1598–1599) in 2.4.16–36 of *The Faerie Queene*, the story of Phedon (Claudio), Claribell (Hero), Philemon (Don John), and Pryene (Margaret). But Shakespeare's version diverges in important details from Spenser's narrative as often as it follows it. (After immediately killing his affianced Claribell for the sexual deceit that he believes he has witnessed, Phedon learns the truth that he saw Claribell's maid Pryene dressed in Claribell's gown committing the infidelity, and so he fatally poisons the deceit's creator, Philemon, Pryene's lover, and with murderous intent chases Pryene until he becomes possessed by a fury [and so Furor's captive]). This is where Spenser's version of the tale ends. Moreover, editors usually assert that Spenser's telling of the story is secondary for Shakespeare to the prior versions of the tale found in the twenty-second story from the *Novelle* of Matteo Bandello (1554) and in canto 5 of Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* (1516; English trans. by Sir John Harington [1591]). The Spenserian atmosphere created by allusion and imitation is with few exceptions absent from Shakespeare's representation in *Much Ado* of a famous tale that Spenser adapted to illustrate (by default) the necessity of temperance.
 50. *Spenser: The Faerie Queene* 672.
 51. Note that Rosalind's unqualified gift of herself to her father and to her soon-to-be husband is virtually simultaneous. She thus whole-heartedly, generously in her expansive love, avoids the potentially disastrous results inherent in quantifying and dividing her love, as Shakespeare's Cordelia and Desdemona do when they respectively say, "You [Lear] have begot me, bred

me, loved me. I / Return those duties back as are right fit . . . That lord whose hand must take my plight shall carry / Half my love with him, half my care and duty" (*King Lear*, 1.1.96–97, 101–2); "My noble father, / I do perceive here a divided duty. . . . You are the lord of duty. . . . But here's my husband, and so much duty as my mother showed / To you, preferring you before her father, / So much I challenge that I may profess / Due to the Moor my lord" (*Othello*, 1.3.182–83, 186, 187–91).

52. Hymen simply says to Phoebe (not to Phoebe and Silvius), "You to his love must accord, / Or have a woman to your lord" (5.4.128–29), while the god tells Audrey and Touchstone, "You and you are sure together / As the winter to foul weather" (5.4.130–31).
53. By concluding that Hymen thus is "the god of every town" (5.4.141), Shakespeare's song ironically qualifies the god's gifts at the moment of highest tribute by reminding auditors that Hymen is not the god of the forest or the country outside the towns.
54. *As You Like It*, The Oxford Shakespeare, Oxford World's Classics 224.
55. My claims about the accessibility through time of an otherworldly reality entail the corollary that special knowledge becomes possibility through the epiphany—in the case of Hymen's, the privileged knowledge of the sanctity and essence of marriage. My argument thus counters the assertion of Robert N. Watson, in "As You Liken It: Simile in the Wilderness," *Shakespeare Survey* 56 (2003): 79–92, that Shakespeare in *As You Like It* saturates the comedy with the idea of likeness, primarily through variations on the trope simile, and that the effect of this saturation is "the suspicion that we cannot know things only as we liken them, never in and of themselves" (79). Underlying this claim is the assumption that "the world is less observed than constructed, less an accessible reality than a manufactured contingency" (79). But these assumptions are modern, or more properly, postmodern, rather than late Elizabethan. Watson assumes that *As You Like It* points to "a polarity of the linguistically entangled human mind and the material objects which that mind can know only partially, only by the constraints of comparison" (80). In the epiphany of Hymen, however, an idea becomes an accessible reality. The representation of the Roman god is not meant to be an essential ideal clothed (and thus distorted) in the costume of an ancient Roman god, a figure begging comparison with the idea depicted by the figure, but the thing itself, a mystical appearance in earthly time of Marriage.
56. A. Stuart Daley, in "The Triumph of Patience in *As You Like It*," *Aligarh Journal of English Studies* 13.1 (1988): 45–66, notes that "[t]he time [of the play] is the present time of the closing years of the sixteenth century, when 'the poor world is almost six thousand years old' [4.1.86–87]" (48). John D. Cox, in "Shakespeare and the French Epistemologists," *Cithara* 45.2 (2006): 23–45, esp. 43, doubts on no basis other than "the assumption of [Shakespeare's] transcendent genius" that the playwright did not believe the Elizabethan commonplace, inscribed in the Geneva Bible's commentary and voiced by Rosalind, that the world was six-thousand years old.
57. Watson 87.
58. Armstrong identifies imagery in acts 1 and 3 of *As You Like It* that is suggestive of "the rib which was taken from man to form woman" (127).

59. For an alternative analysis of the masque of Hymen, see Marilyn Williamson, "The Masque of Hymen in *As You Like It*," *Comparative Drama* 2 (1968): 248–58, esp. 255–57.

Three: Words and Deeds in *As You Like It*

1. Raymond Waddington, "Moralizing the Spectacle: Dramatic Emblems in *As You Like It*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33 (1982): 155–63, esp. 157. Brian Vickers, in *The Artistry of Shakespeare's Prose* (London: Methuen, 1968), typically asserts that *As You Like It* "is a play in which Plot has been almost forgotten in the cause of Wit" (200).
2. Thomas McAlindon, *Shakespeare and Decorum* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1973) 5–6. Chapter 1 of McAlindon's book is devoted to documenting the Renaissance fascination with words, deeds, and decorum (1–18). Jane Donawerth touches on the expressive alternatives of words and deeds in *Hamlet in Shakespeare and the Sixteenth-Century Study of Language* (Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1984) 244–67.
3. See Maurice Hunt, "Words and Deeds in *All's Well That Ends Well*," *Modern Language Quarterly* 48 (1987): 320–38.
4. Hamlet's remarks in this instance seem to apply as much to late Elizabethan England as the following remarks of Lafew and Gloucester do to social conditions in Renaissance France and pagan Britain: "They say miracles are past, and we have our philosophical persons to make modern and familiar things supernatural and causeless. Hence is it that we make trifles of terrors, ensconcing ourselves into seeming knowledge when we should submit ourselves to an unknown fear" (*All's Well That Ends Well*, 2.3.1–6);
 These late eclipses of the sun and moon portend no good to us. Though the wisdom of nature can reason it thus and thus, yet nature finds itself scourged by the sequent effects. Love cools, friendship falls off, brothers divide; in cities, mutinies; in countries discord; in palaces, treason; and the bond cracked twixt son and father. . . . We have seen the best of our time. Machinations, hollowness, treachery, and all ruinous disorders follow us disquietly to our graves. (*King Lear*, 1.2.106–17)
5. William Shakespeare, *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington, 5th edition (New York: Pearson Longman, 2004) 1146.
6. King Henry might seem in the last act of *The Life of King Henry V* (1599) to reform partially his speech when he repeatedly tells Katharine, Princess of France, that he "speak[s] to [her] plain soldier" (5.2.151)—that is to say, honestly, truly—when he woos her to be his English queen; but (as many commentators have noted) his play-ending obscene joking with the Duke of Burgundy about Katharine's sexuality at her expense (5.2.293–328) and his disturbing commodifying of her during the final negotiations with France (5.2.331–46) call into question the sincerity of his speech throughout his courtship.
7. Roslyn L. Knutson, "Falconer to the Little Eyases: A New Date and Commercial Agenda for the 'Little Eyases' Passage in *Hamlet*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 46 (1995): 1–31, esp. 10–11. Also claiming a 1599–1600 date for

- Hamlet* is Harold Jenkins (William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, ed. Harold Jenkins, The Arden Shakespeare, Second Series [London: Methuen, 1982]) 13).
8. Margreta de Grazia, "Shakespeare's View of Language: An Historical Perspective," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 29 (1978): 374–88, esp. 381.
 9. Maurice Hunt, "Shakespeare's Empirical Romance: *Cymbeline* and Modern Knowledge," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 22 (1980): 322–42.
 10. For the argument that Touchstone's knight, pancakes, and mustard represent a satiric jab at Ben Jonson's knight Puntarvolo and this character's phrase "Not without mustard" (a dig, spoken in *Every Man Out of His Humour*, at Shakespeare's motto *Non Sans Droict*), see S. Viswanathan, "As You Like It, I.ii.55–72," *American Notes and Queries* 18.5 (1980): 70–72; James P. Bednarz, *Shakespeare and the Poets' War* (New York: Columbia UP, 2001) 113–14; and Katherine Duncan-Jones, *Ungentle Shakespeare: Scenes from His Life* (London: Thomson, 2001) 96, 121. Basically Shakespeare asserts through this complex allusion that Ben Jonson's oaths are hollow because Jonson lacks the guarantor of personal honor.
 11. The definitive study of this aspect of Shakespeare's language is Sigurd Burckhardt, *Shakespearean Meanings* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1968) esp. 22–46, 260–84.
 12. William Shakespeare, *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans et al., 2nd edition (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997) 406.
 13. Cf. Alexander Leggatt, *Shakespeare's Comedy of Love* (London: Methuen, 1974) 194–95; and Mark Bracher, "Contrary Notions of Identity in *As You Like It*," *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 24 (1984): 225–40, esp. 234. Vickers also positively values Rosalind's and Celia's corrective repartees to each other's witplay (211–13).
 14. William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, ed. Alan Brissenden, The Oxford Shakespeare, Oxford World's Classics (1993; Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998) 111.
 15. Concerning Le Beau's calling the breaking of ribs "sport," Harold Jenkins, in "As You Like It," *Shakespeare Survey* 8 (1955): 40–51, remarks that "[t]his is the callousness one learns at a court ruled by a tyrannous Duke" (42). Jenkins considers Le Beau to be "a little sketch for Osric, with his foppery of diction and his expert knowledge of sport" (50).
 16. Hallett Smith, in *Shakespeare's Romances: A Study of Some Ways of the Imagination* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1972) 77–78, also comments on the speechlessness of Orlando and Rosalind, likewise noting that her belief that he calls her back is imaginary.
 17. Raphaëlle Costa de Beaugard, in "Laughter Chastened: A Study of Comic Languages in *As You Like It*," *For Laughs: Puzzling Laughter in Plays of the Tudor Age* (Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang, 2002) 211–29, posits "a double level of language in the play: the authorized language of the court . . . and the language outside the court" (213). This double level of language is complicated by "the problematics of bawdy language in stage business" (211). For other analyses of the rhetorical language of the play, see Martha Ronk Lifson, "Learning by Talking: Conversation in *As You Like It*," *Shakespeare Survey* 40 (1987): 91–105; and Swapam Chakravorty, "Translating Arden: Shakespeare's Rhetorical Place in *As You Like It*," *Shakespeare and the Mediterranean: The Selected Proceedings of the International Shakespeare Association World Congress*,

- ed. Tom Clayton, Susan Brock, and Vicente Forés (Newark: U of Delaware P, 2004) 156–67.
18. For more on this idea, see Jonathan Goldberg, *Voice Terminal Echo: Postmodernism and English Renaissance Texts* (New York: Methuen, 1986) 68–86. Cf., however, Paul J. Willis, “‘Tongues in Trees’: The Book of Nature in *As You Like It*,” *Modern Language Studies* 18.3 (1988): 65–74.
 19. In “The Moral Languages of *Rosalynde* and *As You Like It*,” *Studies in Philology* 68 (1971): 167–76, esp. 172–73, Robert B. Pierce argues that Duke Senior’s “language [is] at some remove from reality” in his speech on the sweet uses of adversity, a remove consistent with Shakespeare’s introducing built-in criticisms of the speech’s sentiments. “The pastoral world to which [the Duke] retreats is a verbal construction” (173). See also Albert R. Cirillo, “*As You Like It*: Pastoralism Gone Awry,” *ELH* 38 (1971): 19–39, esp. 27–28; and Howard Cole, “The Moral Vision of *As You Like It*,” *College Literature* 3 (1976): 17–32, esp. 19–24.
 20. The maudlin, self-pitying elements in Jaques’ moralization of the deer are identified by Judy Z. Kronenfeld, “Shakespeare’s Jaques and the Pastoral Cult of Solitude,” *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 18 (1976): 451–73, esp. 457–59.
 21. For an exhaustive analysis of Jaques’ moralized spectacle of the hunted deer, one which makes it the symbolic commentary on the play to that point, see A. Stuart Daley, “To Moralize a Spectacle: *As You Like It*, Act 2, Scene 1,” *Philological Quarterly* 65 (1986): 147–70.
 22. William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, ed. Agnes Latham, The Arden Shakespeare (London: Methuen, 1975) 61.
 23. The lameness of Orlando’s poetry is described by R. Chris Hassel, Jr., *Faith and Folly in Shakespeare’s Romantic Comedies* (Athens: U of Georgia P, 1980) 119–20, 134; and by Peter Erickson, “Sexual Politics and the Social Structure in *As You Like It*,” *Massachusetts Review* 23 (1982): 65–83, esp. 68–69.
 24. Cole makes essentially the same point (26); his article is partly concerned with Shakespeare’s casting truths in *As You Like It* in flat or uneloquent language and falsehoods or distortions of the truth in memorable rhetoric (17–32 passim).
 25. Grace Tiffany, in “‘That Reason Wonder May Diminish’: *As You Like It*, Androgyny, and the Theater Wars,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 57 (1994): 213–39, esp. 226–30, persuasively argues “that Shakespeare fashioned *As You Like It* in part to reject the satiric method demonstrated and championed by [Ben Jonson’s 1599 play *Every Man Out of His Humour*]” (215). Robert Pierce argues that Duke Senior’s indictment effectively discredits the satiric impulse described by Jaques (171–72). Also see Oscar J. Campbell, *Shakespeare’s Satire* (London: Oxford UP, 1943) 44–64, esp. 46–57; David P. Young, *The Heart’s Forest: A Study of Shakespeare’s Pastoral Plays* (New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1972) 43–44; Dale G. Priest, “*Oratio* and *Negotium*: Manipulative Modes in *As You Like It*,” *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 28 (1988): 273–86, esp. 273–75; and James P. Bednarz, “Shakespeare’s Purge of Jonson: The Literary Context of *Troilus and Cressida*,” *Shakespeare Studies* 21 (1993): 175–212, esp. 189.

26. Anthony Trollope, *An Autobiography*, ed. Michael Sadleir and Frederick Page, Oxford World's Classics (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999) 185–86.
27. David Bevington, on the contrary, believes that Shakespeare leaves Jaques' and Duke Senior's debate on satire unresolved. See "Shakespeare vs. Jonson on Satire," *Shakespeare 1971*, ed. Clifford Leech and J. M. R. Margeson (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1972) 107–22, esp. 115–18.
28. John Russell Brown, *Shakespeare and His Comedies* (1962; rpt. London: Methuen, 1968) 155.
29. Sir Philip Sidney, *An Apology for Poetry*, ed. Geoffrey Shepherd (London: Thomas Nelson, 1965) 107–9.
30. Orlando and Adam's emblematic re-creation of pious Aeneas bearing on his back aged Anchises is confirmed by John Doebler, *Shakespeare's Speaking Pictures* (Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1974) 33–34 and pl. 4; and by Waddington 156–57. Both critics cite Geoffrey Whitney's emblem "*Pietas filiorum in parentes*" in *A Choice of Emblemes* (1568) as a possible source of Shakespeare's conception. See also Erickson 75.
31. In addition to the cited passage in *An Apology for Poetry*, see Henry Peacham, *The Complete Gentleman, The Truth of Our Times, and The Art of Living* in London, ed. Virgil B. Heltzel (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1962) 96.
32. In this respect, the example of Hercules, one of whose labors Orlando enacts during his wrestling with Charles, is important. In *An Apology for Actors* (1612), Thomas Heywood links Hercules' desire to perform twelve admirable labors with the nobility communicated by the lively staged images of his father Jupiter's worthy deeds (Qtd. in David S. Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Shapes of Time* [Hanover, NH: UP of New England, 1982] 18):

"In the first of the *Olimpiads*, amongst many other active exercises in which *Hercules* ever triumph'd as victor, there was in his nonage presented unto him by his Tutor in the fashion of a History, acted by the choise of the nobility of Greece, the worthy and memorable acts of his father Jupiter, which being personated with lively and well-spirited action, wrought such an impression in his noble thoughts, that in meere emulation of his fathers valor (not at the behest of his Stepdame *Iuno*) he perform'd his twelve labours."

Shakespeare's association of Hercules in *As You Like It* with expressive images moving the will to enact virtuous deeds thus was confirmed by Renaissance critical theory, which implies that the mode of drama was originally favored for such representation.
33. D. A. Beecher, "Antiochus and Stratonice: The Heritage of a Medico-Literary Motif in the Theatre of the English Renaissance," *The Seventeenth Century* 5 (1990): 113–32, esp. 126.
34. For an analysis of Rosalind's homeopathy, see Hassel 136; Ruth Nevo, *Comic Transformations in Shakespeare* (London: Methuen, 1980) 193; and Maurice Hunt, "Homeopathy in Shakespearean Comedy and Romance," *Ball State University Forum* 29.3 (1988): 45–57, esp. 50–52.
35. Admittedly, the passion of romantic love, according to the Renaissance Galenic theory of the humours, could so adversely affect the lover's heart and body that death was an imagined possibility. But as Lily B. Campbell clearly implies in her summary of this view in *Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes: Slaves of Passion*

- (1930; rpt. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1968) 63–83, such a death was an imagined rarity. As Rosalind has noted, Orlando in his neat dress shows no signs of “adust” love melancholy, the extreme form of a disease that might result in death. Shakespeare’s focus is on Orlando’s naïve blindness to the often invoked metaphorical dimension (or status) of medical theory that was only on rare occasions thought (and then usually by doctors and not by writers) to be fatal.
36. D. J. Palmer, in “Art and Nature in *As You Like It*,” *Philological Quarterly* 49 (1970): 30–40, esp. 37–38, also finds Rosalind’s attempt to physic Orlando ultimately unsuccessful—as does Dale Priest 279–80 and Clare R. Kinney, “Feigning Female Fainting: Spenser, Lodge, Shakespeare, and Rosalind,” *Modern Philology* 95 (1998): 291–315, esp. 308. Noting that there “has been plenty of critical discussion of [Rosalind’s] ‘education’ of Orlando, [and that] it is not clear that Orlando ever escapes certain ideologies of gender” (307–8), Kinney cites Marjorie Garber, “The Education of Orlando,” *Comedy from Shakespeare to Sheridan: Change and Continuity in the English and European Dramatic Tradition*, ed. A. R. Braunmuller and James C. Bulman (Newark: U of Delaware P, 1986) 102–12. But Kinney claims that Rosalind’s intention to “teach her lover to ‘speak to her in the natural language of men and women’”—Garber’s claim—is never realized in the play in a persuasive “dialogue between equals” (308).
 37. In “Rosalynde and Rosalind,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 31 (1980): 42–52, Edward I. Berry notes, concerning Rosalind’s advice to Phoebe, that she “plays the role of satirist here, of course, but she is neither detached nor objective” (48).
 38. See William M. Jones, “William Shakespeare as William in *As You Like It*,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 11 (1960): 228–31; Jonathan Bate, *The Genius of Shakespeare* (New York: Oxford UP, 1998) 7–8; and James P. Bednarz, *Shakespeare and the Poets’ War* 117–27.
 39. *Holy Bible: The New King James Version* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1990) 1872.
 40. Positive traits of William’s character have been described by Cole 26–27; Hassel 113–13; and by A. Stuart Daley, “The Dispraise of the Country in *As You Like It*,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 36 (1985): 300–14, esp. 306.
 41. Edward Berry remarks that the “insistence upon deeds as well as words serves in many ways as a paradigm of the difference between Lodge’s art and Shakespeare’s. . . . Rosalind’s acceptance of Orlando depends ultimately upon deeds rather than words” (50).
 42. For the Renaissance iconographic equation of the serpent with envy and verbal slander, see *The Faerie Queene* 1.4.31 (Edmund Spenser, *Spenser: The Faerie Queene*, ed. A. C. Hamilton; text ed. Hiroshi Yamashita and Toshiyuki Suzuki, Longman Annotated English Poets, 2nd edition [Harlow, UK: Pearson/Longman, 2001] 68); and Samuel Chew, *The Pilgrimage of Life* (1962; rpt. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1973) 110.
 43. See *The Faerie Queene* 1.4.33; Waddington 160–61; and Richard Knowles, “Myth and Type in *As You Like It*,” *ELH* 33 (1966): 1–22, esp. 6n.19.
 44. Waddington 161. For the evocation in this episode of Hercules wrestling the Nemean lion, see Knowles 5; and John Doeblér, “Orlando: Athlete of Virtue,” *Shakespeare Survey* 26 (1973): 111–17, esp. 114.

45. *As You Like It*, ed. Brissenden 142; *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. Evans 310; *As You Like It*, ed. Latham 47.
46. David Young exhaustively catalogues the appearance of “if” conditional statements in the language of the play’s characters, and argues that the rhetorical technique contributes largely to the play’s “atmosphere of artifice and hypothesis” (46–50). See also Maura Slattery Kuhn, “Much Virtue in *If*,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 28 (1977): 40–50.
47. This claim is substantiated by the commentary on the symbolism of Desdemona’s red-spotted handkerchief in Lynda Boose, “Othello’s Handkerchief: ‘The Recognizance and Pledge of Love,’” *English Literary Renaissance* 5 (1975): 360–74, esp. 362–66; and by that in Martha Ronk, “Locating the Visual in *As You Like It*,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 52 (2001): 255–76, esp. 268.
48. For the basis of Rosalind’s magic, see Cirillo 34–37.
49. Tiffany 234. Echoing Tiffany’s judgment is Juliet Dusinberre, “As *Who* Liked It?” *Shakespeare Survey* 46 (1994): 9–21, esp. 17.

Four: *As You Like It* and the “Warwickshire” of Shakespeare’s Mind

1. Paul Alpers, *What Is Pastoral?* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996) 148–53, 158–61.
2. James P. Bednarz, *Shakespeare and the Poets’ War* (New York: Columbia UP, 2001) 117. The autobiographical burden of Colin Clout’s role in book 6 of *The Faerie Queene* is described by Humphrey Tonkin, *Spenser’s Courteous Pastoral: Book Six of the Faerie Queene* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1972) 137–39.
3. John Aubrey, *Brief Lives* (Rochester, NY: Boydell & Brewer, 1993) 286.
4. Russell Fraser, *Young Shakespeare* (New York: Columbia UP, 1988) 79–86.
5. Fraser 80.
6. Fraser 81.
7. Aubrey 285–86.
8. Fraser 30.
9. See Maurice Hunt, “Old England, Nostalgia, and the ‘Warwickshire’ of Shakespeare’s Mind,” *Connotations: A Journal for Critical Debate* 7.2 (1997/98): 159–80.
10. Mark Eccles, “The Shakespeares and the Ardens,” *Shakespeare in Warwickshire* (Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1961) 3–23.
11. Anne Barton, “Parks and Ardens,” *Essays Mainly Shakespearean* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994) 352–79, esp. 353–54. In a similar vein, see A. Stuart Daley, “Where Are the Woods in *As You Like It*?” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 34 (1983): 172–83.
12. Francis Meres, *Palladis Tamia (1598)* (New York: Scholars’ Facsimiles and Reprints, 1938) 281b–282.
13. Notable interpretations of the William of *As You Like It* as William Shakespeare include William Jones, “William Shakespeare as William in *As You Like It*,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 11 (1960): 228–31; Howard C. Cole, “The Moral Vision of *As You Like It*,” *College Literature* 3 (1976): 17–32, esp. 26–27; Jonathan Bate, *The Genius of Shakespeare* (New York: Oxford UP, 1998) 7–8; and,

- particularly, Bednarz 117–27. Bate remarks that “[t]he self-representation as tongue-tied William of Arden [in *As You Like It*] is deliciously ironic because Shakespeare’s true wit and verbal facility are amply on display in the character of Touchstone” (7).
14. Eric Sams, *The Real Shakespeare: Retrieving the Early Years, 1564–1594* (New York: Yale UP, 1995) 44–48, 206–9.
 15. See Jeanne Addison Roberts, *Shakespeare’s English Comedy: The Merry Wives of Windsor in Context* (Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1979) 27–50 passim; and William Green, *Shakespeare’s Merry Wives of Windsor* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1962) esp. 7–72.
 16. William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, ed. Alan Brissenden, *The Oxford Shakespeare, Oxford World’s Classics* (1993; Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998) 174.
 17. *As You Like It*, ed. Brissenden 174.
 18. David Riggs, *The World of Christopher Marlowe* (New York: Henry Holt, 2004) 347. Patrick Cheney, in *Marlowe’s Counterfeit Profession: Ovid, Spenser, Counter-Nationhood* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1997) esp. 3–87, 157–74, and 190–220, has also argued that Marlowe modeled his career on Ovid’s, in this case on “the paradoxically oscillating pattern of three fixed genres: amatory poetry, tragedy, and epic” (263).
 19. “Ovid challenged the emperor Caesar Augustus’s attempt to regulate the sexual behavior of Roman citizens. Writing in opposition to the Julian laws of 18 BC, which criminalized adultery, Ovid appealed to a libertine counter-nation governed by desire” (Riggs 105).
 20. Riggs 105.
 21. Bate 123.
 22. Because the words “room” and “Rome” were homonyms in early modern London pronunciation, Shakespeare perhaps punningly suggests that Ovid finds “little room” in the ironic “little Rome” of a much smaller barbarous city.
 23. Eric Sams has remarked that

[i]n the inquest on Marlowe’s death the key word was “le recknynge,” which was given as the cause of the quarrel. . . . The reckoning was not mentioned in contemporary accounts of Marlowe’s death and this detail was not discovered until 1925, so the author of *As You Like It* must have had more than common knowledge about the Deptford incident. (238)
 24. Christopher Marlowe, *The Jew of Malta, Drama of the English Renaissance, I, The Tudor Period*, ed. Russell A. Fraser & Norman Rabkin (New York: Macmillan, 1976) 263–93, esp. 266. Charles Nicholl, in *The Reckoning: The Murder of Christopher Marlowe* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1992) 72–76, esp. 73–74, finds a third allusion in *As You Like It* 4.1.86–98 to Marlowe. In Rosalind’s speech about the world being “almost six thousand years old. . . . [and] [m]en hav[ing] died from time to time. . . . but not for love” (4.1.87, 96–97), Nicholl notes a reference in Shakespeare’s evocation of the subjects of Marlowe’s popular poem, Hero and Leander, to Francis Meres’s claim that Marlowe died fighting over a lewd love (Shakespeare denies the rumor: no man died for love), as well as a reference to Marlowe’s supposed heresy, according to the informant Baines, that the world was 16,000 or more years

- old rather than the biblical 6,000. This third allusion to Marlowe is also cited by Kay Stanton, "Shakespeare's Use of Marlowe in *As You Like It*," "A Poet and a filthy Play-maker": *New Essays on Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Kenneth Friedenreich, Roma Gill, and Constance B. Kuriyama (New York: AMS Press, 1988) 23–35, esp. 23, 27–29.
25. Nicholl, with reference to this idea, concludes that Shakespeare in *As You Like It* is thinking . . . about all the fuss now surrounding Marlowe: the perturbations of the Puritans, the lies of Meres, the banning of the *Elegies*. Through the wise fool Touchstone he is saying that when a dead poet's reputation is mishandled and his work misunderstood, as Marlowe's now is, it is like a kind of second death for him: a death even worse than his first, physical death in that little room in Deptford. (75)
 26. *As You Like It*, ed. Brissenden 166.
 27. *Holy Bible, The New King James Version* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1990) 1872. Citations of scripture in this chapter are taken from this edition.
 28. Positive traits of William's character have been described by R. Chris Hassel, Jr., *Faith and Folly in Shakespeare's Romantic Comedies* (Athens: U of Georgia P, 1980) 113–14; and by A. Stuart Daley, "The Dispraise of the Country in *As You Like It*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 36 (1985): 300–14, esp. 306.
 29. For accounts of the code and operation of English primogeniture, especially in its severe effects on younger sons, see Anthony Esler, *The Aspiring Mind of the Elizabethan Younger Generation* (Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1966); and Elizabeth Mazzola, *Favorite Sons: The Politics and Poetics of the Sidney Family* (New York: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2003). Esler demonstrates that "the fundamental law" of inheritance "condemned many a younger son to social inferiority, and compelled him to win back by his own efforts the honor and authority his elder brother would simply inherit" (54–55). Mazzola, after defining primogeniture, graphically illustrates its operation in Sir Henry Sidney's concentrating his wealth and favor on his elder son Philip to the effectual dispossession of the younger son Robert (35–38). Ruth Kelso, in *The Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century* (1929; rpt. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1964), notes that "[t]he strongest argument for the English practice of primogeniture was that if the family possessions were divided among all the children, none could support the charges of maintaining high estate and the whole house must sink" (28). Louis Adrian Montrose, in "'The Place of a Brother' in *As You Like It*: Social Process and Comic Form," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 32 (1981): 28–54, argues that "primogeniture was not a binding law but a flexible social custom in which the propertied sought to perpetuate themselves by preserving their estates intact through successive generations" (34).
 30. Playgoers' inclination to compare the two Oliviers of *As You Like It* may have been encouraged by the possibility that the two roles were performed by the same actor of the Lord Chamberlain's Men. See Margaret Maurer, "Facing the Music in Arden: 'Twas I, But 'Tis not I,'" *As You Like It from 1600 to the Present*, ed. Edward Tomarken (New York and London: Garland, 1997) 475–509, esp. 491.
 31. Ann Jennalie Cook, "Shakespeare's Gentlemen," *Shakespeare Jahrbuch 1985*, ed. Werner Habicht, Deutsche Shakespeare Gesellschaft West (Bochum: Ferdinand Kamp, 1985) 9–27, esp. 19.

32. See editor David Bevington's note on this verse to this effect in *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, 5th edition (New York: Pearson/Longman, 2004) 362.
33. C. L. Barber and Richard P. Wheeler, *The Whole Journey: Shakespeare's Power of Development* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1986) 48. Stephen Greenblatt, in *Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare* (New York: Norton, 2004), provides a listing of the specific property originally held by Mary Arden that was sold off by debt-ridden John Shakespeare until "[a]ll Will's mother, Mary, had left of what she brought to the marriage was the Arden name" (61).
34. Shakespeare may have reprised this situation later in his career, when in *Pericles, Prince of Tyre* (c.1606–1608) fishermen are able to restore only his father's "rusty armor" to the destitute shipwrecked titular character (2.2.118–21). Pericles thanks his humble rescuers for "giv[ing] [him] somewhat to repair [him]self," "part of the heritage / Which [his] dead father did bequeath to [him]" (2.2.124, 125–26). Pericles calls this armor, apparently a coat of mail, a "coat of worth" (2.2.138), as though it were a coat of arms. This image is apt, for by this recovered object Pericles states that he "may appear a gentleman" in Simonides' court (2.2.143). Shakespeare however undercuts the dignity and worth of this armorial coat of arms by showing Pericles compelled to beg the fishermen to give him the coat and to listen to their crass reminder that later, when he has some money, he ought to feel obliged to compensate them financially for what he has begged of them (2.2.138, 150–54).
35. S[amuel] Schoenbaum, *Shakespeare's Lives* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970) 642. Also see Greenblatt, who assumes that Gilbert was a provincial rather than a London haberdasher (66, 78). Mark Eccles claims that the haberdasher Gilbert Shakespeare, who—according to the local register—died in Stratford "adolescens" (unmarried), "lived in both Stratford and London" (107–8).
36. Katherine Duncan-Jones, *Ungentle Shakespeare: Scenes from His Life*, The Arden Shakespeare (London: Thomson Learning, 2001) 200. Also see Eccles 107.
37. Duncan-Jones 200.
38. For a postmodern psychoanalytic reading of Oliver's hatred of his younger brother Orlando as grounded in Shakespeare's presumed infant hatred of Gilbert Shakespeare for displacing him from mother Mary's breast, see the finely spun analysis of William Kerrigan, "Female Friends and Fraternal Enemies in *As You Like It*," *Desire in the Renaissance: Psychoanalysis and Literature*, ed. Valeria Finucci and Regina Schwartz (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1994) 184–203, esp. 195–98. Kerrigan concludes that "Oliver forcing his younger brother to eat with the servants seems from this perspective an appropriate revenge" (195).
39. Sir Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, ed. Maurice Evans (New York: Penguin, 1977) 275–83.
40. It is possible that Shakespeare, when he first considered changing the name of the bastard brother in the source story in Sidney's *Arcadia*, thought of his brother Edmund, perhaps currently acting for the King's Men or a nearby theater company, because his brother's illegitimate "infant" [child] who would later die in 1607 may have been born during the composition of one of the texts of *King Lear*—a possibility that may have associated the name Edmund with bastardy in Shakespeare's mind.

41. *Holy Bible* 1551.
42. So noted by Alan Brissenden, *As You Like It* 99, who cites as his authority Richmond Noble, *Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge* (1935; rpt. New York: Octagon, 1970) 277–78.
43. *Holy Bible* 1544. This quotation is the gloss on Luke 12:13: “Then one from the crowd said to Him, ‘Teacher, tell my brother to divide the inheritance with me.’” The quotation cited in my text also constitutes in the New King James version the referent for understanding Luke 15:12.
44. Commentators on the parable of the lost son sometimes claim that the elder son represents the Pharisee who fails to enjoy his inheritance. Andrew Barnaby, in “The Political Conscious of Shakespeare’s *As You Like It*,” *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 36 (1996): 373–95, esp. 382–84, provides a reading different from mine of the relevance of the parable of the lost son for *As You Like It*.
45. Ben Jonson, *Discoveries 1641, Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden 1619*, ed. G. B. Harrison, Elizabethan and Jacobean Quartos (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1966) 28.
46. Ambivalence in *As You Like It* in the strength of affection—or lack thereof—between father and son may mirror a similar ambiguity in Tudor society. Lawrence Stone, notably in *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500–1800* (New York: Harper and Row, 1977) esp. 93–218, argued that affection between members of the early modern, or pre-modern, English nuclear family was less intense, less pronounced, than that circulating among members of its modern counterpart. Stone’s claim, however, was afterward denied by the research of scholars such as J. A. Sharpe, *Early Modern England: A Social History 1550–1760* (London: Edward Arnold, 1987) 57–76; Ralph Houlbrooke (ed.), *English Family Life, 1576–1716: An Anthology from Diaries* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988) esp. 136, 142, 152; and David Cressy, *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997) esp. 393, 394. Despite important challenges to Stone’s argument, some truth nevertheless appears to reside within it. My speculative analyses of the father-son bond in *As You Like It* and in Shakespeare’s life may reflect an Elizabethan affective phenomenon more complex than has been conjectured.
47. Barber and Wheeler 48.
48. Barber and Wheeler 48.
49. Jonathan Bate, “Deep England,” April 9, 2004; 32nd Annual Meeting, Shakespeare Association of America; The Fairmont Hotel, New Orleans, LA.
50. Concerning this restoration of Oliver’s, Alan Brissenden notes that “[e]ither Oliver, or Shakespeare, has forgotten that Duke Frederick has confiscated the de Boys estate [at 3.1.9–12]” (*As You Like It* 210). Rather than being a memory lapse on Shakespeare’s part (the obvious explanation), this discrepancy reveals, in my opinion, the playwright’s determination to realize repeatedly in the latter part of the play a fantasy of wealth acquired (and shared) through primogeniture or its equivalent.
51. [S]amuel Schoenbaum 25.
52. In his *Shakespeare's Lives*, Schoenbaum states,

Diligent research would show that [the minor] William could not have obtained a license without the express willingness of his

father, and that, when the groom was a minor, the bondsmen were customary friends or kindred of the bride chosen to safeguard her interests. It would be pointed out that banns were prohibited from Advent Sunday (December 2nd in 1582) until January 13th: without a special dispensation the couple would have had to wait two months to wed, and Anne's [pregnant] condition made such a delay awkward. (25)

53. Schoenbaum 23.
54. Schoenbaum 23.
55. Schoenbaum 27. This report is attributed to Ben Jonson, in his *Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthorndon*.
56. Aubrey 285.
57. Qtd. in Schoenbaum 54.
58. The argument of this paragraph is a general impression, admittedly not based on a systematic count of the facetious, punning utterances of Shakespeare's leading female characters. Rosalind's namesake Rosaline in *Love's Labor's Lost* seems to be nearly as verbally witty, notably in punning, as Rosalind. The shared name may be significant in this respect.

Five: Becoming a Gentleman in *As You Like It*

1. Thomas Dekker, *The Shoemaker's Holiday: A Pleasant Comedy of the Gentle Craft, Drama of the English Renaissance, I, The Tudor Period*, ed. Russell A. Fraser and Norman Rabkin (New York: Macmillan, 1976) 481–509, esp. 496, 497, 507.
2. William Shakespeare, *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington, 5th edition (New York: Pearson/Longman, 2004) 905.
3. For a description of Elizabethan books related to the conduct of a gentleman, see Ruth Kelso, *The Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century* (1929; rpt. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1964).
4. Stephen Greenblatt, *Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare* (New York: Norton, 2004) 78.
5. Ben Jonson, *Every Man Out of His Humour*, ed. Helen Ostovich, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2001) 107. All quotations of *Every Man Out of His Humour* are taken from this edition.
6. See James Bednarz, *Shakespeare and the Poets' War* (New York: Columbia UP, 2001) 113–14.
7. Lawrence Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558–1641* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966) 66–71.
8. Katherine Duncan-Jones, *Ungentle Shakespeare: Scenes from His Life* (London: Thomson Learning, 2001) 100–1.
9. Henry Peacham, *The Complete Gentleman, The Truth of Our Times, and The Art of Living in London*, ed. Virgil B. Heltzel (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1962) 3–174, esp. 23. Bruce R. Smith, in *Shakespeare and Masculinity*, Oxford Special Topics (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000) 59, also cites this writing of Peacham's to note that Shakespeare's claim for armigerous status had to be grounded in John Shakespeare's status. Peacham anticipates his judgment

that a stage player could never be a gentleman in the actor metaphor of the following passage:

Neither must we honor or esteem those ennobled or made gentle in blood who by mechanic and base means have raked up a mass of wealth, or because they follow some great man, wear the cloth of a noble personage, or have purchased an ill coat at a good rate, no more than a player upon the stage for wearing a lord's cast coat, since nobility hangeth not upon the airy esteem of vulgar opinion, but is indeed of itself essential and absolute. (13)

10. Greenblatt 80.
11. Bednarz, *Shakespeare and the Poets' War* 114. Katherine Duncan-Jones remarks that
 [t]he Archbishop of Canterbury's inordinately long "Salic law" speech [in Shakespeare's *Henry V*], surprisingly appears in full even in the 1600 "bad" Quarto text. Its defence of the legitimacy of descent through the female line can be seen as reflecting Shakespeare's own preoccupations in the year [1599] in which he attempted, unsuccessfully, to have the new Shakespeare arms quartered with those of his mother's forebears, the Ardens. (110)
12. Bednarz, *Shakespeare and the Poets' War* 114.
13. Juliet Dusinberre, "Pancakes and a Date for *As You Like It*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 54 (2003): 371–405, esp. 380. Dusinberre concludes that Touchstone's reference to pancakes indicates that *As You Like It* was first performed on 20 February 1599 before the Queen in the Great Hall of Richmond Palace because this was Shrove Tuesday, on the night of which pancakes were traditionally served throughout England. This early date however apparently precludes two allusions often heard in the play, to the 1 June 1599 ban against the publication of verse satire (1.2.82–84) and to the play's performance in the new Globe Theater (2.7.139). Dusinberre's date also appears to preclude any allusion in *As You Like It* to Jonson's *Every Man Out of His Humour*, since the first performance of this play at the Globe Theater almost certainly occurred sometime between August or September and later December 1599. Nevertheless, it is possible to subscribe to Dusinberre's argument for a February 1599 date for *As You Like It*, and argue that the allusions to Jonson's *Every Man Out*—as well as those to the Bishops' ban and performance at the Globe—were added to an early script of *As You Like It*, with the revised script providing the basis for the 1623 Folio text of the comedy (the only text in existence).
14. I am anticipated in this paragraph's argument detrimental to Jonson and involving Sogliardo and these passages of *Every Man Out of His Humour* by James Bednarz, "Shakespeare's Purge of Jonson: The Literary Context of *Troilus and Cressida*," *Shakespeare Studies* 21 (1993): 175–212, esp. 179; and, notably, by Grace Tiffany, *Erotic Beasts and Social Monsters: Shakespeare, Jonson, and Comic Androgyny* (Newark: U of Delaware P, 1995) 221.
15. Knighthood in England had been devalued when the Earl of Essex and Lord Howard of Effingham had by themselves instantly made sixty-eight soldiers knights during the 1596 Cadiz expedition, an inflation swelled by Essex's

impulsive creation of eighty-one more knights during the 1599 Irish campaign (Stone 72–73). Shakespeare's seemingly incongruous association of Jonson with knighthood appears designed to capitalize upon this late Elizabethan deflation of knighthood's value.

16. David Riggs, *Ben Jonson: A Life* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1989) 49–53.
17. One of Jonson's thumbs was branded with the letter "T" (for Tyburn, where he would have been hanged). When in autumn 1598, Jonson "walked out of the Old Bailey utterly destitute, a branded felon whose [recently adopted Roman Catholicism] would continue to identify him as a criminal," he "abruptly resumed his old trade of bricklaying. Between October 6, 1598, and January 31, 1599, Jonson managed to become a member of the Worshipful Company of Tilers and Bricklayers" (Riggs 53). That Jonson was not far from Shakespeare's thoughts when he composed *Touchstone's* remarks about a knight, pancakes, and mustard is suggested by Celia's response to one of *Touchstone's* jests in conversation shortly after the passage vilifying Jonson: "Well said. That was laid on with a trowel" (1.2.96). A trowel is the defining tool of a bricklayer, precisely the profession that Jonson appears to have reassumed just before (or while) Shakespeare wrote *As You Like It*.
18. For the late Elizabethan craze of verse satire, see C. S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954) 468–78.
19. See Alvin B. Kernan, *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance*, Yale Studies in English 142 (New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1959) esp. 137–38, 156–63.
20. Making the argument most fully that Jonson informs Jaques' characterization in *As You Like It*, and that the association is not complimentary of Jonson, is Tiffany 185–92. Cf. however Russ McDonald, *Shakespeare & Jonson / Jonson & Shakespeare* (Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1988) 77–78.
21. For the classic analysis of the relation of Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* to Jonsonian dramatic satire, and indirectly to the verse satires of the end of the sixteenth century, see Oscar James Campbell, *Comical Satyre and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1938).
22. Campbell notes that Shakespeare's and Jonson's fellow actor Will Kempe, in the second part of *The Return from Parnassus* (c. 1601–2), exclaims, "'O that *Ben Jonson* is a pestilent fellow, he brought up *Horace* giving the Poets a pill [i.e., in *Poetaster*], but our fellow Shakespeare hath given him a purge that made him betray his credit'" (218). Because *Poetaster* is dated 1601 (later than the date proposed for *As You Like It*), "almost all critics agree that, if a purge of that sort exists in any of Shakespeare's work, it is embodied in the character of Ajax [in *Troilus and Cressida*]" (Campbell 218).
23. Shakespeare may have rationalized this exceptional lapse by reflecting that he had made the stinging of Jonson so veiled that only Jonson and a few others would be aware of it.
24. James Cleland, *Hero-paideia: or, The Institution of a Yovng Noble Man* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1607) 168.

25. The basic treatment of this subject in Shakespeare's plays is Ann Jennalie Cook, "Shakespeare's Gentlemen," *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* 1985, ed. Werner Habicht, Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft West (Bochum: Ferdinand Camp, 1985) 9–27. Also see Camille Wells Slight, "The Two Gentlemen of Verona and the Courtesy Book Tradition," *Shakespeare Studies* 16 (1983): 13–31. A seminal, still readable analysis of the subject appears in the previously cited Kelso, *The Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century*.
26. For a convincing case-by-case documentation of the pervasiveness and severity of acts of physical violence between and among Elizabethan gentlemen, see Stone 223–50. "The extreme caution, even timidity, displayed by [Queen] Elizabeth and [Lord] Burghley in the face of aristocratic violence is striking evidence of the insecurity of their position" (Stone 237).
27. Cleland, Chapter 27, "Of the single combate" 232–39, esp. 236, 237–38.
28. John Ferne, *The Blazon of Gentrie* (London: John Windet, 1586) 302–41.
29. Ferne 310ff.
30. Stone 242–50, esp. 243. For more on the Elizabethan innovation of ceremonial yet bloody sword and rapier dueling, see Anthony Esler, *The Aspiring Mind of the Elizabethan Younger Generation* (Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1966) 105–8.
31. Kelso 103. Kelso finds the argument that "the duel is necessary to prevent civil war" in book 4, chapter 7 of Jean Bodin's *Six Livres de la République* (1576), which was translated into English by Richard Knolles as *The Six Bookes of a Commonwealth* (publ. 1606). Kelso nicely describes how dueling became a compulsive trait of Elizabethan gentlemen (99–105).
32. Stefano Guazzo, *The Civile Conversation of M. Steeven Guazzo*, trans. George Pettie and Bartholomew Young (1581, 1586; rpt. London: Constable & Co., 1925) 2:195.
33. Cook points out that Ruth Kelso's bibliography in *The Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century* lists almost one-thousand new books in this period devoted to "defining the gentleman and prescribing courses for training him" (11).
34. Esler 113.
35. Stone 247.
36. Six times Laertes is called a gentleman immediately prior to his duel with Hamlet: twice by Osric (5.2.107, 111) and four times by Hamlet (5.2.122–23, 127–28, 173, 225).
37. Ben Jonson, for example, in his poem, "To the memory of my beloved, the Author Mr. William Shakespeare," prefixed to the *Shakespeare First Folio* (1623), wrote: "Yet must I not giue Nature all: Thy Art, my gentle Shakespeare, must enjoy a part." After examining the data informing a Shakespeare biography, the antiquary J. O. Halliwell-Phillips concluded that his subject was "universally esteemed [by his contemporaries] as gentle and amiable" (Qtd. in S[amuel] Schoenbaum, *Shakespeare's Lives* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970] 411).
38. Cook 10.
39. Cook 16.
40. Slight 26–29.
41. The requirement of gentle blood for a gentleman is typically set forth by John Ferne at the beginning of *The Blazon of Gentrie* 14–15. For the biological

and cultural assumptions underlying this opinion, usually presented with reference to Shakespeare's plays, see David S. Berkeley, *Blood Will Tell in Shakespeare's Plays* (Lubbock: Texas Tech University, 1984); and his essay, "Shakespeare's *Severall Degrees in Bloud*," *Shakespeare's Theories of Blood, Character, and Class: A Festschrift in Honor of David Shelley Berkeley*, ed. Peter C. Rollins and Alan Smith (New York: Peter Lang, 2001) 7–18. For the argument that *As You Like It* is designed to demonstrate that only inherited gentle blood can make a gentleman or gentlewoman, notably an Orlando, Rosalind, and Duke Senior, see Dilin Liu and Anumarla Govindan, "From *Rosalynde* to *As You Like It*: Shakespeare's Celebration of Blood Order," in *Shakespeare's Theories of Blood, Character, and Class* 61–76. Unlike the categorical, no-exception claims of David Berkeley and his former students, I argue in the present chapter that Shakespeare shows in *As You Like It*, as he does throughout the canon, that the possession of certain character traits not usually thought of as restricted to born gentlemen and gentlewomen is more important than inherited gentle blood in conferring and defining gentle status.

42. Cf., however, Shakespeare's satire of the "born" gentleman in *The Winter's Tale* 5.2.128–47.
43. Quoted from *As You Like It*, ed. Richard Knowles, A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare (New York: MLA, 1977) 16.
44. Knowles 16.
45. William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, ed. Agnes Latham, The Arden Shakespeare (London: Methuen, 1975) 5; William Shakespeare, *As You Like It, The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans et al., 2nd edition (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997) 399–436, esp. 404; William Shakespeare, *As You Like It, The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: Norton, 1997) 1591–1657, esp. 1601; *As You Like It, The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington 293–332, esp. 299.
46. Knowles 16.
47. On this precedent set by Macready, see Cynthia Marshall, *As You Like It, Shakespeare in Production* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004) 101.
48. Knowles 17.
49. William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, ed. Alan Brissenden, The Oxford Shakespeare, Oxford World's Classics (1993; rpt. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998) 101.
50. Baldassare Castiglione, *The Book of The Courtier*, trans. Sir Thomas Hoby (London: Dent, 1928) 31–35, esp. 31. Interestingly, Castiglione notes that the courtier's virtues can be seen, not only in his "learning to handle sundrie kind of weapons" but also in "wrestling" and in public displays of other kinds of physical activities such as vaulting (45).
51. Castiglione 68.
52. Castiglione 133.
53. Castiglione 271, 272.
54. Cleland 206–7.
55. Marshall 4.
56. Marshall 170.
57. Marshall 213–14. Marshall notes that in Stein's staging, after "the hart was skinned, . . . one lord wore its hide and another its horns in a primitive dance" (81).

58. Marshall 76, 92.
59. Most likely a staging of details of the graphic violence involved in killing a hart works incidentally to remind playgoers of what its literal laceration and death would be like, so that theater-goers intensely realize that the Petrarchan conceit of the death of the lover's hart/heart remains a fanciful fiction.
60. Brissenden glosses Rosalind's phrase "broken music" in her utterance as "[m]usic played by a combination of different kinds of instruments," and claims that she "is making a pun comparing the fractured bones of the young man with the broken ribs of a smashed instrument, such as a lute" (*As You Like It* 111).
61. Marshall 76.
62. The lion symbolizes the deadly sin of wrath most memorably for Shakespeare's generation in Edmund Spenser's pageant of the seven deadly sins in book 1, canto 4 of *The Faerie Queene*: "And [*Envy*] beside rides fierce reuenging *Wrath*, / Vpon a Lion, loth for to be led" (1.4.33.1–2) (Edmund Spenser, *Spenser: The Faerie Qveene*, ed. A. C. Hamilton; text ed. Hiroshi Yamashita & Toshiyuki Suzuki, Longman Annotated English Poets, 2nd edition [Harlow, UK: Longman, 2001] 68).
63. Cleland, chapter 14, *The Institution of a Young Noble Man* 201–5.
64. Cleland 185. The speech of Shakespeare's gentlemen in *As You Like It*, particularly that of Duke Senior and Orlando, illustrates the perspicacity, lack of linguistic affectation, and relatively natural eloquence recommended by Cleland (184–89) and Stefano Guazzo (1:124–27) in their directives for gentle, or noble, speech.
65. Shakespeare in *The Merchant of Venice* (c.1596–1597) associates Bassanio's giving of "rare new liveries" with Lancelot Gobbo's intention of giving Bassanio "a dish of doves." Lancelot's complete utterance involving the rare liveries is addressed to his father Old Gobbo, who has brought a brace of doves as a present for his son's master, Shylock. "Give me your present to one Master Bassanio, who indeed gives rare new liveries" (2.2.103–5), Lancelot however says. James Hall, in his *Dictionary of Subjects and Symbols in Art* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974) esp. 109, catalogues several of the many painterly versions of the dove as a symbol for the Holy Ghost. (Pigeons carry this symbolic burden in *Titus Andronicus* [c.1589–1592] 4.3.89–93; see Maurice Hunt, "Compelling Art in *Titus Andronicus*," *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 28 [1988]: 197–218, esp. 205, 216). When Old Gobbo gives these doves to Bassanio instead of Shylock on Lancelot's behalf, they earn the son "a livery / More guarded [trimmed with braided ornament] than [that] of his fellows" (2.2.146–47). Shakespeare subtly implies in *The Merchant of Venice* that this "fresh array" is connected to Christian love and grace. The same connotation arises less distinctly in *As You Like It* in Duke Senior's special dressing of Oliver.
66. The cousins' gentle status is underscored indirectly when Second Lord identifies "Hisperia, the Princess' gentlewoman" as the source of the belief that Orlando is somehow associated with the disappearance of the young women from the court (2.2.10). Even the lower classes at the Globe Theater understood that a gentlewoman serves gentlewomen equal or more elevated in rank than herself.

67. When Phoebe addresses Ganymede, "Sweet youth, I pray you chide a year together. / I had rather hear you chide than this man woo" (3.5.65–66), she may insure the futility of Rosalind's homeopathic purge. Rather than applying Rosalind's harsh criticism of her physical appearance and her manners to herself and reforming, Phoebe may simply want endlessly to hear this scoffing, simply because Ganymede's anger makes "him" attractive to her. "[S]he'll fall in love with my anger," Rosalind tells Silvius in an aside; "if it be so, as fast as she answers thee with frowning looks, I'll sauce her with bitter words" (3.5.68–70). But these "bitter words" may merely serve to make Ganymede seem more attractively angry. Furthermore, Rosalind's transvestism undoes her purpose, even as Viola loses her purpose in *Twelfth Night* when Olivia's love for Cesario complicates Viola's wish to love Orsino and be loved by him in return. "Disguise, I see, thou art a wickedness / Wherein the pregnant enemy does much" (*Twelfth Night*, 2.2.27–28), Viola laments, once she realizes that Olivia has fallen in love with her costume. Similarly, Rosalind's reformation of Phoebe may become impossible when the shepherdess unexpectedly falls in love with her own pride reflected in the (calculated) prideful (scoffing) behavior of "pretty" Ganymede. "It is a pretty youth," Phoebe tells Silvius; "not very pretty—but sure he's proud; and yet his pride becomes him. He'll make a proper man" (3.5.114–16). Still, in the last analysis, Rosalind's homeopathy may have silently had its purgative effect. For at play's end, Phoebe accepts Silvius in an apparently new spirit: "I will not eat my word [her pledge to marry Silvius, if she cannot marry Ganymede]. Now [Silvius] thou art mine, / Thy faith my fancy to thee doth combine" (5.4.144–45). This last verse seems to indicate that Phoebe, aware of the depth of Silvius's faithful love, sees and loves him in a deeper, comparable imaginative light.
68. Knowles 163. Knowles points out that Horace Howard Furness, in 1890, remarked that
 "Spedding's emendation, *pulpiter* . . . is plausible and alluring. It is the word of all words to introduce the train of thought that follows [it], with which 'Jupiter' has no connection . . . Moreover, 'Jupiter' is not printed in Italics [in the Folio text] as though it were a proper name . . . and as it is printed in the only other place where it is used in this play [2.4.1]; which adds to the likelihood that it is here a misprint . . . But, on the other hand the text is clear without [Spedding's emendation]; once before Rosalind has appealed to 'Jupiter' [2.4.1], and to use this mouth-filling oath, which is 'not dangerous,' may have been one of her characteristics, as certainly the use of expletives in general is." (163)
69. Knowles 164.
70. Knowles 164.
71. Louis A. Montrose, "Of Gentlemen and Shepherds: The Politics of Elizabethan Pastoral Form," *ELH* 50 (1983): 415–59, esp. 426–30. Montrose adopts the four-part classification of Thomas Smith, *De Republica Anglorum* (1583), noting that "[t]he first group [of gentlemen] encompassed the entire social elite, from the monarch and peers down to simple gentlemen—not only country gentry but wealthy bourgeois social climbers who invested in land, and university educated professionals, clergy, and scholars" (429).

72. Peter Laslett, *The World We Have Lost* (New York: Scribner, 1973) 27.
73. For Shakespeare's status as playwright, as a laborer in his art, see Maurice Hunt, *Shakespeare's Labored Art* (New York: Peter Lang, 1995) 259–78, esp. 264. David Riggs notes the twice-repeated use of the word "playwright" for dramatist in Jonson's *Epicæne* (1609), in which it appears as a term of abuse (25). Riggs presents the most thorough and illuminating analysis to date of the workman status of public dramatists in Elizabethan England.
74. Thomas Smith, *De Republica Anglorum: A Discourse on the Commonwealth of England*, ed. Leonard Alston (1906; rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1972) 40.

Six: Transvestite As You Like It

1. Bruce R. Smith, *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England: A Cultural Poetics* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991) 151.
2. Lisa Jardine, in *Still Harping on Daughters: Women and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare* (Brighton, UK: Harvester P, 1983) 30–32, makes essentially the same claim as Smith does about Julia's and Lucetta's dialogue in *Two Gentlemen* 2.7; like him, she fails to realize that their talk is agonistic.
3. William Shakespeare, *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington, 5th edition (New York: Pearson/Longman, 2004) 91.
4. Maurice Hunt, "The Two Gentlemen of Verona and the Paradox of Salvation," *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature* 36.1 (1982): 5–22, esp. 9–11, 12–16; and "Catholicism, Protestant Reformation, and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*," *Shakespeare's Religious Allusiveness: Its Play and Tolerance* (Aldershot, UK; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004) 1–17, esp. 1–3. "By taking the name Sebastian for her male persona, Julia associates herself with a prototypic Christian martyr, converting her pilgrimage of love into a Catholic exercise of mortifying service redemptive for a fallen young man—her beloved Proteus" (1–2).
5. Sir Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, ed. Maurice Evans (New York: Penguin, 1977) 350–51, 359–67.
6. Sidney 238.
7. Sidney 239.
8. Sidney 130–35.
9. Sidney 133. In Musidorus's words, Amazonian Pyrocles "utterly subverts the course of nature in making reason give place to sense, and man to woman" (133).
10. All citations of *James the Fourth* are from Robert Greene, *The Scottish History of James the Fourth*, ed. Norman Sanders, *The Revels Plays* (London: Methuen, 1970).
11. The dramatic romance *Clyomon and Clamydes* (1576 Stationers' Register), possibly by Thomas Preston, reveals in dramatic romance the type of suffering transvestite heroine encountered in Sidney's prose romance. Neronis disguises herself as a male page/squire and ends up faithfully serving her beloved knight, Clyomon. Even as Imogen would later in a transvestite identity embody faithfulness by suffering the enormity of "male" adversity, transvestite Neronis tells unsuspecting Clyomon that her name is "C[oe]ur Daceer" ("Heart of Steel"). She proves, through constant service, to have a heart of steel regarding her love for this knight, who comes to appreciate her service

and thus returns her affection when she reveals her female self and he knows what she has had to endure (*Clyomon and Clamydes*, ed. W. W. Greg, Malone Society Reprints [Oxford: Oxford UP, 1913]; Maurice Hunt, "Romance and Tragicomedy," *A Companion to Renaissance Drama*, ed. Arthur F. Kinney [Oxford: Blackwell, 2002] 384–98, esp. 386–87).

12. Smith 152.

13. Smith 152–53.

14. Disguised as an armed knight "full of amiable grace, / And manly terror mixed therewithall" (3.1.46.1–2), female Britomart, early in book 3 of *The Faerie Queene* (1590), provokes lustful feelings in Malecasta (Edmund Spenser, *Spenser: The Faerie Queene*, ed. A. C. Hamilton; text ed. Hiroshi Yamashita and Toshiyuki Suzuki, Longman Annotated English Poets [Harlow, UK: Longman, 2001] 297):

Whom when the Lady saw so faire a wight,
 All ignorant of her contrary sex,
 (For shee her weend a fresh and lusty knight)
 Shee greatly gan enamoured to wex,
 And with vaine thoughts her falsed fancy vex:
 Her fickle hart conceiued hasty fyre,
 Like sparkes of fire, which fall in sclender flex,
 That shortly brent into extreme desyre,
 And ransackt all her veines with passion entyre.

(3.1.47)

Britomart soon becomes aware, in Malecasta's "crafty glaunce," of her lust for the man she imagines Britomart to be; but she "dissembled it with ignoraunce" (3.1.50.6, 9). Near the end of a sensual banquet, Malecasta, sobbing, confesses her sexual desire for the knight. Surprisingly, Britomart does not condemn Malecasta; because she too burns secretly, painfully, in love (for Artegall), she pities Malecasta's passion and also believes that "great rebuke it is, loue to despise, / or rudely sdeigne a gentle harts request" (3.1.55.3–4).

The homoerotic overtones of Britomart's refusal to rebuke Malecasta's passion for her are allegorically figured in the wound that Malecasta's protective courtier, Gardante (Lecherous Gazing), inflicts upon Britomart once she has jumped from her bed, disturbed by Malecasta who has crept into it to fondle the knight. Gardante's arrow "gore[s] [Britomart's] side, yet was the wound not deepe, / But lightly rased her soft silken skin, / That drops of purple blood thereout did weepe, / Which did her lilly smock with staines of vermeil steep" (3.1.65.6–9). A. C. Hamilton rightly notes that here "[t]he gored side is a sexual wound" (Spenser, *Spenser: The Faerie Queene* 300). But rather than signifying the womb (Britomart's and Malecasta's relationship could not involve generation) or the male sexual wound in the thigh (two women are involved in this scenario), Britomart's bleeding wound represents her vulnerability to the female homoerotic gaze. The shallowness of this wound, the razing rather than the penetration of Britomart's skin, suggests that Britomart is not likely to succumb to female homoerotic desire. But it does suggest that her transvestite identity, involving the opposite sex, has entailed homosexual attraction in at least one, if not both, participants in a sexual wooing.

When lecherous Malecasta slinks toward Britomart's bed, she "with a scarlott mantle couered [herself], / That was with gold and Ermines faire enuloped" (3.1.59.8–9). Symbolic of absolute purity in Petrarch's *Triumph of Chastity* and in the next canto of *The Faerie Queene* (3.2.25.7–9), the white-furred ermine had become a personal symbol of the Virgin Queen, Elizabeth; in the April Eclogue of *The Shepheardes Calender* (1579), Elizabeth ("Elisa, Queene of shepardenes all") appears "Yclad in Scarlot like a mayden Queene, / And Ermines white" (34, 57–58) (Edmund Spenser, *The Shepheardes Calender, The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser*, ed. William A. Oram et al. [New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1989] 1–213, esp. 72, 73). Sidney in *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia* also associates the ermine with a simulacrum of Queen Elizabeth, Helen of Corinth (164–65). (Maurice Hunt, "The Double Figure of Elizabeth in *Love's Labor's Lost*," *Essays in Literature* 19 [1992]: 173–92, esp. 187–88.) A crowned ermine in fact appeared on the left sleeve of Elizabeth in the 1585 "Ermine" portrait of the Queen (Roy Strong, *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* [London: Thames & Hudson, 1987] 113–15; *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* [Wallop, Hampshire, UK: BAS Printers, 1977] 147–49). Spenser appears to have reprised his iconography of Elizabeth in the April Eclogue of *The Shepheardes Calender* in the color and embroidery of Malecasta's nightgown in *The Faerie Queene*, presumably to accentuate her promiscuous sexuality by ironic contrast with his Queen's official virginity. Despite this presumed effect, the evocation of Elizabeth in Malecasta operates as one of Spenser's many subversive comments on the royal woman who frustrated his desire for patronage. In this case, the potential female homoerotic element in a "mannish" royal woman who used masculine pronouns in reference to herself and refused to marry a man materializes ever so briefly.

15. Quotation from *Gallathea* is taken from the text of the play in John Lyly, *Gallathea and Midas*, ed. Anne Begor Lancashire, Regents Renaissance Drama Series (Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1969). Since forms of the word "lesbian" described female homoerotic desire only long after Shakespeare's age, I refer in the following paragraphs to the attraction now conveyed by this word by the phrase "female homoeroticism."
16. To compound this homoeroticism, Lyly shows Diana's nymphs falling in love with either "beautiful" Melebeus or Tityrus, the names that Gallathea and Phyllida have given themselves (3.1.1–116, esp. 92), and fighting among themselves over the objects of their desire.
17. Commentators on *Gallathea* who have emphasized not only the female-female but also the male-male homoeroticism of the play—after all, boys playing women appearing as boys physically and verbally express sexual passion for each other—include Joel B. Altman, *The Tudor Play of Mind: Rhetorical Inquiry and the Development of Elizabethan Drama* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1978) 123; Michael Shapiro, *Gender in Play on the Shakespearean Stage: Boy Heroines and Female Pages* (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1994) 94–97; Michael Pincombe, *The Plays of John Lyly: Eros and Eliza* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1996) 130, 139–43; Kent Cartwright, "The Confusions of *Gallathea*: John Lyly as Popular Dramatist," *Comparative Drama* 32 (1998): 207–39, esp. 217–19; Theodora A. Jankowski, "'Where There Can Be No Cause of Affection': Redefining

Virgins, Their Desires, and Their Pleasures in John Lyly's *Gallathea*," *Feminist Readings of Early Modern Culture: Emerging Subjects*, ed. Valerie Traub, M. Lindsay Kaplan, and Dymphna Callaghan (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996) 253–74, esp. 260–67; and Mark Dooley, "Inversion, Metamorphosis, and Sexual Difference: Female Same-Sex Desire in Ovid and Lyly," *Ovid and the Renaissance Body*, ed. Goran V. Stanivukovic (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2001) 59–76. Cf., however, Christopher Wixson, "Cross-Dressing and John Lyly's *Gallathea*," *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 41 (2001): 241–56, who argues that the subversive effects of Gallathea's and Phyllida's cross-dressing are "more social than sexual" (250). Still, Wixson acknowledges and documents in the cross-dressed women of the play the presence of female homoeroticism of a subversive nature (251–53).

18. See, for example, the hermaphrodite that Scudamour and Amoret become at the end of book 3 of the 1590 edition of *The Faerie Queene* (3.1.44–47). Also see Ellen Caldwell, "John Lyly's *Gallathea*: A New Rhetoric of Love for the Virgin Queen," *English Literary Renaissance* 17 (1987): 22–40, esp. 30–32; and Leah S. Marcus, *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Reading and Its Discontents* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1988) 69–87.
19. The best account of Lyly's creation in *Gallathea* of a universe of constant mutability, of an Ovidian world in ceaseless flux, is provided by Leah Scragg, *The Metamorphosis of Gallathea: A Study in Creative Adaptation* (Washington, DC: UP of America, 1982) 15–35. Scragg precisely summarizes the complex sexual indeterminacy of Phyllida and especially of Gallathea (23).
20. Jankowski also notes that

choirboys [in the plays of children's companies] often became objects of audience members' erotic interest. One source of humour in comedies put on by boy companies was the disparity between the implied sexual innocence of the actors and the often bawdy sophistication of the lines they spoke. Such a juxtaposition would foreground the boys' youth and suggest that the desire they generated was pederastic. (266)
21. G. K. Hunter, in *John Lyly: The Humanist as Courtier* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962) 310–13, explains at length how in Shakespeare's *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* Julia's transvestite disguise enables the "lived-through" growth of her understanding of romantic love's comprehensive nature, and of its pathos, by comparison with the absence in Lyly's *Gallathea* of similar awarenesses through growth within the disguised Gallathea and Phyllida.
22. Michael Pincombe asserts that "[e]ven those critics most devoted to allegorical interpretations of Lyly's plays have drawn a blank with *Galatea*" (135–36). Pincombe cites R. Warwick Bond's opinion that "'Of Allegory in [*Gallathea*] there is very little'" (144; John Lyly, *The Complete Works of John Lyly*, ed. R. Warwick Bond [1902; rpt. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1973] 3:424).
23. This is the allegorical reading of the play given by Anne B. Lancashire in the Introduction of her edition, *Gallathea and Midas* xi–xxxi, esp. xxi–xxii, xxiii–xxvii. "[I]n the Venus-Diana debate [Lyly suggests] that Diana herself may be fated eventually to love, for on one level of the play Diana allegorically represents Queen Elizabeth, goddess-like in power and chastity, and yet a mortal woman: *Telusa* 'Diana cannot yield; she conquers affection.' / *Cupid* 'Diana shall yield; she cannot conquer destiny' (IV.ii.80–90)" (Lancashire xxv). Other

sustained allegorical readings of *Gallathea* appear in Caldwell 22–40; Philippa Berry, *Of Chastity and Power: Elizabethan Literature and the Unmarried Queen* (New York: Routledge, 1989) 123–25; and Jacqueline A. Vanhoutte, “Sacrifice, Violence, and The Virgin Queen in Lyly’s *Gallathea*,” *Cahiers Élisabéthains* 49 (April 1996): 1–14. None of these allegorical readings—respectively, of Queen Elizabeth’s divided nature, of a mystical union of love and chastity, and of the Queen’s androgyny as a form of public sacrifice—is as plausible as Lancaster’s interpretation. Despite his claim that most commentators on *Gallathea* find little allegory in the play, Pincombe goes on to claim briefly that a confused allegory, of which Lyly may not have been fully aware, can be found in *Gallathea* depicting “the cult of virginity as a tyrannical erotic régime” (136–38, esp. 136). Lyly botches this allegory, Pincombe claims, by losing control of the symbolism of Diana in it (138).

24. Phyllis Rackin, in “Androgyny, Mimesis, and the Marriage of the Boy Heroine on the English Renaissance Stage,” *PMLA* 102 (1987): 29–41, also places Lyly’s *Gallathea* at one end of a spectrum of early modern English plays—with the other end represented by Ben Jonson’s *Epicoene* (1609)—in an analysis which claims to show a change in the value of the female transvestite character. (Rackin includes Shakespeare’s *Merchant of Venice*, *As You Like It*, and *Twelfth Night* in this analysis.) For this commentator, “Gallathea and Phyllida exist on another plane entirely—idealized, mythological, and ahistorical, . . . [reaffirming] the androgyne . . . associated in Neoplatonic tradition with the ideal perfection lost at the time of the Fall” (34). *Epicoene*, however, reflects a Jacobean skepticism about the worth of the androgyne and of heterosexual marriage, which Rackin finds Lyly endorsing concurrently with his idealization of androgyny. Rackin argues that the three Shakespearean comedies in their generally accepted chronology of composition register a growing skepticism about the value of androgyny and marriage. I fail to find the idealized value in the transvestites Gallathea and Phyllida claimed by Rackin in her treatment of Lyly’s play. These characters alternately express their frustration with their androgynous identity and their homoerotic attraction to their counterpart in a manner that sexually titillates, and even provokes, their audience. For a different treatment of the transvestism of *Gallathea*, see Peter Saccio, *The Court Comedies of John Lyly: A Study in Allegorical Dramaturgy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1969) 131.
25. For evidence supporting my claim, see Michael Shapiro’s extensive account of the erotic stimulation provided by Heywood’s female transvestite in *The Four Prentices of London* (120–22).
26. Shapiro 221–23. In Appendix A of this study, Shapiro categorizes and describes types of female transvestite characters with their evolutionary history in various kinds of literature, from sixth-century saints’ lives through medieval chivalric romances and Renaissance romantic epics, to early modern novellas, occasionally with their respective incarnations in early modern English plays (207–20).
27. A sampling of this criticism would include Louis Adrian Montrose, “‘The Place of a Brother’ in *As You Like It*: Social Process and Comic Form,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 32 (1981): 28–54; Jardine 9–36, esp. 19–20; Catherine Belsey,

- "Disrupting Sexual Difference: Meaning and Gender in the Comedies," *Alternative Shakespeares*, ed. John Drakakis, 2nd edition (1985; London: Routledge, 2002) 170–94, esp. 184–88; Valerie Traub, "The Homoerotics of Shakespearean Comedy," *Desire and Anxiety: Circulations of Sexuality in Shakespearean Drama* (London: Routledge, 1992) 117–44, esp. 123–30; Marjorie Garber, *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing & Cultural Anxiety* (1992; rpt. New York: Routledge, 1997) 71–77; Stephen Orgel, *Impersonations: The Performance of Gender in Shakespeare's England* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996) 32–33, 57–58, 63–64, 70–71; Jeffrey Masten, "Textual Deviance: Ganymede's Hand in *As You Like It*," *Field Work: Sites in Literary and Cultural Studies*, ed. Marjorie Garber, Paul B. Franklin, and Rebecca L. Walkowitz (London: Routledge, 1996) 153–63; Martin Orkin, "Male Aristocracy and Chastity Always Meet: Proverbs and the Representation of Masculine Desire in *As You Like It*," *Journal of Theatre and Drama: JTD* 3 (1997): 59–81, esp. 59–71; Cynthia Marshall, "The Doubled Jaques and Constructions of Negation in *As You Like It*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 49 (1998): 375–92, esp. 380–81, 386, 389–90; Jessica Tvordi, "Female Alliance and the Construction of Homoeroticism in *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night*," *Maids and Mistresses, Cousins and Queens: Women's Alliances in Early Modern England*, ed. Susan Frye and Karen Robertson (New York and Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999) 114–30, esp. 116–28; and Michael Keevak, "The Playing of Sodomy in *As You Like It*," *NTU Studies in Language and Literature* 9 (2000): 37–60.
28. James M. Saslow, *Ganymede in the Renaissance: Homosexuality in Art and Society* (New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1986) 2; Stephen Orgel, "Nobody's Perfect: Or Why Did the English Stage Take Boys for Women?" *South Atlantic Quarterly* 88 (1989): 7–29, esp. 22. John Minsheu, in *Ductor in Linguas, The Guide into the tongue* (London: John Browne, 1617), defines "'a Ganymede or Ganymede [as] a boy hired to be used contrary to nature, to commit the detestable sinne of Sodomie. Vi. Ingle'" (Qtd. by Masten 160).
 29. Jean Howard, "Introduction," *As You Like It, The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: Norton, 1997) 1591–99, esp. 1596.
 30. Lines in this love banter during which physical gestures or glances between two male actors might emphasize its homosexual overtones include these utterances of Orlando (of course directed to his imagined Rosalind): "I would kiss before I spoke" (4.1.66); "How if the kiss be denied?" (72); "Then love me, Rosalind" (104); and his explicitly taking the boy actor for his wife (124). Homosexual overtones of Rosalind's might include Ganymede taking Orlando's hand to plight troth (4.1.113); "his" explicitly taking Orlando for "his" husband (126); and "his" telling Orlando "I will satisfy you if ever I satisfy man" (5.2.109).
 31. William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, ed. Alan Brissenden, The Oxford Shakespeare, Oxford World's Classics (1993; rpt. Oxford UP, 1998) 123.
 32. Moreover, Orlando never does learn that Ganymede was Rosalind (that the young man he thought was a young man was a lovely young woman), an event crucial to a male character's reformation in *James IV* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*.
 33. Robin Headlam Wells, "Twelfth Night, Puritanism and the Myth of Gender Anxiety," *The Shakespeare International Yearbook 3: Where Are We Now in*

Shakespearean Studies? ed. Graham Bradshaw et al. (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2003) 79–102. Wells concludes that “*Twelfth Night*... emphasizes the differences between the sexes rather than their interchangeability” (96).

34. Arguing for this establishment of patriarchy and of traditional gender in the context of analyses of cross-dressing in *As You Like It* are many commentators, including Peter Erickson, *Patriarchal Structures in Shakespeare's Drama* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1985) 15–38, esp. 23–25, 32; and Jean E. Howard, “Crossdressing, The Theatre, and Gender Struggle in Early Modern England,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39 (1988): 418–40, esp. 434–35. (Cf. Howard’s revision of this essay as a chapter, “Power and Eros: Crossdressing in Dramatic Representation and Theatrical Practice,” in *The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England* [London: Routledge, 1994] 93–128, esp. 118–21.)

This page intentionally left blank

WORKS CITED

- Alpers, Paul. *What Is Pastoral?* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996.
- Alter, Robert. *The Pleasures of Reading in an Ideological Age*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1989.
- Altman, Joel B. *The Tudor Play of Mind: Rhetorical Inquiry and the Development of Elizabethan Drama*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1978.
- Armstrong, Edward A. *Shakespeare's Imagination: A Study of the Psychology of Association and Inspiration*. 1946. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1963.
- Aubrey, John. *Brief Lives*. Rochester, NY: Boydell & Brewer, 1993.
- Barber, C. L. *Shakespeare's Festive Comedy: A Study of Dramatic Form and Its Relation to Social Custom*. 1959. Cleveland: World, 1963.
- Barber, C. L., and Richard P. Wheeler. *The Whole Journey: Shakespeare's Power of Development*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986.
- Barnaby, Andrew. "The Political Conscious of *As You Like It*." *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 36 (1996): 373–95.
- Barnet, Sylvan. "'Strange Events': Improbability in *As You Like It*." *Shakespeare Studies* 4 (1968): 119–31.
- Barton, Anne. "Parks and Ardens." *Essays Mainly Shakespearean*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. 352–79.
- Bate, Jonathan. "Deep England." April 9, 2004. 32nd Annual Meeting, Shakespeare Association of America. The Fairmont Hotel. New Orleans, Louisiana.
- . *The Genius of Shakespeare*. New York: Oxford UP, 1998.
- Beckman, Margaret Boerner. "The Figure of Rosalind in *As You Like It*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 29 (1978): 44–51.
- Bednarz, James P. "Imitations of Spenser in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*." *Renaissance Drama* n.s. 14 (1983): 79–102.
- . *Shakespeare and the Poets' War*. New York: Columbia UP, 2001.
- . "Shakespeare's Purge of Jonson: The Literary Context of *Troilus and Cressida*." *Shakespeare Studies* 21 (1993): 175–212.
- Beecher, D. A. "Antiochus and Stratonice: The Heritage of a Medico-Literary Motif in the Theatre of the English Renaissance." *The Seventeenth Century* 5 (1990): 113–32.
- Belsey, Catherine. "Disrupting Sexual Difference: Meaning and Gender in the Comedies." *Alternative Shakespeares*. Ed. John Drakakis. 2nd edition. London: Routledge, 2002. 170–94.
- Berger, Harry, Jr. *The Allegorical Temper: Vision and Reality in Book II of Spenser's Faerie Queene*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1957.

- Berkeley, David Shelley. *Blood Will Tell in Shakespeare's Plays*. Lubbock: Texas Tech University, 1984.
- . "Shakespeare's *Severall Degrees in Bloud*." Rollins and Smith. 7–18.
- Berry, Edward. "Rosalynde and Rosalind." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 31 (1980): 42–52.
- Berry, Philippa. *Of Chastity and Power: Elizabethan Literature and the Unmarried Queen*. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Bevington, David. "Shakespeare vs. Jonson on Satire." *Shakespeare 1971*. Ed. Clifford Leech and J. M. R. Margeson. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1972. 107–22.
- Black, James. "The Marriage-Music of Arden." *English Studies in Canada* 6 (1980): 385–97.
- Bono, Barbara J. "Mixed Gender, Mixed Genre in Shakespeare's *As You Like It*." *Renaissance Genres: Essays in Theory, History, and Interpretation*. Ed. Barbara K. Lewalski. Harvard English Studies 14. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1986. 189–212.
- Boose, Lynda. "Othello's Handkerchief: 'The Recognizance and Pledge of Love.'" *English Literary Renaissance* 5 (1975): 360–74.
- Bracher, Mark. "Contrary Notions of Identity in *As You Like It*." *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 24 (1984): 225–40.
- Brooks, Harold F. "Introduction." *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Ed. Harold F. Brooks. The Arden Shakespeare. London: Methuen, 1979. xxi–cxliii.
- Brown, John Russell. *Shakespeare and His Comedies*. 1962. London: Methuen, 1968.
- Bulfinch, Thomas. *Bulfinch's Mythology*. 1834. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- Bulman, James C. "*As You Like It* and the Perils of Pastoral." *Shakespeare on Television: An Anthology of Essays and Reviews*. Ed. J. C. Bulman and H. R. Coursen. Hanover, NH: UP of New England, 1988. 174–79.
- Burckhardt, Sigurd. *Shakespearean Meanings*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1968.
- Burns, Margie. "Odd and Even in *As You Like It*." *Allegorica* 5.1 (1980): 119–40.
- Caldwell, Ellen. "John Lyly's *Gallathea*: A New Rhetoric of Love for the Virgin Queen." *English Literary Renaissance* 17 (1987): 22–40.
- Campbell, Lily B. *Shakespeare's Tragic Heroines: Slaves of Passion*. 1930. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1968.
- Campbell, Oscar J. *Comical Satyre and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida*. San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1938.
- . *Shakespeare's Satire*. London: Oxford UP, 1943.
- Capp, Bernard. "The Political Dimension of Apocalyptic Thought." *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance Thought and Literature*. Ed. C. A. Patrides and Joseph Wittreich. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1984. 93–124.
- Cartwright, Kent. "The Confusions of *Gallathea*: John Lyly as Popular Dramatist." *Comparative Drama* 32 (1998): 207–32.
- Castiglione, Baldassare. *The Book of the Courtier*. Trans. Sir Thomas Hoby. Everyman's Library 807. London: Dent, 1928.
- Chakravorty, Swapn. "Translating Arden: Shakespeare's Rhetorical Place in *As You Like It*." *Shakespeare and the Mediterranean: The Selected Proceedings of the International Shakespeare Association World Congress*. Ed. Tom Clayton, Susan Brock, and Vicente Forés. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2004. 156–67.

- Cheney, Patrick. *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession: Ovid, Spenser, Counter-Nationhood*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1997.
- Chew, Samuel. *The Pilgrimage of Life*. 1962. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat P, 1973.
- Cirillo, Albert R. "As You Like It: Pastoralism Gone Awry." *ELH* 38 (1971): 19–39.
- Clayton, Jay, and Eric Rothstein. "Figures in the Corpus: Theories of Influence and Intertextuality." Clayton and Rothstein. 3–36.
- , eds. *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991.
- Cleland, James. *Hero-paideia: or, The Institution of a Young Noble Man*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1607.
- Cole, Howard. "The Moral Vision of *As You Like It*." *College Literature* 3 (1976): 17–32.
- Cook, Ann Jennalie. *Making a Match: Courtship in Shakespeare and His Society*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1991.
- . "Shakespeare's Gentlemen." *Shakespeare Jahrbuch 1985*. Ed. Werner Habicht. Deutsche-Shakespeare Gesellschaft West. Bochum: Ferdinand Kamp, 1985. 9–27.
- Cox, John D. "Shakespeare and the French Epistemologists." *Cithara* 45.2 (2006): 23–45.
- Cressy, David. *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.
- Culler, Jonathan. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1981.
- Daley, A. Stuart. "Calling and Commonwealth in *As You Like It*: A Late Elizabethan Political Play." *The Upstart Crow: A Shakespeare Journal* 14 (1994): 28–46.
- . "The Dispraise of the Country in *As You Like It*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 36 (1985): 300–14.
- . "To Moralize a Spectacle: *As You Like It*, Act 2, Scene 1." *Philological Quarterly* 65 (1986): 147–70.
- . "The Triumph of Patience in *As You Like It*." *Aligarh Journal of English Studies* 13.1 (1988): 45–66.
- . "Where Are the Woods in *As You Like It*?" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 34 (1983): 172–83.
- de Beaugregard, Raphaëlle Costa. "Laughter Chastened: A Study of Comic Languages in *As You Like It*." *For Laughs: Puzzling Laughter in Plays of the Tudor Age*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang, 2002. 211–29.
- de Grazia, Margreta. "Shakespeare's View of Language: An Historical Perspective." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 29 (1978): 374–88.
- . "Weeping for Hecuba." *Historicism, Psychoanalysis, and Early Modern Culture*. Ed. Carla Mazzio and Douglas Trevor. New York: Routledge, 2000. 350–75.
- Doebler, John. "Orlando: Athlete of Virtue." *Shakespeare Survey* 26 (1973): 111–17.
- . *Shakespeare's Speaking Pictures*. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1974.
- Donawerth, Jane. *Shakespeare and the Sixteenth-Century Study of Language*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1984.

- Dooley, Mark. "Inversion, Metamorphosis, and Sexual Difference: Female Same-Sex Desire in Ovid and Lly." *Ovid and the Renaissance Body*. Ed. Goran V. Stanivukovic. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2001. 59–76.
- Drakakis, John. "Trust and Transgression: The Discursive Practices of *Much Ado About Nothing*." *Post-Structuralist Readings of English Poetry*. Ed. Richard Machin and Christopher Norris. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987. 59–84.
- Duncan-Jones, Katherine. *Ungentle Shakespeare: Scenes from His Life*. The Arden Shakespeare. London: Thomson, 2001.
- Dusinberre, Juliet. "As *Who Liked It?*" *Shakespeare Survey* 46 (1994): 9–21.
- . "Pancakes and a Date for *As You Like It*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 54 (2003): 371–405.
- Eccles, Mark. "The Shakespeares and the Ardens." *Shakespeare in Warwickshire*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1961. 3–23.
- Elam, Keir. "'As They Did in the Golden World': Romantic Rapture and Semantic Rupture in *As You Like It*." *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* 18 (1991): 217–32.
- Erickson, Peter. *Patriarchal Structures in Shakespeare's Drama*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1985.
- . "Sexual Politics and the Social Structure in *As You Like It*." *Massachusetts Review* 23 (1982): 65–83.
- Esler, Anthony. *The Aspiring Mind of the Elizabethan Younger Generation*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1966.
- Ferne, John. *The Blazon of Gentry*. London: John Windet, 1586.
- Fortin, René. "'Tongues in Trees': Symbolic Patterns in *As You Like It*." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 14 (1972–73): 569–82.
- Fraser, Russell. *Shakespeare: The Later Years*. New York: Columbia UP, 1992.
- . "Shakespeare's Book of Genesis." *Comparative Drama* 25 (1991): 121–28.
- . *Young Shakespeare*. New York: Columbia UP, 1988.
- Friedman, Donald M. *Marvell's Pastoral Art*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1970.
- Friedman, Susan Stanford. "Weavings: Intertextuality and the (Re)Birth of the Author." Clayton and Rothstein. 146–80.
- Frith, Katharine R. *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1530–1645*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1979.
- Frow, John. *Marxism and Literary History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1986.
- Garber, Marjorie. "The Education of Orlando." *Comedy from Shakespeare to Sheridan: Change and Continuity in the English and European Dramatic Tradition*. Ed. A. R. Braunmuller and James C. Bulman. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1986. 102–12.
- . *Shakespeare After All*. 2004. New York: Anchor, 2005.
- . *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing & Cultural Anxiety*. 1992. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Gardner, Helen. "As *You Like It*." *More Talking of Shakespeare*. Ed. John Garrett. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1959. 17–32.
- Gibbons, Brian. "Amorous Fictions and *As You Like It*." "Fanned and Winnowed Opinions": *Shakespearean Essays Presented to Harold Jenkins*. Ed. John W. Mahon and Thomas A. Pendleton. London: Methuen, 1987. 52–78.
- Goldberg, Jonathan. *Voice Terminal Echo: Postmodernism and English Renaissance Texts*. New York: Methuen, 1986.

- Green, William. *Shakespeare's Merry Wives of Windsor*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1962.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare*. New York: Norton, 2004.
- Greene, Robert. *The Scottish History of James the Fourth*. The Revels Plays. Ed. Norman Sanders. London: Methuen, 1970.
- Guazzo, Stefano. *The Civile Conversation of M. Steeven Guazzo*. Trans. George Pettie and Bartholomew Young. 1581. 1586. 2 vols. London: Constable & Co., 1925.
- Halio, Jay L. "‘No Clock in the Forest’: Time in *As You Like It*." *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 2 (1962): 197–207.
- Hall, James. *Dictionary of Subjects and Symbols in Art*. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Hamer, Mary. "Shakespeare's Rosalind and Her Public Image." *Theatre Research International* 11.2 (1986): 105–18.
- Hassel, R. Chris, Jr. *Faith and Folly in Shakespeare's Romantic Comedies*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1980.
- Hoff, Linda Kay. *Hamlet's Choice: Hamlet—A Reformation Allegory*. Studies in Renaissance Literature 2. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen P, 1990.
- Holy Bible: The New King James Version*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1990.
- Houlbrooke, Ralph, ed. *English Family Life, 1576–1716: An Anthology from Diaries*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1988.
- Howard, Jean E. "Cross-Dressing, the Theatre, and Gender Struggle in Early Modern England." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39 (1988): 418–40.
- . "Introduction." *As You Like It. The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katharine Eisaman Maus. New York: Norton, 1997. 1591–99.
- . *The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Hunt, Maurice. "Compelling Art in *Titus Andronicus*." *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 28 (1988): 197–218.
- . "The Countess of Pembroke's *Arcadia*, Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and the School of Night: An Intertextual Nexus." *Essays in Literature* 23 (1996): 3–20.
- . "The Double Figure of Elizabeth in *Love's Labor's Lost*." *Essays in Literature* 19 (1992): 173–92.
- . "'Forward Backward' Time and the Apocalypse in *Hamlet*." *Comparative Drama* 38 (2005): 379–99.
- . "Hellish Work in *The Faerie Queene*." *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900*, 41 (2001): 91–108.
- . "Homeopathy in Shakespearean Comedy and Romance." *Ball State University Forum* 29.3 (1988): 45–57.
- . "*Kairos* and the Ripeness of Time in *As You Like It*." *Modern Language Quarterly* 52 (1991): 113–35.
- . "Old England, Nostalgia, and the 'Warwickshire' of Shakespeare's Mind." *Connotations: A Journal for Critical Debate* 7.2 (1997/98): 159–80.
- . "Romance and Tragicomedy." *A Companion to Renaissance Drama*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002. 384–98.

- Hunt, Maurice. "Shakespeare's Empirical Romance: *Cymbeline* and Modern Knowledge." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 22 (1980): 322–42.
- . *Shakespeare's Labored Art*. New York: Peter Lang, 1995.
- . *Shakespeare's Religious Allusiveness: Its Play and Tolerance*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004.
- . "A Speculative Political Allegory in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*." *Comparative Drama* 34 (2000–2001): 423–53.
- . "The Two Gentlemen of Verona and the Paradox of Salvation." *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature* 36.1 (1982): 5–22.
- . "Words and Deeds in *All's Well That Ends Well*." *Modern Language Quarterly* 48 (1987): 320–38.
- Hunter, George K. *John Lyly: The Humanist as Courtier*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962.
- Jankowski, Theodora A. "'Where There Can Be No Cause of Affection': Redefining Virgins, Their Desires, and Their Pleasures in John Lyly's *Gallathea*." *Feminist Readings of Early Modern Culture: Emerging Subjects*. Ed. Valerie Traub, M. Lindsay Kaplan, and Dympna Callaghan. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 253–74.
- Jardine, Lisa. *Still Harping on Daughters: Women and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*. Brighton, UK: Harvester P, 1983.
- Jenkins, Harold. "As You Like It." *Shakespeare Survey* 8 (1955): 40–51.
- Jones, Emrys. "Stuart *Cymbeline*." *Essays in Criticism* 11 (1961): 84–99.
- Jones, William. "William Shakespeare as William in *As You Like It*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 11 (1960): 228–31.
- Jonson, Ben. *Discoveries 1641, Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthorndon 1619*. Ed. G. B. Harrison. Elizabethan and Jacobean Quartos. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966.
- . *Every Man Out of His Humour*. Ed. Helen Ostovich. The Revels Plays. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2001.
- Kastan, David S. *Shakespeare and the Shapes of Time*. Hanover, NH: UP of New England, 1982.
- Kaula, David. "Hamlet and the Image of Both Churches." *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 24 (1984): 241–55.
- Keevak, Michael. "The Playing of Sodomy in *As You Like It*." *NTU Studies in Language and Literature* 9 (2000): 37–60.
- Kelly, Thomas. "Shakespeare's Romantic Heroes: Orlando Reconsidered." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 24 (1973): 12–24.
- Kelso, Ruth. *The Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century*. 1929. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1964.
- Kermode, Frank. *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction*. London: Oxford UP, 1966.
- Kernan, Alvin B. *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance*. Yale Studies in English 142. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1959.
- Kerrigan, William. "Female Friends and Fraternal Enemies in *As You Like It*." *Desire in the Renaissance: Psychoanalysis and Literature*. Ed. Valeria Finucci and Regina Schwartz. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1994. 184–203.
- Kimbrough, Robert. *Shakespeare and the Art of Humankindness*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1990.

- Kinney, Clare R. "Feigning Female Fainting: Spenser, Lodge, Shakespeare, and Rosalind." *Modern Philology* 95 (1998): 291-315.
- Knowles, Richard. "Myth and Type in *As You Like It*." *ELH* 33 (1966): 1-22.
- Knutson, Roslyn L. "Falconer to the Little Eyases: A New Date and Commercial Agenda for the 'Little Eyases' Passage in *Hamlet*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 46 (1995): 1-31.
- Kökeritz, Helge. *Shakespeare's Pronunciation*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1958.
- Kronenfeld, Judy Z. "Shakespeare's Jaques and the Pastoral Cult of Solitude." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 18 (1976): 451-73.
- Kuhn, Maura Slattery. "Much Virtue in *If*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 28 (1977): 40-50.
- La Belle, Jenijoy. "Touchstone's Dial: Horology or Urology?" *English Language Notes* 24 (1987): 19-25.
- Laslett, Peter. *The World We Have Lost*. New York: Scribner, 1973.
- Leggatt, Alexander. *Shakespeare's Comedy of Love*. London: Methuen, 1974.
- Lewis, Clive Staples. *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1954.
- Lewis, Cynthia. "Horns, the Dream-work, and Female Potency in *As You Like It*." *South Atlantic Review* 66.4 (2001): 45-69.
- Lifson, Martha Ronk. "Learning by Talking: Conversation in *As You Like It*." *Shakespeare Survey* 40 (1987): 91-105.
- Liu, Dilin, and Anumarla Govindan. "From *Rosalynde* to *As You Like It*: Shakespeare's Celebration of Blood Order." Rollins and Smith. 61-76.
- Lodge, Thomas. *Rosalynde, or Euphues' Golden Legacy. Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, Volume II: The Comedies, 1597-1603*. Ed. Geoffrey Bullough. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1958. 158-256.
- Lyly, John. *The Complete Works of John Lyly, Volume 3*. Ed. Warwick R. Bond. 1902. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1973.
- . *Gallathea and Midas*. Ed. Anne Begor Lancashire. Regents Renaissance Drama Series. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1969.
- Mallin, Eric S. *Inscribing the Time: Shakespeare and the End of Elizabethan England*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1995.
- Marcus, Leah. *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Reading and Its Discontents*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.
- . "Shakespeare's Comic Heroines, Elizabeth I, and the Political Uses of Androgyny." *Women in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Literary and Historical Perspectives*. Ed. Mary Beth Rose. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP, 1986. 135-53.
- Marlowe, Christopher. *The Jew of Malta. Drama of the English Renaissance, I, The Tudor Period*. Ed. Russell Fraser and Norman Rabkin. New York: Macmillan, 1976. 263-93.
- Marshall, Cynthia. *As You Like It*. Shakespeare in Production. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.
- . "The Doubled Jaques and Constructions of Negation in *As You Like It*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 49 (1998): 375-92.
- . "Wrestling as Play and Game in *As You Like It*." *Studies in English Literature: 1500-1900* 33 (1993): 265-87.
- Marvell, Andrew. *Andrew Marvell*. Ed. Frank Kermode and Keith Walker. The Oxford Authors. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990.

- Masten, Jeffrey. "Textual Deviance: Ganymede's Hand in *As You Like It*." *Field Work: Sites in Literary and Cultural Studies*. Ed. Marjorie Garber, Paul B. Franklin, and Rebecca L. Walkowitz. London: Routledge, 1996. 153–63.
- Maurer, Margaret. "Facing the Music in Arden: 'Twas I, But 'Tis not I.'" *As You Like It from 1600 to the Present*. Ed. Edward Tomarken. New York and London: Garland, 1997. 475–509.
- Mazzola, Elizabeth. *Favorite Sons: The Politics and Poetics of the Sidney Family*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- McAlindon, Thomas. *Shakespeare and Decorum*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1973.
- McDonald, Marcia. "The Elizabethan Poor Laws and the Stage in the Late 1590s." *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 7 (1995): 121–44.
- McDonald, Russ. *Shakespeare & Jonson / Jonson & Shakespeare*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1988.
- McGee, Arthur. *The Elizabethan Hamlet*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1987.
- Meres, Francis. *Palladis Tamia (1598)*. New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1938.
- Mincoff, Marco. "What Shakespeare Did to *Rosalynde*." *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch (Weimar)* 96 (1960): 78–89.
- Moffet, Robin. "Cymbeline and the Nativity." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 13 (1962): 207–18.
- Montrose, Louis Adrian. "Of Gentleman and Shepherds: The Politics of Elizabethan Pastoral Form." *ELH* 50 (1983): 415–59.
- . "'The Place of a Brother' in *As You Like It*: Social Process and Comic Form." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 32 (1981): 28–54.
- Muir, Kenneth. *Shakespeare's Sources*. Vol. 1. London: Methuen, 1957.
- Nelson, William. *The Poetry of Edmund Spenser: A Study*. New York: Columbia UP, 1963.
- Nevo, Ruth. *Comic Transformations in Shakespeare*. London: Methuen, 1980.
- Nicholl, Charles. *The Reckoning: The Murder of Christopher Marlowe*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1992.
- Noble, Richmond. *Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge*. 1935. New York: Octagon, 1970.
- Orgel, Stephen. *Impersonations: The Performance of Gender in Shakespeare's England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- . "Nobody's Perfect: Or Why Did the English Stage Take Boys for Women?" *South Atlantic Quarterly* 88 (1989): 7–29.
- Orkin, Martin. "Male Aristocracy and Chastity Always Meet: Proverbs and the Representation of Masculine Desire in *As You Like It*." *Journal of Theatre and Drama: JTD* 3 (1997): 59–81.
- Ozawa, Hiroshi. "'I Must Be Cruel Only to Be Kind': Apocalyptic Repercussions in *Hamlet*." *Hamlet and Japan*. Ed. Yoshiko Uéno. New York: AMS Press, 1995. 87–101.
- Palmer, D. J. "Art and Nature in *As You Like It*." *Philological Quarterly* 49 (1970): 30–40.
- Peacham, Henry. *The Complete Gentleman*. *The Complete Gentleman, The Truth of Our Times, and The Art of Living in London*. Ed. Virgil B. Heltzel. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1962. 1–174.

- Pierce, Robert B. "The Moral Languages of *Rosalynde* and *As You Like It*." *Studies in Philology* 68 (1971): 167–76.
- Pincombe, Michael. *The Plays of John Lyly: Eros and Eliza*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1996.
- Plottel, Jeanine Parisier, and Hanna Charney. *Intertextuality: New Perspectives in Criticism*. New York: New York Literary Forum, 1978.
- Potts, Abbie Findlay. "Spenserian 'Courtesy' and 'Temperance' in *Much Ado About Nothing*." *Shakespeare Association Bulletin* 17 (1942): 103–11, 126–33.
- Preston, Thomas. *Clyomon and Clamydes*. Ed. W. W. Greg. Malone Society Reprints. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1913.
- Priest, Dale. "Oratio and Negotium: Manipulative Modes in *As You Like It*." *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 28 (1988): 273–86.
- Quinones, Ricardo J. *The Renaissance Discovery of Time*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1972.
- Rackin, Phyllis. "Androgyny, Mimesis, and the Marriage of the Boy Heroine on the English Renaissance Stage." *PMLA* 102 (1987): 29–41.
- Rambuss, Richard. *Spenser's Secret Career*. Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture 3. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.
- Reid, Robert L. "The Fairy Queen: Gloriana or Titania?" *The Upstart Crow: A Shakespeare Journal* 3 (1993): 16–33.
- Riggs, David. *Ben Jonson: A Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1989.
- . *The World of Christopher Marlowe*. New York: Henry Holt, 2004.
- Roberts, Jeanne Addison. *Shakespeare's English Comedy: The Merry Wives of Windsor in Context*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1979.
- . "Shakespeare's Forests and Trees." *Southern Humanities Review* 11 (1977): 108–25.
- Rollins, Peter C., and Alan Smith, eds. *Shakespeare's Theories of Blood, Character, and Class: A Festschrift in Honor of David Shelley Berkeley*. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Ronk, Martha. "Locating the Visual in *As You Like It*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 52 (2001): 255–76.
- Saccio, Peter. *The Court Comedies of John Lyly: A Study in Allegorical Dramaturgy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1969.
- Sams, Eric. *The Real Shakespeare: Retrieving the Early Years, 1564–1594*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1995.
- Saslow, James M. *Ganymede in the Renaissance: Homosexuality in Art and Society*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1986.
- Schleiner, Louise. "Voice, Ideology, and Gendered Subjects: The Case of *As You Like It* and *Two Gentlemen*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 50 (1999): 285–309.
- Schoenbaum, Samuel. *Shakespeare's Lives*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1970.
- Schwartz, Robert B. "Puritans, Libertines and the Green World of Utopia in *As You Like It*." *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch (Weimar)* 123 (1987): 66–73.
- Scoufos, Alice Lyle. "The *Paradiso Terrestre* and the Testing of Love in *As You Like It*." *Shakespeare Studies* 14 (1981): 215–27.
- Scragg, Leah. *The Metamorphosis of Gallathea: A Study in Creative Adaptation*. Washington, DC: UP of America, 1982.
- Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. Ed. Alan Brissenden. The Oxford Shakespeare. 1993. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.

- Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katharine Eisaman Maus. *The Norton Shakespeare*. New York: Norton, 1997. 1591–1657.
- . *As You Like It*. Ed. Richard Knowles. A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. New York: MLA, 1977.
- . *As You Like It*. Ed. Agnes M. C. Latham. The Arden Shakespeare. London: Methuen, 1975.
- . *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*. Ed. David Bevington. 5th edition. New York: Pearson/Longman, 2004.
- . *Hamlet*. Ed. Harold Jenkins. The Arden Shakespeare, Second Series. London: Methuen, 1982.
- . *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Ed. G. Blakemore Evans, J. J. M. Tobin, Herschel Baker, Anne Barton, Frank Kermode, Harry Levin, Hallett Smith, and Marie Edel. 2nd edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997.
- Shapiro, James. *A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare, 1599*. New York: HarperCollins, 2005.
- Shapiro, Michael. *Gender in Play on the Shakespearean Stage: Boy Heroines and Female Pages*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1994.
- Sharpe, J. A. *Early Modern England: A Social History 1550–1760*. London: Edward Arnold, 1987.
- Shulman, Jeffrey. “*The Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye* and the Tongue-tied Orlando.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 31 (1980): 390.
- Sidney, Sir Philip. *An Apology for Poetry*. Ed. Geoffrey Shepherd. London: Thomas Nelson, 1965.
- . *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia*. Ed. Maurice Evans. New York: Penguin, 1977.
- Slights, Camille Wells. “*The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and the Courtesy Book Tradition.” *Shakespeare Studies* 16 (1983): 13–31.
- Smith, Bruce R. *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare’s England: A Cultural Poetics*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991.
- . *Shakespeare and Masculinity*. Oxford Special Topics. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.
- Smith, Hallett. *Shakespeare’s Romances: A Study of Some Ways of the Imagination*. San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1972.
- Smith, Thomas. *De Republica Anglorum: A Discourse on the Commonwealth of England*. Ed. Leonard Alston. 1906. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1972.
- Snyder, Susan. “Guyon the Wrestler.” *Renaissance News* 14 (1961): 249–52.
- Spenser, Edmund. *Spenser: The Faerie Queene*. Ed. A. C. Hamilton. Text ed. Hiroshi Yamashita and Toshiyuki Suzuki. Longman Annotated Poets. 2nd edition. Harlow, UK: Longman, 2001.
- . *The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser*. Ed. William A. Oram, Einar Bjorvand, Ronald Bond, Thomas H. Cain, Alexander Dunlop, and Richard Schell. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1989.
- Stanton, Kay. “Shakespeare’s Use of Marlowe in *As You Like It*.” “*A Poet and a filthy Play-maker*”: *New Essays on Christopher Marlowe*. Ed. Kenneth Friedenreich, Roma Gill, and Constance B. Kuriyama. New York: AMS Press, 1988. 23–35.
- Stone, Lawrence. *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558–1641*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1966.

- . *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500–1800*. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.
- Stopes, Charlotte C. *The Life of Henry, Third Earl of Southampton, Shakespeare's Patron*. 1922. New York: AMS Press, 1969.
- Strong, Roy. *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry*. Wallow, Hampshire, UK: BAS Printers, 1977.
- . *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1987.
- Taylor, Donn Ervin. "‘Try in Time in Despite of a Fall’: Time and Occasion in *As You Like It*." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 24 (1982): 121–36.
- Taylor, Michael. "As You Like It: The Penalty of Adam." *Critical Quarterly* 15 (1973): 76–80.
- Thron, E. Michael. "Jaques: Emblems and Morals." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 30 (1979): 84–89.
- Tiffany, Grace. *Erotic Beasts and Social Monsters: Shakespeare, Jonson, and Comic Androgyny*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1995.
- . "‘That Reason Wonder May Diminish’: *As You Like It*, Androgyny, and the Theater Wars." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 57 (1994): 213–39.
- Tolman, Albert H. "Shakespeare's Manipulation of His Sources in *As You Like It*." *Modern Language Notes* 37 (1922): 65–76.
- Tonkin, Humphrey. *Spenser's Courteous Pastoral: Book Six of the Faerie Queene*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1972.
- Traub, Valerie. "The Homoerotics of Shakespearean Comedy." *Desire and Anxiety: Circulations of Sexuality in Shakespearean Drama*. London: Routledge, 1992. 117–44.
- Trollope, Anthony. *An Autobiography*. Ed. Michael Sadleir and Frederick Page. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.
- Turner, Frederick. *Shakespeare and the Nature of Time*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1971.
- Tvordi, Jessica. "Female Alliance and the Construction of Homoeroticism in *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night*." *Maids and Mistresses, Cousins and Queens: Women's Alliances in Early Modern England*. Ed. Susan Frye and Karen Robertson. New York and Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999. 114–30.
- Vanhoutte, Jacqueline A. "Sacrifice, Violence, and the Virgin Queen in Lyly's *Gallathea*." *Cahiers Élisabéthains* 49 (April 1996): 1–14.
- Vickers, Brian. *The Artistry of Shakespeare's Prose*. London: Methuen, 1968.
- Viswanathan, S. "As You Like It, I.ii.55–72." *American Notes and Queries* 18.5 (1980): 70–72.
- Waddington, Raymond. "Moralizing the Spectacle: Dramatic Emblems in *As You Like It*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33 (1982): 155–63.
- Waller, Gary F. *The Strong Necessity of Time: The Philosophy of Time in Shakespeare and Elizabethan Literature*. The Hague: Mouton, 1976.
- Watson, Robert N. "As You Liken It: Simile in the Wilderness." *Shakespeare Survey* 56 (2003): 79–92.
- Weiner, Andrew D. "Sidney/Spenser/Shakespeare: Influence/Intertextuality/Intention." Clayton and Rothstein. 245–70.
- Wells, Robin Headlam. "Twelfth Night, Puritanism and the Myth of Gender Anxiety." *The Shakespeare International Yearbook 3: Where Are We Now in*

- Shakespearean Studies?* Ed. Graham Bradshaw, John M. Mucciolo, Tom Bishop, and Angus Fletcher. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2003. 79–102.
- Westerwheel, Bart. “The Dialogic Imagination: The European Discovery of Time and Shakespeare’s Mature Comedies.” *Renaissance Culture in Context: Theory and Practice*. Ed. Jean R. Brink and William F. Gentrup. Aldershot, UK: Scholar P, 1993. 54–74.
- Williamson, Marilyn. “The Masque of Hymen in *As You Like It*.” *Comparative Drama* 2 (1968): 248–58.
- Willis, Paul J. “‘Tongues in Trees’: The Book of Nature in *As You Like It*.” *Modern Language Studies* 18.3 (1988): 65–74.
- Wilson, Rawdon. “The Way to Arden: Attitudes toward Time in *As You Like It*.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 26 (1975): 16–24.
- Wilson, Richard. “‘Like the old Robin Hood’: *As You Like It* and the Enclosure Riots.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 43 (1992): 1–19.
- Wilson, Thomas. *The Arte of Rhetorique*. 1553. London: John Kynngston, 1584.
- Wixson, Christopher. “Cross-Dressing and John Lyly’s *Gallathea*.” *Studies in English Literature: 1500–1900* 41 (2001): 241–56.
- Woodbridge, Linda. “Country Matters: *As You Like It* and the Pastoral-Bashing Impulse.” *Re-Visions of Shakespeare: Essays in Honor of Robert Ornstein*. Ed. Evelyn Gajowski. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2004. 189–214.
- Young, David P. *The Heart’s Forest: A Study of Shakespeare’s Pastoral Plays*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1972.

INDEX

Note: The index excludes material contained in the endnotes and works cited. The titles of works by Shakespeare and Edmund Spenser are listed separately.

- Alciati (Andrea Alciato), 73
allegory, 8, 11–12, 14–15, 17–18, 19,
25, 27, 29, 32, 39, 41–50, 68,
73, 141
All's Well That Ends Well, 51, 56,
76, 102
Alpers, Paul, 77
Amoretti, 8
Anatomie of Absurditie, The, 51
Anna of Denmark, Queen, 44
Antony and Cleopatra, 96
Arden, Mary, 79, 98
Aristophanes, 49, 66
Aristotle, 13, 16, 19–20
ars moriendi bene, 30
Art of Love, The, 86
Ascham, Roger, 76
Aubrey, John, 78–9, 101
- Bacon, Sir Francis, 54
Bailey, Lucy, 122
Bale, John, 42–3
Bancroft, Bishop Richard, 1
Barber, C. L., 93, 98
Barnaby, Andrew, 2, 3
Barton, Anne, 80
Bate, Jonathan, 98, 99
Bednarz, James, 5, 8, 77, 109
Beecher, D. A., 68
Berry, Edward, 7
Bevington, David, 3, 52, 53, 106, 118
- Bible, The, 17, 26, 32, 42, 49, 50,
72, 110
James, 72, 89
Job, 32
Luke, 32, 95, 96
Mark, 26
Matthew 26, 32
parable of the lost son, 95–7
Psalms, 15, 32
- Bion, 11
Blazon of Gentry, The, 112
Book of Common Prayer, The, 89
Book of the Courtier, The, 120–1
Book of Nature, The, 36
Botticelli, 46
Boyle, Elizabeth, 45–6
Bracher, Mark, 58
Brissenden, Alan, 46, 59, 73, 86, 89,
118, 120
Brooke, Ralph, 108
Brooks, Harold F., 8
Brown, John Russell, 67
- Caesar, Augustus, 86
Camden, William, 7, 109
Campion, Edmund, 18
Castiglione, Baldassare, 120–1
Catholicism, Roman, 18
Cheke, John, 76
Chaucer, Geoffrey, 37
Civile Conversation, The, 114

- Cleland, James, 111, 112, 121, 125, 127
- Clyomon and Clamydes*, 144–5
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 4
- Combe, John, 116
- Combe, Thomas, 116
- Complete Gentleman, The*, 108
- Condell, Henry, 1
- Cook, Ann Jennalie, 92
- Coriolanus*, 54
- Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia, The*, 5, 77–8, 94, 107, 133, 134, 135–6, 137, 144
- court masque, the, 44, 45, 138
- Cymbeline*, 5–6, 15, 25, 54–5, 102, 133, 138–9, 142, 146
- Cynthia's Revels*, 110
- Daley, A. Stuart, 2
- Dante, 43
- de Grazia, Margreta, 54
- Dekker, Thomas, 105, 106
- De Republica Anglorum*, 131
- Dethick, Sir William, 108, 109
- de Vere, Edward (Earl of Oxford), 128
- Dexter, John, 122
- Dickens, Charles, 4
- Doebler, John, 11, 12
- Drakakis, John, 15
- Drayton, Michael, 80
- Drummond of Hawthornden, William, 7
- Dusinberre, Juliet, 109
- Eclogues* (by Virgil), 61, 77
- Elizabeth I, Queen, 1, 6, 52, 68–9, 76, 113, 114, 139, 141
- Elizabethan culture, late, 18, 26, 48, 52
- and language, 52–3, 54–5, 75–6
- Apocalypse, 27, 42–3, 48
- bankruptcy of Ovidian/Petrarchan idolatry and satire, 75–6
- dating, 1–2, 6, 24
- gentleman status, 105–6
- humoral medicine, 68–9
- love melancholy, 68–9
- queen's aging, 6, 52, 68, 75
- enargeia*, 67
- England's Helicon*, 77
- Epithalamion* (by Spenser), 8
- Esler, Anthony, 114
- Essex, Earl of (Robert Devereux), 7, 8
- Euphues, or the Anatomy of Wit*, 76
- Evans, G. Blakemore, 73, 118
- Every Man in His Humour*, 1
- Every Man Out of His Humour*, 5, 106, 108, 109–10
- Faerie Queene, The*, 2, 3, 7–8, 9, 10, 12–18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 43–7, 78, 139–40
- Ferne, John, 112
- Field, Richard, 79
- forest of Arden, the, 78, 80, 82, 101
- Fortin, René, 18
- Four Prentices of London, The*, 141–2
- Fraser, Russell, 11, 78, 79
- Frith, John, 101
- Gallathea*, 5, 134, 139–42, 145, 146
- Garber, Marjorie, 145
- Garden of Eden, The, 27, 30, 42, 43
- Gender in Play on the Shakespearean Stage: Boy Heroines and Female Pages*, 142
- gentleman, 106–7, 110–12, 118–31
- classification, 131
- dueling, 112–16
- quality of blood, 116–18, 124
- see also William Shakespeare and Elizabethan culture, late
- Gibbons, Brian, 44
- Golden Age, The, 30–1, 49
- Greenblatt, Stephen, 118, 145
- Greene, Robert, 5, 92, 93, 136–8, 139, 142
- Guazzo, Stefano, 114

- Guilpin, Everard, 110
Gulliver's Travels, 54
- Halio, Jay, 25–6
 Hall, Dr. John, 102
 Hall, Joseph, 110
 Hamilton, A. C., 12, 13, 17–18
Hamlet, 2, 10, 19, 25, 27, 42–3, 52–3, 54, 55, 59, 85, 103, 105, 106, 114–15, 126–7, 147
 Hathaway, Anne, 93, 95, 100, 101, 146
 Heminge, John, 1
Henry IV, Part 1, 96
Henry IV, Part 2, 82
Henry V, 1, 2, 35, 85, 105–6, 147
Henry VI, Parts 1, 2 & 3, 35, 85
Henry VI, Part 3, 85
Henry VIII, King, 42
Hero and Leander, 3, 70, 86, 143
Hero-paideia: or, the Institution of a Young Noble Man, 111–12, 112, 121
 Heroic Age, The, 27, 29, 32, 39, 42
 Heywood, Thomas, 141
 Hoby, Sir Thomas, 121
 homeopathy, 20–1, 37–8, 40, 68–71
 homoeroticism, 5, 8–9, 37–8, 134–5, 136–8, 139–44
Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England: A Cultural Poetics, 134
 Howard, Jean E., 8–9, 143
- Image of Bothe Churches, The*, 42–3
- James I, King, 1, 44, 114
Jew of Malta, The, 87
 Jones, David, 122, 123
 Johnson, Samuel, 118, 119
 Jonson, Ben, 1, 5, 7, 24, 44, 79, 82, 97, 106, 107, 108, 109–10, 111, 112, 113, 118
Julius Caesar, 2
- Keats, John, 4
 Kelso, Ruth, 113
 Kermode, Frank, 26
King John, 98–9
King Lear, 15, 17, 54, 60, 72, 76, 85, 89, 94
 Kinney, Clare, 8
 Knowles, Richard, 11, 12, 18, 118, 119
- Laslett, Peter, 131
 Latham, Agnes, 7, 12, 73, 118
 Leggatt, Alexander, 58
 Levine, Laura, 145
 Lodge, Thomas, 7, 8, 9–10, 14, 15, 17, 78, 90, 102, 142
 love melancholy, 19
 also see Elizabethan culture, late
Love's Labor's Lost, 4, 53–4, 59, 75
 Lucy, Sir Thomas, 79, 83
 Lyly, John, 5, 76, 90, 140–1, 146
 Lyly, William, 76
- Macbeth*, 25
 Macready, William Charles, 119
 Mallin, Eric, 2
 Mantuan (Baptista Mantuanus), 11
 Marlowe, Christopher, 3, 37, 70, 86–8, 92, 93, 143
 marriage, 22–3, 35, 37, 40, 41, 44–9, 70, 71, 72–4, 100, 146–7
 Marshall, Cynthia, 122
 Marston, John, 110
 Marvell, Andrew, 31
 Mary I, Queen (Mary Tudor), 2
 McAlindon, Thomas, 51
 McDonald, Marcia, 2
 McGee, Arthur, 2
 melancholy, 18–19
 also see love melancholy and Elizabethan culture, late
Merchant of Venice, The, 29, 35, 102, 128, 134, 142
 Meres, Francis, 1, 82, 88, 89, 101–2

- Merry Wives of Windsor, The*, 82–5
Midsummer Night's Dream, A, 4, 8, 25, 45, 78
 Mincoff, Marco, 7
 Montrose, Louis Adrian, 2, 3, 131
Mother Hubbard's Tale, 8
Much Ado About Nothing, 1, 15, 44, 78–9, 102, 147
 Munday, Anthony, 77
 myth, 25, 43, 50, 141, 142
 Hercules and Antaeus, 10–11, 29
 Hercules and the Nemean Lion, 14, 15, 39, 73
 Nash, Thomas, 51, 92, 93
 Nelson, William, 12
 oaths, status of, 56–7
 Ovid, 86, 87, 89
Palladis Tamia, 1
 pastoral, mode of, 4, 11–12, 32, 35, 40, 43, 44, 49, 50, 60–5, 68, 71, 77, 80, 100, 131
 Peacham, Henry, 108
Pericles, Prince of Tyre, 25
 Petrarch, 19
 Petrarchan love, 22, 40, 69
 Pettie, George, 114
Poetaster, 110
Poly-Olbion, 80
Primavera, 46
 primogeniture, principle of, 27–8, 90, 93–4, 95–6, 99–100, 118
Purgatorio, 43
 Rankins, William, 110
Rape of Lucrece, The, 79
Richard II, 99
 Riggs, David, 86
 romance, genre of, 24, 25, 54, 135–8, 139, 144–5
Romeo and Juliet, 96
 Ronk, Martha, 11
Rosalynde, or Euphues' Golden Legacy, 7, 9–10, 14, 15, 17, 78, 90, 102, 142
 Rowe, Nicholas, 83, 92
 Royal Society, The, 54
 Sams, Eric, 82–3
 Sannazaro, Jacopo, 11, 43, 77
 satire, mode of, 3–4, 19, 24, 33, 34, 62–3, 65–8, 70, 110–12
 Schleiner, Louise, 17
 Schoenbaum, Samuel, 94, 101
Scottish History of King James IV, The, 5, 136–8, 142, 144
 Scoufos, Alice Lyle, 11, 43, 47–8
 Sisson, C. J., 130
 Shakespeare, Edmund, 79, 90, 94–5
 Shakespeare, Edward (Edmund) (illegitimate nephew), 94
 Shakespeare, Gilbert, 90, 94
 Shakespeare, Hamnet, 79, 146
 Shakespeare, John, 79, 82, 90, 93–4, 95, 97, 98, 101, 108, 117–18
 Shakespeare Judith, 102
 Shakespeare, Richard (brother), 90, 94
 Shakespeare, Richard (grandfather), 94, 117
 Shakespeare, Susanna, 95, 100–1, 101–2
 Shakespeare, William
 alter egos, 72, 78, 80, 82–5, 87, 88
 and *kairos*, 80, 87, 88
 and Romanticism, 4
 artistic development, 35, 85–9
 education, 82–5, 86–8, 90
 family, 28, 78–80, 82, 83, 90, 92, 93, 94–5, 96–8, 99, 102, 103
 gentleman status, 5, 93–4, 98, 106, 107–10, 112, 116, 117–18, 131
 marriage, 100–1
 public vs. private selves, 3, 4–5, 77
 temperament, 82, 97
 words vs. deeds, relationship to topic of, 54–5, 75–6

- Shapiro, James, 2, 3
 Shapiro, Michael, 142
Shepherd's Calendar, The, 8, 9, 77
Shoemaker's Holiday, The, 105
 Sidney, Sir Philip, 2, 5, 24, 32, 43, 67,
 77–8, 94, 107, 128, 131, 133,
 134, 135–6, 137, 139, 144
*see also Countess of Pembroke's
 Arcadia, The*
- Smith, Bruce, 134
 Smith, Thomas, 131
Sonnets, 33, 37, 96
 Southampton, Earl of (Henry
 Wriothesley), 8
 speaking picture, 67, 72–3
 Spedding, James, 130
 Spencer, Gabriel, 110
 Spenser, Edmund, 1, 2, 3, 7–9, 10,
 12–17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 43–6,
 47–8, 77–8, 139
sprezzatura, 20
 Stallybrass, Peter, 145
 Stationers' Register, *The*, 1
 Staunton, Howard, 118
 Steevens, George, 118
 Stein, Peter, 122
 Stone, Lawrence, 108
 Swift, Jonathan, 54
- Tale of Gamelyn, The*, 9
Taming of the Shrew, The, 107, 134
 Taylor, Donn, 26
Tears of the Muses, The, 8
 temperance, 9–11, 15, 21–4
 and the gentleman, 120–1
 as integration, 16–17, 20
 as mastery, 13–14
 Classical (Aristotelian), 12–14,
 16–17, 19–20
 Judeo-Christian, 17–18
Tempest, The, 25, 41, 44, 45, 91, 124,
 128, 138
 Theocritus, 11, 77
 Tiffany, Grace, 75
- Timber, or Discoveries*, 97
 time
 and epiphany, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49
 Apocalypse, 42
 “backward forward” movement,
 26–7, 32, 42–3, 49, 50
carpe diem, 31, 38, 40–1
 cyclical, 34–5, 37, 39, 47
kairos, 3, 26–7, 29–30, 32, 33–5,
 37, 38–9, 41–2, 44–50
 ripeness of, 27, 28, 33, 34, 35, 36–7,
 40, 41, 46–7, 48, 85, 88
also see Elizabethan Culture, late
 transvestism, 5–6, 102, 146–7
 ideational function of, 133–9, 142,
 144–5
 sexual effect, 133–4, 140–4
Troilus and Cressida, 2, 110
 Trollope, Anthony, 67
Twelfth Night, 6, 46, 68, 88, 93, 102,
 142, 145
Two Gentlemen of Verona, The, 85,
 102, 116–17, 134–5, 136, 137,
 142, 146
- Venus and Adonis*, 79
 Virgil, 11, 32, 43, 61, 77
see also Eclogues
- Waddington, Raymond, 51
 Waller, Gary F., 26
 Wars of the Roses, *The*, 52
 Watson, Robert, 48
 Wells, Robin Headlam, 145
 Wilson, Rawdon, 26
 Wilson, Richard, 2, 3
Winter's Tale, The, 50, 55, 60
 Wheeler, Richard, 93, 98
 White, Grant, 130
 Whitgift, Archbishop John, 1, 86
 words and deeds
 and decorum, 51, 55, 56
 and natural things as speech (*res et
 verba*), 61–4

- words and deeds—*continued*
- historical relationship of, 54–5
 - marriage of, 74–6
 - pious words, power of, 71–2, 88–9
 - primacy of deeds, 59, 60, 70
 - primacy of expressive deeds, 72–4
 - words as deeds, 57–8, 63, 67
 - words, as problematic signifiers, 52, 55, 57–60, 64–5
 - words, therapeutic, 68–71
 - also see* homeopathy *and* William Shakespeare
 - Wordsworth, William, 4