

天主教輔仁大學英國語文學系學士班畢業成果  
ENGLISH DEPARTMENT, FU JEN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY  
GRADUATION PROJECT 2018

指導教授：劉紀雯老師

Dr. Kate Liu

真善美聖

***Identity Crisis in Shakespeare's *The Comedy of Errors****

SANCTITAS BONITAS

PULCHRITUDO

VERITAS

學生：李采芸 撰

Janeen Tsai-Yun Li

Janeen Li  
 403110072  
 Conversation and Composition Sec. C  
 Research Paper (as My Graduation Project)  
 Prof. Late Liu  
 01 August 2017

Identity Crisis in Shakespeare's *The Comedy of Errors*

**Index**

I. Abstract.....	1
II. Arguments.....	2
III. Outline.....	3
IV. Introduction .....	4
V. Literature Review .....	5
VI. Loss and Confusion of Identity in Terms of Family Relations and Social Status .....	7
VII. Antipholus of Syracuse's Awareness and Pursuit of His Personal Identity.....	14
VIII. Conclusion.....	17
IX. Works Cited.....	18

**I. Abstract**

In Shakespeare's *The Comedy of Errors*, the issues of "identity loss" and "madness" are interrelated. The experience of loss and confusion of the characters' social identities results in some characters' worry about their own sanity and others' accusation of their "madness". Although some critics claim that the comedy's comic closure, or the family reunion scene, has settled the problems of displaced identities and brings "safety and relief from the fear of madness" (Whitworth), this paper argues that not everyone's identity is restored for one of them, Antipholus of Syracuse, is still discontent with his newly formed identity .

## II. Arguments

✧ Definition of “identity” and “madness”:

1. The definition of “identity” is multi-layered, including religious, social and personal/ mental levels.
2. The characters are not seen as “individuals” but defined by the bonds they have socially and privately.
3. Most of the characters are not aware of and are content to live without a personal/ mental identity, i.e. selfhood/ individuality. (exception: Antipholus of Syracuse)
4. Only Antipholus of Syracuse is aware of the idea of selfhood/ individuality and dare to pursue it.

✧ Relating “identity” and “madness”:

5. Identity loss and confusions of their social identities make the characters lose their own identities. Characters with different social classes react differently towards this issue, and showcase varied levels of “madness”.

✧ Criticism to the comic closure:

6. The characters’ social identities are restored in the comic closure, but their personal/ mental identities are not—Antipholus of Syracuse’s pursuit of self-identity and individuality is just beginning.

### **III. Outline**

#### I. Opening

- A. Introduction
- B. Defining “identity”: religious, social and personal/ mental identities
- C. Defining “madness”

#### II. Body:

- A. Analyzing how the characters confuse or lose their social identities
  - 1. family relationships
  - 2. marital relationships
  - 3. social statuses: business relationships; master-servant relationships
- B. Relating the fear of identity loss to “madness” and “madness” to identity displacement
- C. Comparing and Contrasting the Characters Reactions towards Their Social Identity Loss or Confusions and Different Levels of “Madness” They Showcase
  - 1. Antipholus of Ephesus: is unaware of his social identity loss
  - 2. Dromio of Ephesus: is unaware of his social identity loss and confusions; a fate-taker
  - 3. Dromio of Syracuse: is frightened by his social identity loss and confusions; a traditional Renaissance character who views his social identity as his ultimate identity
  - 4. Antipholus of Syracuse: is willing to lose and gain different social identities; is frightened by his social identity loss and confusions; is in pursuit of a personal identity
- D. Examining Antipholus of Syracuse’s awareness and pursuit of their personal/ mental identities
  - 1. His awareness of having a lack of personal/ mental identity
  - 2. His failure in his pursuit of a personal/ mental identity
  - 3. His further pursuit of his personal/ mental identity

#### III. Conclusion

- A. Restate my arguments
- B. State what I want the readers of my paper to further explore on this topic.

#### IV. Works Cited

#### IV. Introduction

Have you ever wondered what mankind's biggest fears are? Perhaps you have experienced two of them on top of the list if you've ever asked yourselves, "Who am I exactly?" and "Am I really mad?" In Shakespeare's *The Comedy of Errors*, the issues of "identity loss" and "madness" are examined in the context of the Renaissance society. In this play, two pairs of twin brothers—the Antipholus brothers and the Dromio brothers—have experienced loss and confusions of their social identities, which is "the 'collective sum' of the people, places and ideas that constitute a person's identity and 'good psychological health'" (Tajfel qtd. in Smith 13). According to the Renaissance understanding of "madness", which is mostly physiologically defined (Salkeld 61), Antipholus and Dromio of Ephesus are considered "mad" while Antipholus and Dromio of Syracuse are not when their identities are mistaken. What is the relation between identity displacements, fear, and "madness"? In the comic closure of this play, is everyone's identity restored? Some critics claim that the comedy's comic closure, or the family reunion scene, has settled the problems of displaced identities and has brought "safety and relief from the fear of madness" (Whitworth), but this paper argues that not everyone's identity is restored for one of them, Antipholus of Syracuse, is still discontent with his present identity. "Identity" and "madness" will first be defined in the context of the Renaissance society. Then how the characters lose their social identities will be analyzed. In addition, the characters' reactions towards identity loss and confusions and how they are "mad", in relation to their identity displacements, fear, and the falsity of Renaissance medical science, will be analyzed. Finally, Antipholus of Syracuse's awareness and pursuit of selfhood will be examined.

## V. Literature Review

The issues of identity and madness have been variously defined in the Renaissance and especially in the criticism of Shakespeare's *The Comedy of Errors*. Callaghan defines self-identity in terms of social relations and argues that *The Comedy of Errors* "asks probing questions about whether we are ever psychologically and spiritually whole without our partners, our siblings, or our parents and our children" (44). Smith sees "madness" as "distraction" and "melancholia," similar to "identity displacement" in our sense of the word (13). In other words, identity is related to our mental state, its being in place or displaced and distracted. As reflected from the play, Renaissance people's identities are very likely to be bound to their social relationships and statuses. Does this indicate that if their social identities are lost or confused, they will lose their ultimate identities?

In order to answer the former question, the definition of "identity" in context of the Renaissance, when the play was written, should be clarified. There are three levels of "identity" that are most frequently discussed in the criticism of Shakespeare's *The Comedy of Errors*: the "religious" level of one's identity is granted and confirmed by the church (Whitworth 213); the "social" level of one's identity is generated by the marketplace and the entire community (Wei 1); the "personal/ mental" level of one's identity is self-defined, meaning one's awareness of his/ her uniqueness [i.e. selfhood/ individuality] in the crowd (Sawday 30). This was a debatable concept in the Renaissance, because it was either seen negatively as "an inability to govern the self" or positively as human's inborn right given by God (Sawday 30).

Opposed to identity on the personal and mental levels is "madness", which means a loss of identity on physiological and social senses. In the Renaissance, "madness" is a vocabulary derived from the humoral terminology, literature of Greek

tragedy and the rhetoric of possession (Salkeld 25). Of these three fields, “madness and mentality in Renaissance medicine were explained largely in physiological terms” (Salkeld 61). In the play, the characters are “diagnosed” as “mad” based on certain “physical” features, reflecting the fact that “the body presented a kind of text for the physicians in which the signs of madness could be read” (Salkeld 61). Nevertheless, Whitworth argues that the characters are actually not mad, but the fear created by the confusion of their social identities makes them undergo some “metamorphosis [transformations]” (210). While in Smith’s view, the characters’ “madness” is closely related to their displaced identities, resulting in symptoms of “distraction” and “melancholia” (13).

From a religious perspective, however, madness can also mean an inordinate assertion of identity, or one’s freedom to choose. To connect the Renaissance’s perception of “identity” and “madness,” these two intertwined issues, the relation of the characters’ pursuit of “selfhood/ individuality” at the level of their personal/mental identities and their being accused as “mad” should be closely examined. According to Sawday, some Renaissance people believed that “‘autonomy/ [selfhood/ individuality]’ is what God insists his angelic and human creatures already possess, since he has made them ‘free to choose’” (30); therefore, in this perspective, there is no connection between the pursuit of “selfhood/ individuality” and “madness”. However, some associated one’s pursuit of “self” with evil power (Sawday 30). Those who held the latter point of view towards “self-hood” possibly would have considered one’s pursuit of “his/her uniqueness in the crowd” (Sawday 30) as a behavior of “madness.”

Therefore, this paper argues that the characters in Shakespeare’s Renaissance play *The Comedy of Errors* are defined by their social bonds but not seen as

“individuals.” The characters, except Antipholus of Syracuse, view their social identities as their ultimate identities. They aren’t aware of their lack of a personal/mental identity, i.e. selfhood/ individuality, and are content to live without it. Thus, identity loss and confusions of the characters’ social identities make them lose their own identities. Towards this issue, the characters react differently, and showcase varied levels of “madness”. In the comic closure of the play, the characters’ social identities are restored, but they still have a lack of personal/mental identity — Antipholus of Syracuse’s pursuit of self-identity and individuality is just beginning.

#### **VI. Loss and Confusion of Identity in Terms of Family Relations and Social Status**

The two pairs of twin brothers in this play—the Antipholus brothers and the Dromio brothers—have all experienced social identity loss or confusions in terms of their family relationships, marital relationships and social statuses. In the beginning of the play, Antipholus of Syracuse’s loss of family relationships is implied when he actively decides to “lose” himself for the sake of seeking for his mother and twin brother:

I to the world am like a drop of water  
 That in the ocean seeks another drop,  
 Who, falling there to find his fellow forth,  
 Unseen, inquisitive, confounds himself.  
 So I, to find a mother and a brother,

In quest of them unhappy, lose myself. (Shakespeare 1.2.35-40)

Through the lens of William Schutz’s Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation, it is this dearth of “inclusion, which has to do specifically with the need to belong to a circle of acquaintances [i.e. his family]” (qtd. in Smith 13) that



Antipholus of Syracuse doesn't want to "confound" himself, but rather "lose" himself to seek for his lost mother and twin brother to complete his circle of acquaintances (Shakespeare 1.2.35-40). Without this inclusion, or a complete circle of acquaintances which is his family, Antipholus of Syracuse is a "drop of water" that "seeks [for] another drop" in "the ocean", and is "unhappy [unsatisfied]" with his current situation (Shakespeare 1.2.35-40). In other words, Antipholus of Syracuse faces his family relationships loss actively by "losing" himself with a risk of losing his other social identities.

A loss or confusion of the characters' marital relationships also contributes to a confusion of their social identities. Antipholus of Ephesus suffers from this almost throughout the entire play after his wife Adriana, who has mistaken Antipholus of Syracuse as her husband, locks him out of his own abode as a stranger. Because of this confusion, Adriana replies rather rudely to Antipholus of Ephesus' knock on the door by saying, "your wife, sir knave? Go, get you from the door" (Shakespeare 3.1.64-65). After this incident, Antipholus of Ephesus considers "there is something in the wind" so that his wife deliberately denies him as her husband (Shakespeare 3.1.70). This confusion of marital relationship not only contributes to the complexity of "the error", but also puts a question mark in Antipholus of Ephesus' identity.

Antipholus of Syracuse, who is mistaken as Adriana's husband, also experiences a marital identity confusion. Though he is clear about his bachelorship, Adriana's offer of this false marital relationship makes him wonder whether or not he is just in a dream, "To me she speaks; she moves me for her theme./ What, was I married to her in my dream?/ Or sleep I now, and think I hear all this" (Shakespeare 2.2.117-118)? Antipholus of Syracuse's confusion of reality and dreams gives him a sense of identity confusion and makes him "lose" himself even to a further extent.

Antipholus of Syracuse's servant Dromio of Syracuse is claimed by Adriana's

kitchen maid Luce as her husband, because she has mistaken him for Dromio of Ephesus. Being forced to accept a title as Luce's husband, Dromio of Syracuse is so disconcerted that he questions his identity:

Do you know me, sir? Am I Dromio?

Am I your man? Am I myself?

[...]

Besides myself I am due to

a woman: one that claims me, one that haunts me, one

that will have me. (Shakespeare 3.2.73-83)

It is this stranger woman who “haunts” Dromio of Syracuse with her false claim of their marital relationship that makes him suffer from a sense of identity loss because of his forced new social role. He has to confirm his social role with his master Antipholus of Syracuse by asking whether he is still his master's servant or not in order to restore his social identity, which makes him be himself. Otherwise, he is lost.

A confusion of social status contributes to the characters' sense of social identity loss. When Antipholus of Syracuse is “forced” to take on his twin brother's marital identity, he also takes on his brother's social status, which is higher than his own—married, owning an abode with a kitchen maid, and a golden chain for his wife (Shakespeare 3.2.169~4.1.190). However, Antipholus of Syracuse doesn't enjoy but is rather frightened by this new social status. For example, even if Antipholus of Syracuse emphasizes that the goldsmith Angelo will “ne'er see chain nor money more” if he refuses to “receive the money [for the chain] now”, Angelo still insists to charge Antipholus of Syracuse for the golden chain when they meet at suppertime (Shakespeare 3.2.176-182). After experiencing this incident, Antipholus of Syracuse thinks that people here are way too nice:

What I should think of this I cannot tell.

But this I think: there's no man is so vain  
 That would refuse so fair an offered chain.  
 I see a man here needs not live by shifts,  
 When in the streets he meets such golden gifts.  
 I'll to the mart, and there for Dromio stay.

If any ship put out, then straight away! (Shakespeare 3.2.184-190)

This sudden raise of Antipholus of Syracuse's social status makes him feel strange. He suspects that this island, Ephesus, is haunted by witchcraft. He is also astonished by the fact that it seems that people here will receive "golden gifts" in the streets without "live[ing] by shifts" or working to earn their living (Shakespeare 3.2.187-188). Adding to his previous experience of almost yielding to Luciana's "mermaid's song" (Shakespeare 3.2.168), Antipholus of Syracuse is certain about his judgement of going "straight away" from Ephesus to escape from "witchcraft" and such a loss of his social self (Shakespeare 4.1.190).

Different characters, however, respond to their experience of identity displacements or confusion differently, which reveals different degrees of self-possession. Antipholus of Ephesus considers his identity loss and confusions as something external—his wife and servant's messing up with him. He never suspects—that there is something wrong with himself and his mind. He is not even frightened by the "errors" that are caused by his displaced identities, but is only irritated by his current situation. For instance, he only considers that "there is something in the wind" when his wife locks him out (Shakespeare 3.1.70), and decides to punish her by beating her up with a rope (Shakespeare 4.1.16-18). When Antipholus of Ephesus doesn't receive the correct items he has asked for, he simply reacts with anger instead of noticing that he has confused Dromio of Ephesus and Dromio of Syracuse; he merely thinks that his servant isn't obeying his order. For example, Antipholus of

Ephesus scolds Dromio of Syracuse as “a madman”, “a peevish sheep” and “a drunken slave” when Dromio of Syracuse has prepared a ship for him instead of the rope he has asked for (Shakespeare 4.1.93-97). Antipholus of Ephesus gets angrier when Dromio of Ephesus brings him a rope instead of the money from Adriana that he has ordered, and beats Dromio of Ephesus with the rope (Shakespeare 4.4.8-16). It is obvious that Antipholus of Ephesus thinks that his “betraying” wife who locks him out, his “disobedient” servant who brings him wrong items, and the “unreasonable” goldsmith Angelo who refuses to give him the chain (Shakespeare 4.1.27-44) are deliberately messing up with him. Ironically, Antipholus of Ephesus is considered as “mad” or “possessed” by the physician Pinch due to his “pale and deadly looks” (Shakespeare 4.4.93-95). However, Antipholus of Ephesus accuses Pinch as a “dissembling harlot,” asks the reason why Pinch wants to “make [such] a loathsome abject scorn of me [him]” and threatens to “pluck out those false eyes” of Pinch (Shakespeare 4.4.102-106). Therefore, Antipholus of Ephesus’ reaction towards his identity loss and confusions is only anger. He doesn’t thinking himself as “mad” or “possessed”. Instead of questioning his current identity, he clings to his original social identity.

Different to his master Antipholus of Ephesus, Dromio of Ephesus never blames his identity displacement problems on others but submits himself to fate. For instance, when he is beaten by Antipholus of Ephesus with a rope due to his master’s confusion of the two Dromios, Dromio of Ephesus only thinks that he is “in adversity” (Shakespeare 4.4.20). He even admits that he is “an ass” when his master scolded him, and views his being beaten as a habit of his bad tempered master who “heats”, “cools”, “waked[s]”, “driven[s] [him] out of doors”, and “welcomed[s] [him] home” with beating and blows (Shakespeare 4.4.27-39). It is clear that Dromio just takes what life offers him, and doesn’t blame himself or his master for his current

situation. In other words, he is not aware that he is beaten up and scolded because of the identity confusion of him and his twin brother Dromio of Syracuse. Interestingly, with a sound mind, Dromio of Ephesus is “diagnosed” as “possessed” with his master Antipholus of Ephesus by the physician Pinch, who claims that “both man and master is possessed. [...] They must be bound and laid in some dark room” (Shakespeare 4.4.93-95). Nevertheless, by persuading his master to “be mad” and “cry ‘the devils’”, so that they won’t be “bind [bound] for nothing” (Shakespeare 4.4.127-128), Dromio of Ephesus is apparently not mad at all. This only reflects the fact that “madness and mentality in Renaissance medicine were explained largely in physiological terms” (Salkeld 61). The physician Pinch’s wrong judgement is based on physical features of “madness” resulted from Antipholus and Dromio of Ephesus’ identity displacements. Thus, Dromio of Ephesus reacts to his identity confusion by accepting it as his fate. He doesn’t question his fate but just passively takes it. He is a fatalist and a loyal servant to his master, who always tries to fulfill the duties of his social role and accepts unfair treatments.

Though Dromio of Syracuse is never a fate-taker like Dromio of Ephesus, he is a traditional Renaissance character who views his social identity as the upmost important factor that defines his own identity. When he undergoes a series of “transformation” because of his identity confusions, he is in fear, and he doubts his own sanity. Dromio of Syracuse believes that his mistaken marital relationship with the fat kitchen maid has “transformed” him to a “curtal dog”, an “ape” and an “ass”—from a human to an animal or even a non-animal (Shakespeare 2.2.201-205, 3.2.151). As a consequence of this “transformation”, Dromio of Syracuse has to double check his social role with his master in order to tell if he is sound-minded and is being himself or not (Shakespeare 3.2.73-83). Thus, similar to Dromio of Ephesus, Dromio of Syracuse values his social identity as his ultimate identity, for losing which means

a loss of himself (Shakespeare 3.2.73-83). In brief, Dromio of Syracuse reacts towards his identity confusion with a fear of losing his social identity and a suspicion of having lost his mind.

Antipholus of Syracuse, on the other hand, reacts differently from the other three characters. He does not cling to his original social identities like Antipholus of Ephesus does but he risks to lose it in order to gain a more complete identity. Neither is he a fate-taker like Dromio of Ephesus, nor is he so traditional a Renaissance character as to value his social identities over everything like Dromio of Syracuse. For example, Antipholus of Syracuse is the only character in the play who actively decides to “lose” himself before “the error” begins (Shakespeare 1.2.35-40). When Adriana takes him home for dinner as her husband, Antipholus chooses to “say as they [Adriana and Luciana]”, to be a “preserver”, and “in this mist at all adventures go” (Shakespeare 2.2.218-219); in other words, Antipholus of Syracuse is willing to “play the game”, and to go on an adventure of taking on another person’s identity. Antipholus of Syracuse even desires to take on a new identity when he is strongly attracted by Luciana, Adriana’s fair, unwed sister. He woos her by saying, “Are you a god? Would you create me new?/ Transform me, then, and to your power I’ll yield” (Shakespeare 3.2.31-40). At this moment, Antipholus of Syracuse wants to yield to the power of love, to let Luciana be his “god” and “create me [him] new” (Shakespeare 3.2.31-40). This is the peak of Antipholus of Syracuse’s identity loss and confusions, when he has lost his mother and brother, has taken on his twin brother’s identity as Adriana’s husband, and has become a romance lover who begs his love-at-first-sight to bestow him a new identity. It is not until later when his servant Dromio of Syracuse complains about his forced marital relationship and his fear of losing himself (Shakespeare 3.2.73-83) that Antipholus of Syracuse realizes the seriousness of his identity confusions:

There's none but witches do inhabit here,  
 And therefore 'tis high time that I were hence.  
 She that doth call me husband, even my soul  
 Doth for a wife abhor. But her fair sister,  
 Possessed with such a gentle, sovereign grace,  
 Of such enchanting presence and discourse,  
 Hath almost made myself traitor to myself.  
 But lest myself be guilty of self-wrong,

I'll stop mine ears against the mermaid's song. (Shakespeare 3.2.161-168)

Antipholus of Syracuse relates Dromio of Syracuse's witchcraft-like experience to his own when he is claimed by Adriana as her husband and has fallen in love with Adriana's fair sister Luciana. He suddenly realizes that Luciana's strong power of "teach[ing]" him to "think and speak" and "create [creating]" himself "new" has almost made him a "traitor to myself [himself]", or lose himself (Shakespeare 3.2.31-40, 3.2.165-168). At this point, it is the first time that Antipholus of Syracuse is afraid of losing his identity and his sound mind due to "witchcraft". Therefore, he concludes, "there's none but witches do inhabit here", and decides to escape from the island Ephesus (Shakespeare 3.2.161-168). In brief, Antipholus of Syracuse faces his identity loss and confusions actively by choosing to try taking on new identities and to risk losing his original social identities. This is very experimental of him as a Renaissance character who traditionally should have a fixed social identity. It is only when he is afraid to lose himself because of "witchcraft" that he decides to get rid of those new identities he has taken on.

## **VII. Antipholus of Syracuse's Awareness and Pursuit of His Personal Identity**

Fortunately, the characters' social identities and their "mind" are restored in the

comic closure of the play. However, the characters still have a lack of personal/mental identities, i.e. their individuality, because their identity are still defined by their bonds in the society. In the family reunion scene, though the Abbess Emilia, mother of the Antipholus brothers and wife of Egeon, serves as the “divine aid”, brings “safety and relief from the fear of madness”, and solves the characters’ identity displacements (Whitworth), Antipholus of Syracuse is still discontent to only live with his restored social identities but not having an individuality. This can be inferred by his reactions towards having found his “other drop in the ocean”—his twin brother Antipholus of Ephesus—whom made him “lose” himself and in search of his identity since the very beginning of the play. If Antipholus of Syracuse were content with the restoration of his identity, there would not have been a lack of affection and interaction between the two twin brothers; in other words, Antipholus of Syracuse would possibly have excitedly hugged his twin brother, and enjoyed a couple of enthusiastic conversations with him. Nevertheless, this is the opposite of what happens during the family reunion: Antipholus of Syracuse doesn’t hug his twin brother Antipholus of Ephesus, and even doesn’t address to him directly (Shakespeare 5.1.185-428)! Their conversations are so indirect that they only focus on untangling the confusions of their marital situations and social statuses (Shakespeare 5.1.185-428). In contrast, it is the Dromio brothers who seem to be rejoicing over their reunion, who decide to “go [walk] hand in hand, [but] not one before another” (Shakespeare 5.1.427-428).

Instead of engaging in enthusiastic conversations with Antipholus of Ephesus, Antipholus of Syracuse addresses to Luciana, his love at first sight, “what I told you then/ I hope I shall have leisure to make good,/ if this be not a dream I see and hear” (Shakespeare 5.1.376-378). Antipholus of Syracuse hopes that by marrying Luciana, he can create his own marital bond, and further develop his personal identity. This reflects the fact that Antipholus of Syracuse only view his twin brother as the family



bond that defines his social identity, while marrying Luciana can help him develop his own marital identity. More importantly, Antipholus of Syracuse thinks “love” can undo Luciana’s previous “witchcraft” that made him lose himself. He might also think that that marrying a woman he loves is a decision that he has made totally out of his own will. Though Luciana refuses Antipholus of Syracuse’s offer of marriage by answering his wooing in silence (Shakespeare 5.1.376-378), Antipholus of Syracuse doesn’t seem to give up the pursuit of his own personal/ mental identity. This might just suggest that “love” can’t solve his problem, or can’t grant him another level of identity. However, this is a proof of Antipholus of Syracuse’s struggle of pursuing his self-identity. Although there is no clue whether he will fulfill this task or not in the play, Antipholus of Syracuse’s discontentment of living without a personal identity, and the fact that “love” can’t bestow him an individuality can possibly serve as a strong motivation for his quest of individuality.

Therefore, not everyone’s identity is restored after the family reunion for at least one of them, Antipholus of Syracuse, is discontent with his present identity, which excludes his personal/ mental identity. Being aware of and in pursuit of individuality, Antipholus of Syracuse is a rare case of Renaissance people, who usually see their identities in their social bonds. Perhaps Antipholus of Syracuse’s intention to pursue his personal/ mental identity will make other Renaissance people accuse him as “mad” for he acts against the norm; nevertheless, his awareness and pursuit of individuality is to be encouraged and extolled in modern times. Therefore, Antipholus of Syracuse’s unsuccessful pursuit of his selfhood reflects a limitation of one’s individuality in the Renaissance society.

### **VIII. Conclusion**

Though whether or not one can be complete without his or her personal/ mental identity, and whether Renaissance people were able to pursue their individuality are still unanswerable questions after the analysis of Shakespeare's *The Comedy of Errors*, Shakespeare displays Renaissance people's identity issues through the characters' experiences of identity loss and confusions. He also tries to deal with it in this play, but he never intends to and can't solve this problem. In the play, the characters, except Antipholus of Syracuse, view their social identities as their ultimate identities. Thus, identity loss and confusions of their social identities make them lose their own identities. Only Antipholus of Syracuse is so non-traditional as to try to take on different social roles and to pursue his individuality after the comic closure when everyone else are content to live with their restored social identities. However, it is impossible to tell if Antipholus of Syracuse's pursuit of self-hood will be successful, and whether or not other characters will ever be aware that they have a lack of personal identities. Further studies of history, sociology, philosophy and psychology should be continued in order to answer one of the human beings' toughest questions, "who am I?" in the Renaissance.

Word Count (Intro to Conclusion): 4226

## IX. Works Cited

- Barker, Camilla R. "Shackles in Shakespeare: On the Falsity of Personal Liberty in Renaissance England." *Liverpool Law Review* 35.1 (2014): 25-29. EBSCO. Web. 14 Jan. 2017.
- Callaghan, Dympha. "Do Characters Have Souls?" *Shakespeare Studies* 34 (2006): 41-45. EBSCO. Web. 14 Dec. 2016.
- Landau, Aaron. "'Past Thought of Human Reason': Confounding Reason in *The Comedy of Errors*." *English Studies* 85.3 (2004): 189-205. EBSCO. Web. 14 Dec. 2016.
- Leggatt, Alexander. *Shakespeare's Comedy of Love*. London: Routledge, 2005. 1-19. Print.
- Mascuch, Michael. "Narrative Subjects, Individualism, Autobiography, Authority." *The Origins of the Individualist Self: Autobiography and Self-identity in England, 1591-1791*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997. Print.
- Pandita, Lalita. "Emotion, Perception and Anagnorisis in *The Comedy Of Errors*: A Cognitive Perspective." *College Literature* 33.1 (2006): 94-162. EBSCO. Web. 14 Dec. 2016.
- Salkeld, Duncan. *Madness and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1993. Print.
- Sawday, Jonathan. "Self and Selfhood in the Seventeenth Century." Ed. Roy Porter. *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Middle Ages to the Present*. New York: Routledge, 1997. 29-47. Print.
- Shakespeare, William. *Comedy of Errors*. Ed. Stanley Wells. New York: Oxford, 2008. Print.
- Smith, William K. *Reinterpreting the Comedy of Errors: Exploring "Madness" and the Need to Belong*. MA Thesis. Utah State University, 2009. Print.
- Wei, Angela Chun-Ling. *Self-identity in The Comedy of Errors: the Power of Law, Marketplace and Christianity*. MA Thesis. Fu Jen Catholic University, 2000. Print.
- Whitworth, Charles. "Farce, City Comedy and Romance: from the introduction to *The Comedy of Errors*." *Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages: The Comedy of Errors*. Ed. Harold Bloom and Janyce Marson. New York, Infobase Publishing, 2010. 202-216. Print.