

“METHINKS YOU MY GLASS”: SHAKESPEARE’S TWINS  
IN TEXT AND PERFORMANCE

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of  
Texas State University-San Marcos  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of ARTS

by

Kelsey A. Kling, B.F.A.

San Marcos, Texas  
December 2008

“METHINKS YOU ARE MY GLASS”: SHAKESPEARE’S TWINS  
IN TEXT AND PERFORMANCE

Committee Members Approved:

---

Debra Charlton, Chair

---

Charles Ney

---

Sandra M. Mayo

Approved:

---

J. Michael Willoughby  
Dean of the Graduate College

**COPYRIGHT**

by

Kelsey A. Kling

2008

For “two goodly sons”

Everett Douglas Kling

and

Elliott Garner Kling

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I can no other answer make, but thanks,  
And thanks, and ever thanks . . .

I will be forever grateful for the wisdom and support of Dr. Debra Charlton. Not only did she provide the seed of this thesis, but also valuable insight all along the way. My unusual route through my graduate studies required the special understanding of many parties, most especially Dr. John Fleming. To my other committee members, Dr. Charles Ney and Dr. Sandra Mayo, I also offer many thanks for continuing with me until completion of this thesis and for lively classroom discussion in the past two years.

I must also thank my biggest and most ardent supporter, my husband, Steve Kling. He never lets me quit. I quite literally would not have made it through my studies were it not for the help and encouragement of Claudia Kling and Margaret Altom who offered babysitting and pep-talks whenever required.

For being great listeners when I needed a bard-friendly ear, my thanks to Robert Matney, Elizabeth Fisher, and Ian Manners.

This manuscript was submitted on October 28, 2008.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
CHAPTER	
I. “A natural perspective that is and is not”: a Historical Construct of Twinship.....	1
II. “What have befall’n of them and thee till now”: Sources and Motifs in the Twin Comedies.....	12
III. “I am not that I play”: Character and Identity.....	26
IV. “For him I imitate”: Twin Representations on Stage.....	49
V. This “uncertain voyage”: In Defense of <i>The Comedy of Errors</i> .....	66
WORKS CITED.....	74

## CHAPTER I

“A natural perspective that is and is not”:  
a Historical Construct of Twinship

Twins are at the beginning of things, one to make and one to destroy, one to order and one to disorder, one to bind and one to loose, yet the two born together, defining each other, mirroring or even disguised as each other, cloven in two yet cleaving together (Gross 23).

The history of Western civilization is rife with myth and legend concerning the nature of twinship. When William Shakespeare first put quill and ink to paper to write *The Comedy of Errors*, his first comedy concerning this theme, he drew from a deep well.

At night, in the southwestern sky, two stars wink at one another as they travel westward together and then slowly sink below the horizon. These are the stars Castor and Pollux, the brightest stars in the constellation of Gemini, the astrological twins. The stars are named for the legend of the Dioscuri. As with all legends, many versions abound, but one of the more widely known is this: Zeus fell in love with the beautiful mortal Leda, wife of Tyndareus, and seduced her in the form of a swan. Leda became pregnant by both Zeus and her husband and bore two eggs. From each egg, a set of twins was born. Zeus was the father of Pollux and Helen, the woman whose face launched a

thousand ships, and Tyndareus was the father of Castor and Clytemnestra, the wife of the man who launched those ships. Though she was both the sister and sister-in-law of Clytemnestra, Helen was also arguably the reason for all of Clytemnestra's subsequent woes in the Trojan War, so their relationship could be classified as antagonistic. Castor and Pollux, however, were as close as if they had shared the same egg. In some accounts, when Castor died, Pollux appealed to Zeus to surrender his immortality and share his brother's fate. Zeus agreed and eventually created the stars in their honor, that they might never again be separated (Hamilton 42).

In Plato's *Symposium*, Aristophanes lays out a fable about the origin of human nature and love:

The sexes were originally three, men, women, and the union of the two; and they [the union] were made round--having four hands, four feet, two faces on a round neck, and the rest to correspond. Terrible was their strength and swiftness; and they were essaying to scale heaven and attack the gods. . . . At last Zeus hit upon an expedient. Let us cut them in two, he said . . . . He spake, and split them as you might split an egg with an hair; and when this was done . . . the two halves went about looking for one another, and were ready to die of hunger in one another's arms. . . . For love is the desire of the whole, and the pursuit of the whole is called love. There was a time when the two sexes were only one, but now God has halved them . . . . Wherefore let us exhort all men to piety, that we may obtain the goods of which love is the author, and be reconciled to God, and find our own true loves, which rarely happens in this world. (5)

From this story can be derived the modern notion of a soul mate, the one being who can complete and give wholeness to another.

Somewhat antithetical to this fable is the story of Romulus and Remus, in which the opposition of divided halves results in conflict rather than harmony. According to Plutarch, these twins were condemned in infancy to the river by their great-uncle for fear they would usurp his power. They did not drown but were instead suckled by a she-wolf and raised by a swineherd (20-21). As adults, the brothers rose up against their uncle, killing him. Together they founded the city of Rome (22-23). Legend says Romulus later killed Remus in a quarrel over where the foundation of the city should be laid (24).

Perhaps even more widely known is the Genesis story of the sons of Isaac. Isaac, who was the son of Abraham, was blessed late in his life with twin sons, Esau and Jacob. As the boys grew, Isaac favored Esau, and their mother favored Jacob. Once, famished from a hunt, Esau begged from Jacob some stew that he was cooking. Jacob gave Esau some stew in exchange for Esau's birthright. Later, Jacob deceived his father, who could no longer see. Disguised as his brother, Jacob received the blessing that should have gone to Esau (Genesis 25:24-34, 27:19-24).

The above examples are merely a selection taken from Western heritage, and as Elizabeth Stewart points out, "No matter the framework for analyzing twins, it is quite evident that twins are conceptualized in myths as both positive and negative, harmonious and rivalrous, happy and unhappy, divine and human" (11). The duality inherent in this statement is the focus of all that follows here. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of years after these myths were passed down, William Shakespeare took up the subject of twinship himself and penned two of his great comedies, *The Comedy of Errors* and

*Twelfth Night*, concerning sibling pairs that share this unique relationship. However, not all of Shakespeare's pairings are so literal. From the first play of his canon to his last, Shakespeare used doublings in other forms to illustrate the dual nature of the world in which we live. From *The Two Gentleman of Verona* to *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, doubles are a near constant in his work. In the histories and tragedies, this dualism usually takes the form of antagonism. In comedy, doubling takes the form of substitution or identity confusion (Rhodes 11). Eight of Shakespeare's history plays concern themselves with the English civil wars known as the Wars of the Roses that pitted the house of Lancaster (the red rose), against the house of York (the white rose). In perhaps his most beloved play, *Romeo and Juliet*, he sets his ill-fated lovers from opposing houses, and only their tragic demise can allay the hatred between Montague and Capulet. *King Lear* depicts the disintegration of a family when sister opposes sister and brother opposes brother, the conflict between Edmund and Edgar being heightened by the illegitimacy of the former. In his comedies, the dualism is sometimes triangulated by another factor until it can happily resolve itself. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the lover's affections are displaced by magic, and the pairings transpose until the plotting results in two happy couples. What begins as Lysander/Hermia/Demetrius and Helena becomes Lysander/Helena and Demetrius/Hermia, then Lysander/Helena/Demetrius and Hermia, and finally the desired outcome of Lysander/Hermia and Demetrius/Helena. In *As You Like It*, Rosalind's disguise as the boy Ganymede prevents her from expressing her feelings for Orlando until her true identity is revealed. However, dualism in Shakespeare is manifested not only in plot and character, but also in theme. The oft-quoted *Hamlet* line "To be or not to be . . ." is a prime example of this dualism of thought that is

ubiquitous in Shakespeare. Life versus death, dark versus light, sanity versus madness, love versus hate, and many other antithetical themes are found throughout his plays.

T.S. Eliot, when looking at Shakespeare's "continuous development," noted that Shakespeare put more and more of himself into his plays. Since "the choice of both theme and of dramatic verse technique in each play seems to be determined increasingly by Shakespeare's state of feeling, by the particular stage of his emotional maturity at the time," his crowning achievement is not one play "but the whole pattern formed by his sequence of plays," and what we should see as "the full meaning of any one of his plays is not in itself alone, but in that play, in the order in which it was written, in relation to all of Shakespeare's other plays, earlier and later" (Cole 405). Therefore, it is necessary to consider twinship as it appears not only in the individual plays, but also in the canon as a whole.

The objective of this thesis is to examine not only the twins of Shakespeare's dramaturgy, but also *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night* as "twin" plays of the canon, for no other two plays are so strongly connected across the canon as these. Through an investigation of their common sources and motifs, similarities and differences in the characterization of twinship, production practices, and the interrelationship between these factors, it will be shown that examining them in conjunction unlocks the richness and fullness of this unique sibling duality.

While there is no shortage of scholarship on either play, there is no definitive work on the twins of Shakespeare. There are some sources, dissertations primarily, that deal with the twins, though each in its own way. John Moore Mercer's Sibling Relationships in Shakespeare's Plays: Course, Quality, and Function is most closely

compatible and valuable to this thesis. Mercer is quick to grasp the advantage of examining Shakespeare's first comedy with his last to show both the similarities and differences between the twins and how this reflects on the growing expertise of Shakespeare's dramaturgy. Taking a more psychoanalytic approach, in "A Natural Perspective, That Is And Is Not": The Rhetoric of Siblings in Shakespeare's Comedies, Emily Tedrowe argues that in the comedies, *Errors* and *Twelfth Night* included, there is more honest recognition of the necessary preoccupation with primogeniture and marriage (as an extension of sexuality) as a means of maintaining social order. These notions are compounded in *Errors* and *Twelfth Night* respectively and are complicated further still by the unique twin psychology of identity, being at once a "self" and part of a whole. Todd Trubey is also concerned with identity. His dissertation, Classical Romans, Renaissance Italians, and Shakespeare: An Intertextual Study of the Relationship between Individuals and Social Systems in Literary Texts, is primarily concerned with manipulation or substitution of identity. He comments heavily and cogently on *Errors* and *Twelfth Night* and their textual antecedents.

First to be considered is the notion of twinship as a recurring motif in Shakespeare. Yet, it is not just the motif of twinship that is common to both these plays. There are major themes that both complement and complicate this motif, specifically witchcraft (trickery), madness, and time, and they will be explored as well. Chapter Two will encompass a discussion of the sources of the first twin relationships in *The Comedy of Errors* and trace the common elements forward to *Twelfth Night*. As stated above, there is a preponderance of mythology that easily supports twinship as a valid basis for drama, but Shakespeare did not use (at least not directly) any of the myths here outlined.

Instead, he chose plays from the Roman and Italian traditions. Shakespeare utilized the *Menaechmi* and the *Amphitruo* by Plautus as the basis for *The Comedy of Errors*, and *Gl'Ingannati* and its English adaptation “Apolonius and Silla” by Barnabe Riche as the sources for *Twelfth Night*. However, this ground is well trodden. Alison Gaw’s “The Evolution of *The Comedy of Errors*” still stands as one of the comprehensive works on the sources and development of *Errors*. She heralds the play as an amazing dramaturgical leap for the young playwright. T.W. Baldwin’s On the Compositional Genetics of The Comedy of Errors views the play as more of a compositional road map to examine Shakespeare as an author and connect this work to the rest of the canon. Even in this seminal work, the obvious connections between *Errors* and *Twelfth Night* receive very little attention. L.G. Salingar in his “The Design of *Twelfth Night*” has painstakingly shown how Shakespeare followed both Plautus and Riche for *Twelfth Night*. Perhaps the most helpful source on the subject of twinship as a recurring motif is Leah Scragg’s Shakespeare’s Mouldy Tales. She dedicates a chapter to the twin plays, also briefly outlining the sources. Scragg departs from the previous three authors and examines the connection between *Errors* and *Twelfth Night* not only by source, but also by theme. In particular, she illustrates madness as a connective thread. It is this theme of madness, along with the themes of witchcraft and time, that course through the canon from *The Comedy of Errors* to *Twelfth Night*. The similarities retained between the plays in both in source and theme will be emphasized, as well as their affect on characterization and production choices.

The biographical connection that Shakespeare had to twinship will also be considered. As the father of fraternal twins, Shakespeare had a unique perspective on this

type of sibling dynamic. Richard Wheeler's "Death in the Family" is only one article that reflects a growing trend in Shakespearean scholarship, that of referencing the life of Shakespeare when considering the work of Shakespeare. At least two of the authors quoted in this thesis wrote their works due to a special connection to twins themselves. Kenneth Gross is a twin, and Dr. Elizabeth Stewart is a mother of twins. The compulsion to write of this special relationship when it is present in one's own life is evident. How much of Shakespeare's personal life went into creating his fictional twins is the stuff of speculation, but what is known of his life will be duly noted in this thesis.

Character is the focus of Chapter Three. Similarities and differences in the early and later twin relationship will highlight this section. In her excellent book, Exploring Twins, Elizabeth Stewart examines twinship as a social construct, both in itself and within society at large. Tracing twinship from its mythological roots, she provides a backdrop from which to examine the inherent nature of twinship. Her work provides the frame from which both pairs of twins can be analyzed. Here also, the dissertations by Mercer and Tedrowe prove very insightful. They each examine the twins, however they do so from opposite perspectives. Mercer is concerned with the overall patterning of the sibling relationships, while Tedrowe is more concerned with their individual psychology. Similarities and differences in the external sense will be noted, considering not only the obvious physical differences between the pairs, but also what happens to the twins in the plots of these plays. This section highlights the rhetoric that is intrinsic to the twin dynamic as opposed to other sibling relationships in Shakespeare and will show how the twin identity is analogous to Shakespeare's overall theme of identity and dualism. The

primary question here is: did Shakespeare see his twins as individuals or as two halves of a whole? This chapter will attempt to provide an answer.

The next chapter examines what happens when this question is addressed in performance. The mode of casting these plays directly impacts on character and also influences the motif brought out in the production. Chapter Four will examine the production histories of *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night*. The question of character raised above is linked to the question of whether one actor or two should play the roles of the twins. Does the “willing suspension of disbelief” extend to the representation of twins on stage? Does an audience need to see “one face . . . two persons,” or will the mind make the necessary leap when there are in fact two persons in these roles? What are the consequences of casting decisions on character and theme? To answer these questions, five casting choices will be examined, and the various ways in which productions conceive the twin relationship will be evaluated. *Errors* provides a much more interesting platform from which to argue this point because it contains two sets of twins, therefore providing more variations from which to choose, whereas *Twelfth Night* (aside from the Globe’s landmark original practices production) is less fluid in its casting choices compared to its predecessor. While a few attempts have been made at casting one actor as both Viola and Sebastian, this has not been as readily accepted as the single Antipholuses or Dromios. Richard Slawson offers a comprehensive examination of *Errors* in performance and argues that casting choices reflect the dominant theatrical view of the era and audience acceptance. John Moore Mercer writes again on the twins in “Making the Twins Realistic.” He chronicles casting decisions in both *Errors* and *Twelfth Night* and how they have metamorphosed with varying degrees

of success over the years. These articles have many points of intersect. While the original sources have been cited herein, it is important to note the indebtedness of this section to the research performed by Mercer and Slawson regarding production history. However, both authors are primarily concerned with the mechanics of casting and little attempt is made by either to address the impact of these decisions on character or the production as a whole. After tracing the casting decisions surrounding these plays, this chapter will examine how each of these decisions supports or supplants the themes and characterizations that have been previously discussed.

In conclusion, it is the recommendation of this thesis that the twinship issue be given further attention in production. Twinship is not simply a vehicle for a plot of mistaken identity. It is a vessel containing some of the most fundamental questions and themes of Shakespeare. Shakespeare was influenced by his own experience and the myth and literature that preceded him to include this particular sibling relationship in his dramaturgy because it provides an obvious platform for a immensely important theme in the canon, the discussion of identity. The connective cords that bind these plays together, almost twin-like in themselves, prove that there should be more scholarship on these plays. The final chapter of this thesis will argue that this examination should not merely be scholastic but also include the laboratory that is production. This chapter will outline a brief proposal suggesting why these plays should be produced together and how this may be done. However, should these plays not be produced in repertory (as they rarely are), the argument is that greater attention should be paid to *The Comedy of Errors* in performance. This thesis will not contend any fundamental superiority of one play to the other. Still, to know and appreciate one is to know and appreciate the other. Affinity for

*Twelfth Night* runs high both with artists and audiences, as evidenced by its long and much lauded production history. Though much recent scholarship has rescued *Errors* from some of the negative connotations of mere farce, it has for the most part lacked the same resonance as *Twelfth Night*. *The Comedy of Errors* is a text that boasts a long underappreciated richness, and because of its many opportunities for experimentation, it consequently begs to have more attention in production.

## CHAPTER II

### “What have befall’n of them and thee till now”: Sources and Motifs in the Twin Comedies

Thus far, the focus of this work has been to provide an historical context for the examination of Shakespeare’s twins. This chapter will narrow the focus onto Shakespeare’s specific sources and associated motifs for these two exemplary comedies. For purposes of this discourse, sources will be loosely defined as the literary genetics of the plays, the preexisting texts that gave *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night* their skeletal structure, and the circumstances of Shakespeare the man, his life and milieu. In crafting these plays, Shakespeare used source material available to him and infused his own genius to create these lasting texts. Even though Shakespeare did not utilize the dramaturgical device of twins anywhere except in *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night*, these plays have much more in common than the twin plot contrivance. One of the primary sources for both plays is the Roman comedy *Menaechmi* by Plautus. This section will also highlight the motifs common to these two plays: time, witchcraft (trickery), and madness. Individually, these themes are not unique to these plays. However, it is their collective prominence that makes this particular triad of themes unique. With shared motifs, source material, and subject matter of twinship, *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night* have numerous points of intersect and are connected at a very fundamental level. They are in essence “twinned.” The goal of this chapter is to

emphasize the common features of these plays and lay the framework for the discussion of character that is to come.

Scholars generally agree that *Errors* is based in large part upon two Plautine comedies, *Menaechmi* and to a lesser extent on the *Amphitruo*. A brief description of the *Menaechmi* plot will make the relationship between it and *Errors* evident. A merchant of Syracuse brings one of his identical twin boys to market in Tarentum. While there, the child, Menaechmus, is carried off and later adopted by a wealthy merchant of Epidamnus. The father of the boys dies of grief. The surviving twin, Sosicles, was renamed for the lost brother. Years later, Menaechmus of Syracuse (Sosicles) comes to Epidamnus with his servant Messenio to seek his lost brother (Argument 1-4, Prologue 1-35). Menaechmus of Epidamnus has a shrewish Wife, and he decides to taunt her by giving one of her mantles to a Courtesan (I.ii). Later the Courtesan returns the mantle to Menaechmus Sosicles (II.iii). The Wife accuses Menaechmus of taking the mantle, which he denies and is shut out of their house (IV.ii). When Menaechmus tries to get the mantle back, the Courtesan protests that she already returned it to him along with a bracelet. He denies this also and is shut out of her house, too (IV.iii). The Wife accosts Menaechmus Sosicles, and when he denies any association with her (V.i), she assumes he is mad and calls her father to set him straight (V.ii). The father sends for the doctor (V.iv), who tries to take away local Menaechmus (V.v), but Messinio rescues him. The twins finally encounter each other, but they are so amazed that Messinio must sort out the resolution (V.ix). From *Menaechmi*, Shakespeare adapts his basic plot outline: identical male twins are separated at a young age; then one comes to seek the other. In Menaechmus and Menaechmus Sosicles of *Menaechmi*, Shakespeare has his *Errors*

character prototypes for Antipholus of Ephesus and Antipholus of Syracuse, respectively. Antipholus of Ephesus must contend with a jealous wife, Adriana, and a courtesan, and must suffer the accusations of lunacy arising from incidents of mistaken identity. Where Plautus focuses on the local twin, Shakespeare looks instead to the visiting twin. Antipholus of Syracuse has his identity mistaken by the Ephesians, including his twin's wife, with the object of contention becoming the gold chain (Plautus's mantle). To these broad similarities, Shakespeare adds his own complexities, which result in a more unified play. Rather than simply reuniting the brothers, Shakespeare creates the parental roles of Egeon and Emilia and reunites the entire family. He also gives the wife a sister, Luciana, with whom the visiting brother falls in love (Scragg 14).

Another great Shakespearean stroke is the twinning of the servant characters. Menaechmus of Epidamnus has a parasite called Peniculus (II.i), and Menaechmus Soscicles has a servant called Messenio (II.i). These are the Dromio prototypes. It is this doubling of both the master and servant characters that Alison Gaw believes is implicitly borrowed from the *Amphitruo* and superimposed on *Menaechmi* (625). The *Amphitruo* has as its central characters not twins but two sets of doppelgangers. The god Jupiter has fallen in love with the mortal Alcmena and disguises himself as her husband, Amphitryon, in order to seduce her while her husband is at war. Unaware of the trick being played on her, she becomes pregnant with twins by both Jupiter and her husband. Jupiter's servant Mercury, who is impersonating Amphitryon's servant, Sosia, reveals this in the Prologue. T.W. Baldwin argues that Shakespeare's borrowing of the *Amphitruo* is in device only, not in details of plot. Both Gaw (625) and Leah Scragg (14) contend that the barring of Antipholus of Ephesus from his home in Act III, Scene i is

taken from the *Amphitruo* (Watt 402). Yet, they all join in the sentiment that though Shakespeare borrowed elements from the Roman sources, *Errors* is in essence his own amplification and not simply a reproduction of *Menaechmi* or *Amphitruo*. Besides the second doubling, there is more subtle shading of *Amphitruo* in *Errors*. In Act I of the former, it is revealed that Alcmena will give birth that day to twin sons, one the son of her husband, the other the son of the god Jupiter. This rather strange twin-like relationship can be seen in the Antipholus-Dromio dynamic. While they are not brothers, they have grown up together, and their master-servant relationship reflects the same birth disparity as the mortal versus the god-sired twins. Though the double doubling of servant-master relationship has been lifted from *Amphitruo*, Shakespeare's mistaken identities arise from ignorance rather than willful deceit.

There is one other noteworthy source from antiquity relating to both *Errors* and *Twelfth Night*. This is less concerned with plot or character, but as it relates to later topics of discussion it should be mentioned here. The sea, and its associated images of storm and shipwreck, is the final motif to be discussed. Baldwin asserts that the hapless plight of Egeon, the storm, and resultant shipwreck that he describes at the beginning of the play (I.i.62-120) most closely parallels that of the titular character of the *Aeneid* by Virgil (239). Indeed, Baldwin claims this as the model for all poetic storms and shipwrecks, and therefore it is the source for the recurring symbol of the shipwreck in the Shakespearean canon, including *Twelfth Night*. The *Aeneid*, along with Homer's *Odyssey*, are two of the major classical epics of a sea journey that becomes a life journey. H.H. Huxley's article "Storm and Shipwreck in Roman Literature" cites many of the more obscure examples. The sea, vast and powerful, is a constant in the lives of an island

monarchy such as England and is a near constant referent in the Shakespearean canon. Every play contains at least one nautical reference, and in some cases several references. Several other plays, notably *Pericles* and *The Tempest*, concern themselves with journeys at sea. The sea journey, to an Elizabethan audience, is representative of the passage through life and the storm symbolic of the chaos that can intrude upon that journey (Scragg 18). In each play, it is quickly revealed how a storm and shipwreck have thrown the lives of the twins into chaos (*TN* I.ii.9-17).

Upon seeing the first recorded performance of *Twelfth Night* in 1602, John Manningham observed that it was “much like *The Comedy of Errors* or *Menaechmi* in Plautus, but most like and near to that in Italian called *Ignanni* [*Gl’Ingannati*] (Lothian xxvi). This rather perceptive observance carries the discussion to sources of *Twelfth Night*. Manningham observed the common Roman denominator of both plays, *Menaechmi*, and the Italianate lineage of *Twelfth Night*. *Gl’Ingannati* is the prime source for Viola’s plot line, while Sebastian seems closer in origin to the *Menaechmi*, though it is impossible to unknit the plot that Shakespeare made around the two. It is likely that *Gl’Ingannati* was not the direct source for *Twelfth Night*. Geoffrey Bullough argues that it is a non-dramatic adaptation of the Italian story by Barnabe Riche that is the intermediate source on which *Twelfth Night* is based (270). In Riche’s “Apolonius and Silla” a young woman is separated from her brother by the sack of Rome. However, in Riche they are simply brother and sister. She escapes the convent where she has been placed by her father and, in disguise, becomes a page in the service of the man she loves. She becomes his emissary to the lady he wishes to marry, and a triangle forms when the lady falls in love with the disguised page. The arrival of the brother allows for the happy

coupling in the end. The similarities here are clear. Shakespeare does not adopt wholly from Riche, but he hearkens back to his earlier work. Again, the main characters are twins, though this time they are fraternal. Again, a shipwreck divides his twins, and again the insertion of the other half creates the environment for mistaken identity. Though the relationships do not manifest themselves in the same way, Riche's story lifts many names from Acts 18: Pontus, Priscilla, Apollos. Slyly, Shakespeare picks up on another name from Acts: Caesarea. L.G. Salingar in his "The Design of *Twelfth Night*," has painstakingly showed how Shakespeare followed Riche for Viola and Plautus for Sebastian (118-128). In fact, Sebastian is a true echo of Antipholus of Syracuse regarding circumstance. Like his *Errors* counterpart, he finds himself in a strange land after a shipwreck that separates him from his twin. As he makes his way through the town he is recognized by its inhabitants and is even loved by a strange noblewoman. The strange events that unfold cause Sebastian to question his sanity before finding his sister in the recognition scene, thus explaining the mistaken identities (Scragg 26). The Roman and Italian traditions are also alive in *Twelfth Night* in other ways; for example, the witty banter of Feste, the clown, and the boastful swagger of Sir Toby Belch.

There is one more source to be examined, that of the author's personal life. For the last half century or more, it has been a prime question of scholarship whether is it valuable, or even permissible, to read the works of Shakespeare through a biographical lens (Wheeler 130). (Presumably, this not unrelated to the tired authorship issue). However, there is a fair amount of extant information on the life of the man from Stratford, so it seems wholly unwise not to examine the works through the life. If Shakespeare's work was colored by antiquity and his contemporary social context, as this

paper contends, then the events of his own life must also be brought to bear, especially concerning these two plays.

William Shakespeare was the father of opposite-sex twins. Christened Hamnet and Judith for their godparents and neighbors on February 2, 1585 (Greenblatt 73), they were almost ten years old when *Errors* was first performed in December 1594 (Foakes xvi). Shakespeare's only son died 1596 (Greenblatt 315). Viola, who according to the text is at least thirteen (V.ii.243-244), would have been about the same age as Judith at the time of Hamnet's passing. Shakespeare seems to have written his daughter into the role of Viola, young and bereft of a brother and a father. Perhaps no one knew of the profound connections while watching the first performance of *Twelfth Night* in 1602 (Lothian xxvi). One can only imagine the longing as Shakespeare penned the recognition scene of *Twelfth Night* in which a brother, thought dead, is resurrected. How much time Shakespeare spent in Stratford with his children is purely speculative. However, the parent of twins cannot help but be cognizant of a sacred and unique bond between those siblings. It does not seem possible that a writer, who can so feelingly capture the human soul, would not equally feel the intimate workings of his family. It is therefore the argument of this thesis that Shakespeare was deeply affected by his experience as a father of twins and that it manifested in his work.

It is not enough to simply know that Shakespeare had twins. When looking at *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night*, it is equally fruitful to examine not only where Shakespeare adheres to the classical sources but also where contemporary Elizabethan sensibilities infuse the plays (Watt 402). Here the discussion turns to from the social construct toward the motifs common to these plays. The first and perhaps the most

important of these is Time. As above, time is not simply the passing of time, although that is one of the meanings it carries. In *Errors* “Time” is synonymous with “Nature,” and in *Twelfth Night* it is used congruously with “Fate,” “Fortune,” and “Chance.” This theme surfaces quickly in both plays. Actually, before the action of the plays begin, the work of Nature has already shown its force in the storms and shipwrecks that divide the twins. In the first scene of *Errors*, Egeon describes his present circumstances as “wrought by nature” (I.i.34) and elaborates on the sundering of his family. In the same scene, Egeon is condemned to die at sundown if he cannot produce the thousand marks necessary to ransom him (I.i.21-22). Time is palpable at the onset, like a giant clock ticking off the minutes until Egeon’s death. From these early exchanges it seems to be a negative force in the lives of these characters. However in Act II, Shakespeare allies time and nature in a comic exchange between the Syracusian Antipholus and Dromio:

SYR. ANT. Well, sir, learn to jest in good time; there’s a time for all things.

SYR. DRO. I durst have denied that before you were so choleric.

SYR. ANT. By what rule, sir?

SYR. DRO. Marry, sir, by a rule as plain as the plain bald pate of Father Time himself.

SYR. ANT. Let’s hear it.

SYR. DRO. There’s no time for a man to recover his hair that grows bald by nature

.....

SYR. ANT. Why is Time such a niggard of hair, being (as it is) so

plentiful an excrement?

.....

SYR. ANT. You would all this time have proved, there is no time for all things.

SYR. DRO. Marry, and did, sir: namely, e'en no time to recover hair lost by nature.

SYR. ANT. But your reason was not substantial, why there is no time to recover.

SYR. DRO. This I mend it: Time himself is bald, and therefore to the world's end will have bald followers. (II.ii.63-107)

Time here is treated both literally and figuratively, in images both light and dark, describing the journey of life.

Time also plays an important role in *Twelfth Night*. When the heroine is first seen after her shipwreck, Viola is comforted by the idea of time as fate working in her life:

VIOLA. And what should I do in Illyria?

My brother he is Elysium.

Perchance he is not drown'd: what think you, sailors?

CAPTAIN. It is perchance that you yourself were sav'd.

VIOLA. O my poor brother! and so perchance may he be.

CAPTAIN. True, madam, and to comfort you with chance (I.ii.3-8)

At the end of the scene, she declares, "What else may hap, to time I will commit" (I.ii.60). The language in this scene highlights the role that fate plays in this plot, particularly for Viola. Fate is further emphasized if this scene is performed first in

production, as is often the case. If the play is performed as written with “If music be the food of love, play on” as the first line, the theme of music, rather than fate, is brought to the forefront. In Act II, Scene i Sebastian reveals their bond of twinship:

[My father] left behind him myself and a sister, both born in an hour: if the heavens had been pleased would we had so ended! But you, sir [to Antonio] altered that . . . (18-21).

Sebastian, like his sister, harkens to the force that fate plays in their lives. The heavens saw fit that they were born together and should die together. For Sebastian, Antonio’s rescue represents interference in Fate’s plan.

In Act I, Scene v, Olivia, basking in her new love for Cesario, calls upon Fate to work itself in her favor:

Fate, show thy force; ourselves we do not owe.

What is decreed, must be: and be this so (314-315).

In the scene in which Malvolio daydreams of a life with Olivia, he begins, “Tis but fortune, all is fortune” (II.v.24), and in Viola’s famous Ring speech, she invokes both Fortune and Time:

I left no ring with her: what means this lady?

Fortune forbid my outside have not charm’d her!

.....

O time, thou must untangle this, not I,

It is too hard a knot for me t’untie. (II.ii.16-40)

Repeatedly, in both plays, there is a sense of helplessness in the face of Time, of Fate, of Fortune. The characters cannot help but hope for the outcome they desire, but are

nonetheless powerless to bring it about themselves. This plays into the contemporary notions of Order as ordained by God and therefore infallible (Tillyard 13). The idea of predetermination has an immediate impact on character and identity that will be further explored.

While Order is the just and comfortable stasis, there are many things that happen in the world of these plays that upset that order. There are always darker forces at work. In *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night*, these darker forces take the form of witchcraft and trickery. Martine Van Elk wishes to highlight the cony-catching pamphlets (stories of rogues and trickery) of the day, not as an additional source per se, but as a legitimate influence on the writings of Shakespeare owing to their widespread familiarity (324). She goes on to argue that reading the pamphlets alongside the plays reveals the Elizabethan fascination with identification, misidentification, and the greater social order. Identity and the recognition of that identity are intrinsic to maintaining the social order (325). Without the external recognition that one's identity provides, the social order, and by extension the natural order, of the body disintegrates, leading to chaos and madness. Twins, especially identical ones, are natural disruption to that social order of identity because the world sees "one face . . . and two persons" (*TN* V.i.214). Each instance in which one twin is mistaken for the other is a breakdown in order. Though the actual cause of the breakdown of identity in these plays is benign, as the term 'mistaken' implies, identity can also be preyed upon by those willing to upset the balance. All the twins, Viola excepted, assume that their crisis of identity is the result of a trick or of some supernatural power. Both plays provide rich examples.

No sooner has Antipholus of Syracuse referred to himself as that confounded drop

(I.ii.35-38) than Dromio of Ephesus appears. Antipholus is curious about the money he entrusted to his servant and inquires after it (I.ii). This Dromio truthfully tells that he was not given any money, so Antipholus assumes he has been swindled:

Now as I am a Christian answer me,  
 In what safe place have you bestow'd my money,  
 Or I shall break that merry sconce of yours  
 That stands on tricks . . . (I.ii.77-80)

Thus begins the string of misidentifications in *Errors* that the victims wrongly assume to be tricks. Some characters seem to think that these deceptions go beyond trickery and straight to the devil himself. Consider the Syracusian Antipholus's line after encountering the Ephesian Dromio:

They say this town is full of cozenage,  
 As nimble jugglers that deceive the eye,  
 Dark-working sorcerers that change the mind,  
 Soul-killing witches that deform the body,  
 Disguised cheaters, prating mountebanks (I.ii.97-101)

The pair from Syracuse, thoroughly distraught by their predicament by Act IV, invokes Satan, sorcery, and witches when encountering the Courtesan (IV.iii.46-76). The notion of the devil being at work on earth was part of the Elizabethan reality. For Dromio to play a trick or for the devil's witchcraft to be at work were equally plausible (Miola 26). Perhaps the most widely known device of trickery is contained in the subplot of *Twelfth Night*. In Act II, Scene iii Maria, Toby, and Andrew concoct a plan to dupe the puritanical Malvolio. Maria will write some "obscure epistles" in the handwriting of

Olivia to persuade Malvolio that Olivia is in love with him. This letter leads him to appear before her cross-gartered in yellow stockings (II.iii.146-176, II.v.92-179).

The almost inevitable result of trickery and witchcraft upon identity is a state of assumed madness, the third and final motif to be addressed. But for the spirit of forgiveness that runs in the comedies, the workings of madness would run dark indeed. Though the madness of *Errors* is the result of mistaken identity, it reverberates out beyond the individual. The repeated and compounded misidentifications finally lead Adriana (and everyone else in Ephesus) to believe that her husband is mad, and Doctor Pinch carries him away (IV.iv). In *Twelfth Night*, madness is created internally and externally. Sebastian, being mistaken for Cesario by Olivia's entire household, begins to question his sanity (IV.i, iii). Malvolio, as a result of trickery, is locked up by Sir Toby and Sir Andrew for exhibiting madness, and the trick is carried to rather a more malicious end than is usually expected in comedy (III.iv). Identical twins have a natural advantage in tricking the unsuspecting, however neither set is culpable in the events that lead to the seeming madness of characters in these plays. If, as Scragg suggests, madness is an extension of alienation (22), then perhaps the twins are more mad than the rest, having found themselves literally and/or symbolically adrift in the world.

The focus of this chapter has been to examine how the sources first manifested themselves into the writing of Shakespeare. Further, it describes some of the motifs of Shakespeare's dramaturgy that are common to these plays. Time, trickery, and madness are by no means the only themes present in these works, just as the sources mentioned here are arguably not the only sources for these plays. What is clear is that Shakespeare borrowed unblushingly from Plautus, from Riche, from his life, and from his moment to

create and shape his dramas. This thesis does not profess to be a definitive work of source study on either *The Comedy of Errors* or *Twelfth Night*. Rather, source study is included in order to relate these plays by more than their twin protagonists. By virtue of these common factors as well as sharing three relevant motifs, these plays are clearly interrelated. What is particularly fascinating is that these motifs repeatedly direct the reader to a fundamental query of Shakespeare, the question of identity. The following section will explore similarities as well as differences in character, and how each of the motifs discussed here impact those characters' identities.

### CHAPTER III

#### “I am not that I play”: Character and Identity

There is a fundamental advantage in examining these two plays simultaneously. *The Comedy of Errors* is certainly one of Shakespeare’s earliest comedies (Foakes xxiii). *Twelfth Night* is his last festive comedy, that is, ending on a satisfactory note. His final three comedies *Measure for Measure*, *All’s Well That Ends Well*, and *Troilus and Cressida* have since been classified as “problem” comedies, or lacking an orderly conclusion. As discussed in the previous chapter, Plautus and Riche provided Shakespeare with much of the material for his plays. By modifying Riche in the direction of Plautus, specifically by using elements of *Menaechmi* in both *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night*, Shakespeare arrives at two comedies that are much more similar in tone and theme to one another than either of their sources. It is in the manipulation of source and theme that the contrivance of the twin plot is elevated to meaningful character. As Foakes so aptly puts it, “[Shakespeare’s] modification of the sources are used to develop a serious concern for the personal identity of each of the main characters and for the relationships between them” (xliii). The central relationship that Foakes refers to is the twin relationship. As Chapter One illustrated, twins are defined from birth in relation to one another, and their identities will forever be marked by that duality.

What is under review here is how this duality is reflected in the identity of each individual twin.

The question “Who am I?” is the fundamental query of identity. In Elizabethan England, people had begun looking to different places to answer that question. Slowly, the humanist philosophy began to whittle away at the Church’s notion of predetermination: that God had a plan for all and that mere humans should not question nor attempt to change that plan. By the time Shakespeare began writing, a man’s choices were as relevant as birthright in determining one’s basic identity. In the case of twins, the role of choice is perhaps more important because the fact of their birth does not provide enough social distinction. “The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars but in ourselves that we are underlings,” he wrote in *Julius Caesar* (I.ii.139-140). The role of Fate (or Time) in a person’s life was no longer absolute, but fluid and even “fickle” (*Rom.* III.v.60-62). Just as Fate is not absolute in determining identity, external forces may be at work, and an individual may be subject to the negative effects of trickery on his or her identity. Without the benefit of modern outward signifiers, a person’s identity was socially defined and subject to the frailties of that society.

When it becomes impossible to tell who someone is (regardless of whether the other is deceiving you intentionally or not), it is clear that the mechanisms that keep individuals in their rightful place have broken down. . . . These works demonstrate that social identity, on which order depends, is not fixed, divinely ordained, or natural, but open to usurpation, theft, loss, or exchange. (Van Elk 325-326)

Beyond Fate/Time and society, but inclusive of those two elements, is an individual's own sense of selfhood. Whatever identity has been built by the former factors can be utterly dashed if the individual assumes himself or is assumed to be mad. Madness, where it is genuine, can dissociate an individual from his sense of self and create a vacuum of unknowing. These three motifs from the previous chapter will resurface with each individual discussion of identity and character herein.

For all their similarities, there are marked differences between the Dromio-Dromio, Antipholus-Antipholus, and the Viola-Sebastian relationships. This chapter will examine these disparities, and determine what bearings they have on the respective sibling dynamics and individual characterizations. To this end, this chapter examines each relationship in three parts: course, quality, and function (Mercer 5). The course of the relationship is essentially the circumstances and plot, and this directly influences the quality, or nature, of the relationship. The dramatic function that twinship serves in the play is more or less determined by the previous two factors (5-6). Through each stage of this structure, discussion will be enhanced by discourse on motif. The identities of the individual characters will be examined, and this examination will provide the framework for the later discussion of character representation.

First to be considered is the course that each relationship takes. Much of this was covered previously, but it bears repeating. Mercer sifts through the details to arrive at a common plot scenario of *Errors* and *Twelfth Night*, which essentially highlights the elements derived from the *Menaechmi* plot (12-13). However, Mercer is much too quick to distill. His summary does broadly cover the plot, but in his desire to create patterns in the plot and the relationships, he has forcefully tuned out many of the details, sometimes

even facts, that have direct bearing on the quality of the relationship between the siblings, not the least of which is the inclusion of a second pair of twins in *Errors*. What he fails to realize in his chapter concerning the twins is that the “sameness” of the twin dynamic is always implied, and his attempts to pattern them are redundant. In a relationship in which similarities are assumed, why not choose instead to celebrate the differences between the individuals?

This section will consider the similarities where they exist but will be primarily concerned with three differentiating circumstances of the course of these plays. The first and most obvious difference is that there are two types of twins in these plays. The twin sets of *Errors* are identical male-male twins. Viola and Sebastian, though they much resemble each other (II.i.24-25), are fraternal male-female twins, and the inherent tensions that exist in these dynamics will be discussed. Second to be examined are the familial bonds that are broken and reformed. Third, Time again plays a critical role in the course of these plays. In this instance, it will be the literal passage of time as well as the influence of Fate. It is important to note here that these differentiations are based on knowledge gleaned from the entire text. These circumstances are not necessarily revealed in the same course in each play or to both the audience and the characters. *When* the revelations happen is possibly as important as the revelation itself. For example, the audience does not discover the twin relationship in *Twelfth Night* until Act II, and it is revealed in the first scene of *Errors*.

Twins, and their respective dynamics, present some unique questions about custom and presuppositions in culture. Though the audience participates in the willing suspension of disbelief in order for the comedy to play to its fullest effect, it does not

mean the world of the play is exempt from the convention of family structure which has its predetermined system of competition, expectations, and assumptions that are made based upon that system (Tedrowe 10-11). If anything, these assumptions are amplified by the twin duality. Take, for example, the social convention of primogeniture as it applies to the brother-brother relationship. The problem of inheritance is highlighted most notably in *As You Like It*, wherein Orlando and Oliver literally wrestle over their father's legacy. The same issue persists in *Errors*, though the sibling context is different. The twinship of the Antipholuses creates a question of identity that society at large is not prepared to answer: in the case of first born twin sons, who is to inherit? Because the Antipholus brothers were raised apart and both by wealthy men, the question of who will inherit their father's fortune is diffused and allows for the brothers to be civil siblings rather than rivals. The pair is further balanced by their marriage to sisters who likely have an equal dowry (V.i.374-375). Viola, particularly since she has lost their father, is subject to and dependent on Sebastian for financial support, as well as to arrange for and protect her sexuality through her marriage. It is small wonder then that believing her brother to have perished and herself bereft of the security that her twin relationship offers, she decides to dress as a eunuch to protect her virtue and to seek employment from Orsino (I.ii.55). In contrast to Viola, Olivia, also having lost her father and brother, is now in a state of independence and is free to manage her financial and marital affairs. Additionally, Viola upturns social expectations when she (as Cesario) finds Sebastian a wife by virtue of having been in the relationship with Olivia first (Tedrowe 16). This will be discussed in more detail below.

However, the immediate twin dynamic is not the only familial relationship to consider:

*The Comedy of Errors* involves the division of the entire family – husband and wife, father and son, mother and son, brother and brother, and master and servant. . . . [T]he members of Egeon’s family are searching, not merely for one another, but for a sense of personal identity that has been diminished by their separation. The ‘errors’ that occur in the main plot are thus not simply a product of the arrival of the second pair of twins. They are an extension of a process already at work – the disintegration of that sense of selfhood that derives, in part at least, from an acknowledged place within the family group. (Scragg 15-16)

As this passage points out, there are three important relationships present in *Errors* that are not in *Twelfth Night*. The master-servant relationship is the source of most of the misidentifications in *Errors*, and is therefore essential to both the quality and function of these twin relationships. In the first half of the frame, Egeon sets up the basic plot and given circumstances. Emilia, Egeon’s wife, was assumed lost along with her infant master-servant pair, but she appears near the end as the Abbess (V.i.342). In the last scene comes the resolution: Dromio-Dromio meet, Antipholus-Antipholus are reunited with their parents, and their parents are reunited with each other. The audience is aware throughout that Egeon is the father of the Antipholus twins. In contrast, *Twelfth Night* makes little mention whatever of the parents of the twins. There is one fleeting reference that Sebastian cries as easily as his mother (II.i.38-39), and in Act II, Scene ii the

audience learns that Sebastian and Viola are twins and that their father is dead. So, as the play begins, only in each other do Sebastian and Viola have a familial bond:

I am all the daughters of my father's house,  
And all the brothers too . . . (II.iv.121-122)

It is arguable that a master-servant bond exists between Orsino and Viola. However, the nature of their relationship resists that label, for their actions more closely resemble a peer relationship. Orsino will only entrust his suit to Olivia to one whom he can trust implicitly:

Thou [Cesario] know'st no less but all: I have unclasp'd  
To thee the book even of my secret soul. (I.iv.13-14)

It must also be noted when these bonds of family are severed. The shipwreck that divides the pairs in *Errors* occurs in the infancy of the twins. Viola and Sebastian are separated in adulthood, and only Viola holds out hope that the other is alive and that they will meet again. Antipholus of Syracuse arrives full of hope that he will find his counterpart and their mother. Therefore, when the twins are reunited in the end, the effect is quite different in each play. For the *Errors* twins, they are entering their sibling dynamics for the first time. For Viola and Sebastian, they are resurrecting their dynamic and simply picking up where they left off.

Third, time is an integral motif of both *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night*, and it plays an essential role in the course of these twin dynamics. Time, in all its manifestations, is supported by the structure of the text, and this structure also affects character. Though later editors have since subdivided the text of *Errors*, in the Folio, the text is broken only by acts, and there is every indication that the action is continuous

across even those divisions (Foakes xii). This continuous action coalesces with the fact the Egeon has only one day to raise the fee for his release (I.i.150). The single day timeframe may help explain why this is Shakespeare's shortest play. Another aspect of the text is its verse-prose composition. No other Shakespearean play contains so few prose lines as *Errors*, about one-eighth the total (Shaw 18). A preponderance of verse and the seeming inevitability of Egeon's demise demand that the playing of *Errors* be swift and agile. Characters are not afforded the luxury of reflection. The errors compound themselves so quickly that the twins do not have the chance to react rationally to their situations. *Twelfth Night*, in comparison, has a fairly luxurious amount of prose and operates with a more luxurious timeline. The scope of the play is at least three months (V.i.92, 97), and unlike that of *Errors*, has space enough to contain the Toby-Maria-Malvolio subplot in addition to the main twin plot. Time is repeatedly personified in *Twelfth Night* and is given latitude to work its machinations.

These factors directly influence the quality of the relationships and the individual identity of these characters. In Shakespeare, the quest to identify one's self is often in relationship to the sibling. This is perhaps best illustrated by the brothers of *King Lear*, where Edmund and Edgar's struggle for their rightful place as the favored son is also the struggle for their eventual place in society. In these comedies, *Errors* in particular, this quest is compounded. A twin, more than any other sibling, most clearly demonstrates the physical manifestation of identity. How much harder it must be to establish an identity when there is a physical copy from whom you must endeavor to distinguish yourself. In both *Errors* and *Twelfth Night*, this twin identity is mutable and can be blurred or altered, but not escaped. The argument here is that each of the main characters is undergoing a

crisis of identity when the course of the play begins, and by the end of the play has found a resolution to that crisis, if not the identity they seek.

*The Comedy of Errors* is a play about identities and selfhoods . . . . For the twins are not only physically indistinguishable, they also share the same names – socially, the signifiers by which identity and individuality are primarily conferred. [T]here is an important sense in which the two Antipholuses (like the two Dromios) *are* the same person, are undifferentiated versions of the same selfhood (Dutton 32).

As the scene rises on Ephesus, Egeon has already set up the circumstances of his family. All the relationships are divided by time and distance, and it is into that confusion that Antipholus of Syracuse enters. Even after much time, he does not consider himself to be wholly apart from his twin and will continue to be incomplete without the other, as the text suggests:

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. (I.ii.35-40)

His quest then seems to be as much about finding himself as finding his lost loved ones, but he has made them one and the same. This quest is immediately thwarted, for in the following lines the first misidentification occurs when he recognizes the Ephesian Dromio as his own servant (I.ii.41-42), and after this encounter begins to feel he is the

victim of some device or witchcraft (I.ii.95-99). Without knowing it, Antipholus wanders into a strange land where his identity is both known and unknown, unknown to himself (being still separate from his twin) and known to Ephesus as his twin. The profound alienation he expresses is thrown into an immediate relief as he is identified in town as himself and not himself (Tedrowe 25). It is, of course, a dramatic necessity that he not realize that he is being mistaken for his twin. Instead of exploiting the confusion and usurping this newfound identity, he expresses his bewilderment and even fear of the forces at work in Ephesus (Scragg 19). This Antipholus, a “quasi-metaphysical” (Bloom 22) fellow, looks inward for the resolutions of these misidentifications. The recognition of his identity is so complete in Ephesus that he assumes it must be he, and not the town, that is slowly going mad. When he is invited to dine with Adriana and Luciana, he muses that he is “Known to these and to myself disguised” (II.ii.214). Ironically, it is in garb of his brother’s identity that he discovers his own identity through his love for Luciana:

. . . would you create me new?

Transform me then, and to your power I’ll yield. (III.ii.39-40)

It is the finding of this “better part” (III.ii.61) of himself rather than his twin that completes his quest (Foakes xliii).

Where the identity of Antipholus of Syracuse is mutable, Antipholus of Ephesus considers his identity to be fixed. Where the brother from Syracuse considers the possibility of his madness due to misidentification, the Ephesian brother denounces all claims that he is not himself. Before the audience meets Antipholus of Ephesus, they are made privy to the estrangement between him and his wife Adriana. Their estrangement

is so complete that when she mistakes her brother-in-law for her husband, she might as well be addressing her spouse who has also become a stranger to her:

The time was once when thou unurg'd wouldst vow  
 That never words were music to thine ear,  
 That never object pleasing in thine eye,  
 That never touch well welcome to thy hand,  
 That never meat sweet-savour'd in thy taste,  
 Unless I spake, or look'd, or touch'd, or carv'd to thee. (II.ii.113-118)

Circumstances do not improve for this Antipholus. He and his Dromio are refused access to his own house while Antipholus of Syracuse is dining there. That his wife denies him is cause enough for rancor (III.i.62), but since this happens in front of other merchants, his anger is compounded by embarrassment. This occurs again when the goldsmith begs of Antipholus of Ephesus the price of the chain he gave to Antipholus of Syracuse, and the former's "reverend reputation" (V.i.5) is called into question (IV.i.64-76). At first the mistaken identities provoke laughter, but the seeming inability of the characters to solve the problem engenders some fear. Throughout the play, Antipholus of Syracuse is for the most part benefited by the mistaken identity, while Antipholus of Ephesus is maligned by it and loses status within the town. In Act IV, Scene iii Antipholus of Syracuse has been misidentified all over town as his brother. He decides that he is surrounded by "sorcerers" (11), and his encounter with the Courtesan is the final straw. It is she who first declares the Ephesian Antipholus to be "mad" (78). When the local Antipholus is mistaken for the Syracuse brother by his father, the point is driven home that selfhood is not enough to maintain identity or status. An external

endorsement of that status is needed (Scragg 22). His loss of control is understandable. His identity and that of his brother can only be restored through an agent of change. This agent fittingly appears in the form of a holy vessel, the Abbess who is Emilia, their mother. Yet, when order is restored, the reunion between these brothers is a cool one. This is odd, for if the audience readily accepts the rest of the conventions necessary to make this play work, a joyful reunion would be no less palatable.

The reunion between the Dromios is, by contrast, full of charm. Perhaps these men, lacking in the status of their masters, perceive they have nothing to lose by embracing their brother. Rather, they instantly recognize their equality:

We came into the world like brother and brother,

And now let's go hand in hand, not one before another (V.i.425-426).

The Dromios serve an important dramatic function. In the course of all the misidentifications, they serve as a medium of reflection for their masters. It is the Ephesian Dromio who succinctly states what is happening when he and his master are locked out in Act III, Scene i:

O villain, thou hast stol'n both mine office and my name; (44)

And it is Dromio of Syracuse who poses the basic questions about what is happening to his master and himself:

SYR. DRO. Do you know me sir? Am I Dromio? Am I your man? Am I myself?

SYR. ANT. Thou art Dromio, thou art my man, thou art thyself.

(III.ii.72-75)

There is little reassurance in this affirmation however. The journey of the Dromios is no less confusing than that of their masters, and they both speak of their transformation into asses (IV.iv.26) or fools by the day's events:

SYR. DRO. I am transformed, master, am I not?

SYR. ANT. I think thou art in mind, and so am I.

SYR. DRO. Nay, master, both in mind and in my shape.

SYR. ANT. Thou hast thine own form.

SYR. DRO. No, I am an ape.

Luciana: If thou art chang'd to aught, 'tis to an ass.

SYR. DRO. 'Tis true, she rides me, and I long for grass;

'Tis so, I am an ass, (II.ii.195-201)

There is a relief in this reunion that is not present in their masters', but that is reflected in the reunion of the other sibling pair yet to be discussed: Viola and Sebastian.

It is evident that the exploits of Sebastian are similar to those of Antipholus of Syracuse, but Sebastian has his own story to tell. As previously stated, Viola and Sebastian have grown up together. Since they have no family other than each other, their loss is more acute and has not been tempered by time. Sebastian seems to be more affected by the loss of his twin than is Viola. He remembers her fondly to Antonio: "She is drowned already, sir, with salt water, though I seem to drown her remembrance again with more" (II.i.26-28). The audience bears witness to his mourning process, which therefore seems more plausible and less prideful than Olivia's excessive laments described in the first scene (I.i.26-32). Sebastian marvels at the turn of events that bring him into Olivia's favor (IV.i.59-62), but upon reflection he does not assume himself to be

mad nor question his fundamental identity as do men of *Errors*; rather he attempts to reconcile with reason. His Act IV, Scene iii speech perfectly illustrates the type of analysis that time does not allow for in *Errors* and touches on the themes discussed in the previous chapter:

This is the air, that is the glorious sun,  
 This pearl she gave me, I do feel't, and see't,  
 And though 'tis wonder that enwraps me thus,  
 Yet 'tis not madness.  
 .....

For though my soul disputes well with my sense  
 That this may be some error, but no madness,  
 Yet doth this accident and flood of fortune  
 So far exceed all instance, all discourse,  
 That I am ready to distrust mine eyes,  
 And wrangle with my reason that persuades me  
 To any other trust but that I am mad,  
 Or else the lady's mad; yet if 'twere so,  
 She could not sway her house, command her followers,  
 Take and give back affairs and their dispatch,  
 With such a smooth, discreet, and stable bearing  
 As I perceive she does. There's something in't  
 That is deceivable. But here the lady comes. (1-21)

One wonders if, had Olivia not intruded on his reverie, he may have eventually hit upon the explanation that he is being mistaken for his twin. Sebastian is a source of constancy and loyalty in the play and is a grounding force for the plots (Weaver 96). It is the characteristic of loyalty they share, as much as any physical feature, that shows Sebastian and Viola to be siblings. Largely ignored in scholarship in comparison to his sister, Sebastian should not be overlooked, because he is the agent of change in *Twelfth Night* (Weaver 94). His arrival in Illyria and subsequent misidentification as Cesario (IV.i) will unlock the triangle, and his interjection into the subplot also helps bring about that end. Olivia's anger, aroused by Sebastian's fight with Andrew and Toby, is what forces Toby to give up the device against Malvolio:

If he [Malvolio] may be conveniently delivered, I would he were, for I am now so far in offence with my niece that I cannot with any safety pursue this sport to the upshot. (IV.ii.70-73)

Were it not for her brother's arrival, Viola might be forced to continue in her charade in perpetuity. Sebastian's marriage to Olivia and final meeting with Viola clears the way for Viola's relationship with Orsino.

Viola, one of Shakespeare's most admired heroines, has been the subject of countless articles of scholarship, particularly concerning the gender issues that are inherent in the play. This is not an attempt to add to that already excellent and full body of work, but rather to discuss Viola in her twin dynamic. Only two brief points will be made regarding gender. In her excellent essay "Twins and Travesties: Gender, Dependency and Sexual Availability in *Twelfth Night*," Lisa Jardine couches Viola's gender and Viola and Sebastian's relative situations in terms of domestic place. This was

touched on briefly above. As a woman dressed as a boy or simply as a woman, Viola occupies the same subservient position in Orsino's (or Sebastian's) household. Her sexuality is vulnerable outside the household of her brother, so only as a man is she sexually unavailable (Jardine 28-29). As the twins are fatherless and alone, their situations are resonantly similar (31). Viola, needing a guise to protect herself and grieving at her loss of her only male kin, chooses to memorialize him by imitating, but not completely assuming, his identity (I.ii.53-55).

Prove true, imagination, O prove true,  
 That I, dear brother, be now ta'en for you!  
 .....  
 He nam'd Sebastian. I my brother know  
 Yet living in my glass; even such and so  
 In favour was my brother, and he went  
 Still in this fashion, colour, ornament,  
 For him I imitate. (III.iv.384-394)

But does adopting the costume of a man mean she must also adopt the maleness of a man? Modern discourse on this subject asserts that gender is a social construct (Dolan 10). To all of Illyrian society, save the sea captain, Viola is a man, but to herself she is always a woman. This distinction is crucial. Viola makes the audience her confidante, and therefore to the audience, as well as to herself, she maintains her female gender even when dressed as a boy, more specifically her brother:

[B]y the very fangs of malice I swear, I am not that I play (I.v.184-185).

Viola is almost immediately and comically aware of the implication of her disguise:

I'll do my best

To woo your lady: [Aside] yet, a barful strife!

Whoe'er I woo, myself would be his wife. (I.iv.40-42)

Viola is at once powerless and content in her position. She cannot reveal herself to Orsino, and since he may not woo her, she is content to do whatever will make him the happiest, which is to court Olivia in his stead. The unintended result is, of course, that Olivia falls in love with Viola. In a fashion, Viola's decision to dress as a man, her disguise, is the first "mistaken" identity of *Twelfth Night*. It is specifically her gender identity and by extension her general social identity that is displaced. If the audience were not aware of her sex, the wooing scenes between Viola and Olivia and the duel between her and Sir Andrew would assuredly fall flat. Her frustration at her predicament is best stated in her ring speech:

What will become of this? As I am man,

My state is desperate for my master's love:

As I am woman (now alas the day!)

What thriftless sighs shall poor Olivia breathe?

O time, thou must untangle this, not I,

It is too hard a knot for me t'untie (II.ii.35-40).

This speech parallels her brother's later one in many respects. It artfully follows a line of logic, but clearly there are some situations which rhetoric alone will not solve. Without an obvious or logical solution to her predicament, she is content to commit herself to

Time. Viola, like her brother, must simply churn with the flow of events and hope to reach a resolution. Also like Sebastian, Viola is fiercely loyal to those she loves, and it is her loyalty that is a prime motivator for her actions. Ironically, she reaches a point of finality and is willing to die for Orsino only moments before her brother enters to unravel the mistaken identities (V.i.132-133).

The reunion between Viola and Sebastian is far more plausible than the twins of the *Errors* plot. This is hardly surprising considering the past history of this pair. Since there is no one else to corroborate their identities, they must be tested in each other:

SEBASTIAN. Do I stand there? I never had a brother;

Nor can there be that deity in my nature

Of here and everywhere. I had a sister,

Whom the blind waves and surges have devour'd:

Of charity, what kin are you to me?

What countryman? What name? What parentage?

VIOLA. Of Messaline: Sebastian was my father;

Such a Sebastian was my brother too:

.....

SEBASTIAN. Were you a woman, as the rest goes even,

I should my tears let fall upon your cheek,

And say, 'Thrice welcome, drowned Viola.'

VIOLA. My father had a mole upon his brow.

SEBASTIAN. And so had mine.

VIOLA. And died that day when Viola from her birth

Had number'd thirteen years.

SEBASTIAN. O, that record is lively in my soul! (V.i.224-250)

Viola is finally able to shed her masculine attire and reclaim her identity as a woman.

For all the analysis of character, the twin relationship serves several specific dramatic functions. The first function is to provide the broad structure of the plot through the device of the quest. There is a double quest in *Errors*. Antipholus is seeking his brother, and Egeon is seeking Antipholus. In *Twelfth Night*, the goal of the quest ended by the shipwreck is vague at best. None of the siblings know each other to be alive. Yet the audience does, and they wait for the characters' sorrow to turn to joy in the end. As Mercer points out, this first function could have been fulfilled by many other kinds of relationships (23), however the twin element establishes the environment in which the second function, mistaken identity, can occur. Shakespeare does not draw on real life for the physical likenesses of the twins: even identical twins are not identical in personality and opposite-sex twins look as much alike as any boy-girl siblings. Rather, he draws on the literary convention that all twins, once gender adjustments are made, look exactly alike. It is this device that creates amazement and confusion in the recognition scenes for both the characters and the audience. Orsino exclaims:

One face, one voice, one habit, and two persons!

A natural perspective, that is, and is not! (V.i.214-215).

While the actors do not necessarily appear to be the same, the audience nonetheless takes delight in the convention, which is the final dramatic function of the twin relationship: creating comedy. Much of the laughter in these two plays (the hilarious subplot of *Twelfth Night* notwithstanding) comes not only from the identity confusion of the

characters, but also from the audience's recognition of that confusion. The gap between what the characters understand versus what the audience understands is perhaps wider in these plays than any other of the canon. In writing on *The Comedy of Errors*, Bertrand Evans notes:

Comic effect emerges not once from character as such. If the Dromios prove laughable, it is not in themselves but in the incompleteness of their vision of situation that they prove so. Language, which regularly afterwards is squeezed for its comic potential [as in *Twelfth Night*], here serves chiefly to keep us advised of situation. With neither character nor language making notable comic contribution, then, the great resource of laughter is the exploitable gulf spread between the participants' understanding and ours. (1)

The device of mistaken identity is used to great comical effect in *The Comedy of Errors* and to greater sophistication in *Twelfth Night*. The basic dramatic situation in *Errors* is a simple one: locals mistake a visiting twin for his resident brother, and then expect him to remember previous encounters with the other twin. Shakespeare mostly keeps this doubling confusion between master and servant. In the first scene, Antipholus of Syracuse gives his Dromio money to keep. Then he encounters Dromio of Ephesus and each denies knowing what the other is talking about: Dromio's safekeeping of the money and Antipholus's promise to eat dinner with Adriana. The errors continue. However, for all the daftness exhibited by Antipholus of Syracuse in the play, it could be assumed that the source of the confusion would eventually be found out (except Egeon must be saved that day).

In *Twelfth Night*, the comedy derives not so much from mistaken identity as is seen in *Errors*, though that is an essential element, but from the presumption of identity. Viola's identity as "Cesario" is modeled after Sebastian, but she has not assumed his identity. The male identity she puts on is the source of her trouble:

Disguise, I see thou art a wickedness,

Wherein the pregnant enemy does much (II.ii.26-27).

The use of cross-gender mistaken identity creates a kind of humor not possible in *Errors*. Both Orsino and Olivia become involved in a same-sex romance with Viola-Cesario. The complot begins when Orsino sends Viola as his emissary to Olivia and continues when Olivia falls in love with Cesario and sends Malvolio with a ring in chase of her. In her famous ring speech, Viola realizes Olivia's mistake and misfortune:

I left no Ring with her: what means this Lady?

Fortune forbid my outside have not charm'd her:

.....

She loves me, sure: the cunning of her passion

Invites me in this churlish messenger.

.....

I am the man: if it be so, as 'tis,

Poor Lady, she were better love a dream. (II.ii.16-25)

Similarly, Orsino does not realize that his page is subtly trying to win his love in Act II, Scene iv while he is trying to squash his own conflicting thoughts. Viola comes dangerously close to revealing herself in this confessional scene. When Orsino argues that women are not capable of loving as deeply as men, Viola claims:

[W]ere I a woman, I should [love] your lordship.

It is comical that Olivia unwittingly falls in love with a woman and that Orsino does not realize his “Boy” (II.iv.15) is trying to woo him, but this comedy is not dependent on Viola’s having a twin. Viola is not aware of her brother’s survival as the audience is (though the possibility is opened up after IV.iii), and it seems to her inevitable that her circumstances will have to continue in this manner, only hoping time will help it fadge. However, in order to break the unhappy triangle that has formed between Orsino, Olivia, and Viola and have the requisite happy ending full of marriages and revels, another must enter to take her place in one or the other of the relationships (Mercer 30). Since Shakespeare prefers order, a twin brother is used. It is only after Sebastian arrives in Illyria in Act III, Scene iii that the potential for mistaken identity, such as that in *The Comedy of Errors*, is possible. The incidents of mistaken identity in *Twelfth Night* are few, but they all converge on Viola in the last scene: Antonio condemns Cesario for ingratitude, Olivia accuses him of infidelity, and Sir Andrew declares him to be the “devil incarnate” (V.i.179-180) for beating him and Sir Toby. One other character, though not a twin, also exhibits a presumption of identity. Malvolio tries to elevate himself above his station. The letter he finds makes him believe that Olivia loves him, so he puts on all the aspects the letter describes to win her, cross-garters and all (III.iv). It is this presumption that leads Olivia to believe he is mad. His resolution is not so satisfying as that of Sebastian and Viola.

Mercer states there is a paradox in the twin dynamic in these plays. Antipholus of Syracuse claims to pine for his twin, yet barely makes mention of him beyond Act I. He has been on a multi-year quest to find his brother, yet it never occurs to him that he might

be mistaken for his twin in Ephesus. Some of this is out of dramatic necessity. For all the closeness professed by both set of twins, they do not appear on stage together until the recognition scenes in Act V, and these scenes are less than the joyous reunions that the previous rhetoric indicates. Shakespeare clearly intended for the twins to be close, so why the relative distance in his dramaturgy? Mercer claims that it is Shakespeare's larger concern for plot in these two plays that makes the emotional relationship take a lesser, almost non-existent, place (19).

This thesis suggests otherwise: that the inherent closeness of the twin relationship would be something accepted as true. The historical construct of this relationship suggests an inescapable bond, if not always one of pure amity. Perhaps, the rhetoric of closeness is not there because Shakespeare deemed it unnecessary. It is true that the twin dynamic is absolutely integrated into the plot. Yet, it is not Shakespeare's found and modified plots that keep these plays "fresh and lasting" (I.i.31-32). Harold Bloom readily admits he favors character over action, but he also argues that no other author rivals Shakespeare in the creation of personality (xviii-xix). It is this gift, his characters, which should be celebrated. This chapter has been an attempt to celebrate these characters as individuals as much as twins. In order to fully appreciate these characters, they must be seen in performance; therefore the following section will explore various ways in which these twin relationships are explored on stage.

## CHAPTER IV

### “For him I imitate”: Twin Representations on Stage

The natural progression of this study now moves to the stage; for it is in production that motif and character become most apparent. The previous chapter illustrated the similarities and differences between each twin and their counterpart. This chapter will examine how these similarities and differences manifest themselves in performance. However, this is not a straight linear progression; there are variables to be considered. Text adaptation and stage convention play a large part in the plausible staging of these plays. Casting is a subset of convention and the one that will be most closely scrutinized here. Experimentation in casting has long been a feature of Shakespeare productions, particularly in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. These casting decisions have relevant consequences for its particular production, and it will be the goal of this chapter to explore those consequences, especially regarding two topics already discussed in this thesis, motif and character. Five casting scenarios will be considered: casting two actors to play the Antipholus roles, casting one actor in both Antipholus roles, casting Sebastian and Viola in the traditional mode with male and female actors, using one actress to portray both Viola and Sebastian, or in the mode of original practices with an all male cast. Each possibility carries with it distinct

advantages and disadvantages from a production standpoint. These will be weighed along with critical commentary.

Before the issue of casting is addressed, it is a worthy digression to discuss the convention of belief that is part of the theatre-going experience, the willingness to accept as true the obvious fiction that is presented in the space of the performance. For *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night* this holds “doubly” true. Each of these modes of casting requires varying degrees of the willing suspension of disbelief. To accept the illusion of any or all of the following scenarios, an audience member must first accept the already unlikely situation that the general plots present: that identical twins, when dressed alike (as they always are), are absolutely indistinguishable from one another. If this is readily accepted, then how much further is the audience willing to extend that sense of plausibility? Do they delight in the illusion of identical physical manifestation or in the transparency of the illusion? As will be illustrated below, companies have gone to great lengths over the years either to maintain or to shatter this illusion with varying degrees of success, with success being defined as an engaged and participatory audience. The question of whether or not a casting choice proves believable may not always be directly expressed in the arguments below, but is always implied. Just how much illusion is needed to suspend disbelief for *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night*?

Richard J. Slawson argues that the evolution of the casting choices in *Errors* is, for the most part, a direct reflection of the dominant theatrical mode of the time. For example, the original *Menaechmi* would have required the actors to don identical masks to achieve the illusion of the twins (59). So too, actors and directors of various times have used the conventions available to them to achieve the desired level of realism. In

two excellent (and often overlapping) articles, Slawson and John Moore Mercer trace the production history of *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night*. However, both authors focus primarily on the methods employed to stage the twins and the varying degrees of success of those methods. They make almost no attempt to analyze whether or not the methods they discuss are dramaturgically sound. This chapter will pick up where they leave off.

It should be noted that many of the examples detailed below center on the Dromio rather than the Antipholus pair. This is mainly because productions began experimenting with Dromio casting scenarios first. However, many of the dramaturgical issues involved in each performance mode apply to both Antipholus-Antipholus and Dromio-Dromio pairs. For example, the use of costume design to mask physical disparities between the actors is a method that could be employed for either set of *Errors* twins. Therefore, it is assumed below that a casting choice made for one pair in a given production of *Errors*, such as double casting the Antipholus pair, might also hold true for the other pair. Examples cited below concerning the Dromios are likely relevant to the Antipholuses as well, and vice versa.

As Chapter Two illustrated, Shakespeare freely adapted his source materials to arrive at his text. In turn, Shakespeare was freely adapted by succeeding playwrights to fit their own purposes, and *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night* are no exception. Presumably, some of these adaptations desired to make the plays more realistic by changing or even omitting the “far-fetched” plot lines of the twins. For example, the *Twelfth Night* that Samuel Pepys saw in the 1660s may have done away with Viola and Sebastian and thus the improbabilities that plot line contained (King 13). *Twelfth Night*

in particular suffered from a long succession of transformations and adaptations before the nineteenth century recovered the text (Lothian lxxx-lxxxi). In contrast, some of the adaptations of *The Comedy of Errors* capitalized on the twin relationship: William Woods' *The Twins, or Which Is Which?* and Monk Lewis's *The Twins; or Is It He or His Brother?* (Mercer, *Twins* 98). Text adaptation also plays a key part in accommodating modern casting choices, as will be demonstrated below.

Staging convention can also be used to heighten the question of the stage reality. Several attempts have been made to explain, among other improbable similarities, just how the twins come to be dressed alike on the same day. A 1980 production of *The Comedy of Errors* at the New Jersey Shakespeare Festival had the Syracusian twins buy their Ephesian costumes from a cart when they arrived during Mardi Gras in New Orleans (Keyishian 199-200). The circus theme has become a popular backdrop in recent years. The 1983 Goodman Theatre production had the Syracusian brothers arrive in suits and ties but adopt the circus attire of Ephesus upon arrival, and so they end up in the same garb as their counterparts (Fink 415). The problem of costuming the twins alike in *Twelfth Night* is perhaps even more perplexing. J.P. Kemble, who likely began the tradition of switching the first two scenes of the play, added a line:

That trunk, the reliques of my sea-drown'd brother,  
Will furnish man's apparel to my need. (Odell 62)

Why Viola was able to find Sebastian's trunk and not Sebastian perhaps adds to, rather than dissipates, the costume confusion (Mercer, *Twins* 100). The assumption that both Viola and Sebastian have lost all but their lives in the shipwreck makes the dramatic circumstance that they are dressed alike in Acts III, IV and V all the more implausible.

Regardless of where Viola finds her clothes, the choice to switch the scenes is perhaps a relevant one, for it immediately establishes what is probable in this world. The audience sees Viola as a woman, then accepts, based on her rhetoric, that from that point on they will see her as a man (I.ii.53-55), and that her brother may in fact be alive (I.ii.7, 20-21). Therefore, when Sebastian appears in Act II, Scene i and reveals he and Viola were “born in an hour” (19), an audience can more likely accept the scenario that Viola and Sebastian look alike. Similarly, within twenty lines of Egeon’s exposition, the twin scenario is established:

. . . two goodly sons,  
 And, which was strange, the one so like the other,  
 As could not be distinguish’d but by names. (I.i.50-52)

Script adaptation and stage convention will only go so far toward creating this twin illusion. The most powerful tool in achieving the desired effect onstage is that of casting. The first choice to be examined is the casting of two actors in the Antipholus roles. This seems to be the casting choice that is called for in the text. T.W. Baldwin goes as far as to suggest the first cast list for *Errors*, placing Thomas Pope and William Kemp as the Dromios and Augustine Phillips and George Bryane as the Antipholuses (Personnel 229n). Though by no means certain or able to be proved, this list does suggest that casting two actors was the original mode. Baldwin goes on to suppose that the reasoning behind this choice was that Mr. Kemp and Mr. Pope were both strong comic actors, and that casting had little to do with their appearance (Slawson 60). If this is true, and it is impossible to substantiate this claim, then precedent is set from a very early point that the illusion of “sameness” would somehow need to be created in the mind of

the audience. Considering that Elizabethan audiences readily accepted men as women on stage, the need to create this illusion may not have been strongly felt. The first positive evidence of casting of *Errors* is the so-called “Nursery” promptbook of the 1670s. In it, two actors are identified as the two Antipholuses, but the final scene is lost and the extant stage directions give no clue how the twins were played or if they resembled one another at all (G.B. Evans 9). The first half of the eighteenth century seems to offer few other clues. In the 1762 premiere production of Thomas Hull’s adaptation of *Errors*, called *The Twins*, the playbill lists actors but does not assign parts (Genest 4: 653). It is known that the actor William Thomas Lewis played Antipholus of Syracuse for ten years (1779-1789) opposite three different Ephesian Antipholuses (Hogan 151-155). Clearly, Lewis could not have realistically resembled all these counterparts, so it seems that even up to the turn of the nineteenth century, the Antipholuses were cast on the merit of their acting and that a similar appearance was not deemed necessary in order to create the twin illusion (Slawson 61).

According to Slawson, the 1800s saw a change in the demand for pictorial realism. This was usually accomplished in one (or a combination) of two ways, actor resemblance and mimicry. Actors’s inherent physical likeness, or lack thereof, was usually modified further by costume design. This was the method commonly employed when actors were cast on merit or lines of business rather than physical resemblance. An early example of the practice of mimicry came in 1798 when the professional mimic Thomas Rees played Dromio opposite the well-respected Joseph Munden. The Monthly Mirror called it a “vile caricature,” obviously implying the failure of mimicry to achieve the level of realism desired. Nevertheless, it illustrates the demand of the public to be

caught up in the illusion. Later, Munden, playing opposite a new Dromio (William Blanchard), was criticized for not appearing to be physically alike his counterpart. Mr. Munden was apparently much shorter than Mr. Blanchard. However, the Antipholuses in the same production were considered “well suited” (Genest 8: 233). In reviewing Frederick Reynold’s 1819 musical version of *The Comedy of Errors*, Leigh Hunt noted that the Dromios were “persons no more resembling each other than moisture to drought . . . or a plum pudding and a pepper box” (328). Later, in America, the pairing of the gifted mimic James Henry Hackett (Dromio of Ephesus) opposite John Barnes in 1826 was successful enough in its illusion to give *The Comedy of Errors* its place in the contemporary American repertory (Shattuck 1:57). Mr. Barnes played Dromio many times in his career (ending in 1840), but it was Hackett’s successful imitation of Barnes that paved the way for the wildly popular pairing of William H. Crane and Stuart Robson as the Dromios in 1878.

Despite the accomplishment of these mimetic brothers, it was many years before it was conceived that actual siblings should attempt the twin roles. One can only speculate about why this casting scenario had not occurred previously. By far the most successful and prolific of these sibling-twins was Charles and Henry Webb. According to one review, the illusion was so complete that the brothers could not be distinguished except by their different colored stockings (Day and Trewin 34). Between the years of 1864 and 1878, they toured Ireland and England as the Dromios, acting in and producing the play over 1,500 times. In some productions, they cast brothers in the master roles (Foakes liii, Slawson 64-65). Charles Webb directed the New York production starring Robson and Crane. Sources are not in agreement as to their physical likeness (Shattuck

2:18, French 88). Costume and makeup were used to modify their appearance, but it was Crane's imitation of Robson that made the illusion complete. Speaking "more like Robson than Robson himself" (Odell, Annals 599), the effect was so striking that more than thirty years later, the New York Times critic John Corbin still hailed their recognition scene as a standard of excellence (Slawson 63).

As theatre moved into the twentieth century, there was a greater sense of innovation and of what was possible on stage. Though sources disagree about how this decision came about, productions began to experiment with a new mode of casting *The Comedy of Errors*, using one actor to play both twins. Mercer speculates that the choice followed along the continuum of demand for physically identical twins (*Twins* 106). Another claims it was perhaps the theatrical response to what had become possible in the world of cinema, the double exposure (Slawson 67). Perhaps the relative improbability of finding two actors alike enough to play the roles (Ford 13-14) made the decision a practical one. Regardless of how it came about, the first evidence of this new mode of casting was a 1923 production in New York by the Ethiopian Art Theatre of Chicago in which Charles Olden played both Dromios. This "jazzed" Shakespeare was not very well received and one critic, while praising Olden's comic ability, pined for the glory of the Robson-Crane recognition scene (Corbin 22). It was a full forty years before the experiment was tried again with any success, this time at the Colorado Shakespeare Festival at Boulder in 1962. The roles were played by Edwin L. Johnson, E. Lee Johnson, Richard L. Sterne, and R. Livingston Sterne; four actors who were, of course, only two people (Perkin 543). The illusion of four was kept only thinly veiled. In the final scene, T-shaped poles were brought out on stage bearing the hats and capes of the

four brothers. Rather than cut the text, both actors simply moved from under one pole to the other to deliver their counterpart's lines. Perhaps influenced by the success of *Errors* at Boulder, the next year it was produced by the famed American Shakespeare Festival in Stratford, Connecticut. This production tried to keep the illusion complete until the end, using stand-ins for the final scene (Ogden 437-438). This has become a common dramaturgical device for achieving the double cast (Lindblad 333). Since the advent of this casting mode, doubling both the Dromios and the Antipholuses has become "not an uncommon device" in American and European theatre (Leiter 62). However, it was not until 1990 that the English stage saw its first doubling of the twins in Ian Judge's production in Stratford (Smallwood 348).

The above production history of this play illuminates a myriad of possibilities for casting, all of which are now conventionally accepted. The choice to cast either one or two actors has become a subjective choice of a director. Each of these casting choices has inherent challenges. In casting two actors, the question arises: how much of a physical likeness, if any, should be created for the stage? The ways in which that likeness might be created have been discussed above. Some productions have chosen to do away entirely with the illusion of sameness, either because the director trusts the audience's sense of imagination or because it is deemed that illusion is not needed at all. For example, the 1967 New York Shakespeare Festival's production had actors cast entirely on merit alone, with the result no less admirable:

It is interesting that [Syr. Antipholus] looks no more like [Eph. Antipholus] than [Syr. Dromio] resembles [Eph. Dromio], yet we accept them as dead ringers with no trouble at all. This is partly because of . . .

carbon-copy costumes but mostly because the rest of the cast is so stunned by the resemblance that it would be impolite of us to doubt it. *Consensus thus breeds illusion.* (emphasis added) (Sullivan 58).

Robert Woodruff's 1983 production with the Flying Karamazov Brothers made any resemblance between the twins irrelevant. Their abilities as jugglers were of much greater import than their appearance in this production (Fink 416). Though the visual reality may perhaps be compromised slightly with two actors, there is much that is beneficial in this production choice. One summary advantage is that all the text will be heard. The recognition scene in this play is abbreviated, and to cut an already terse reunion in order to accommodate just one actor diminishes the happy end of this play somewhat (Mercer, *Twins* 99). Also, as discussed previously, the Antipholuses are very different men. If the emphasis on creating sameness is not present, then the actors are free to explore the individuality of the characters. However, if the choice is made to create a likeness, then there exists the possibility of carrying the illusion too far:

To convince the audience that the twins are really are identical . . . actors have mirrored each other's poses and movements, or one actor has mimicked the body language and voice of his counterpart. In addition, actors have worn identical hair cuts and colors; they have used make-up to mask differences of feature [etc.]. Often however, these attempts have been so successful that audiences have been unable to tell the actors apart and thus have missed the dramatic irony. (Mercer, *Twins* 102-103)

*Errors* is a play about juxtaposing time, place, and identity, therefore differentiation of at least a modest scale is necessary in order for the themes of this text to fully play.

Differentiation, while certainly a concern of a two-actor scenario, is the primary challenge faced by a single actor chosen to play both roles. After all, why should not the other characters confuse the twins if the audience cannot make them out either? Some of the devices for differentiation are the same as those used to create sameness, for example in the 1962 Boulder production, one Antipholus wore an orange handkerchief and gloves, the other wore green (Hoyle). However, if there is too much differentiation in costume, then other characters would then be able to tell the Antipholuses apart. As this mode of casting has become more widely accepted and employed, greater reliance has been placed on the actor to create the various nuances of character necessary to differentiate the twins. Vincenzo Nicoli, who played both Antipholuses in the New Globe's 1999 production of *Errors*, was challenged to create the Ephesian brother with the physicality of a gorilla and the Syracusan brother with the physicality of a dolphin (Nicoli). By whatever means the character development is accomplished, it must be accomplished fully: "Casting one actor as one set of twins can either be a tour de force or the death of the production" (Slawson 68). The great advantage in this choice is providing an opportunity for a young actor to exercise great comedic range, and when successful is a delight to witness. The great disadvantage in this production choice is that the emphasis can often be placed squarely on the performances of the twins. In reviewing Oregon Shakespeare Festival's 2005 production of *The Comedy of Errors*, Alan Armstrong notes:

Why have theatre companies embraced the cinematic device of single-casting the twins? The merged Dromio and Antipholus roles become attractive star turns for two actors, but make spear-carriers out of two other company members who might have played their brothers. What

is gained is . . . our delight in the virtuosity of the single actor who plays both twins. What is lost is the fundamentally different trick of Shakespeare's theatre of the imagination, which invites us, against the evidence of our own eyes, to believe in the identical appearance of two actors who do not (and must not, for the trick to work) perfectly resemble each other (141).

The correlate to an emphasis on the performance is an overall de-emphasis on the text. As mentioned above, one of the common ways of achieving this mode is by cutting the final scene. However, the fact that the twins do not meet on stage until the final recognition scene is not necessarily justification for only using one actor. In fact, George Walton Williams argues specifically against this practice:

The immediate juxtapositions of the two Antipholus Twins--the disappearance of one twin and the sudden appearance of the other [beginning in Act III]--strike me as being an interesting technical device designed to point out the contrasts between the two and so to contribute to the theme of identity; and as *The Comedy of Errors* is the origin of so much in the mature canon, it should be profitable to look at later plays with this device in mind (44).

This assessment is in concert with the previous chapter's discussion of character. Once the notion of twinship is established, the audience does not spend time trying to further justify their "sameness," but rather needs to differentiate the twins in their mind in order to understand the story. The dramaturgical device of "the disappearance of one twin and the sudden appearance of the other" sets up a kind of corporeal antithesis between the

twins that is more clearly defined with two actors in those roles. What one actor has to work doubly hard to create in the physical plane might be easily accomplished by simply following the lines of casting that seem to be called for by the text.

Like *The Comedy of Errors*, *Twelfth Night* has a long history of casting experimentation. Unlike *Errors*, these experiments have not often proved successful. It may be that some experimentation was driven, at least in part, by the need to see a Sebastian that bore a greater physical resemblance to Viola. Other experiments were simply production concepts, that while successful, failed to be adopted as mainstream casting choices. A man would have originally played Viola, but since women have been allowed on the English stage, it has become one of the most coveted female roles in the canon.

Certainly, it is more difficult to find an actor and actress who look alike than two men who do. Because *Twelfth Night* does not rely so wholly on the device of mistaken identity as *Errors* does, there is not the implicit demand for sameness as there is in the earlier play.

Although Viola and Sebastian must not be wildly unlike . . . it is in fact the natural difference between the actors in this and similar plays which prevents the spectators' sharing in the general confusion and makes them able to distinguish the twins as the other characters cannot

(Lothian lxxxvii).

In the eighteenth century, a portly actor named John Palmer played Sebastian early in his career. "How the lack of resemblance between him as Sebastian and the actress playing Viola was made endurable is hard to guess" as he seemed more suited to the role of Toby

Belch (Lothian lxxxvii). In the early 1800s, Leigh Hunt criticized the notion of a Sebastian who towered over his sister (Child, *Errors* xxxvii). Some Sebastians, however, have looked remarkably like their Violas. In 1901, a review of Beerbohm Tree's production had little good to say except that the actor playing Sebastian had "the advantage of looking really like" the actress playing Viola (Beerbohm 69). Of John Barton's 1969 production at Stratford, one reviewer wrote, "they've finally found a Sebastian . . . who really does look like his sister" (Tanner). *Twelfth Night* has also seen some real siblings in the roles of the twins. In 1790, Mrs. Dora Jordan played opposite her brother Mr. Bland. The London Times declared that his "strong similitude in feature to [his sister] was the only claim which could render [Mr. Bland] worthy of a moment's notice" (11 Feb 1790, 2). Mrs. Harriet Siddons and William Murray repeated the feat in 1815 at Edinburgh. Despite their sibling likeness, the experiment was not well received (Child, *TN* 176). It seems that for all the intellectual knowledge that it is impossible for these fraternal twins to look exactly alike, there is still a practical desire for this likeness on stage.

The undeniable pattern of the above modes of casting is that all too often Sebastian is cast because of his physical likeness to the actress playing Viola (Mercer, *Twins* 104), and not necessarily based on his own merit. True, these roles are not as balanced as the twin roles of *Errors*, but to cast an inferior actor for the sake of similarity is a great disservice to the script. As discussed in the previous chapter, Sebastian plays in important role as the agent of change in *Twelfth Night* with his arrival in Illyria and subsequent misidentification as Cesario. His Act IV, Scene iii speech is the one beacon of rhetorical logic in this play. It is the lone opportunity to shape the man that is

ultimately worthy of Olivia. “Strong resemblance of costume, and tolerable resemblance of personal appearance, are quite enough to preserve this particular theatrical illusion in *Twelfth Night*” (Lothian lxxxviii). Therefore, it is favorable to cast actors based on merit, rather than appearance, as the above criticism indicates.

Yet, casting a weak actor as Sebastian is perhaps better than no Sebastian at all. In Germany, experimentation with a Viola-Sebastian doubling occurred in 1851. Performing Schlegel’s translation, a woman named Baier Burick “played both Viola and Sebastian, and when personating the latter she gave a manliness to her voice and step which would almost have deceived us to her identity” (Winter 35). A stand-in was used to accomplish the final scene. The first English language doubling occurred in 1865 with Kate Terry, sister of the famed Ellen, playing the twins. The London Times rejoiced that the part of Sebastian had not gone to a “third-rate actor” but also thought the heightened resemblance might have confused the audience. The use of a stand-in for the recognition scene was apparently lackluster (Sprague 18-19). This experiment in casting was not repeated until 1937 when Jessica Tandy took on both roles for the Old Vic (with Laurence Olivier as Toby Belch) (Trewin 164). Again, the double casting made the “mistaken identity more plausible, but [marred] the effect of the last scene when a mute double [had] to be brought in” (Crosse 94). This lack of enthusiasm for stand-ins for the final scene would be echoed in the 1960s for *Errors*.

By far the most innovative casting choice for *Twelfth Night* in the last several years was ironically dubbed an “original practices” approach. The New Globe’s employed an all-male cast for its 2002 production. The casting choice was made in part to commemorate the 400<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the first recorded performance of *Twelfth Night*

at Middle Temple Hall on February 2, 1602. The use of men playing women (or women playing men for that matter) in Shakespeare certainly is not novel for modern audiences, but the blanket concept of reviving Elizabethan practices was certainly ambitious, and one that yielded mixed results. Rather than simply making a casting choice, the casting was part of an overall concept. Some reviewers seemed to take this in stride (Johns 25), but others were less pleased with the overall scope. While he enjoyed the performances, David Nicol commented that the travesty failed to pierce the veil and explore the sexuality of the text:

Despite this success in making the convention of the boy player acceptable to a modern audience, I felt that Redmayne's [Viola] work had been made too easy, because his performance missed an element that the Globe's all-male productions have continuously excluded thus far: sex. The Globe Company needs to experiment with casting actors who are androgynous enough to be sexually alluring to heterosexual men. After all, the central joke of *Twelfth Night* is that Viola thinks her disguise as a eunuch will negate her sexuality, whereas, in fact, she becomes attractive to both sexes . . . . The company's avoidance of it may be deliberate: they may wish to avoid offending the sensibilities of a modern mainstream audience. But I think it is an experiment that needs to be attempted, both because the plays often require it, and because it challenges the audience to accommodate an Elizabethan staging technique that is less 'safe' than the neutered transvestitism [The Globe] has offered thus far (Nicol).

This experiment will likely be repeated in the future, but is not likely to become a widespread casting practice. Actresses have long deplored the lack of female roles in Shakespeare. A surge toward “original practices” would deprive many actresses of the chance to perform one of the great females roles of the canon.

It is interesting that again these plays intersect, and that the issues encountered in casting the twins in *The Comedy of Errors* are often the same issues faced when casting *Twelfth Night*. The previous chapters have cited instances where these plays overlap in source, theme, and character development. Given the many points of intersect, the final chapter will examine a hypothetical scenario in which these plays might also be produced together.

## CHAPTER V

### This “uncertain voyage”: In Defense of *The Comedy of Errors*

Thus far, this thesis has examined these two plays in a progressive fashion, from source and motif, to character, to performance, highlighting the similarities and differences between them. Chapter Two illustrated the twinship of these plays, citing not only the twin plot scenario, but also the sharing of a major source and several motifs. The discussion departed slightly from the similarities in Chapter Three in order to examine these characters as individuals, always keeping in mind the unique bond they share. Chapter Four included a critical examination of casting scenarios for these twin plays. The final stage in this progression is to see if the prior arguments stand up to the ultimate test in Shakespeare: performance. The previous chapters provide sufficient evidence to consider *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night* to be twin plays, not simply two plays about twins. Carrying this argument one step further, this chapter proposes a repertory performance construct for these plays. A repertory staging serves three important functions. First, it highlights the similarities inherent to these twin plays thoroughly discussed in Chapter Two. Second, it elevates *The Comedy of Errors* from its position of relative unpopularity. Third, it promotes a reconsideration of the long-standing dismissal of *Errors* as mere farce.

A repertory staging of these plays is not an untried concept. In the early years (1882) of the Royal Shakespeare Company, formerly the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre, Edward Compton directed these plays simultaneously with identical casts. He clearly followed lines of business castings (actors playing relatively the same character types), as the same actor played Pinch and Sir Toby and the director himself played Malvolio and one of the Dromios. Since that year, the attempt has not been duplicated at the RSC, though in a few other instances the plays were produced in the same year with some overlap of casting. For example, in Adrian Noble's 1983 production of *Errors*, Zoe Wanamaker played Adriana and later that same year she also played Viola (RSC). The RSC, dedicated primarily to the works of Shakespeare, serves as a model for many companies around the world and sets trends in Shakespearean performance. Though it has been over one hundred years since its first attempt, it is not farfetched to assume that if next year the RSC attempted a repertory run of *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night*, that in the next several years several other companies would duplicate the practice.

It is possible to cast these two plays with the same group of actors. Listed below is one possible casting scenario. Casting is the subjective choice of the director, but based on discourse of the previous two chapters, the following list provides one of several probable options. It is based on the lines of business casting that Baldwin claims was the original method of casting the plays. For example, the famous clown Will Kemp might have been one of the first Dromios. Assuming that a "tolerable resemblance" can be created between the twins, this list reflects the choice to cast two actors in the twins roles of *Errors* and to cast women in the female roles.

## Cast List:

<u><i>The Comedy of Errors</i></u>	<u>Actor</u>	<u><i>Twelfth Night</i></u>
Solinus, Duke of Ephesus	Actor A	Orsino, Duke of Illyria
Egeon, Merchant of Syracuse	Actor B	Sir Toby Belch, Olivia's uncle
Antipholus of Ephesus	Actor C	Antonio, a pirate
Antipholus of Syracuse	Actor D	Sebastian, Viola's twin
Dromio of Ephesus	Actor E	Feste, a jester
Dromio of Syracuse	Actor F	Sir Andrew Aguecheek
Angelo	Actor G	Valentine, Duke's man
Balthasar	Actor H	Curio, Duke's man
Doctor Pinch	Actor I	Malvolio, Olivia's steward
A Merchant/ A Courtezan	Actor J	A Sea Captain/ Fabian
Emilia, an abbess / Nell (or Luce)	Actress 1	Maria, Olivia's attendant
Adriana, wife of A. of Eph.	Actress 2	Olivia, a countess
Luciana, her sister	Actress 3	Viola, in love with Orsino

This is by no means the only option. If these plays were staged in a modern repertory setting, there would probably be some concern for the balancing of parts across the two productions, as well as providing contrast between the roles. This casting suggestion is not definitive. Rather, it simply opens the door to the possibility of a merged run of these plays.

Given the relative ease of double casting these plays, and overall production concept notwithstanding, it is possible to stage them together. This shows yet another level of compatibility between *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night*. After reviewing

all the evidence cited in this thesis regarding the twinship of these plays, a question naturally arises: why are two plays so clearly complementary as these not produced together more often? To answer this question, a more pointed one must be posed: why is *The Comedy of Errors* not produced more often? According to the RSC archives, since the founding of the company in 1875, *The Comedy of Errors* has been produced only 37 times and *Twelfth Night* has received 93 productions. In fact, between 1916 to 1962, *Errors* all but dropped out of the company's production roster (RSC). In researching this thesis, there was no shortage of critical material on either play. However, even in the spectrum of Shakespearean criticism, *The Comedy of Errors* has only recently received the same conscientious examination as *Twelfth Night*. This surge in commentary has not brought with it a surge in frequency of production.

There are many reasons why this might be, but the chief one to be discussed here is, in a word, farce. Coleridge offers up a much-quoted definition of farce as it pertains to *The Comedy of Errors*:

The myriad-minded man . . . Shakespeare, has in this piece presented us with a legitimate farce in exactest consonance with the philosophical principles and character of farce, as distinguished from comedy. [A] proper farce is mainly distinguished from comedy by the license allowed, and even required, in the fable, in order to produce strange and laughable situations. The story need not be probable, it is enough that it is possible. A comedy would scarcely allow even the two Antipholuses . . . farce dares add the two Dromios. [I]n a word, farces commence in a postulate, which must be granted. (216)

This definition of farce is wholly appropriate for *The Comedy of Errors*, but does it not also apply to *Twelfth Night*? If indeed the distinguishing characteristic is the “license allowed,” then the “postulate” for *Twelfth Night* is no more improbable than that of *Errors*. If “a comedy would scarcely allow even the two Antipholuses,” then should it be expected to allow the Viola and Sebastian pairing without being classified as farce? This definition is admittedly antiquated, but it poses an interesting argument. It is certainly not the goal to here to reclassify *Twelfth Night* as farce, nor to detract from the longstanding accolades of this play, but rather to examine why *Errors* is not generally considered to be a closer peer to *Twelfth Night*. In the two hundred years since Coleridge’s definition, farce has taken on an undeniably negative connotation, dismissed by some critics as the lowest form of drama. Somehow, *The Comedy of Errors* has retained this moniker while *Twelfth Night* has escaped it, and they have therefore fallen toward different ends of the Shakespearean comedic spectrum. Therefore, the twinship that these plays share, which has been strenuously argued for in this thesis, has been somewhat lost in the semantics of genre categorization. It is perhaps this genre distinction, more than any other factor, that has relegated *The Comedy of Errors* to its classification as an inferior comedy and therefore not worthy of attention in performance.

In his excellent article “Fear of Farce,” Russ McDonald attempts to reclaim *The Comedy of Errors* from the “hierarchy of modes” or “genre snobbery” that has infused the study and critique of Shakespeare.

Farce is at the bottom of everyone's list of forms, and yet Shakespeare is at the top of everyone's list of authors . . . . It seems inappropriate that the cultural monument known as Shakespeare should have anything to do with

a popular entertainment that we connect with the likes of the Marx brothers. . . . Criticism resists a Shakespeare capable of wasting his time on such a trivial form. (78)

Critics, say McDonald, have combated this categorization in many ways, the most common to:

dissociate Shakespeare from [this] vulgar category is to discuss the early plays as precursors of the mature style, as seedbeds, that is, for ideas and methods that will flower in the later comedies and even in the tragedies . . . . This anticipatory practice amounts to reading the career backward: a play is conditioned by what follows it, and its distinctive qualities may be underrated or deformed. (78)

Rescuing farce from the doldrums of triviality may be an impossible task, or at least one for a different thesis. *The Comedy of Errors* is not a trivial play, though it is by most definitions a farce. Schlegel wrote, “if the piece be inferior in worth to other pieces of Shakespeare, it is merely because nothing more could be made of the materials (381). However, it is in Shakespeare’s adaptation of the source materials that many critics praise him. “Shakespeare gives us a play of more mixed dramatic idiom. . . . [The] atmosphere of Plautus is still present, but it no longer monopolizes the play; it is varied by suggestions of fantasy and mystery, and the result is a mixture of styles that goes deeper. . . . It is a mixture of different ways of viewing the world” (Leggatt 3). Shakespeare’s adaptation of Plautus is perhaps more skilled even than his adaptation of Riche, for the result is a more tightly unified play than any other in the canon. Another reason for *Errors*’s dreary performance history might be that as a farce it is considered more plot

driven, and as such is not perceived to have the great characters of *Twelfth Night*. Though the plot of *Errors* is neatly bound, it does not contain the fantastic device of Malvolio's fake letter. Neither Adriana nor Luciana hold the same sway in the plot as Viola nor do they speak with the same sweeping poetry. Thankfully, the advent of the single Dromios and Antipholuses has done much to revive *Errors*. Perhaps the perceived problems of staging this play, primarily finding actors who resemble one another, are among the reasons for its lull in twentieth century production compared to its later sibling. In spite of the lines of reasoning presented here in favor of *Errors*, this play remains woefully underrepresented in the performance canon. The title line of this chapter was taken not from *The Comedy of Errors* or *Twelfth Night*, but from *Timon of Athens*. *Twelfth Night* will likely never suffer the same marginalization that has plagued *The Comedy of Errors*, but the line from *Timon* is a reminder here that there are other plays more neglected in performance than even *Errors*.

This thesis has been an attempt to rediscover the twins of Shakespeare in the context of each other, to dare to examine them together as separate yet equal entities. For all the parallels drawn in these pages, the differences continue to reassert themselves. Though all twins share a common biology, are perhaps even identical in makeup, they are each unto themselves, whole individuals. Such is the case with *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night*. Though they share the Plautine heritage, Shakespeare has created distinct plots and characters in these plays. All of Shakespeare's twins are on a similar quest to discover or rediscover their identity. Though some measure of wholeness could not be found without the discovery of their respective sibling, their journeys are largely individual and involve finding completeness outside of their twin dynamic. There are

undeniable similarities that have been chronicled here, but they are not the same play.

Ultimately, they stand alone, individual and complete.

## WORKS CITED

- Armstrong, Alan. "The Comedy of Errors: presented by the Oregon Shakespeare Festival at the Angus Bowmer Theatre, Ashland, Oregon." Shakespeare Bulletin 23.1 (2005): 139-143.
- Baldwin, T.W. On the Compositional Genetics of The Comedy of Errors. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1965.
- . On the Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company. New York: Russell, 1961.
- Beerbohm, Max. "Beerbohm Tree's *Twelfth Night*." Twelfth Night: Critical Essays. Ed. Stanley Wells. New York: Garland, 1986. 65-69.
- Bloom, Harold. Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human. New York: Riverhead Books, 1998.
- Bruckner, D. J. R. "O Dromio, Dromio! Wherefore Art Thou Dromio?" New York Times 14 July 2000: E7.
- Bullough, Geoffrey, ed. Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare: Vol. 2: The Comedies 1597-1603. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.
- Child, Harold. "The Stage History of *The Comedy of Errors*." The Comedy of Errors. Ed. Arthur Quiller-Couch and John Dover Wilson. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962. xxvi-xxx.
- . "The Stage History of *Twelfth Night*." Twelfth Night, Or What You Will. Ed. Arthur Quiller-Couch and John Dover Wilson. London: Cambridge University Press, 1930.
- Cole, Howard C. "Shakespeare's Comedies and their Sources: Some Biographical and Artistic Inferences." Shakespeare Quarterly 34.4 (1983): 405-419.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. Coleridge's Literary Criticism. Ed. John William Mackail. London: Henry Frowde, 1908.
- Corbin, John. "Jazzed Shakespeare." New York Times. 16 May 1923: 22.

- Crosse, Gordon. Fifty Years of Shakespearean Playgoing. London: A.R. Mowbray, 1941.
- Day, M.C. and J.C. Trewin. The Shakespeare Memorial Theatre. London: Dent, 1932.
- Dolan, Jill. The Feminist Spectator as Critic. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1991.
- Dutton, Richard. “*The Comedy of Errors* and *The Calumny of Apelles*: An Exercise in Source Study.” A Companion to Shakespeare's Works: Literature and Culture. Eds. Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard. Vol. 3. Boston: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.
- Evans, Bertrand. “Here Sit I in the Sky: First Explorations.” Shakespeare's Comedies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960. 1-32.
- Evans, G. Blakemore. Shakespearean Prompt-Books of the Seventeenth Century. Vol. 3. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1964.
- Fink, Joel G. Rev. of *The Comedy of Errors*. Theatre Journal 35.3 (1983) 415-416.
- Foakes, R.A., ed. Introduction. *The Comedy of Errors*. By William Shakespeare. The Arden Shakespeare. 2nd ser. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 1968.
- Ford, John R. “‘Methinks You are My Glass’: Looking for *The Comedy of Errors* in Performance.” Shakespeare Bulletin 24.1 (2006): 11-28.
- French, Robert Dudley. “The History of the Play.” *The Comedy of Errors*. The Yale Shakespeare. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984. 82-88.
- Gaw, Allison. “The Evolution of the Comedy of Errors.” PMLA 41.3 (1926): 620-66.
- Genest, John. Some Account of the English Stage, From the Restoration of 1660 to 1830. Vol. 4, 8. Bath: Carrington, 1832.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare. New York: W.W. Norton, 2004.
- Gross, Kenneth. “Ordinary Twinship.” Raritan 22.4 (2003): 20-39.
- Hamilton, Edith. Mythology. New York: Little Brown & Co., 1998.
- Hogan, Charles Beecher. Shakespeare in the Theatre: 1701-1800. Vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon, 1957.
- Hoyle, Martin. Rev. of *The Comedy of Errors*. Financial Times 27 Apr 1990: N. pag.

- Hunt, Leigh. Leigh Hunt's Dramatic Criticism, 1808-1831. Eds. Lawrence Huston Houtchens and Carolyn Wasburn Houtches. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.
- Huxley, H.H. "Storm and Shipwreck in Roman Literature." Greece & Rome 21.63 (1952): 117-124.
- Jardine, Lisa. "Twins and Travesties: Gender, Dependency, and Sexual Availability in *Twelfth Night*." Erotic Politics: Desire on the Renaissance Stage. Ed. Susan Zimmerman. New York: Routledge, 1992. 27-38.
- Johns, Ian. "*Twelfth Night*; First Night." London Times 25 May 2002: 25.
- Keyishian, Harry. "New Jersey Shakespeare Festival." Shakespeare Quarterly 32.2 (1981): 199-200.
- King, Walter N. Introduction. Twentieth Century Interpretations of *Twelfth Night*. Ed. Walter N. King. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1968.
- Leggatt, Alexander. Shakespeare's Comedy of Love. New York: Routledge, 1974.
- Leiter, Samuel L., ed. Shakespeare Around the Globe: A Guide to Notable Post-war Revivals. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986.
- Lindblad, Ishrat. "Shakespeare in Sweden." Shakespeare Quarterly 35.3 (1984): 329-334.
- Lothian, J.M. and T.W. Craik, eds. Introduction. *Twelfth Night*. By William Shakespeare. The Arden Shakespeare. 2nd ser. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 1975.
- McDonald, Russ. "Fear of Farce." "Bad" Shakespeare: Revaluations of the Shakespearean Canon. Ed. Maurice Charney. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1988: 77-90.
- Mercer, John Moore. "Making the Twins Realistic in the *Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night*." Explorations in Renaissance Culture 19 (1993): 97-113.
- . Sibling Relationships in Shakespeare's Plays: Course, Quality, and Function. Diss. University of Missouri - Columbia, 1984. Published Privately.
- Miola, Robert S. Shakespeare and Classical Comedy: The Influence of Plautus and Terrence. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Nicol, David. "Review of *Twelfth Night* at the Middle Temple." Early Modern Literary Studies 8.1 (2002): N. pag.

- Nicoli, Vincenzo. Interview. GlobeLink. 10 Apr. 2008. <<http://www.globelink.org/resourcecentre/comedyoferrors/interviewwithvicenzonicoli/>>
- Odell, George C.D. Annals of the New York Stage. Vol. 10. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.
- Odell, George C.D. Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving. Vol. 2. New York: Scribner's, 1920.
- Ogden, Dunbar H. "The 1963 Season at Stratford, Connecticut." Shakespeare Quarterly 14.4 (1963): 437-439.
- Perkin, Robert L. "Shakespeare in the Rockies, V." Shakespeare Quarterly 13.4 (1963): 541-543.
- Plato. Symposium. Trans. Benjamin Jowett. Project Gutenberg. <<http://www.gutenberg.org/dirs/etext99/sympo10.txt>>
- Plautus, Titus Maccius. Plautus: Amphitruo. Ed. Thomas Cutt. Intro. Jacob E. Nyenhuis. Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1970.
- Plautus, Titus Maccius. Three Comedies, The Braggart Soldier, The Brothers Menaechmus, The Haunted House. Trans. Erich Segal. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Plutarch. Plutarch's Lives. Ed. A.H. Clough. Project Gutenberg, 1996. <<http://www.gutenberg.org/dirs/etext96/plivs10.txt>>
- Royal Shakespeare Company Performance Database. 17 Apr. 2008. Shakespeare Centre Library (SCL) <<http://calm.shakespeare.org.uk/dserve/dserve.exe?dsqCmd=index.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqApp=Archive>>.
- Rev. of *Twelfth Night*. Drury Lane Theatre, London. London Times 11 Feb 1790: 2.
- Rhodes, Neil. "Double Identities." Around the Globe: The Magazine of Shakespeare's Globe Summer 1999: 10-12.
- Salinger, L.G. "The Design of *Twelfth Night*." Shakespeare Quarterly 9.2 (1958). 117-139.
- Schlegel, August Wilhelm. "Criticisms on Shakespeare's Comedies." Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature. Ed. Rev. A. J. W. Morrison. Trans. John Black. 2nd ed. London: George Bell & Sons, 1892. 379-99.
- Scragg, Leah. Shakespeare's Mouldy Tales: Recurrent Plot Motifs in Shakespearean Drama. New York: Longman, 1992.

- Shakespeare, William. The Arden Complete Works of William Shakespeare. Eds. Richard Proudfoot, Ann Thompson, and David Scott Kastan. 3rd series. Rev. ed. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2001.
- Shattuck, Charles H. Shakespeare on the American Stage. 2 vols. Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1976-1987.
- Shaw, Catherine M. "The Conscious Art of The Comedy of Errors." Shakespearean Comedy. Ed. Maurice Charney. New York: New York Literary Forum, 1980: 17-28.
- Slawson, Richard J. "'Dromio, Thou Dromio': The Casting of Twins in Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors*." New England Theatre Journal (1991): 59-71.
- Smallwood, Robert. "Shakespeare at Stratford-upon-Avon, 1990." Shakespeare Quarterly 42.3 (1991): 345-359.
- Sprague, Arthur Colby. The Doubling of Parts of Shakespeare's Plays. London: Society for Theatre Research, 1966.
- Stewart, Elizabeth A. Exploring Twins: Towards a Social Analysis of Twinship. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003.
- Sullivan, Dan. "*Comedy of Errors* Is Staged in the Capital." New York Times 28 Feb 1968: 40.
- Tanner, Doreen. "A Bittersweet Play Produced with Colour." Rev. of *Twelfth Night*. Royal Shakespeare Theatre. Liverpool Post 22 Aug 1969: N. pag.
- Tedrowe, Emily G. "A Natural Perspective, That Is And Is Not": The Rhetoric of Siblings in Shakespeare's Comedies. Diss. New York University 2003. New York: UMI, 2003. 3089345.
- Tillyard, E.M.W. The Elizabethan World Picture. New York: Vintage Books, 1959.
- Trewin, J.C. Shakespeare on the English Stage 1900-1964: A Survey of Productions Illustrated from the Raymond Mander and Joe Mitchenson Theatre Collection, 1964. London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1964.
- Trubey, Todd Roger. Classical Romans, Renaissance Italians, and Shakespeare: An Intertextual Study of the Relationship between Individuals and Social Systems in Literary Texts. Diss. Northwestern University, 1997. Illinois: UMI, 1997. 9814329.

- Van Elk, Martine. "Urban Misidentification in *The Comedy of Errors* and the Cony-Catching Pamphlets." SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 43.2 (2003): 323-46.
- Watt, H.A. "Plautus and Shakespeare: Further Comments on *Menaechmi* and *The Comedy of Errors*." The Classical Journal 20.7 (1925): 401-7.
- Weaver, John J.W. "The Other Twin: Sebastian's Relationship to Viola and the Theme of *Twelfth Night*." Essays in Honor of Esmond Linworth Marilla. Eds. Thomas Austin Kirby and William John Olive. Baton Rouge: LSU Press. 89-100.
- Wheeler, Richard P. "Deaths in the Family: The Loss of a Son and the Rise of Shakespearean Comedy." Shakespeare Quarterly 51.2 (2000): 127-53.
- Williams, George Walton. "Shakespeare's Twins: Choric Juxtaposition." Renaissance Papers (2005): 43-50.
- Winter, William. Shakespeare on the Stage. 2nd series. New York: Moffat, Yard, 1915.

## VITA

Kelsey A. Kling is a graduate student in Theatre History and Criticism program. Kelsey came to Texas State University-San Marcos as an actor with numerous professional credits and award nominations. Most recently, she received both Austin Critics' Table and B. Iden Payne Awards for her role of Lisa in *The Glory of Living*. Kelsey received her B.F.A. in Theatre with honors from Southern Methodist University and also studied Shakespeare at BADA and at Shakespeare & Company and has nearly two decades of classical dance training. She is a member of Actors' Equity Association, the Hyde Park Theatre Company, the Austin Shakespeare Festival Company, and is a recognized Combatant by the Society of American Fight Directors (SAFD). She has conducted several workshops in Shakespeare and stage combat for summer youth programs and has volunteered extensively in the field of arts administration.

Permanent Address: 3808 Sawmill Drive

Austin, TX 78749

This thesis was typed by Kelsey Altom Kling.

