

NOVA MYHILL

---

**'Wanton Females of All Sorts': Spectatorship in *The Antipodes***

*Focusing on Richard Brome's presentation of the theatre in The Antipodes (1638) as a force for social stability and sexual regulation, this essay reads the play as a response to the attack on the stage in William Prynne's 1633 Histrio-Mastix, particularly in terms of the increasingly prominent female playgoer in the 1630s. Satirizing assumptions about the sexually predatory spectacle and the emotionally liquid playgoer that underlie anti-theatrical anxieties of early modern London, The Antipodes also suggests a larger model for relations between theatre audiences and theatrical spectacles. This model ultimately places authority with spectators rather than players or playwrights and imagines the audience, like the chaste and witty Diana, asserting its control over the private theatres of Caroline London.*

William Prynne's massive 1633 anti-theatrical tract *Histrio-Mastix* suggests that all participants in the business of theatre in seventeenth-century London are responsible for the damnable state of affairs into which the city has fallen, and calls upon them to repent and abjure their sinful behaviour.<sup>1</sup> These participants include not only the players and playwrights but also the members of the theatre audience, who 'are now more in number, more various in judgements, in humours, in apprehension, than they have been in former ages'.<sup>2</sup> While Prynne's enormous compendium of arguments, running to over a thousand pages, initially reads as an indiscriminate barrage of assaults on the theatre, his sense of the Caroline audience as being 'more various in judgements' than earlier theatre audiences leads him to present arguments aimed at different segments (real or imagined) of that audience, acknowledging the female spectator as a significantly more active agent than did Elizabethan critics such as Stephen Gosson and Antony Munday.

---

Nova Myhill (nmyhill@ncf.edu) is an associate professor of English at New College of Florida.

While Gosson and Munday both discuss women primarily as spectacles, vulnerable to the male spectator's gaze, Prynne begins to imagine the female spectator not as a thing apart, to be addressed in an afterword such as Gosson's 'To the Gentlewoman Citizens of London',<sup>3</sup> but rather as one type of spectator among many. Experienced and inexperienced, old and young, male and female, spectators include those who have 'been constant Play-Haunters besmeared with their filthe and dung for divers yeeres together'; those who are 'young and but newly entered into this dangerous course of play-haunting'; 'ingenious Youthes and Girles ... young (that I say not old) Gentlemen and Gentlewomen of birth and quality'.<sup>4</sup> Their pleasure in attending plays threatens all with the loss of 'your time, your money, your estates, your good names, your lives, your salvation',<sup>5</sup> but Prynne envisions all as having significantly different relationships to the stage.

Prynne's discussion of the effect of the stage on its audiences and vice versa is significantly more complex than that of his Elizabethan predecessors. The same can be said of the playwrights whose works occupied the stages that Prynne attacked; where Elizabethan dramatists tend to present an audience that functions as a unified group, with any variation from this consensus clearly marked as aberrant, Caroline playwrights are more likely to represent spectatorial practice as varying depending on class, gender, and level of theatrical experience and to suggest the stage's vulnerability to audience censure.<sup>6</sup> The female spectator, in particular, becomes a significant focus in plays such as Ben Jonson's *The Staple of News* (1626), Philip Massinger's *The Roman Actor* (1626), and James Shirley's *The Bird in a Cage* (1633), presumably in response to the increasing number and influence of women in Caroline private theatre audiences.<sup>7</sup>

More than any other play in its period, Richard Brome's *The Antipodes* (1638) explicitly invites consideration of theatre's effect on its audience and the variety of possible ways of watching the inset play. In its presentation of a wide range of playgoing experiences, Brome's play engages with Prynne's anti-theatrical polemic, exploring the ways that spectatorship is gendered, the potential that theatre offers for desire in its female playgoers, and the ability of women to create a spectatorial position for themselves rather than embodying the one that anti-theatrical discourse created for them. While discussions of early modern spectatorship tend to gender spectators male and spectacles female,<sup>8</sup> *The Antipodes* explicitly explores the insufficiency of this model, suggesting not only that women might be judging spectators but also

that men’s failure to recognize this possibility might be the true source of the social disorder and disruption for which the theatre is wrongly blamed.

The relationship between the stage and its spectators — male and female, old and young — is *The Antipodes*’ principal concern. The play’s middle three acts are devoted to one of the longest and most sustained inset dramas in the English theatre. This play within a play, also entitled ‘The Antipodes’,<sup>9</sup> has been arranged by Letoy, ‘a fantastic lord’, ostensibly for the purpose of curing Peregrine, a young gentleman who has gone mad through excessive reading of travel literature. Performed in Letoy’s house by his domestic staff, ‘The Antipodes’ is designed to convince Peregrine that he has traveled to ‘the Antipodes of England’ where ‘all / Degrees of people, both in sex and quality, / Deport themselves in life and conversation / Quite contrary to us’ (1.6.131–4)<sup>10</sup> so that he will ultimately rebel against all of this strangeness, see it as aberrant rather than desirable, and choose the real world of England and the procreative pleasures of the marriage bed over the fantasy of travel. While Letoy’s play responds specifically to Peregrine’s particular form of madness, its larger function is to regulate the sexual behaviour of Peregrine’s entire family — his virgin wife Martha, his jealous old father Joyless, and his young stepmother Diana who, infuriated by her husband’s unjust suspicions, deliberately provokes them.

Brome’s presentation of the theatre in *The Antipodes* as a force for social stability and sexual regulation may be read as a response to Prynne’s attack on the stage, particularly in terms of the position of the increasingly prominent female playgoer in the 1630s. While Jonas Barish suggests that any ‘defense’ that Brome provides is fundamentally casual, and claims that *The Antipodes* does not directly engage anti-theatrical polemic,<sup>11</sup> Prynne’s text and his punishment for it haunt the play. As Richard Cave observes, ‘Brome’s several references in the text to persons deprived of their ears, as Prynne was, suggests he had his anxieties about where his satiric imagination was leading’<sup>12</sup> and these references, combined with Brome’s serious consideration of the social function of the theatre in *The Antipodes*, invite consideration of potential dialogue between the two texts.<sup>13</sup> Joyless, an irrationally jealous old man who constantly sees sexual corruption where none exists, uses a language largely derived from Prynne’s tract, and his young wife Diana’s behaviour utterly contradicts Prynne’s major claims about the theatre’s threat to social stability in general and the female playgoer in particular. Further, in the eventual triumph of Diana’s integrity over attempts by several of the play’s male characters to read her as sexually corrupt (or corruptible), *The Antipodes*

suggests a larger model for relations between theatre audiences and theatrical spectacles that ultimately places authority with spectators rather than players or playwrights and imagines the audience, like the chaste and witty Diana, asserting its control over the private theatres of Caroline London.

Prynne's discussion of the 'many wanton females of all sorts resorting by troopes unto our Playes, our Playhouses, to see and be seene'<sup>14</sup> shares Gosson's avowed concern for the 'gentlewoman citizens of London' — the threat to their reputations: 'all ages, all places have constantly suspected the chastity, yea branded the honesty of those females who have been so immodest as to resort to Theaters, to Stage playes, which either finde or make them Harlots'.<sup>15</sup> I am interested here in the precise relationship between female playgoer and 'Harlot'; 'finding' a harlot implies that women bring sexual corruption to the theatre, while 'making' a harlot suggests that a sexually pure woman might be corrupted by her experience as a spectator. Brome presents both of these possibilities — the first in *Martha* and the second in *Diana* — and satirizes assumptions about both the stage and the female playgoer that underlie the most basic anti-theatrical anxieties of early modern London.<sup>16</sup>

While it is impossible to say with certainty how many women attended private theatres in the 1630s, appeals to ladies in prologues and epilogues became increasingly frequent,<sup>17</sup> constructing the idea of the female spectator as a judge with significant power over the drama's success or failure. At the same time as addresses to ladies both rendered them visible and constructed them as influential, Prynne similarly granted women in the audience a potential agency that Gosson and Munday had not. In his text, 'the dissoluteness of our lascivious, imprudent, rattle-pated gadding females' who 'are never well pleased nor contented, but when they are wandring abroad to Playes' is not only the product of their playgoing; it is also its cause.<sup>18</sup> Prynne envisions the female playgoer, that is, as an active spectator, not exclusively a passive spectacle for male audience members.<sup>19</sup>

Brome's *Martha* is a parodic version of the 'lascivious' woman Prynne envisions — desperate for the child that is the product of sexual relations yet totally unaware of this connection. Still a virgin three years after her wedding because her husband's madness has prevented the consummation of their marriage, *Martha* searches hopefully for a sexual partner to impregnate her, who may be as easy to find in or at the inset play as anywhere else. Her innocent, yet promiscuous, desire mocks Prynne's anti-theatrical conviction that the theatre is a hotbed of sexual encounters; 'that stage-playes devirginate unmarried persons, especially beautiful, tender virgins who resort unto them

(which I would our female play-haunters and their Parents would consider): that they defile their soules with impure carnall lusts; and so let in eternall death upon them'.<sup>20</sup> Brome's inset play devirginates instead a married virgin, redirecting her indiscriminate desire for that action that will produce a child (any child) to her husband, and his to her.

Martha seeks not only a child but also the knowledge that she recognizes both she and Peregrine lack: 'he does not / Lie with me to use me as he should, I fear; / Nor do I know how to teach him' (1.4.63–5). Martha turns to the inset play as a source of sexual instruction and sexual partners only after she fails to convince the sexually experienced, and fertile, Barbara Blaze to show her 'what belongs to child-getting: I'll lie with you and practice if you please. / Pray take me for a night or two, or take / My husband and instruct him but one night' (66–8). With no more success, Martha attempts to find a sexual partner in the inset play; when an Antipodean lady orders her husband to impregnate a merchant's wife in exchange for 'silks / And cloth of gold' (2.7.33–4), Martha offers to make it easy for him: 'If it be me your wife commends you to, / You shall not need to stray from your own house. / I'll go home with you' (64–6).

As this passage suggests, Martha understands neither performance nor fiction. When she enters the playing area for her wedding to Peregrine, now king of the Antipodes, she betrays no awareness that she is playing a part or becoming a spectacle. She generates no sexual desire in any of the men who see her except perhaps her own husband, who is no more capable than she of perceiving that they have both become actors on a stage. Martha is precisely the uncritical spectator Prynne envisions, vulnerable to sexual advances. But the theatre, rather than debauching her, redirects her indiscriminate and confused longing for a child towards her own husband, and provides both of them with the sexual awareness needed for them to consummate a marriage which has been collapsing for lack of this experience. If performance produces desire, it does so as a corrective to the deadening of sexual appetite produced by Peregrine's obsessive reading,<sup>21</sup> leading both Peregrine and Martha from sexual ignorance and imaginary offspring to procreative marital sex that will sustain rather than undermine patriarchal lineage.

While Martha serves as an argument for the theatre's sexual probity, Diana, in a far more complex manner, serves as an argument for the female spectator's ability to become an acute critic, not only of the play she attends but of the anti-theatrical assumption that for her to enter the theatre is for her to be shaped by the male gazes around her. In 1577 the female spectator

is already the locus of anti-theatrical anxieties about seeing and being seen: in the first sustained attack on the stage, John Northbrooke asks 'what safegarde of chastitie can there be, where the woman is desired with so many eyes, where so many faces look upon her and again she upon so many?'<sup>22</sup> Like his Elizabethan predecessors, Prynne conceives of the theatre as a site of licentiousness, debauching women both through their experience as spectators — learning vice from seeing it performed on stage — and far more importantly through their experience as spectacles for male audience members who may see, desire, and seduce them.

Although Joyless is a more experienced spectator than either Diana or Martha, neither of whom has previously seen a play, his concept, and therefore his experience, of the theatre derives almost entirely from standard anti-theatrical writings. Like most of the theatre's early opponents, Joyless finally perceives the threat to chastity not from the stage but among the spectators. The main danger of 'publique assemblies in prophane plaies' is the presence of 'so manie inticements vnto loosenes, & so manie meanes to traine you to unthriftines there',<sup>23</sup> particularly the possibility of married women being lured into adulterous assignations — an area Prynne explores in exhaustive and exhausting detail.<sup>24</sup>

Joyless fears that Diana's experience of playgoing, even within the private space of Letoy's home, will make her a whore in two quite different ways — as a spectator and as a spectacle. He is certain that 'should the play but touch on the vices of [London], / [Diana]'d learn and practice 'em' (2.2.41–2); the education that 'The Antipodes, is to give his son is similarly available to his wife, but what he imagines might return his son to sanity — that is, the understanding that the ways of the Antipodes should be 'reform'd' (4.3.25) rather than imitated — is the same thing that he fears will make Diana lose her wits (2.9.43) and follow the examples of dominant wives and sanctioned cuckoldry that 'The Antipodes' offers her.

But Diana's position as spectacle for Letoy is far more threatening to her than her position as spectator to the disordered world of 'The Antipodes'. Diana's attendance at the play in Letoy's house allows him access to her; due to her cooperation with his plan to arouse Joyless's jealousy in order to later cure it, which is revealed only in the last act, for most of the play she appears to both Joyless and the audience as the willing object of Letoy's desire,<sup>25</sup> and her presence, like that of Prynne's female spectators, opens her to the fate of 'honest women [being] allured with abhominable speeches ... there is the practising with married wiues to traine them from their husbands'.<sup>26</sup> If

Martha’s innocent promiscuity refutes the suggestion that the theatre is a site of sexual license, Letoy and Diana’s behaviour initially appears to confirm it and Joyless voices it explicitly, complaining that Letoy and Diana’s kissing ‘indeed is prologue to a play, / Composed by the devil and acted by the Children / Of his Black Revels’ (2.6.29–32).

Joyless does not consider the actors a threat until Diana, in a move no different from her avowed ‘lik[ing] of [Hughball’s] person / As well as his rare skill’ (1.6.14–15), admires one of the actors, saying that ‘now I look well on [Byplay], he’s a proper man’ (2.9.46). Diana draws attention to her own position as desiring subject, inverting ‘early modern gender roles with respect to spectatorship and spectacle by objectifying and sexualizing the male body’.<sup>27</sup> Despite Joyless’s fear that ‘she’ll fall in love with an actor and undo me’ (47), Diana’s expressed sexual interest in Byplay has consequences only for Joyless’s jealousy; at no point does Diana have any actual interest in Byplay except as a performer in ‘The Antipodes’. Unlike the spectator Joyless imagines in his anti-theatrical discourse, Diana has perfect control over how what she sees affects her — her pleasure in Byplay’s skill, as well as his person, is rooted in her consistent ability to distinguish between the world of the play and her own, and to construct a relationship between the two for her own pleasure.

The play’s male characters interpret Diana as sexually available because she is both a spectacle and a spectator. But Diana maintains her chastity and uses Joyless’s assumptions against him, rather than being defined by them. Although she has never seen a play before, Diana quickly learns how to watch, recognizing her favourite actor Byplay in his various roles, and her admiration for him grows as she recognizes his virtuosity in playing different roles in which she does not initially recognize him. When Diana first sees Byplay, she completely identifies him with the character he plays, accusing him of being ‘a dogged fellow / To the three poor old things; fie upon him’ (2.9.17–18), but later, as she identifies him in various roles, her praise changes to ‘never was such an actor as Extempore!’ (4.10.102). For Diana to move from seeing Byplay as equivalent to his character(s) to seeing his skill, for her to change her expectations of what constitutes excellence based not on Antipodean customs but on theatrical convention, is for her to recognize the fictionality of the spectacle before her. In her chastity, but also in her learning to separate the actor from the role, Diana is the opposite of the emotionally liquid woman envisioned by both Joyless and Prynne.

Joyless fears any interaction between Diana and the actors because he sees it as Diana making herself an actor, a spectacle, a notorious whore;<sup>28</sup> as Laurie Osborne argues, ‘the mere presence of the female playgoer raises the potential that *she* will become the spectacle.’<sup>29</sup> When Diana proposes to ask the character of the lawyer to remit his fee, Joyless tells her ‘pray do — they may perhaps want one to act the whore among them’ (3.5.54). To Joyless, Diana’s pleasure in the play reveals her theatricality, for ‘none delight in those spectacles, but such as would be made spectacles’,<sup>30</sup> but it is Joyless and Letoy, not Diana, who ultimately make spectacles of themselves in their highly visible (mis)understandings of the sort of spectacle she presents.

Joyless’s determination to think Diana essentially pliable leads him to judge her behaviour only through the behaviour around her, and Diana threatens him with precisely that pliability: ‘I know not what I may be made by your jealousy’ (3.9.113); ‘Your jealousy durst not trust me / Behind you in the country, and since I’m here, / I’ll see and know and follow the fashion; if / It be to cuckold you, I cannot help it’ (3.6.54–7). In pretending to be what Joyless fears her — not a wanton, but a fundamentally uncritical audience, a pure object molded by both his and Letoy’s opinions that she will go to bed with the first man who asks her — Diana replicates, and in her final ‘invincibility’ repudiates, the anti-theatrical view of theatre audiences as unable to form judgements and of women as unable to avoid both the reputation and the reality of becoming ‘whores’ simply by placing themselves in a visible position.

For the first three acts, Diana seems likely to live up (or down) to Joyless’s fear that she will ‘learn and practice’ the vices represented on the stage, and by extension in London itself. In addition to her flirtation with Letoy, she admires the ‘good example’ of the Antipodean wife’s complete command over her husband (2.7.29–31) and applauds the Antipodean practice of old husbands allowing their young wives young lovers (54–61). But in her consistent comparison between the world of ‘The Antipodes’ and London, Diana insists that the two societies are ‘finely contrary’ (3.5.93); if this is a naive understanding of the London that Brome satirizes, it also indicates Diana’s clear sense of separation between acceptable behaviour on the stage and acceptable behaviour in the world. Instead of learning ‘the vices’ of either London or of the Antipodes where ‘cuckold making ... is held / in reputation ... As generation were to be maintain’d / Only by cuckold making’ (1.6.176–82), Diana learns how to watch a play while maintaining her chastity in the



face of both Antipodean acceptance of cuckoldry and Letoy's seductions, arguments, and threats.

At the end of the inset play, Letoy makes what certainly appears to be a serious attempt to coerce Diana into a sexual relationship. When she rebuffs him, he threatens that if she does not yield, he will 'put thee in [Joyless's] hands / Now in his heat of fury, and not spare / To boast thou art my prostitute" (5.6.115–17). But Diana utterly rejects Letoy's efforts to shape her into what he desires: 'I'm past a child, and will be made no wanton' (5.5.76). Beneath Diana's outward performance of the pliable self envisioned by anti-theatrical writers, her husband, and Letoy, lies an absolutely unshakable and utterly conservative understanding of the stability of both her marriage vows and her self. Diana's ability to recognize the difference between the world of the play and the world she occupies mirrors the distinction between the 'counterfeit face of scorn' (99) that she has turned to Joyless in an effort to cure his jealousy and the genuine veneration she owes to 'the very name / Of husband' (52–3).

Diana's spirited defence of her own chastity and the sanctity of the marriage bed defeats Letoy's efforts to prove her a wanton and convinces both Letoy and Joyless, who has been brought to spy on them, that she is 'invincible' (5.6.1). This invincibility reveals the fundamental inadequacy of the model of spectatorship that makes the woman only a spectacle and men spectators, shapers, and judges of her actions. In explaining his actions to Joyless, Letoy claims to have been interested only in Diana's response, and almost unaware of his own part in her temptation:

I tried and tempted her for mine own ends,  
 More than for thine ...  
 And had she yielded, I not only had  
 Rejected her (for it was ne'er my purpose,  
 Heaven I call thee to witness, to commit  
 A sin with her), but laid a punishment  
 Upon her greater than thou couldst inflict. (28–34)

Letoy argues that his self-proclaimed purity of intention transforms him into a spectator to Diana's response, rather than a participant in the scene, and the sight he has arranged for Joyless to see is Diana's display of chastity (or lack thereof), not his temptation of her.

But Letoy's simultaneous involvement and unwillingness to acknowledge that involvement, his pretense that he can watch Diana's chastity test without

also producing it, calls into question the possibility of full control of theatrical spectacle for either the spectator or the actor. Letoy claims that his own motive in attempting to seduce Diana was to test her virtue before revealing that he, not his friend Master Truelock, is her true father, and ‘so much / To make her mine, as I should find her worthy’ (5.7.42–3); having passed this test, Diana is ‘now ... my daughter, and mine heir’ (44). But Letoy’s control is far from perfect; in revealing that he has himself been prey to jealousy at least as desperate as that of Joyless and Blaze — he has refused to acknowledge Diana as this daughter before this because he believed, entirely irrationally, that his wife was unfaithful — Letoy opens himself to the same sort of examination. Joyless asserts that he values Diana not for her birth and fortune, gifts of Letoy, but ‘her well-tried virtue’ (51), which Diana has displayed for herself. Diana never verbally acknowledges her new father, and the play may never overturn the assumption of Barbara, Letoy’s cast-off mistress, that Letoy calls Diana his daughter because ‘That’s a true trick / Of all old whoremasters, to call their wenches daughters ... if I had been a gentlewoman born, / I should have been your daughter, too, my lord’ (5.8.38–9, 50–1).<sup>31</sup> The scene also raises the uncomfortable question of what would have happened had Diana not proven invincible — the parental relationship that Letoy insists guarantees the purity of his intentions also marks his advances on Diana as incestuous, a monstrous and tyrannical abuse of his authority as both host and father.

Diana’s repudiation of Letoy’s advances convinces both her husband and her father that there is indeed such a thing as a virtuous woman, and marks her success in establishing what sort of a spectacle she presents despite the determined misreadings of her interpreters. This aspect of the play vindicates the female playgoer more generally; Diana succeeds as a spectator because she is able to learn to watch in new ways, without losing her sense of self. Her claim that she is ‘past a child, and will be made no wanton’ (5.5.76) applies immediately to Letoy’s efforts to seduce or coerce her into a sexual relationship, but it also applies more broadly to Gosson’s and Prynne’s claim that ‘Stage plays ... either finde or make [female playgoers] Harlots’;<sup>32</sup> neither the celebration of cuckoldry found in the inset play nor the seductive appeal of the fine gentleman who produces it can finally affect Diana’s behaviour.

We may extend Brome’s defence of the female playgoer to a broader consideration of the relation between all playgoers and all playhouses. In anti-theatrical visions of the early modern audience, the female spectator is both oxymoronic and paradigmatic in her relation to her surroundings. Despite

the formulation, found most explicitly in Gosson and reproduced in Munday and intermittently in Prynne,<sup>33</sup> that insists there is no such thing as a female spectator, only a female spectacle, the vision of the spectator presented in anti-theatrical tracts is, as Dymrna Callaghan argues, overwhelmingly feminized in its 'susceptibility to the operations of mimesis'.<sup>34</sup> Callaghan argues that the female spectator is thus 'the exemplary spectator',<sup>35</sup> the figure who renders the effects of the stage on its audience most explicitly visible.

While Callaghan's argument rests primarily on Antony Munday's *A Third Blast in Retrait from Playes* (1580) and other accounts that represent excessive emotions, another strand of primarily anti-theatrical writing such as Gosson's *Playes Confuted in Five Actions* presents the position of spectator as vulnerable not merely to emotional manipulation but to possession, in which 'These outward spectacles effeminate and soften ye hearte of men, vice is learned in beholding, sense is tickled, desire pricked, & those impressions of mind are secretly conveyed over to ye gazers, which ye players do counterfeit on ye stage'.<sup>36</sup> Gosson imagines these 'effects' as entirely outside the players' control as 'strange consorts of melody ... costly apparel ... effeminate gesture ... and wanton speech ... slip down into the heart and with gunshot of affection gaule the minde where reason and affection should rule the roste'.<sup>37</sup> The threat to the audience is that it will become 'effeminated', softened and penetrated by the players' counterfeits, ravished by effeminate gesture, utterly deprived of the sovereign (masculine) faculty of reason.

Laura Levine argues that 'the fear of effeminization which came to dominate antitheatrical tracts disguised a profound conflict about the nature of the self',<sup>38</sup> a self understood as simultaneously monstrous in its desires and unstable in its susceptibility to outside influence. This anxiety is, as Levine also observes, an anxiety specific to the male self; the female spectator is almost unimaginable in these texts. This is not to say, of course, that Elizabethan anti-theatrical writers did not recognize that women attended the theatre or that they might be affected by it. But with remarkable consistency, these texts suggest that any transgressive sexual behaviour in which the theatre might cause women to engage stemmed from their presence among male spectators rather than their own desires.<sup>39</sup> Gosson warns 'the gentlewoman citizens of London' against frequenting the theatre because 'you can forbid no man, that vieweth you, to note you and that noteth you to judge you'.<sup>40</sup> This discussion of the oxymoronic female spectator asserts that to be a spectacle is to be in a position of vulnerability — the opposite of his claim that the spectacle of the actor exercises a shaping power over audience members.

Gosson's insistence on the shaping power of the spectacle creates a system in which gender dynamics become fluid; the anxiety that surrounds the boy actor is a synecdoche for the anxiety surrounding the relationship between spectator and spectacle, in which both occupy positions of penetration and of reception simultaneously and the theatre, rather than the stage, becomes a site of bewildering instability and transformation.<sup>41</sup>

This question of where authority is located in the theatre, or who is doing what to whom, intersects meaningfully with Prynne's anti-theatrical anxieties about 'the irritation, the inflammation, the fomentation of divers sinnfull lusts', to say nothing of the potential for 'actuall adultery, whore-dome, and uncleannesse' inherent in women seeing and women being seen.<sup>42</sup> Letoy's assertion of control over the experience of those who enter his house dramatizes the anti-theatrical fantasy of the theatre as Satan's synagogue: a site controlled by a malevolent intelligence, shaping the experience of actors and audience alike, all of whom are reduced to spectacles created and shaped by and for his pleasure. But Letoy's final admission of his own irrational jealousy, his own lack of self-mastery, demonstrates this position as untenable; however meaning is created in the theatre, spectacles have as large a share in the process as spectators and any effort to keep the two entirely separate is doomed to failure.

Discussing the evening's entertainment, Hughball, the doctor who has undertaken the cure, promises Letoy that Martha, Joyless, and Diana 'shall all be your guests tonight, and not alone / Spectators, but ... actors / To fill your comic scenes with double mirth' (2.1.42–4). When discussing the relation between audience, play, and playhouse in Caroline London, the position of Joyless and his family in Letoy's house is particularly interesting for two reasons. First, Hughball's claim that the family will be Letoy's 'guests' draws attention to the social (rather than economic) relationship between the playhouse and its audience; second, the representation of an audience that is 'not alone spectators' engages with the fact, potentially uncomfortable to both the theatre's detractors and its practitioners, that the position of spectator can never be clearly differentiated from that of spectacle, particularly in the smaller private theatres in which some members of the audience literally shared the space of the stage with the players, including some seated on stools (rather than in boxes) that directly competed with the actors for both space and attention.<sup>43</sup>

Despite the amount of time lavished on the inset play, the members of the Joyless family, not the characters in 'The Antipodes', are usually the source

of dramatic action, in their interactions not only with the inset play but also with each other. The inescapable presence of the represented audience combined with the way in which the physical space of the theatre represents almost precisely what it is — a stage in Caroline London upon which a play is being enacted — calls the theatre audience to focus on its own position and methods of spectatorship. Andrew Gurr and Melissa Aaron’s arguments that Jonson’s *The Alchemist* substantially depends on the house of Lovewit and the Blackfriars playhouse being understood as identical spaces emphasize the extent to which the paying spectators are always part of the spectacle.<sup>44</sup> This is particularly the case for *The Antipodes*; the play repeatedly suggests that the stage always represents a part of a structure coterminous with the theatre itself, and explicitly under the control of Letoy, who not only owns the house in which the play is to be performed but has also written the play and produces it with actors who are literally his servants.<sup>45</sup>

The theatre audience resembles Joyless and his family in being members of the same society, living in the London anatomized in both the inset play and in the frame. In the first lines of the play, Blaze tells Joyless, ‘To me, and to the city, sir, you are welcome, / And so are all about you: we have long / Suffer’d in want of such fair company’ (1.1.1–3). When *The Antipodes* was first produced in 1638, the theatre had suffered this want for almost a year and a half due to the long plague during which Brome wrote *The Antipodes*.<sup>46</sup> Blaze’s reference to ‘all about’ Joyless thus includes the theatre audience as well as Joyless’s family, who do not appear on stage for several scenes. At the start of the play, the theatre audience and the represented audience share the same physical position, though not the same interpretive methods. They also might have originally shared the position as ‘guests’ of the playhouse far more literally had the play been staged at the Cockpit, for which Brome wrote it, rather than at Salisbury Court.<sup>47</sup>

At some point during the plague closure of the theatres in 1636–7, Christopher Beeston claimed that he ‘invited some noblemen and gentlemen to see [his company] act, at his house, the Cockpit. For which, since he perceives it is imputed as a fault, he is very sorry and craves pardon’.<sup>48</sup> Matthew Steggle suggests that ‘the Beestons were seeking to bend the rules surrounding the prohibition of performance by reframing the event, not as a commercial venture but an informal, aristocratic occasion, with the audience imagined as invited (but, perhaps paying) guests rather than mere customers’, which is why they ‘uniquely among London theatrical entrepreneurs in London at this date ... were continuing to buy in new drama’ in 1636–7, specifically

Brome's *The Antipodes*.<sup>49</sup> We must view Letoy's insistence on both the theatre's capacity to reform the morals of its audience and his own control over the spectacles presented in his house in the context of the Beestons' attempt to reformulate the theatre in terms of guest/host relations, rather than the stubbornly mercantile terms in which inductions to *The Magnetic Lady* at the Blackfriars (1633) and *The Careless Shepherdess* at Salisbury Court (1638) present the relation between audience and play.<sup>50</sup>

The Beestons' hope that they might get around the restrictions on playing by eliding the distinction between the domestic space of 'house' and the commercial space of 'playhouse' accords with anxieties about the disorder attendant upon 'gathering the wicked together'<sup>51</sup> where moral, as well as physical, contagion is inevitable. In stark contrast to visions of the theatre as a place of social subversion, where 'servants as it is manifestly to be proved, have consented to rob their Masters to supply the want of their Harlots: there is the practicing of married wives to train them from their husbands',<sup>52</sup> the Beestons offer a vision of 'some noblemen and gentlemen' gathered in a private house. In Brome's representation of private theatricals, however, this image of an ideal audience is as much an object of satire as the anti-theatrical vision of the audience of women ready to collapse into sexual corruption; in the world of *The Antipodes*, judgement is to be found, if at all, in Diana, not Letoy and Joyless, the two 'noblemen and gentlemen' who incorrectly believe that her position in the audience implies her sexual availability.

*The Antipodes* suggests that the private house in fact poses a greater threat to both female chastity and interpretive autonomy than the public theatre. If the audiences of Caroline private theatres are imagined (largely accurately) as enormously powerful and severe critics due to their almost daily attendance at the theatre,<sup>53</sup> Brome provides them with their inverse — naive spectators from the country come to be refashioned by a play put on by an infinitely experienced city lord. Much is made of the theatrical inexperience of the represented audience. Byplay believes that Peregrine, 'the mad patient ... that ... never saw / A play in's life [will] think he is in the Antipodes / Indeed, when he is on stage among us' (2.2.58–61), and Diana wishes to see the play because she is from the country, new come to London, and 'never saw a play' (1.6.200, 2.3.38). Martha seems not to even recognize that such a thing exists. The naiveté of the represented audience inverts the power relations of the Caroline theatre, apparently placing the shaping power in *The Antipodes* squarely into the hands of Lord Letoy.

Letoy’s authority over the world of his play stems from both his status as its author and his position as master of his house. His actors are literally his servants and his home is his empire. The extent to which Letoy’s pleasures are ‘all within myself’ (1.5.57) speaks to a striking level of control, literalizing the legal fiction of players as servants to a great lord. This withdrawal from the public and economic dimensions of the theatre mirrors the Beestons’ attempt to transform the commercial space of the theatre into the social space of entertainments for nobility. All of the signs of Letoy’s power are ‘exercises’ of which he is the primary spectator or participant, but never the object on view. Letoy’s proclaimed indifference to how he is seen, his choice to dress his servants better than himself, and even his decision to watch the inset play from where ‘we may sit, and [Peregrine] not see us’ (2.5.1) represents one way in which he measures his power. But neither Letoy nor the theatre audience can remain invisible; their presence in one another’s houses requires that all become objects of scrutiny and judgement.

The inset play of ‘The Antipodes’ proper begins with Peregrine awakening from a drugged slumber, believing himself to be ‘in th’Antipodes / Indeed’; precisely because he believes this, and has no understanding of the concept of theatrical performance, all parts of the theatre have the same level of reality to him. For Hughball’s cure to work, Peregrine must believe himself to be in the Antipodes, which transforms everyone he can see into an ‘Antipodean’. Peregrine’s spectatorship is not restricted to the inset play; his unawareness of theatrical convention defeats the presumed invisibility of the theatre audience as well as that of the represented audience. If Peregrine can see Martha, an audience member whom he is explicitly not supposed to see (2.5.1; 2.7.69), he can also, on some level, see the gallants on stools who share the physical space of the stage and the theatre audience in the main part of the auditorium. The audience is, after all, composed of Londoners, in whom Peregrine says he has seen customs that were ‘deriv’d from the Antipodes’ (4.1.14). The presentation of ‘women who are ruling their husbands, wives seducing their servants, aldermen who lack wit ... [which are] already established as satiric *topoi* in real London [imply] that Anti-London is not always an inversion of normality but a revelation of what normality ordinarily hides.’<sup>54</sup> Brome’s presentation of what constitutes Antipodean behaviour, as well as Peregrine’s view of his audience, implies that Peregrine and Martha are not the only ones in the Antipodes. The members of the theatre audience too are guests in Letoy’s house, as the theatre itself becomes the space in which Joyless is trapped by Letoy’s possession of ‘the keys’ (4.13.48).

Joyless's experience as Letoy's 'guest' is as nightmarish a version of the threat of the theatre as anything Prynne cites. His desperate attempts to leave the house with Diana, thus removing her from Letoy's open attempts to seduce her, fail utterly in the face of Diana's desire to see her first play and Letoy's insistence that 'I will not / Be so dishonored, nor become so ill / A master of my house, to let a lady / Leave it against her will and from her longing' (2.3.45–8). As Letoy's guest, Joyless is entirely within his power, apparently losing his position as head of his own household. The repositioning of the theatre audience from participants in a monetary transaction to guests in a private house substantially reduces their power over the spectacle of the play;<sup>55</sup> while this is obviously less of a problem for the theatre audience than for Joyless, the play similarly denies them their place of judgement, positioning them instead as 'Antipodeans' who form part of the spectacle of 'The Antipodes' which exposes the manners of London to satire and ridicule.

But Letoy's attempts to occupy the sole position of spectatorship and judgement cannot withstand his desire to reshape his own place in the larger society from which he has withdrawn. Both in presenting his attempted seduction of Diana to Joyless and, more importantly, in inviting Diana's supposed father, Master Truelock, to enter the house and reveal Diana's true parentage, Letoy makes a spectacle of himself. While he maintains control over Peregrine and Martha, who have missed this series of revelations, Diana, Joyless, and the theatre audience know him for 'a thing beyond a madman ... / Jealous', and Barbara Blaze still knows him for an 'old whoremaster' (5.7.31–2, 5.8.39).

The play ends not with Letoy but with an epilogue spoken by Hughball and Peregrine; while Letoy has proclaimed the success of Peregrine's cure — begun with his participation in the inset play, continued in the consummation of his marriage, and completed in his watching a masque of Letoy's devising — neither the doctor nor his patient are willing to place authority there. Turning to the theatre audience, Hughball observes that

Whether my cure be perfect yet or no,  
It lies not in my doctorship to know  
Your approbation more may raise the man  
Than all the College of Physicians can;  
And more health from your fair hands may be won  
Than by the stroking of the seventh son. (5.12.34–9)



The theatre audience, not the characters of the play, will finally determine the success or failure of the cure; that audience's judgement, expressed in applause, not only approves Peregrine's cure, it creates it, as Letoy's play can only hope to. Peregrine describes the instability and vulnerability of all of the characters, not just himself: 'on the waves of desperate fears we roam / Until your gentler hands do waft us home' (5.12.42–3). This final appeal for applause from the theatre audience offers it, not Letoy, the power of judgement, and suggests the vulnerability of the stage to an audience composed not of a single powerful lord but one 'more various in judgements, in humours, in apprehension', composed of men and women, old and young, experienced and inexperienced, who have come to see and be seen. As Brome presents the experience of playgoing, the members of the theatre audience maintain the ability to judge even as they cannot (and would not seek to) avoid being seen and judged themselves.

While the judgement Brome emphasizes encompasses critical discrimination as much as sexual probity, Prynne insists that 'all ages, all places have constantly suspected the chastity, yea branded the honesty of those females who have been so immodest as to resort to Theaters, to Stage playes, which either finde or make them Harlots'.<sup>56</sup> This suspicion, in Prynne's formulation, is always justified. The presence of a woman at the theatre marks her as violating St. Paul's injunction to 'all women ... to be sober, chaste, keepers at home ... that they may be chaste and sober'. To leave the house is to demonstrate 'the dissoluteness of our lascivious, imprudent, rattle-pated gadding females' who 'are never well pleased nor contented, but when they are wandring abroad to Playes'.<sup>57</sup> But if a private house like Letoy's becomes a site of both performance and spectatorship, the female spectator cannot be protected by her enclosure in a private, interior space. Her own ability to judge those around her, not her success in concealing herself from the public eye, produces her only safety.

Diana's name marks her as chaste, but it also tells the story of another female spectator. Prynne's *Histrion-Mastix* quotes Saint Augustine on Dinah, the daughter of Jacob who in Genesis 34 'walked abroad, to wit, to the spectacles of the world, that she might see the women of that country'.<sup>58</sup> The wandering, gazing Dinah is seen, desired, and raped by the king's son; commenting on this outcome, St. Augustine unsympathetically remarks that 'had she continued home among her owne she had not been deflowered by a foreign ravisher'.<sup>59</sup> Prynne uses this story to illustrate that for a woman to seek to be a spectator is for her to become the object of a male gaze and

lose her chastity. Brome's Diana, who determines to see the play because it is a fashion of the city, replaces this narrative, which both Joyless and Letoy place on her, with one that reveals her as a judge and spectator, not only of the play but also of the actions of the men around her. Her 'invincibility' — the refusal to conform her behaviour to the way in which she knows she is seen — finally renders Joyless's and Letoy's irrational jealousy visible — to themselves, to the other characters, and to the theatre audience — revealing the men who think of themselves as judging spectators as spectacles to be judged. *The Antipodes* thus imagines the female spectator as the paradigmatic spectator through her ability to exercise judgement, not her vulnerability to being judged.

## Notes

---

- 1 William Prynne, *Histrion-Mastix* (London, 1633; STC: 20464a), 991–2.
- 2 Ibid., 'To the Christian Reader', n.p.
- 3 Stephen Gosson, *School of Abuse* (London, 1579; STC: 12097.5), F1v–F4v.
- 4 Prynne, *Histrion-Mastix*, 989–91.
- 5 Ibid., 991.
- 6 For an overview of relations between the Caroline theatre and its audience see Michael Neill, 'Wits Most Accomplish'd Senate: The Audience of the Caroline Private Theaters', *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 18 (1978), 341–60. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/450366>. Nova Myhill, 'Taking the Stage: Spectators as Spectacle in the Caroline Private Theaters', Jennifer A. Low and Nova Myhill (eds), *Imagining the Audience in Early Modern Drama, 1558–1642* (New York, 2011), 37–54, suggests the playwrights' consideration of a more heterogeneous audience than does Neill's essay. For a discussion of the potential to read the theatre audience either as a collection of individuals or as a corporate entity, see Paul Yachnin and Anthony Dawson, *The Culture of Playgoing in Shakespeare's England: A Collaborative Debate* (Cambridge, 2001).
- 7 Andrew Gurr, *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London* (Cambridge, 1987), 63. See also Julie Sanders, "'Twill Fit the Players Yet": Women and Theatre in Jonson's Late Plays', Richard Cave, Elizabeth Schafer, and Brian Woolland (eds), *Ben Jonson and Theatre: Performance, Practice, and Theory* (London, 1999), 179–90.
- 8 As Jean Howard notes, the 'most fundamental premise' of anti-theatrical writers is 'that women in theater were simply objects of scrutiny and desire' ('Women as

- Spectators, Spectacles, and Paying Customers’, David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass (eds), *Staging the Renaissance* (New York, 1991), 72).
- 9 As both Brome’s play and the inset drama are called ‘The Antipodes’, in order to avoid confusion I italicize title of the play and place the title of the inset play in quotation marks.
  - 10 Richard Brome, *The Antipodes*, ed. Anne Haaker (Lincoln NE, 1966). All quotations are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text.
  - 11 Jonas Barish, ‘Three Caroline “Defenses” of the Stage’, A.R. Braunmuller and J.C. Bulman (eds), *Comedy from Shakespeare to Sheridan: Change and Continuity in the English and European Dramatic Tradition* (Newark, 1986), 211.
  - 12 Richard Cave, ‘*The Antipodes*: Critical Introduction’, *Richard Brome Online* (<http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/brome/>), 35.
  - 13 Prynne had his ears cropped in 1633 as a punishment for labelling ‘women players’ — a category that might be imagined to include Queen Henrietta Maria and her ladies who performed at court — as ‘notorious whores’ (Prynne, *Histrion-mastix*, 6r 4). Undaunted, he continued his polemical output against various policies of the court of Charles I, for which this punishment was inflicted on him a second time in 1637, ‘when Brome was composing or revising *The Antipodes*’ (Richard Brome, *The Antipodes*, Modern Text, edited by Richard Cave, *Richard Brome Online*, n. 3559). For additional discussion of Brome’s attention to this form of punishment and its potential relation to Prynne, see notes 4462, 3642, and 3653. I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for *Early Theatre* for drawing my attention to this and several other pertinent references. For a discussion of Prynne’s trial and punishment in the context of the Caroline court and theatre, see Kim Walker, ‘New Prison: Representing the Female Actor in Shirley’s *The Bird in a Cage* (1633)’, *English Literary Renaissance* 21.3 (1991), 385–8. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6757.1991.tb00745.x>. Walker reads Shirley’s play as an immediate response to *Histrion-mastix*.
  - 14 Prynne, *Histrion-Mastix*, 991–2.
  - 15 *Ibid*, 992. Where possible, I have cited quotations from Elizabethan anti-theatrical tracts as quoted in Prynne rather than in their original form.
  - 16 Jennifer Airey makes a similar argument about Wycherly’s drama, claiming that *The Country Wife* satirizes the anti-theatrical claim that the theatre corrupts its female spectators. Wycherly, however, does this at the expense of the female playgoer: ‘Female virtue in the play is always merely illusory, while Wycherly’s construction of theater presumes that women are inherently infected by transgressive desires. Wycherly’s theater thus claims to satirize and expose a corrupt culture, not contaminate it further’ (‘“For Fear of Learning New Language”: Antitheatricalism and the Female Spectator in *The Country Wife* and *The Plain Dealer*’, *Restoration: Studies in English*

- Literary Culture, 1660–1700* 31.2 (2007), 7). Brome, however, defends both the theatre and the female spectator.
- 17 Neill, 'Wits Most Accomplished Senate', 342–4.
- 18 Prynne, *Histrion-Mastix*, 993–4.
- 19 Jean Marsden argues that 'it is only in the late seventeenth century that attacks on the stage begin to focus directly upon the effects of the theater on the audience, and in particular the female audience' ('Female Spectatorship, Jeremy Collier and the Anti-Theatrical Debate', *English Literary History* 65.4 (1998), 878). DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/elh.1998.0035>. Prynne allows for the significance of the female playgoer substantially earlier than Marsden's work suggests.
- 20 Prynne, *Histrion-Mastix*, 340–1.
- 21 Douglas A. Brooks, 'Inky Kin: Reading in the Age of Gutenberg Paternity', Marta Straznicky (ed.), *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers, and Readers in Early Modern England* (Amherst, 2006), 204.
- 22 John Northbrooke, *A Treatise wherein Dicing, Dauncing, Vaine Playes or Enterluds ... Are Reproved by the Authoritie of the Word of God and Auntient Writers* (1578), ed. Arthur Freeman (New York, 1974), 63.
- 23 Antony Munday, *A Third Blast in Retrait from Playes* (London, 1580; STC 21677), 71.
- 24 Prynne, *Histrion-Mastix*, 433ff.
- 25 Cave discusses Diana's performance of desire as a sustained improvisation, indicative of her quick wit and her verbal and theatrical ability. 'The Antipodes: Critical Introduction', paragraphs 16–17.
- 26 Munday, *Third Blast*, quoted in Prynne, *Histrion-Mastix*, 440.
- 27 Andrew Griffin, 'Ram Alley and Female Spectatorship', *Early Theatre* 9.2 (2006), 91.
- 28 Prynne, *Histrion-Mastix*, 6r 4.
- 29 Laurie E. Osborne, 'Staging the Female Playgoer: Gender in Shakespeare's Onstage Audience', Viviana Comensoli and Anne Russell (eds), *Enacting Gender on the English Renaissance Stage* (Urbana, 1999), 214.
- 30 Munday, *Histrion-Mastix*, 66.
- 31 The one line that may be taken as Barbara's acknowledgment of the filial relationship between Letoy and Diana, 'Good madam, pardon errors of my tongue' (5.12.30), has been variously assigned to Barbara and Martha in modern editions; see Cave's note to 5, 1103. See also Cave, 'Introduction' (37) for a discussion of Diana's silence following the revelation of her parentage.
- 32 Gosson, *School of Abuses*, quoted in Prynne, *Histrion-Mastix*, 992.
- 33 In the course of this essay, I claim that Prynne presents the female spectator in several entirely contradictory ways. Prynne's text is frequently internally inconsistent;

this is unsurprising given its encyclopedic tendencies and an organizational structure for his vast array of sources that owes more to similarities of topic than uniformity of argument or underlying assumptions.

- 34 Dymrna Callaghan, *Shakespeare Without Women* (New York, 2000), 144.
- 35 Ibid.
- 36 Gosson, *Playes Confuted in Five Actions* (London, 1582; STC 12095), G4.
- 37 Gosson, *Playes*, quoted in Prynne, *Histrion-Mastix*, 436.
- 38 Laura Levine, *Men in Women’s Clothing: Anti-Theatricality and Effeminization from 1579 to 1642* (Cambridge, 1994), 24.
- 39 Jean E. Howard, *The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England* (New York, 1994), 76–80.
- 40 Gosson, *School of Abuses*, F2.
- 41 This uncertainty about where authority lies in the spectator/spectacle relationship — who is shaping whom — makes sodomy an important metaphor for explaining the relation between playgoer and actor: ‘the goodly Pageants being ended, every mate sorts to his mate, every one brings another homeward on the way very friendly, and in their secret conclaves (covertly), they play the Sodomites or worse. And these be the fruits of Playes and Enterludes for the most part’. Philip Stubbes, *Anatomy of Abuses* (London, 1583; STC 23380.5), quoted in Prynne, *Histrion-Mastix*, 435.
- 42 Prynne, *Histrion-Mastix*, 327, 376.
- 43 The most recent consideration of the portion of the audience seated on stools in the private theatres is Tiffany Stern’s work on the Blackfriars, ‘Taking Part: Actors and Audience on the Stage at Blackfriars’, Paul Menzer (ed.), *Inside Shakespeare: Essays on the Blackfriars Stage* (Selinsgrove, 2006), 35–53. Stern’s emphasis on the constant visibility of this group seems central to any consideration of indoor theater plays, such as *The Antipodes*, that include a represented audience on the stage. See also Myhill, ‘Taking the Stage’, 40–1.
- 44 Andrew Gurr, ‘Who Is Lovewit? What Is He?’, Cave, Schafer, and Woolland (eds), *Ben Jonson and Theatre*, 5–19; Melissa D. Aaron, “Beware at What Hands Thou Receiv’st Thy Commodity”: *The Alchemist* and the King’s Men Fleece the Customers, 1610’, Menzer (ed.), *Inside Shakespeare*, 72–9.
- 45 Audrey Birkett, ‘Actors, Audiences and Authors: The Competition for Control in Brome’s *The Antipodes*’, Peter Orford, Michael P. Jones, Lizz Ketterer, and Joshua McEvillia (eds), *Divining Thoughts: Future Directions in Shakespeare Studies* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 2007), 60–2.
- 46 Ian Donaldson, *The World Upside-Down: Comedy from Jonson to Fielding* (Oxford, 1970), 92.

- 47 For a full account of Brome's contract dispute, including copies of the relevant documents, see Anne Haaker, 'The Plague, the Theater, and the Poet', *Renaissance Drama* 1 (1968), 283–306. Matthew Steggle provides a more recent discussion of the contract in the larger context of Brome's career (*Richard Brome: Place and Politics on the Caroline Stage* (Manchester and New York, 2004), 67–71), while Eleanor Collins argues for the highly anomalous nature of the contract in 'Richard Brome's Contract and the Relationship of Dramatist to Company in the Early Modern Period', *Early Theatre* 10.2 (2007), 116–28 and 'Richard Brome and the Salisbury Court Contract', *Richard Brome Online*.
- 48 Gerald Eades Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, cited in Steggle, *Richard Brome*, 108.
- 49 Steggle, *Richard Brome*, 109. Collins convincingly argues that Brome's entering into this arrangement with Beeston while under contract to Heton was consistent with normal theatrical practice, considering 'the nature of the theatrical market ... as governed by the variable factors of plague time, repertory strategy, and playwright availability, [rather] than as a regulated and stable enterprise' ('Dramatist to Company', 123); Heton's insistence on the letter of the contract is the behaviour that would have been surprising at the time.
- 50 These inductions are discussed in detail in Myhill, 'Taking the Stage'.
- 51 Munday, *Third Blast*, quoted in Prynne, *Histrion-Mastix*, 440.
- 52 Ibid.
- 53 Neill, 'Wits Most Accomplish'd Senate', 345–6.
- 54 Martin Butler, *Theatre and Crisis, 1632–1642* (New York, 1984), 215.
- 55 Comparison between Joyless's utter helplessness in Letoy's house and the remarkable power wielded over the inset play by George, Nell, and their unending supply of gold in Beaumont's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* may be rewarding, particularly in light of Karen Kettlich's argument that *The Antipodes* was 'designed to play in repertory with *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*', which Beeston had secured the right to perform at this time. See Kettlich, "Now mark that fellow; he speaks Extempore": Scripted Improvisation in *The Antipodes*, *Early Theatre* 10.2 (2007), 131.
- 56 Prynne, *Histrion-Mastix*, 992.
- 57 Ibid, 993–4.
- 58 Ibid, 434–5.
- 59 Ibid, 435.