THE METADRAMATIC INNER PLAY IN RICHARD BROME'S *THE ANTIPODES*

Chiang Hsiao-chen
National Changhua University of Education

Richard Brome (c.1590-1652), a Jacobean playwright, is known to have been in Ben Jonson's service, probably as his secretary. Brome's *The Antipodes* (1638) includes some of Richard Hornby's metadramatic forms which operate to interrupt the dramatic illusion. Such metadramatic forms, or the metatheatrical device of a play, form the chief structure in *The Antipodes*, (from Act 2 to Act 5). In the inner play, self-reference, as emphasized by the actors' constant discussions of the actors' constant discussions of theatrical issues such as their study and memorization of lines, impromptu speeches, actions, prompter's lines, costumes, properties, dressing room, personal roles, the necessity to give up planned performances for impromptu plays, and criticism from audiences both inside and outside of the inner play, remind the audience of dramatic illusion. These issues break the theatrical claim that *The Antipodes* is an artistic presentation of "real" life; rather, it is a drama about a drama.

The reexamination of other plays also reveals similar metadrama emphasis. For example, in studying the stage history of *The Taming of the Shrew* from 1594 to 1983, Tori Haring-Smith finds that earlier renditions were often performed as a farce, while late twentieth century renditions were as a metadrama. During the 1950s and 1960s, directors like John Barton began to reexamine the play and focused on its play-within-a-play structure by adding an Epilogue and other sections to the First Folio text. These additional lines give Sly a new importance, highlight the play-within-a-play structure, and, most obviously, remind the audience of the nature of the drama—illusion. Haring-Smith describes the metatheatrical performance as follows:

> They [the added Epilogue and other lines] ensure that the audience would not forget that Katharine and Petruchio were simply roles adopted by two members of a troupe of strolling players. The actors changed costumes in full view of the audience, called on their prompter when they forgot lines, and even joined the stage audience when they were not playing their roles. At the end of the play, as Sly awoke beside the alehouse, the players could be seen in the distance, traveling on to their next one-night stand. (149)

Such emphasis on the play-within-a-play design challenges the traditional idea that a

Received: Feb. 18, 2004/Accepted: May 30, 2004
Sun Yat-sen Journal of Humanities 19 (winter 2004): 57-69

play serves as a mirror that reflects reality. Indeed, the modern performance of the play attempts to convey the idea that the nature of drama is nothing but deception. As Haring-Smith states, the audience is made aware that Katharine and Petruchio are but "two members of a troupe of strolling players." For example, the onlookers are even shown the making of the play: actors change their costumes on stage and call on a prompter to help them with forgotten lines. In addition, the illusion of reality is completely shattered by the image of the traveling actors' leaving in the distance just before the curtain falls. Hence, this kind of performance makes explicit the illusoriness, artificiality, or arbitrariness of the essence of theatricality. Therefore, this play about plays can be termed metadramatic.

The concept of metadrama, or metatheater, was first significantly discussed by Lionel Abel in his *Metatheater: A New View of Dramatic Form* (1963). This notion has since been reviewed and applied mostly to Shakespeare in James L. Calderwood's *Shakespearean Metadrama* (1971) and *Metadrama in Shakespeare's Henriad* (1979), Robert Egan's *Drama within Drama* (1975), Sidney Homan's *When the Theater Turns to Itself* (1981). Yet "[T]hese various studies," as Richard Hornby argues in *Drama, Metadrama, and Perception* (1986), "tend to be rather limited in their range; metadrama is rarely given an adequate definition" (31).

Hornby himself defines metadrama as "drama about drama" (31); or briefly, "the play is the thing." Metadrama is also defined as a play that "calls attention to itself as a work of theater and self-consciously examines the nature of drama" (Barnet 1521). For instance, in metadrama, a play may be employed within a play to demonstrate how it is performed, or characters in the play may self-consciously tell the audience that they are not portraying their true selves, but only role playing. They may also discuss the nature of drama (like "the nature of dramatic illusion" in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* or "the nature of acting in *Hamlet*") (Barnet 1521) or comment on the theater itself.

Defining metadrama as "drama about drama" also brings about subsequent effects. Hornby claims that metadrama "does not reflect life; instead it reflects itself" (17). This notion challenges the traditional definition of drama, such as Aristotle's definition of tragedy as "imitation of action," and Cicero's definition of comedy as "imitation of life, the glass of custom, and the image of truth" (Evans 67). The classic idea of drama as "imitation," "glass," "image" of life, "custom," and "truth" indicates that drama functions to reflect human life. However, such traditional theater's claim to mirror reality is significantly reexamined by some twentieth-century critics like Lionel Abel, who believes that while tragedy tries to tell us that things are unalterably true, metatheater convinces us that there is no absolute truth but fiction. Abel declares conventional tragedy, as an imitation of true life, dead: instead, we now have metatheater (112). The prefix *meta* suggests "beyond," so metadrama means drama beyond drama, "at least drama of a traditional sort" (Calderwood 1971: 4). Hence, by virtue of the definition of metadrama, Hornby thinks that metadrama sharpens our awareness that a play on stage is not a total reflection of true life but an illusion. In effect, metadrama focuses the audience's attention on dramatic artificiality and arbitrariness, and forces the audience to stop suspending their disbelief.

Hornby delineates five types of metadrama that remind audience of the dramatic nature of illusion:

1. The play within the play.
2. The ceremony within the play.
3. Role playing within the role.
4. Literary and real-life reference.
5. Self reference. (32)

First, Hornby notes that the technique of a play within highlights the fact that other characters are watching the inner play on stage, and hence reminds the audience that the play is also an illusion. The inner play of *The Mousetrap* in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is an example. Second, in ceremonies within a play, such as "feasts, balls, pageants, tournaments, games, rituals, trials, inquests, processions, executions, funerals, coronations, initiations" (49), the viewing audience knows that these are performed, not real. Thus, a ceremony within the play is "metadramatic" in the sense that it "stimulates an interest in the nature of human 'performing'" (55) such as in the abdication ceremony of *Richard II*. Third, role playing within one's role occurs when "a character consciously and willingly takes on a role different from his ordinary self" (73). In *The Merchant of Venice*, for instance, Portia takes the role of "Balthasar," Doctor of Law, in order to enter the Venetian court and save Antonio's life. The audience knows that "Balthasar" is not the real judge, so this type of role playing is "most metadramatic" (74). Fourth, some literary and real-life references within the play may also break the dramatic illusion. There are four types of literary references: citation, allegory, parody, and adaptation. For example, Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion* can be related to the stories of Cinderella, the Ugly Duckling, the myth of Pygmalion, and even Ibsen's *A Doll House* (where Eliza finally breaks free of male control) (89, 93). When aware of these references, the audience knows the play is made up and the dramatic world imaginary. Fifth, self-reference is always metadramatic. When a character suddenly steps out of the fictional world of a play and directly addresses the audience, he or she expresses self-reference. This direct and immediate self-reference destroys all the imaginative world of the play, and the audience is reminded that it is only a "playing holiday" (104). A familiar example is Prince Hal in *Henry IV*, Part I, who advises the audience he will imitate the sun and will be due to reform later. "These types of metadrama," writes Hornby, "should be seen not as passive categories, but rather as instrumental ones. They are rarely found in pure form, but often occur together or blend into one another" (32). In other words, these forms can be used as devices ("instrumental"); combined, they help create the effect that the play on stage is an obvious illusion.

In the same way, certain features, especially the play within the play, in Richard Brome's *The Antipodes* (or, *The World Upside Down*) (1638), a Renaissance travel play, qualify it to be interpreted as a metadrama. For example, in the main part which includes a play within the play, the actors and director/playwright are aware that they are performing a play, and keep discussing the making of the said play. Moreover, the on-stage audience keeps commenting on the acting of these players. Consequently, dramatic "realism" is repeatedly undermined by these theatrical practices.

Summarily, the play, *The Antipodes*, begins with Joyless, a worried old country gentleman anxious about his son Peregrine, because the young man suffers from "Melancholy" (a mental disease or insanity) caused by his immersing himself in Sir John Mandeville's travel accounts. Doctor Hughball suggests Peregrine travel away

from Renaissance London to an unknown place, the Antipodes, where old men are sent to school by their children, ordinary people govern magistrates, coachmen beat captains, women overrule men, men do housework and women go hunting and hawking, men are ducked, wives seduce their servants, merchants ask gentlemen to cuckold them, and parrots teach their mistresses to talk. The Doctor also describes to his patient, Peregrine, the strange citizens there: a patient counseling a physician; a puritan tradesman teaching a traveler to lie; a ballad-woman giving light to the most learned antiquary; a fool giving grave instructions to a lord ambassador; a parish clerk giving military discipline to a general. The Doctor believes that the bizarre trip will gratify Peregrine's desire for exotic sights and expects Peregrine's wits to be restored after the fantastic journey. Peregrine is then drugged into believing that he has slept for days. After waking from his sleep, he is told that he has arrived at the Antipodes. During the journey, he finds the new place "th' antipodes of England," where everything is contrary to that in England. At the end of the bizarre trip, Peregrine is cured and accepts his wife.

Structurally, this fantastic journey in *The Antipodes*, with its strange and reversed laws, customs and practices is presented in the form of a play within a play, invented by playwright/director Lord Letoy and his company of players. It includes some of Hornby's metadramatic forms which operate to interrupt the dramatic illusion. Specifically, metadramatic form, or the metatheatrical device of a play within a play (from Act 2 through Act 5) is its chief structure. Additionally, in the inner play, trials, knighting and dancing scenes form "the ceremony within the play." Several real-life references in the inner play can also be found, such as the allusion to the Elizabethan comedians, Tarlton and Kemp. Self-reference, as manifested through the actors' constant discussions of theatrical issues such as the study and memorization of lines, impromptu speeches, actions, prompter's lines, costumes, properties, dressing room, personal roles, the necessity to give up planned performances for impromptu plays, and criticism from audiences both inside and outside of the inner play, also remind the audience of dramatic illusion. These issues break the theatrical claim that *The Antipodes* is an artistic presentation of "real" life.

Introduction of the metadramatic play within a play begins in Act 2 Scene 1, where Peregrine has been sleeping for twelve hours. Here, Doctor Hughball and Lord Letoy discuss the preparation for the inner play to show the upside-down world of the Antipodes. The Doctor says to Letoy, "Your fancy and my cure shall be cried up / Miraculous. O, y'are the lord of fancy" (4-5). The compliment indicates the imaginative nature of the drama and reveals the playwright as a fanciful and imaginative man. Letoy then describes his actors:

> Well, sir, my actors
> Are all in readiness, and I think, all perfect
> But one, that never will be perfect in a thing
> He studies. Yet he makes such shifts extempore
> (Knowing the purpose what he is to speak to)
> That he moves mirth in me 'bove all the rest. (2.1.14-19)

The audience is further reminded that the play is an imaginative product, not a "real" event through the playwright/director's commentaries on an actor—"that mimic

fellow"—as a real person. Playwright/director Letoy describes this actor as none too good at memorizing lines, but good at improvisation and so capable of making impromptu speeches that he always pleases the playwright. After commenting on the gift of this actor, Letoy compares himself with "poetic furies" who "complained when actors failed to do justice to the products of [...] their creative frenzy" (Parr 247n20). Unlike those angry playwrights, Letoy himself would not threaten an actor's life just by adding or omitting simply "a syllable" during the whole play. His comparison reveals the contemporary relationship between furious and violent playwrights versus poor and insignificant actors. The least possibility of suspense of disbelief in the audience's mind is further undermined when the Doctor states that he will find chances to talk with the actor between scenes when the actor is not playing a part on stage. In order to offer information to Peregrine, his young patient and mad traveler, the Doctor says, "For I must take occasion to interchange / Discourse with him [the actor] sometimes amidst their scenes" (2.1.28-29). Taking his patient to travel in this fantastic kingdom, the Doctor acts as both a guide to Peregrine and an audience in the inner play. However, unlike his patient, the Doctor knows that all is just a show; he can thus have a conversation with the actors "amidst their scenes."

The Antipodes also deals with theatrical practices and problems. After ensuring that all the actors are ready, (except for the one who can handle the situation by making impromptu lines), Letoy wants the Doctor to gather spectators to enjoy the "comedy." The on-stage audience includes old and jealous Joyless (Peregrine's father), the old man's young wife Diana, Peregrine's wife Martha, and Blaze's wife Barbara. While the Doctor is away fetching viewers, Letoy calls his actors, addresses their theatrical problems and advises them on how to act:

> LETOY. Go fetch 'em then, while I prepare my actors.
>
> *Exit* DOCTOR.
>
> [*Calls.*] Within there, ho!
> 1. (*within*) This is my beard and hair.
> 2. (*within*) My lord appointed it for my part.
> 3. (*within*) No,
> This is for you; and this is yours, this grey one.
> 4. (*within*) Where be the foils and targets for the women?
> 1. (*within*) Here, can't you see?
> LETOY. What a rude coil is there!
> But yet it pleases me.
> 1. (*within*) You must not wear
> That cloak and hat.
> 2. (*within*) Who told you so? I must
> In my first scene, and you must wear that robe.
> LETOY. What a noise make those knaves! Come in, one of you.
> *Enter* QUAILPIPE, three actors, *and* BYPLAY.
> LETOY. Are you the first that answers to that name?
> QUAILPIPE. My lord.
> LETOY. Why are not you ready yet?
> QUAILPIPE. I am not to put on my shape before

I have spoken the prologue. And for that, my lord,
I yet want something.
LETOY. What, I pray, with your grave formality?
QUAILPIPE. I want my beaver shoes and leather cap
To speak the prologue in, which were appointed
By your lordship's own direction.
LETOY. Well, sir, well –[*Fetches them.*]
There they be for you. I must look to all.
QUAILPIPE. Certes, my lord, it is a most apt conceit,
The comedy being the world turned upside down,
That the presenter wear the capital beaver
Upon his feet, and on his head shoe leather.
LETOY. Trouble not you your head with my conceit,
But mind your part. Let me not see you act now
In your scholastic way you brought to town wi' ye,
With seesaw sack-a-down, like a sawyer.
Nor in a comic scene play *Hercules Furens*,
Tearing your throat to split the audiences' ears. (2.1.45-74)

Here, the dialogue between Letoy and Quailpipe manifests the theatrical issue of stage preparation. Traditionally, a play aims to present "true" human life in an artistic mode, and therefore realistic theatrical preparation is generally concealed offstage. In contrast, in *The Antipodes*, the noise and disturbances of actors behind the scene are moved to the front stage and exposed to the audience, making them aware that all the dramatic presentation is pure show. The audience hears actors arguing for their costumes (robe, beard, hair, cloak, hat) and props ("foils and targets"), a confusion unheard of in traditional plays.

Furthermore in a metadrama, the realistic process of discussion between the actors and playwright/director about the proper way to perform is displayed on stage. For example, in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the "rude mechanicals" discuss methods to present a terrible lion, the moon, and the wall during their rehearsal at the Duke's oak. Bottom suggests to Quince, the playwright/director, a prologue to tell the ladies that the fake lion is played by Snug. Bottom also figures out a way to have the moon shine: "Why, then may you leave a casement of the great chamber window where we play open, and the moon may shine in at the casement" (3.1.48-50). As for the wall, Bottom recommends a man perform the wall with "cranny." As artisans argue with Quince about the ways to present the lion, the moon, and the wall on stage in their rehearsal, so does Quailpipe in *The Antipodes* argue with Letoy. Quailpipe suggests he should wear a "capital beaver upon his feet" and put "on his head shoe leather" to convey an image of "upside-down" as the trope of the inner play—i.e., an upside-down world. However, unlike Quince who adopts his actors' suggestions, Letoy rejects Quailpipe's concern about his "conceit."

In addition, to displaying the discussion on acting, Letoy also appraises good and bad acting. For example, like Thomas Heywood's *Apology for Actors* (1612), which warns the actor of university drama against standing "in his place like a lifeless Image, demurely plodding, & without any smooth & formal motion" (Parr 249n71-72), playwright/director Letoy also disparages the mechanical "scholastic" (university

dramatic) style of action and monotonous speaking ("With seesaw sack-a-down, like a sawyer"). Similarly, like Hamlet, who lectures strolling players on how to act, and who depreciates bombastic actors who "tear a passion to tatters, to very rags, to split the ears of the groundings" (3.2.8-9), Letoy tells his actor not to rant his lines ("Tearing your throat to split the audients' ears").

Letoy continues to criticize another actor, Byplay, for freely adding his own lines and even changing or cutting what the "writer / With care and skill composed" (2.1.96-97). Byplay is also criticized for speaking to the wrong objects ("And when you are / To speak to your co-actors in the scene, / You hold interlocutions with the audients" (2.1.97-99). When Byplay retorted that it was what earlier comedians did to produce a comic effect, Letoy reproves fools and jesters of older times, such as Elizabethan theatrical clowns, Richard Tarlton and William Kemp, for their crude wits to "move mirth and laughter." Letoy says

> Yes, in the days of Tarlton and Kemp,
> Before the stage was purged from barbarism,
> And brought to the perfection it now shines with.
> Then fools and jesters spent their wits, because
> The poets were wise enough to save their own
> For profitabler uses. [...] (2.1.102-107)

Such real life references, according to Hornby's definition of metadrama, include allusions to real persons, living or dead (95); thus, this allusion to Tarlton and Kemp is metadramatic because it is an intrusion from outside life and shatters dramatic illusion. After warning Byplay not to imitate the fools and jesters of older stages, Letoy concedes to Byplay trying his wit in answering the Doctor's and Peregrine's questions with impromptu lines.

Another on-stage manifestation of theatrical process surfaces when all the actors, music, and props seem ready except for one: the mute. Letoy, faced with the urgency, recruits Blaze, a painter rather than actor, for the role:

> LETOY. "Honest Blaze,
> Prithee go in; there is an actor wanting.
> BLAZE. Is there a part for me? How shall I study't ?
> LETOY. Thou shalt say nothing.
> BLAZE. Then if I do not act
> Nothing as well as the best of 'em, let me be hissed. (2.1.139-143)

Blaze accepts the role and after his performance, reveals himself to his wife Barbara, one of the audience, self-consciously explaining what a mute is: "A mute is one that acteth speakingly, /And yet say nothing. I did two of them, / The sage man-midwife, and the basket-maker" (5.1.118-120). Thus, the play within the play in Act 2 Scene 1 is essentially a metadramatic form because it centers on theatrical problems like props, correct acting and speech, argument between playwright/director and actors, criticism of previous fools and jesters, and impromptu casting of a layman to replace a mute character.

Moving on to Act 2 Scene 2, when the music arises, the play within a play starts with the stage direction reading, "*Enter* LETOY, JOYLESS, DIANA, MARTHA, and BARBARA *in masks. They sit at the other end of the stage,*" and Letoy saying, "Here we may sit and he [Peregrine] not see us" (2.2.45-46). The real audience can thus see the stage audience sitting on one end of the stage. The journey in the inner play is also portrayed as just a performance, not a real trip in a real geographical location. In addition, after Quailpipe's Prologue, instead of an immediate entry of actors to perform, the stage audience comments on acting. For example, on Quaipipe's act, Letoy commented, "This had been well now, if you had not dreamt / Too long upon your syllables." Then, when Diana wonders if that is a Prologue, Letoy kisses her and replies, "this was prologue to the play, / As this is to our sweet ensuing pleasures." Furthermore, when Joyless, the jealous husband, curses, "may hell take ye for't," daughter-in-law, Martha expresses weariness and desires to go home (2.2.67-68, 73-74, 77, 78). Therefore, the stage audience's scandalous love, jealous fury, and complaints not only interrupt the real audience's enjoyment of the inner play but also destroy the theater's claim to reality.

Subsequently, when the actors enter to act out Letoy's script in the following scenes, Letoy continues to comment on their performances. For example, when Byplay says, "My lady and myself," Letoy corrects in his aside, "You and your lady, / You should ha'said, puppy" (2.2.98-99), "presumably because in the Antipodes the order of courtesy is reversed" (Parr 257n99-100). In addition, when the onstage audience talks too loudly, Letoy asks them to be silent: "Peace, Master Joyless, you are too loud. Good still" (2.2.146). In yet another example, when the Doctor and Peregrine enquire of Byplay, Letoy asks the stage audience to pay attention to Byplay's extempore: "Good! Now Mark that fellow; he speaks extempore" (2.2.198). The playwright/director is proud of his "fair play" and pleased to have his actors under his control: "And for my actors, they shall speak or not speak / As much, or more, or less, and when I please. / It is my way of pleasure, and I'll use it" (3.14-16).

On stage after about 270 lines, criticism of the actors continues and another extempore challenges Letoy's confidence in his power over his play. Then in the middle of the inner play, when actors fail to enter, Letoy calls, "Why do you not enter? What, are you asleep?" (3.286) and Byplay, as Letoy's actor instead of a character, comes out and explains what happened in the back tiring house:

> BYPLAY. My lord, the mad young gentleman—
> JOYLESS. What of him?
> BYPLAY. He has got into our tiring-house amongst us,
> And ta'en a strict survey of all our properties;
> Our statues and our images of gods,
> Our planets and our constellations,
> Our giants, monsters, furies, beasts, and bugbears,
> Our helmets, shields, and visors, hairs, and beards,
> Our pasteboard marchpanes, and our wooden pies.
> LETOY. Sirrah, be brief; be not you now as long in
> Telling what he saw as he surveying. (3.287-296)

As in Act 2 Scene 1, the crude theatrical realism is again presented on stage when props in the tiring-house are itemized. The long list goes on: statues and images of gods, clothes of the "Sone & Mone" ("Our planets and our consternations") (Gurr 187), giants, monsters, beast, weapons, masks, hairs and beards, decorative cakes and sweets ("marchpanes") and "wooden pies." The props are later mentioned by Blaze to his wife Barbara: "Come in and help me on with't in our tiring-house, / And help the gentleman, my fellow dancers, / And thou shalt then see all our things, and all / Our properties, and practice to the music" (5.1.123-126). These references to the dressing room make the audience realize the fact that the play is entirely artificial.

In addition to the long list of props, Byplay steps out of the inner play and further describes in detail what Peregrine does in the tiring-house. He reveals that upon snatching a sword and shield with which Byplay plays Bevis, killing monsters, knocking down the Cyclops, cutting devils' faces, the mad patient Peregrine takes the "imperial diadem and crowns / Himself King of the Antipodes" (3.315-316). This revelation serves to indicate that theater is not reality, and destroy any illusion of a self-contained inner play.

After describing Peregrine's unexpected and unscripted mad behavior to Letoy Byplay informs his lord that the Doctor has soothed the patient, and that all control has resumed. The playwright/director then commands, "Proceed you with your play" (3.326), "Sit, / The actors enter" (350). Moving into the court scene, Byplay, the former Extempore, now plays the judge who says. "I will not hear / Any complaint before I understand / What the defendant can say for himself" (3.375-377). During the reverse procedure, the judge insists on hearing a defendant first, then the plaintiff. At the end of a rather confusing argument comes another theatrical problem: the actor on stage forgets his lines. The prompter "*within*" says, "Dismiss the court." However, Byplay fails to catch on, so Letoy repeats, "Dismiss the court; cannot you hear the prompter? Ha' you lost your ears, judge?" Byplay thereby replies "No" to Letoy, a stage audience, and "Dismiss the court" [*To Officer*] (3.480-482). Thus, the boundary between the inner play actor and the stage audience is not clearly delineated.

Like actors who change clothes on stage in the metatheatrical performance of *The Taming of the Shrew*, cited above, Byplay abruptly "*removes his robes*" in front of the stage audience. Diana forthwith recognizes Byplay-the-judge as Byplay-the Extempore, who related the dressing-room incident. Diana says, "Protest, Extempore played the judge! And I / knew him not all this while" (3.485-487). Thus, with clothes as a way of disguising oneself removed, an actor's self is exposed and dramatic illusion is again definitely dispelled.

After taking off his clothes, Byplay kneels and kisses Peregrine, "the King." Peregrine asks for a sword to knight Byplay (not written anywhere in the script). In this unscripted knighting scene, at this point, Letoy, as playwright/director, freely steps into the inner play to assist in the unexpected situation by offering his real sword. Nevertheless, the help is rejected because Peregrine does not want the Lord's sword ("*Throws down Letoy's sword*") and insists on having the officer's. Actor Swordbearer says to Letoy in an aside, "It is a property, you know, my lord, / No blade, but a rich scabbard with a lath in't." Letoy replies, "So is the sword of justice, for aught he knows" (3.515-519), thereby manifesting theatrical realism via this prop: a sword without blade; a "painted fixture" (Parr 283n520). Hence, the fake sword reminds the audience of the nature of drama: artificial, counterfeit, and make-believe.

Impromptu shows and lines become indispensable as Peregrine becomes increasingly interactive and involved with the actors in the inner play. In Act 4, for instance, a young gentleman is wrongly accused by a maid of treating her violently. The Constable, instead of seeking the truth, decides to arrest the gentleman because "what were justice if it should not support / The weaker side?" (4.102-103). Peregrine observes this scene and asks, "Call you this justice?" He then intrudes on the performance and tells the young man to leave. The actor, along with the Gentleman character, "*hesitates*." Not knowing how to continue acting, he says to the Doctor, "He puts me out; my part is now / To bribe the constable" (4.106-107). The Doctor says to him, "Be gone." Hence again, Letoy's script can not be successfully acted out due to the unexpected interruption made by Peregrine's intrusion.

In subsequent scenes Peregrine destroys all the designed inner play. Required to speak impromptuly, Byplay begins stuttering, "Your grace/ Abounds—abounds—your grace—I say, abounds—" Letoy, angered by Byplay's incompetence with words, rebukes him: "Pox o'your mumbling chops. Is your brain dry?" Faced with the mad traveler's constant inquiry, Byplay himself seems exhausted. Finally, the playwright/ director decides to "[g]ive over the play, and do all by extempore" (4.390-392, 400).

Such intrusions lead to the relinquishing of the original script and alteration of the actors' original parts. In another example, in Act 4, the impromptu scene about Peregrine's marriage to Martha is controlled by playwright/director Letoy, who steps in and directs the onstage inner play ("Letoy *enters and mingles with the rest, and seems to instruct them all.*") As a result, not only are the original lines changed; original costumes are also removed and the previously designed dancing party delayed to the next day. However, unaware of the change in plot, Quailpipe enters "*in a fantastical shape*," only to be confronted by Letoy's inquiry:

> What, in that shape?
> QUAILPIPE. 'Tis for my part, my lord.
> Which is not all performed.
> LETOY. It is, sir, and the play for this time. We
> Have other work in hand.
> QUAILPIPE. Then have you lost
> Action—I dare be bold to speak it!—
> Most of my coat could hardly imitate. (4.482-487)

As Parr comments, "Having been unfairly rebuked at the start (2.1.56) for not being ready, poor Quailpipe is now deprived of his last and (in his eyes) best turn" (304 nn481-83). The poor actor who self-consciously wants to impress his director with his fantastic coat is now ordered, sans any appreciation, to "shift" his beautiful costume. However, although the inner play "[w]as broke off," Letoy regains his authority in the dancing party when he says to Quailpipe, "Prithee say no more, / But see upon my signal given they act / As well as I designed" (5.2.299-301).

Although Letoy's original script is to show an upside-down world, the Antipodes, whose purpose is to cure the mad young traveler, Peregrine's constant intrusion in the inner play forces Letoy to direct an impromptu show instead of a planned play. Nevertheless, Peregrine is not the only intruder, others being the stage audience commenting on the performance of the inner play, and the Doctor who says they are

"All Antipodeans" (2.2.163), when Peregrine sees Letoy and the guests. Due to these intrusions, the boundary between actors in the inner play and actors as stage audience again collapses. The stage audience's criticism of and responses to the play within the play similarly obstruct the performance. For instance, in Act 2.scene 2, the Lady in the Antipodes realm reminds her husband that she is the "supreme head" of the family and that the "portion" (dowry) he has brought her is "not so abundant," so he should obey her order to sleep with an old man's wife in return for the old man's "silks" and "cloth of gold." Herein, Diana comments, "In truth, she handles him handsomely" and states, "Yes, and such wives are worthy to be liked / For giving good example" (115, 123-125). As for the old man giving the husband gifts to "get his wife with child," Diana regards this case somewhat "reasonable" because she compares the case in the inner play with the case of her old husband, Joyless:

> Make't your own case: you are an old man;
> I love a gentleman; you give him rich presents
> To get me a child (because you cannot). Must not
> We look to have our bargain? (240-243)

In fact, Diana responds so enthusiastically to the show on stage that at one point, Letoy is afraid she might "fall in love the actor" (2.2.229). In addition, after seeing many inverted customs or social situations in the Antipodes, such as a shabby lawyer, smart poet, poor alderman, jeering judge, beggar-like courtiers, Diana exclaims, "In the Antipodes; how contrary in all / Are they to us!" (3.3.216-217). Thus, Diana acts as a commentator on Letoy's play, her words evincing the theatrical arbitrariness.

In conclusion, the metatheatrical inner play discussed above shows Brome's *The Antipodes* as an "anti-form in which the boundaries between the play as a work of self-contained art and life are dissolved" (Calderwood 1971: 4). Letoy's artistic inner play is repeatedly interrupted by theatrical reality both inside and outside the inner play, such as the actors' words and action, the director/ playwright's ability to control the play, an unexpected intruder's breaking into the hiring house, fake props, and onlookers' questions and comments. In other metatheatrical analysis, such as in his reading of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Chiu Chin-jung also finds the inner play, *Pyramus and Thisby*, metadramatic because it "mirrors the process of theatrical production" (87). Like in *The Antipodes*, mechanical preparation shows the process of theatrical production, from the choosing of a play, casting, stage planning, lighting, props, and rehearsal, to the final acting in front of the nobles. In fact, except for the criticism from the stage audience, everything seems under the control of the director and/or actors. However, *The Antipodes*, mirrors a more complicated process of theatrical production, because early in the performance, the playwright/director and actors have to deal not only with ordinary theatrical exercises, but also with the unexpected "mad traveller-audience" whose intrusion nearly collapses the production of the whole inner play, eventually forcing Letoy to give up his "fair play."

WORKS CITED

Abel, Lionel. *Metatheater: A New View of Dramatic Form*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1963.

Barnet, Sylvan, et al., eds. *Types of Drama: Plays and Contexts*. New York: Longman, 2001.

Calderwood, James L. *Shakespearean Metadrama*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1971.

---. *Metadrama in Shakespeare's Henriad* : *Richard II to Henry V*. Los Angels: U of California P, 1979

Egan, Robert. *Drama within Drama: Shakespeare's Sense of His Art in King Lear, The Winter's Tale, and The Tempest*. New York: Columbia UP, 1975.

Evans, G. Blakemore, ed. *Elizabethan~Jacobean Drama: The Theater in Its Time*. New York: New Amsterdam, 1990.

Greenblatt, Stephen, et al., eds. *The Norton Shakespeare*. New York: Norton, 1997.

Gurr, Abdrew. *The Shakespeare Stage*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.

Homan, Sidney. *When the Theater Turns to Itself* : *The Aesthetic Metaphor in Shakespeare*. Lewisburg, Pa.: Bucknell UP, 1981.

Hornby, Richard. *Drama, Metadrama, and Perception*. London: Associated UP, 1986.

Hring-Smith, Tori. *From Farce to Metadrama: A Stage History of The Taming of the Shrew, 1594-1983*. London: Greenwood, 1985.

Parr, Anthony, ed. *Three Renaissance Travel Plays*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995.

邱錦榮。〈莎劇中的後設策略〉。《英美文學評論》5 (2001): 55-87。

ABSTRACT

Richard Brome's *The Antipodes* (or, *The World Upside Down*) (1638), a Renaissance travel play, can be viewed as a metadrama, which is a play about plays. The main part of *The Antipodes* includes a play within the play, wherein actors and the director/playwright are aware that they are performing a play and keep discussing the making of the said play. Moreover, the on-stage audience keeps commenting on the acting of these players. Dramatic "realism" is repeatedly undermined by theatrical practices.

Key words: *The Antipodes*, Richard Brome, Richard Hornby, metadrama

提　要

英國文藝復興時期之劇作家理查・伯若姆所著之《對蹠地》(1638)是一齣旅遊喜劇，本論文討論該劇具有「後設戲劇」之特質，亦即該劇是一齣討論戲劇的劇本。《對蹠地》的主要劇情發展呈現在「劇中劇」中，我們看到演員、導演/編

劇者很清楚知道他們在表演一齣戲，他們不停地張羅演出的道具、服飾，討論演出的問題和技巧，將後台真實情景全部呈現。再者，「劇中劇」之外的舞台上的演員觀眾也相互批評討論所觀賞的「劇中劇」。簡言之，《對蹠地》以舞台劇演出之現實層面摧毀戲劇呈現真實人生的迷思。

關鍵詞:《對蹠地》、理查．伯若姆、理查．洪恩比、後設戲劇

＊ **Hsiao-chen Chiang** (蔣筱珍) is Associate Profesor of English at National Changhua University of Education. Her teaching and research interests include the Renaisance, Shakespeare, feminism, literature and film, drama, and English teaching. She has been hosting two television teaching programs for Open College broadcast at Chinese Television System: *Chinese and English Translation* and *An Approach to English Literature*. Her recent publications include: "Constraint and Mobility: Women and Theatrical Culture in the Emnglish Renaissance," *Sun Yat-sen Journal of Humanities* 6 (2003): 55-71; "The Trope of an Upside-Down World: Carnival and Menippean Satire in Richard Brome's *The Antipodes*." *Concentric* 30.2 (July 2004): 55-72.