PART 3:

CLOSE-UPS

Chapter 7

South Bank Shakespeare Goes Global:

Broadcasting from Shakespeare's Globe and the National Theatre

Pascale Aebischer

In 2003, Shakespeare's Globe, in association with BBC4, was the first company in the UK to broadcast a 'live, uncut, theatre performance of Shakespeare' using HD digital video (Marr 2003). Since then, the Bankside theatre has been joined by its upriver neighbour, the National Theatre, in a game-changing endeavour to broadcast 'South Bank Shakespeare' to national and international audiences. The theatres' respective locations opposite Westminster's Houses of Parliament and the City of London, the seats of political and financial power, is crucial to their identity. As the National Theatre's former artistic director Nicholas Hytner (2003 - 2015), puts it: 'The South Bank in the 1590s and early 1600s was where almost the whole of London went at some point to see its fears, hopes, lives and politics anatomised. And I think if you've got something called the National Theatre, you have to try and reach for that again' (Wark 2017). Whereas their authority stems from their historical association with the early modern theatre industry, South Bank Shakespeares are shaped by the theatres' distinctive architectures and the types of performer-audience dynamics fostered by the buildings' affordances, as interpreted by their successive artistic directors.

Through their architecture, Shakespeare's Globe and the National Theatre adopt contrasting positions vis-à-vis the tension, in Shakespeare's plays, between illusion and theatrical self-consciousness or, in Bridget Escolme's words, between 'people who talk to themselves' and those who 'talk to the audience' (2005: 9). In the Globe, the thrust stage and the daylight performers share with the surrounding spectators mean that 'imaginative complicity is essential for the creation of illusion' and the performance style is presentational (Purcell 2009: 150). The Shakespearean subjectivities (re)constructed through such complicity depend 'upon the potential for direct encounter between performer and spectator within a continually foregrounded theatre building' (Escolme 2005: 8). Integral to the experience of creative co-presence which William B. Worthen has dubbed 'Globe performativity' is the reconstructed building itself (2003: 110). The material re-imagining of the first Globe contributes to the generation of a powerful sensation of transhistorical presence in which past words, characters and conventions commingle with twenty-first century subjectivities, objects and ambient noise. For the Globe, 'access' to its work 'draws together the related but very different ideas of physical, cultural and intellectual accessibility' that are all part of the Globe's mission to 'further the experience and international understanding of Shakespeare in performance' (Carson 2008: 115; Shakespeare's Globe 2017). Because the theatre does not benefit from government funding, its broadcasts have been dependent on partnerships with distributors and production companies. The four BBC broadcasts from the theatre (three 'live' from the Globe, one delayed from the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse), the recorded theatre DVDs of productions in 2007, 2009 and thereafter, the Globe on Screen cinema screenings of between 2011 and 2016, and the Globe Player streaming platform launched in 2014 all contribute to the theatre's mission to make the Globe experience global in reach.

By contrast, from the National Theatre's foundation, its Olivier stage, despite its 'open' shape and absence of a proscenium arch (see Greenhalgh, chapter 1), has tended to portray Shakespeare as the inheritor of nineteenth-century realist performance practice, with the fourth-wall convention locking characters into a world separate from that of their audience – i.e., a theatre designed for 'people who talk to themselves'. Designed by Denys Lasdun as a brutalist layering of concrete boxes, the National Theatre's appearance proclaims its uncompromising modernity. In its main auditorium, the structure of the building itself recedes into the background, with attention focused instead on set design and sophisticated stage technologies, with excellent sightlines from all vantage points. Access to its productions is profoundly connected to the National Theatre's commitment to being 'as national as possible'. Arts Council funding supports the drive 'to keep ticket prices affordable, to reach a wide audience and to … maintain artistic risk-taking, accessibility and diversity' (National Theatre). NTLive's cinema broadcasts are one further way in which this mission can be fulfilled, increasing the theatre's 'virtual capacity' to include nationwide audiences while generating additional income and brand recognition from international distribution (Bakhshi and Throsby 2010: 5; Groves 2012).[1] For the occasion of the live broadcast, each receiving cinema is reimagined as a satellite auditorium of the National Theatre, complete with printed cast list (a requirement by NTLive), downloadable e-programme, and a theatre-style interval which, together, act as cognitive prompts that invite broadcast audiences to experience the receiving venue as 'theatrical'.

There is, I argue, a clear (though not a necessary) connection between the theatre buildings, the performer-audience dynamics they foster in live performance, the companies' understanding of 'access', and the manner in which broadcasts from the two theatres engage with their remote audiences. Recognising that broadcasts are shaped, to an

significant extent, by 'established industry skillsets' of multi-camera live capture (Wyver 2017), I examine how broadcast directors create consistent house styles for NTLive and Shakespeare's Globe by deploying those skills when they adapt to the buildings and the productions' own engagement with the stage spaces and their audiences. Each house style remediates its own atmosphere, understood as, in Gernot Böhme's definition, 'the common reality of the perceiver and the perceived', an aura-like 'spatially extended quality of feeling' (1993: 122, 118). Whereas NTLive's Shakespeare broadcasts produce a predominantly illusionist Shakespeare attuned to the modern technologies and performance styles on display on the Olivier stage, broadcasts from Shakespeare's Globe between 2003 and 2016 reflect the company's predominantly presentational performance style under artistic directors Mark Rylance (1995 - 2005) and Dominic Dromgoole (2005 - 2016). Most recently, the stylistic convergence of broadcasts from the two theatres has begun to blur the distinctions between illusionist and presentational styles.

This chapter shows how through paratexts, camerawork, and the triggering of strong affective responses, broadcasts are able to generate atmospheres in which broadcast audiences experience a 'distributed presence' that transcends boundaries of time and space. A phenomenology of space and affect grounded in Michel de Certeau's work allows me to explain how broadcasts generate the experience of spatial inclusion or exclusion, which in turn contributes to the sensation of participation in the event. I argue that strong affects have the capacity to transcend spatial and temporal boundaries, connecting remote audiences with the performance in the here-and-now of their emotional response. The handling of strong affect, combined with a representation of space as transactional, is a catalyst of what Erin Sullivan describes as 'aliveness as an experiential and affective quality' (chapter 3).

Shared affect and the creation of spaces

On 15 September 2011, the NTLive broadcast of Hytner's production of *One Man,*

Two Guvnors, directed for screen by Robin Lough, opened not inside the National Theatre's

Lyttelton auditorium, on whose proscenium stage the performance took place, but just

outside, on an impromptu Astroturf piazza framed by coloured party lights against the

backdrop of the Thames riverside and the National Theatre's iconic concrete walls. There, a

crowd had gathered for the free screening of the production on a giant pop-up screen. As

night fell, broadcast viewers could see people milling around, sitting on the Astroturf, or

dancing to the sound of a skiffle band. The music acted as a sound bridge when the camera

cut to the inside of the Lyttelton, where a packed audience was watching the band.

Fifty minutes later, James Corden's permanently ravenous servant Francis turned to

his audience to ask if anyone had a sandwich for him. Promptly, somebody in the stalls

offered up his sandwich. When Corden, helplessly cracking up with laughter, went wobbly in

the knees and buried his head in his hands, a camera located at the side of the stalls picked

out the owner of the sandwich. 'Of all the nights…', spluttered Corden in recognition that

this was the performance that was being broadcast live, as another shot showed the

whooping, applauding front rows. If spectators had suspected that Corden's corpsing was a

pre-scripted 'glitch' designed to generate the frisson of liveness for the theatre audience,

Corden's interjection (which, in effect, was the only improvisation that actually took place in

this sequence) extended that frisson to the cinema audience.

The peripatetic mix of shots cutting between indoor and outdoor areas during the

pre-show was also in evidence during the interval feature, which took broadcast viewers out

onto the Piazza before leading them backstage. The curtain call, too, began inside the

Lyttelton and ended on the Piazza. This mobile representation of the spaces in and around

the auditorium meshed together with Corden's infectious laughter to transport broadcast

viewers affectively into a performance space which reached beyond the boundaries of the

theatre. Set off by Corden's wobbly-kneed giggles, the Lyttelton audience's responsive

laughter acted 'as a sign that all members of the group [were] willing to enter into the play

frame' (Ghose 2008: 6). Shared laughter could ripple across the physical boundaries of stage

and stalls to encompass within that play frame London's South Bank and cinemas

worldwide. Laughter, in combination with Lough's fluid representation of the theatre

building's inside and outside, enabled the fixed and stable *place* of the National Theatre

building to become an atmospheric *space* that became the common reality of production

and viewers worldwide. In Michel de Certeau's influential formulation,

> A place (*lieu*) is the order (of whatever kind) in accord with which elements are
>
> distributed in relationships of coexistence. It thus excludes the possibility of two
>
> things being in the same location (*place*). The law of the 'proper' rules in the place:
>
> the elements taken into consideration are *beside* one another, each situated in its
>
> own 'proper' and distinct location, a location it defines. ([1984] 1988: 117; original
>
> emphases)

By contrast, a *space* is determined through operations and actions:

> A *space* exists when one takes into consideration vectors of direction, velocities, and
>
> time variables. Thus space is composed of intersections of mobile elements. It is in a
>
> sense actuated by the ensemble of movements deployed within it. Space occurs as

the effect produced by the operations that orient it, situate it, temporalize it…. In

short, *space is a practiced place.* ([1984] 1988: 117; original emphases)

Corden's infectious laughter allowed the 'law of the "proper"' to be transgressed both

spatially and temporally. Audience members were invited to laugh with Corden and,

through that shared social practice, it became possible for separate entities – the theatre

audience and the broadcast audience, the moments of performance and reception – to

inhabit the same *space* as they experienced a shared affect in an emphatically marked

present.

The 'distributed self' through which subjects can express their consciousness across

different digital platforms via avatars (Email addresses, Twitter handles, Facebook personas,

etc.; Gilbert and Forney 2013: 26-27) can therefore be seen at play in broadcast situations

(see also Sullivan's thoughts on 'distributed co-presence', chapter 3). Remote viewers can

experience a 'simultaneous mental occupation of two spaces' and time periods (Wardle

2014: 141). I felt this distributed presence, the experience of being both within the space of

the broadcast and in a separate place and time, with disruptive vehemence when watching

One Man, Two Guvnors six years later in the National Theatre archive: it translated into

excruciating self-consciousness over the disconnection between my physical location in a

place of silent study and the convulsion of suppressed laughter that, tears streaming down

my face, bound me affectively into the remote space, time, and atmosphere of the

broadcast. Affective responses potentially enable the viewer be present simultaneously in

two temporalities and spaces, irrespective of whether the broadcast is watched 'live' or

asynchronously.

The National Theatre as a *space*: illusionist Shakespeare for NTLive

In view of Nicholas Hytner's recurring historical narrative regarding the South Bank location which anchors the National Theatre's mission in Shakespeare's holding up a mirror to contemporary politics, it is not surprising that Shakespeare featured prominently in the theatre's repertoire during his artistic direction. With Shakespeare known to 'nearly always [perform] well' (Flo Buckeridge, email, 24 July 2017), in total, over twenty per cent of NTLive's total output in those years was dedicated to Shakespeare and all eight Shakespeare plays staged in the Olivier between June 2009 (the date of NTLive's first broadcast) and July 2017 have been screened. An additional four were broadcast from other producing houses under the tagline 'the best of British theatre to a cinema near you' (see also Bennett, chapter 2).

Just two multi-camera directors, Robin Lough and Tim van Someren, are behind all the NTLive broadcasts of Shakespeare's plays from the National Theatre. Between them, they have created a distinctive NTLive style of illusionist Shakespeare broadcast that immerses viewers in the stage space of the Olivier. Complex paratextual framing additionally establishes a strong sense of the theatre's structure, location and history, and the Shakespearean legitimacy that arises from these factors. Paratexts and camerawork use complementary strategies to portray the theatre as a space full of de Certeau's 'intersections of mobile elements' that spatially extend to the broadcast viewer an atmosphere of aliveness and the experience of illusionist immersion in a performance of Shakespeare in which characters 'talk to themselves'. Theatre audiences, consequently, tend to be elided from the broadcasts themselves even though they feature prominently as a backdrop for the broadcast presenters' introductions (Greenhalgh 2014: 259). Meanwhile, affective bridges connect cinema audiences with their invisible counterparts in the theatre,

allowing broadcast viewers to experience their presence as distributed across the cinema and the theatre auditoria.

In the run-up to a recording, the broadcasting department liaises with the theatre's marketing department to create promotional materials, interview scripts and documentaries that are filmed in-house or farmed out to external producers (Buckeridge, personal interview, 11 March 2017). These paratexts are subsequently in part repurposed as promotional and educational material that is integrated on the National Theatre's website, to which broadcast viewers are repeatedly directed with pointers to the digital theatre programme. Within the broadcasts, these paratexts play a key role in orienting viewers in relation to the building, the specific auditorium from which the show is broadcast, the National Theatre's history, and its connection with and approach to Shakespeare.

A vivid example of NTLive's promotion of South Bank Shakespeare to mark the Shakespeare quatercentenary is the broadcast of Polly Findlay's *As You Like It* on 25 February 2016. The 26 minutes of introductory material started with the now standard loop of slides that invited audiences to access the theatre and its wares via a range of platforms. Broadcast viewers unable to physically enter the building could instead either project a part of themselves outwards to 'Join in the conversation' via NTLive's social media channels (Twitter, facebook, email), or, conversely, have a part of the theatre, in the form of books and gifts, sent to them thanks to the international shipping available from the bookshop 'Inspired by National Theatre productions and our iconic building'. With NTLive positioned as a space full of potential transactional vectors into and out of the building, the next item worked to root that space in its geographical environment. To this purpose, a filmed tour through key London sites (St Paul's Cathedral, the London Eye, the Palace of Westminster) embedded the NTLive experience in London's tourist-destination environment before

concluding with external night-time footage of people entering the brightly-lit National Theatre. Shots of auditoria, cameras, and operating desk were then mixed with NTLive's slogans 'World class theatre…Filmed live in high definition…Now playing in over 2,000 cinemas worldwide.' This produced yet more vectors of movement into the building and back out towards worldwide audiences, though the emphasis on interaction was now toned down. A documentary film, produced in-house by the NTLive team, dedicated to 'Shakespeare at the National Theatre' zeroed in further to the core of the broadcast. Here, the Shakespeare Institute's Abigail Rokison reflected on the National Theatre's gestation as 'a house for Shakespeare', while Benedict Nightingale (a long-time theatre critic for *The Times*) enthused about the Olivier stage's ideal fit 'for the amplitude of Shakespeare'. Olivia Vinall, a veteran Desdemona and Cordelia at the National, gushed about the Olivier's 'intimate' feel and Shakespeare's continued relevance to audiences 'either emotionally or socially or politically or historically'. The theatre's recently appointed artistic director Rufus Norris concluded: 'I am sure that as long as people are speaking English, as long as people are listening to English, they'll be listening to Shakespeare. Nobody's done it better', while a slow fade-in superimposing Shakespeare's face over one of the concrete walls cemented the playwright's association with the very fabric of the building.

This, then, set the screen for the broadcast of *As You Like It*, live-mixed from the Olivier auditorium following two camera rehearsals. With the broadcast audience primed to appreciate the 'intimacy' of the vast Olivier stage, Tim van Someren's cameras eliminated the theatre audience from the visual field once the house lights went down. The single exception, the entrance of a character through the stalls in the final scene, was disorienting for broadcast viewers as a camera abruptly swivelled into the darkened auditorium to capture that arrival. Instead of being invited to experience spatial inclusion via a proxy

theatre audience (as in *One Man, Two Guvnors*), cinema audiences were swiftly immersed in a broadcast that complemented theatrical modes of signification with conventions borrowed from film and television. In his mix, van Someren approximated the film style and speed of editing associated with professional wrestling for the arrival of the imposing figure of Charles the wrestler in the fighting ring.[2] The high-up crane camera rapidly zoomed down on Charles in his golden cape, receded just as fast, tracked left to right before cutting back to the crane camera, which zoomed-and-swivelled back down. The technological hype of this professional's entrance contrasted with Orlando's down-to-earth arrival, filmed with a simple stage-level tracking shot. The camerawork thus carried much of the burden of telling a story which opposed pastoral simplicity with the technological excesses and competitive violence of city life. When, in designer Lizzie Clachan's *coup de théâtre*, the court's office desks and chairs were raised to dangle halfway from the flies as the trees and branches of the forest of Arden, a slow tracking shot encompassing the set and a closer-up view of chairs and tables swaying mid-air were followed by a crane shot revealing the rubble-strewn stage floor. The camera set-up conveyed, for remote audiences, the affective force of the Olivier's stage technologies that introduced a breath-taking verticality into the production. In what Sullivan describes as the crane camera's 'poetic view of seeing' (2017: 649), viewpoints unavailable to theatre audiences translated the vertiginous surrealism of Clachan's scene change into the medium of theatre broadcast. And when Oliver first arrived in the forest and had eyes only for Celia, the story of their budding love was told through narrative framing, as the cameras focused on the lovers-to-be and disregarded Rosalind.

Van Someren's camerawork thus remediated, for cinema audiences, the atmosphere of the Olivier stage's state-of-the-art stage machinery and its combination of vastness with a strong central focal point. If the Olivier's design had pushed performers towards an

illusionist performance style, the absence of interaction between performers and spectators

within the theatre was heightened by the broadcast. The theatrical 'intimacy' vaunted in the

introductory paratexts was converted into cinematic 'immediacy': the illusion of immersion

in and direct encounter with the performance (see also Way 2017: 395). While such

immediacy does not 'commit the viewer to an utterly naïve or magical conviction that the

representation is the same thing as what it represents' (Bolter and Grusin 2000: 30), it

nonetheless generates a powerful sense of presence and mobility within the performance

space. The cinema audience was wrapped in its own collective experience of a broadcast in

which camera movement, framing and speed of editing generated a space brought to life

'by the operations that orient it, situate it, temporalize it'.

What nevertheless anchored the image in the 'live' theatrical context was the aural

bridge of laughter on the soundtrack. Laughing with the theatre audience at, for instance,

the absurdity of a human sheep keeling over after eating a post-it note 'leaf' generated the

final, crucial vector that allowed broadcast viewers to enter the play frame of the

broadcast's atmospheric space. Without going to the lengths of *One Man, Two Guvnors*, the

paratexts and camerawork of NTLive's *As You Like It* thus represented the National Theatre's

Olivier auditorium as a geographically specific, historically Shakespearean, transactional

space. By combining the screen equivalent of theatrical illusionism, immediacy, with an

affective sound bridge, it offered broadcast viewers experiences analogous to those of the

theatre audience, with whom they could laugh within the play frame that connected

communities of viewers across 2,000 cinemas worldwide. The dynamics I have outlined in

the *As You Like It* broadcast can also be found at work in NTLive's other Shakespearean

comedies, *All's Well That Ends Well* (2009) and *The Comedy of Errors* (2012). If a satellite

cinema audience refrains from laughing along, on the other hand, the affective

disconnection between theatre and cinema can, as I will explain at the end of this chapter, result in an experience of emotional and spatial distance.

Laughter is not the only affective vector capable of contributing to the experience of distributed presence. This is clear when looking at the broadcast of Nicholas Hytner's sinister *Timon of Athens*, directed for screen by Robin Lough (2012), as an example of NTLive's Shakespearean tragedies. Here, too, the NTLive team's paratextual materials complemented the camerawork within the broadcast to create an illusionist Shakespeare in which the National Theatre was presented as a transactional space, even as they emphasized, with critical force, the geographical specificity of the theatre's location vis-à-vis its London environment. Two elements stood out from the standard paratexts that introduced the screening: a promotional feature produced by NTLive's sponsor AVIVA and a documentary that contextualized Hytner's production.

The AVIVA advert prominently included the National Theatre's concrete structure as a backdrop for an introduction to AVIVA's 'Street-to-School' project in Calcutta. The mini-feature explained how NTLive's corporate sponsor was supporting 400,000 children in 17 countries. These figures rubbed shoulders with broadcast presenter Emma Freud's vaunting, straight afterwards, of the 'totally sold out production', which was being broadcast to over 600 cinemas worldwide: it was as if the theatre's success and its global expansion through broadcasting needed to be offset by the global charity work of NTLive's sponsor.

The corporate sponsorship underpinning NTLive came under indirect, but nonetheless robust, scrutiny in the subsequent documentary *A Timon for Our Times* about the context for the production.[3] There, Shakespeare became the meeting point of vectors bringing together the National Theatre, the City of London, the Parliament at Westminster, and Shakespeare's Globe against the backdrop of the global recession of 2008. Standing

inside the window of the Gherkin building overlooking the heart of London's financial district, Paul Mason (Economics Editor, BBC2 Newsnight) spoke of the connections between wealth, arts sponsorship, and privileged access to political power. Meanwhile, shots of then Prime Minister David Cameron and Mayor of London Boris Johnson entering an exclusive arts event illustrated Mason's reference to 'gift-giving and backscratching' in high-level politics. A view from Waterloo Bridge panning from the City of London on the North Bank towards the National Theatre on the South Bank then precisely located the theatre in relation to the production's thematic setting. Strikingly, Hytner's statement that 'what Shakespeare is *always* writing about is his own world' was accompanied by footage of 'Occupy' tents outside St. Paul's Cathedral and a zoom into Shakespeare's Globe across the river. Even as the feature ended with footage of the National Theatre, the neighbouring Globe thus became a shorthand for South Bank Shakespeare's historical authenticity, guaranteeing the broadcast's adherence to a Shakespearean model of relevance to contemporary politics.

That urgent sense of relevance was carried over into Tim Hatley's design for *Timon*, which incorporated in his naturalistic set several of the landmarks featured in the documentary. Consequently, the inside of the theatre bore a clear relationship to its outside, as multiple vectors connected the production to London's geography of power and wealth. With the auditorium darkened, Lough's crane camera in its establishing shot of a tent city on the Olivier stage immersed viewers in an illusionist environment which mirrored the historical 'Occupy' protesters in the documentary. A further link was created when the inauguration of 'The Timon Room' in an art gallery reflected the documentary's footage of real-life politicians, who were furthermore indexed by a scene set in a members' club with huge windows looking out on Westminster's Houses of Parliament. Much in the manner of

van Someren, Lough's mobile use of the crane and cameras on tracks immersed the broadcast viewers within the production's illusionist space and blocked out the theatre audience even in moments when Apemantus, the play's cynical truth-teller, addressed that audience directly, looking past the camera into what the broadcast represented as a void.

In this misanthropic environment, it was disgust, not laughter, that acted as a visceral bridge uniting cinema and theatre viewers in the here-and-now of the production when Simon Russell Beale's Timon, disillusioned about his parasitical dinner guests, served them faeces on silverware. Repulsion sharpened into collective nausea when, in a revolting detail picked out by a long tracking shot, Timon circled the table before rubbing a handful of gloopy excrement into the bald pate of one of his guests. As queasiness united audiences, characters and performers, Lough cut to a shot from the rising crane camera to show Timon's dinner guests rushing off. Disgust functioned as the affective vector that enabled broadcast audiences to inhabit two places at once.

NTLive's Shakespeare broadcasts thus typically deploy an illusionist form of South Bank Shakespeare that presents the National Theatre as a transactional space which wraps remote viewers in a spatially extended atmosphere. NTLive's paratexts begin by situating cinema viewers within their own environment but represent the theatre as an increasingly transactional space criss-crossed by multiple vectors (this is true especially of broadcasts from the Olivier, but is also true of NTLive broadcasts from other venues). Meanwhile, during the broadcasts themselves, the mobile camerawork immerses cinema viewers in a stage space that excludes the theatre audience. The distributed presence generated through these mechanisms is welded together through affects which have the potential to bind remote audiences into the here-and-now of the performance in an experience of aliveness. This is a broadcast experience which, thanks to the technological 'bravura' of

crane camera and tracks (Barker 2013), is emphatically *not* theatrical, not identifiable with a

possible audience viewpoint within the theatre, even as the medium is used to highlight the

theatricality of its modern stage designs, technologies, and performances – and of the

cinema audience's collective response to the production in a satellite auditorium.

Shakespeare's Globe as a *place*: presentational broadcasting

Broadcasts from Shakespeare's Globe have a long and complex history involving

multiple partners, phases, artistic directors and broadcast directors. It is therefore the more

significant that, nevertheless, a fairly consistent house style has emerged which once more

takes a lead from the affordances of the theatre building. NTLive's Shakespeare broadcasts,

we saw, invite cinema viewers into the *here-and-now* of the performance. By contrast,

Shakespeare's Globe's strategy is to invite remote viewers, whether in a collective cinema

setting or watching on their own on a small screen, to observe the *there-and-then* of an

always already remote and separate place, time, and atmosphere. The building's history as a

reconstruction generates a mode of engagement with the work produced within it which is

at ease with the contradictory notions that there is a specifically Shakespearean, interactive

Globe performativity accessible only by virtue of physical presence within the building, and

that all performance within that building is essentially in a relationship of 'surrogation' vis-à-

vis an early modern original (Roach 1996: 2). The fact that this original is at a significant

temporal and even a small geographical remove exposes 'the obvious discontinuities,

misalliances, and ruptures' between the 'previous Golden Age' of Shakespeare and

performance practice in today's Globe. It is therefore easy for broadcasts from

Shakespeare's Globe to tap into this dynamic and pitch themselves as a further level of

surrogation: as a stand-in for an experience of Globe performativity which it 'must vainly aspire both to embody and to replace' (Roach 1996: 3).

De Certeau's 'law of the "proper" [which] rules in the place' determines that while broadcast audiences can see the Globe's 'groundlings' standing in the yard and might view them as their proxy, they can only with difficulty *experience* what it is like to stand shoulder-to-shoulder in an open-air arena. Instead, the light shared by performers and spectators in the Globe excludes broadcast audiences regardless of their viewing context: whereas the physical regime of the darkened cinema for NTLive broadcasts facilitates the elision of the similarly seated and darkened theatre audiences and hence the cinema viewer's immersion in the illusionist performance, no such elision is possible in Globe broadcasts. When the broadcasts re-mediate the profoundly transactional performance space of the Globe as a separate 'proper' place, they present the theatre audience as an integral part of the 'things, persons or their constellations' that constitute the atmosphere of a Globe performance (Böhme 1993: 122). Broadcast audiences remain in their own, separate places. Broadcasts from Shakespeare's Globe offer viewers the ability to *observe*, rather than *experience*, the spontaneous generation of Globe performativity in the there-and-then of the Globe, which itself is a surrogate for an authentic Shakespeare who is both a constitutive part of the building and always already at multiple removes. Without producing affective aliveness, the live-capture of a performance nonetheless allows it to continue '*living* … even as the live event to which it is related has receded into the past' (Aebischer 2013: 146).

This distance between production and reception is implicit in the temporal gaps between the capture (normally across two consecutive performances), its post-production mix to edit out potential disruptions by pigeons, helicopters, and party boats on the Thames, and the release of Globe on Screen cinema broadcasts and DVDs the following

year. This strategy privileges on-demand access over the eventness of a live broadcast; however, it was only arrived at after an initial attempt at temporal liveness. The South Bank Shakespeare presented by Sue Judd's broadcast of Tim Carroll's production of *Richard II* on 7 September 2003 on BBC4 put a heavy emphasis on the production team's research into 'Original Practices'. Interview material with practitioners introduced viewers to presentational performance and the use of an all-male cast. 'If the Globe has a mission,' Head of Theatre Music Claire van Kampen affirmed, 'it's reconnecting the audience with the play… *everybody* can come and experience a play here.' '*Here*,' though, was neither the broadcast nor viewers at home but Shakespeare's Globe. The use of the Globe's stage, galleries and tiring house as backdrops to the interviews introduced viewers to every nook and cranny of the building, with the camera lingering on specific features. The paratexts thus literally *presented* the Globe as a unique and separate place filled with arcane performance practices that were not just geographically, but also 'culturally remote' (Carson 2008: 121). Meanwhile, the overdetermination of the spatial orientation betrayed an anxiety regarding the ability of the broadcast to act as a surrogate for bodily experience. Although in his introduction, presenter Andrew Marr belaboured the risk inherent in this live broadcast and tried to portray its liveness as a guarantor of a shared experience (Purcell 2013: 213), his warning to the television audience that 'if it rains, then you, along with the actors, may have to struggle a little bit' backfired in stressing the potential sensory disconnection between television viewers dealing with sound disruption and theatre audiences struggling with dripping ponchos.

The documentary framing of the production effectively overwhelmed the broadcast of the production itself, which ended up as little more than an illustration of the research and performance methods described in the frame. Through its extraordinary visual

180

closeness to the fetishized building, costumes, and make-up, the *Richard II* broadcast

adopted the medium's equivalent of a presentational performance style by *presenting* the

building and the 'Original Practices' approach to its viewers without giving them *presence*

within it. When, to start the performance, an actor asked the theatre audience to refrain

from recording the production, he raised a laugh from the Globe audience which he

acknowledged by admitting that they 'may have noticed that there is a great deal of audio

and video recording equipment in the theatre tonight.' Since that equipment was carefully

located outside the image frame, the comment cemented the broadcast audience's

separation from the Globe experience: they would be watching the 'groundlings' watching

the play and its recording but would be neither able to see nor to laugh in the same way.

Unlike the community-building laugh in Corden's 'corpsing' that reached out to the

broadcast viewer, the laugh here acted as a reminder of the boundary between theatre and

broadcast audiences.

Following a more low-key BBC4 broadcast of *Measure for Measure* in 2004, when HD

video recording of Globe productions resumed under Dominic Dromgoole in 2007, all

pretence at temporal liveness vanished, as did the paratextual apparatus setting

Shakespeare in his historical South Bank context. Instead, most Globe cinema broadcasts

and recorded theatre DVDs and online streams start with an establishing shot of the

theatre's exterior timber frame with audiences entering before promptly cutting to the

inside of the wooden 'O', thus briskly setting up the geographical location of the Globe as a

place. This is followed, within the broadcasts themselves, by camerawork that typically

affords viewers an 'open and theatrical perspective' onto the stage (Sullivan 2017: 640).

Kriss Russman's camerawork for *As You Like It*, filmed in 2009 and released as a DVD

the following year, is typical in its constant inclusion of the Globe audience either visually or

through sound. Thea Sharrock's production, like many at the Globe, repeatedly spilled from the stage into the pit, with Jack Laskey's Orlando throwing Charles the wrestler off the stage or carrying old Adam through a throng of schoolchildren. Re-mediated as a DVD, the effect is spatially and affectively distancing, in that the groundlings' fright and delight when performers encroach on their space cannot produce the same reaction in the broadcast audience, for whom the space is *not* transactional. Instead, the moment emphasizes the remote viewers' exclusion from the Globe. The fact that individual audience members are an integral, recognisable, part of the broadcast is also alienating if viewers, who for example enjoy the facial expressions of a group of schoolchildren in the yard, suddenly see them replaced by grown-ups because audiences from two performances are edited together. A different type of disengagement is occasioned when Tim McMullan's Jaques insults the Globe audience by pointing at them in a slow circular motion as the 'fools' he is invoking 'into a circle' (2.5.56-57). Even if a viewer of the DVD laughs along with the Globe audience, the cause and even the mood of the laughter in the two audiences are fundamentally different. The groundlings' laughter signals the 'affective affirmation' typical of laughter as a social practice in the Globe (Caldwell 2013: 397), tying them into an experiential community in an indicative mood in the here-and-now of the performance. By contrast, the broadcast audience's laughter is appreciative and in a conditional mood, demonstrating affective understanding of how the situation would be funny had they been part of the there-and-then of the performance.

The bulk of recordings of productions at Shakespeare's Globe are thus 'live' only in the sense that they are 'captured "live" in high definition' in the presence of an audience – a digital surrogate for an analogue surrogate of an always remote authentic Shakespeare (Shakespeare's Globe 2014).[4] To return to the definitions set up in our introduction, these

are simply 'theatre broadcasts' which may, as Margaret Jane Kidnie explains in chapter 8, benefit from the liveness effects generated by NTLive's dominance in cinema programming, but which do not themselves aspire to generate the illusion of simultaneity and distributed presence. Because, as Chui-Yee Cheng explains, 'the building and the audience themselves perform, they are part of the show, and it's what gives it its live quality' (personal interview, 11 March 2017), remote audiences are, by definition, separate from this experience. The emphasis of Globe recordings is on an understanding of 'access' as (to return to Carson's formulation) 'physical, cultural and intellectual' rather than spatial and affective. Globe-style South Bank Shakespeare, while deriving authenticity from its building and the Globe performativity it presents to its viewers, incorporates the ruptures characteristic of surrogation in its temporal and geographical separation of theatre and broadcast audiences, each in their proper place with affects appropriate to their respective experiences. The Globe experience hinges on considering the building itself as a performer, which creates a unique atmosphere within which Shakespearean subjectivity emerges as the result of architecture, performer and audiences coming together in a single place and time. As a result, broadcast audiences experience the building as a distinct place in which the broadcast is anchored but from which they are geographically and affectively separate.

Coda: South Bank Shakespeares converge

The opposition between the NTLive's illusionist South Bank Shakespeare proclaiming its modern relevance and the presentational recordings of Globe productions that harken back to an always remote Shakespearean authenticity has been challenged by broadcasts from the two theatres in 2016 and 2017 in which those approaches showed signs of convergence. As theatre directors decided to work against the affordances of the buildings

and broadcast directors followed suit, the resulting hybrid South Bank Shakespeare meshed the illusionist and the presentational into a mash-up of both. In response, viewers of the Globe broadcast changed their engagement in a manner that reflects the current trends in audience engagement through social media Sullivan and Nicholas explore in greater detail (chapters 3 and 4).

When Emma Rice took over the artistic direction of Shakespeare's Globe, she promptly had big holes drilled into its oak beams to accommodate a modern sound system and stage lights. In collaboration with the BBC and with experienced Globe broadcast director Ian Russell at the helm, Rice then used the BBC's 2016 'Shakespeare Lives' online platform for a live stream of her inaugural production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* on 11 September 2016. The broadcast opened with presenter Meera Syal standing in the yard and situating the present-day playhouse in relation to its Shakespearean ancestors just 'a few hundred yards away'. Syal's interval interview with Rice, who declared herself 'hugged by the space', was joyously celebratory. Gesturing at the crowd of spectators milling around her, Syal's enthusiasm for the building and its historical associations with Shakespeare could not be disentangled from her love of the 'exciting and fresh' interpretation of the play that spoke to the preoccupations of the present. As Rice pointed out, each night, a character walked on 'reading the *Metro*, and it's today's paper, today's news!' Through their celebration of the theatre's past and the sensory warmth of its architecture, Syal and Rice were also acclaiming its qualities as a physically, financially and culturally accessible, profoundly transactional space which interacts with the wider cultural context of present-day London. As Rice exclaimed: 'I love the space so much: you can wander along the river and come in for five pounds and see the most amazing plays performed so fresh and live!'

The emphasis on an atmosphere of free-flowing, chatty, joyful 'liveness' in the broadcast frame spilled into the performance, which insistently brought the past into the present in a transgression of 'the law of the "proper"' and affirmation of the theatre's transhistoricity that affected every aspect of this production. Liveness was also evident in Russell's camerawork, which responded to the production in the moment, without prior rehearsal. The positioning of six cameras around the 'wooden O' of the building's two galleries allowed Russell to show every part of the performance space, which extended through the yard where actors performed on table-tops, at some point in the fading daylight. When Katy Owen's Puck force-fed a banana she had previously licked to an audience member, the disgusting hilarity of the situation was increased by the shocked and delighted facial expressions of the bystanders included in the frame, with laughter and disgust combining to work against the Globe's separateness as a 'place'. And as night fell and the stage lights increasingly plunged the groundlings into darkness, creating something akin to the erasure of the theatre audience and potential for a more immersive broadcast experience familiar from NTLive, broadcast audiences, like their counterparts in the theatre, could 'feel the darker themes falling and the cost of the troubles us mortals get into' (Rice).

The laughter that was so prominent a feature of both paratext and production reached out to the online audience in an invitation to 'enter into the play frame' even as the format of live-streaming made the distributed presence fostered by NTLive hard to achieve. What this production's broadcast modelled instead was a mode of engaging with the Globe as a space that can have its cake and eat it, that can accommodate multiple technologies and subjectivities that span the four hundred years separating us from Shakespeare. The production's set was Shakespeare's Globe itself, in the heart of present-day multicultural, metrosexual London in which the inconstancy of Ncuti Gatwa's Demetrius could be

185

explained by his repression of homosexual desire for Ankur Bahl's camp 'Helenus'. 'Rita' Quince (Lucy Thackeray), a Globe usher, in her burlesque of a health-and-safety address, acknowledged the building's recent history through her reference to having received her tambourine as a gift from Mark Rylance. And even while Rice's use of amplified sound and light flew in the face of the building's reputation as 'stripped of technological intervention' (Carson 2008: 121), Quince's prohibition of mobile phones was a nod to the aversion to modern technology associated with previous artistic directors. What reconciled these contradictions were the fairies, who bridged the gap between the early modern and the present, since their dissolute state and mash-up of Elizabethan and modern dress could be explained by the fact that they had, as Rice put it, 'been around for four hundred years. They've done every drug, every party, they're absolutely wrecked'.

Against the background of the fairies' exhausted continuity, Syal presented the production as engaging in a series of surrogations that charted a narrative of progression towards the joyous here-and-now of this live stream event: the original Globe burnt down, was rebuilt, destroyed, and is now rebuilt as Shakespeare's Globe; Shakespeare's company was replaced by male artistic directors who are now replaced by Rice; Shakespeare's Athens made way for 'Bankside' and 'Hoxton'; Helena was replaced by Helenus, and so on. Syal's direct address to the broadcast audience meanwhile not only reminded them of *when* they were ('live'), but also *where* they were: in front of a computer 'already steeped in heavy interactivity' (Harries 2002: 176), part of a digital 'participatory culture' that acted as a surrogate for Globe performativity (Jenkins 2009: 5-10). As Sullivan demonstrates in chapter 3, locked out of the 'proper' place of the Globe, online audiences responded to the broadcast's joyfully free-flowing chattiness 'tactically' by creating a surrogate yard (de Certeau [1984] 1988: 36-37), sharing their laughter and partaking in quick-fire discussions

on social media beyond the control of Shakespeare's Globe. If the dominant mode of engagement with an NTLive Shakespeare broadcast is attention in a presence distributed across theatre and cinema, in this broadcast it was multi-tasking in a presence distributed across the broadcast space and social media. Viewers organized themselves spontaneously into a community of fans in exchanges that were 'dynamic, collective and reciprocal' (Jenkins 2002: 160). Rice's reinterpretation of the affordances of the Globe as including present-day performance technologies had a tangible impact on how online viewers experienced the broadcast's atmosphere as offering the tactical opportunity to generate a surrogate yard.

As the Globe rebranded its South Bank Shakespeare as relevant, digitally interactive, communal, potentially immersive, and affectively 'live', under Rufus Norris' artistic direction and with Emma Keith as Head of Broadcast, NTLive evolved in the opposite direction. In September 2015, it launched 'National Theatre. On Demand. In Schools', a selection of broadcasts linked to the National Curriculum that are free at the point of access for all UK primary and secondary schools. With this initiative, NTLive began to move away from the brand's previous emphasis on liveness and ephemerality (Buckeridge 2017). The broadcast of Simon Godwin's *Twelfth Night* directed for screen by Robin Lough on 6 April 2017 also marks a shift in approach. Responding to this production's mix of naturalistic and presentational performance styles in which characters repeatedly broke through the 'fourth wall' to talk to the audience, Lough's camerawork switched between illusionist immersion in the stage space and acknowledgement of the theatre audience. Disturbingly, his most marked use of the theatre audience as a proxy for the cinema viewers occurred during the letter scene and the direct address to the audience of Feste – that is, at the moments when Tamsin Greig's Malvolia was cruelly mocked for expressing her previously repressed sexual

desire for Phoebe Fox's Olivia (re-gendered homosexual characters were all the rage on the South Bank in 2016-17). Throughout the broadcast, the soundtrack regularly offered broadcast viewers an affective sound bridge of laughter to connect them with their counterparts in the theatre. But at those moments when laughter became politically charged, Lough's cameras provided broadcast viewers with a visual anchor for that shared laughter by including the front row of the stalls in the frame. Laughing at the humiliation of a scapegoated lesbian was facilitated for broadcast audiences by camerawork that included a proxy theatre audience showing no particular restraint in siding with the production's straight characters, whose 'homophobia [was] largely played for laughs' (Duncan 2017). My own experience of this broadcast, as a result, was conflicted and contradictory: when immersion in the illusion switched to presentation of direct interaction with the theatre audience at Malvolia's expense, I felt a disjunction between my own response and that modelled by the theatre audience. Resistance to laughter translated into my experience of separation from the Olivier auditorium as a discrete place even as both the production and the broadcast worked against the affordances of the Olivier to create an approximation of Globe performativity.

Just 44 days after the live stream of Rice's inaugural *Dream*, Neil Constable (CEO, Shakespeare's Globe) announced her departure. He explained how Rice's introduction of artificial sound and light had broken the mould of the theatre and concluded that in 2018, programming would once more be 'structured around "shared light" productions without designed sound and light rigging' (Constable and Rice 2016). How the appointment of Michelle Terry as the theatre's fourth artistic director will affect broadcasts from Shakespeare's Globe is unclear at the time of writing, though the CinemaLive live theatre broadcast of *King Lear* to cinemas in the UK on 21 September 2017 – another innovation

188

under Emma Rice's leadership – is yet more evidence of the emergence of a hybrid South Bank Shakespeare. What is clear, however, is the extent to which broadcasts from Shakespeare's Globe and the neighbouring National Theatre hinge on a complex combination of narratives regarding the buildings' histories, their Shakespearean connections, and their technological affordances. These factors shape the distinctive brands of South Bank Shakespeares they produce through their paratexts and the camerawork of the broadcasts themselves. Even when they work against the affordances of their respective buildings to create a more hybrid broadcast experience, these broadcasts produce complex engagements with the companies' histories and performance styles, using the buildings and their locations as a means of anchoring their global Shakespeares firmly in London's South Bank to generate complex and evolving modes of participation in South Bank Shakespeare for their remote audiences.

References

Aebischer, P. (2013), *Screening Early Modern Drama: Beyond Shakespeare*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bakhshi, H. and D. Throsby (2010), *Beyond Live: Digital Innovation in the Performing Arts*,

NESTA Research Briefing February 2010.

Available online: https://www.nesta.org.uk/sites/default/files/beyond_live.pdf

(accessed 12 July 2017)

Bakhshi, H. and A. Whitby (2014), *Estimating the Impact of Live Simulcast on Theatre*

Attendance: an Application to London's National Theatre, NESTA Working Paper

14/04.

Available online:

https://www.nesta.org.uk/sites/default/files/1404_estimating_the_impact_of_live_s

imulcast_on_theatre_attendance.pdf (accessed 12 July 2017)

Barker, M. (2013), *Live to Your Local Cinema: The Remarkable Rise of Livecasting*, Kindle

Book, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Böhme, G. (1992), 'Atmosphere as the Fundamental Concept of a New Aesthetics', *Thesis*

Eleven 36 (1): 113-26.

Bolter, J.D. and R. Grusin (2000), *Remediation: Understanding New Media*, Boston: MIT

Press.

Buckeridge, F. (2017), 'National Theatre Live: From Stage to Screen', *FuturePlay Festival*, 11

May.

Available Online:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jbIcNuEpEyU (accessed 12 July 2017).

Caldwell, W. C. (2013), 'The Comic Structure of the Globe: History, Direct Address, and the

Representation of Laughter in a Reconstructed Playhouse', *Shakespeare Bulletin* 31

(3): 375-403.

Carson, C. (2008), 'Democratising the Audience?' in C. Carson and F. Karim-Cooper (eds),

 Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment, 115-26, Cambridge: Cambridge

 University Press.

Constable, N. and E. Rice (2016), 'Press Release: Statement Regarding the Artistic Direction

 of Shakespeare's Globe', Shakespeare's Globe, 25 October.

 Available online:

 http://www.shakespearesglobe.com/uploads/files/2016/10/statement_regarding_t

 he_artistic_direction_of_shakespeare_s_globe_final.pdf (accessed 12 July 2017).

de Certeau, M. ([1984] 1988), *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Berkeley: University of California

 Press.

Duncan, S. (2017), '[Review] *Twelfth Night*, dir. Simon Godwin, National Theatre',

 Clamorousvoice, 28 February 2017.

 Available online:

 http://www.shakespearesglobe.com/uploads/files/2016/10/statement_regarding_t

 he_artistic_direction_of_shakespeare_s_globe_final.pdf (accessed 22 June 2017).

Escolme, B. (2005), *Talking to the Audience: Shakespeare, Performance, Self*, Abingdon:

 Routledge.

Gilbert, R. and A. Forney (2013), 'The Distributed Self: Virtual Worlds and the Future of

 Human Identity', in R. Teigland and D. Power (eds), *The Immersive Internet:*

 Reflections on the Entangling of the Virtual with Society, Politics and the Economy,

 23-36, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ghose, I. (2008), *Shakespeare and Laughter: A Cultural History*, Manchester: Manchester

 University Press.

Greenhalgh, S. (2014), 'Guest Editor's Introduction', *Shakespeare Bulletin*, 32 (2): 255-61.

Groves, N. (2012), 'Arts Head: David Sabel, Head of Digital, National Theatre', *The Guardian,*
10 April.

Harries, D. (2002), 'Watching the Internet', in D. Harris (ed), *The New Media Book*, 171-82*,*
London: British Film Institute.

Jenkins, H. with R. Purushotma, M. Weigel, K. Clinton and A. J. Robinson (2009), *Confronting
the Challenges of Participatory Culture: Media Education for the 21st Century*,
Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Jenkins, H. (2002), 'Interactive Audiences?' in D. Harris (ed), *The New Media Book*, 157-70*,*
London: British Film Institute.

Marr, A. (2003), Broadcast Introduction, *Richard II* [TV broadcast] BBC4, 7 September 2003.

National Theatre (2017), 'About the National Theatre'.

Available online:

https://www.nationaltheatre.org.uk/about-the-national-theatre/ (Accessed 19
March 2017).

Purcell, S. (2009), *Popular Shakespeare: Simulation and Subversion on the Modern Stage*,
Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Purcell, S. (2013), 'The Impact of New Forms of Public Performance', in Christie Carson and
Peter Kirwan (eds.), *Shakespeare and the Digital World*, 212-225, Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.

Roach, J. (1996), *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance*, New York: Columbia
University Press.

Rosenthal, D. (2013), *The National Theatre Story*, E-book, London: Oberon Books.

Shakespeare's Globe (2017), 'About Us'.

Available online:

http://www.shakespearesglobe.com/about-us (accessed 13 June 2017).

Shakespeare's Globe (2014), 'Press Release: Shakespeare's Globe launches Globe Player', 4

November.

Available online:

http://www.shakespearesglobe.com/uploads/files/2014/11/2014_11_03_globe_pla
yer_release_final2.pdf (accessed 12 July 2017).

Stone, A. (2016), 'Not Making a Movie: the Livecasting of Shakespeare Stage Productions by

the Royal National Theatre and the Royal Shakespeare Company', *Shakespeare*

Bulletin 34 (4): 627-43.

Sullivan, E. (2017), '"The forms of things unknown": Shakespeare and the Rise of the Live

Broadcast', *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35 (4): 627-62.

Wardle, J. (2014), '"Outside Broadcast": Looking Backwards and Forwards, Live Theatre in

the Cinema – NT Live and RSC Live', *Adaptation* 7 (2): 134-53.

Wark, K. (2017), 'Eliza Carthy and Nicholas Hytner: Art for All', *Start the Week*, BBC Radio 4,

24 April 2017.

Way, G. (2017), 'Together, Apart: Liveness, Eventness, and Streaming Shakespearean

Performance', *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35 (3): 389-406.

Worthen, W. B. (2003), *Shakespeare and the Force of Modern Performance*, Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Wyver, J. (2017), '"Make Choice and See": Towards a Poetics of Multims', *Shakespeare,*

Media, Technology and Performance, University of Exeter, 24 June.

---

[1] The history and process of NTLive has been documented by Barker (2013), Buckeridge (2017), Rosenthal (2013), Bakhshi and Whitby (2014), Stone (2016), Way (2017). For the funding of NTLive, see Groves (2012) and Rosenthal (2013). In this volume, see especially Bennett and Kidnie.

[2] The speed of the mix was made possible by the camera scripts' unusually high number of cues: 1322 overall compared to Lough's 852 for *Othello* (camera scripts for *As You Like It* and *Othello*, National Theatre Archive, London).

[3] *A Timon for Our Times* was directed for NTLive by Adam Low, edited by Joanna Crickmay and researched by Emily Thomas.

[4] The 32 online live streams on The Space broadcast as part of the 2012 'Globe to Globe' Festival are the exception (see Appendix).