Gender, Aura, and the Close-Up: Broadcasting Shakespeare for Female Audiences

Pascale Aebischer

In October 2016, the audience survey produced for the *From Live-to-Digital* report revealed that women made up 76% of audiences for English "Event Cinema" broadcasts. 72% of these audiences were between 45 and 74 years old (with a concentration in the 65–74 bracket).[1] The Shakespeare productions enjoyed by these audiences, as Rachael Nicholas's research shows, were largely directed by men, both for the stage and for the screen: of the 128 single-play Shakespeare broadcasts she records between 2003 and 2017, only eighteen were directed for the stage by women, and a mere nine had women screen directors.[2] Add to this that women make up fewer than 16% of characters in Shakespeare's plays and we end up with an incongruous situation in which, in the first two decades of the twenty-first century, audiences composed of a majority of white older women were watching the work of a male playwright, performed and directed, for both stage and screen, overwhelmingly by men.

These statistics form the backdrop to my examination of two broadcasts of productions set in the pressurized, predominantly, if not exclusively, male environment of army camps, and which not only sought to represent female Shakespearean characters as (in Nicholas Hytner's terms) "pretty feisty" but which, through casting decisions, increased opportunities for women performers.[3] The first is National Theatre Live and Live from Stratford-upon-Avon stalwart Robin Lough's broadcast of Nicholas Hytner's 2013 production of *Othello* for the National Theatre. In Hytner's production , re-gendering a senator added a woman to the Senate scene in Act One, while Cyprus was reimagined as a modern British army base in a foreign desert environment in which female soldiers, such as Lyndsey Marshal's Emilia, were perpetually nervous and watchful within the testosterone-

laden atmosphere. The second is the broadcast, in 2017, of the all-female *Julius Caesar* for the Donmar Warehouse, which was live-camera-directed by Rhodri Huw, with Phyllida Lloyd in overall charge as director of both the stage and screen versions. Not only is the second half of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* concerned with the male rivalries springing up between and within opposing warring factions, but that single-sex pressure cooker was intensified by Lloyd's decision to set the entire production inside a women's prison in which Shakespeare's play was performed by the inmates. The production as a whole "asked the question, 'Who owns Shakespeare?'" and opened up the play to be owned by women inmates and women performers of different races, cultural backgrounds, and age groups.[4] In particular, it powerfully showcased performers such as Jackie Clune, Martina Laird, and Harriet Walter, whose ages correspond closely to that of the broadcast audience Lloyd caricatures as "'like old fogies'."[5] For these performers, playing male characters opens up a vast repertoire of exciting new roles at an age when finding satisfactory roles in the Shakespeare canon becomes a real challenge (who wants to be restricted to playing Queen Margaret, the Countess of Roussillon, or a witch in *Macbeth*?).

In this essay, I want to think through the question of how the medium of theater broadcasting can generate, for its audiences, a sense of the remote performers' presence and their aura, particularly through the use of the zoom lens and the close-up. The use of these cinematographic devices, I argue, is gender-specific, so that audiences, regardless of their gender, are invited to respond to male- and female-gendered characters (but not necessarily their performers) in different ways. Analyzing how stage performances of gendered identities are reproduced and intensified through camerawork in productions that deliberately draw attention to gender norms enables me to introduce into the critical discussion of theater broadcasts an awareness of how their cinematography contributes to encoding and framing performances of gender and gendered presence for a majority female broadcast audience.

Reactivating Walter Benjamin's "aura" in the hybrid medium of theater broadcast

The question of whether a photographic or filmic medium can reproduce the presence of the original artwork, person, or performance for viewers rooted in a different place and time has long been the subject of debate and arguably goes back to Walter Benjamin's foundational essay, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" (1935). Reproductions, he argued, are "lacking in one element: [the artwork's] presence in time and space, its unique existence at the place where it happens to be," which guarantees its "authenticity." When it is unmoored from its original location, Benjamin finds that the "quality of [the artwork's] presence is always depreciated," leading to a "wither[ing]" of its "aura,"[6] which Erin Sullivan helpfully describes as the "ineffable substance that draws you in, that makes a work of art present, unignorable, captivating, thrilling."[7] The aura of an artwork, Benjamin explains, arises in part from "the unique phenomenon of distance" between the viewer and the artwork, a point which he develops in relation to the difference between painting or theater and the— at the time of his writing—relatively new medium of film.[8] In the theater, the viewer is "well aware of the place from which the play cannot immediately be detected as illusionary," so that theater audiences are always aware of the divide between reality and illusion. Likewise, a "painter maintains in his work a natural distance from reality." In film, by contrast, "the cameraman penetrates deeply into [the] web [of reality]," erasing from the artwork any sense of distance from the object portrayed, positionality in relation to it, and sign of the technological "equipment" used to remediate it.[9]

Despite Benjamin's broadly negative assessment of reproductive media's ability to maintain the original's aura, he also readily admits that photography and film have their positive aspects.[10] In particular, these media make it possible for artworks to reach the "masses" through an encounter between their reproduction and "the beholder or listener in his

own particular situation" that "reactivates the object reproduced."[11] In his argument, Benjamin thus shifts from an emphasis on the "unique" work of art in a specific setting and time to a recognition that artworks designed for reproducibility may create new modes of encounter that "meet the beholder halfway" and in which the artworks are *reactivated*.[12] This shift is key to the experience of watching theater broadcasts, which are based on productions staged and designed with an eye on their potential to be reproduced in broadcast form. In their very nature, the reception of a cinema broadcast involves the remote audience travelling to a venue in which they meet the image which is travelling to the same destination via satellite link. But even in a home setting, e.g. when watching *Julius Caesar* not via the UK-wide cinema broadcast on July 12, 2017 but on terrestrial television one year later (BBC4, June 17, 2018), there is, as Margaret Jane Kidnie explains, a mutual reaching out as the "spectator's technology-enabled body reaches out to engage in the moment with the actors' reciprocally-enabled bodies, troubling a seemingly self-evident boundary between presence and absence premised on the conjunction of body, place, and time."[13] Stephen Purcell is right to point out that theater broadcasts are "developing a set of conventions which are unique to neither film nor theatre, but specific to itself"[14]—and this means that it is worth rethinking how this medium can change the parameters of Benjamin's contention regarding the withering of the original's aura resulting from mechanical reproduction.

The mutual reaching out of audience and performer can lead to what Josette Féral refers to as "presence effects"; that is, a feeling, for the audience, "that the bodies or objects they perceive are really there within the same space and timeframe that the spectators find themselves in, when the spectators patently know that they are not there."[15] These effects arise with particular force when a performer, rather than being the object of the broadcast, takes the position of subject and appears to reach beyond the confines of the theater to touch the broadcast viewer with their aura. Such moments provoke an intensive sense of connection

that belies Daniel Schulze's contention that broadcast audiences are "passive" and unable to connect with performers because "in fact they are not beyond the fourth wall but beyond the 'fifth wall'" of the screen.[16] In reviews of the two productions I consider here, it is clear that the performers were vibrantly present in the theater: Adrian Lester is described as "exuding . . . charisma" as Othello, and the entire cast of *Julius Caesar* is said to have been "electrifying," especially in front of school audiences.[17] Theirs was the "transformative power, and . . . life force" that Erika Fischer-Lichte explains results from stage "actors bring[ing] forth their phenomenal body and its energy" so that they "appear as *embodied minds*" to the spectators who, in response to the actors' presence, "experience both self and other as *embodied minds.*"[18] This is what Fischer-Lichte terms "the radical concept of presence, written as PRESENCE": "the spectator experiences the performer and himself [*sic*] as embodied mind in a constant process of becoming—he perceives the circulating energy as a transformative and vital energy."[19]

A similar meeting of minds—one embodied, the other disembodied but nonetheless capable of bringing forth the energy of their phenomenal body—is also, I would argue, possible in a broadcast setting. When Benjamin distinguished sharply between theater and film, he did so without any sense that one day a hybrid medium would emerge that might be able to combine reproducibility and the ability to reach a mass audience with the production of a medium-specific aura and sense of positionality vis-à-vis the performance. After all, as Sullivan's analysis of broadcasts from Shakespeare's Globe reveals, one of the advantages theater broadcasts have over film is that they routinely include wide-angle shots that allow audiences to adopt "a more typically theatrical point of view, in which a close focus on individual performers is underpinned by a steady awareness of the space surrounding them," so that viewers are periodically reminded of the divide between illusion and reality and of their distance from the performance.[20]

More importantly still, given Benjamin's insistence on the viewer's distance from and positionality in relation to the artwork as the elements that preserve the artwork's aura, the camera's ability to zoom in on a performer's face in a sustained shot, thus eliminating the "sense of depth and its corresponding rules of perspectival realism," has the potential to reactivate, for the benefit of the broadcast audience, the performer's auratic presence in the here-and-now of the cinema.[21] As Alex Waldmann, fresh from performing Brutus for an RSC Live-from-Stratford-upon-Avon broadcast of *Julius Caesar*, explained to Beth Sharrock, Shakespeare's soliloquies make it possible for stage performers to calibrate their performance for the screen, allowing the "moment-to-moment process of thought" to be picked up by cameras trained on the performer "to capture minute details of emotion and expression" that may not be visible to the theater audience.[22] The camera's ability to close in on the face of a performer in long medium close-ups and close-up shots enables performers to gradually "grow" their presence so that it fills the screen with an intensity that replicates that of the early daguerreotype portrait photographs which, for Benjamin, preserve the aura of the sitter because the slowness of the exposure "taught the models to live inside rather than outside the moment . . . they grew as it were into the picture."[23] Slow exposure results in the image bearing in it the traces of "intensified temporality" as it captures "something of the subject's unfolding into the image."[24] Benjamin sees "the fleeting expression of a human face" as captured in early portraits with long exposure times as emanating the aura of "loved ones, absent or dead" with "melancholy, incomparable beauty."[25] It is at the moment when the performer is the most obviously unmoored from their location, isolated from their theatrical surroundings, that paradoxically their aura can be most powerfully communicated to the remote viewer.

At moments when the broadcast camera rests on a performer's face and the performer's thoughts unfold before the viewer as if in slow motion, the liveness of

performance, which Peggy Phelan famously identified with the fact of its disappearance, becomes almost tangible for the assembled remote audience.[26] With the intensity that is particular to the close-up's ability to "[focus] on hidden details of familiar objects" so that "space expands" and "entirely new structural formations of the subject are revealed," a broadcast audience can see, frame-by-disappearing-frame, the ever-disappearing thoughts behind the performer's facial expression and eyes.[27] Like the long exposure time of early photography, the sustained focus of a broadcast camera on a face on which fleeting thoughts and emotions are always in the process of both appearing and disappearing creates, for the viewer, Fischer-Lichte's PRESENCE. Through its combination of camerawork and the live performance of the actor in the presence of an audience, in other words, the medium of theater broadcast is, in these long shots, concentrating on the unfolding of emotion and thought in a performer's face, reactivating the energy and aura of the performer's phenomenal body.

Gendering presence: two case studies

Theatrical PRESENCE and the ability to develop a sense of a performer's "aura" on the broadcast screen, however, appear to be differentially available to male and female characters in Lough and Hytner's *Othello* and Lloyd and Huw's *Julius Caesar*. That, in turn, has implications for the way the audience responds to these characters. The gendering of auratic presence is evident from the start of *Othello*'s Senate scene, which, by transferring the action from the openly theatrical set of the first scene to a much more filmic, naturalistic box set into whose space the camera penetrates deeply, "move[s] both the broadcast and the production into a different register."[28] From the start of this scene, the camerawork is at pains to articulate, for the broadcast viewer, a sense of intimacy with Othello, framing him as a charismatic performer whose energy has the power to enthrall onstage and offstage audiences

alike. When Lester begins his first address to the senators with "Most potent, grave, and reverend signiors" (1.3.77), the camera begins to zoom in on him in a long single shot, gradually cutting out the senators who surround him until Othello is alone in a mid-shot. This shot relies on the previous scene-setting for context but effectively alters the viewer's relationship to Lester: no longer an actor on the stage, he becomes an auratic screen presence in an illusionist framework, with the slow zoom suggesting that his aura is transcending the constraints of the camera in real time.[29] That pattern is repeated for his 146-line set-piece explaining how he won Desdemona's favor, which is filmed in a very slow shot that starts from a wide angle and gradually zooms in on Othello. Almost imperceptibly, the crane-mounted camera moves sideways until it ends up placed behind the shoulder of the only woman in the scene (the re-gendered senator). This woman stands in for the broadcast viewer whose point-of-view she shares when Othello addresses his lines about the "Anthropophagi, and men whose heads / Do grow beneath their shoulders" specifically to her to illustrate how he can impress ladies with his exotic tales (1.2.145–6). The gradual zoom has an almost hypnotic effect that draws the viewer ever more closely into Othello's headspace and enables the aura of the actor to reach out to broadcast viewers who are just as in thrall to Lester's charismatic presence as are Desdemona and the female official in his on-stage audience.

By contrast, Desdemona is shown in a series of wide group shots and two-shots from the moment she enters this scene. The way in which Desdemona shares the frame with Othello and Brabantio to demonstrate her relationship with the two men in her life when speaking of her "divided duty" is typical (1.2.181). When a close-up shows her hurt reaction to her father's rejection, it is brief and there is no opportunity for her to grow her presence into the frame. Instead, the cameras thereafter begin to exclude Desdemona. She only reappears—and shows that she has been listening intently to the men's debate throughout—when she hears that she might be kept away from Othello during his expedition to Cyprus. At

that point, she springs up from her seat in a corner of the room and a camera seeks her out, framing her with the group of men in the room. The closest Desdemona gets to receiving the level of attention lavished on her husband is when Othello chimes in to support her request to accompany him to Cyprus: at that point, the camera moves sideways between her face and his, stylistically uniting the couple. But even here the camera does what it has done throughout the scene: it shows Desdemona not as an individual who attracts interest for her own sake, but as *relational* and *responsive*, someone who only acquires significance through her interactions with others. That may, of course, be a result of the star casting and marketing of the production as centering on the relationship between Lester's Othello and Kinnear's Iago, but it is still striking to see this marketing focus on the male star translate into the minutiae of camerawork. Whereas the broadcast audience deeply feels Othello's presence and his aura is allowed to grow slowly into the frame, therefore, Desdemona remains at an emotional remove from the viewer.

Those different approaches to filming Othello and Desdemona continue throughout. As his jealousy intensifies, Lester's Othello in his big speeches consistently benefits from slow zooms that pull the viewer into his tragic emotion, giving him a vibrant presence. Purcell observes that Kinnear's Iago, too, benefits from "frequent close-ups and a tendency to close in on his soliloquizing figure."[30] Desdemona, by contrast, continues to share the screen with others. The Willow scene is representative: the most frequent camera setting frames Desdemona and Emilia together as they sing and quietly talk over a can of beer. It is only in the bedroom scenes—first, when Othello calls Desdemona "that cunning whore of Venice" (4.2.91), and second, in the murder scene—that the pattern changes. In the first of these, Othello and Desdemona get roughly equal camera time and neither benefits from a slow close-up until the very end, when Othello pushes Desdemona onto the bed and the camera rests on her; yet her agitation marks her out as the object of pity rather than a *present* subject

capable of growing into the frame. In the murder scene, too, Desdemona and Othello have roughly equal amounts of screen time, with reaction shots alternating with wide shots of the pair together in a hectic edit in which the camera often rests on Desdemona's face while Othello speaks, registering her fear. The very nature of the scene precludes stillness, and the murder itself is captured in a single, distant shot of the couple on the bed which gives the broadcast audience an almost voyeuristic view into the space as if from outside—a return to a theatrical understanding of the space that distances the viewer from both characters. Once Desdemona is dead, the camera enters the space again to focus on Othello, giving him slow zooming close-up after slow zooming close-up, thus cementing once and for all his superior star appeal, aura, and presence.

Such a gendering of auratic presence in the *Othello* broadcast recurs to a remarkable degree in Lloyd's *Julius Caesar*: even with an all-female cast and a director who feels profoundly "ambivalent about stage performances on screen,"[31] the cameras' treatment of male-gendered characters differs from that of female-gendered characters; in other words, it is not only the actors who perform gender on stage, but the cameras which perform gender for the screen. What becomes clear from Lloyd's DVD commentary and an extra on "Performing Gender" is that the gendering of presence and its link to a stillness that fills the space of the theater and the broadcast screen is no accident. Both Jackie Clune (Caesar) and Lloyd speak of the improvisation exercises the cast did in order to learn to perform masculinity, which involved learning to "demand focus" and become "the biggest thing in the room" by being still, the argument being that men know they are important and entitled and therefore do not make the busy gestures women do to ingratiate themselves with their interlocutors.[32] As Lloyd put it, performing masculinity was sometimes "about taking space, sometimes . . . about a stillness, a directness."[33]

Lloyd associates this stillness specifically with Harriet Walter, whom she describes as "one of the greatest *listening* actors there ever was. So every time I cut away to her, she is guiding the audience through this complex text. . . . the closer you go in, the more you see her soul."[34] Within the broadcast, this attention to masculine stillness as a way of allowing the viewer to see a performer's "soul" translates into extraordinary sequences of slowly unfolding close-ups that alternate between Martina Laird's restless Cassius and Walter's spectacularly still Brutus (Figure 1), whose aura seems to burn a hole into the screen as emotions fleetingly emerge and disappear again on her face. Not for nothing does Lloyd refer to Walter's "electric screen presence," and she is pleased that the in-the-round staging of the original production and its blacking-out of the theater audience allows her to "get on the eyeline."[35] This allows the broadcast audience to "disappear into the action," blocking out the theater audience who, at other points (such as Caesar's murder, which happens in the midst of the appalled audience and which Lloyd herself filmed crouching behind Clune in the stalls) "really *have* to participate," acting as "400 unsuspecting extras" both in the theater and on broadcast screens.[36] Once again, male-gendered screen presence is contingent on immersion in the image and the abolition of distance and positionality.

Figure 1: auratic presence: Brutus (Harriet Walter) bidding farewell to Cassius

This treatment of Brutus, Cassius, and Caesar contrasts markedly with that received by the play's few female characters: Clare Dunne's Portia, Zainab Hasan's Calpurnia, and

Leah Harvey's Soothsayer. The last of these is a vulnerable prison inmate on a tricycle "who looks like she's come out of some godforsaken crack den" and who is filmed alternately in wide shots as she slowly circles the other characters on the stage or at a disconcertingly crooked angle by an upward-facing GoPro camera placed inside her bicycle basket which conveys her "basket case" state of mind (forgive the pun).[37] Whereas this might not represent a necessarily gendered way of filming and might be more about conveying the weirdness of the character's prognostications, the same is clearly not true of Dunne's heavily pregnant Portia, whose appearance is "a first reminder that there are actual women in the production,"[38] and who is most often filmed in two-shots with either Brutus or Lucius that show her responsive and relational in much the same way as we saw with Vinall's Desdemona.

Nor is it true of Hasan's Calpurnia, who benefits from the most extreme close-up of the entire broadcast: a shot of her features set in a stony mask of despair at the thought "that Casca is going to overwhelm . . . Caesar" (Figure 2a).[39] That single extreme close-up on her frozen features while Caesar talks *about* her, making her the object of discussion and the viewer's gaze, is juxtaposed with group shots which more adequately represent Lloyd's overall approach to this character: she is either left out of the frame altogether or in the foreground yet in relational positions vis-à-vis the men who "pull focus", as Clune's Caesar noticeably does in Figure 2b. Throughout this sequence, Hasan's Calpurnia works hard "to make herself invisible" because, Lloyd explains, women are always "having to disappear when men are doing business together."[40] This deliberate seeking-out of "invisibility," on Hasan's part, and its reinforcement by the way the cameras treat her, has an impact on the way the extreme close-up is read within the montage: juxtaposed with shots that stress Calpurnia's insignificance in Rome's heady political environment (and ultimately in her relationship with Caesar) and her ability to be absent to everyone around her even when she

is there, the close-up seeks out her face to let it fill almost half of the frame, but without allowing her aura to reach through the frame to the broadcast viewer. As in the vast majority of theater broadcasts, in Lloyd's *Julius Caesar*, no performer directly looks into the camera, however much their aura may be reaching out to the broadcast audience—Walter's gaze in Figure 1, directed subtly to one side of the camera, is typical in that respect. By contrast, Hasan's Calpurnia directs her empty stare sideways out of the camera frame altogether, exhibiting what Noa Steimatsky terms "facial reticence": "the averted look implies the avoidance of face-to-face reciprocity as a basis of social interaction."[41] Even when in extreme close-up, Hasan's performance is one of absence and the audience responds to her as distant and unreachable. When, subsequently, Caesar grabs her face and pushes Calpurnia to the ground, the erasure of her facial presence and her objectification reaches its violent climax.

Figure 2 a and b: extreme close-up of Calpurnia (Zainab Hasan); Julius Caesar (Jackie Clune) and Calpurnia (Zainab Hasan)

In both *Othello* and *Julius Caesar*, therefore, the cameras tend to treat female characters as less worthy of sustained interest in and of themselves than their male counterparts, using "theatrical" modes of filming that, while true to the positionality that marks out the original artwork, preclude them from connecting with the broadcast audience through an aura that grows into and through the screen to convey PRESENCE. That is true despite the overtly feminist agenda underpinning Lloyd's *Julius Caesar* or the paratextual

features accompanying the *Othello* broadcast, which concentrate on children and middle-aged women munching popcorn, while Emma Freud's live but evidently tightly scripted pre-show interview with Hytner heavy-handedly seeks to appeal to a female audience with questions about the "really feisty" treatment of women in the production and the announcement of a forthcoming celebratory National Theatre event involving "several dames." However much these two broadcasts may have been designed with the middle-aged female audience demographic in mind, and however much Lloyd was keen to appeal to a more diverse audience, that does not translate into equal treatment of male and female characters on screen.

The implication is quite devastating: not only do the plays themselves privilege male over female characters through sheer weight of numbers, and not only do they afford male (star) performers many more opportunities to share their character's thoughts through soliloquies, which, in turn, lend themselves to the spatiotemporal expansion of close-ups and the generation of auratic presence, but that scripted privilege is translated into a much more insidious experiential and emotional privilege in the broadcast setting. There, the majority female audience is invited, by the presence effects generated by camerawork, to experience male characters as PRESENT subjects, whereas female characters, and the women who perform them, are "absent" objects of the gaze, less charismatic and kept at an emotional remove in the remote setting of the theater. It is only when women perform men's roles, as in Lloyd's *Caesar*, that female performers, by virtue of playing male characters, are able to meet their largely female middle-aged broadcast audiences halfway as equals, reactivating the aura of the theatrical encounter in the cinema. But they only get to do that *if they play men*. Watching Lloyd's *Caesar*, middle-aged women in the audience could rejoice in the prominence and the charisma of Walters, Caird, and Clune, but they had to accept that it is only the performance of masculinity that made it possible to see their demographic counterparts in the broadcast fill the screen with the force of their PRESENCE. If theater

broadcasts continue as one of the principal ways in which audiences outside metropolitan centers access productions of Shakespeare, it is worth being aware of the extent to which the medium's ability to generate presence effects continues to reinforce, in insidious ways, wider cultural prejudices that favor male performers over female ones, and that train female viewers to accept their screen counterparts' invisibility and merely relational importance not just in Shakespeare's plays, but in society at large.

Bibliography

Benjamin, Walter. "A Short History of Photography." *Screen* 13, no. 1 ([1931] 1972): 5–26.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." In *Illuminations*, by Walter Benjamin, edited by Hannah Arendt, translated by Henry Zohn, 217–51. New York: Schocken Books, [1935] 1968.

Doane, Mary Anne. "The Close-Up: Scale and Detail in the Cinema." *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 14, no. 3 (2003): 89–111.

Donmar Warehouse, *Julius Caesar*, dir. stage Phyllida Lloyd, dir. screen Phyllida Lloyd with live camera director Rhodri Huw. DVD, Opus Arte, 2017.

Féral, Josette. "How to Define Presence Effects: the Work of Janet Cardiff." In *Archaeologies of Presence: Art, Performance and the Persistence of Being*, edited by Gabriella Giannachi, Nick Kaye, and Michael Shanks, 29–49. London: Routledge, 2012.

Fischer-Lichte, Erika. "Appearing as Embodied Mind – Defining a Weak, a Strong and a Radical Concept of Presence." In *Archaeologies of Presence: Art, Performance and the Persistence of Being*, edited by Gabriella Giannachi, Nick Kaye and Michael Shanks, 103–18. London: Routledge, 2012.

Freud, Emma. Broadcast Introduction and Interview with Nicholas Hytner. *Othello*, dir. stage Nicholas Hytner; dir. screen Robin Lough. NT Live, 2013. London: National Theatre Archive.

Kidnie, Margaret Jane. "The Stratford Festival of Canada: Mental Tricks and Archival Documents in the Age of NTLive." In *Shakespeare and the 'Live' Theatre Broadcast Experience*, edited by Pascale Aebischer, Susanne Greenhalgh, and Laurie E. Osborne, 133-46. London: Bloomsbury, 2018.

Killeen, Alex. "Screening 'Julius Caesar': In Conversation with Phyllida Lloyd." *Culturised*, July 12, 2017. https://culturised.co.uk/2017/07/screening-julius-caesar-in-conversation-with-phyllida-lloyd/.

Lloyd, Phyllida. "Programme Note." *Julius Caesar*, dir. stage Phyllida Lloyd, dir. screen Phyllida Lloyd with live camera director Rhodri Huw. Distributed in cinemas, 2017.

Nice, David. "Julius Caesar, BBC Four review - electrifying TV launch of all-women Shakespeare trilogy." *The Arts Desk*, June 18, 2018. https://theartsdesk.com/theatre-tv/julius-caesar-bbc-four-review-electrifying-tv-launch-all-women-shakespeare-trilogy.

Nicholas, Rachael. "Appendix: Digital Theatre Broadcasts of Shakespeare, 2003–17." In *Shakespeare and the 'Live' Theatre Broadcast Experience*, edited by Pascale Aebischer, Susanne Greenhalgh and Laurie E. Osborne, 227–42. London: Bloomsbury, 2018.

Phelan, Peggy. *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*, London: Routledge, [1993] 2005.

Purcell, Stephen. "'It's All a Bit of a Risk': Reformulating 'Liveness' in Twenty-First Century Performances of Shakespeare." In *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Performance*, edited by James C. Bulman, 284–301. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Reidy, Brent Karpf, Becky Schutt, Deborah Abramson, and Antoni Durski. *From Live-to-Digital: Understanding the Impact of Digital Developments in Theatre on Audiences, Production and Distribution*. Arts Council UK, October 2016. https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/From_Live_to_Digital_OCT2016.pdf.

Schulze, Daniel. "The Passive Gaze and Hyper-Immunised Spectators: The Politics of Theatrical Live Broadcasting." *Journal of Contemporary Drama in English* 3, no. 2 (2015): 315–26. https://doi.org/10.1515/jcde-2015-0024.

Sharrock, Beth. "A View from the Stage: Interviews with Performers." In *Shakespeare and the 'Live' Theatre Broadcast Experience*, edited by Pascale Aebischer, Susanne Greenhalgh, and Laurie E. Osborne, 95–101. London: Bloomsbury, 2018.

Spencer, Charles. "Othello, National Theatre, Review." *The Telegraph*, April 24, 2013. https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/theatre/william-shakespeare/10013155/Othello-National-Theatre-review.html.

Steimatsky, Noa. *The Face on Film.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Steimatsky, Noa. "On the Face, in Reticence," in *Film, Art, New Media: Museum Without Walls?* edited by Angela Delle Vacche. 159–77. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137026132_9.

Sullivan, Erin. "Aura, Aliveness, and Art." *Digital Shakespeares*, April 21, 2017. https://digitalshakespeares.wordpress.com/2017/04/21/aura-aliveness-and-art/.

Sullivan, Erin. "'The forms of things unknown': Shakespeare and the Rise of the Live Broadcast." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35, no. 4 (2017): 627–62.

Williams, Nora. "(Un-)Strangemaking Gender: Cross- and Single-Gender Productions of Shakespeare." Paper presented for the Directing and Dramaturgy Working Group at the Theatre and Performance Research Association conference, University of Exeter, September 6, 2019. http://norajwilliams.hcommons.org/tapra-2019/.

Notes

[1] Brent Karpf Reidy, Becky Schutt, Deborah Abramson, and Antoni Durski, *From Live-to Digital: Understanding the Impact of Digital Developments in Theatre on Audiences, Production and Distribution* (Arts Council UK, October 2016), 29, 25, https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/From_Live_to_Digital_OCT2016.pdf.

[2] Rachael Nicholas, "Appendix: Digital Theatre Broadcasts of Shakespeare, 2003–17," in *Shakespeare and the 'Live' Theatre Broadcast Experience*, eds Pascale Aebischer, Susanne Greenhalgh and Laurie E. Osborne (London: Bloomsbury, 2018), 227–42. Nicholas's work also shows that whereas there are six women multi-camera directors who have worked on Shakespeare broadcasts, there are eighteen men who have this experience, with Robin Lough, Ian Russell, and Tim van Someren directing the bulk of all Shakespeare theater broadcasts.

[3] Nicholas Hytner, in Emma Freud, broadcast introduction to *Othello*, dir. stage Nicholas Hytner; dir. screen Robin Lough, NT Live, 2013 (London: National Theatre Archive).

[4] Donmar Warehouse, *Julius Caesar*, dir. stage Phyllida Lloyd, dir. screen Phyllida Lloyd with live camera director Rhodri Huw (DVD, Opus Arte, 2017), DVD blurb. Nora Williams offers a fierce critique of the racial politics underpinning Harriet Walter's account of how she and Lloyd considered the cast's racial diversity plausible because it "could believably represent the racial and social mix of a prison population." As Williams puts it: "Never mind a cast that could believably represent the population of modern London—or, for that matter, early modern London—or, for that matter, Ancient Rome. No, no—according to Walter (and, implicitly, Lloyd), it's prisons, apparently, where a multicultural group of women performing a Shakespeare play will not seem strange. How telling." Nora Williams, "(Un-)Strangemaking Gender: Cross- and Single-Gender Productions of Shakespeare," Paper presented for the Directing and Dramaturgy Working Group at the Theatre and Performance

Research Association conference, University of Exeter, September 6, 2019,

http://norajwilliams.hcommons.org/tapra-2019/.

[5] Phyllida Lloyd in Alex Killeen, "Screening 'Julius Caesar': In Conversation with Phyllida Lloyd," *Culturised*, July 12, 2017, https://culturised.co.uk/2017/07/screening-julius-caesar-in-conversation-with-phyllida-lloyd/. The screen release went out of its way to appeal to a younger demographic with an offer of £5 tickets for the under-25s, but while in London the audience demographic was noticeably diverse, there was no evidence of a noticeably younger demographic in attendance at screenings in the Exeter Picturehouse Cinema or Nottingham Broadway Cinema, for instance.

[6] Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in *Illuminations*, by Walter Benjamin, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans.Henry Zohn (New York: Schocken Books, [1935] 1968), 220–1.

[7] Erin Sullivan, "Aura, Aliveness, and Art," *Digital Shakespeares*, April 21, 2017. https://digitalshakespeares.wordpress.com/2017/04/21/aura-aliveness-and-art/ .

[8] Benjamin, "Work of Art," 222.

[9] Benjamin, "Work of Art," 233.

[10] Sullivan, "Aura," also draws attention to Benjamin's ambivalence.

[11] Sullivan, "Aura," and Benjamin, "Work of Art," 223, 221.

[12] Benjamin, "Work of Art," 220.

[13] Margaret Jane Kidnie, "The Stratford Festival of Canada: Mental Tricks and Archival Documents in the Age of NTLive," in *Shakespeare and the 'Live' Theatre Broadcast Experience*, eds Pascale Aebischer, Susanne Greenhalgh and Laurie E. Osborne (London: Bloomsbury, 2018), 134.

[14] Stephen Purcell, "'It's All a Bit of a Risk': Reformulating 'Liveness' in Twenty-First Century Performances of Shakespeare," in *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Performance*, ed. James C. Bulman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 289.

[15] Josette Féral, "How to Define Presence Effects: the Work of Janet Cardiff," in *Archaeologies of Presence: Art, Performance and the Persistence of Being*, eds Gabriella Giannachi, Nick Kaye, and Michael Shanks (London: Routledge, 2012), 29–49 (31).

[16] Schulze, Daniel, "The Passive Gaze and Hyper-Immunised Spectators: The Politics of Theatrical Live-Broadcasting," *Journal of Contemporary Drama in English* 3, no. 2 (2015): 319. https://doi.org/10.1515/jcde-2015-0024..

[17] Charles Spencer, "Othello, National Theatre, Review," *The Telegraph*, April 24, 2013, https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/theatre/william-shakespeare/10013155/Othello-National-Theatre-review.html; David Nice, "Julius Caesar, BBC Four review – electrifying TV launch of all-women Shakespeare trilogy," *The Arts Desk*, June 18, 2018, https://theartsdesk.com/theatre-tv/julius-caesar-bbc-four-review-electrifying-tv-launch-all-women-shakespeare-trilogy.

[18] Erika Fischer-Lichte, *The Routledge Introduction to Theatre and Performance Studies* (London: Routledge, 2014), 34.

[19] Erika Fischer-Lichte, "Appearing as Embodied Mind – Defining a Weak, a Strong and a Radical Concept of Presence," in *Archaeologies of Presence: Art, Performance and the Persistence of Being*, eds Gabriella Giannachi, Nick Kayem and Michael Shanks (London: Routledge, 2012), 115.

[20] Erin Sullivan, "'The forms of things unknown': Shakespeare and the Rise of the Live Broadcast," *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35, no. 4 (2017): 639.

[21] Mary Anne Doane, "The Close-Up: Scale and Detail in the Cinema," *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 14, no. 3 (2003): 91. My reading of Benjamin runs

---

counter to Doane's in "Close-Up," 92, where she associated the close-up with the decay of the aura whereas my reading, taking into account Benjamin's comments on the long exposure of the daguerreotype, sees the close-up with the preservation of the aura.

[22] Beth Sharrock, "A View from the Stage: Interviews with Performers," in *Shakespeare and the 'Live' Theatre Broadcast Experience*, eds Pascale Aebischer, Susanne Greenhalgh and Laurie E. Osborne (London: Bloomsbury, 2018), 98.

[23] Walter Benjamin, "A Short History of Photography," *Screen* 13, no. 1 ([1931] 1972): 17.

[24] Noa Steimatsky, *The Face on Film* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 8.

[25] Benjamin, "Work of Art," 226.

[26] Peggy Phelan, *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance* (London: Routledge, [1993] 2005), 146.

[27] Benjamin, "Work of Art," 236.

[28] Purcell, "Reformulating 'Liveness'," 289.

[29] With thanks to Peter Kirwan for sharing this observation.

[30] Purcell, "Reformulating 'Liveness'," 290.

[31] See also Lloyd in Killeen, "Screening 'Julius Caesar'."

[32] Jackie Clune in "Performing Gender," DVD extra, Donmar Warehouse, *Julius Caesar*.

[33] Phyllida Lloyd, "Director's Commentary," DVD extra, Donmar Warehouse, *Julius Caesar*.

[34] Lloyd, "Director's Commentary."

[35] Phyllida Lloyd, "Programme Note," *Julius Caesar*, dir. stage Phyllida Lloyd, dir. screen Phyllida Lloyd with live camera director Rhodri Huw, distributed in cinemas, 2017.

[36] Lloyd, "Director's Commentary" and "Programme Note."

[37] Lloyd, "Director's Commentary."

[38] Lloyd, "Director's Commentary."

[39] Lloyd, "Director's Commentary."

[40] Lloyd, "Director's Commentary."

[41] Noa Steimatsky, "On the Face, in Reticence," in *Film, Art, New Media: Museum Without Walls?* ed. Angela Delle Vacche (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 196, 193. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137026132_9.