

Theatrum Mundi and site in four television Shakespeare films

Cahiers Élisabéthains: A Journal of
English Renaissance Studies
2019, Vol. 99(1) 76–88
© The Author(s) 2019
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/0184767819837548
journals.sagepub.com/home/cae



Victor Huertas Martín

Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia

Abstract

This article explores metatheatricality and site specificity in four Shakespeare television films produced by Illuminations Media: Gregory Doran's *Macbeth* (2001), *Hamlet* (2009) and *Julius Caesar* (2012), and Rupert Goold's *Macbeth* (2010). Drawing on metatheatrical theory applied to the screen and recent criticism on site-specific theatre, I explore the films as self-referential and self-conscious works embedded in environments that oppose the artifice of drama to the 'reality' of normative television film. Shakespeare's aesthetic metaphor, presented in self-contained theatrical worlds, does not depict autonomous fictions but is disrupted by outside 'reality'.

Keywords

Metatheatre, site specificity, self-referentiality, self-consciousness, metalepsis

Résumé

Cet article analyse la métathéâtralité et le théâtre in situ dans les versions télévisées de quatre pièces de Shakespeare produites par Illuminations Media: *Macbeth* (2001), *Hamlet* (2009) et *Julius Caesar* (2012), créées par Gregory Doran, et *Macbeth* (2010), de Rupert Goold. En utilisant une méthodologie métathéâtrale appliquée à l'écran, et des approches critiques portant sur le théâtre in situ, nous étudierons ces versions filmées comme des œuvres autoréférentielles et autoréflexives inscrites dans des environnements qui opposent l'artifice du théâtre à la 'réalité' des créations télévisées normatives. Loin de dépendre une fiction autonome, la métaphore esthétique de Shakespeare, présentée dans des univers dramatiques clos, se voit perturbée par une 'réalité' extérieure.

Corresponding author:

Victor Huertas Martín, Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, Facultad de Filología, Paseo Senda del Rey 7, 28040 Madrid, Spain.

Email: cuccioli25@hotmail.com

Mots clés

Métathéâtre, theatre in situ, autoréférentialité, autoréflexivité, métalepse

Many critics have explored metatheatricality in screen Shakespeares: as forms of nostalgia for the popular art of theatre; as challenge to Shakespeare's cultural authority; as denunciation of politics of the spectacle; as criticism of the entertainment industry; and as encouragement of participation among media users.¹ Shakespearean scholars have recently rethought metatheatricality in intertextual, paratextual, performative and scenic contexts.² This essay explores metatheatricality in four Shakespeare films: Gregory Doran's *Macbeth* (2001), *Hamlet* (2009) and *Julius Caesar* (2012), and Rupert Goold's *Macbeth* (2010).³ While some articles tackle the metatheatrical features of two of these films,⁴ they have not been studied as a group of metatheatrical adaptations whose engagement with Shakespeare's *theatrum mundi* metaphor conforms their working methodology. The films' spatial characteristics, I contend, transform the recordings into metatheatrical allegories. Since these spaces are theatrically configured, reading the productions from a metatheatrical perspective invites us to rethink them not just as hybrid films – as they have been referred to⁵ – but as theatrically self-referential and self-conscious works.⁶ Characters are confined within theatrical worlds where they need to fulfil prescribed roles, living lives that resemble, and ultimately are, ongoing performances. The boundaries between these performances and the surrounding reality are often hard to distinguish. The characters enter, flee from and return to the metaphoric entrances, wings and performance spaces suggested by the locations. The films invariably conclude as *coups de théâtre* wherein the main characters meet death either onstage or before reaching the stage. Metatheatrical transgressions blur the limits between fiction and reality, not only regarding the theatricality versus reality dialectics within the films but also at extradiegetic levels. To prove these points, I will draw on theories of metatheatre and critical works on site-specific performance. I will then resituate the concepts of metatheatre and site specificity in these films. Finally, I will focus on the films' self-referential and self-conscious operations.

Context

John Wyver, head of Illuminations Media, produced these four films. Though he claims that, in making them, the company did not follow an established recording methodology,⁷ in light of the results, we can say that they consistently recreate the metaphor of the world seen as a theatre performance. Directors of photography were recruited to translate the stage productions to film by combining 'real-world locations and theatrical environments [and] a range of film languages [demonstrating] effective strategies for the use of spaces, technologies, filming styles and genre conventions [extending] the original's meanings and impact for new audiences'.⁸ Wyver admits that, together with the directors, he tried to reproduce the 'essence' of the stage productions rather than make films.⁹ Indeed, when transferring conventions of site-specific performance to the screen, the

directors explored the potentialities of television using a metatheatrical language unconstrained by the spatial limits of conventional performance venues. The films became works of art about theatre, though not live theatre.

It is important to note that traditional forms of 'television theatre' present intersections with the conventions of Renaissance theatre. Jacek Fabiszak draws from Jerzy Limon's definition of the space in television theatre as an 'amorphous space',¹⁰ which emphasises the 'verbal plane'.¹¹ For Fabiszak, this space is a 'non-distinct' one, for it suggests the setting via convention, *synechdoche* and metaphor. It merely provides a background for the performers.¹² More to the point, citing Limon, Fabiszak proposes that television theatre 'is a work of art which tells about another work, or – in other words – a text about another text'.¹³ What is more, the actors' work unveils the artificiality and the craft of their characterisation.¹⁴ I argue that this logic is applied to the films I analyse. When broadcast and released on DVD, their theatricality was marketed by trying to appeal to the 'permanence and authority' that Michèle Willems attributes to video performance.¹⁵ If, broadly speaking, most television theatre, including these films, capitalises on theatrical aesthetics (and comment on the theatre plays represented), we should examine how Illuminations Media's films expand our understanding of meta-theatre on screen.

First, rather than sticking to the traditional studio recording system for recorded theatre, these films were recorded with a single camera. This allowed the artists greater flexibility and spatial mobility than they would have been allowed to have in any television studio. They could freely explore the locations from different angles and perspectives, incorporate varied camera moves, frame them with multiple generic conventions – such as those of horror film, *cinéma vérité*, surveillance film and so on – and use several parts of the performing venues: performative space, backstage areas, and the outside. Given the admittedly metonymical and metaphorical character of television theatre,¹⁶ the locations could also stand as metaphorical constructions of the world as a theatrical space that still contained elements of the real world. For instance, the war zone in Doran's *Macbeth* inside London's Roundhouse could be simultaneously identified by knowing viewers as the iconic arts venue but, also, as an unlocalised country destroyed by war.

Alternations between real-world locations and theatrical or artificial studio spaces have been common in British television theatre from its inception. However, these films largely display and thematise the transit areas – the no-man's-lands – between theatrical areas and real-world locations. As Raymond Williams says,

you can only determine the function of . . . realism, and thence the critical significance of a description of it as that, when you have analysed not only the local method but the relation of that method to other methods and other intentions within the work.¹⁷

The outside worlds created by the Illuminations Media Shakespeare films oppose the artifice of indoor performative spaces. As already mentioned, these are connected to this outside reality by corridors, gates, backdoors, tunnels, cloister corridors and different suggested and explicit entrances. Such dialectics frame outside scenes as being 'about

the real'¹⁸ as opposed to indoor scenes. The galleries, ballroom and kitchen inside Welbeck Abbey (Nottinghamshire) depict a dystopian underground Scotland. St Joseph's chapel in Mill Hill (London) is transformed into a house of mirrors where characters are watched by CCTV cameras. The features of Oriental City, the abandoned Asian shopping mall on Edgware Road (London), resembles the urban decay depicted in *Julius Caesar*. The performance spaces in the locations are either theatre stages,¹⁹ or spaces resembling recording studios, with CCTV cameras and recording booths behind mirrors,²⁰ or abandoned arenas, as is the case with the Roundhouse. As the team intended, the specificity of the locations suggest a local history. For example, the theatrical features, walls and corridors inside the Roundhouse may recall legendary concerts – for example, the debut of Pink Floyd in 1966 – and theatre hits like Tony Richardson's *Hamlet* (1969) or Mary Whitehouse's *Oh! Calcutta!* (1969–70).

Metatheatricality

In scholarly discussion, the concept of metatheatres is often extended to other mediums outside theatre,²¹ but some critics suggest that it only works elsewhere as self-conscious theatrical reflexivity, not as metatheatres proper.²² As I argue in 'Filming Metatheatres', in agreement with Mary Ann Freese Witt, my priorities lie in examining the operations carried out by metatheatricality.²³ In the films I consider, as mentioned above, characters are performers in theatrically organised worlds. They may show awareness of being trapped in such performances and, arguably, transgress the diegetic levels circumscribing their actions. This dynamic fits Pedro J. García Pardo's definition of metatheatres. He defines it as a metaphor of a life in which we play 'certain parts or conduct patterns, acting according to certain received or self-imposed guidelines, i.e. a script written by an author . . . until death ends the performance in which we are characters'.²⁴ According to him, filmic-embedded plays are self-referential, if thematically dealing with theatre, or self-conscious, if the frontiers between the narrative frame and the embedded piece are blurred or if the artifice of the piece is unveiled.²⁵ To distinguish these effects, García Pardo identifies four modes of reflexivity: (a) discursive reflexivity, which is developed by the narrator's extradiegetic discourse; (b) thematised reflexivity, which takes place at the intradiegetic level; (c) specular reflexivity, which develops embedded plays and metadiegetic artefacts such as *mise en abyme*; and (d) transgressive reflexivity, which blurs diegetic levels through metalepsis.²⁶

As already suggested, theatrical configurations recall the conventions of embedded theatre in the films I discuss. They differ from Shakespearean 'mirror movies'²⁷ in their dissolution of limits between the framing narrative and the embedded play, so they fit into García Pardo's categorisation of reflexive works as 'self-conscious'.²⁸ For example, the backstage scenes function as transitions between the real world and the play inside the embedded plays. These transitory spaces make it hard for the viewer to pinpoint the limits of performance. Except in the public scenes of *Julius Caesar* – 1.1, 1.2, 3.1 and the last lines of 5.5 –, neither Doran nor Goold include audience members, a fact that underlines the productions' spectral relationship with the theatrical art. Many important

actions take place in the performative spaces. Yet, the productions subvert the convention of Elizabethan drama, whose use of the tiring house for performing has been discarded,²⁹ as Wyver's team records scenes in corridors, private rooms, kitchens, dining halls, facilities and backstage spaces.³⁰ Interestingly, the number of backstage scenes increases in the subsequent Shakespearean films produced by Illuminations Media.³¹ This pattern reflects the four films' overall transition from predominantly theatrical to predominantly realistic conventions.

Furthermore, such progression increases the intensity with which outside realities expose theatrical apparatuses as relatively alien micro-systems. Outside realities grow aesthetically, politically and socially more pervasive. To what effect, may we ask? Though theatricality can be joyful and politically or ideologically subversive – as various embedded plays within films show – in the four films I consider, it resembles the disciplinary systems denounced by Kershaw in his analysis of traditional theatrical venues.³² In his view, the theatrical metaphor situates human beings in surveillance regimes where they perform according to certain exhortations.³³ For example, at the opening of *Julius Caesar* the presence of the statue of Caesar and the ubiquitous representation of the tyrant's image all over the place makes his authority over-determining. The surveillance phenomenon Mark Thornton Burnett detects in twenty-first century *Hamlets*, common 'in a terror-haunted world, [where] film itself might constitute an optical disciplinary mechanism',³⁴ is current in these films. However, the films' outside spaces do not provide a satisfactory alternative to the disciplinary theatres inside the recording venues, for the characters invariably return to the performing spaces to meet their Nemeses. In both *Macbeth* films and in *Hamlet*, the hero dies fighting in the performing area. In *Julius Caesar*, Brutus dies backstage, so he only makes it back to the stage as a corpse exhibited by his conquerors.

Site specificity

The directors and the producer were adamant about not wanting to be too specific in relation to setting.³⁵ Nonetheless, the contingency of the sites allows us to read the films as recorded site-specific performances.³⁶ London's Roundhouse, originally a nineteenth-century train shed, became an arts venue in the 1960s, thanks to Arnold Wesker's Centre 42 artistic initiative. This arts centre's architecture acts as the 'host' of Doran's *Macbeth*, while the 'ghost' is the film's design concept: the aforementioned war zone.³⁷ As a result, what symbolised human, artistic and technological progress is transformed into a post-apocalyptic dystopia.

For *Hamlet*, the resplendent St Joseph's Gate was painted with marble fablon to simulate the hall of mirrors used for the stage production. Though the showing of recording cameras was deliberately avoided,³⁸ the entrances and exits communicating the nave with the cloister are visible and the characters are seen going through the wings of a small studio theatre. Welbeck Abbey was one of the settings for the English Civil War and, also, long before this, for two of Ben Jonson's court masques: *The King's Entertainment at Welbeck Abbey in Nottinghamshire* (1633) and *Love's Welcome at*

Welbeck (1633). Such associations undoubtedly contrast with the katabatic atmosphere created by Anthony Ward and photographed by Sam McCurdy, who made use of the underground galleries built up in the nineteenth century. These tunnels, linking the ballroom and other spaces, were utilised as hospital corridors, private bedrooms, house facilities and torture chambers for the fictional world Goold created.

For *Julius Caesar*, the team employed the Royal Shakespeare Theatre stage, whose scenery had been transformed into the seating of a football stadium.³⁹ The 'boxes' contiguous to the stage were realistic locations for plotting, street murder, domestic scenes, war scenes and day-dreaming about the possible outcome of Caesar's downfall.⁴⁰ The battle scenes were recorded at the Oriental City, today called Bang Bang Oriental Foodhall, whose food court had been popular among Colindale office workers and where performing arts events celebrated the visibility of London's Asian communities. When the production was filmed, the centre had been derelict since 2008. The state of the space conveyed the visual effects evoking urban warfare after Caesar's assassination and the ensuing civil war.

Self-referential and self-conscious metatheatricality

The site specificity of the four films combines digital narratives, video art, film, performance and audio recordings. These conventions are self-referential since the characters operate and interact with such devices fulfilling the roles of spectators and creators, too. Doran says he recorded *Macbeth* as *cinéma vérité* inspired by contemporary war documentaries and video diaries.⁴¹ Viewers and cameramen were acknowledged and addressed by the hero, and thus incorporated as permanent presences into the narrative. Stylistic variety, inter-genericity, archive inserts, pastiche and visual citation in Goold's *Macbeth* stimulate the spectator's intertextual journey through this theatrical construction. The viewer accompanies the protagonist through rooms where different filmic intertexts are deployed.⁴² Much of the film's horror imagery stresses the Witches' stage management of the action. They use technology to reanimate the dead, to meta-cinematically show virtual projections of dead characters and even to animate objects.

Specular reflexivity appears in *Hamlet* since CCTV cameras diversify viewpoints reminding us that the characters are under surveillance. In the Danish court, whose workings and operations resemble those of a theatre performance, public delivery of scripted lines alternates with Hamlet's recording of private thoughts in his video-diary.⁴³ Doran borrows the CCTV surveillance and the video-diary conceits from Michael Almereyda's *Hamlet* (2000) and the false mirrors within the performance space from Kenneth Branagh's version of 1996. As in the latter film, Claudius and Polonius watch Hamlet from behind these false mirrors. This space contiguous to the stage is, however, reminiscent of a booth of a recording studio. By extension, its wings and black curtains, its small size and its rectangular layout turn the nave into a mixture of a studio theatre and a small empty TV studio.

Elements of outside reality are inserted in the theatrical spaces of the four films.⁴⁴ Though theatricality pervades these spaces, the abundance of realistic elements disrupt

traditional television theatre conventions through the use of documentary technique, direct addresses to the camera, recording of scenes at the graveyard, the cloister, the shopping mall, the woods near Welbeck Abbey and so on. It deploys contemporary forms of mediation – such as inserting mobile phone shots – that are removed from Renaissance theatrical convention. Such metonyms of the outside world remind us that rather than being autonomous, these theatrical spaces are embedded within larger systems subject to historical and technological change. Even in Doran's *Macbeth*, where the outside is only suggested, we are aware of this embedding of the theatrical world in an external reality.⁴⁵ Inside this confined dark world, outside light cuts through the windows and the sounds of vehicles outside the venue stress the fact that the ongoing performance is embedded in a larger reality.

Viewers are tasked with distinguishing performances within performances. In Doran's *Macbeth*, the hero breaks the theatrical illusion both at intradiegetic as well as extradiegetic levels. More importantly, the Witches in Goold's *Macbeth* are stage managers controlling every single prop and movement in the embedded story. In Scene 1, they turn their gaze towards the viewers and walk forward before vanishing. After this, the lights go off only to turn on as if to re-start a performance. Such performance takes place within the film, but the Witches momentarily address the spectators on the other side of the screen. Therefore, extradiegetic and intradiegetic ruptures take place in the films and characters switch from one level to the other.

As García Pardo indicates, reflexivity is transgressive if characters break the fourth wall.⁴⁶ As I will show, the momentary contacts between characters and viewers can count as metaleptic since they invite co-spectatorship and, occasionally, audience participation. In Doran's film, Hamlet is a creator, an actor and, also, a spectator. Though Hamlet asks Horatio to tell his story (5.2.328), he has been recording parts of his memories in video-diaries to tell himself how he should perform (3.2.349–53, 4.4.32–66).⁴⁷ Before the end of Hamlet, the hero's face in a mirror shot delivers the 'the readiness is all' (5.1.194–5) line to his own reflection in a broken mirror. He has become a spectator and the viewer his co-spectators as he foresees his death. At other times, for example, when the Prince records the play-within-the-play, we see the action through Hamlet's camera lens. In Goold's film, the Witches carry Lady Macbeth's corpse to the morgue and traverse the corridor where Macbeth finds them. This encounter prompts Macbeth's soliloquy on the 'poor player' (5.5.17–27),⁴⁸ which he addresses directly to the spectators. Alternated with outside war scene inserts, Macbeth's address to the camera resembles a news broadcast in which the speaker interpellates the TV spectators.

In *Julius Caesar*, metalepsis transcends the screen's limits. Following Harry Newman's recent validation of Renaissance paratexts as examples of metatheatre,⁴⁹ a form of paratextual transgressive metalepsis can be said to affect this film when Tim Crouch's spin-off *Cinna the Poet* (2013), a play later turned into film, has the poet Cinna (Jude Owusu) retell his personal tragedy to schools live and on film. This spin-off, evidently based on Doran's *Julius Caesar*, encouraged audiences' creative participation through direct questioning and writing prompts. Volunteers could submit their creations to the London recording studio. The actor who played Cinna in both

productions figuratively crossed the threshold inter-connecting the diegetic space with the real world and encouraged stage and screen audiences to be co-creators in Cinna's dramatisation of the events. Cinna, who acknowledges the students attending or viewing the performances, prompts them to write short poems related to what is taking place in *Julius Caesar*. These poems were intended to be published on the World Shakespeare Festival website, though these contributions, with few exceptions traceable through the internet, are inaccessible today.

The films' metatheatricity extends itself to the larger phenomenon of theatre in the current audio-visual media. These hybrid films – situated somewhere between film and theatre⁵⁰ – need a more precise description beyond the mere recognition of the dialogical relation of codes – theatrical and filmic – within them. If, as I have been arguing, theatricality opposes reality, in accordance with Williams's suggestion, we need to see realism in relation to 'other methods and intentions within the work'.⁵¹ Today, while realism is increasing in television drama and TV adaptations of literature, television theatre is disappearing. For this reason, Fabiszak says, we risk obliterating the identity of television theatre.⁵² While he referred to Polish examples, this phenomenon can also be partly perceived in British television theatre, where Shakespeare is more likely to appear onscreen in the form of a drama series, live cinema or feature film, rather than follow the conventions of traditional television theatre. Wyver admits that the films under discussion, though they reached wide audiences, did not generate sufficient financial benefits to continue producing them in a sustained manner.⁵³ By 2021, RSC Live will have completed the recording of the Folio plays, which will confirm the hegemony of live cinema as a form of transmitting theatre to wide audiences. The four films analysed here move away from traditional TV theatre conventions since elements of realism come into play and, implicitly, they also elicit a debate that has been going on in British television for decades. John Caughie and Lez Cooke's theoretical and historical studies on British television drama show that television's tendency to realism dates at least from the 1960s when producer Sydney Newman, inspired by the Royal Court Theatre, promoted a type of social and realistic writing distanced from television theatre.⁵⁴ When BBC launched the complete Shakespeare series, the reception was poor and it is only recently that critical studies have tried to show its merits. It is worth noting that during the Thatcherite period, 'cost-effective' television took over the educational role that television theatre had performed previously. This does not mean that Shakespeare has disappeared from TV but, with the coming of digital television channels, many other vernacular, technologically driven, live and realistic forms of representation of Shakespeare's works on television have developed.

In other words, the dialectics between outside reality and indoor artifice makes a historical commentary on the transitions from one form of recording theatre – a more traditional studio-bound form of TV theatre recording – to other forms of adapting it for television, that is, forms are more regularly associated with film language and forms that more multifariously portray the mediated world we inhabit. The corridors in the locations of Illuminations Media's Shakespeares are not just passageways but symbolically charged lines showing what seems to be the natural way in which recorded theatre will evolve, leaving traditional television theatre behind as a dying, yet residual, form.

Conclusion

Metatheatre depends on the recording sites and the spatial arrangements of the films. Such arrangements configure performance spaces, backstage areas and exterior environments in order to constitute architectural theatrical worlds surrounded by real worlds. The four films I have analysed here combine the artifice of the stage with different codes, registers and generic filmic intertexts, including realism. The intersections produced between these discourses render the films metatheatrical since characters inhabit worlds configured as both symbolic and physical theatres with passageways to outside environments. The films indicate that these external environments are real worlds as opposed to theatrically configured ones. Following conventions of filmic embedded theatre, the *theatrum mundi* metaphor is bereft of limits, barriers and frontiers since it reaches the outside world.

These outside environments anchor theatrical worlds in reality. This effect expands the possibilities for self-referentiality and self-consciousness as the camera freely moves around all the spaces in these theatres and digital technology facilitates the combination of reflexive and intertextual resources. Such freedom of movement also involves fluid transitions between theatrical and real worlds. The four films allow us to distinguish spatially arranged diegetic layers, which in turn permits us to think of these worlds as metafictional constructions. Though site-specific performances allow theatre and life to converge, the speed with which locations are changed, as afforded by film editing, cannot be matched in a theatre venue.

Finally, the camera reveals transitions from performative spaces to offstage spaces. Though characters return to the performative space, reality proves more pervasive as the films progress. Thus not only do the films pose questions about the limits of the concept of recorded theatre, but the dialectics between realistic and theatrical codes implicitly comment on the divergence between traditional forms of television theatre and the dominant realistic modes in twenty-first century television.

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgements are owed to Marta Cerezo Moreno for her very helpful and encouraging feedback and suggestions; to Jacek Fabiszak for generously sending me a copy of *Polish Televised Shakespeares*; to the reviewers for their straightforward, theoretically strong and pedagogical feedback; to John Wyver for a series of interviews and for facilitating several materials and for explaining the structure of shooting scripts; to Pedro J. García Pardo for sending his article to me; to Lisa Jane Roberts and Ellison Moorehead for proofreading the manuscript. Acknowledgements are also owed to Prof. Alex Sampson (University College of London), who helped me arrange my research stay at UCL, British Library and British Film Institute in August 2017 for the writing of the article.

Conflict of interest

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. See Douglas Lanier, *Shakespeare and Modern Popular Culture* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, [2002] 2012); Douglas Lanier, 'Nostalgia and Theatricality: The Fate of the Shakespearean Stage in the *Midsummer Night's* Dreams of Hoffman, Noble and Edzard', in Richard Burt and Lynda Boose (eds), *Shakespeare the Movie II: Popularizing the Plays on Film, TV, Video, and DVD* (London, Routledge, 2003), 154–72; Maurizio Calbi, *Spectral Shakespeares: Media Adaptations in the Twenty-First Century* (New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); Philippa Sheppard, *Devouring Time: Nostalgia in Contemporary Shakespearean Adaptations* (Montreal, McGill's University Press, 2017); Mark Thornton Burnett, *Filming Shakespeare in the Global Marketplace* (New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); Stephen O'Neill (ed.), *Broadcast Your Shakespeare: Continuity and Change Across Media* (London and New York, Bloomsbury, 2018). For classifications on metatheatrical devices in screen Shakespeares, see Sarah Hatchuel, *Shakespeare from Stage to Screen* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004); Agnieszka Rasmus, *Filming Shakespeare: From Metatheatre to Metacinema* (Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 2007).
2. See essays exploring metatheatricality in Renaissance performance published in *Shakespeare Bulletin*, 36:1 (Spring 2018).
3. These films, based on previous stagings, were produced by Illuminations Media in collaboration with RSC, BBC, BBC Wales, NHK Enterprises, WNET and KQED.
4. See Víctor Huertas Martín, 'Theatrical Self-Reflexivity in Gregory Doran's *Hamlet* (2009)', *Epos, Revista de Filología*, 32 (2016), 243–62; Víctor Huertas Martín, 'Filming Metatheatre in Gregory Doran's *Macbeth* (2001): Refracting Theatrical Crises at the Turn of the Century', *Atlantis: Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies*, 40:2 (2018), 101–21.
5. See Maurice Hindle, *Shakespeare on Film* (London, Palgrave, 2015); University of Westminster, 'Adapting Stage Productions for the Screen' (2014), 1. Available at: <https://impact.ref.ac.uk/CaseStudies/CaseStudy.aspx?Id=42139> (accessed 4 February 2019).
6. Roman Jakobson defines 'metalanguage' as the level of language which speaks of language. As the scholar says, 'Any process of language learning, in particular child acquisition of the mother tongue, makes wide use of such metalingual operations'. See Jakobson, 'Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics', in Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language* (New York, The Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Wiley and Sons, 1960), 350–77, 356. Drawing from works written by theoreticians of metatheatricality such as Lionel Abel, Robert J. Nelson, Slawomir Swiontek and others, Pedro Javier García Pardo distinguishes between two aspects of metatheatre. 'Self-referentiality' points at the ways in which artworks reflect on, make reference to or consider their medium. 'Self-consciousness' is a form of doubly emphasised reflexivity since the work refers to itself and unveils its own artificial condition, its constructed character, its artifice and its fictionality. García Pardo, 'La Reflexividad Teatral del Escenario a la Pantalla', *Tropelías. Revista de Teoría de la Literatura y Literatura Comparada*, Número Extraordinario, 2 (2017), 409–36, 412.
7. Hindle, *Shakespeare on Film*, 283.
8. University of Westminster, 'Adapting Stage Productions . . .', 1.

9. John Wyver, 'Interview with Author' (London, Unpublished, 2016); Hindle, *Shakespeare on Film*, 281–3.
10. Jerzy Limon, *Trzy Teatry (Three Theatres)* (Gdańsk, Obraz/Słowo Terytoria, 2004), 131, quoted in Jacek Fabiszak, *Polish Televised Shakespeares: A Study of Shakespeare Productions within the Television Theatre Format* (Poznań, Motivex, 2005), 11.
11. Fabiszak, *Polish Televised Shakespeares . . .*, 11.
12. Fabiszak, *Polish Televised Shakespeares . . .*, 11, 26.
13. Limon, *Trzy Teatry*, 144, quoted in Fabiszak, *Polish Televised Shakespeares . . .*, 18.
14. Fabiszak, *Polish Televised Shakespeares . . .*, 35.
15. See Michèle Willems, 'Video and its Paradoxes', in Russell Jackson (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007), 35–46, 44. Regarding the 'Illuminations' films, the DVD covers bear the seal of RSC or Illuminations Media, or they assert their theatrical precedence. The special features divide the films' chapters following act and scene divisions of academic editions. The shooting scripts merely break down Shakespeare's scripts into shots and close-up shots and camera movements. Interviews with and commentaries by directors and actors deal with the production processes for both staging and filming and expand the viewers' experiences through the DVDs' extra features.
16. See Fabiszak, *Polish Televised Shakespeares . . .*, 27.
17. Raymond Williams, 'A Lecture on Realism', *Afterall: A Journal of Art, Context and Enquiry*, 5 (2002), 106–15, 106.
18. John Corner distinguishes between two types of realism. The first type (Realism 1) relies on verisimilitude. The second type (Realism 2) focuses on 'the project of reference (of being about the real)'. Such categories exclude questions on the nature of the narrative's construction and presuppose trust in the reliability of what the work of art shows. See John Corner, 'Presumption as Theory: "Realism" in Television Studies', *Screen*, 33:1 (1992), 97–102, 98–9, quoted in Fabiszak, *Polish Television Shakespeares . . .*, 27.
19. See *Julius Caesar* [DVD], directed by Gregory Doran (London, BBC/Illuminations, 2012).
20. See *Hamlet* [DVD], directed by Gregory Doran (London, Illuminations, 2009).
21. Martin Puchner, 'Introduction', in Lionel Abel, *Tragedy and Metatheatre: Essays on Dramatic Form* (New York, Holmes and Meier, 2003), 1–24, 24.
22. Pardo, 'Reflexividad Teatral . . .', 419.
23. Mary Ann Freese Witt, *Metatheater and Modernity: Baroque and Neobaroque* (Madison, Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2013), 9. Cited in Martín, 'Filming Metatheatre . . .', 104.
24. Pardo, 'Reflexividad Teatral . . .', 411.
25. Pardo, 'Reflexividad Teatral . . .', 411–12.
26. Pardo, 'Reflexividad Teatral . . .', 414.
27. In Kenneth Rothwell's classification of Shakespeare films, 'mirror movies' are films whose subject matter is the rehearsal and production of a Shakespearean play. See Rothwell, *A History of Shakespeare on Screen: A Century of Film and Television* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, [1999] 2004), 208.
28. Pardo, 'Reflexividad Teatral . . .', 416.
29. David Bevington, *This Wide and Universal Theater: Shakespeare in Performance Then and Now* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2007), 26.
30. Wyver has confirmed that the primary authors in the recordings were the stage directors ('Interview . . .'). Nevertheless, the conventions of filmic embedded theatre appear in the four films, though the two directors present completely different styles. Likewise, various metatheatrical elements such as the backstage–onstage interaction and a series of mirror shots featuring the character as an actor getting ready for an upcoming performance are recurrent in the four films.

- Interestingly, these two conceits are also present in *Gloriana, A Film* (dir. Phyllida Lloyd, 2001), produced by Illuminations Media around the same time as Doran's *Macbeth*.
31. In Doran's *Macbeth*, 13 of 27 scenes are recorded backstage – 3.5 and 3.6 are cut. In *Hamlet*, 12 of 28 scenes are recorded on the studio stage at the nave. In Goold's *Macbeth*, 5 of 28 scenes are recorded in the performance space. In *Julius Caesar*, 3 of 18 scenes are recorded onstage.
 32. Joanne Tompkins, 'The "Place" and Practice of Site-Specific Theatre and Performance', in Anna Birch and Joanne Tompkins (eds), *Performing Site-Specific Theatre* (New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 1–17, 7.
 33. For an analysis of Goold's *Macbeth* as society of surveillance and society of control, see Victor Huertas Martín, 'Rupert Goold's *Macbeth* (2010): Surveillance Society and Society of Control', *SEDERI*, 27 (2017): 81–103.
 34. Mark Thornton Burnett, "'I See My Father'" in "'My Mind's Eye'": Surveillance and the Filmic *Hamlet*', in Mark T. Burnett and Ramona Wray (eds), *Screening Shakespeare in the Twenty-First Century* (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 31–52, 32.
 35. See 'Interview with Gregory Doran', *Macbeth* [DVD], directed by Gregory Doran (London, Illuminations, 2003); 'Interview with Rupert Goold', *Macbeth* [DVD], directed by Rupert Goold (London, Illuminations/KQED, 2010); Wyver, 'Interview . . .'. In *Julius Caesar*, Doran claims to be thinking of Africa as a metaphor of the cycles of violence repeated in post-independence African countries (See "'Making-off" of *Julius Caesar*', *Julius Caesar* [DVD]).
 36. Site-specific performance relies upon the peculiarities of pre-existing spaces. Performance and site interpenetrate, overlap and coexist. Barriers between spectators and players, the fictive and the real, are fluid. This adds new political and aesthetic meanings to the plays. Likewise, site specificity stresses the presence of parallel realities transcending the theatrical and incorporates aspects of the real world into the narrative. Though site specificity is bound to the place, there are many examples of site-specific works transferred to different locations. Site-specific theatre also intertextually engages other media: sound-based and audiovisual. See Tompkins, 'The "Place" and Practice of Site-Specific', 1–17, 7.
 37. For Mike Pearson, the 'host' is represented by the architecture in the venue; the 'ghost' is what is added to the site. See Mike Pearson, *Site-Specific Performance* (New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 36.
 38. Wyver, 'Interview . . .'.
 39. See "'Making-Off" . . .'.
 40. Art department assistant Matilda Wainwright confirms that this was the rationale behind the choice of setting. See "'Making-Off" . . .'.
 41. See 'Interview with Gregory Doran', *Macbeth* [DVD].
 42. For an analysis of Goold's filmic horror and Greenaway's intertexts, see Boika Sokolova, "'Horrible Imaginings": Rupert Goold's Film Adaptation, a *Macbeth* for the Twenty-First Century', in Sarah Hatchuel, Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin and Victoria Bladen (eds), *Shakespeare on Screen: Macbeth* (Mont-Saint-Aignan, Presses Universitaires de Rouen et du Havre, 2013), 149–69; 'Interview with Rupert Goold'.
 43. For analyses on the *theatrum mundi* metaphor in this film, see Sébastien Lefait, "'This Same Strict and Most Observant Watch" (1.1.71): Gregory Doran's *Hamlet* as Surveillance Adaptation', *Borrowers and Lenders: The Journal of Shakespeare and Appropriation*, 3:2 (2013–14); Martín, 'Theatrical Self-Reflexivity . . .'.
 44. For instance, Doran introduces real trees into the Roundhouse arena and refurbishes the spaces with benches, candles, roods and all the furniture expected in Catholic churches for the English scene.

45. The dark world inside the Roundhouse is often flooded with light coming through the windows. Likewise, Macbeth momentarily abandons the place after the 'Tomorrow' speech through the backstage door. We only listen to the cars and see the daylight in Chalk Farm.
46. Pardo, 'Reflexividad Teatral . . .', 417.
47. In these scenes, Hamlet records himself with his handheld camera, which he uses as a video-diary. References to playtext are taken from Philip Edwards (ed.), *Hamlet* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003).
48. References to the playtext are taken from Sandra Clark and Pamela Mason (eds), *Macbeth* (London, Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2015).
49. Harry Newman argues that paratexts accompanying first editions of Renaissance playtexts invited metatheatrical readerly involvement. See 'Reading Metatheatre', *Shakespeare Bulletin*, 36:1 (2018), 89–110.
50. Hindle, *Shakespeare on Film*, 289.
51. Williams, 'A Lecture on Realism', 106.
52. Fabiszak, *Polish Televised Shakespeares*, 16.
53. Wyver, 'Interview . . .'.
54. See John Caughie, *Television Drama: Realism, Modernism, and British Culture* (Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press, 2000); Lez Cooke, *British Television Drama: A History*, 2nd ed. (London, Palgrave and British Film Institute, 2015).

Author biography

Victor Huertas Martín obtained his doctorate from the Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia (UNED), which awarded him their Extraordinary Doctorate Award in 2018 for his PhD dissertation 'Hybridity in John Wyver's BBC Shakespeare's Films: A Study of Gregory Doran's *Macbeth* (2001), *Hamlet* (2009) and *Julius Caesar* (2012) and Rupert Goold's *Macbeth* (2010)'. His current research focuses on the dialogical relation between theatrical and filmic languages in screen adaptations of Shakespearean plays. He is co-editing a collection of essays, *Television Series as Literature: From the Ordinary to the Unthinkable*, with Reto Winckler.