

[This research bulletin was copied from Wayback machine,
<https://web.archive.org/web/20030818235450/http://www.rdg.ac.uk/globe/research/1998/Rev98Morning.htm> , accessed 22nd May 2019]

1997 Review Conference

- Morning Session
- Afternoon Session
- Evening Session

Introduction

This year's review conference took place shortly after the end of the season, on Sunday 27 September. The Red Company was about to leave on its trip to Japan, where they were to perform *As You Like It* at the Tokyo Globe. The meeting brought together forty persons closely related to the Globe or having taken part in one or more of the seven shows presented on the Globe stage during the course of the summer. All the proceedings took place on the Globe stage.

Mark Rylance's paper

Mark Rylance, the Globe's Artistic Director, circulated his paper and summarised his points about this season and the future. His prime concern is that we need to find a form of eloquence in speech and gesture that can match the eloquence of Shakespeare's texts, and go beyond the perceived physical limitations of the stage, i.e. the pillars and the difficult sightlines they create. He wondered why the actors all tend to play predominantly to the front, but also why groundlings predominantly expect the action to take place there, in spite of the efforts made by the ushers to encourage them to stand on the sides of the stage before performance begins.

The very different staging options made by *The Merchant of Venice* and *As You Like It* prompted the question of whether we should be exploring only what **we** think the Elizabethans did with amphitheatres, or also what we can do with amphitheatres. *As You Like It* brought the roughness of the auditorium onto the stage, by replacing the oak doors with barn doors, and using hangings made of undyed rough fabric. But if we drop the use of the yard for authentic productions, as is most likely, achieving the kind of oneness this production created might mean painting the auditorium, for this would reduce the artificial separation between actors and audience, and make "all the world" really become "a stage". However, there are two difficulties: 1) the resistance of the Artistic Directorate and 2) the cost (£260,000 to paint the whole theatre). Unity would also be improved if the Lords' Rooms were filled with audience at every performance, but this would require a raised second row and some adjusting of the *Frons Scenae*, in order to improve sight lines. In the afternoon session Philip Bird wondered, like many directors who have refused to work at the Globe, whether this oneness could not be realised by having a plain stage rather than painting the auditorium. Other participants noted that the audience in the auditorium itself becomes as decorative and attractive to the eye as the stage decoration. Andrew Gurr confirmed that there is evidence that the pilasters were carved and painted in dull russet, a colour strong enough to unify stage and auditorium.

General Discussion

Communication and storytelling

The first topic discussed was the problem of **communication** at the Globe. Though many of us found they could follow the stories in all the plays without difficulty, including small children (who were particularly taken with *As You Like It*), it was found that two factors could be detrimental to effective storytelling. The first was exemplified by the deep setting cluttered with furniture that blocked the sides off in *The Honest Whore* - which showed that moving back from the pillars simply displaces the problem of the sight lines. The second was the conclusion that it is easier to communicate thoughts than feelings at the Globe, and that this explains why the Globe's resounding successes have been with comedy. Feelings and emotions were felt to have a negative effect on storytelling, on the one hand because they are boring, on the other because they obscure the language. Actors agreed that profound feelings are hard to express on the Globe stage, and it was suggested that our acting style is both too repressed and too centred on emotion. Actors may need more trust in the power of the language, and even of the individual word, to convey emotion. They may also need to explore more expressionist styles of acting, such as the Russian or Eastern European approaches. Some wondered whether this would appeal to modern British audiences. Lilo Baur's calm and composed delivery of the most passionate speeches in *The Honest Whore* was cited as an example of perfect clarity combined with expression. David Fielder summed up this point by saying that actors need to communicate the story of the emotional condition they are playing.

Rehearsal work: emotion, text or movement?

What type of rehearsal work produces the most successful staging at the Globe? For *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (1996) and *The Honest Whore* many of the rehearsals consisted of improvisations concentrating on emotional conditions set in modern day situations. Rosalind King wondered whether that was the best way? Actors responded that such work is meaningful because the emotions in Shakespeare's plays still ring true, and because actors need to know in their guts the reasons why they say the words they say. Without the link between motion, motive and emotion, they do not understand why they are doing what they are doing, as was the case in the rehearsal process for *A Mad World, My Masters*. Very elaborate text-work, which can become more like teaching than rehearsing, produces a hollow result if it isn't combined with work on emotions. Jonathan Bond pointed out that actors need to be so strong at the Globe, in order to command the story, the language and the audience, that every possible technique should be used in rehearsal with the aim of increasing their strength. Some actors in the production of *A Mad World, My Masters*, whose rehearsal work was centred on movement rather than motives, found that they only discovered their characters and made sense of their movements through actual performance and thanks to their experience of playing *As You Like It* on the Globe stage.

To the question of whether the rehearsal process was wasted since most movements were restaged in production week, Anastasia Hille answered that she had not enjoyed that process for *As You Like It* but found the preparation very good in retrospect, once she was on stage. Having felt alternately "outside looking in" or "inside looking out", she only found the dream world of Shakespeare's play once she came into the space. Here she found the sky a hypnotic attraction, feeling that she, as actor, effected the link between it and the physical presence of the groundlings. According to her, the Globe requires actors to be very fit and athletic, to have a thorough emotional preparation and to analyse the texts in depth. Philip Bird confirmed that intensive text preparation, which he carried

out for *King John* - in the absence of any collective rehearsal - had helped the words become his own and enabled the emotion to flow naturally from him on the day of performance.

Feedback during rehearsal

Mark Rylance named 3 points Peter Brook considers as central when preparing a performance:

1. The imaginative relationship between actor and character, with its focus on details
2. The relationship between actors and fellow-actors, which aims to make the production true and imaginative
3. The relationship between actors and audience

He expressed concern that the Globe companies had not worked on the relationship between play and audience enough, partly because working in the empty playhouse can be quite daunting, both for actors and for directors. Richard Olivier confirmed that whereas Norbert Kentrup (who played Shylock) would have gladly rehearsed on stage from day 1, other actors were far more reluctant to do so. Most directors agree that at least one extra day in the theatre would have been useful.

The discussion then centred on ways of bringing in some form of audience during rehearsals. Mark Rylance suggested small groups of "innocent" outsiders, in the rehearsal room, whereas several actors thought the tourist groups are a valuable means of creating a social interaction at an early stage in rehearsal, even though they only stay for 15 minutes in the space. Such groups are the closest we can get to independent observers, and could even occasionally be used to provide dialogue and feedback - although this would probably not be helpful on how to communicate better and wider. Besides, the audience is such an unknown at the Globe that one small group's response cannot be taken for a reference. Mark Rylance thinks rehearsing in public presents the risk that some actors might be encouraged to play out too early, and not be introspective enough, or to change their voice in a way not pertinent to the story. David Fielder, on the other hand, felt the social interaction could bring things out in people and change them, and could make the theatrical process less "precious". Several actor-teachers felt that rehearsing with tourist groups would be useful as a vocal exercise, and that having them sitting in all possible parts of the auditorium would help prevent actors from playing to the front.

The audience in performance and the problem of intervals

Mark Rylance noted that performance with groundlings is greatly enhanced by "imaginative involvement", where the audience becomes part of the action, either as the army in *Henry V*, the courtroom members in *The Merchant of Venice*, a character's conscience in most soliloquies. In the performance of *King John*, they became the followers of the characters at the front of the stage talking to Hubert on the battlements, but some of them resisted that assimilation.

The closest we have come **to interval-free performances** are 2-minute breaks, necessary for costume-changes. This preserves the social exchange and makes catching up on the story possible. It is a wonderful opportunity to have the clown join the audience. It also generates the possibility of alternating sitting and standing, which most "regulars" practice. This discussion gave rise to two suggestions: a system of seat-exchange tickets or the adoption of slightly higher price for the cheapest sitting tickets to justify the difference with groundling tickets.

Intervals were still felt to be necessary for the many audience members, who feel awkward about going out during actual performance, or who don't want to miss anything. Yet many ushers and guides point out that the information in Shakespeare's plays is usually repeated, so that coming back in refreshed by a drink would simply make the rest of the performance more enjoyable. Longer intervals also make it easier to catch up on the story, especially for the less familiar non-Shakespearean plays.

Graham Christopher felt that the possibility of moving around is one of the most enjoyable aspects of performance at the Globe, and added that we are still too reverential and do not accept the transitory nature of performance. David Fielder, whose function as Touchstone included announcing intervals, found it very difficult to summon audience members back in - in fact the place of the interval was changed for that reason in *As You Like It*. Strong music is still the best method, but it doesn't prevent a lot of coming and going from continuing during the resumption of the action, especially in the very short intervals. Claire van Kampen on the other hand noted that in *The Merchant of Venice* the effect of the interval music in bringing the audience back in improved over the course of the season. She felt it was an instinctive response to the Globe that probably recreates original practice. The fact that the clown (Marcello Magni) kept the action going also prevented a mass exodus and preserved the involvement of the audience, whereas in *The Maid's Tragedy* in 1997, the appearance of stage management on stage during the breaks broke the spell. In other less familiar plays, e.g. *The Honest Whore*, many people think the long break is the end and leave.

One suggestion made in response to these problems was to have a flexible interval system, dependent on the weather (short if it rains, long if it is very hot).

The case of The Merchant of Venice

Two participants expressed their frustration at not having been able to cry out "for shame" to the Christian characters when they forced Shylock to convert or in support of his reproaches to them for mistreating him. Was it fear of the neighbours? Experience shows that it is easy to participate in a light-hearted fashion by shouting witty comments or supplying help to characters in difficulty, but in spite of all his efforts Norbert Kentrup was not able to get audience members to express their anger. In fact he told several participants that he was more interested in the silent reaction of the majority than in the obscene cheering of those who approved of the forced conversion.

Mark Rylance explained the point of view he and Richard Olivier had chosen for this production. According to them, Shylock was a Jew and a villain, but there was no connection between those two facts. They deliberately ignored the fact that the Elizabethans did see a connection, but definitely not that the Holocaust had taken place. Their purpose was to hold up a mirror to present audiences, in the hope that the anti-semites would be seen and shamed. Mark was surprised and pained by the reactions of the press and many audience members, but wondered whether the cheering had not simply been happening silently in other theatres. He also noted that no one reacted in the same way to the booing of the French in *Henry V* in 1997, which had surprised both actors and directors from the very first performance on, and in fact reduced some of the American actors playing the French to tears. He wondered if reactions might have been different if 6 million French citizens had been slaughtered fifty years ago.

Rosalind King and other participants objected that many people had indeed been disturbed, and felt that the booing was directly caused by the staging, e.g. by the actors pausing after every insult about the French. She saw it as a consequence of the Artistic Directorate's encouragement to boo and hiss,

which she contends is based solely on anti-theatrical testimonies from the 16th and 17th century and produces anti-historical behaviour such as the throwing of rotten eggs or *baguettes*. She also saw the booing as counterproductive to the complexity of Shakespeare's plays: Henry's speech at Harfleur, threatening rape and violence, should clearly make audiences feel uncomfortable, an effect that can only be lost if the French are systematically booed.

Mark Rylance replied that the brutality shown in both *Henry V* and *The Merchant of Venice* is necessary to bring about the accession to grace that comes after it in act V of both plays. He added that the actors are indeed beginning to learn how to steer the audience: the groundlings booing Shylock in the Trial scene had been doing so in response to Salerio's quietly hissing as he entered. When Neil D'Souza gave this up, the booing immediately stopped.

The conclusion reached is that no one is at present consciously encouraging booing and hissing, but also that both actors and audiences are educating themselves from year to year. Finally, because no two performances are alike, it is very difficult to calculate a staging in terms of audience response.

Finally David Fielder pointed out that the last performance of the season, where audience participation reaches unprecedented heights, turns into an event rather than the representation of a story, and is not necessarily the most enjoyable for the actors.

Modern dress versus authentic clothing

It is still unclear how big a factor of reception the choice of dress represents. *The Merchant of Venice* was made very remote by its Venetian costumes. *A Mad World, My Masters* failed to define the Puritanical environment that forced the characters to behave the way they do. One experiment envisaged is to present the same production alternately in modern and authentic dress. In fact, Richard Olivier is organising a workshop for American lawyers on 31 October, where act IV of *The Merchant of Venice* will be performed in modern dress on the Globe stage.

Afternoon Session

Peter Kyle expressed his confusion as to the purpose of the Review Conference and wondered if the present group was the most appropriate to carry it out. Too much time was being spent on discussing the actor-audience relationship: it seems fairly obvious that spectators gather to the front because they want to see what is in the Discovery Space or what is happening on the thrust bed. He was fascinated to hear that not all academics agreed with Andrew Gurr's positions on the use of the stage.

Professor Andrew Gurr's paper

Professor Gurr reminded participants that the very first Review Conference in 1996 had been called a post-mortem. The first full-blown conference was in 1997. He made several points and expanded on the ones listed in his paper (see annex 2), and participants answered some of them.

Staging

1. The end of the Opening Season produced more three-dimensional work than any of this year's productions.

Some participants responded that a play like *A Mad World, My Masters* was completely different when seen from the back of the stage and the front: only half of it was visible from the Lords' Rooms. Sitting in the Gentlemen's Rooms made it very hard to get involved because the staging was too far front, except in the play within the play. Claire van Kampen objected that the whole production team had ceaselessly repeated to the actors that they should open up and avoid the pillars, and yet they constantly slipped back into the "Valley of Death", some of them in fact confessing their attraction to the security it seems to afford. It was also a production that used diagonals extensively.

Mark Rylance stated that all actors find it counter-instinctive to play to the sides because there are so few people there. Andrew Gurr objected that it was a problem of the chicken and the egg, because groundlings do not realise that there are good spaces on the sides, under the Gentlemen's Rooms. According to him, the responsibility for bringing audience members to the sides of the stage rests with the stage, not with the audience.

David Rintoul stated that diagonals are important, as all directors have noted, but he felt that compared to the Sheffield Crucible or Chichester, circles were even more effective at the Globe. Morris Perry added that one of the principles of playing in the round is never to face one another directly.

The problem of the Lords' Rooms is that there are very few spectators up there, versus one thousand more or less facing the stage. The modern equivalent of rich patrons might be casting directors and film producers. It would certainly be useful to have spectators sitting there in rehearsal, to make actors aware that they have their back to someone earlier on in the season.

It was also noted that actors didn't look up enough - from the upper gallery in *The Honest Whore*, only dead faces were visible. According to Mark Rylance it's not just actors who have lost the habit of looking up, it's a general feature of 20th century life: we don't see the decorations that were placed high up on buildings, even on the Empire State Building.

2. *The Merchant of Venice* company handled audience reactions in a more sophisticated and controlled way than in *Henry V*. Not being able to cry out "shame" was less problematic than last year.
3. The doors. There is a lot of debate among scholars on whether naming a "green carpet" is descriptive or suggestive. The same applies to knocking on a door. Booth theatres, for instance, only had curtains, no wooden doors. Elizabethan doors could very easily be lifted off their hinges. If an actor has to close the door himself, it can become very cumbersome.

David Fielder answered that he disliked the conceptual use of the doors: choosing from which door to enter for a symbolic reason (one door representing the Court or Shylock's house etc.) simply got in the way. Both companies agreed that it was far more effective to

base the choice on practical reasons: which one is the closest etc.

Imaginary doors were created very effectively by the actors (e.g. John McEnery) in *A Mad World, My Masters*.

4. On the basis of the performances of *The Merchant of Venice*, there is good hope for tragedy at the Globe, in spite of the mixed reception *The Maid's Tragedy* aroused.

Speed and length of performance

Telling the story more quickly may well work better here than we believe. Professor Gurr has seen a satisfactory production of *Romeo and Juliet* that lasted under 2 hours, and also appreciated the wonderful briskness of *A Mad World, My Masters*. Ben Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* is clearly stated to have lasted 2 and ½ hours, and it is the longest play in the repertoire, along with *Hamlet* and *Richard III*. The Elizabethans were obviously far more ruthless about cutting than we think. Shakespeare wrote more than necessary because he enjoyed it, but he knew his texts would be cut. In response, several actors noted that living playwrights expect to cut their texts in rehearsal.

Andrew Gurr stated that the five choruses in *Henry V* were probably always cut, as in the Quarto, but Rosalind King and Richard Proudfoot objected that this was a subject of intense controversy. David Rintoul, on the other hand, recalled cutting 400 lines from the text of *Hamlet* 15 years ago, and achieving a result that almost matched the Quarto.

According to Peter Kyle, people come to the Globe for a social occasion of which the play is a part. They may very well want to dwell here longer. But Andrew Gurr responded that movies usually last two hours at the longest. Was that not tale-telling about people's attention span?

David Fielder objected that present audiences do not have the vocabulary and information academics master, so that playing too fast would make the plays impossible to understand for most people. Rosalind King and Pauline Kiernan replied that quickness and pace were very different things.

Morris Perry wondered to what extent we have the skills to make sense of complex texts. All actors have to help is their range of inflection, to break texts down for audiences. He felt we would need listeners to tell them how much they understood. He wondered how Shakespeare's actors coped, especially young boys who had to play such complex scenes as the Rosalind-Celia or Portia-Nerissa exchanges.

The Globe is reviving the story-telling quality of the plays as against their poetic dimension. Yet however difficult the text is to follow, the pleasure and enjoyment of hearing Shakespeare's words is not diminished.

The Globe Repertoire (and the use of the yard)

1. *The Merchant of Venice* was originally written for the Theatre, though it was later staged at the Globe. *As You Like It* was the first play ever written specifically for the Globe, yet this production made least use of the historical specificity of the space: the trees, the literalness of the set, the use of the yard all went against what we know of Renaissance staging.

David Fielder answered that his instinct is that in the period the yard was not used, but we are not in the period. The wrestling scene in *As You Like It* forced the audience to adapt all the time: it was a useful ploy with a modern audience, to change their attitude and make them discover something about the atmosphere of a Renaissance theatre. Peter Kyle, for his part, enjoyed the use of the whole space in *As You Like It* as well as in *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside* in 1997: how can we not respond as we are today to such an extraordinary space?

Professor Gurr agreed that there is a good case for a radical spread of production styles at the Globe, but felt that it was a pity that *As You Like It*, of all productions should have been so free. He did recognise it as a wonderfully successful production, if only because of its commercial success. He conceded that the wrestling did sufficiently discompose and force the activity of the process on the audience. But he felt this should not be repeated too often.

2. Sixty plays were written for the Globe, fourteen of them by Shakespeare. It is important to explore these 46 others, (rather than the non-Globe repertoire), especially since we have seen the success of the non-Shakespearean plays this year and last year. He noted that *The Maid's Tragedy* was the Globe's boldest choice to date, and typical of the kind of play that should be performed here.

Mark Rylance agreed that we should strive to choose Globe plays, but also the best of the plays written for other amphitheatres, like *The Honest Whore*, which was first performed at the Fortune. He would also like to introduce Greek and Roman amphitheatre plays, and later on modern plays written with the Globe in mind. He added that many actors resent having to play Middleton or Dekker, and return to Shakespeare with gratitude.

Several participants revealed that the non-Shakespeare plays were made popular by the lack of ticket availability for the two Shakespeare productions, but the outcome was generally that they were glad of the experience. It was noted that in the height of the season, there were 19 days in a row without a main-house Shakespeare production, which seemed a pity. Patrick Spottiswoode thought that it was a mistake to market the four plays together on one poster: a more costly but more specific and aggressive marketing approach might be necessary.

The idea of a Repertoire Committee was envisaged in the afternoon session, as some academics had suggested setting one up. The point was that academics might be of help in picking from the 609 Elizabethan, Jacobean and Caroline plays and the modernised versions (e.g. Brecht's *Edward II* and *Coriolanus*). They could simplify the process of choice for directors, especially if the group was informal and avoided the problems created by recommendations that might then be rejected. However, Mark Rylance felt that he needs great flexibility as Artistic Director, in order to preserve the dedication of the directors and the sense of meaning of a season, which usually centres around a given theme or set of themes. He quoted the examples of *Henry V*, a rough production whose faults he recognises, but that benefited from a wonderful company spirit, and of *The Maid's Tragedy*, a choice made by director Lucy Bailey in preference over *A King and No King* that he himself had recommended.

The problem of evidence

Andrew Gurr proposed that the roof extension should be made of oak shingles: one such remain was found in the Rose excavations. It would suppress the dripping if we replaced the present extension.

Mark Rylance objected that he was nervous about making decisions based on one remnant from another playhouse, and was not even necessarily convinced that "All the world's a stage" was an advertisement for the Globe. He is happy to refrain from using the yard, yet worried about the quality of the evidence.

Andrew Gurr replied that positive evidence, however small, weighs more than negative evidence. We do know that *As You Like It*, *Henry V* and *Julius Caesar* were written in 1599 and performed at the Globe.

Mark Rylance agreed that we should explore fields where we do have positive evidence. He restated that Lucy Bailey had attempted to make the theatre one place thanks to the rough hangings. He also confided that he had a hard time preventing Norbert Kentrup from using the yard.

Other questions

The Discovery Space and the Tiring House

David Fielder did not like the grotto effect created in the Discovery Space in *As You Like It*: It did not help as an actor to have to scoot through pretty things before beginning to act, and it complicated entrances that are difficult enough to handle without cue-lights. Mark Rylance added that the result of the deep Discovery Space was to separate the Tiring House into two sides, whereas in all other productions the Tiring House is actually part of the stage, a waiting area for all actors together. In fact, Jenny Tiramani, the Globe designer, would like to replace the electric light used back there by candlelight (effect?).

To actors worried about playing in the Discovery Space without light, Andrew Gurr replied that when it represented a study, it would have had a candle on the desk. Actors would only be discovered there, and would almost immediately come out for their speeches, if only because of the spectators sitting in the Lords' Rooms or Gentlemen's Rooms.

In *A Mad World, My Masters*, the Discovery Space was used to great effect in at least two scenes.

- When Harebrain discovered his wife with Penitent Brothel, he had the whole depth of the central opening to arrive from, making it possible for the lovers to stand under the Heavens trap, the most powerful spot on the stage. This would not have been possible had he simply walked out of closed curtains.
- In the scene where the Courtesan and her mother tricked Follywit, they were seen plotting together at the back of the Discovery Space then in front of the side doors, thus taking in the whole audience. Belinda Davison found this effect subtler and less attention grabbing than simply emerging from or poking her head through closed curtains (as the evidence suggests clowns did).

In *The Merchant of Venice*, it was a late decision to have the caskets hidden in the Discovery Space: it had the effect of creating a temple with a hidden altar, enhancing the mystery. It also prevented most of the audience from shouting advice out to the choosers.

Professor Proudfoot pointed out that we don't really know what the Central Opening was used for, except for thrusting out large pieces of furniture, like beds - as was done very effectively in both Middleton plays. He was afraid playing scenes within the Discovery Space might seem very static - though worth experimenting. Graham Christopher and Philip Bird replied that hiding one part of a scene to one part of the audience makes them concentrate on the other part: actors versus caskets, speakers versus watchers. It encourages actors to focus more on the essential part of acting that consists of making the audience sense they are listening - not just see them listening. It also forces the audience itself to listen more attentively.

In *As You Like It*, the arrival into Arden and the entrance of Hymen were highlights of the spectacle, and some participants felt that audience-members who missed them were excluded. Others really enjoyed the ripple of laughter or amazement that went through the yard as the characters came on. The actors already on stage were also adepts at using their hands and bodies to signal arrivals of characters that were not visible to all the audience.

Music

According to Peter Kyle, the Globe is one of the theatres that is most like a concert hall in London. Yet Claire van Kampen stated that it will be a long time before our audience become more sensitised to music. She finds it very difficult to write for this space, whichever instruments are used. In theory, for example, the trumpets and cornets underlining the text in act V of *The Merchant of Venice* would have to be behind doors, way back in the Tiring House.

Focus and language

In the courtroom scene in *The Merchant of Venice*, the focus was very hard to establish. There was a raging argument in rehearsal as to the staging of that difficult scene. It emerged that it was up to the actors to establish the focus, since there is no lighting at the Globe. Many felt that modern actors are too complacent about leaving the focussing work to the projectors. The company worked on ways of creating focus by expressing curiosity, through deliberate movements or on the contrary, through complete stillness. Marcello Magni, for instance, insisted that focus would best be created by his total absence of movement in the Candido scenes in *The Honest Whore*.

Mark Rylance is concerned that we need to find the same kind of focus in the realm of sound: consonants must be developed without compressing vowels, speed must be gained without compromising comprehension. Mary McNulty suggested that the use of regional voices is already helping, since many accents (especially Northern ones) have sharper consonants and franker vowels.

Why are there two companies?

Two companies are necessary to keep the pace of the season: a huge amount of energy is necessary to present 11 performances per week. Over the past 2 years, the companies have not been able to merge, and have developed very different personalities: the White Company has been more Saturnine and argumentative, they have struggled with their plays (*The Merchant of Venice* in 1998, *The Winter's Tale* in 1997), whereas the Red Company has been very united around "happier" plays (*Henry V* in 1997, *As You Like It* in 1998).

The stage and auditorium

To Andrew Gurr's suggestion that the doors should have grilles and hinges making removal easier Maralyn Sarrington answered that there were several such grilles already, and that the doors are indeed very easy to remove, and several productions have already involved playing without doors.

The pillars are still a problem: the square pedestals block off the view at the bottom and emphasise the Proscenium effect.

Unity in the auditorium could be obtained with dark red hangings which might also improve the acoustics in the lower gallery. The yard surface could be painted in bull's blood, as is done in Switzerland – this would also act as a varnish.

Several actors pointed out that the dressing-rooms are too far from the wardrobe with 4 plays running simultaneously.

Evening session: looking forward

The format of the Review Conference

Patrick Spottiswoode once again brought up the question of whether the present format was the most appropriate for the Season Review - a confrontation of theory and practice, of academics and actors in a meeting with haphazard participation. Should the meeting not take place earlier and have a more focussed agenda?

Several answers were made:

Mark Rylance felt that there was information for all in such a meeting - for the guides, actor-teachers, the Artistic Directorate, the academics and for Globe Education. It is important that academics like Andrew Gurr should hold their hard line and have the artistic teams throw rotten eggs at him, and it is also important for Globe Research to publish the feedback from the actors and directors.

Pauline Kiernan stated that an earlier meeting might attract more people, but asserting opinions before the end of the season might be detrimental to the spirit of the productions and to the actors' morale. David Fielder agreed that there was greater freedom and clarity for the actors at the end of the season, and added that during the season, the actors needed their time off! He felt that the ad-hoc nature of the event was actually useful.

Jerry Link pointed out that American scholars who might want to take part in the Conference can usually only stay in the UK until mid-August, so they are almost automatically excluded.

Jonathan Bond suggested that if academics formulated questions at the beginning of the season for contemplation and review by the actors at the end of the season, it would help them express their ideas and impressions.

In this way, the meeting could become an open forum of ideas for the companies rather than a post-mortem analysis.

And if it took place in the mid-season break, it could also involve the suggestion of alternate staging ideas to directors and actors, for experimentation during the season.

Ushers and box-office staff should be invited to the meeting, as well as academics who disagree with Andrew Gurr, e.g. on the use of the yard, so that the picture could be complete.

It might be useful to provide a digest of the letters of complaint received during the season at the Review Conference (NB this year they were mostly negative about the catering, but many of them had to do with restricted view or took position on the production choices of *The Merchant of Venice*).

The conclusion was that however imperfect the format, this type of meeting is extremely helpful to all parties involved.

The 40 principles of the 1997 Review Conference and publication policy

Elspeth Udvardhely was concerned that the Globe is still in the midst of growing pains, and wondered whether we should not be careful about how much we release to the world at this early point of our existence. Mark Rylance and Andrew Gurr answered that the 40 principles published after last year's conference were only the results of a think-tank, a set of personal statements and recommendations which need to be regarded as such and published accordingly. They are neither house-rules nor intangible, but an open list to which more and more ideas will be added, in conferences such as the present one. Reactions are invited to the principles proposed last year and this year, and in fact it is clear that not all participants agreed with all of them. For instance, there was no general agreement on the three rules of thumb proposed by the OSC (see Andrew Gurr's paper, A.4). A new set of proposals was then elaborated by the participants for the use of the theatre department in view of next year's season.

Proposals made at the 1998 Globe Review Conference

Actor preparation

- On arrival, give the actors a tour of the Theatre, a talk about the rebuilding project and the work of Globe Education.
- Focus on clarity from the very beginning of the season with the *help* of co-actors.
- Since we cannot guarantee that any seat will offer unrestricted view at all times, put every effort into improving audibility at all times.
- Devote more time to verse-speaking work.
- Leader Hawkins' "vulgar fraction" - In Burbage's day, an actor was one in 5 million. Now we are one in 55 million. As a result we now feel smaller. If we want to work in this space, we have to be bigger, within ourselves as well as in volume. It will express itself in greater audibility and physical expression.
- More rehearsal time on stage.
- More vocal and physical exercises on stage, involving both companies together.
- Because the Globe is an intensely physical theatre, remember that physical preparation is essential.
- Involve the musicians much earlier in the rehearsal process and provide more musical rehearsals with the actors: they enjoy it and it is a useful discipline.
- Actors and researchers should listen to what has resonance to the space in the text of the plays, e.g. "pillars", "temple", "all the world's a stage" etc.

- Work on improvisational skills
- Remember that emotional conditions are boring and opt rather to be eloquent and active.

Rehearsals and the Theatre

- Introduce the acting companies to the tour-guides.
- Take advantage of the ushers and guides' sympathy and invite them to be part of the "innocent" audience members allowed into rehearsal.
- Use the tours as audience, invite them to use the whole space, and acknowledge them rather than enduring them.
- Invite small groups of children to rehearsal.
- Invite the box-office staff to see the plays early on in the season, or even during rehearsal time, so that they understand what they are selling to the public.
- Continue the ongoing relation between Education and Theatre departments, so that the actor-teachers and guides can understand the ethos of the productions.
- Because nothing the present rehearsal rooms can give any indication of the reality of the space, make every effort to provide rehearsal rooms that are more like the Globe auditorium. (**NB** plans for such rooms exist and are dependent on fund-raising.)

Authenticity and staging

- Learn the Elizabethan skill of giving focus in the absence of light.
- Let us not be restricted by authentic practice.
- Let us keep the brief on authenticity as broad as possible: not just matter but also spirit.
- Continue the discussion on whether to embrace playing in the round, and the architectural decisions it implies, e.g. reducing the handrail.
- Ban sofas on stage.
- Try using curtains instead of the side doors
- Introduce a seat-share system.
- Introduce more shows with several 2 minute breaks instead of the single 15 minute break.
- Experiment with Hermogenes' seven styles of speech:
 - Clarity
 - Grandeur
 - Beauty
 - Speed
 - Ethos
 - Verity
 - Gravity