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1. Introduction

A theatrical production lives – or dies – through its effect on an audience, and that should be an important part of any study of Shakespeare’s plays in performance.

- John Russell Brown

Particularly in The Globe: in the shared light, and the unprecedented embrace of that wooden O, in the collective imagination and the connection and communication between story, storyteller and audience, that is where the plays breathe.

- Michelle Terry, Artistic Director at Shakespeare’s Globe

I revel in my own love for theatre and performance, and challenge myself to write from within that feeling, rather than masking that sustaining primary emotion behind a veil of abstraction or obfuscation.

- Jill Dolan

More than 400 years after Shakespeare’s death, his plays live on in theatres around the world. How his texts should be interpreted for a postmodern stage presents a challenge for today’s theatre practitioners; how they are received, however, lies in the hands of the audience. The reconstructed Shakespeare’s Globe on Bankside in London has taken on the daunting task of searching for a middle ground between original and modern theatre practices to examine the effects of the unique playing conditions the theatre offers to actors and audiences. Because of the resulting practices, Shakespeare’s Globe “has become famous for its lively interplay between stage and audience.” Audience interaction, mostly facilitated by the shared light and other spatial properties, has sparked discussion about the role of the Globe audience in a performance and their relationship

---


with the actors. Furthermore, questions of how actors adapt to the performance space and the strategies they may employ to keep the audience’s attention have come into focus. Research in this field of audience studies could gain insights into the effects of performing Shakespeare’s plays in a space similar to his original theatre on spectators and actors.

Even though performance would not exist without audiences, surprisingly little research has been conducted about them. Only in more recent years have some major books been published about the experience of audiences in the theatre. Susan Bennett’s work, for example, counts towards the most important publications on audiences. For this thesis, in particular, books and essays about Shakespeare and audience have been consulted: Purcell, Kiernan, Kattwinkel, Werner, Woods, and Kenny, for instance, have added notable contributions to the discussion. Yet, some scholars name research gaps which they claim still need to be filled. Brown states that “the progressive experience of the audience during a performance” requires consideration; Bennett, on the other hand, mentions another field of neglect concerning audience research: the relationship between production and reception “for specific cultural environments, for specific types of theatre.” In addition, Kattwinkel points out the importance of research on audience as community by analysing audience participation. It is a combination of these opinions on possible research gaps in the field of audience and performance studies, that has led to the research question of this thesis. Additionally, the three quotes at the beginning of this introduction reflect the topic and the method employed. Firstly, Brown stresses the importance of the audience in any analysis of Shakespeare performance.
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15 See Kattwinkel, “Introduction”, xvi.
16 See Brown, “Shakespeare’s”, 212.
Accordingly, a recurring focus on the audience constitutes one of the key principles in this thesis. Secondly, artistic director Terry intuitively describes the basis for my interaction model: “the connection and communication between story, storyteller and audience.” Lastly, Dolan’s comment on writing about theatre alludes to my approach to studying performance: taking my own experiences seriously and using them as a starting point to describe the effects of audience interaction.

The aim of the thesis is to analyse audience interaction at Shakespeare’s Globe in London, exploring the influence of the theatre’s unique performance space and playing conditions on spectators and actors. The research will be conducted under the premise that audience interaction in this particular performance context can lead to a feeling of ‘togetherness’ or community (communitas). To achieve the aim of this thesis, the ‘new’ Globe’s unique performance space will be explored, various performance theories will be considered, and interviews with directors and actors will be discussed. Additionally, the research will be informed by my own experience as a Globe audience member and my notes from live performances. In an attempt to create a list of strategies for audience interaction, which have been applied at the Globe, possible foundations for interaction will be examined and an interaction model with performance parameters will be established. The strategies will be illustrated by specific examples from performances to show possible instances of audience interaction and their effects during a performance at Shakespeare’s Globe.

Because studying an audience “implies a shift from interpreting an aesthetic object to studying the cognitive and emotional responses of actual human beings,” an analysis may result in certain challenges. Terminological difficulties may arise, as there exist many names for audiences, for example ‘playgoers’ or ‘spectators’. Literally the term ‘spectators’ would determine audience members as mere ‘onlookers’; however, I would like to stress that I apply these terms interchangeably to describe audiences without implying any specific meanings. Additionally, drawing conclusions from audience reactions can be problematic, as audiences are comprised of individuals and performance
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may be influenced by a host of different parameters; this means that no performance will be completely identical. This is why this thesis attempts to avoid generalisations about audiences at the Globe. By establishing strategies which can be applied by actors and mostly leaving reactions by audiences open to interpretation, this thesis merely offers accounts of possible instances of audience interaction. General effects on Globe audiences are suggested tentatively. Instead of dictating how an audience should react or feel, I refer to my own experience and observations from performances. Therefore, the list of interaction strategies does not make a claim to completion. Directors and actors in different productions may make use of more or less of the strategies suggested.

To arrive at these strategies, a combination of methods will be employed. The thesis adopts aspects from more than one theory, because multiple ways of thinking have proven useful in the comparatively young field of audience studies: approaches from semiotics and cognitive science, in addition to concepts by Turner and Dolan on the effects of interaction, will be considered. Concerning the influence of opinions and experiences by actors and directors on the argument of this thesis, I follow McConachie’s approach that, while theatre practitioners may not “make the best critics and historians”, “their knowledge from an artist’s perspective”20 should not be underestimated in terms of determining the effects of performance on audiences. This is why interviews with actors and directors from the Globe Archive, as well as essays by people active in theatre practice, have been chosen to inform the strategies for audience interaction and to illustrate the examples taken from my own observations. The method of including my own experiences from performances stems from the methodology Kattwinkel deems most suitable for the study of theatrical events: “participant observation, a technique taken from anthropology and performance studies.”21 This technique implies that “the scholar must be willing to take part fully as an audience member, which likely means leaving all objectivity at the door and participating herself.”22 Hereby, experiential knowledge of a performance can be gained, which may lead to a conclusion closer to actual audience perception. Following Wood’s model of observing performance as an individual23, I offer

22 Ibid., xi.
23 See Woods, Globe, 55-56.
my own experience from the perspective of a student, a tourist, and somebody who has acted on a stage before, always combined with accounts by artists, scholarly research and performance theories.

First, theoretical approaches towards audience reception and interaction will be compared to arrive at the main theories for this thesis. This will be achieved by discussing scholarly criticism from the fields of reader-response theory, semiotics, phenomenology and cognitive science; in addition, advances in empirical research will be addressed. Secondly, questions of the reconstructed Globe as a paradoxical performance space between authentic early modern theatre and postmodern innovation will be addressed by contrasting opinions of researchers, theorists, and actors. The goal of this chapter is to arrive at the Globe’s foundations for interaction. Then a simple interaction model will be used to demonstrate the parameters found crucial for audience interaction in this particular performance context. The supposed influences of each parameter on audience interaction will be discussed in detail. On the grounds of these findings, the next chapter establishes a tentative list of interaction strategies found to be applied by actors and directors at the Globe. Finally, the alleged feelings of ‘energy’ and ‘togetherness’ emanating from an audience at the Globe will be discussed by means of the concepts by Turner (communitas) and Dolan (‘utopian performative’).

2. Understanding the Audience: Approaches in Performance Theory

The spectator has been in the limelight of performance studies for decades now. It is widely accepted, for example, that a theatrical event needs an audience to be considered a performance. This is the case because, other than a prose text, a performance is not a completed product, but a process which relies on elaborate communication between spectator and stage.24 There is no doubt, then, that a spectator’s involvement in theatrical performance requires analysis; however, as Sarah Werner claims in an essay on audiences in Shakespeare, “there is rarely sufficient questioning of what it is that audiences do.”25 The theories proposed to fill this research gap are manifold, rooted in other fields of
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research, and often contradicting. Even though no “Theory That Explains It All To You” has emerged to date, many attempts have been made to conceive a theory which is most apt to investigate the role of the audience and its interaction with the stage in theatrical performance.

**Reader-response Theory**

Developed in the 1960s and 1970s, reader-response theory constituted a first step towards understanding how a reader, or – in this case – a spectator derives meaning from a text (including performance text). Reader-response theory’s notion of “inferential completion”, a process by which a reader fills gaps in a text with their own creative thoughts, seemed to be a useful concept for theatre studies to explain the spectator’s contribution to the meaning of a performance. Additionally, reader-response theory sought to problematise the dominance of the author in the production of meaning, which, applied to the theatre, means that the spectator is of equal importance to the playwright when it comes to making meaning of a play. The two central figures supporting the theory were Wolfgang Iser and Hans Robert Jauss, having coined terms like “horizon of expectation” and “implied reader”, which became prevalent concepts in literary studies. In Iser’s discussion of reader-response theory, he openly acknowledges that the interaction between a literary work’s structure and its recipient is dominating the reading process. Iser also pointed out that, as opposed to social interaction, reading does not offer the possibility of face-to-face interaction: “A text cannot adapt itself to each reader it comes into contact with.” This poses an interesting thought for performance
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studied because what has been rendered impossible for a written text by Iser, can be implemented on stage; performance does involve face-to-face interaction and it can be adapted to an audience during the process. Hence, performance is never entirely the same. Additionally, because with theatrical performances the “reading time is controlled by the performer and not the audience, any opportunities for review […] have the potential to provoke an intensity of activity.”\(^{35}\) This argument by Bennett may stem from Iser’s reasoning that a reader benefits from gaps in a text, as they stimulate imagination and, therefore, “even trivial scenes can seem surprisingly profound.”\(^{36}\) Even though reader-response has contributed notably to the field of literary studies and, consequently, to theatre studies, Bennett puts forward some points of criticism. She acknowledges that the theory shines light on receptive processes, but all the while finds fault in its failure to address the influence of the dramatic text or performance itself. While reading constitutes an experience usually enjoyed privately, watching a performance is inherently different due to the event’s social and productive elements, Bennett argues.\(^{37}\) Certainly, these points count to the reasons why reader-response theory fell out of favour as early as in the 1980s.\(^{38}\) However, the theory has left its marks on critical performance theory. Without it, it is highly doubtful theorists of the twentieth century would have developed such interest for the interactive role of the spectator in theatrical performance.\(^{39}\)

**Theatre Semiotics**

Following Ferdinand de Saussure’s theory of language, the subdiscipline of theatre semiotics (the study of sign systems in performance contexts) transpired.\(^{40}\) The theory is based on Saussure’s claim that “[t]exts are comprehensible only in relation to the structures that govern our expectation”,\(^{41}\) an understanding that reiterates arguments from reader-response theory. Semiotic theory used to rather give prominence to the interplay

\(^{36}\) Iser, “Spectator”, 182.
\(^{38}\) See Balme, *Cambridge*, 39.
\(^{39}\) See Bennett, *Audiences*, 36.
\(^{40}\) See Balme, *Cambridge*, 78.
\(^{41}\) Purcell, *Shakespeare*, 28. See Purcell’s chapter “Making Sense of the Stage” for a more detailed account of the beginnings of semiotic theory.
between text and mise en scène, than to the interaction between stage and spectator. However, in a similar way as reader-response theory, semiotics now seeks to stress the central role of the spectator in theatre practice. The influential theatre semiotician Keir Elam, for example, states: “It is with the spectator […] that theatrical communication begins and ends.” Even though one of the base concepts of theatre semiotics is the de-or re-codifying of text by the spectator, Elam suggests that, more importantly, the spectator serves as the motivator of theatrical communication “through a series of actions at once practical and symbolic, of which the first is the simple act of buying a ticket.” In addition to Elam, other semioticicians, for example Pavis and de Marinis, have explained the cycle of communication that is set in motion by the spectator. The cycle works through the signs that are transmitted by the stage, and then received by the audience, who, in turn, produce responses, often taking the shape of signs for the stage. Due to their inherent liveness, theatre performances require “constant interaction between senders and receivers of signs”, according to semiotic theory. The semiotic cycle of communication, then, serves as one explanation of the process behind audience interaction.

Offering new ideas and solutions to making sense of audiences in the theatre, the “understanding of the theatre as a multi-layered sign-system has become highly influential”, and still remains one of the most important theories in critical performance theory. The audience’s role in this sign-system is to decode multiple systems in the same instant. This means, in Purcell’s words, that a spectator has to be “aware of both the actor and the character whom the actor is portraying; of the material reality of the stage set, and of the fictional location which it represents.” Bennett explains that there are two types of signs for the audience to decode: signs, which are part of the actor (language, voice, movement, and physical appearance), and signs, which are not (set, props, lighting, sound, and music). Building her main argument on semiotic theory, Bennett stresses the importance of examining the interrelationship of different signs to arrive at the audience’s
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50 See Bennett, *Audiences*, 149.
role within the system. In addition to the interpretation of stage signs, most researchers working in the area of semiotic theory suggest that signs communicated by the audience are equally important. Alter, for example, proposes a list of possible signs from the audience which includes loud and clear signs like applause, whistling, laughter, verbal comments, and standing up; additionally, he also mentions less obvious signs like private conversations, snores, sniffling, snickers, and creaking seats. The director Vsevolod Meyerhold even went so far as to analyse his productions, utilising a code of signs he conceived as part of an attempt to review the effects a performance may have on an audience. These are the signs he recorded from his audiences:

a silence; b noise; c loud noise; d collective reading; e singing; f coughing; g knocks or bangs; h scuffling; i exclamations; j weeping; k laughter; l sighs; m action and animation; n applause; o whistling; p catcalls, hisses; q people leaving; r people getting out of their seats; s throwing of objects; t people getting onto stage

However, interpreting signs like these correctly can be a difficult task, particularly for actors who try to adapt their actions to the audience’s responses. Does silence mean apprehensiveness or boredom? Does laughter designate amusement or ridicule? Depending on the context, the same sign could signify a multitude of meanings, which also raises problems for researchers. Purcell argues that, while analysing overall audience response can be interesting, it only “gives an inevitably subjective and impressionistic account, […] and may neglect resistant, nuanced, or minority reactions.” Furthermore, the semiotic content changes with every performance, rendering a repeat of the exact same arrangement of signs impossible. However, it is not only the changing sign systems on stage that influence the meaning of individual performances, but the spectator as well. Semiotic theory claims that due to “the complexity and openness of signification on the stage”, individual spectators may “focus their attention in any number of ways”,

51 See ibid., 71.
52 See Alter, Theory, 266 and Elam, Semiotics, 96.
53 See Alter, Theory, 266.
55 See Alter, Theory, 266.
56 Purcell, Shakespeare, 16.
which is why “no two spectators see exactly the same play”,\(^{58}\) making it harder for researchers to analyse the influence of signs on the whole audience.

Because of the problems concerning audience analysis and other perceived flaws, theatre semiotics has been subject to criticism by researchers. Balme, for example, blames the preeminent influence of semiotics on theatre theory in the 1970s and 1980s for the neglect of spectator research,\(^{59}\) while Kennedy criticises semiotic theory’s tendency to see actors as transmitters and spectators merely as receivers.\(^{60}\) According to semiotic theory, then, a performance could only be deemed successful if the spectators decoded the received signs as intended by the producers and actors.\(^{61}\) Therefore, more recent branches of semiotics have adapted the theory to include empirical studies\(^{62}\) and cultural studies, stressing the social nature of performance to arrive at the most popular model of semiotic theory,\(^{63}\) summed up by Keir Elam:

> Every spectator’s interpretation of the text is in effect a new construction of it according to the cultural and ideological disposition of the subject […] It is the spectator who must make sense of the performance for himself, a fact that is disguised by the apparent passivity of the audience. However judicious or aberrant the spectator’s decodification, the final responsibility for the meaning and coherence of what he constructs is his.\(^{64}\)

This definition of theatre semiotics describes an independent, active spectator with their own predisposed experiences influencing the meaning of the performance, which is their own construct. However, Kennedy also raises a valid point when he states that “a semiotic scheme to explain spectatorship is an incomplete procedure that takes insufficient account of interactivity”\(^{65}\). To be able to analyse audience interaction, alternative theories will have to be considered.

\(^{58}\) Ibid., 91.
\(^{59}\) See Balme, *Cambridge*, 34.
\(^{62}\) See Balme, *Cambridge*, 40 for an example on how empirical research can be included.
\(^{63}\) See Purcell, *Shakespeare*, 32.
\(^{64}\) Elam, *Semiotics*, 95.
\(^{65}\) Kennedy, *Spectator*, 12.
Phenomenology

Recognised as a critique of semiotic theory, phenomenology – “the study of immediate subjective experience” ⁶⁶ – stems from philosophical thinking established at the end of the nineteenth century by Husserl.⁶⁷ The emphasis lies on phenomenological theory’s attempts “to reclaim the materiality of props, lighting, stage space, costumes, and of course the human body itself from a theory that would reduce such things to signs.”⁶⁸ According to Balme, this mode of approaching performance constitutes a change of focus towards the spectator; instead of analysing “an aesthetic object”, researchers study “the cognitive and emotional responses of actual human beings.”⁶⁹ A major figure in the study of phenomenology, Merleau-Ponty dedicated his writings to the so-called ‘embodied consciousness’,⁷⁰ “the mind-brain’s dependence on the body’s concrete situatedness within the physical and social world that encompasses it.”⁷¹ Iser showed interest in this concept by regarding literary art a phenomenon which “manifests itself to the consciousness” ⁷² during the reading process, thereby setting the text and the reader in motion. He concluded that the actions in response to a text should be included in the analysis of literary art.⁷³ Applied to performance theory, this means that the embodied consciousness of a spectator is affected by performance, sparking bodily engagement. Theatre scholars today adopt phenomenology to describe processes that go beyond verbal properties: the lived-in experience of spectators and the “thingness of theatre and of performance in general.”⁷⁴

Like many other researchers critical of semiotics as the only theory describing performance processes, Bert O. States sought out phenomenology to write about the relationship between actors and spectators. When he describes responses by the audience (e.g. laughter and silence), which semioticians would classify as signs, he yields emotive
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⁶⁶ Purcell, Shakespeare, 38.
⁶⁷ See Balme, Cambridge, 85.
⁶⁹ Balme, Cambridge, 34.
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⁷² Fortier, Theory, 88.
language like “the overflow of feeling in its silence”, “the effects of group apathy”, and “the weight of the eyes”, and alludes to a certain “energy” in performance.\(^{75}\) His language corroborates the notion that the decoding of signifiers is only a part of what occurs during performance. Justifying a phenomenological interpretation of the spectator, Purcell argues with an analogy that “we experience the behaviour of the stage not as computers might, receiving and processing data, but as embodied beings.”\(^{76}\) However, despite their criticism of semiotics, most phenomenologists perceive their research as a “useful counterbalance” to semiotics, rather than a replacement. Generally, they do not seem to see any reason why the two different approaches should not be combined in analysis.\(^{77}\)

In this context, Hart establishes the source of things as well as signs to be the materiality of the body in performance;\(^ {78}\) therefore, the body could represent a common denominator of sorts for the two approaches. Whether with or without the inclusion of semiotics, theatre practitioners and scholars alike have found “the bodily engagement of audiences as something to explore, exploit, and celebrate.”\(^ {79}\) Due to its focus on the bodies of spectators and performers, then, the phenomenological approach proves useful for the analysis of the processes involved in audience interaction.

**Cognitive Science**

Cognitive science may be in the position to provide scientific proof for the claims made by phenomenologists. Only recently have theatre researchers discovered the advantages of cognitive science for studying performance\(^ {80}\) in an attempt to contrive “more human-friendly” theories.\(^ {81}\) This search for such theories may stem from the shift in metaphor from the brain being likened to a computer, to the brain being seen as embodied and creative.\(^ {82}\) Performance studies being a creative field, many researchers suggest cognitive science as a solution to unanswered questions that are affiliated with a spectator’s

---

76 Purcell, *Shakespeare*, 37.
81 See Hart, “Performance”, 34.
biology: How can an audience “watch, understand, appreciate, and be moved by a theatrical production”? What theatre scholars want to achieve with the approach, is to gain insights into the processes behind an audience’s perception of “spatial relations and moving actors and how empathy works to draw [a spectator’s] attention to a performer’s body.”

The term ‘cognitive science’ itself describes a rather broad field of investigation, interdisciplinary in its nature. As a result, any field showing interest in the interaction taking place between “mind, brain, body, language, and environment” likely considers this approach. However, unlike, for example semiotics, which is a theory defined by a common methodology, cognitive science is not “a coherent discipline” but relies on “a set of common interests, allegiances, and reference points.”

One of the most important reference points is the concept of the ‘bodymind’. To be able to explain this comparatively new concept, firstly Cartesian dualism – the belief in a separation between body and mind – has to be mentioned. As its name suggests, this notion was developed by René Descartes in the seventeenth century. Applied to the theatre, Cartesian dualism suggests that an actor’s emotions exist separately from their movements and facial expressions, which results in the belief that actors only pretend to feel a certain emotion. However, according to empirical research in the field of cognitive science, there is no division between mind and body, even though we might naturally feel as if there were a split. As a result, an actor’s emotions can be considered inseparable from their actions because “physical experience shapes conceptual thought, and thought operates through many of the same neuronal pathways as physical action.” This is why Kemp, focusing on cognitive embodiment in his book about actor training, argues for a more holistic approach to performance: the concept of the bodymind. In sum, this concept may allow
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83 Ibid., 1.
84 McConachie, Audiences, 7.
85 Cook, Neuroplay, 4.
88 See ibid., 16.
89 See ibid., xvi.
90 See ibid., xv.
scholars to more successfully analyse “the reflexive and integrated relationship between physicality, thought, emotion, and expression” presented on stage.

Not only do cognitive concepts apply to actors on stage, but also to the spectator in the auditorium. After all, as Cook points out, audiences have to “process extraordinarily complex information without getting lost” during a performance. This stands in accordance with Shakespearean plays, where a great deal of information is expressed through language which modern audiences may find hard to decode. On this account, cognitive scientists like Bruce McConachie focus on the question of “what audiences do to engage with and become engaged by a performance.” The research on audiences in this field is relatively new, but the crucial role of the bodymind has already been established to explain the physical actions that are connected to the mental processing of performance. Arguments made by cognitive science researchers contribute to the image of an active spectator, instead of a passive, motionless onlooker. There are two important linked assumptions which lead to this view: firstly, “cognitive imitation is a crucial part of spectating”; secondly, empathy and emotion are embodied processes. Cognitive imitation means that spectators mirror the action they see on stage. Intriguing evidence for this hypothesis was first provided in the 1990s by Italian neuroscientists who recorded a set of neurons in monkeys’ brains, while the animals were performing a certain action. The scientists discovered that the same set of neurons became active when the monkeys were merely watching another monkey perform the action. Purcell concludes from this that “observing an action may not be entirely separate from performing it.” This means that in a performance context seemingly passive spectators lounging in their seats, may catch the emotions of the actors/characters on stage because they mirror their actions for meaning. Hence, McConachie concludes that “embodying other’s emotions produces emotions in us, even if the situation is an imagined or fictitious one.”
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92 Cook, Neuroplay, 3.
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97 See McConachie, Theatre, 30.
98 See McConachie, Audiences, 72.
99 See Purcell, Shakespeare, 40.
100 Ibid., 67.
fashion, cognitive scientists may provide theatre scholars with the key to understand why
audiences react in certain ways to what unfolds on stage.

Another manner in which audiences become active is through the creation of
categorical categories. These are metaphors which create cognitive systems through our
bodily experience in the ‘real’ world. However, categorical categories can also be altered
through theatre experiences that incorporate or even challenge them.\textsuperscript{101} The influential
cognitive linguist George Lakoff defines categorical categories as ‘image schemas’;\textsuperscript{102} for example, he names structures like CONTAINERS, PATHS, LINKS, FORCES,
BALANCE, or relations like UP-DOWN, FRONT-BACK, PART-WHOLE, CENTER-
PERIPHERY. At first glance, the different schemas might not seem to share any
particular traits, but they are all connected through one common denominator – our body.
For instance, the container image schema suggests that we see our body as a container
with an ‘outside’ and an ‘inside’, and the paths image schema could be used to “project
an embodied experience of moving along a path onto an abstract concept like ‘life’.”
According to Lakoff, we create meaning with these metaphors.\textsuperscript{103} To sum up, these
arguments claim that spectators interact with the stage and make meaning drawing on the
experiences they have gained through bodily experiences.

Due to these new attempts at explaining the construction of meaning, some
cognitive scientists are convinced they can criticise or even refute methodologies from
semiotic or phenomenological approaches.\textsuperscript{104} McConachie, for example, condemns
semiotics for its alleged limited view of spectator activity by claiming that “these scholars
unscientifically assume that spectators are primarily engaged in trying to understand the
symbolic meanings of a theatrical performance.” He deems cognitive science superior
because of its scientifically reliable approaches and psychological evidence as support.\textsuperscript{105}
Even though McConachie concedes that his approach does not offer a unified answer to
the questions posed by performance,\textsuperscript{106} he stresses that cognitive science “has a better
chance of discovering some critical and historical truths than do theories that cannot be
validated scientifically” because it is a theory “grounded in falsifiable theories and

\textsuperscript{101} See Cook, Neuroplay, 2 and Kemp, Acting, xvi.
\textsuperscript{102} See Lakoff as cited in Cook, Neuroplay, 8.
\textsuperscript{103} See Cook, Neuroplay, 8-9.
\textsuperscript{104} See Purcell, Shakespeare, 41.
\textsuperscript{105} See McConachie, Theatre, 57.
\textsuperscript{106} See McConachie, Audiences, 7.
While Kemp also laments the semiotic influence on actor training and theatrical styles,\textsuperscript{108} Cook takes a more balanced stance by explaining that she does not apply cognitive science to her field “because it is more ‘objective’ or true” than semiotics or other theories, but simply because cognitive science privileges “imagination, creativity, and the body”, which she deems more valuable for her research.\textsuperscript{109} Additionally, according to Zunshine, literary scholars adopting cognitive science should deal with its findings in a critical and pragmatic way, always applying them through the filter of their own discipline. This is sound advice, particularly considering how much there has yet to be discovered about our complex human brain to contrive a complete theory of cognition suitable for analysing literature or performance.\textsuperscript{110}

To conclude, cognitive science, with its empirical base, certainly already offers worthwhile findings to understand the role of the bodymind, and, therefore, opens up new intriguing possibilities of investigating the interaction between audience and stage.

\textbf{Empirical Research}

Even though strictly speaking not a theory, empirical research should be discussed in the context of different methodologies which have been adopted to study audience response to performances. As long as methods from neuroscience, like measuring brain activity, are not easily available, asking audiences themselves about their experiences in the theatre has proven most fruitful for many researchers. Schoenmakers and Tulloch, for example, suggest that instead of theatre makers and scholars, the audiences should be able to speak for themselves,\textsuperscript{111} and Freshwater criticises other researchers for failing to ask real audiences by only considering their own responses or reviews from experts.\textsuperscript{112} As Sauter points out, interest that is not only centred around an ‘ideal’ spectator, but the real spectator, is pursued by audience and reception research.\textsuperscript{113} Before empirical research

\textsuperscript{107} Ibid., 14.
\textsuperscript{108} See Kemp, Acting, xvi.
\textsuperscript{109} See Cook, Neuroplay, 3-4.
\textsuperscript{110} See Zunshine, “Introduction”, 2. Zunshine’s research interest lies in the field of cognitive literary studies.
\textsuperscript{112} See Freshwater, Theatre, 4.
\textsuperscript{113} See Sauter, Willmar. “Introducing the Theatrical Event.” Theatrical Events: Borders, Dynamics,
emerged in performance studies, it was mostly conducted to collect data of “the ‘typical’ viewer”, constructing possible mainstream audiences for theatres. Of course, what these mostly quantitative approaches lack is a way to record the specific aesthetic responses to performance by theatre audiences; qualitative approaches, on the other hand, “require respondents to actually articulate their impressions, feelings, opinions, either in writing or verbally”. Today, scholars use a theoretical-empirical approach; combining theories from theatre studies with results from empirical studies, they formulate hypotheses about audience experience and interaction. Reason, for example, conducted a “qualitative research project designed to explore perceptions and responses to the experiences of live theatre” of teenagers on a school trip to watch Shakespeare’s *Othello*. One method to go about the research is ‘Theatre Talks’; this means that a group of people watches a performance together to sit down afterwards and casually talk about experiences from the performance. Usually, these people are unobtrusively guided through their conversation by a group leader. The goal is to discover the issues the group mentions in connection with the performance, and how individual opinions might differ.

Generally, a shift towards theatrical event research with an orientation towards cultural studies has taken place, which focuses on production as well as reception. In this way, researchers seek to “explore different responses to acting, set and costume design, use of popular music, and interpretation among different age groups and genders in the audience”. Following this version of empirical research and applying the method of ‘Theatre Talks’, Penelope Woods conducted one of the first studies on audience response at Shakespeare’s Globe as her PhD project. Additionally, she included “interviews with performers and creatives, archival data and critical scholarship to
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establish new understandings of current spectatorship at the Globe Theatre”. Although different in its objective, Woods’ research serves as inspiration and point of reference for this thesis.

In sum, particularly the proposed focus of empirical research on the relationship between spectator and “performance, production, and broader socio-cultural […] contexts” are important for any analysis of the processes involved in audience interaction.

**Adopting a Theory**

Scholars researching audience engagement in performance are presented with an array of theories and methods to choose from. McConachie, for example, insists that today’s scholars need to make an important decision – a decision for one of the theories available. However, Purcell takes issue with the assumption that the different approaches oppose each other. Instead, he suggests that, because “most audience members are simultaneously reading, making cultural associations, forming group identities, encountering objects, and responding kinaesthetically”, a dialogue between theories may be possible. This is why Gangi, criticising semiotics for being too reductive, suggests a combined approach with another theory; hence, an approach including both semiotics and another theory to complement it could lead to a better understanding of audience interaction, possibly illuminating aspects not covered by one single approach.

Considering these arguments and the advantages of some of the theories, an approach consisting of aspects from semiotics and cognitive science seems most reasonable for this thesis. This decision has been made even though some scholars argue that, because the theories have roots in contradicting ideas, they cannot be combined; on the contrary, because of their differences they may illuminate various aspects of audience
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interaction. While the influence of reader-response theory and the prevailing interpretative value of phenomenology for audience research will not be disregarded, the two chosen theories will be prevalent in supporting the argument of this thesis.

3. The Reconstructed Theatre: Foundations for Interaction

And that is really what Shakespeare’s plays are all about. They are all about your participation, your imagination, adding to the play, involving yourselves in the play and performance. It is real participation, very different from anything we experience in the theatre now, and one which we will hope to recreate at the Globe.

– Sam Wanamaker, 1989

This chapter is about the history of the reconstructed ‘Shakespeare’s Globe’ on Bankside (reconstructed after a vision by Sam Wanamaker), the way the theatre and its audience have been received by scholars and critics, as well as the parameters which are necessary for audience interaction in performance. Therefore, the title of this chapter, ‘Foundations for Interaction’, is intended both in a literal and a figurative sense. Firstly, in a literal sense, the title refers to the very foundations of the ‘new’ Globe – the building, where audience interaction takes place. Since the plans for the reconstruction became known, a great number of analyses and opinions have been published. Prescott, for example, praises the theatre as “the most important innovation in British Shakespearean performance since the founding of the Royal Shakespeare Company in 1960-1”; Banks refers to it as a “new and alien” playing space; and Kiernan simply concludes that the Globe represents “such a bundle of paradoxes it defies easy categorisation”. This chapter seeks to address the criticism the ‘paradoxical’ Globe has had to face even before its reconstruction was finished, pointing out the theatre’s resemblance to a theme park and finding fault with its tourist audience; on the other hand, this chapter will also deal with
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more positive voices, stressing the theatre’s general aura and authenticity. Secondly, the title of this chapter can be read in a figurative sense, denoting the parameters involved that lead to or favour audience interaction: theatrical frame, theatre building, play text, actor/director, and audience. To this end, an interaction model has been created to illustrate the relationship between these parameters and prove that performances at the Globe differ remarkably from those at conventional theatres. Because the “controlling devices of lighting, set design and props” are not applicable at Shakespeare’s Globe, “the relationship between actor and audience changes”, facilitating stronger interaction. Analysis of each parameter separately will support this assumption. Taken together, this chapter provides the performance context at the Globe, before interaction strategies can be conceived.

The ‘Globe Paradox’

The American actor Sam Wanamaker had a dream – a dream to build a monument worthy of the works of Shakespeare not far away from its original location in London. Surprised that during his 1949 visit in London he could not seem to find anything to suggest the former existence of a grand Elizabethan theatre, apart from a rather uninspiring black plaque, he first had the idea for a reconstruction of the building. Twenty years later Wanamaker founded the Globe Playhouse Trust, gathering not only academic scholars and archaeologists, but also financial backers to help his dream become reality. As soon as he had gleaned all early modern sources available, he commissioned architect Theo Crosby to plan the most accurate reconstruction of the Globe possible for him. Sam Wanamaker himself likened the process of constructing the theatre to the research conducted in early modern music by building instruments with old techniques: Elizabethan materials were selected to replicate the architecture of the Globe.

132 By ‘conventional theatres’ I refer to proscenium arch theatres with a darkened auditorium, which are arguably still the most common theatre type in the Western part of the world.
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However, interestingly, the Wanamaker reconstruction does not present the first ever Globe reconstruction. Even the first Globe built, explains Phelan, mirrored the design and architecture of a previous theatre. When in 1613 the house was destroyed in a fire, it was reconstructed in the same location and persisted until its demolition for living space in 1644. Therefore, Phelan concludes that today’s Globe is “the most recent version of an ongoing project of reconstruction.”\(^{138}\) In this sense, Wanamaker merely continued the tradition of reconstructing the Globe – albeit over 300 years later. In 1997, then, Shakespeare’s Globe was revealed to the public as, in Sam Wanamaker’s words, “an international working monument to the world’s greatest playwright”, with the intention to “promote the international study, appreciation and performance of Shakespeare and his contemporaries with a programme of productions, master classes, demonstrations, exhibitions, workshops, lectures and seminars.”\(^ {139}\) Over the years, it has become much more: The Globe is widely acknowledged as a “theatre laboratory” of sorts, where Shakespeare’s plays are tested against the conditions for which they were originally written. Understanding the plays, as a result, becomes a visceral experience, an experience undoubtedly connected to the body and its surroundings.\(^ {140}\) The reconstruction had only just begun, when Wanamaker anticipated one of the most crucial factors in revealing new insights into Shakespearean performance: the “interplay between the audience and the actor.”\(^ {141}\)

It is fair to say that the Globe has undertaken more objectives than any conventional theatre would. Its focus on education and commercial success, while maintaining authenticity and quality performance of classic texts, presents a cultural balancing act, if not a paradox.\(^ {142}\) Various critics have found fault with the Globe’s paradoxical existence between past and present and responded accordingly. When reviewing some of the scholarly books and articles on the matter, three major points of criticism can be identified: (1) the Globe is inauthentic; (2) the Globe audience does not behave appropriately; (3) the Globe resembles a theme park and its performances are like

\(^{140}\) See Banks, Shakespeare, 13-14.
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a pantomime. In what follows, examples of this criticism, along with some counter-arguments, will be provided.

Since its opening, the Globe has sparked an ongoing debate about what it is exactly that “constitutes Shakespearian authority and authenticity”.\textsuperscript{143} As Shakespeare’s Globe\textsuperscript{144} prides itself on its space for authentic Shakespearean performance, some scholars, for example Kennedy, have criticised it for merely being a facsimile, not the original. Kennedy calls the Globe “an invented sight” which, he claims, is inferior to original structures like Shakespeare’s Birthplace in Stratford-upon-Avon.\textsuperscript{145} However, even the house, where, it is assumed, Shakespeare was born, has undergone extensive restoration, leading to new additions being passed off as originals to tourists.\textsuperscript{146} People tend to forget that there exist many such reconstructions: even big parts of St. Paul’s Cathedral had to be rebuilt after the Great Fire.\textsuperscript{147} This is not to suggest intentions to deceive visitors behind such reconstructions. As long as there is an awareness of past as a reconstruction, the concept of ‘authenticity’ can be judged from a critical distance. Calling the Globe an invented sight, on the other hand, would disregard the minute work of scholars over many decades to estimate the physical conditions of the original playing space. The reconstruction did involve guesswork, but it was guesswork supported by “archaeological research, visual interpretation of drawings, historical and cultural scholarship, and a nexus of beliefs and assumptions about the project of reconstruction more generally”.\textsuperscript{148} Apart from this, Kiernan argues that insights into the connection between architecture and performance at the Globe may surpass “a limited and limiting definition of authenticity”.\textsuperscript{149}

Not only has the structure of the Globe been branded as inauthentic, but its audience as well. The greatest stumbling block towards authenticity, towards an uncovering of the past, according to Prescott, is simply the contemporary postmodern audience.\textsuperscript{150} There seems to prevail a general feeling of despair amongst some scholars
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about audience behaviour, particularly regarding the Globe’s tourist audience. Kennedy, for example, laments the spectators’ attitude towards the performance, which he claims resembles audience behaviour at “a football match or a rock concert”, with the playgoers “talking, drinking, eating, wandering around, [and] shouting back at actors.”\textsuperscript{151} Critics assume that this behaviour stems, firstly, from “the unusual environment” the Globe provides for theatregoers: Used to the controlled focus of a dark and quiet indoor auditorium, artificial lighting, and cushioned seats, the audience responds to the Globe space in a way many disapprove of.\textsuperscript{152} Secondly, the behaviour is explained by pointing out the differences in physical quality, living conditions, and attitude towards Shakespeare between early modern and postmodern audiences.\textsuperscript{153} Spectators today derive their behaviour at the Globe from modern experience, which is why playing and spectating is “more affected by contemporary theatrical manners than the thoroughly unknown techniques of Shakespeare’s company”\textsuperscript{154}, Kennedy surmises. Additionally, Hodgdon relates this argument to audience interaction by questioning the authenticity of frequent communication between stage and auditorium in early modern times.\textsuperscript{155} These mostly valid points of criticism undeniably require consideration. On the one hand, critics seem to disapprove of a contemporary audience attempting to replicate early modern behaviour at the Globe, while, on the other hand, they also complain about the impossibility of replication due to the experience and expectations of postmodern spectators. Of course, this poses a problem if copying early modern performance is set as the ultimate goal; however, if an approximation to gain insights into how early performance may have been like can be tolerated, the Globe audience presents an apt opportunity for research. Even though rather limited and fragmented,\textsuperscript{156} there is evidence of similarities between today’s spectators at Shakespeare’s Globe and early modern playgoers at the Globe. For example, the social classes visiting the Globe in
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Shakespeare’s time can roughly be compared to the demographic seen today, in the sense that Shakespeare’s Globe tends to be open to everyone. Banks points out that “a wide range of social classes attended performances at the Globe, not just a social elite.”\(^{157}\) Today there are a few factors which encourage a socially diverse mix of spectators: the Globe’s cheap ticket prices (standing tickets in the yard only amount to £5), its convenient location on Bankside close to all the tourist sights, and its openness to school classes and student visitors. It is not surprising, then, that this eclectic variety of people often leads to a lively, engaged performance with a wealth of audience interaction. Informed by her research on early modern audiences, Cook describes how audience behaviour may have played out at the ‘old’ Globe: “Paying spectators bantered with the actors, blocked the view with their hats, jeered or left during plays they did not like, surreptitiously wrote down the best lines, [...] cracked jokes and nuts, flirted, or went to sleep during the performance.”\(^{158}\) It becomes clear that the behaviour reported by Cook might not be so unlike audience behaviour at the Globe today. Of course, it could be argued that this is learnt behaviour according to what modern audiences deem appropriate behaviour for the unusual Globe setting; it is equally possible, though, that the playgoers naturally react to the architecture, the shared light, and other distinct features of the theatre. The truth is simple: researchers do not know exactly how early modern audiences behaved. When critics dismiss the displayed behaviour today as reminding them of a “panto”,\(^{159}\) we do not know whether maybe performance in Shakespeare’s time did approximate what we call a pantomime today. Kiernan argues that “we have so little with which to compare this ‘joint playing’” and that there is “no other term that conveys the effects of this sense of the audience’s liberation.”\(^{160}\) Supporting this assumption, research from cognitive science has found that past spectators “possessed all of the same foundational capabilities that animate [...] spectators today”,\(^{161}\) which would reaffirm the argument that audience reactions might not look very different today. Interestingly, Werner evades the discussion by claiming that it is not relevant whether the audiences are the same because “both audiences are responding to a script that is approximately the same and both audiences
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watch their own contemporaries performing that script onstage.”\textsuperscript{162} This would mean that
the general properties of Shakespearean performance at the Globe stay roughly the same, no matter what time period the audience is from.

In sum, the criticism of audiences spurs useful debate about what behaviour should be deemed appropriate at the Globe.\textsuperscript{163} This debate has triggered a “learning curve” in spectators, which has led to more controlled audience reactions since 1997.\textsuperscript{164} Even though some critics still find fault in the unconventional reactions by theatregoers, and the interactions might not always be historically authentic in a stricter sense, the Globe continues to subvert today’s theatre norms towards a unique spectator experience.

Another argument against the Globe project was addressed by Sam Wanamaker at the time of construction. Critics anticipated that a reconstruction of the Globe by an American would be revealed as nothing short of a theme park, alluding to alleged similarities with Disneyland.\textsuperscript{165} Even today, the Globe is referred to as equivalent to Disneyland, as an excess of cultural tourism, as “a created heritage structure”\textsuperscript{166} and as “another infinitely consumable product in the global market of cultural tourism.”\textsuperscript{167} Instinctively, I would vehemently deny these claims. Unlike a theme park, the Globe was founded not only with commercial success or entertainment in mind, but with an intention to conduct research and educate as well. However, Worthen puts forward some convincing arguments of why the comparison to a theme park is not that far-fetched. Firstly, he states that what the Globe has in common with theme parks, is its “aesthetics of theming”; this means that the Globe, similar to a theme park, sells a themed experience of the past to its audience. Secondly, he mentions the theatre gift shop, which presents a contrast to the rest of the experience and stresses its catering to tourists.\textsuperscript{168} Nevertheless, Worthen also recognises the differences between the Globe and theme parks, as in that theatregoers at the Globe are in general established as active participants, while theme park visitors assume a more passive role “as consumers rather than producers of
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experience.”

Additionally, the audience do not re-enact the past and actors do not try to copy Elizabethan acting styles, so a theme park-like “performance of ‘performance’” is avoided. As a result, the Globe’s commercial orientation and marketing as a tourist site should not be ignored, but drawing parallels to theme parks is only marginally feasible.

After having addressed all these critical voices, the question could be asked why the Globe, amongst all theatres in London, has seemingly been subjected to the most criticism. Kiernan correctly observes that the ‘Globe paradox’, meaning the reconstruction having been built using sixteenth-century methods but with a postmodern spectator in mind, attracts critics. Even though some of their points of criticism are valid, it appears that the true purpose of the Globe is easily forgotten if too much attention is paid to them. Sam Wanamaker had always intended the Globe as “a new building inspired by the past”, operated in a modern context. In the same vein, Worthen argues that the Globe was not solely built “for its audiences to conjure an imagined experience of Shakespeare’s theatre”, but “as a springboard to the ongoing dialogue between Shakespeare’s plays and contemporary audiences, the experience of live, contemporary theatre.” Only then would “its experimental mission” be fulfilled.

Therefore, the ‘Globe paradox’ is easily reconciled if the focus on the modern context is acknowledged. In addition, J. L. Styan recognises the Globe’s main purpose in what it can offer to an audience: a “better understanding and enjoyment of Shakespeare’s plays in performance” due to the architecture providing the physical conditions the plays were composed for. This constitutes a reason for success many other theatres have attempted to copy. As a result, the Globe exerts its influence beyond its own domain in that, as theatre shapes change accordingly around the world, audience experiences change as well. In the end, this is really what the Globe strives to achieve – contemporary, exciting, and interactive
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performance experiences for avid theatregoers already in love with Shakespeare’s work, as well as for tourist visitors merely stumbling upon the theatre for the first time.

**Parameters of Interaction**

![Diagram of Audience Interaction Model]

Eric Bentley is known for having conceived the most straightforward definition of theatrical performance: “The theatrical situation, reduced to a minimum, is that A impersonates B while C looks on”\(^{176}\). Stripped from all other parameters which might influence a performance, this quote describes the basic relationship between actors/characters and spectators. To establish an interaction model for the performance context of the Globe, which as accurately as possible illustrates the factors influencing audience interaction, a variety of other parameters need to be considered (See fig. 1).

While, as Bentley states, in theory two entities in a relationship to each other suffice to constitute a performance, his definition can be enhanced by defining the specific nature of the relationship. Because the audience is forced into a passive role (“C looks
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on”), interaction does not seem to occur in Bentley’s definition. Fischer-Lichte, therefore, expands on the basic definition by stressing that only an encounter clearly designated as “interactive and confrontational” leads to a performance event.177 This reasoning is supported by cognitive science with McConachie elaborating on the necessary conditions for effective performative communication: “Theatrical engagement always works in two directions. That is, theatre audiences must engage with actors (and indirectly with others behind the scenes), and artists of the theatre must engage with spectators […]”.178 What is important here, is that McConachie also includes contributors who are not seen on stage, like, for example, the director. The work of a director is important in the interaction visible in the theatre because he “shapes a production to provoke particular expectations and responses within an audience”, Bennett states.179 Because of this, the director is included in the parameter for the actors. So far, only the base line of the interaction model’s triangle has been accounted for by Bentley’s definition and its extension; McConachie’s thinking, however, opens up new possibilities of who and what to include in a more comprehensive definition of performance relationships. By defining the play text, and therefore also the playwright, as a parameter of interaction, the triangle is completed. The play text sits at the top of the triangle because it represents the overall theme the performance centres on. Interaction between actors and audience occurs through the text shaped by a playwright. In her book about dramatic spaces Low, for example, is interested in how performance, text, and space exert influence over spectator experience.180 Particularly in the case of the Globe, boasting an unusual environment for contemporary playgoers, the question of how space affects audience interaction proves crucial. This is due to the Globe being invested with meaning in the same way all space is, according to semiotic theory.181 The triangle in the interaction model, then, is enclosed by a circle, representing the wooden ‘O’ and the meanings associated with it. Separating the circle, a vertical line is drawn, indicating the two spaces of the stage and the auditorium or yard. The line is dotted to denote the permeability of the line, meaning that
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Globe actors may cross it into the yard to achieve certain theatrical effects. All of the parameters are embedded in the ‘theatrical frame’, established for audience studies by Elam\(^\text{182}\) and Bennett\(^\text{183}\). Elam states that performance depends “on the frame which the participants place around the event.”\(^\text{184}\) Focused on the spectator, this means that “theatre-going is defined by a series of complex behaviours that regulate the way spectators behave to each other and to the performance and performers on stage”, Balme explains.\(^\text{185}\) In the context of the interaction model at hand, the theatrical frame also comprises the spectators’ ‘horizon of expectation’\(^\text{186}\) and the ‘paratheatrical’.\(^\text{187}\)

Loosely based on the theme-centred interaction (TCI) concept by psychoanalyst and educator Ruth Cohn,\(^\text{188}\) the new interaction model for this thesis has been adapted for the Globe environment. Originally, TCI was created for group work, for example in an educational context. At first glance, the decision to adopt this model for the theatre may seem unusual to some; however, a quote by Banks explains how audience interaction at the Globe can be illustrated employing parameters analogous to those for classroom interaction:

> Actors entered the Globe stage with a script, just as a teacher enters a classroom with a lesson plan. How well the performance went, actors soon learnt, relied on the quality of interaction between themselves, the play, the audience and the playhouse itself, just as a session in the classroom relies on the quality of interaction between students, teacher and the environment or circumstances under which the session takes place.\(^\text{189}\)

Banks renders the exact parameters which have been included in the new interaction model for the Globe as crucial for a successful interactive performance.
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In brief, the analysis of performance, specifically audience interaction, at the Globe requires the coverage of all of the parameters illustrated in the interaction model. Attention has to paid as to how each of the parameters affects what is said or done on stage or in the auditorium. This is why close analysis of each of the parameters is required.

Theatrical Frame

The theatrical frame determines an audience’s reactions and overall experience of a performance. While earlier performance research mostly focused on more immediate factors influencing performance, like the stage and the theatre building, modern Globe researchers are interested in “the wider architectural or spatial environment” and how “performativity is shaped by expectations, modes of attention, and habits of participation” with the theatre’s focus on “historical education and entertainment” in mind. Traditionally, in semiotic theory, the theatrical frame is defined as a set of “cognitive principles which, like all cultural rules, have to be learned” by the audience. Elam explains that these principles “are applied by participants and observers to make sense of a given ‘strip’ of behaviour” on stage. For her interaction model, Bennett defined an inner and an outer frame; for this thesis, the outer frame is relevant because it consists of the “cultural status of the event, its economic basis, its marketing, and so forth.” Together, the theatrical frame encompasses the audiences’ awareness of the theatrical event itself and the performance environment, and everything that might affect a spectator’s horizon of expectation, like the paratheatrical.

Firstly, the frame is established by the audience acknowledging performance “as an event aside from other kinds of activities, a practice with its own rules and conventions.” As a result, all actions on stage and in the auditorium should occur according to these rules. For example, due to the building being an open-air theatre,
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the actors and the audience may be subjected to various sounds (airplanes, party boats, sirens, cars etc.), certain unexpected visitors (pigeons), and adverse weather conditions. Elam suggests that audience members best “‘disattend’ those events” because they are “extra-textual” and not “contributory to the representation proper” on stage. Shaughnessy, however, argues that focusing one’s attention on the action unfolding on the stage alone is practically impossible in the Globe environment:

[...] one’s eye is drawn relentlessly away from onstage action and towards fellow audience members, towards the assertively modern neighboring buildings which interrupt the prospect of sky through the open roof; while the anomaly of open-air performance perceptually amplifies the ambient sound of the city, the noise of the everyday no longer the muffled background to stage speech but its equal and partner.

In this way, he acknowledges even the soundscape of the city as part of the play world. Shaughnessy and Phelan both report instances of when exterior sounds contributed to the meaning of a play they were attending at the Globe. Not only the audience, but also the actors face an important choice to make: Do they acknowledge and incorporate the sounds coming from the city, or do they ignore them? The Globe actor Katy Owen recalls a moment from when she played Puck in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* (2016), in which a helicopter suddenly hovered over the Globe, emitting a thundering sound during one of her speeches. Owen waited for it to pass before she uttered her next line, “Night and silence!”, causing the audience to erupt in applause. This account offers a prime example of how actors may exploit these external factors to their own advantage by incorporating them into the action. However, as Purcell points out, the audience alone decide whether they participate in the terms set for the theatrical exchange or not. The Globe’s theatrical frame is only fulfilled, if the audience shed their ideas about the behaviour appropriate at a conventional proscenium arch theatre before entering the yard, where enthusiastic participation has become the theatrical norm.
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Secondly, according to Carson, “the audience is not limited to the activity that takes place inside the theatre building”\textsuperscript{202} or noises outside, but also other external factors. These factors, then, influence the “horizons of expectation brought by an audience to the theatre”, which “are bound to interact with every aspect of the theatrical event”\textsuperscript{203}, as Bennett states. Consequently, certain cultural markers surrounding theatre venues are crucial in determining spectators’ horizon of expectation\textsuperscript{204} and, therefore, their behaviour when watching a play. For example, audiences who often visit the Globe will have already established certain ideas about what kind of behaviour is expected at the theatre.\textsuperscript{205} On the other hand, the behaviour may also be influenced by other Shakespeare performances at other venues, and by period film and music.\textsuperscript{206} More importantly, factors directly connected to the theatre may affect an audience’s horizon of expectation as well; these factors can be summarised by the concept of ‘the paratheatrical’. Generally, the paratheatrical denotes everything which influences audience reception outside of performance.\textsuperscript{207} This includes, for example, programmes, merchandise, and front of house routines. Purcell explains that these are elements and processes, by which Globe audiences are ‘constructed’.\textsuperscript{208} The Globe also offers guided tours of the building, granting visitors a glimpse behind the scenes. Additionally, there are pre-show discussions with artists and scholars, post-show Q&As, educational courses about Shakespeare, and research workshops with audience feedback. This results in the Globe representing a welcoming, lively space, which is rarely ever empty. Carson states that the constant – and desired – presence of audiences in the theatre indicates a certain ‘comfort’ visitors feel when entering the building. The Globe researcher attributes this feeling to three main factors: physical, cultural and intellectual accessibility. This means that the Globe’s location on Bankside, its status as a ‘must see’ venue, its low ticket prices, and
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its appeal to different social classes, all play roles in how the theatre is perceived by its audience. Depending on how the audience interpret the paratheatrical factors constituting the Globe, they could label it as “art, heritage, history, education, recreation, amusement”, and so on.

In sum, the Globe’s theatrical frame provides the audience with a variety of paratheatrical elements which may influence pre-conceived audience expectations, and lead to the kind of interactive behaviour Globe audiences are known for.

Theatre

![Diagram of the Globe space from above](image)
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The theatrical frame and theatre space cannot be completely separated from each other, as architecture shares a considerable part in determining spectator expectations. According to Bennett, “each playing space provides the audience with specific expectations and interpretive possibilities”, while the environment provides meaning by either setting the theatre apart from it, or seamlessly incorporating it. For example, dwarfed by the towering Tate Modern museum and surrounded by food chains, hotels, and banks, Shakespeare’s Globe gains meaning by clashing with modern architecture. Nevertheless, rather aspects of how the space inside a theatre may influence audience
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experience will be discussed in detail here. To this end, the extensive research on theatre space by semiotician Marvin Carlson, which focuses on “how the space of performance may contribute to the meaning of the total theatrical experience”,²¹³ is consulted as a basis for this section.

Audiences used to be of limited interest to theatre historians when analysing theatre buildings, as researchers laid their main focus on how the architecture was constructed. However, more recent researchers like Bennett deem “the reciprocal effects of architecture on the audience and their reception of the plays”²¹⁴ crucial for analysis. Carlson explains these effects from a semiotic standpoint: Because theatre buildings are charged with social and cultural meanings, they influence an audience’s meaning-making-process during a performance.²¹⁵ Coming from the perspective of cognitive science, McConachie generally agrees with this statement, in that theatre buildings, just like minds, are never clean slates; they are invested with “a history and culture that will partly control how spectators look at performers.”²¹⁶ Additionally, the meanings of theatre buildings will change over time due to the cultural development of the society decoding them.²¹⁷ For example, today’s Shakespeare’s Globe is a popular tourist attraction, located in the centre of London and even seen as a sacred cultural space, where Shakespeare lives on; however, the original Globe was “located on the fringes of the city in rather questionable neighborhoods.”²¹⁸ Even though it is a reconstruction, the building still carries these memories of the past within its walls, but, at the same time, offers “a practical and cognitive framework for performance events in the present.”²¹⁹ This existence in both the past and the present is accompanied by another apparent contradiction. Representing a static building, but also attempting to create a sense of liberation from any fixed time or space in the spectator through performance, the Globe expresses its status as a structure with several spatial and temporal identities.²²⁰
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Before more assumptions about its effects on performance are made, the general structure of the Globe space should be addressed (Refer to fig. 2 and 3). The most basic architectural feature of the Globe is its roundness, achieved by building a polygon with a multitude of sides. Central to the building is its thatched roof with a big opening over the yard, letting in natural light. The raised stage is protected from the weather by the so-called ‘heavens’, which are supported by two pillars. One key aspect about the stage design is that the audience is able to watch a play from all sides in the yard and on three levels in the tiered galleries. The audience in the yard, known as ‘groundlings’, have to stand through the performance, while the galleries offer wooden benches to sit on.\textsuperscript{221} Focusing on the spatial aspects of the Globe, through closer analysis of the Globe’s thrust stage, yard, and open roof, may reveal how these elements contribute to the interactive relationship between audiences and actors.

There is substantial evidence for a correlation between stage forms and audience interaction.\textsuperscript{222} The Globe’s thrust stage or ‘apron stage’ extends the ludic space into the auditorium, uniting actors and spectators, without abandoning its own integrity as a separate performance space.\textsuperscript{223} Concerning proxemic relations between actors and audience, the distance between the ludic space and the watching space is crucial. In larger proscenium arch theatres, the distance between the auditorium and the stage often hinders the audience’s reading of facial expressions and gestures of the seemingly small actors. This, in effect, may lead to a feeling of superiority in the spectators over the actors, as Kennedy notes.\textsuperscript{224} However, at the Globe, the little distance between standees in the yard and actors on stage\textsuperscript{225} may contribute to a greater sense of intimacy and equality between the parties. While Carlson suggests that the player’s space may always be its own world, impenetrable by spectators,\textsuperscript{226} Kiernan argues that the shared light and the close distance between stage and auditorium at the Globe help incorporate audiences into the play world, inviting “the playgoers into a vicarious experience of what [a character] is doing”.\textsuperscript{227} As a result, Globe audiences may feel more involved in an intimate scene like, for example,
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the last scene of *Othello* in Desdemona’s bedroom. Soliloquies may also develop more energy on the Globe stage, where downstage centre is usually preferred as a spot to achieve intimate moments, while addressing the audience.228 These moments are of great importance in a Globe performance, as the audience’s attention is not kept by elaborate stage design or lighting; it is the work of the actors combined with the imagination of the audience, that are responsible for a successful performance. The stage itself fades from the spotlight, when the “playgoers are compelled to concentrate on the voices and bodies of the actors”229 to be drawn into the action.

Most researchers also agree that audience interaction at an open-air theatre appears more pronounced than at many conventional indoor theatres.230 Hardly can actors receive any visual signs from the audience at a conventional theatre due to its darkened auditorium; therefore, audience interaction happens through aural signs, if at all.231 Balme comments that the proscenium arch, which became the norm in the nineteenth century, practically hid the audience from the actors on stage.232 This, of course, is not the case at Shakespeare’s Globe. The naturally lit auditorium enables eye contact between actors and spectators, which has turned out to be the most defining factor enabling audience interaction.233 Thus, the visual sense seems to play a major role at the Globe. On the other hand, the former artistic director Mark Rylance claims that sound is “a more powerful tool in staging at the Globe than sight” because, for example, “live music replaces lighting and set as a very expressive part of play.”234 Supporting this argument, the director Claire van Kampen points out the purposeful arrangement of songs in Shakespeare’s plays, which guides the audience through a Globe performance, instead of other mise en scène elements common today.235 Another point to consider concerning the open roof, is the effect of adverse weather conditions on the performance and the audience. Interestingly, acoustics can be affected by rain or humid air to the point that actors are forced to project more than on a clear, dry day.236 Apart from this, when it is raining during a performance,
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actors feel that the audience is more impatient; as a result, the play moves quicker. Generally, the viewing experience in the Globe space is not what modern theatregoers would necessarily describe as comfortable. Either standing in the yard, looking up at the stage for hours, or sitting on hard wooden benches, the audience have to invest bodily exertion into the act of watching a performance. It is this discomfort though, Carson insists, that “helps to engage the audience in the participatory nature of the event” because they seem to endorse the “egalitarian and Shakespearean about a theatre that is open to the elements”. The architecture of the Globe, therefore, stresses the active physicality of watching a play, appealing to all the senses. It stands in opposition to conventional theatres, where the performance mostly takes place in spectators’ heads. the Globe space does not intend to fully immerse audiences in an illusion at all times; rather, audiences are made aware of their bodies being in a theatre, viewing actors performing a play.

The Globe space presents a canvas for the audience’s imagination, which is guided by music and the actors’ bodies. While the stage stays roughly the same (even though sometimes minimal scenery is added, or the stage is extended even further into the yard), the performances do not fail to create new worlds every time. The key to success lies in the natural light from above, which establishes eye contact, and creates an intimate performance space with almost no boundary or ‘fourth wall’ between ludic and watching space. It seems like the audience is part of the play world – an important circumstance to facilitate interaction.

Playwright

This section deals with the text performed on the Globe stage and the implied playwright’s intention. Iser identifies two poles, when it comes to analysing a literary work: the artistic pole (the author’s text) and the aesthetic pole (“the realization accomplished by the reader”). He explains that ‘the work itself’ be located in between the two poles, in the middle of “the reality of the text” and “the subjectivity of the reader”. If this model is applied to performance, the artistic pole could be seen as the playwright’s
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text, and the aesthetic pole as the interpretation and actualisation of it on stage by the director. In a performance context, however, ‘the work itself’ cannot be described with these two poles alone, as the “generation of meaning in theatre is more complex, and involves more kinds of participants, than literary practice does”.241 It is with the audience and their meaning-making of the dramatic text and the performance that the ‘work itself’ is uncovered.242 While it is true that the text affects multiple parameters of performance, including the audience243, the audience exerts an influence on the text through the performance as well.244 The Globe theatre does not only allow this influence, but welcomes it as a means to learn of possible hidden meanings in the text. As Banks explains, the Globe’s main objective is to present Shakespeare’s text in a way as to “serve the story of a play”, meaning that the director’s decisions aim towards gaining a deeper understanding of the text through performance.245 In modern times, there has been a shift from the playwright to the director and his or her actors as central figures in the telling of stories for the stage.246

However, there once used to be more importance attached to the text and the playwright: An older tradition of analysis of Shakespeare as a playwright suggests that he deliberately used devices to influence the audience through his texts. Taking soliloquies and asides as examples of these devices, the researchers of this tradition claim Shakespeare was “a god-like (or, at least, director-like) controller of his audience’s experiences”.247 For example, in 1979 Jean Howard wrote about Shakespeare’s ‘contrapunctual stage technique’, mentioning his clever use of asides to keep an audience’s attention, and stating that “Shakespeare so carefully orchestrates his stage events.”248 The idea of Shakespeare as an ‘orchestrator’ appears in other writings around this time. The playwright Selbourne, for instance, took Shakespeare’s word as the only truth and wondered what he would think of how his plays are performed in modern times,
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were he alive. According to this line of argument, the way audiences react has been predetermined by the playwright to a certain degree. If an audience does not respond in the manner allegedly anticipated by the playwright, it is either their own fault or the director’s oversight in staging the text true to its intended purpose. Even though the concept of Shakespeare as a god-like controller or orchestrator of audience experience can be deemed an exaggeration based on the research that has been conducted since then, even some modern theatre practitioners believe in a rhythm written into the text to influence audience response. Purcell, on the other hand, is more tentative about attributing such levels of control over modern audiences to Shakespeare, as he is convinced that “it is audiences, not texts, who make meaning”. Taking this modern semiotic view as a starting point, he states that, while certainly particular patterns can be observed in the texts, they were conceived for Elizabethan or Jacobean audiences, and, therefore, may likely affect today’s audiences in different ways. It may never be possible to predict a modern audience’s reaction to the text, but markers set by Shakespeare help directors and actors to establish when and where on stage audience contact should be initiated. As a result, the actors’ playing style and the audience’s response and understanding of the action are affected by implementing these markers. Still, this cannot be seen as evidence for Shakespeare exerting any direct control over audience interaction. Rather, Shakespeare determined “the scope which his texts allow for particular kinds of relationships with the audience”, as Purcell explains.

Sometimes the relationships of direct address are established by metatheatrical elements in the text. These elements include, for example, the prologue, the epilogue, the soliloquy, and the aside. Because it is unlikely that there were terms for soliloquies and asides in Shakespeare’s time, the devices for direct address must have been so prevalent in theatre practice that playwrights incorporated them instinctively in their texts. Prologues and epilogues, in particular, prove interesting devices in their challenging of the fictional world. By addressing the audience directly and, therefore,

---
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recognising their existence, a character breaks conventional rules of performance. A prologue fulfils the purpose of transitioning the audience from their world into the world of the play, where different rules and sets of behaviour are required; it is “an implicit request for attention.” An epilogue, on the other hand, invites the audience to step out of the performance, which has almost come to an end; it is “an appeal for applause”.257 Both devices can be seen as rites of passage for the audience; they are liminal acts of speech set between performance and real life.258 For example, at the end of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, Puck utters these concluding words: “Give me your hands, if we be friends, / And Robin shall restore amends”. (5.1.423-424) These lines could be realised on stage involving various levels of interaction. Puck could just stay on stage, waiting for the applause he requested, but the words could also be interpreted in a more literal way. As a result, it would be possible for Puck to bend down to the groundlings or even step down into the yard, shaking hands with a few spectators. At the end of Emma Rice’s production of 2016, for instance, Puck put down his water pistol he was brandishing to splash the
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audience during the performance and held his hands up, followed by all of the other cast members. As the act of holding up one’s hands is usually a sign of surrender, this gesture could be interpreted as the actors giving up their characters (and their water weapons) to submit themselves to the judgement of the audience. After all, it lies in the hands of the audience to release the actors from the fictional world with their applause.

The analysis of these moments of direct address in the text presents an obvious starting point in the development of audience interaction for actors and directors.\textsuperscript{259} Shakespeare’s ‘directions’ in the text offer possibilities for theatre makers to converse with the audience. This is why Kiernan does not call them ‘stage directions’ but ‘audience directions’.\textsuperscript{260} Apart from the more obvious devices for direct address mentioned, generally, the moments wielding the most intense impact on the audience are of a more subtextual nature, for example, “changes of tempo, rhythm, texture and weight” which may lead to “the release of laughter, or grip of expectation”.\textsuperscript{261} This shifts the focus to the effect of the text on the body of the audience. Banks claims that Shakespeare’s words “play a physical role” in that a performance should not only take place in the audience’s heads, but it should be a visceral experience, just like it is for actors.\textsuperscript{262} The conditions present at the Globe may be most suitable to achieve this goal.

**Actor / Director**

And it's like being in a rock gig, it's not like being in a traditional theatre space. And everybody's so close to you. That's the special thing about the Globe, that relationship, that immediate relationship with the audience. And there's no hiding from it; it's the most terrifying and thrilling experience I think I've ever had.

-Katy Owen, Globe actor\textsuperscript{263}

Now moving on to the base of the triangle of the interaction model, this section revolves around one of the direct participants in interaction – the actor; but also, around someone who, even though they cannot respond to audience reactions during a performance,
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facilitates audience interaction – the director. As can be inferred from Katy Owen’s passionate reaction to the Globe stage, performing in this unusual space poses new opportunities, as well as challenges for actors. Accordingly, Banks calls the theatre “a massive classroom where [an] actor can be both student and teacher”. The factors which, on the one hand, encourage interaction may, on the other hand, cause actors to struggle with keeping the audience’s attention on them. For example, their stage presence needs to be strong enough that the audience does not get distracted by other occurrences in the lit auditorium.

The actor is the communicator of the text, the transmitter of creative input from the director, and the interactive link between stage and auditorium; in short, the actor is the face of the performance. While the playwright and the director contribute to the performance indirectly, but cannot respond to audience reactions themselves, actors induce responses from the audience with whatever they do on stage and can, in turn, react to these responses. Their actions and reactions take effect on the performance as a whole. When the rehearsal process is over, and it is time for a production to move to the stage, it becomes difficult to identify the contributions made by the actors and the director, respectively. How the actors move, convey feelings with facial expressions and gestures, speak their lines, and so on, is always the result of a collaboration with the director incorporating the ideas of both parties into the performance. Claire van Kampen compares her experience of directing Othello at the Globe to “leading a band”. She defines her role in the production as the coordinator of the choices actors make on stage: “[The] actors are my band: I conduct them, but I facilitate their making music together”. The unique playing conditions at the Globe offer opportunities for directors that exceed what is possible at other venues. Consequently, the director Cohen argues that, generally, directors strive to “direct plays that challenge the intellectual assumptions of their audiences”, while at the Globe the whole behaviour involved in being a spectator is put to the test. More than any other theatre, the Globe requires the director to focus
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on how to achieve successful communication between actors and audience. In the end, however, actors are the ones visible to the spectators. This is why this section deals with the actor as the main subject, but always with the director and other contributors in mind.

What actor Katy Owen discerns as one of the characteristics of performing at the Globe in the quote at the beginning of this section, is that “everybody’s so close to you”. Conventional “proxemic relations between actor and spectator”\(^\text{270}\) of a few metres, for example the public distances at most proscenium-arch theatres, are challenged at the Globe. Here, “the actor as storyteller” is “surrounded by an intimate circle of listening ears”, instead of distant shadowy figures, Kiernan explains.\(^\text{271}\) As a result, theatre makers and theatregoers alike perceive the Globe as an intimate space.\(^\text{272}\) To a great degree, this perception stems from the close proxemic experience at the venue. On a stage with minimal scenery or special effects, like the Globe space, the actor’s body moves into the main focus of the audience. Particularly through their proximity to the yard, the massing of bodies on the Globe stage largely affects audience experience.\(^\text{273}\) This becomes visible when actors move “from locus (upstage area) to platea (downstage area) for greater intimacy”, according to Low.\(^\text{274}\) The approach of the actor onto the platea already constitutes a social distance to the spectator, and may develop into a personal or intimate distance, depending on stage directions determined by the director. After all, sometimes actors are encouraged to step into the yard, brushing past spectators, or even touching them purposefully. Actors need to be aware, however, that audiences may not be used to such closeness at the theatre; such intimacy may, therefore, result in an uncomfortable encounter for some groundlings.\(^\text{275}\) In sum, proxemic relations play a paramount role in defining what degree of audience interaction is possible in a theatre. Shakespeare’s Globe subverts conventions concerning proxemic distance by challenging the usual public distance and allowing social or even intimate distance.

To cope with the challenges posed by the intimate distance, the common lit space, and the various responses of the audience, Globe actors need a certain set of skills. It is a balance actors aim to strike between inviting an audience from the real world into the
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play world, and keeping the fiction intact. In other words, actors need to interact with the audience without breaking communication with their colleagues on stage. Kiernan perceives this as a major challenge, which “requires an extremely strong preparation process, and a disciplined ‘tuning’ of the play once in performance”.276 For example, even during moments of silence actors need to keep the audience’s attention by means of their bodies: movement, gestures, facial expressions, and overall stage presence need to be on point at all times.277 Concerning the stage space, actors and directors opt for a technique called ‘3-D Acting’. This involves exploiting the whole depth and breadth of the stage: Actors should withstand the temptation to use the two pillars as a frame but move the action to the sides of the stage whenever possible. Furthermore, directors need to be aware of the possibilities of diagonal blocking for more effective and interesting character positioning on stage.278 Not only the positioning of individual characters has to be considered but thought has to be devoted to the space between them as well. It has been discovered that two characters having a conversation on the Globe stage require to be placed at a certain distance from each other. Even when intimacy is the goal, “a long deep diagonal” between characters can be more effective from the audience’s perspective than close proximity. This effect may occur due to the intimate tension between two actors who are further apart spatially, but somehow closer together on an emotional level.279 When it comes to the actors’ movement, techniques common at more conventional theatres have to be reconsidered. Usually a rule of thumb demands the actor to avoid too much movement while talking. When an actor is giving a soliloquy, for example he or she should stand in one place. At the Globe, however, continuous, dynamic movement actually boosts dramatic effect. Only occasionally can an actor remain still during a speech, as long as he or she delivers it centre stage, where audience visibility is at its best.280 The actor David Fielder confirms the nonconformity of moving while speaking on stage by stating that he learned not to speak on the line in modern theatre practice.281 Apart from this, the movement performed has to be very clear and pronounced, or it would get lost on the large Globe stage. On the other hand, the movement should not
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culminate in “grand gestures” because they would disagree with the intimacy inherent to the stage.\textsuperscript{282} Similarly, the actors’ voices need to be strongly projected to be heard, but this needs to happen without the loss of subtlety.\textsuperscript{283} In sum, the unique properties of the Globe theatre often require actors to rethink their training and modify their techniques.

However, the acting techniques mentioned are merely the basis of a successful performance. Rehearsals serve as groundwork to establish the workings of a performance, but audiences will dictate how the production develops further, when stage rehearsal has ended. Kiernan interviewed actors on this process, and most of them commented that they found it hard to judge how their movement and voice would transfer to an audience with an empty yard during rehearsals. Consequently, directors and actors need to work on certain techniques and may adjust blocking and movement even after the production has started.\textsuperscript{284} Productions at the Globe cannot be pre-set and then performed under almost the same conditions every night; therefore, they underlie a process of change, which is determined by audience reactions. For actors, this process may seem taxing and intimidating because it constitutes a certain loss of control over the performance; at the same time, as Kenny suggests, “it also offers the instant feedback on the performance that is not provided in other theatres”.\textsuperscript{285} Because of this feedback loop, some actors and directors have attempted to predict audience responses, and influence performance in a way as to evoke specific instances of audience interaction. Purcell compares this belief in the predictability of audience response with the notion of the playwright as god-like controller of audience experience. Deeming such a degree of influence on the part of the actors an overstatement, Purcell nevertheless grants them some power over the audience.\textsuperscript{286} An actor, he states, can be “finely attuned to his audience’s expectations and responses” and create “a powerful sense of conversation between stage and auditorium”.\textsuperscript{287} This effect can be explained with the help of cognitive science. Because, according to the theory, bodies on stage and their movement may “shape abstract thought and conceptual meaning” in an audience, it is the actor who combines the elements of
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story, space and time to interact with an audience.\textsuperscript{288} Reflecting my experiences as a spectator at the Globe, particularly Mark Rylance comes to mind as a master at combining these three elements for effect. Having been the first artistic director and knowing the stage like the back of his hand, he presents a prime example of how to play off of audience reactions naturally and with ease.

In sum, actors affect the audience’s experience at the Globe by employing techniques tailored to the unique space. The director and the playwright contribute to the performance indirectly, but the actors are the ones in direct contact with the audience; therefore, when it comes to analysing audience interaction, considering the effect of the actor’s body is crucial.

\textbf{Audience}

In \textit{As You Like It} Jaques begins his famous speech with the lines: “All the world’s a stage, / And all the men and women merely players”. (2.7.42-43) No other theatre can be imagined, where these words ring truer than at the new Globe – where \textit{all} the men and women in the audience may contribute to the performance as players in their own right. Whether Shakespeare intended the lines to have this additional connotation may be left open to interpretation; today, however, the audience’s work at the Globe is recognised as ‘performative’ by most researchers.\textsuperscript{289} Even though others point out some obvious differences between performers on stage and the spectators, for example that the latter are free to leave the theatre or withdraw their attention from the play,\textsuperscript{290} most researchers ascertain the role of the audience as a progressive influencer on the action on stage,\textsuperscript{291} akin to another performer. Fortier goes as far as to call the audience “the true master of the situation”.\textsuperscript{292} The audience’s visible presence in the lit yard and its closeness on three sides of the stage are necessary conditions for audience interaction.\textsuperscript{293} Being the counterpart to the actors in the base of the interaction triangle, the audience inhabits a crucial role: Interaction does not occur without the audience’s presence of body and mind.
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Having referred to ‘the audience’ mostly as a collective so far, the time has come to take an attempt at defining the playgoers, the spectators, the onlookers, and the groundlings who visit the Globe. A variety of researchers have addressed the problem of terming the crowd of individual spectators ‘an audience’. Freshwater, for example, determines that at one performance the audience may be comprised of multiple smaller groups of audiences, who, in turn, consist of individuals with a range of different attitudes towards the event. From a semiotic perspective, the different horizons of expectation and constructions of meaning by individual spectators have to be acknowledged. Consequently, when writing about audiences, varying dynamics in audience constellations must be heeded. Even though researchers will refer to ‘the spectator’ in theoretical musings about performance, it is important to ascertain that there is an abundance of possible “cognitive and emotional reactions, mental acts and interpretive interventions that come into play when watching a performance” which are triggered by “any number of differentiating factors”. With this, Balme addresses the cognitive perspective on the difficulties of defining ‘the audience’. Additionally, individual reactions in an audience can only be manifold, considering that Shakespeare wrote his plays in a way as to elicit responses based on every spectator’s unique life experience. Therefore, one spectator may never endorse the audience as a collective they are part of because, according to Purcell, “they may understand their individual responses both in parallel and in contrast to those of the shadowy group called ‘audience’ from which they stand apart”. When writing a research paper, however, addressing every spectator’s individual response would not be feasible; responses have to be dealt with as from a collective. This can be related to ideas from reader-response criticism, which stress individual readers’ responses, while, at the same time, create an ‘implied reader’ for critical analysis, who is based on structural elements found within the text – so-called ‘response-inviting’ structures. Loosely applied to audience studies, this means that, even though spectators should be thought of as individuals, when they are part of an audience, they become part of a whole collective organism. Employing arguments from
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cognitive science, Cook elaborates that, for the most part, an “audience is an organism that laughs, applauds, and comprehends as one”, and this is how they should be treated in observational performance research. In the light of this, various researchers offer advice on how to write about audiences. For example, Werner recommends heeding caution not to judge too quickly when writing about the alleged feelings of other audience members; instead, she suggests “raising questions rather than making statements about their possible responses”. In sum, audiences can be treated as a collective because they at least “temporarily enact a group identity”, as long as their responses are not generalised without sufficient evidence. Writing about Globe audience responses should always be treated tentatively and within the framework of observable behaviour.

A negative example of generalisation and over-simplification of the Globe audience is how some critics treat cultural tourists as spectators. Often the groundlings in the yard are branded as rowdy tourists, ignorant of how to react appropriately to the plays by England’s famed national treasure. For instance, Kennedy criticises tourists for pretending to have a genuine early modern theatre experience and deems the perceived collective feeling of ‘togetherness’ an illusion. This criticism can be partly attributed to the visibility of the groundlings’ behaviour to those critics, who watch from the galleries, and to a general scepticism of a carnivalesque crowd. Prescott highlights the obvious unease of London’s theatre critics with “both carnival and contemporary, global theatre-going”. This includes carnivalesque elements like “skipping work […], food, drink, and sex” – elements which Puritan contemporaries were, and postmodern critics still are suspicious of. Another aspect often criticised is that the audience takes on the role of groundlings in the yard, playing along with the actors according to the space they are in. This “performative nature of spectatorship at the Globe”, however, is deemed as something to be encouraged by others, especially when it comes to the theatregoers in the yard. It seems that, as soon as purchasers of the £5 tickets enter through the iron gates
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of the venue, they adopt the role of the much-discussed groundlings. The word ‘groundling’ was derived from little fishes found at the bottom of rivers.\textsuperscript{310} There are hardly any references to ‘groundlings’ in early modern sources because the term was most likely coined in the nineteenth century; therefore, the name for the standees in the yard needs to be interpreted in the context of nineteenth century class myths, instead of early modern ideas of spectatorship.\textsuperscript{311} Nevertheless, the term ‘groundlings’ offers a common denominator for standees in the yard, by which they can identify themselves as a group. It is not only the name that is responsible for this feeling as a community, however, but the physical conditions as well. Being a groundling is not a comfortable experience: Having to stand for a couple of hours and rubbing shoulders with your fellow attendees reminds oneself more of a rock concert than a high-brow theatre experience. It could be argued, then, that this unusual state of the body watching a performance adds to the adoption of the role as a groundling. As Purcell states, “all audiences play at being audiences” and “they adopt certain behaviours as a group and in response to that group”.\textsuperscript{312} At the Globe, this means that the group spirit of being a groundling for the duration of the play leads to more interactive behaviour, as this is the behaviour
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\caption{The groundlings are leaning onto the stage in close proximity to Othello (André Holland)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{310} See Banks, \textit{Shakespeare}, 16.
\textsuperscript{311} See Falocco, \textit{Shakespeare’s}, 151.
\textsuperscript{312} Purcell, \textit{Shakespeare}, 150.
commonly associated with the role. The fact that theatregoers may adopt a character, supports the assumption that the audience are not a mass of mere onlookers, but performers in their own right.

Consequently, the question arises in what ways audiences at the Globe are more active and more similar to performers than at other theatres. Bennett takes arguments from semiotics to explain that at conventional theatres, spectators only become active through their decoding of the signs on stage; their visible behaviour, however, appears to be passive. 313 McConachie mostly blames this passive physical behaviour on the darkened auditorium common in conventional theatres, and likens the experience of watching a play in these spaces to viewing a film. 314 Because of this, in today’s theatre practice, the audience’s role as a contributor to the performance may easily be forgotten. This is not the case at the Globe, where active behaviour is encouraged enthusiastically. It is remarkable how a performing audience – similar to what had already existed in early modern times – can appear subversive or even innovative in a postmodern context. A spectator at Shakespeare’s Globe becomes active in more than one way: not only interpretively through intellectual experience, but also through phenomenological involvement and contributory reactions. 315 Particularly the visceral experience of the play through phenomenological processes is crucial as an audience member at the Globe. In a comment that could be related to cognitive theory, actor and director Mark Rylance claims that the standing body leads to a “different state for the heart and mind”. He adds that the theatre’s openness to the elements may trigger “an awakened and sometimes drenched sense of the physical body” in the audience. 316 This heightened sense of the body opens up a plethora of physical actions for audiences, which may even disrupt the performance. 317 Spectators are free to move around, leave the theatre and come back, eat and drink, hug and kiss their partner, idly lean onto the stage, chat with their neighbour, holler and hoot, and much more. In short, an audience member can choose freely whether to submit their body’s attention to the action or not. Furthermore, a spectator may opt to contribute to the action, be it in a positive or a negative way. The actors, then, react to
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contributions, controlling or stopping them if necessary.\textsuperscript{318} How much the audiences may influence the action, becomes apparent in the extension of performance time at Globe events. Audience reactions, for example applause, significantly prolong the duration of a performance.\textsuperscript{319}

One might ask how it is possible for an individual to pay attention to the performance on the Globe stage, considering the physical influences and possibilities in spectator action mentioned. McConachie addresses this problem by introducing the concept of ‘cognitive multitasking’. According to the concept, spectators are equipped with mechanisms to conquer the sea of sensations around them and focus on the unfolding action on stage. McConachie even suggests that the energy needed for this focus actually increases attention to the extent that more enduring memories of the performance are created in the mind/brain.\textsuperscript{320} Some audience members might not be accustomed to the focus of attention at the Globe or, for that matter, to the degree of response required, which may pose another problem. In his account about acting on the Globe stage, Mark Rylance discusses possible obstacles faced when interacting with an audience: “Their responses are not always sincere or involved. Many are shy and unused to expressing themselves in a public place and so they fall into received patterns of response”.\textsuperscript{321} In spite of this, generally, the audience are not only able to take in incredible amounts of stimuli, but also play along with the actors on stage. Claire van Kampen praises these abilities and professes her belief that the Globe audience “has become a theatre practitioner”.\textsuperscript{322}

While actors and directors predominantly seem to agree with the view of the audience as performer, there are researchers who would not go as far as to endorse this comparison. Because the audience is invited into the play world to perform a part, and the yard and the stage merge into one playing space, the audience may appear like another character in the performance.\textsuperscript{323} According to research in cognitive science, this is due to the playgoers knowing instinctively that they are allowed to “engage in collaborative play” for the duration of the performance, because “play is fundamentally an emotion, a
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neuronal and chemical system”, universally present.\(^{324}\) The Globe researcher Woods, however, criticises likening the audience to performers, as “they are engaged in a complementary but fundamentally different set of tasks”. She establishes the main difference in that spectators do not act and do not experience the performance as actors do, because they cannot anticipate what will follow in the course of the action. Woods acknowledges the importance of the audience’s role in a production at the Globe, but she also stresses its distinctness from the work of a performer.\(^{325}\) In theory, there certainly has to be made a distinction between the work of the actor and the audience. There is no doubt that, when it comes to the preparation necessary for a production alone, very different tasks have to be fulfilled by actors and spectators, respectively. In practice, on the other hand, it can be helpful to imagine the audience as another actor, as Mark Rylance explains:

Eventually, in my last years, I really came to feel that it was not just about speaking, it was about thinking of the audience as other actors […] Anything they did was like another player on the stage doing something, so they were always there and when you were alone they were your conscience or your soul.\(^{326}\)

Thus, Rylance expresses how an audience may support the performance of an actor on stage. This means that, when it comes to acting techniques, reacting to the audience like to another actor can be advantageous; however, it does not necessarily imply that the audience is exactly like another actor in every way. Playing off the audience’s responses as if they were a fellow actor on stage, can be seen as a solution to the problem of how to perform to a visible audience whose reaction cannot be ignored.

In conclusion, there may not be possible a wholesale judgement about whether the audience represents a performer in their own right. However, the work done by the audience should not be underestimated. They do not merely observe the action, but immerse themselves in it; consequently, they become active. The audience’s role in meaning-production is even stronger than at conventional theatres and adds to the variation in perception of the play at hand from performance to performance.\(^{327}\) Thus, the
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“radical significance and centrality of the audience to the theatrical exchange”\textsuperscript{328} is undeniable.

4. The Reconstructed Experience: Strategies for Audience Interaction

When new actors arrive at the Globe, firstly, they may be overwhelmed by how different the playing experience will turn out to be; they may be intimidated by the expecting gazes of the audience; they may be terrified by the prospect of unexpected responses by spectators. “Don’t speak to them, don’t speak for them, speak with them, play with them”,\textsuperscript{329} is Mark Rylance’s first encouraging advice for these actors. This constitutes the first step towards facilitating successful audience interaction on the actors’ part. Allowing the audience to become involved in the action by performing together \textit{with} them, not performing \textit{for} them, is the goal. This means that the audience become the motivation for a character’s performance, not just observers of it. According to Purcell, this results in the audience’s role in the play becoming “both more pleasurable and more complicated”.\textsuperscript{330} Actors and directors at the Globe aim to bridge the gap between stage and audience and assign a more active role to the audience. Amongst other things, they attempt to adopt a ‘you address’ of sorts to collaborate with the audience.\textsuperscript{331} To this end, various strategies for interaction have been developed by actors and directors – or have been engendered naturally while working with the space. These strategies do not only include basic vocal and visual acting techniques to keep up audience attention like ‘spatial-cuing’;\textsuperscript{332} for example, strategies can also comprise “estranging [the audience], playing them, talking to them, casting them, immersing them, or affecting them viscerally”.\textsuperscript{333} While these categories of interaction were established by Purcell, something similar will be attempted in this chapter.

The following strategies were developed by combining research conducted by theatre scholars, comments by directors on their work, interviews with Globe actors on
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their craft and stage experience, and my personal experience as a Globe audience member. At times, the strategies will be illustrated by quoting actors who report on extraordinary instances of audience interaction, or interactive behaviour I have noted during my playgoing experience. Incorporating examples from my own experience as an audience member to analyse audience interaction strategies complies with a method of conducting audience research preferred by Susan Kattwinkel. Focusing on the experience of the body, Kattwinkel argues that “the activities of speaking, listening, and acting allow the scholar to gather experiential knowledge in contrast to the solely exterior knowledge gained from detached observation”.

This is why this section includes three performances for which I could be present in the audience: *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* directed by Emma Rice, *The Winter’s Tale* directed by Blanche McIntyre, and *Othello* directed by Claire van Kampen. Of course, the aim is not to provide a definitive list of strategies every actor in every performance must adhere to. Rather, the theatrical potential provided by the unique parameters of the Globe should be explored by seeking out possible strategies of interaction available to actors and directors. The question is how a production may yield opportunities to address its audience and for its audience to react. These created opportunities for interaction, however, may also lead to certain problems for theatre makers to tackle. How can active audience participation be attained and contained at the same time? For instance, should audience interaction go so far as to seriously interrupt the action on stage, the play may be affected by the loss of its fictional integrity. Preventing this from happening proves a balancing act by the performers, as audience behaviour cannot be predicted for each performance. As Werner observes, “there is no guarantee that an audience will react the way in which a performer expects”. Apart from this, audiences are not required to react and may often resist actors’ endeavours to interact with them in a certain way. Every audience is different,
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which is why every performance will stay unpredictable and unrepeatable. Thus, the five suggested strategies might not work for each and every audience.

The idea of the audience as another actor lies at the heart of most of the interaction strategies. Even though some researchers are sceptical of a direct comparison between the two, imagining the audience as another actor can be a tremendously useful aid for performers at the Globe. Perceived as “an extension of the company on stage”, the spectators can be “addressed, included, questioned, or put into a specific role”, which leads to a plethora of staging possibilities for directors and may give rise to new interpretations of the plays. Hereby, Shakespeare’s text always serves as a starting point: This is where actors and directors look for cues on how to interact with the audience in a way that makes sense for postmodern spectators in a reconstructed theatre. As a result, the focus of the first strategy is the text – namely, how theatre makers at the Globe help the modern audience understand early modern plays by interacting with playgoers. Inducing laughter as a means to ensure a constant feedback loop plays a role here. Another strategy comprises the direct address of individual audience members, using eye contact or body movement in correspondence to the text, or even physical touch. In connection to singling out one individual, the strategy of casting the whole audience as a group character has also become common practice at Shakespeare’s Globe. Furthermore, interaction can also be achieved by exploiting the Globe space in certain ways: either by choices in stage design, or by purposefully positioning the actors closer to or amongst the audience. Lastly, devices of direct address, particularly metatheatrical elements, should be implemented by actors to enhance the quality of interaction. These five major audience interaction strategies have been formulated as if they were advice given to a Globe actor; they present bundles of minor strategies that have been grouped according to their purpose. It shall be noted that, as performance constitutes a synthesis of different techniques, with a host of processes occurring simultaneously, sometimes the established strategies will overlap.
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Aid in the audience’s understanding of the text

The Globe audience usually consists of a diverse crowd of people: theatre scholars stand next to tourists and pupils, while behind them, acting students may strike up a conversation with a group of interested friends, who have never been to a Globe performance before. As a result, the theatre aims to cater to the needs of both avid theatregoers and novices alike. One important aspect in this regard is facilitating the understanding of the play text for everyone present – even those not familiar with Shakespeare’s work – to create an enjoyable theatre experience. The language gap between early modern English and modern English can be bridged by employing a range of acting devices. Audience interaction plays a crucial role in this, as active communication with the audience may aid in the understanding of the action.

Firstly, “extra-textual elaborations” can be inserted to enhance audience interaction and expand on the meaning of the text. This includes vocal additions, so-called ad libs. For example, the actor Tibu Fortes, who played one of the fairies in Emma Rice’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, comments on this addition of helpful words or sounds to the text:

I was talking to someone yesterday and there’s a couple of ad libs - scripted ad libs - that we have through the show. And it’s really helpful for the ear, because we don’t speak Shakespeare in every day [life], and as lovely and as admired and wonderful as it is, it takes a lot of concentration. So sometimes when someone adds in an ad lib, it snaps your brain out of it and then brings you back into focus […] Fortes’ account illustrates how small additions to the text can benefit actor-audience communication; Purcell, however, argues that Shakespeare’s text alone suffices to establish a conversation with the spectators. Mark Rylance seems to have found a middle ground between the two opinions on ad libs. In his portrayal of Iago in *Othello*, Rylance uttered vocalisations between words or sentences to bring across his message. It sounded like, after finishing a sentence, his character was still musing on what he had
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just said, without speaking actual words. To support his sounds, Rylance would sometimes gesture at other characters on stage or at the audience, raising his eyebrows as if expecting a reaction; mostly, it seemed, his character was looking for signs of comprehension or approval of his vicious plans. It could also be argued that the actor’s vocalisations served as buffers between passages of text to let the audience process the information they had just received. In effect, this technique could lead to a better understanding of the unfolding action and Shakespeare’s language. In his interview about acting in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, Fortes’ elaborates further that the sound of music may also add to the audience’s understanding of the play. Controversially, popular music was used in the production by Emma Rice to create a contrast to the world of Shakespeare. When, suddenly, "Single Ladies (Put a Ring on It)" by Beyoncé starts playing during the dialogue between Hermia and Helenus in Act I, audience members, who might have drifted off, may be taken aback by this stark contrast and forced to focus on the action again. Some groundlings, familiar with the popular song, even started dancing and singing along, when I was watching the performance from the yard. More traditional music imitating the sound of early modern music, however, can have a similar effect. A musical interlude incorporating dance and a mandolin solo by Iago before the feast in Act II set the scene, and, at the same time, provided a break from the dialogue and a chance for the audience to process previous actions. In this way, music may help the audience to be more prepared to focus on and understand the following text.

Furthermore, the actors’ movement – including facial expressions and gestures – may be just as crucial for comprehension as sound. According to Sue Lefton, who was a
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movement coach during the Globe’s opening season, “you cannot separate the physical from the text”. Lefton instructs actors to think of their voice and their body as one mask, stressing the importance of clarity in movement to help the audience understand the action. Then, even though many audience members may not understand Shakespeare’s language, they can still follow the performance through the actors’ bodies.

Lastly, laughter plays a powerful role in the interactive relationship between actors and audiences, as it can serve as a marker of understanding. Shakespeare’s text is laden with references and puns, which were likely to induce laughter in an early modern audience; however, many of these jokes usually do not provoke the same reactions in modern audiences. It is the actor’s task to revive Elizabethan puns by adopting the interactive techniques mentioned: Ad libs and exaggerated movement may help the audience appreciate old jokes and dead puns. Yet, audience laughter is not only caused by these spelled out jokes. In an actor interview, Luke MacGregor, who played Florizel in The Winter’s Tale, explains how the audience can communicate their understanding of the text through laughter:

It feels like sometimes the audience give a vocal reaction and a response to basically saying, "We're with you, we understand". There were lines that aren't laugh out loud, hilarious lines that were getting big laughter, and it felt like it was [the audience] were like, "We're with you. We get what you're saying, we understand." But it's lovely, it is infectious.

Therefore, laughter may serve as a means for the audience to become active in the theatrical exchange. As MacGregor knows from his experience on stage, this kind of laughter is contagious; when a few groundlings start to laugh – maybe even at a minor joke – it soon feels as if a tidal wave of hilarity ripples through the yard and even reaches the spectators in the galleries. Kenny attributes this effect to the architecture of the Globe and the lit auditorium. The theatre’s round shape, where audience members can see each other laugh, allows for “a triangulation of laughing”. This means that audience members, who respond to a joke on stage, might infect others to join in; in effect, sometimes spectators are not necessarily only reacting to the action on stage, but to their fellow
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playgoers as well. As a result, laughter is spread and maintained far more than in conventional theatres with dark auditoriums. Generally, laughter is a means for the audience to communicate to the actors that they are with them. Additionally, actors may find the circumstances at the Globe leading to more laughter during a performance reaffirming of their way of acting.

Theatre makers at the Globe have recognised the importance of laughter for audience interaction and, consequently, aim to stress the comedic elements in the plays. Laughter-inducing interaction presents the key to the Globe’s reputation of granting intellectual accessibility to all of the audience. Moments inducing laughter are easily detected in Shakespeare’s comedies; more surprisingly, on the other hand, are the moments of comic relief found in the tragedies. For instance, Globe director Cohen suggests actors “play the moment, not the play or its supposed genre”. In this way, a tragedy like Othello can start out reasonably light-hearted: the audience may even be invited to laugh at Iago’s interaction with them through his soliloquies and asides. In the production of 2018, for example, Rylance played Iago in such a way as to gain the audience’s sympathy by eliciting as many laughs as possible, while revealing his evil machinations to the audience. A review in The New York Times called the production “a rare opportunity to experience an ‘Othello’ from which you emerge – from the first act, anyway – wanting to grin”. When the mood suddenly changes in Act V, and it dawns on the audience that they have been laughing with a despicable villain, a disturbed and subdued feeling may be sensed amongst the spectators. On the other hand, in a play like The Winter’s Tale, a reversed effect can be observed. The play starts out like a tragedy but develops into a comedy with the arrival of a clown after Act III. In consequence to this contrast, the second half of the play may seem even more hilarious. Kiernan argues that the effects caused by Shakespeare’s dramaturgy become heightened in the Globe space, as it may “affect ‘same-light’ audiences in direct and tangible ways”. Subsequently, laughter gained from interaction could be responsible for building up
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relationships with characters, which may turn sour later in the play. The effect of a performance on an audience’s conscience can be steered through this technique. Even more importantly, as Kenny argues, “laughter demonstrates a shared moment between actor and audience through the performance of the text” and, therefore, facilitates both interaction and understanding. Of course, laughter is a universal response at the Globe, playing into other strategies as well.

In sum, aiding in the audience’s understanding of the text constitutes one of the more general strategies of audience interaction; the strategy can be seen as an objective, which continually shapes the actions of Globe performers.

Directly address individuals

The visibility of each and every audience member has led to new possibilities for actors in addressing the audience. While in conventional theatres more modern practices allow for breaking the fourth wall to address the audience directly, the effects of doing so may never achieve the level of thrill associated with this technique at the Globe. Interaction with individual spectators has become so frequent, that particularly the groundlings need to be prepared for direct address through eye contact, text, or even touch at all times.

Lines can be directed at different individuals as a means to include the whole audience in the action. This is done for a sense of amusement this strategy may trigger in the whole audience. In practice, certain insults in Shakespeare’s text can be exploited to momentarily cast individual members of the audience into a role. When characters are mentioned in the text who do not appear on stage, an opportunity to point out a member of the groundlings is posed. Already causing chuckles in a conventional theatre, where the insults are usually thrown out into the space off-stage, these instances become even more fun when directed at an unsuspecting spectator. In the performance of Othello I watched, for example, Rylance took some of Iago’s insults at the beginning of the play, when he is talking to Roderigo, as an opportunity to point out an audience member. While uttering the lines “You shall mark / Many a duteous and knee-crooking knave / That, doting on his own obsequious bondage, / Wears out his time much like his master’s ass /
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For naught but provender, and when he’s old, / cashiered. / Whip me such honest knaves!”, (1.1.43-49) he gestured towards a man in the audience, as if to prove his point that such subservient fools exist. The audience erupted in laughter, whereupon he uttered his ad-lip utterances, purveying a sense of feeling agreed with. Before the feast, then, the actor/character jokingly offered a glass of wine to a groundling in the front row, just to snatch it away when she wanted to take it. This little interaction also resulted in a burst of laughter. Direct interaction with individuals presents an apt device to prompt laughter in an audience, but subtler forms of the same are possible to achieve different effects. For instance, as the actor Toby Cockerell reports, he would establish eye contact with audience members who were not paying attention to the play to regain their attention.362

Actors also refer to the feedback they receive, be it positive or negative, from looking directly at or interacting with an audience member during a speech. Will Keen, who played Leontes in The Winter’s Tale, describes his experience with direct address as generally rewarding. Yet, he also talks about his disappointment with individuals in the audience who would look away when they were addressed, who may have been uncomfortable with eye contact. Keen attributes his feelings about this to “all those trainings for the ego” actors go through, which result in “the fantasy you have in a dark theatre that people are listening to you”.363 His colleague Priyanga Burford explains how she deals with rejections on the part of the audience: “I looked at this one lady and she didn't want me to speak to her, it was very obvious. […] But she looked very upset and she looked down, which had a really interesting effect on me in the moment in the play. And it actually really helped me”.364 Tibu Fortes, on the other hand, talks about his positive experience with direct address in A Midsummer Night’s Dream: “And sometimes like as a sentinel, I have to sit at the front of the stage and say flirt with some people. And some people really go for it! You’re like, ‘Oh, oh, now you’ve really shocked me instead of me shocking you!’”365 For example, when I was watching this performance of A Midsummer Night’s Dream, standing in the front row, Tibu Fortes/the fairy started flirting with me. He sat down on the edge of the stage right in front of me, lifting his leg, and
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flicking his tongue. I have to admit that I was too stumped to directly react to any of this, so I only recall burying my face in my hands laughing. All of these anecdotes go to prove that Globe actors have to acquire the skill to work with whatever feedback they receive from individuals spontaneously.

Even more direct than maintaining eye contact with individuals or gesturing towards an audience member is physical contact. In conventional theatre practice the basic rules of proxemics are generally upheld between the audience and the actors: Public distance is what is deemed appropriate for theatre contexts, while intimate distance is reserved for private encounters. According to Fischer-Lichte, “the fundamental opposition between seeing and touching in theatre”366 is already obsolete. Ascertaining that “the binary between public and private belongs to the past”, she wonders what physical contact between actor and spectator may accomplish today.367 At the Globe, where the presence of the actor’s body is already heightened by the natural light and the intimate space, physically touching an audience member does not seem like an extreme boundary to cross. The act of touch may contribute to the overall realisation that the actor is not a distant illusion, but a corporeal reality, a manifested presence like the spectators themselves. Kennedy argues that this notion may result in the actor being perceived as at the same time “more human and more threatening”,368 which generates an interesting dynamic between actors and spectators at the Globe. Tibu Fortes, referring to the production of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, describes the experience as extraordinarily visceral and accessible because of the actors’ physical contact with individual audience members: “[…] we’re still touching them, kissing them, passing through them all the time”.369 Katy Owen, who played Puck in the same production, offers an anecdote about an intimate encounter with an audience member:

There was this gentleman at the front of the stage the other day and I went in for a kiss, and he was very elderly (I would say he was in his 90’s) and he looked very fragile. And I thought as I was doing it, that little seed of doubt crept into my head, and I thought, ‘How is he going to respond to this?’ And I went in, on the lips, and I snogged him! And when I drew away I thought, ‘Oh!’ He looked up at the crowd and he went, ‘Yes! Yes!’ And they gave him a round of applause. And you can’t carry on, you have to play that moment, you have to let him have it. […] And they
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clapped him and he looked delighted that he was a) kissed, and b) then applauded
for his reaction to the kiss. And I love that sort of stuff.370

This account provides an interesting insight into how actors perceive intimacy with
audience members. The physical contact attempted by Katy Owen can be interpreted as
a success in regard to the reactions of the individual and the rest of the audience;
nevertheless, Owen weighed up the situation for a moment, which shows that such contact
can be daunting for actors as well. When successful, such intimate interaction opens up
more “transgressive opportunities of performance, […] violating common notions of
where Shakespeare belongs, and how he should be represented”,371 as Kennedy explains.
On the other hand, actors may need to heed caution when touching an audience member,
reading them closely before doing so. The Globe director Cohen even argues for actors
to abstain from physical contact with spectating individuals completely, as watching a
performance “is a mental and not a physical thing, and no audience member should have
to deal with an actor touching him or her without permission”.372 This presents surprising
advice from a director, as the Globe has generally been established as a theatre, where
such transgressions are commonplace to the point where they are anticipated by the
audience.

Even though some critics and theatre practitioners might advise caution with
directly addressing audience members and reactions may vary, the strategy may “help
explore the interplay between proximity and distance, public and private, or visual and
tactile contact”.373 All arguments considered, direct interaction can present an effective
strategy, but also requires the actors to employ tact and sensitivity towards the individuals
involved.

**Cast the audience as a group**

With this strategy, the circle of direct address becomes wider, as the whole audience at
once is included in the interaction. To this end, actors and directors aim to assign group
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identities to audiences, wherever possible. Freshwater points out that this practice can lead to excitement in spectators because of “the uncertainty about how much participation will be required”, as a consequence of this new identity. Theatre makers at the Globe are aware of the implications of such group identities, carefully constructing them for their spectators. Two modes of assigning group identities can be observed in the Globe context: casting the audience as a fictional group character and exploiting the audience’s role as a group of spectators.

The first mode relies on direct or indirect instances in the text, where groups or crowds are mentioned. In this way, audiences can be cast as an army in Julius Caesar and as wedding guests in A Midsummer Night’s Dream. Banks suggests that audiences can be treated like “a group of instant extras”. Having to assume a role in the fiction, the audience is presented with a carnivalesque experience which subverts and democratizes the normally fixed theatrical order of actors and onlookers. Secondly, when the audience are not specifically cast into a fictional role, the second mode of identification applies. Instead of assigning them the role of play characters, rather their identity as Globe spectators is stressed, involving them into the unfolding action and the conflict of a performance. Whenever an actor holds a speech, they need to ask themselves whether it is addressed at the audience or at other characters on the stage, and what role the audience plays in this instant. Cohen argues that all of Shakespeare’s plays “have such public moments that transcend the bounds of the stage to include the world inside the theatre” – they merely need to be identified by directors and actors. Depending on the mood of the scene and the character speaking, the audience can be cast as “confidante, judge, friend, or foe”. This entails important consequences for performances held at the theatre: While in illusory conventional theatre the audience is generally excluded from the fictional world, at Shakespeare’s Globe actors/character inhabit the same world as the audience. This is why the audience can be “in complicity with the setting of traps and
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deceits”, for example as witnesses to Puck playing tricks on the other characters in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. Probably the most prominent example of this assumption of identity, the audience can also be cast as a confidante by an antagonist character. As characters like Iago reveal their evil machinations to the audience, “a knowing complicity between actors and audience” develops. Purcell argues that these villainous characters, who build up a relationship with the audience, are “Shakespeare’s most seductive figures”. By letting the audience in on their plans in an intelligent and eloquent manner, they can create a feeling of conflict in the audience. In the production of *Othello*, for example, Mark Rylance played an outstandingly charming and witty Iago, who seemed be able to wrap a great deal of the audience around his little finger by inducing plenty of laughter during the first half of the play. Generally, the audience may be enjoying their role as the trusted confidante, while also questioning their involvement in the morally abhorrent plans of the villain. Purcell claims that this conflict may amount to an intense feeling of theatrical pleasure. The goal of the strategy is to elicit a more complex response than just the production of laughter or the booing of a villain. Iago’s objective is to involve the audience into an “ultra-live dialogue” – as artistic director Michelle Terry calls the interaction between actor and spectators – until the audience stands as “the final character in the story” at the end of the play. Although in a way complicit in Iago’s actions, the audience remains as judge.

The overall effect exerted on the audience by this strategy is what Werner calls ‘participatory identification’. By assigning the audience a role in the play, either an actual group character or a role derived from their identities as spectators, they may feel as though they were participating in the fictional world. This practice presents a strategy frequently adopted by directors and actors to stress the “democratic nature of the Globe”, where actors and spectators alike are expected to actively take part in the theatrical event.
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Exploit the space

Playing the Globe space in the same way as the stage at a proscenium arch theatre would be used, would be futile. The space was not made to look like film screen, but to allow three-dimensional acting, exploiting the whole stage, including the pillars. Furthermore, due to the natural light illuminating the whole theatre, the yard can be played by actors as well. For this purpose, sometimes the stage is extended further into the yard.

Various techniques have been discovered in terms of dramaturgical stage positioning. The corners of the stage away from the pillars have been found to be suitable for audience interaction and direct address, as this spot presents a powerful position to gain the support of the audience. By separating themselves from the rest of the stage, the pillar serving as a boundary, actors stand closer to the audience than to the other characters in the middle of the stage. Depending on the context of the scene, this could cause the audience to sympathise more strongly with the actor/character in the corner. Even more unique to the Globe appears its frequent use of the yard. Extensions are often built to stretch the ludic space further into the yard. Sometimes these extensions look like the existing stage, other times directors and stage designers conceive innovative options to have actors exploit the yard. For example, in Emma Rice’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* actors could hop from the stage onto round tables with white tablecloths. In particular Puck would often dart across the stage, jump from one table to another, and stop to deliver a few lines or interact with audience members. The groundlings had to heed caution not to stand in the way of the actor and sometimes their shoulders served as support for a large leap. Katy Owen praised this extensive use of the yard but compared the necessary physical activity to running a marathon. Nevertheless, she remarked that this is how the Globe space is supposed to be used. It seems only fitting that an actor in the role of a spirit is granted such freedom of movement. Apart from this, the platforms offered extensive opportunities for exceptional dramaturgical positioning of the actors. During the play-within-the-play, for instance, the wedding guests were sitting down on the tables in the yard, while the mechanicals were performing on the main stage.
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Figure 7: The stage design of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* with tables in the yard

Figure 8: Ships ‘sailing’ through the audience in *Othello*
Furthermore, at the beginning of the play, the lovers entered through the audience and climbed a table. The production of *Othello* did not have such platforms; however, other creative means were employed to play the yard. For example, small ships were built, so that characters could ‘sail’ through a sea of spectators towards the stage. The actor David Fielder does not deem it likely that playing the yard was part of original practice. Despite reasoning that safe usage of the yard is only possible because today’s audiences are civilised and polite, arguably more so than Elizabethan theatregoers, Fielder embraces the practice at the reconstructed Globe.\(^\text{392}\)

This strategy of exploiting the space forces the audience to engage with the performance with their whole body: spectators have to turn their heads to follow the action and move away from actors when they nudge through. Additionally, because the actors can move so freely between the stage and the yard, the whole theatre becomes a performance space, which may add to the audience’s sense of being part of the fictional world. In brief, the strategy adds several staging possibilities by enabling a moulding of the whole theatrical space, not just the ludic space, and promotes physical interaction between actor and spectator.

### Make use of metatheatrical devices

The metatheatrical devices described in this section are soliloquies, asides, prologues, epilogues, and end-of-play jigs. Even though not explicitly stated, all of these elements can be found in Shakespeare’s texts. It is the director’s and the actors’ task to employ them effectively at the new Globe. If successful, the devices allow another layer of meaning, which helps facilitate audience interaction. Metatheatrical instances in performance, alluding to the collaborative theatrical process itself, constitute a joke to enjoy together with the audience. Conveyed with a wink, these moments refer to the make-belief world created together in the theatre.\(^\text{393}\) Therefore, they should be encouraged, as they may strengthen the relationship between actors and spectators.

Because soliloquies and asides were added as specific stage directions to Shakespeare’s text by modern editors, it may appear that these are the only moments

---

\(^{392}\) Fielder as cited in Kiernan, *Shakespeare*, 135.

\(^{393}\) See Cohen, “Globe”, 220.
when characters are allowed to converse with the audience. As Purcell argues, however, Shakespeare did not constrict his characters in this way, meaning that there could be uninterrupted interaction between actors and audience. Interpreting asides and soliloquies as dialogues with the audience is an apt method for actors to promote interaction. 394 Instead of representing a character’s inner monologue when they are alone on stage, a soliloquy is meant to be addressed to the visible audience at the Globe. Effectively, a soliloquy becomes an intimate, private moment, shared between the character and the audience, in which the audience becomes a confidante. 395 This may not only help the audience to empathise with a character, but also aids the actor in their delivery. Having a visible crowd of people to address and being able to observe their responses, may add new elements to an actor’s performance. The metatheatrical layer of these moments stems from the actors acknowledging the spectators’ role as an audience they can directly address.

Prologues and epilogues were commonly omitted in nineteenth-century productions of Shakespeare’s plays, as these metatheatrical texts did not conform with the illusionistic approach mainly taken during this time period. Only in the twentieth centuries did the devices regain the interest of directors. The texts create a liminal space in which a particular kind of interaction between audience and actors is possible before and after the play. 396 Pointing out its fictionality with a prologue and an epilogue, a performance can set its rules of theatrical transaction and introduce the actors playing the roles, respectively. 397 Usually, a production will perform the liminal texts available, as some plays do not start with a prologue but offer an epilogue and vice versa. To make amends for the lack of a prologue in A Midsummer Night’s Dream, a new one was conceived for Emma Rice’s 2016 production. The prologue was written for the mechanics to welcome the audience and explain the rules of watching a play at the Globe. To add another metatheatrical layer, the mechanics introduced themselves as Globe employees, wearing aprons similar to the uniform worn by the volunteer stewards who check tickets, sell programmes, and so on. Two of the mechanics were on stage, while the others were standing in the audience, waiting to be called out and introduced.
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by their colleagues. The witty speech from the tambourine-wielding leader of the ‘Globe employees’, disguised as a pre-performance health and safety talk, included actual rules for the audience (for example, no video and no photography is allowed); however, some other nonsense-rules were added, resulting in laughter from the audience. Nick Bottom, introduced as the ‘health and safety officer’, for example, explained how the audience should behave in the event of a fire: The audience would be required to “make two very clear channels through to the doors” and “allow the actors to exit first”. Additionally, jokes about alleged Elizabethan theatre etiquette were made: “We are all for original practice here at the Globe, but please do refrain from public urination and spreading syphilis”. By adding a modernised version of a prologue to *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, Emma Rice prepared the audience for the ensuing humour and the play world in general. The self-referential jokes of the prologue stand in the tradition of other known prologues, while also referring to new metatheatrical elements, like the supposed audience behaviour at the ‘old’ Globe. Furthermore, the audience is acknowledged as being part of the performance from the beginning, as they are addressed directly by the mechanicals. This may ready the spectators for more audience interaction later in the performance.

While prologues serve to transition the audience into the play world, epilogues are to achieve the opposite effect. Often this element at the end of a play addresses the audience directly to thank them for their attention and plea for applause. This is when the actors may slip out of their characters again. In connection to this, so-called jigs have become common practice at the reconstructed Globe. Jigs are short dance numbers to a catchy tune performed after the epilogue of comedies, as well as tragedies, usually in place of a conventional curtain call. According to Woods, jigs offer a “release of tension felt by everyone who has shared the work of concentrating and being physically invested in their attention and care for the characters”, in particular after tragedies. Woods attributes the need for a jig to the audience and the actors craving “a mutual resolution in the physically and emotionally draining affective labour of performance and reception at Shakespeare’s Globe”. The audience may rid themselves of the strong emotions experienced during the performance by moving their bodies and clapping to a bawdy tune before leaving the theatre. For example, after *Othello’s* strenuous last act, the actress playing Desdemona slowly came to life again and started dancing happily with all of the
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other characters, which may have triggered some release in the audience. The audience is presented with the metatheatrical element involved in a jig: the character of Desdemona may be dead, the actor, of course, is not. As a result, as Kiernan argues, a jig reveals “the implications for our understanding of the relationships between fiction and theatre worlds”.399

In sum, prologues and epilogues present a frame for the play, which serves as a liminal area to transition from the world of the audience to the world of the play and back again. Through the direct address in soliloquies and asides, “Shakespeare juxtaposes a faraway fictional space with the world of his audience”.400 Purcell likens the strategy’s effect to Brechtian estrangement,401 as these moments may remind the audience of the performance’s theatricality. However, this does not mean that performances at the Globe aim to disrupt an ‘illusion’. Kiernan opposes the practice of seeing a Shakespeare play as an “imitation of life, an ‘illusion’ which, is ‘broken’ every time a play draws attention to itself as fiction”.402 On the contrary, theatregoers may even feel more connected to actors addressing them as themselves, because the barrier of theatrical illusion is dismissed and

399 Kiernan, Shakespeare, 59.
400 Purcell, Shakespeare, 84.
401 See ibid., 87-88.
402 Kiernan, Shakespeare, 44-45.
the real performer behind the role is partly revealed. Actor Nick Fletcher confirms this argument with his experience of directly addressing the audience:

When you look into the eyes of an actor and that actor looks into your eye at the same time you should be aware at that point that you’re actually watching an actor in a role playing a part in a fictional world, but it doesn’t break the spell. […] Suspension of disbelief and all of that doesn’t really come into question because everybody’s pretending – the audience have got to contribute as much for it to work.

It may be true that an audience member in the Globe theatre is prevented from complete immersion into the fictional world by their awareness of the theatrical event, partly induced by metatheatrical elements like soliloquies, asides, prologues, and epilogues. However, the devices may also serve to connect the spectators to the actors and, therefore support audience interaction.

5. Effects of Audience Interaction on Theatre Experience

After two seasons at the Globe, former artistic director Emma Rice was forced to step down. Her innovations, such as the introduction of amplified sound and artificial lighting, caused heavy debates about authenticity and the purpose of the Globe. Even though Rice’s productions were popular with audiences, selling out rapidly, traditionalists had the last word in deciding the future course of the Globe. One of the theatre critics for The Guardian, Susannah Clapp, objected to the Globe’s decision because Rice’s work “honoured the particular connection at the Globe between audience and actor”. Clapp did not believe that Rice’s changes broke with one of the Globe’s cherished qualities: the unique interactive relationship between actors and audience. Research shows that interactivity at the Globe constitutes a considerable part of the theatre’s appeal for audiences. It has come to my attention that many scholars and theatre practitioners have attempted to describe the effects related to audience interaction. Claims have been made
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that interaction could be “enabling, empowering, democratic and even transformative”.\textsuperscript{409} Furthermore, audiences may take joy in the act of collaboration.\textsuperscript{410} This chapter deals with possible effects and implications of audience interaction. It aims to detect possible reasons for the theatrical pleasure audiences may experience due to interaction and connect this feeling to the concepts of \textit{communitas}, ‘flow’, and ‘utopian performatives’.

Sam Wanamaker intended the new Globe space to offer to audiences something new, unfamiliar and almost frightening to restore the joy of watching a Shakespeare play in spectators.\textsuperscript{411} Since the concept of mirror systems was established by cognitive science, new grounds for “the human need for and enjoyment of theatre and similar games of make-believe”,\textsuperscript{412} have been discovered. Researchers from different fields have aimed to describe the joy audiences may gain from watching a theatrical performance. Falocco, for instance, finds it hard to pin down the reason for the Globe’s appeal,\textsuperscript{413} while Worthen invents the term ‘Globeness’ to describe the theatre’s success.\textsuperscript{414} According to Purcell, the feeling is what transpires when “audiences and actors share in the thrill of the unexpected and in the moment of discovery”.\textsuperscript{415} Probably for lack of a fitting word, States simply calls the feeling actors and spectators embody ‘the thing’.\textsuperscript{416}

Theatre practitioners at the Globe have been describing ‘the thing’ as an exceptional feeling, which emerges when actors and audiences join in a communal instant of theatrical energy.\textsuperscript{417} The actor Rory Edwards refers to an “atmosphere that’s created by the people involved in the project” which involves a “spiritual dimension”, creating a “bridge between Shakespeare and now”;\textsuperscript{418} Toby Cockerell talks about the energy the audience gives off through their communal mass reaction to the performance;\textsuperscript{419} Tibu Fortes describes the effect the audience has on the performers as an “amazing feeling”;\textsuperscript{420} while his colleague, Katy Owen, also talks about a certain kind of energy emanating from
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the audience.\textsuperscript{421} Scholars have taken up on such descriptions of Globe performance as well, with Brown considering “the mood and ideas that are in the air”\textsuperscript{422} as an important part in performance, and Kiernan stressing the shared energy between stage and yard.\textsuperscript{423} As a result, it can be observed that the concepts of energy and community play a significant role in the perception of Globe performance amongst theatre practitioners and some researchers. Others, however, have criticised these descriptions of theatre experience. Silverstone, for example, calls such accounts from actors ‘fictions’; she is sceptical of the performers and the audience producing an empowering energy everyone in the theatre can feel.\textsuperscript{424} These doubts are supported by Auslander’s research, who caused debate over the status of live performance in a mediatised society.\textsuperscript{425} In his seminal work, he qualified the positive effects most connected to live performance: “spontaneity, community, presence, and feedback between performers and audience”, by comparing them with effects linked to mediatised forms.\textsuperscript{426} Despite her criticism, Silverstone concedes that the belief in an energy emanating from the performance seems to play a crucial part in the success of the Globe.\textsuperscript{427} Generally, if this feeling of energy has been manifested in spectators’ and actors’ minds, whether it be ‘real’ in a scientific sense or not, it can be deemed worthy of consideration in audience research. Nevertheless, for this argument’s purpose, less elusive terms for the connection between audience and actors through interaction may be called for.

There is another experience Globe actors often refer to. Mark Rylance, for instance, talks about the collective creation of the play between actors and spectators\textsuperscript{428} and, therefore, the development of a group consciousness amongst the audience during a performance.\textsuperscript{429} These descriptions offer instances of theatrical experience at the Globe, in which actors and/or audiences “feel themselves allied with each other”,\textsuperscript{430} leading to a universal concept for which the cultural anthropologist Victor Turner coined the term
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According to Turner’s wife, Edith Turner, communitas expresses “a group’s pleasure in sharing common experiences with one’s fellows.” Communitas may occur as a feeling of joy in “moments of change freed from the regular structures of life” such as “in festivals, in music, in work situations, in times of stress, in disaster, in revolution, and in nature.” The origins of the concept lie in Turner’s and van Gennep’s research into rites of passage in different cultures. Van Gennep’s work concerning transitional rites has frequently been linked to the theatre, as his three phases – the phase of separation from society, the transformational phase, and the phase of reincorporation into society with a changed status – can all be found in performance contexts. Applied to a theatrical performance at the Globe, then, this means that first spectators are separated from ‘normal’ society by the act of going to the theatre, or, at the latest, after having heard the transitional prologue; secondly, the audience are put through extraordinary experiences, experiences which require different rules than their everyday lives; lastly, now changed through the performance, playgoers return to society, possibly by means of an epilogue and a customary end-of-play jig. Turner called the second phase a state of liminality, in which experiment and innovation are bound to occur. In this context, parallels to the concept of the carnival by Bakhtin become apparent, which refers to an accepted form of anarchy in a safe space detached from society, where, temporarily, feelings and reactions do not need to be suppressed. This is particularly true for the Globe, where conventional theatre rules do not apply. Therefore, the Globe may present an ideal space for the ritual aspects of theatrical performance, which defy common psychological and sociological notions of theatre experience. Because of Globe performances displaying similar qualities to transformational rites, the concept of communitas can be adopted to mean an “intensified sense of communality able to erase boundaries between individuals” in the theatre context. It has to be noted, however, that theatre performances and rites should not be regarded identical experiences; even though they
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may share a variety of features (mise en scène, rehearsals, improvisation, entertainment, etc.), rituals are different in their tradition of transforming social statuses and identities, with its effects reaching beyond the last phase defined by van Gennep.438

The discussion of how communitas may emerge at the Globe involves a focus on the spectators’ bodies. Research has shown that both physical and mental engagement is encouraged at the Globe; therefore, the audience may “feel like they are creating and expressing common sentiment along with the performers and each other”, 439 which would establish a form of communitas. In effect, this would create an almost seamless sense of unity amongst the audience and the actors, by which interaction thrives. This may be the reason why even direct interaction, when someone is playfully insulted at the cost of the whole audience or an individual, joy and laughter are elicited from the spectators.440 Subsequently, Turner saw his concept as imbued with positive significance. Some theatre practitioners, on the other hand, would not have approved of communitas developing during a performance. Brecht’s theatre presents a prime example of an opposition against communitas, as he disapproved of performance which encourages audiences to become physically absorbed in a play, uniting with their fellow playgoers.441 Some of today’s scholars remain sceptical of applying the concept to theatrical performance as well. Auslander and Silverstone argue that the sense of ‘togetherness’ does not arise from a theatrical performance, and therefore not from interaction, but merely from being a part of an audience.442 While these two scholars acknowledge the limited existence of communitas, Kennedy denies the concept in a theatrical context as a whole: “No psychological unity, no specific consciousness, can be supposed in a gathering of spectators. The only certainty is their presence.”443 Other researchers, who do not fully endorse the concept, compromise by stressing the spectator’s individuality in addition to the possible feeling of unity. Purcell, for example, does not believe that complete unity can be achieved in the theatre, as instances “that are marked by the most powerful feelings of togetherness for some audience members are likely to generate feelings of alienation,
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exclusion, or resistance in others.” According to Edith Turner, this view may stem from the fact that researchers often watch performances from a distance, which results in *communitas* evading them. She states that researchers may only grasp the concept if they become part of a performance and immerse themselves in it. It can be argued that, therefore, the feeling of *communitas* is at its strongest in the yard, where the standees are subjected to the most visceral experience and immediate feedback from the actors, as well as fellow groundlings. Most researchers, on the other hand, may often watch from the galleries adopting an objective gaze, which likely inhibits a sense of *communitas* to arise.

Apart from this argument against the critics of *communitas*, there is also scientific proof for the existence of the concept in theatre contexts. Kenny, for example, employs crowd psychology to explain the unification of spectators. Similar to watching a sporting event together with a crowd, going to see a play at the Globe may lead to more excitement and contagious responses among spectators because of its spatial conditions and the architecture of the theatre. Proof for *communitas* may also be derived from semiotic theory. Elam and Bennett refer to ‘homogeneity of response’ in spectator-spectator communication, which means that the decoding of meaning by one individual is only shared if it is confirmed by the general reception by the rest of the audience. Additionally, homogeneity can also signify that reactions are infectious; laughter in one part of the yard, for example, usually stimulates the same response in another part. According to a semiotic reading, then, homogeneity of response represents the force which leads to the audience perceiving the meaning making process as something promoting unity. However, because critics like Kennedy question, whether a universal can be found in the meaning-making of an audience, further proof for *communitas* from cognitive science will be provided.

What semioticians call ‘homogeneity of response’ may be identified as ‘emotional contagion’ in the terms of cognitive science. Unified responses in the theatre today stem from the need for rapid group reactions when our ancestors used to hunt and gather together. Because of this common evolutionary heritage, primary emotions like laughter,
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surprise, disgust or shock will travel quickly from the stage to the yard through mirror neurons in the spectator brains. This is why almost everyone in the yard will “laugh, cry, and even gasp simultaneously”. To illustrate this effect, McConachie likens ‘emotional contagion’ in the theatre to the travelling of sound inside the body of a violin: “Put us together in an auditorium and our bodies and minds are like the inside of a good violin; we resonate and amplify emotions with each other”. This metaphor shows that the ‘body’ – the architecture – in which the performance takes place is crucial for the emergence of *communitas*. According to cognitive science, the wooden ‘O’ of the Globe triggers the image schema of containment in an audience because the round shape of the theatre encircles them. Hart explains the effects of this image schema on spectators as “promoting an overall sense of inclusiveness or community”. The architecture of the Globe, Hart states, engages spectators in a visceral experience of containment “that will cue them together as one imagining community toward the same or similar large-scale and theatrically self-conscious fantasy”. Hart’s descriptions unmistakably prove parallels between the image schema of containment and Victor Turner’s *communitas*. Furthermore, the Globe space emerges as an important marker for the feeling of community between audience members. Interestingly, Styan connects “the roundness and intimacy of the Elizabethan playhouse” to ritualism, because the circle elicits ancient theatrical acts of communal sharing such as tribal rituals in round enclosures in the woods. It can be argued, then, that the wooden ‘O’ links our bodies and minds to an old image schema of containment, which inevitably promotes a sense of community. Additionally, the ritualistic aspect inherent to the Globe due to its roundness supports the application of Turner’s concept to the theatre because it was originally established to describe rites of passage. *Communitas* may not be applicable to audience experience at proscenium arch theatre, but it is a concept suitable to define the effects of audience interaction at the Globe, which, as a performance space, may unconsciously conjure up ritualistic images in audiences. It is not solely the architecture which helps evoke *communitas*, however; rather, the architecture presents one important parameter which
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enables audience interaction and, therefore, *communitas*. The architecture and the space of the Globe promote *communitas*, which, in effect, may help audience members become more susceptible to interaction, because they feel more connected to the actors on stage and other audience members. In sum, *communitas* may be amplified by various reciprocally connected parameters.

Now that some proof for its existence at the Globe has been established, other concepts closely linked to *communitas* can be named to illustrate more possible effects of audience interaction. In his later work, Turner mentioned ‘flow experiences’ could be connected to *communitas*, as they emerge in “confrontative activities” involving “masking, costuming, [and] acting in a predictably disorderly fashion”.456 As described in general terms by the psychologist Csikszentmihalyi, flow is an ‘optimal experience’ – “the state in which people are so involved in an activity that nothing else seems to matter”.457 Applied to the theatre, the cognitive operations associated with immersion into the play world, blending and empathizing, may cause ‘flow experiences’.458 ‘Flow’ may occur when spectators join the action with their own awareness of it, and can be heightened through communal experience of it.459 It could be argued that ‘flow’ would actually be interrupted by audience interaction, as audiences are made aware of the theatricality behind the performance; on the other hand, audience interaction could also lead to a different kind of ‘flow’ connected to the acknowledgement of the audience in the fictional world and the building of a relationship between them and the actors/characters.

Another concept which is closely linked to the experience of *communitas* is Jill Dolan’s ‘utopian performative’, which has been coined specifically for the theatre. Dolan describes her concept as “a process of feeling together over obvious differences, inspired by an intensely present moment of theatre”.460 Because of this, for example if someone argues that the diverse audience at the Globe could never have a unified theatre experience, Dolan would likely counter with her concept that there can be profound
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instances in which even the most contrasting individuals can form a community. At the Globe, these most intense moments could be the instances when audience interaction occurs. For example, strategies which aim for direct address, like casting the audience as a group, may evoke the moments indicated by Dolan. Additionally, Dolan’s concept includes the characteristics of utopia to describe these moments. According to her, powerful performance may invite “a hopeful feeling of what the world might be like if every moment of our lives were as emotionally voluminous, generous, aesthetically striking and intersubjectively intense”.\footnote{Dolan, “Utopia”, 164-165.} It is the safe theatre space, where audiences do not have to be afraid of real-world ramifications,\footnote{See McConachie, Audiences, 81.} where a sense of \textit{communitas} can be present, and where interaction between diverse individuals is constant, which constitutes theatre’s own utopia. However, the sense of utopia and the feeling of unity and community are ephemeral.\footnote{See Dolan, “Utopia”, 166.} After the performance the audience awake – as if from a dream – to return to their everyday lives. Utopia and \textit{communitas} disappear when the spectators and the actors part.

Shakespeare’s Globe offers unique playing conditions which favour a feeling of community amongst spectators. These conditions, particularly the lit auditorium, help facilitate more unified responses from spectators, and more refined communication between the stage and the yard.\footnote{See McConachie, Audiences, 97.} According to Fischer-Lichte, this community presents the foundation for a successful feedback loop\footnote{See Fischer-Lichte, Power, 51.} and, therefore, for audience interaction. Even though spectators remain individuals during a performance, their reactions to the action on stage are influenced by the audience as a group. When Globe actors perceive a certain type of ‘energy’ emanating from the audience, researchers may refer to this as ‘homogeneity of response’ or ‘emotional contagion’.

\textbf{6. Conclusion}

This thesis has considered the role of certain parameters of audience interaction at the reconstructed Shakespeare’s Globe in London, and how strategies of interaction may
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contribute to the effect of *communitas* among the audience. Throughout the thesis, theatre practitioner interviews and essays have been employed to illustrate instances of audience interaction with real accounts, while my own experiences as an audience member at the Globe have also been included.

It has been established that Shakespeare’s Globe is not merely a heritage project striving for absolute authenticity and original practice; the theatre is an experimental project attempting to create unique theatre experiences for modern audiences in a reconstructed space. This space allows for new possibilities in establishing audience interaction: The shared light and the roundness of the Globe facilitate eye contact and other means of direct communication with the audience. These defining features set the reconstructed theatre apart from conventional proscenium arch theatres, which entails that audiences are encouraged to leave their usual theatre etiquette behind. Active spectator participation is encouraged: playgoers laugh more, are allowed to move, may even experience physical contact with actors, and so on. To prompt such behaviour, interaction strategies by actors and directors have been developed. This thesis has grouped bundles of acting techniques under five categories, determining the most prominent strategies observed at the Globe. The strategies of aiding in the understanding of the text, directly addressing an individual, casting the audience as a group, exploiting the space, and employing metatheatrical devices do not make claims of being complete. Just as audience and actor communication has progressed since the Globe’s opening, it will develop further in the coming years, as the experiment is continued.

Yet, tentatively, this thesis has attempted to define possible effects of audience interaction, considering the Globe’s unique playing conditions. The concept of *communitas* by Turner, in connection with ideas about ‘flow’ and ‘utopian performatives’, was employed. As a result, it could be concluded that instances of audience interaction count as intense moments of theatre, which support the feeling of ‘togetherness’ in audiences. Apart from this, they may strengthen the relationship between spectators and actors/characters. This, then, presents a form of transient theatrical utopia, where everyone in the safe space of the theatre experiences interaction between diverse individuals together, ideally in ‘flow’. Adopting strategies of interaction, actors aim to maintain the sense of *communitas* during a performance. Hereby, *communitas* can be the result of audience interaction – or the trigger. The concept holds
a reciprocal relationship with audience interaction, facilitated by the unique architectural features of Shakespeare’s Globe.

In order to gain a deeper understanding of the effects of audience interaction strategies, targeted empirical research would have to be conducted, interviewing Globe audiences and actors after performances. However, this thesis may already serve as a starting point to encourage more research targeted towards audiences and their relationship to actors/characters on the modern Globe stage.
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