

## **Doran's and Taymor's *Tempests*: Digitalizing the Storm, a Dialogue between Theatre and Cinema.**

*Estelle Rivier-Arnaud, Université Grenoble Alpes, ILCEA4*

**Key words:** Julie Taymor, Gregory Doran, William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, CGI (computer generated images), virtual world, digital technology, illusion

**Mots clés :** Julie Taymor, Gregory Doran, William Shakespeare, *La Tempête*, images de synthèse, monde virtuel, technologie numérique, illusion

### **Introduction**

When in June 2017, I saw *The Tempest* on the stage of the Barbican Centre in London<sup>1</sup>, I found it breath-taking and amazingly innovative. Perhaps this was due to my unawareness of the new capacities that digital art could already provide the stage with. The invasion of screens and high-tech in the theatrical space is however not new and the dialogue between cinema and theatre started decades ago so much so that we, as members of the audience, are expecting a reciprocal influence whenever we attend a play, notably those written by Shakespeare. Yet in Doran's production, the technology seemed to be even more challenging as it claimed to have a narrative function (See Genette *Figures III*).<sup>2</sup> In other words, the artefact created by computers was meant to tell the story of *The Tempest*, more than the actor's body and voice that merely appeared as media through which the image could be conveyed. As we will see, by replacing a real décor, the 3D image was vivid enough to make the audience believe that it was living and concrete indeed.

Although strongly creative, such images were evocative of another technological process – CGI (computer-generated imagery) – used by Julie Taymor, seven years

---

<sup>1</sup> The production was first staged in Stratford-Upon-Avon in 2016 and then presented in London in July 2017. See the website of the RSC production of the *Tempest*: <https://www.rsc.org.uk/the-tempest/gregory-doran-2016-production>

<sup>2</sup> Gérard Genette makes a distinction between “story” and “narrative,” a narrative being the events of the story dramaturgically shaped.

before<sup>3</sup>, particularly as far as Ariel and the shipwreck were concerned. Taymor's film also offered visual extravaganza when for instance Ariel (Ben Whishaw), appearing from a watery hole, recreated the tempest under Prospero's eyes. Prospero was now Prospera (Hellen Mirren), a rather convincing sleight of hand to blur the genders even further. During this first confrontation between the Master of illusion and his (her) servant, the images piled on top of each other while Shakespeare's lines could be heard, which produced a kind of synesthetic vertigo.

The motif of magic and supernatural forces permeates Shakespeare's *Tempest*, which has fed the stage-directors' thoughts – from Shakespeare until today – and led to the invention or, at least, the imagination (let us think of Edward Gordon Craig) of extraordinary scenographies. In this paper, after exploring both Taymor's and Doran's sets, I will investigate the relevance of the technical means used there to serve Shakespeare's magic: how has the illusion been built? Has digital art efficiently contributed to create wonder and to enhance the poetry of words? By extension, we should wonder whether the new technologies, whereby theatrical and cinematic devices are combined, alter the public's expectations today: could we now see a *Tempest* without artefact and still be spellbound?

### **Taymor's *Tempest*: CGI at the service of poetry and illusion**

If by your art, my dearest father, you have  
Put the wild waters in this roar, allay them.  
The sky, it seems, would pour down stinking pitch,  
But that the sea, mounting to the welkin's cheek,  
Dashes the fire out. O, I have suffered  
With those that I saw suffer: a brave vessel,  
Who had, no doubt, some noble creature in her,  
Dash'd all to pieces. O, the cry did knock  
Against my very heart. Poor souls, they perish'd.  
Had I been any god of power, I would  
Have sunk the sea within the earth or ere  
It should the good ship so have swallow'd and  
The fraughting souls within her.  
Miranda, 1.2.1-10<sup>4</sup>

Julie Taymor's career is rather idiosyncratic, including the artistic fields of musical, puppet-theatre, cinema, opera and theatre of course. The place of her various productions of Shakespeare's plays is however telling in the mass of her iconoclastic

---

<sup>3</sup> Taymor's production premiered at the Venice festival on September 10th, 2010. The trailer and the movie are available online: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qv35Jw76yc>

<sup>4</sup> All the quotations are from Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. Ed. by Stephen Orgel. Oxford: OUP, 2008.

creations.<sup>5</sup> During the late 1980s and early 1990s, she staged several of Shakespeare's plays including *The Tempest* (1986), *The Taming of The Shrew* (1988), and *Titus Andronicus* (1994) although she earned international fame with her Broadway *Lion King* in 1997. Following the critical and financial success of this production (traditional African costumes and animal masks gave a rather unusual aesthetic compared to the whimsical world of Disney), Taymor released *Titus* (1999), based on Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*. The film starred Anthony Hopkins and Jessica Lange. It was set in an anachronistic fantasy world in which various historical periods such as Ancient Rome and Mussolini's Italy were superimposed. The film received a qualified success, which may explain why Taymor waited more than ten years before adapting another Shakespearean play. In a way, *The Tempest* came at a time when she could prove again how skilful she was in challenging the norm and responding to the critics.

Taymor's ambition was to use special effects and gender controversy as means to shape the multi-faceted world of *The Tempest*, to highlight its inner conflicts and show the dynamics of change at stake in the play. The general understanding is that Prospero is not exempt from the madness and delusions that his ship-wrecked enemies suffer on the island. Since Prospero is no longer quick to forgive, to re-imagine him as a woman seemed appropriate. A woman having magic powers could make the nature of the power asserted on the island even more ambiguous. Although referred to as a "witch" once in the film, Prospera is expected to call into question the nature of human relationship, and to use her motherly and benevolent values to thwart the political threats – mainly colonialism – at stake in the play. If the casting was one of the critics' main focuses of concern when the film was released<sup>6</sup>, my point here is rather to understand Taymor's choices in the design of both Ariel and the tempest insofar as the two illustrate key features also present in Doran's production: first, the de/construction of the image and second, the power of illusion.

The first scene of the play opens on a sand castle that appears to be held in the hand of Miranda (Felicity Jones) as the camera moves back. In the background, the sky is tortured: flashes of lightning are striping the horizon. In the next shot, we are in

---

<sup>5</sup> One of Taymor's first projects was the original musical *Liberty's Taken* (1985) soon after a four-year stay in Indonesia. *A Carnival Mass* (1988) earned her an Obie Award for best direction. Her first production of an opera, Stravinsky's opera-oratorio *Oedipus Rex*, was recorded in 1993. She also staged Mozart's *The Magic Flute* the same year, and the following year she took on Richard Strauss' *Salomé*. Other operas came later.

<sup>6</sup> See for instance Vinson, Aaron W. *Challenging identity hierarchies in Julie Taymor's Tempest*. Thesis Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of DePaul University in June 2014, and also Sibley-Esposito, Clare. "Becoming-Ariel: Viewing Julie Taymor's *The Tempest* through an Ecocritical Lens," *Babel* n°24. 2011, 121-134.

the vessel, and can hear the panic-stricken boatmen shouting at the angry sea. The following shots alternate between the sandy beach where Miranda is running, and the mess within the boat: the camera zooms on the various faces of the crew before Alonso (David Strathairn) and Ferdinand (Reeve Carney) are seen kneeling and praying in the captain's cabin. Fire eventually attacks the ship and the bodies: the sailors fall into the sea; the waves invade the screen before Miranda finally reaches Prospera who is confronting the wild sea with her stick held horizontally. The whole sequence is recorded with classical music<sup>7</sup>, which, together with the loud sounds of the storm and of the human voices, gives a rather tragic entrance into the film.

The very motivations that led Taymor to design her adaptation as such are unfortunately not explicitly revealed in the interviews she gave at the time the film was released. We know that the location of Prospera's island was set around the volcanic areas of the big islands of Hawaii and of Lanai. It strengthened the wild dimension of the picture but also its potential idyllic and romantic propensities. This background rather well expressed the characters' words – especially Miranda's at the onset of the play (quoted in the epigraph) – and gave a sense of truthfulness to the scenes. Yet, the computer-generated imagery soon modified the sense of plausibility to make the magic prevail. This technology often used in movies is useful to create the illusion of a historical reconstruction (in biopics and peplums for instance), and can be considered as the contemporary magic wand able to create strong visions of all kinds: fantasy worlds, dreadful apparitions, merriments or, conversely, apocalyptic situations. In Taymor's film, the CGI was also used to create virtual landscapes and characters as when, for instance, Ariel is summoned by Prospera and is asked to describe the storm he is supposed to have set. This second part of Act 1, Scene 2, is usually a way for the stage director to stage the storm scene a second time and create new visions.

In this new sequence, Ariel appears naked from a hole filled with water. His face partly undulates like waves on the surface, which logically draws a link with the content of his tale. As he minutely develops his narration, scenes of the boat in flames appear on screen. Ariel now dressed as a supernatural creature resembling Poseidon, the God of Oceans in Greek mythology or Neptune in the Roman one, has a human face and a golden body that can divide into three:

---

<sup>7</sup> The music score was composed by Elliot Goldenthal.

**Ariel**

I boarded the king's ship; now on the beak,  
Now in the waist, the deck, in every cabin,  
I flamed amazement: sometime I'd divide,  
And burn in many places; on the topmast,  
The yards and bowsprit, would I flame distinctly,  
Then meet and join. Jove's lightnings, the precursors  
O' the dreadful thunder-claps, more momentary  
And sight-outrunning were not; the fire and cracks  
Of sulphurous roaring **the most mighty Neptune**  
Seem to besiege and make his bold waves tremble,  
Yea, his dread trident shake. (1.2.198-206)

Ariel/Whishaw is able to take the multiple shapes implied by Shakespeare's lines, and just like Puck in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, he can move and travel faster than the wind. With the CGI, these protean characteristics are probably easier to transcribe on the screen than on the stage. As the definition of the word indicates, virtual technology enables the director of the film to "interact with [or through] animated characters, [such] as avatars".<sup>8</sup> These avatars seem to be so visually present that we may turn out to be confused about their insubstantiality. This is an aspect that did serve the theatricality of Taymor's adaptation. Indeed, the three-dimensional images that were used to figure out the power of illusion at work in the play as well as the way the illusion manipulates the characters, were Taymor's response to illustrate the actor's metamorphic skill at its best. As Shakespeare implies in the play, the actor is supposedly able to transform him/herself into all possible shapes. He can also direct the action while being part of it. These features are later pointed out by Ariel in Act 3, Scene 3.<sup>9</sup> In the film, he reappears dressed as a titanic black bird that speaks in a sonorous and metallic voice. As Alonso (David Strathairn), Gonzalo (Tom Conti) and Sebastian (Alan Cumming) are watching him with terrorized eyes, the structure of the image itself highlights the theatricality of the whole composition: seen from a high angle shot, the three men appear even more

---

<sup>8</sup> "These avatars are usually depicted as textual, two-dimensional, or 3D representations, although other forms are possible (auditory and touch sensations for example)." <https://www.techopedia.com/definition/25604/virtual-world>

<sup>9</sup> You are three men of sin, whom Destiny,  
That hath to instrument this lower world  
And what is in't, the never-surfeited sea  
Hath caused to belch up you; and on this island  
Where man doth not inhabit; you 'mongst men  
Being most unfit to live. **I have made you mad;**  
And even with such-like valour men hang and drown  
Their proper selves. (3.3. 53-60. My emphasis.)

vulnerable compared to the giant Ariel (mostly seen from a low-angle shot or in a close-up).

In a press conference, Taymor underlined some of the similarities between her preceding productions of *The Tempest* (the first Shakespearean play she actually directed for the theatre<sup>10</sup>). Interestingly enough, if previously she had cast a woman in the part of Ariel, she had mostly focused on the same themes such as gender power, forgiveness (another beautiful scene between Ariel and Prospera), the physicality and poetry of words as well as the aesthetic backdrop from which the silhouettes of the actors could stand out. In her previous production for the stage, the set was also a volcanic place where black sand covered up the proscenium.

As a matter of fact, the editing process she used in her 2010's film production, seems to have been the counterpoint to the cinematic stage that some of the major contemporary directors are promoting today. Indeed in contrast to the works of Robert Lepage or Thomas Ostermeier who cinematize their stage – what Jitka Pelechová calls a “cinéfied narration” (140)<sup>11</sup> – the image in Taymor's film is theatricalized. The special effects, used in all contexts, either to animate the architectural environment or to create fantastic visions, do not seem to have impeded the theatrical scope of the piece. Yet, at the time, some reviews deplored the uselessness of technological artefacts that denied the Shakespearean nature of the play. In *Newsweek* for instance one could read that “the film's special effects, to a surprising extent, add[ed] little to the story,” and that “next to the concise power of [Shakespeare's] language, the screen wizardry [...] seem[ed] like rough magic indeed”.<sup>12</sup>

If Taymor's film was not favourably reviewed when it came out, the conjunction between cinematic and theatrical forces – that I suppose is inherent whenever a play is adapted on screen – was so blatant that the influence of one medium on the other had a future and would probably further strengthen, in a different way though. This is what could be observed – as it seems to me – in Doran's use of digital images seven

---

<sup>10</sup> Actually, before the cinematic version, she directed the play three times for the stage. The dates are not mentioned in her biography.

<sup>11</sup> “Narration cinéfifiée” (my translation). See also Féral (55-69).

<sup>12</sup> And in *The New York Times*, December 2010: “Ms. Taymor's overscaled sense of stage spectacle can be impressive and effective, even moving, but her three-dimensional, high-volume compositions translate awkwardly into the cosmos of cinema, which turns her pageantry into mummery and the physical exuberance she likes to draw from performers into mugging.”

years later, when one could feel as if being on the other side of Taymor's mirror, attending a theatrical performance like the audience in a cinema.

### **Doran's Digital *Tempest* or How Magic May Work Today on Stage**

When Gregory Doran planned a new production of *The Tempest* for the Royal Shakespeare Company in 2016<sup>13</sup>, his designer, Stephen Brimson Lewis, imagined a set that would mark the four-hundredth-year anniversary of the poet. He took the example of the wreck of the *Mary Rose* – an admiral ship that had sunk a few decades before *The Tempest* was written<sup>14</sup> – and built a miniature decor before sketching a 3-D picture from which the RSC workers would actually construct the effective set. Quite interestingly, once the ship's carcass was in full-size, it perfectly mirrored the inner architecture of the RSC theatre with its wooden galleries on three levels. The effect was a fortunate coincidence but also a proof that this artistic choice was well-founded and perfectly coherent. The next step was to make the carcass – that was not meant to change during the whole performance – move, at least seemingly. There, the special effects would play their part.

The major innovation of such a design was the use of motion capture technology to create movement, especially of Ariel's avatar. Digital images projected on either the actors' body or the set would also simulate various places and atmospheres. Even though this technology has long been used to support a variety of artistic creations (among which video games), it was the first time it was used on a stage as a real time live performance capture with the RSC. During the rehearsals, the actor (Mark Quartley) was connected to a computer (Doran's Intel partnership) through multiple sensors. His movements could then be mimetically reproduced by a translucent and gigantic avatar whose movements seemed fluid and evanescent, thanks to twenty-seven projectors. The actor was then both the marionette and the puppeteer.

As Doran and his collaborators explain in a video about the creative process of the production<sup>15</sup>, computerized images are limited only by our imagination. In this play, walking in Shakespeare's steps, the power of illusion must be pushed a step further.

---

<sup>13</sup> Earlier RSC productions include William Bridges-Adams's (1919), Peter Brook's (1957), Clifford Williams's (1978), Ron Daniels's (1982), Nicholas Hytner's (1988), Sam Mendes's (1993), David Thacker's (1995), Adrian Noble's (1998), Michael Boyd's (2002) and Rupert Goold's (2006) among others.

<sup>14</sup> The *Mary Rose* was an English warship vessel of the carrack type, commissioned under Henry VIII's reign. In 1545, it sank on the Solent in front of the king. It was raised in the early 1980s.

<sup>15</sup> See the creative process of the scenography on <https://www.rsc.org.uk/the-tempest/gregory-doran-2016-production/video-creating-the-tempest>

Consequently, for the opening scene, flashes of lightning as well as the loud sounds of thunder and shouts, immediately filled in the theatrical space. Under the light-effects, and thanks to the projection of undulating images through a huge cylinder coming from the flies, the boat hull did seem to pitch and toss. In parallel, the ocean seemed to invade the theatre's boards while the flames were licking the boat's skeleton. On each side of the carcass and at various levels, the actors were yelling their lines while clinging to the boat, thereby strengthening the impression of instability in this apocalyptic moment. When at the end of Act 1, Scene 1, the sailors are supposed to be swallowed by the waves ("Gonzalo: [...] —We split! We split! We split!" 1.1.62), we could see the mirror image of the men's bodies reflected inside the cylinder as though they were *really* drowning. The image was impressive, and strongly highlighting the synchronization between the virtual and the real, the digital and the physical, the robot and the human.

Again, when Ariel entered stage in 1.2, the cylinder came down from the flies to carry his long, evanescent shape. Thanks to Intel's technology, all the movements of the actor could be instantly reproduced, even when the spirit is expected to fly. With the addition of light-effects, the tempest that had presumably drowned the king of Naples and all his courtiers could be revived while Ariel described how he had provoked the disaster. Such a technique made the performance more spectacular than if screens had merely shown images of a wreckage. In Doran's production, the tempest did seem to be happening on stage as a kind of immersive experience.<sup>16</sup> The notion of immersion sounds particularly adequate in such a context and is reminiscent of preceding forms of illusionistic sets like Georges Coates's in *20/20 Blake*. Presented in 1996 in San Francisco, it was conceived as an Artaudian production<sup>17</sup> because of William Blake's monumental religious paintings, recreated on the stage. At the time, the reviews considered the digital manipulation as "[...] the most innovative feature of this lush scenic production" (McKusick 38). Blake's paintings and engravings created the illusion of three dimensions when viewed by the audience through special 3-D glasses, a device that Doran did not use however. Yet, as in Coates's production where images from Blake's illuminated books were magnified to enormous size and projected onto the stage, the performers could walk

---

<sup>16</sup> The word 'immersive' is not used here in the general sense of the term – that refers to the experience of the spectators being literally included in the performance – but describes the actors' bodies being totally submerged by their fictive, illusory environment.

<sup>17</sup> Produced at the Civic Centre Theatre in San Francisco.



into, through, and behind Doran's virtual set. In Coates's as much as in Doran's productions, virtual reality was a way to represent the passionate intensity of either Blake's or Shakespeare's poetry with a dynamic and contemporary medium, thus challenging the audience's expectations while enhancing artistic innovation.

Later in Doran's performance, when Prospero ordered a masque for the union between Miranda and Ferdinand, the illusion of a fairy-like world representing Juno's car, surrounded by the nymphs and, at the end of the scene, the reapers, all singing and dancing, seemed palpable in the theatrical space. Just as in the opening scene where the waves had seemed to flood the whole set, the nymphs' and peasants' woodland appeared as a real entity invading the acting space. VR did make the audience's imagination cross the invisible line between times and geographies, and in so doing initiated a new narrative mode to tell Early modern drama.

Such technicity – however fascinating and innovative – is also very puzzling because of the unlimited scope of its action and the loose definition of theatrical creation it tends to generate. As Elizabeth Grosz points out, these forms of transitional spaces constructed through digital process are spaces “of the in-between” (90), within which we may lose the essence of the theatre, and of the plays.

### **“In-Between-ness”: Kaleidoscopic Shakespeare**

As Steve Dixon writes, the screen images – whether including CGI as in Taymor's *Tempest* or digital live capture as in Doran's – create a liminal space, i.e. a “sense of in-between-ness [...] often called the ‘metatext’ of digital theatre production.” (Dixon 337). The Semioticians like Pierre Bourdieu or Keir Elam have long demonstrated how complex the signs of theatrical productions were to define and delineate. The permeability of theatrical art, but also its openness and its flexibility, enable directors and scenographers to invite new disciplines that will always re-invent the codes of performance. Dixon questions this new relationship established between screen (or digital technology) and stage, implying that they either compete with each other or interact and fuse efficiently:

The semiotic relationship and tension between the screen imagery, which we could call *A*, and the live performers, *B*, is most commonly interpreted as either a *dialogic* relationship (*A* versus/in relation to *B*), or as establishing an *additive* combination which engenders something entirely new, namely *C*, ( $A+B=C$ ). (Dixon 336)

In many cases however, Dixon suggests, the juxtaposition between live performance and projected media is meant to excite a subjective response from the audience, and to appeal to their senses more than to compel them to think and understand the purpose of such juxtaposition. In this field, and as far as Shakespeare's canon is concerned, Robert Lepage's chimeric and uncanny productions are textbook cases. The use of unconventional video projections, kinetic screens, mirrors and ingenious mechanical sets have shown how Shakespeare's plays (but not only) could "morph, mutate, transform, often with thrilling speed and theatrical impact" (John Mahoney in Dixon 351). For example, Lepage's 1992 *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, staged entirely in a shallow pool of water, surrounded by mud, which the actors walked through, was visually grandiose but also efficient in the performative process. The adjunction of images and heavy light effects particularly enhanced the vast potentials of the performance in a classic venue (The National Theatre in London). They also reinforced the dynamics of stage-action that the Shakespearean comedy inspires.

The Builders Association is another theatre company that resorts to large-scale projections (used to a variety of effects), media and computer technology to "reanimate" theatre for a contemporary audience (see for instance *Jump Cut*, 1997 or *Alladeen*, 2003, both high budget multimedia theatre performances). Hence, undoubtedly, the union of genres and technologies whereby the immediacy of drama and the sophistication of projected images are combined has become rather *natural* if not inescapable over the past decades. It is a way to revive the classics as Doran and Taymor also underlined in their works. Shakespeare's *Tempest* offered them the possibility to challenge the boundaries of imagination. Since, through his words and the contexts he shaped, the poet implied there was indeed no limit:

**Prospero**

[...] These our actors,  
As I foretold you, were all spirits and  
Are melted into air, into thin air:  
And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,  
The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,  
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,  
**Ye all which it inherit, shall dissolve**  
**And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,**  
**Leave not a rack behind.** We are such stuff  
As dreams are made on, and our little life  
Is rounded with a sleep. [4.1.148-158. My emphasis]

Digital technology seems the perfect tool to follow Prospero/Shakespeare's advice quoted above. The fleeting nature of the projected images fill in and empty the stage as dreams invade our minds before vanishing in a flash. Furthermore, the structure of *The Tempest* that makes the audience's eyes travel from the sea to the shore, and then from a place to another on Prospero's island, invites the directors and their scenographers to go beyond the letter (or the scenery-words), and offer concretely what only the imagination was able to figure out, back in the 17<sup>th</sup> century.

In a way, we could borrow Marguerite Chabrol's and Tiphaine Karsenti's book-title *Le croisement des imaginaires* ("at the crossroads of imaginary worlds") to define this phenomenon. The cinema – in the way the images are either projected on a screen or in 3-D – and the theatre combine their skills to serve a similar goal: to make Shakespearean art still attractive, semantically and aesthetically. Again this alchemy was already described by Artaud who was the first one to coin the term "virtual reality" when he developed his concept of duplicity (or twoness) in *The Theatre and Its Double*.<sup>18</sup> For him, the double of theatre is its true magical self. The notion of theatre's double includes the vision of a "sacred, transformational and transcendental theatre" (Dixon 241). In other words, it is vain to think that there are impossibilities in theatre. Artaud was a visionary as he conjured images – truly impossible to stage in his time – that were eventually concretized thanks to computers much later (in works like *Anima*, 2002, a 4-D Art's dance theatre production). Such theories invite us to consider the cinema (let us rather say the images) not as the double image of theatre, but as an entity that is a *part of* theatrical practices. Likewise, on today's stages, drama cannot work *without* the capacities offered by computers, if only because the elaborate light-effects are key and inevitable devices that shape the décor in a sophisticated way.

## Conclusion

With the examples of Taymor's and Doran's productions of *The Tempest*, we may question the relevance of the other performances that eschew such degree of sophistication. And yet, if we but observe the permanence of the "authentic" Shakespeare in the New Globe Theatre in London as well as in other venues that

---

<sup>18</sup> Antonin Artaud published a series of essays in 1938 under the title *Le Théâtre et son double* (later translated *The Theatre and its Double*) in which he developed his concept of the theatre of cruelty.

remain faithful to a traditional form of interpretation, we keep being convinced of the efficiency of the poet's words to create magic. What must prevail is indeed the capacity of the play to entertain its audience. *Extra-ordinary* responses to the challenges triggered by Shakespeare's maritime plays like *Twelfth Night*, *Antony and Cleopatra* or *Pericles-Prince of Tyre* among others have been given by Taymor and Doran, at least in *The Tempest*. It was a way for them to explore the abysmal borders of creation, resorting to 21<sup>st</sup>-century tools. And at the same time, rather paradoxically, it was a way for them to remain faithful to Shakespeare, avoiding textual ellipses, and making the meaning of words even more obvious in a colourful, ever-changing, décor.

Just as in Shakespeare's time when the Globe's audience was eager to attend a new play, admire the magnificence of costumes and enjoy the truculence of the dialogues, we are very fond of novelty and look forward to discovering the plays under a new light. We can still interrogate the consequences of cinematographic art and of I.T. in theatre as well as the proliferation of film adaptations of Shakespeare's canon. However, we should not fear the so-called invasion of an art into another but instead, we ought to welcome the recurrent collaboration of genres that gives a new direction to Early-modern drama, beyond the borders of seas and oceans, where the language of performance is universal.

### Works cited

- ARTAUD, Antonin. *Le Théâtre et son double*. Paris : Folio poche, 1991 (also *The Theatre and its Double*. Trad. Mary Caroline Richards. New York: Grove Press, 1994).
- BLUMENTHAL, Eileen. *Julie Taymor: Playing with Fire: Theater, Opera, Film*. New York: Abrams, 1999. Includes two chapters dealing with Julie Taymor's productions of *Titus Andronicus* for stage and screen.
- CHABROL, Marguerite & KARSENTI, Tiphaine. *Théâtre et cinéma, le croisement des imaginaires*. Rennes : Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2013.
- DIXON, Steve. *Digital Performance, A History of New Media in Theater, Dance performance Art, and Installation*. Cambridge, Mass. (USA) & London (UK): MIT Press, 2007. Concerning the topic of this paper, see more particularly: Chapters 8 "The Digital Revolution"; 12 "Robots"; 14 "Digital Theatre & Scenic Spectacle"; 15 "Virtual Reality: The Search for Immersion". And for a broader historical view: chapter 5 "Performance and Technology Since 1960".

- GENETTE, Gérard. *Figures III*. Paris: Seuil. Points. Coll. Points essais, 2019 (1972).
- GROSZ, Elizabeth. "In-Between: The Natural in Architecture and Culture". *Architecture From the Outside. Essays on Virtual and Real Space*. Cambridge Mass: MIT Press, 2001.
- MCAULEY, Gay. *Space in Performance: Making Meaning in the Theatre*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1999.
- MCKUSICK, James. "George Coates, 20/20 Blake". *Blake, An Illustrated Quarterly*. Volume 31. Issue 1. Summer 1997, p. 38-39.
- PELECHOVA, Jitka. « La scène 'cinéfiée': des techniques cinématographiques dans le théâtre d'Ostermeier », in Chabrol M. and Karsenti T. *Théâtre et cinéma, le croisement des imaginaires*. Rennes : Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2013.
- RIVIER, Estelle. "Shakespeare digital sur la scène du Barbican". *Shakespeare en devenir. Les Cahiers de La Licorne. L'Œil du Spectateur*. N°10, 2017-2018. Published online: September 11th, 2017. <http://shakespeare.edel.univ-poitiers.fr/index.php?id=1085> Accessed 10 May 2019.
- SHAKESPEARE, William. *The Tempest*. edited by Stephen Orgel. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

**Interviews and videos available on the web** (All accessed in May 2019)

Taymor's full movie:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rw03uCfM0QM>

Ariel (Ben wishaw) and Prospera (Hellen Mirren), Act 1, scene 2:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lqM28B95IGg>

Ariel's "I have made you mad" scene (3.3).

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4XdBTA90lak>

Taymor's interview in Cannes, Spring 2010:

<https://www.bing.com/videos/search?q=taymor+the+tempest&&view=detail&mid=2F6C8736AEC55438B9D22F6C8736AEC55438B9D2&&FORM=VRDGAR>

Taymor's press conference:

<https://www.bing.com/videos/search?q=taymor+the+tempest&&view=detail&mid=DB81670D32F879C29C29DB81670D32F879C29C29&&FORM=VRDGAR>

Taymor's stage production of *The Tempest*:

<https://www.bing.com/videos/search?q=taymor+the+tempest&&view=detail&mid=4F9C2BE8997294530D234F9C2BE8997294530D23&&FORM=VRDGAR>

Doran's Ariel with the motion capture technology:

<https://www.rsc.org.uk/the-tempest/gregory-doran-2016-production/act-1-scene-2>

Doran: Creating *the Tempest*

<https://www.rsc.org.uk/the-tempest/gregory-doran-2016-production/video-creating-the-tempest>

**The Pictures** of the RSC production are accessible on <https://www.rsc.org.uk/the-tempest/gregory-doran-2016-production>