

Catriona Fallow

New Work In and Beyond Repertory at the Royal Shakespeare Company and Shakespeare's Globe

This article explores the role of new writing within two contemporary Shakespearean institutions, the Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC) and Shakespeare's Globe. Focusing on the 2010 premieres and subsequent touring productions of David Greig's Dunsinane for the RSC and Howard Brenton's Anne Boleyn at the Globe, this article reflects on how these plays derive distinctive meanings from their repertory connection to Shakespeare. At the same time, I argue that by reconceiving accepted historical narratives and figures, these plays also challenge causal links between past and present, including the supposed lineage between Shakespeare and contemporary writers that both institutions espouse.

The Royal Shakespeare Company's (RSC) and Shakespeare's Globe's explicit commitment to exploring and staging Shakespeare's works has, for the most part, dominated critical and popular understandings of both institutions and their primary cultural function. While not unwarranted, this focus has tended to obscure another significant strand of both institutions' repertoires: new work by contemporary playwrights and practitioners. This article explores how both the RSC and the Globe place new work in a supposedly positive, reciprocal relationship with the early modern canon, thereby positioning contemporary writers as direct 'descendants' of Shakespeare. Drawing on two examples of well-known new works by established UK playwrights first staged in 2010 — David Greig's *Dunsinane* for the RSC and Howard Brenton's *Anne Boleyn* at Shakespeare's Globe — I reflect on how these plays at once are shaped by and interrogate the conditions of their production within major Shakespearean organizations. Looking back from the vantage of 2022, in the intervening decade since these plays premiered both have gone on to revivals and tours beyond their original company contexts. Accounting for the afterlives of these plays and how they have — quite literally — moved beyond their repertory origins reveals how they are at once

Catriona Fallow (catriona.fallow@uws.ac.uk) is lecturer in performance at the University of the West of Scotland.

contingent upon and derive distinctive meaning from their repertory connection to Shakespeare, while also posing a challenge to received understandings of different historical figures, places, and narratives, including those which appear in Shakespeare's own writing.

When existing scholarship has addressed the role of new play development at the RSC and the Globe, or when the institutions have articulated their own policies concerning new work, there is typically a tendency to affirm the supposed similarities or productive connections between contemporary playwrights' work and the early modern canon. Early critical accounts of new writing at the RSC, such as Colin Chambers's *Other Spaces: New Theatre at the RSC* and *Inside the Royal Shakespeare Company*, for example, recount founding artistic director Peter Hall's vision for an established ensemble of players engaged in producing 'a vibrant theatre of reanimated Shakespeare and vital new and modern plays presented in an invigorating symbiosis'.¹ This drive towards a symbiotic, mutually beneficial relationship between Shakespeare and new works persists at both institutions, often emphasizing Shakespeare's bygone novelty as a way to draw a direct connection to today's writers. The RSC's deputy artistic director, Erica Whyman, describes how 'Shakespeare was once a new writer. His work was shocking, thrilling, bold. We want to nurture, provoke and present the work of writers who are doing the same thing today'.² For Whyman, that means

connect[ing] contemporary writers and audiences to the spirit of Shakespeare. He and his contemporaries had a strong sense of the world in which they were living and how it was changing. That's something we inherit directly from them. By including writers and new plays we keep our work new and daring, just as Shakespeare's work was in his own time.³

Shakespeare's Globe's literary manager, Jessica Lusk, similarly goes so far as to invoke this supposed genealogy directly:

The Globe has always been a new writing venue. It's hard to believe now but Shakespeare was a new writer once, and The Globe I write from now, (the third Globe) is still a new writing venue today ... Our cause is to celebrate and interrogate Shakespeare's transformative impact on the world — and where can that impact be more felt than in the writers of today ... Artistic descendants of this extraordinary shaman.⁴

Echoing Whyman's sentiments, Lusk's emphasis on Shakespeare's shamanic omniscience further obfuscates distinctions between new work in relation to Shakespeare's own, locating his distinctive 'impact' on these new writers and the work they produce. Recent scholarship such as Vera Cantoni's *New Playwriting at Shakespeare's Globe* reflects this sentiment, making important inroads into addressing the paucity of studies that focus specifically on new writing at this institution. Overall, Cantoni's analysis situates new writing as a continuation of the Globe's wider agenda to explore the opportunities and peculiarities of the conditions of performance in this reconstructed venue. These playing conditions result in what she terms 'specially constructed plays', that are 'influenced not only by the architecture in the which [they] are going to be presented, but also by the season [they are] going to be part of'.⁵ In emphasizing the centrality of the Globe's architecture and the 'contiguity' between new plays and the Shakespearean canon, like Whyman and Lusk, Cantoni similarly suggests that commissioned new works (as well as a small number of existing texts adapted for the Globe) which respond to the 'playhouse's peculiarities' serve to 'test its possibilities in the twenty-first century just as Shakespeare and his contemporaries did in the sixteenth and seventeenth'.⁶

Amid scholarly and popular discourses that tend to pit the RSC and the Globe against one another in what Christie Carson has described as an oversimplified 'David and Goliath struggle', the characterization, position, and supposed value of new work by contemporary playwrights at both institutions is strikingly analogous.⁷ Neither institution accepts unsolicited scripts, with the Globe preferring instead to 'give writers the space and time to work with our academics and research team, spend time with our actors, see plays in our theatres, experiment with and learn from the architectural playing conditions of our two theatres ... and ultimately write a play bespoke to those theatres'.⁸ The RSC similarly offers 'tailor-made commissions aimed at developing new productions for our stages in Stratford-upon-Avon alongside short development projects to explore the beginnings of an idea or take an artist who excites us into new territory'.⁹ These policies suggest that, while their resources, scale, and infrastructure are largely dissimilar, in their negotiation of developing new work alongside a core repertoire of Shakespeare's plays, the RSC and the Globe must navigate broadly similar ideological, practical, and artistic aims.

This negotiation between new and established plays recalls, perhaps, the challenges and commercial imperatives of early modern playing companies who, as Roslyn Knutson has argued, 'needed a diverse battery of offerings continually supplied with new plays to attract playgoers'.¹⁰ In the intervening centuries, of course,

the status and cultural force of Shakespeare has grown exponentially and — as the observations of Whyman, Lusk, and Cantoni suggest — the primacy of Shakespeare as an artistic touchstone and pedagogical tool (one that supposedly instructs or encourages new writers in a distinctive way) is an incontrovertible reality for developing new work at both institutions. But what does the predominance of Shakespeare and an emphasis on symbiosis between both strands of these companies' repertoires have on the plays written by these supposed inheritors of the early modern tradition?

As the emphasis on bespoke, commissioned plays makes clear, the first and perhaps most obvious contextual factor that contemporary writers negotiate when producing new work for either the RSC or the Globe is the potential size of their respective auditoria and playing companies, particularly if cross-cast with a production by Shakespeare or one of his contemporaries. The impact of such economies of scale on potential new work has been a persistent concern for both institutions. Sally Beaman, for example, describes how, early in the RSC's history, London's Aldwych Theatre (acquired by Hall in 1961) had to accommodate transfers of Shakespeare's plays from Stratford. With a seating capacity of over 1000, the scale of the Aldwych and the RSC's cast sizes made attracting new British dramatists difficult and in turn prevented the company of between fifty to sixty actors from exploring more formally and conceptually experimental work:

Hall sought to find plays that would use a Stratford-size company, what he called 'epic plays that are not historical ... plays written for a company with themes that require large casts'. But in seeking such plays Hall was running counter to his time. The new English playwrights who were beginning to emerge were not, in the main, writing such plays; they were writing intense intimate plays, requiring small casts.¹¹

Today, the majority of the research and development of new work at the RSC takes place in The Other Place in Stratford, which reopened in 2016 following an eleven-year closure and includes a 200-seat studio theatre. Until the return of The Other Place, however, new work struggled to find a permanent place on the RSC's main stages, often appearing as part of one-off or short-lived collaborations with other venues like London's Hampstead theatre which, as I will go on to discuss, hosted the premiere of *Dunsinane*.¹² Despite Hall's early suggestion that such 'epic' plays need not be historical, when they do appear on the Royal Shakespeare Theatre or Swan stages, RSC new works tend to centre on specific historical persons, events, and contexts or adapt existing historical or literary sources, rather than focusing exclusively on a playwright's own contemporary era. The

predominance of history plays is, if anything, even more evident in the Globe's stable of new plays. In reference to the Globe's 1600-person capacity amphitheatre, former artistic director Dominic Dromgoole insisted that 'you have to tell big stories at the Globe. You can't put on the well-fashioned miniature. This place needs big lungs, big action, big thought'.¹³ These conditions of production, as Cantoni notes, result in works that display 'an intricate web of references to different time frames' that 'harness the historical sensibility conjured up by such a locale'.¹⁴

From the perspective of thinking of these new works as part of the RSC's and Globe's wider repertoires, in what follows I want to suggest that part of what makes these new works distinctive is the opportunity they present to both speak to and move beyond their institutional origins and the Shakespearean canon. This approach broadly aligns with the aims and methodologies of early modern repertory studies; by focusing on the wider material, social, and economic contexts in which early modern drama was produced, repertory scholarship challenges the tendency to conceive of these plays as the work of an individual dramatist or creative genius. In so doing, as Tom Rutter has argued, the 'repertory approach can be used as a means of struggling against the biggest critical bias of them all: the tendency to devote disproportionate attention to the single dramatist, Shakespeare'.¹⁵ At the same time, however, Rutter is careful also note how 'To a striking extent, the discourse of repertory studies seems to be one Shakespeare is called upon to authorize, even as it seeks to move him to the margins'.¹⁶ This tension between a desire to de-centre Shakespeare, while also calling upon his significant cultural authority speaks to the position of new work in contemporary Shakespearean institutions. To explore how Shakespeare is at once called to authorize and also challenged by the presence of new work in contemporary repertoire, I turn now to two examples of new works explicitly billed as companion pieces to plays by Shakespeare that have also gone on to appear outside of their respective institutions. David Greig's *Dunsinane* and Howard Brenton's *Anne Bolyn* both exemplify how the material considerations and emphasis on reciprocal exchange that characterize these companies' repertory practices shape both the content and form of a new work, as well as its capacity to interpolate or resist the ideals of inheritance that both the RSC and the Globe espouse.

As Paola Botham has noted, both Greig and Brenton are well known as creators of contemporary history plays. Greig's plays, Botham writes, offer 'an interrogation of the past that is more than thematic, dealing with the operation of history itself', while Brenton's Globe plays adopt a dialectical approach 'not to confirm a philosophy of history but as a method for open argumentation, both within the

play itself and between the play and its public'.¹⁷ Both writers, then, adopt the dialectical, interrogative self-reflexivity of contemporary history plays in order to open up meanings and possibilities for their plays and their audiences. Despite the recurring role of history in both writers' work, however, little consideration has been given to how *Dunsinane* and *Anne Boleyn's* institutional origins in Shakespearean companies might have shaped these plays.

As its title suggests, Greig's play begins in the forest of Dunsinane as the English army, called to aid Malcom in overthrowing the tyrannical Macbeth, prepare for battle. Its opening scenes chronicle the downfall of Macbeth, the death of Siward's son, and the revelation that Lady Macbeth — here given what is believed to be her historically accurate name, Gruach — is in fact not dead. Instead, by invoking her ancestral right to the Scottish throne as a descendant of the Moray clan, she is central not only to the events of this play but also, Greig suggests, was more significant than Shakespeare's version of events imagines. As Macduff explains, 'the tyrant came from nowhere. His power belonged to the Queen. The Queen is the eldest princess of Moray. It's she who holds the allegiance of the clan and it's her power that she's keeping for her son'.¹⁸ From the outset then, Greig wields history to disrupt accepted versions of events, including those in *Macbeth*.

As the play progresses, the English general, Siward — a minor character in Shakespeare's original who is here elevated to the play's central anti-hero — doggedly seeks to impose order on and rationalize the customs, landscape, and people of Scotland who, to Siward and his soldiers, represent a world where nothing is as it seems. Exasperated by Siward's incessant need for 'definition' and clarity when trying to establish where to look for the Queen and who to charge with aiding her, Malcom explains 'There are patterns between us [the Scottish Lords]. And into that delicate filigree you are putting your fist'.¹⁹ However noble Siward believes his quest to restore peace to embattled Scotland to be, as he relentlessly pursues Gruach and her son at the expense of many lives, he grapples to reconcile his roles as both bloody invader and peacekeeper, an English general serving a Scottish monarch, Gruach's lover then pursuer, bereaved father and child-killer.

The unresolved dichotomies that characterize Siward speak to what David Pattie has identified more generally as Greig's persistent interest in complicating or undoing binaries. Writing from the perspective of 2016 amid the Scottish Independence referendum, for Pattie the Scotland Greig portrays is one of infinite complexity and multiple meanings. The play 'starts by opposing invader and invaded and ends in a Scotland that is empty and seemingly infinite'.²⁰ While Pattie is concerned chiefly with *Dunsinane's* depiction of Scotland, other scholars,

critics, and Greig himself have alluded to the play's parallels with the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan. The play is, then, both seemingly hyperlocal in its attentions to Scottish history and language, for example, but also global. The possibilities and counter-narratives opened up in Greig's play coupled with its global parallels highlight this production's ability to be both a product of the RSC and infinitely exportable.

In her review of *Dunsinane*, Emily Linnemann reflects on what the play reveals about the place of new writing at the RSC. Published shortly after the play's premiere, Linnemann recounts how she was

always aware that I was watching the RSC and constantly considering what *Dunsinane's* place was in their repertory and in British drama in general. I wondered if the play would be likely to be performed outside of this short run and whether another theater company would ever take it up. Was it an independent piece of new writing, or did it rely on the cultural values of the RSC for its reception and its theatrical success?²¹

With the benefit of hindsight, we can answer Linnemann's speculations on *Dunsinane's* longevity with a resounding 'yes'. Following its run at London's Hampstead Theatre between February and March 2010, not only has *Dunsinane* been performed again but also has become a key export of another major UK theatrical institution: the National Theatre of Scotland (NTS). In April 2011, NTS revived and co-produced the production, touring it to Edinburgh, Glasgow, and the RSC's own Swan Theatre in Stratford-upon-Avon, as well adapting it for BBC Radio 3 in the same year. Later, in 2013, the production toured to various venues across Scotland and England, before securing funding from the British Council to tour internationally to China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Russia, and the United States in 2014–15. In the press coverage of the tour, Greig reflects on the production's change in location ahead of its appearance in China and the United States, observing that there is 'always a slightly different nuance depending on its context ... When we first performed it in England, it was very much seen as a play about the British in Afghanistan and Iraq. In Scotland, they saw it more about Scottish history. I'm sure there will be a different resonance when it comes to China' and 'when we played the show in Moscow the audience felt powerfully that we were describing Ukraine. I expect in America it will have resonance around Iraq'.²²

Greig's play, then, does indeed seem to capture the 'strong sense' of the world in which he and his audiences are living and how that world is changing, something

that Whyman emphasizes as key to both Shakespeare's and new writers' work at the RSC. Moreover, part of the efficacy of Greig's exploration of nationhood, conflict, and history and its appeal in a global market place, I would argue, rests on both the play's provenance in an internationally renowned Shakespearean company but also in its interrogation and subversion of Shakespeare's work. To return to Linnemann's observation, we might usefully understand *Dunsinane* as a piece of new writing that, by knowingly drawing on the cultural values of the RSC for its reception and its theatrical success, has gone on to function independently of its institutional origins.

Like *Dunsinane*, Howard Brenton's *Anne Boleyn* premiered in 2010 and returned to the Globe the following year, during which it won the *What's On Stage* award for best new play. Between 2010 and 2011 the number of performances increased from twelve to twenty-two which, while still a significantly shorter run than any of the Shakespeare plays that featured in the same seasons (*Henry VIII*, for example, had forty-eight shows while *Macbeth* had sixty-four), remains a significant increase given that new plays at the Globe at this time rarely exceeded fifteen performances.²³ Before the widespread success of Morgan Lloyd Malcolm's *Emilia* (2018), then, the most successful Globe new work in terms of longevity and critical reception was Brenton's *Anne*.²⁴

Just as Greig's depiction of Gruach subverted audiences' assumptions about Shakespeare's Lady Macbeth, placing the eponymous protagonist at the centre of Brenton's narrative challenged Shakespeare's depiction of Anne in *Henry VIII* — which situates her as one part of the broader intrigues of the Tudor court. In its first incarnation, the impact of the Globe's repertory system was most apparent when it was cross-cast with *Henry VIII*, further emphasizing new work's ability to offer a counter narrative to Shakespeare's own. The attribution of *Henry VIII* solely to Shakespeare in this instance reflects how the Globe advertised the production. As Farah Karim-Cooper describes, Dromgoole decided to 'omit Shakespeare's collaborators from the publicity material for theatre productions such as the 2010 production of *Henry VIII*, which did not name [John] Fletcher'.²⁵ Rather than trying to reinscribe the 'Romantic genius' of Shakespeare as a single authorial figure, Karim-Cooper suggests that this decision reflects the 'conflicting roles that Dromgoole has to play as artistic director: both theatre director and manager' or, more generally, the commercial imperatives that the Globe is beholden to as a non-subsidized theatre.²⁶ Despite being less commercially lucrative, Karim-Cooper goes on to demonstrate how the work of Shakespeare's contemporaries like Fletcher or Thomas Middleton are simultaneously essential to diversifying the company's programming, while also continually marginalized

in the face of ‘Shakespeare-centricity’.²⁷ Karim-Cooper’s observations suggest, perhaps, that while the RSC and Globe believe that it is Shakespeare with whom modern writers are most ‘connected’, it might in fact be the work of his immediate contemporaries that more usefully demonstrates what it means to produce work in a theatrical landscape dominated by Shakespeare.²⁸

This dominance intensifies when theatres produce such works with the explicit purpose of staging them in rep with Shakespeare’s own. Under the directorship of Dromgoole, for example, new works were typically paired with a Shakespeare production each year, effectively creating miniature playing companies within an individual season or what Lucy Munro has described as a kind of ‘self-contained repertory in which cross-casting reinforce[s] the link between plays’.²⁹ Based on the production records held at the Globe archive, pairing appears to have been initially based on the number of productions of a given show and the actor’s comparative stage time across productions.³⁰ As Anne, actor Miranda Raison was the only character to maintain the same role across *Henry VIII* and *Anne Boleyn*. Her performances of the same character in both Shakespeare’s and Brenton’s plays perhaps takes on a greater symbolic significance than the Globe’s usual practice of cross-casting, echoing Anne’s own temporal dislocation that was both a recurring theme and key structuring device in Brenton’s play. Anne moves, for example, between three temporal contexts: her ‘own’ context of Tudor England; the court of James I of England; and the present-day Globe. Characters constantly remark upon her ability to be at once in and out of history, with Anne as the nexus at which all of these temporal strands coalesce. Addressing James — who has been plagued by visions of the long-dead queen — at the play’s conclusion, she explains, ‘You’re what I saw in the thirteen seconds ... While my head was in the straw. I saw my body. (*Giggles.*) No head! And I saw people kneeling by the scaffold. And behind them, I saw you. (*Aside. To the audience.*) And you. The demons of the future’.³¹

Here, the combination of Anne’s temporal dislocation and the reappearance of the same actor as Anne in a new, different narrative merge, illustrating how the practical implications of repertory casting are inscribed within Brenton’s text itself. In maintaining the same role, Raison acts as a conduit between both productions, representing what Marvin Carlson describes as ‘ghosting’ or a ‘haunted body’, that carries with it the associations of one production to another.³² The Globe’s 2019 season has recently redeployed and extended this technique with the programming of Christopher Marlowe’s *Edward II* and a new work, *After Edward*. In these productions, not only did actor Tom Stuart play the titular monarch in both alongside the same ensemble cast; he was the author of *After*

Edward, evolving the role of the contemporary playwright to perhaps recall the labours of early modern actor-writers crafting works for a particular ensemble of players.³³

Given the specificity of the meanings *Anne Boleyn* derived from its location in the Globe and the venue's unique playing conditions, we might be surprised that, like *Dunsinane*, the production went on to tour to nine other venues across the UK, making it the only new work produced by the Globe to do so. Produced in collaboration with English Touring Theatre and with funding by Arts Council England, the 2012 tour took place when the eyes of the world were on London as the city hosted the Olympic Games and the accompanying Cultural Olympiad, a significant part of which was the World Shakespeare Festival. The Globe's main 2012 season, *The Play's the Thing*, featured no new work beyond *Anne Boleyn's* tour. It instead began with the Globe to Globe season, which saw all thirty-seven of Shakespeare's plays performed by thirty-seven different companies from around the world, and six additional Shakespeare productions by the Globe.³⁴ In a year of unprecedented global attention on the UK's — and specifically London's — cultural offerings, the dominance of Shakespeare is not unexpected. That *Anne Boleyn* featured at all is notable and suggestive of the play's ability to seamlessly integrate into the Globe's own canon for 2012. That said, this production would later go on to win the UK Theatre Award for best touring production, demonstrating its capacity to successfully function outside of the Globe's amphitheatre, no longer in rep with *Henry VIII* or starring Raison, and in the hands of another company.

We can understand both Greig and Brenton's plays as paradigmatic of the reciprocity and symbiosis that underpins the commissioning and staging of new works designed to appear in rep with Shakespeare. Given the dual mandate to be at once new, urgent, and interrogative while also replicating or capturing the essence of Shakespeare, these history plays are ideally suited to the conditions of production and ideological foci of the RSC and the Globe, while at the same time are able to look beyond them; they are contemporary repertory plays par excellence, able not only to sit neatly alongside their Shakespearean counterparts but also to circulate in a wider marketplace where they potentially serve different cultural and political functions. By dramatizing alternative histories — histories beyond Shakespeare that reimagine and foreground historical figures like Anne and Gruach — these new works invite the possibility of reconceiving accepted historical narratives and challenging causal links between past and present, including the supposed lineage between Shakespeare and contemporary writers.

Notes

- 1 Colin Chambers, *Other Spaces: New Theatre at the RSC* (London, 1980); Colin Chambers, *Inside the Royal Shakespeare Company: Creativity and the Institution* (London, 2004), 12–13.
- 2 Erica Whyman ‘New Plays and Writers’, *Royal Shakespeare Company*, <https://www.rsc.org.uk/about-us/new-plays-and-writers>.
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 Jessica Lusk, ‘Shakespeare’s Globe produces new plays?’, *Shakespeare’s Globe Blog*, 26 March 2019, <https://shakespearesglobeblog.tumblr.com/page/2>.
- 5 Vera Cantoni, *New Playwriting at Shakespeare’s Globe* (London, 2018), 18, <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474298278>.
- 6 Ibid, 24.
- 7 Christie Carson, ‘Democratising the Audience?’ in *Shakespeare’s Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, ed. Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper (Cambridge, 2008), 115–26, 115.
- 8 Lusk, ‘Shakespeare’s Globe produces new plays?’.
- 9 ‘How We Develop New Ideas’, *Royal Shakespeare Company*, <https://www.rsc.org.uk/about-us/how-we-make-theatre/how-we-develop-new-ideas>.
- 10 Roslyn L. Knutson, *Playing Companies and Commerce in Shakespeare’s Time* (Cambridge, 2001), 11, <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511486043>.
- 11 Sally Beauman, *The Royal Shakespeare Company: A History of Ten Decades* (Oxford, 1982), 245–46.
- 12 During its run at the Hampstead Theatre, *Dunsinane* appeared alongside Dennis Kelly’s *The Gods Weep*. For further reflection on Kelly’s play and the RSC’s Hampstead season, see Catriona Fallow, ‘Dennis Kelly’s *The Gods Weep* and New Writing at the Royal Shakespeare Company’ in *Beautiful Doom: The Work of Dennis Kelly on Stage and Screen*, eds. Jacqueline Bolton and Nicholas Holden (Manchester, forthcoming).
- 13 Dominic Dromgoole, quoted in Andrew Dickson, ‘You have to tell big stories here’, *Guardian*, 15 April 2009, <http://www.theguardian.com/stage/2009/apr/15/globe-theatre-dominic-dromgoole-shakespeare>.
- 14 Cantoni, *New Playwriting at Shakespeare’s Globe*, 25–6.
- 15 Tom Rutter, ‘Introduction: The Repertory Based Approach’, *Early Theatre* 13.2 (2010), 121–32, 124, <https://doi.org/10.12745/et.13.2.843>.
- 16 Ibid, 126.

- 17 Paola Botham, “‘Look at the Ground and Imagine its Past’: David Greig’s History Plays”, *Contemporary Theatre Review* 26.1 (2016), 49–59, 49, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10486801.2015.1123703>; Paola Botham, ‘Howard Brenton and the Improbable Revival of the Brechtian History Play’, *Journal of Contemporary Drama in English* 2.1 (2014), 170–84, 182, <https://doi.org/10.1515/jcde-2014-0013>.
- 18 David Greig, *Dunsinane* (London, 2010), 30, <https://doi.org/10.5040/9780571286652.00000007>.
- 19 Ibid, 108.
- 20 David Pattie, ‘Dissolving into Scotland: National Identity in *Dunsinane* and *The Strange Undoing of Prudencia Hart*’, *Contemporary Theatre Review* 26.1 (2016), 19–30, 30, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10486801.2015.1123700>.
- 21 Emily Linnemann, “‘A Mistaken Understanding’: *Dunsinane* and New Writing at the RSC”, *Borrowers and Lenders* 5.1 (2010), 1–15, 3, <https://borrowers-ojs-azsu.tdl.org/borrowers/article/view/182/361>.
- 22 David Greig, quoted in Andrew Chin, ‘Dunsinane: Life After Macbeth’, *That’s Shanghai*, 14 April 2014, <http://www.thatsmags.com/shanghai/post/4006/dunsinane-life-after-macbeth>; David Greig, quoted in ‘An interview with Dunsinane playwright David Greig’, *Shakespeare Theatre Company*, <https://www.shakespearetheatre.org/watch-listen/an-interview-with-dunsinane-playwright-david-greig/>.
- 23 For example, in the 2010 season, the other new play by Nell Leyshon, *Bedlam*, received eleven performances while in 2011 Chris Hannah’s *The God of Soho* received twelve. Prompt Book, *Anne Boleyn* (2010), 4, Shakespeare’s Globe Library and Archive, London SGT/THTR/SM/1/2010/AB; Prompt Book, *Anne Boleyn* (2011), 4, Shakespeare’s Globe Library and Archive, London SGT/THTR/SM/1/2011/AB.
- 24 Premiering on the Globe’s mainstage in 2018, *Emilia* seeks to recover the lost history of Emilia Bassanio, moving beyond speculations about her status as merely Shakespeare’s ‘Dark Lady’ to become a proto-feminist revolutionary. Following its run at the Globe, the show transferred to the Vaudeville Theatre in London’s West End in March 2019 and was live streamed in November 2020 amid widespread theatre closures as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 25 Farah Karim-Cooper, ‘The Performance of Early Modern Drama at Shakespeare’s Globe’ in *Performing Early Modern Drama Today*, ed. Pascale Aebischer and Kathryn Prince (Cambridge, 2012), 53–69, 53, <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139047975.004>.
- 26 Ibid.
- 27 Ibid, 54.
- 28 For a consideration of the role of Shakespeare’s contemporaries in the RSC’s programming historically and today, see Coen Heijes, ‘Shakespeare’s Contemporaries at

- the Royal Shakespeare Company' in *Performing Early Modern Drama Today*, 70–84, <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139047975.005>.
- 29 Lucy Munro, 'The early modern repertory and the performance of Shakespeare's contemporaries today' in *Performing Early Modern Drama Today*, 17–34, 31, <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139047975.002>.
- 30 In 2010, for example, alongside *Anne Boleyn's* twelve performances, *Henry VIII* had forty-three (fifty-five shows in total for the playing company). Prompt Book, *Anne Boleyn* (2010), 4.
- 31 Howard Brenton, *Anne Boleyn* (London, 2010), 114, <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781784600129.00000006>.
- 32 See Marvin Carlson, *The Haunted Stage: Theatre as Memory Machine* (Ann Arbor, 2003), <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.17168>.
- 33 For further discussion of *After Edward*, see in this Issues in Review section Peter Kirwan, 'Artist Development and Collective Therapy in the Repertory: The Case of *After Edward*', 157–70, <https://doi.org/10.12745/et.25.2.4733>.
- 34 These included *Henry V*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Richard III*, *Twelfth Night*, *As You Like It*, and *Hamlet*.