University of Reading

Samuel Beckett and intermedial performance: passing between

Article

Accepted Version

McMullan, A. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2531-3746
(2020) Samuel Beckett and intermedial performance: passing between. Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui, 32 (1). pp. 71-85. ISSN 0927-3131 doi: 10.1163/18757405-03201006
Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/85561/

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See Guidance on citing.

To link to this article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/18757405-03201006

Publisher: Brill

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the End User Agreement.

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Samuel Beckett and Intermedial Performance:
Passing Between

Anna McMullan
Professor in Theatre, University of Reading
a.e.mcmullan@reading.ac.uk

This article analyses two intermedial adaptations of works by Beckett for performance in relation to Ágnes Petho's definition of intermediality as a border zone or passageway between media, grounded in the "inter-sensuality of perception". After a discussion of how Beckett's own practice might be seen as intermedial, the essay analyses the 1996 American Repertory Company programme *Beckett Trio*, a staging of three of Beckett's television plays which incorporated live camera projected onto a large screen in a television studio. The second case study analyses Company SJ's 2014 stage adaptation of a selection of Beckett's prose texts, *Fizzles*, in a historic site-specific location in inner city Dublin, which incorporated projected sequences previously filmed in a different location.

Cet article analyse deux mises en scène d'œuvres de Beckett qui ont été adaptées d'un média à l'autre, s'appuyant sur la définition de l'intermédialité d'Agnes Petho en tant que frontière ou voie de passage entre les médias, ancrée dans «l'inter-sensualité de la perception». Après une discussion sur la façon dont la propre pratique de Beckett pourrait être considérée comme intermédiaire, l'essai analyse *Beckett Trio* de 1996 de la American Repertory Company, qui met en scène trois pièces de télévision de Beckett intégrant une caméra en direct projetée sur un grand écran dans un studio de télévision. Le deuxième exemple analyse l'adaptation en 2014 de la compagnie SJ d'une sélection de textes en prose de Beckett, *Fizzles*, dans un lieu non-théâtral et très historique du centre-ville de Dublin, intégrant des séquences projetées précédemment filmées dans un lieu différent.

Keywords: Samuel Beckett, intermedial performance, adaptation, re-mediation, American Repertory Company, Company SJ.

> Intermediality appears as a border zone across which media transgressions take place, or an instable 'place' of 'in-between' … a passageway from one media towards another.
> (Petho 2011, 42)

Ágnes Petho theorises intermediality in film as "grounded in the complex experiences of the embodied spectator, and the inter-sensuality of perception" (11), as filmmakers incorporate or juxtapose within their films modes of perception inherent in different media forms such as tableaux, visual arts, music or theatre. Such a definition, which focuses on the viewer's perceptual and experiential responses to the work, seems appropriate to the practices of Samuel Beckett, who famously wanted to work "on the nerves of the audience, not their intellect" (Brater 1987, 23). Beckett's later work in particular, while apparently focusing on a single medium, incorporates modes of perception characteristic of another medium. For example, *A Piece of Monologue* is delivered by a live actor on stage, but relies on the audience's visual imagination as in prose fiction or radio drama, and evokes framed images like tableaux or filmic shots: "Then slow fade up of a faint form. Out of the dark. A window" (Beckett 1986, 427). Beckett's drama is characterized by the representation or presentation of space and time not as illusions of a real time or place, but as multi-layered, dynamic forces shifting in relation to each other and to the bodies and objects that inhabit them. This essay will argue that intermediality in Beckett's own practice, and in selected examples of staged interpretations of his work, foregrounds the passages between media but also between

different modes of audience perception and different negotiations of time, space and embodiment. [1]

Matthew Causey argues that intermediality is an out-dated term, as the boundaries between media have been eroded in a postdigital environment dominated by human-computer interfaces (2016). Undoubtedly, the ubiquity of digital platforms for negotiating daily life and accessing digitised versions of media forms such as television, film or theatre, has impacted on how audiences interact with diverse artistic practices and how artists create, document and re-mediate their work.[2] However, our digital interactions continue to coincide with or are integrated into works which are created for and experienced in the spatio-temporal and perceptual conditions of a particular medium, such as theatre or film. Claudia Georgi therefore argues that intermediality as a set of discourses and practices "increase[s] rather than decrease[s] the awareness of the mediality and materiality of their respective components and thus prove the continued relevance of the concept of the medium" (23). Beckett is a useful lens through which to investigate intermediality because of his minimalism and intense focus on the perceptual and representational conditions and boundaries of each medium in which he worked.

There is no scholarly consensus around a definition of the term intermediality: discourses and distinctions tend to vary between disciplines, from media studies to visual arts, literature, music, film or theatre and performance. Nevertheless, it might be defined as the ways in which different media combine and interfere with each other's modes and conditions of communication, embodiment and perception. My own discipline is theatre and performance studies, so this article will sketch out some discussions of intermediality in performance, will consider briefly the relevance of these discourses and modes of analysis to Beckett's own apparently medium-specific work, and will conclude with a discussion of two intermedial performances, one an adaptation of Beckett's television plays for performance from 1996 and the other an adaptation of some of Beckett's short prose texts *Fizzles* from 2014. I'm interested in looking at how these productions interfered with habitual ways of experiencing live theatre through their interface and interactions with other media, and specifically, the interchange between the live and the screened body / environment, in the first case through live camera feed, and in the second, through projection.

What is intermediality in relation to live performance?

The term intermediality began to be used in the media obsessed era of the 1960s in relation to performance art and happenings,[3] and then migrated into film studies and from thence to theatre and performance studies towards the end of the twentieth century. Freda Chapple and Chiel Kattenbelt's *Intermediality in Theatre and Performance* is a foundational text in this

[1] The term intermediality has been used by diverse Beckett scholars in order to analyse the work of contemporary artists from different disciplines who are adapting Beckett's work from one medium to another or for whom Beckett's work is a catalyst for their own artistic experimentation. Focusing on performance, Nicholas Johnson writes about "intermedial transgressions" of Beckett's genres in recent adaptations of Beckett's prose for performance, including the work of Gare St Lazare, focusing on the complexities and troubled borders of the term 'genre' in these transgressions (Johnson 2016). David Houston Jones writes about the intermedial archive in *Installation Art and the Practices of Archivalism* (2016), and discusses the installation of Atom Egoyan's 'Steenbeckett' which sets up a series of intermedial resonances between theatre, film and installation versions of *Krapp's Last Tape*, and between analogue and digital technologies. See also Laws 2013, which draws on Werner Wolf's 2002 definitions of intracompositional and extracompositional word-music intermediality to explore, for example, Morton Feldman's collaboration with Beckett in the radio play *Words and Music*.

[2] The term 're-mediation' was coined by Jay Bolter and Richard Grusin in their book of that title (1999), referring to the ways in which new digital media paradoxically obey a double logic of immediacy – the illusion that there is no mediation - and hypermediacy – the multiplication and combination of mediated platforms. Older forms of media are re-mediated in these new media forms.

[3] Dick Higgins noted Samuel Taylor Coleridge's use of the term 'intermedium' in 1812, and introduced the term into art criticism in the 1960s relation to the Fluxus movement: see Higgins 1965 / 2001.

discipline.

> In looking to define intermediality, our starting point is that a significant feature of contemporary theatre is the incorporation of digital technology into theatre practice, and the presence of other media within theatre productions. (11)

This might include the use of projection, live camera feed, or digital sound in live theatre, increasingly used in theatre and performance by companies such as The Wooster Group, Blast Theory, Gob Squad or directors such as Ivo van Hove and Katie Mitchell. For example, in Ivo van Hove / Toneelgroep's *Kings of War* (2016) a compilation of Shakespeare's *Henry V*, *Henry VI* and *Richard III*, screened images took the audience into augmented backstage spaces (filled with virtual sheep at one stage), and live camera was used to highlight the manipulation of mediatized images by those in power. Director Katie Mitchell's use of live cameras since *The Waves* (2006) fragments and interrupts the viewer's perception and experience of the theatre stage, with screens displaying close-ups or filmed sequences while the audience can see the processes by which these framed images are constructed and filmed live on stage. *The Forbidden Zone* (2016), a collaboration between Mitchell and writer Alice Birch, charted the development of different technologies of war during the twentieth century from chlorine gas to the nuclear bomb through the words and lives of generations of women, including Clara Immerwahr who opposed her husband's development of poison gas for the Germans during World War I and committed suicide in 1915, and her grand-daughter Claire, also a scientist, who committed suicide in 1949 on being told that her research into an antidote to chlorine gas was no longer to be funded in order to focus on research into the atomic bomb. The scenography and use of live film camera and crews created a complex layering of historical / temporal and spatial planes: the stage was splintered into different areas, some of which remained hidden from view, or were obscured by a large subway carriage at the front of the stage, and further fractured by screens and booths used for live filming and voice-over. In these very different examples, the juxtaposition of different modes of visual and aural perception, the incorporation of areas we cannot see in Mitchell's work, and the proliferation of spatial and temporal frames in relation to the live body of the actor, augmented but also layered and fragmented the viewer's perception and shaped their interpretation and meta-consciousness of what and how they were watching.

Intermediality as I interpret it, therefore focuses not just on multi-media: the collaboration and inclusion of different media within performance, but on the transformation of the modes of perception, articulation, embodiment and ontology of each medium through this interchange. Intermediality is therefore a source of innovative languages and approaches to performance:

> There is a need to assess how the incorporation of digital technologies and the presence of other media within the theatrical and performance space is creating new modes of representation; new dramaturgical strategies; new ways of structuring and staging words, images and sounds; new ways of positioning bodies in time and space; new ways of creating temporal and spatial interrelations (Chapple and Kattenbelt, 11.

Beckett and Intermedial Performance: reframing space, time and embodiment

Beckett did not directly juxtapose live and mediatised bodies in performance, though he did regularly use live bodies and recorded sound to materialise the split between exterior and interiorized perceptions of the subjects of his drama. While Beckett distilled each medium to its fundamental conditions of representation and reception, he then re-defined the modes of representation, performance, embodiment and reader / viewer / listener perception through reference to his experience of working in other media. Christopher Balme defines intermediality as "the attempt to realize in one medium the aesthetic conventions and habits of seeing and hearing in another medium" (2004, 7). In Beckett's later drama for stage and television, the fragmented body or face is self-consciously evoked against a non-illusionist,

often dynamically shifting series of spatial and temporal frames which transform theatrical and televisual space through cross-referencing the visual arts, music, film and / or the acousmatic voice of radio. Using a phenomenological approach, Dean Wilcox argues that in his later drama:

> Beckett created a dramaturgical structure in which the space of the theatre is addressed as space and not as an illusionary place. It is with this understanding that Beckett was able to side step the notion of dramatic place to allow the theatrical space to take precedence, and, like Cage's work with the non-silence of *4'33",* illuminate the power and presence of that which is presumed empty. (550)

The textual evocation of cinematic visual sequences of *A Piece of Monologue* has already been mentioned above. In *Rockaby* the body of the actor seated in a rocking chair appears in a non-illusionist space defined only by lighting and animated by a recorded voice telling of repeated attempts to locate another being 'like herself' in the wall of empty windows opposite her own. The stage space recalls a Rembrandtesque painting with the sequins on M's dress catching the light, while the act of listening to the voice on the part of actor and audience is the main focus of the play. The stage space therefore shifts as it is reconceived by the text as an upper and then a lower space downstairs, where the space-time of M is merged with that of her Mother also in her 'best black'.

Beckett also translated across media: his radical adaptation of *What Where* into television for Süddeutscher Rundfunk which was then re-adapted for the stage, exploits the use of the framed image of the face (removed from any body image) that occurs across Beckett's television plays, and, as Anthony Paraskeva has demonstrated, recalls the filmic close-up such as Greta Garbo's impassive face at the end of *Queen Christina* (150-152). In *What Where* there is no reference to any singular or illusionist space or time, rather Bam's insistence on the endless, cyclical passing of time crosses the boundaries between the living and the dead, and between human and extra-human time. The two case studies explored below will consider to what extent intermedial performances or adaptations of Beckett's work can also reflect on how different media shape the self-representations of the human subject across time and space, focusing on the intermedial interaction between live performance and the screened body / environment. I will be drawing phenomenologically on my own experience of both performances in order to reflect on their sensory impact on the embodied spectator.

Uncanny screen doubles: the television plays on stage and screen

During the 1996 conference in Strasbourg to celebrate the 90th anniversary of Beckett's birth, participants were invited to attend a performance of *Beckett Trio* which consisted of three of Beckett's plays for television: *Eh Joe*, *Ghost Trio* and *Nacht und Träume*, presented by the Boston based American Repertory Theatre Company, directed by Robert Scanlan, and performed by Alvin Epstein. The plays were performed on one side of a television studio, while a live camera projected mediated images of Epstein onto a large screen facing the audience on the other side of the studio. There is a rather indistinct image of this in a review by Stan Gontarski of Atom Egoyan's 2006 production of *Eh Joe* with Michael Gambon, which also featured live projection, in the context of other staged performances of *Eh Joe* (245). However, the photo was taken in a Boston theatre not in the Strasbourg television studio and bears very little relation to my memory of it which was very much a spatial and multi-layered perceptual experience.

The programme began with *Eh Joe* which I will focus on here. *Eh Joe* was Beckett's first play for television, written shortly after his experience of shooting *Film* in 1994, and was broadcast by the BBC in 1966, with Jack MacGowran as Joe and Sîan Phillips as Voice. It opens with a sequence where Joe "*late fifties, grey hair, old dressing-gown, carpet slippers*" (Beckett 1986: 361) inspects his room, apparently for any unwanted eyes on him, as the protagonist in *Film* seeks to escape being perceived. Once he has satisfied himself that he is alone, Joe sits down "*on edge of bed as when discovered, beginning to relax*" (361).

Throughout this first sequence, the stage directions note that Joe's opening movements are "*followed by camera at constant remove, Joe full length in frame throughout... After this opening pursuit, between first and final close up of the face, camera has nine slight moves in toward face, say four inches at a time. Each move is stopped by voice resuming, never camera move and voice together*" (361). The camera moves ever closer in on Joe's face and eventually eyes, as Voice torments Joe with its mocking account of Joe's relationships with others, including herself, and ends with a narrative about the 'green one' who, abandoned by Joe, commits suicide. The green one's narrative also focuses in on an increasing close-up of her suicide: "Now imagine.... Before she goes.... Face in the cup.... Lips on a *stone*" (366) as Joe in turn, tries to strangle the voice that assails him via "mental thuggee" (363).

The television broadcast is already an extraordinary inter-corporeal, intermedial set of interchanges and perspectives: the viewer is watching television, supposedly (although of course in the twenty-first century they are more likely to be watching a large screen in a lecture theatre or film theatre, a dvd, or a computer screen), but, as Graley Herren notes, *Eh Joe* recalls both silent film and radio (2007, 53): the narrative spoken by the Voice combines visual, almost filmic sequences where we watch the 'green one' journeying to and from the water's edge, her "slip clinging the way wet silk will" (366). We are caught in a network of intermedial perceptions and interactions as the camera focuses on Joe while, as Trish McTighe notes, Voice is a 'tactile force', cutting like flint glass into Joe's grimacing face (37). Both Herren and McTighe cite Eisenstein's concept of montage to convey the juxtapositions between different modes of perception in *Eh Joe* – the viewer is unsettled by the lack of coherence between ear and eye, and by the violence of the struggle between them, which entails not only the suicide of the green one, but the strangling of Voice as Joe's latest aural attacker.

What happens when this inter-sensory struggle is translated from the viewing conditions of television, or even film theatre viewing, to the conditions that ART set up in a television studio in Strasbourg? It was the first time I'd been in a television studio and I was dis-oriented by being in this space. I was confronted by different even contradictory viewing conditions: you couldn't see the screen and the live action at the same time so that the sensory dislocation was intensified. What was fascinating for me was the way my attention was focused initially on the actual three-dimensional playing area, drawn to the live actor on set in front of me. However, as the camera focused in on Joe's face, gradually filling the large screen, my eye was drawn increasingly to the screen. There is a great deal of scholarship in performance studies on the juxtaposition of the live performer with his or her screened image whether via live camera feed, as here, or via pre-recorded projection. Philip Auslander suggests in *Liveness* that in a world dominated by the televisual, we can experience true proximity only on the screen. Matthew Causey has termed this "the screen test of the double: the uncanny performer in the space of technology" (2006, 15). He reflects that: "The subject does not apprehend the object, whether that object is the other of her own subjectivity or the other of worldly objects, but her own phantasmatic projections on the representational screen" (2006, 22).

I became particularly aware of the way in which the body and face of Joe were being framed in the visual field of the screen: especially given the lack of movement in *Eh Joe* and the focus on the action of the camera itself, denaturalising the relationship between figure and ground, the body or face became a picture, framed for visual consumption. However, *Beckett Trio* intensified the way in which Beckett's use of the medium intervenes in and draws attention to that process of visual consumption: in the televisual version of *Eh Joe*, the regular interruptions between Voice and camera challenge the viewer's ability to make these narrative, aural and visual channels cohere, and as the viewers visually stalk Joe via the camera, we are confronted with our own complicity - are we also his tormentors? In the television studio in Strasbourg, the audience's involvement in this interpersonal struggle was for me, dramatised in the spatial interaction between auditorium, the live performer and the mediatised screen. Moreover, the camera relay was live, we saw the operators moving amidst the space, so that we witnessed the production of these images, which introduced yet another

layer of reflection on the medium and its construction of the reality it produces, and multiplied the sense of different, interlocking viewing and performance perspectives.

Beckett Trio in Strasbourg amplified something that was already there in Beckett: where the impact is not just in the content, but, as in the title of the McLuhan book of 1967, the medium is the *massage*: it works on our nerves, as Beckett said of *Not I*, and can disrupt and interrupt our perceptual and conceptual processes, working against spectatorial mastery and drawing attention to the textual and audio-visual mediations through which we access self and others, reality and imaginative creations. The use of live camera in performance intensified not only what Causey has termed the narcissism of "the uncanny performer solipsistically coming face to face with its own perception of seeing oneself see oneself" (2016: 440), but the subversion of that narcissism by framing the close-up of Joe's face as scrutinized by a hostile other both internal and external to the diegesis, and by further disrupting and dispersing the articulations of self across live performance and visual and audio mediations. In contrast, the case study below which discusses Company SJ's 2014 site-specific performance of a selection of Beckett's prose texts, *Fizzles*, does not use close-up, but rather expands and multiplies the spatio-temporal frames through which the vulnerable body of the performer endlessly journeys. Pre-recorded sequences layered the embodied here and now with historical references and resonances and dispersed the audience member's perceptions and shared spatial and temporal co-presence with the performer.

Sarah Jane Scaife's *Fizzles*: intermedial passages between sites and temporalities

Sarah Jane Scaife is an Irish actor and director who is particularly known for an approach to choreography and directing that focuses on the actor's body. Although she has directed the work of several Irish playwrights including W. B. Yeats and Marina Carr, Beckett has been a major point of reference for her throughout her career since her presentation of Beckett's mimes in Dublin in the late 1980s, when she returned from physical theatre training in New York (Scaife 2003). In 2006, Scaife received Culture Ireland funding to work with a number of international theatre companies in China, India, Malaysia, Mongolia and Singapore, in staging Beckett's theater, especially his later, short works. She has written of how her experience of working interculturally in 2006 led to a heightened awareness of the cultural markers of any performance of a Beckett play: "even Beckett's bodies, once on stage, are forced into a confrontation with specificities, site and location" (Scaife 2016, 154). She began to reflect on the specificity of her own cultural formation and environment: "This experience of watching as 'other' in a geographical and cultural space I was not familiar with drove me to look back at my own culture, assessing the incultured and socially inscribed body within the social and architectural spaces of my own city" (2016, 156). She no longer wanted to work in a theatre building but to make work where the city of Dublin became the site and focus of the performances.

When Scaife returned to Ireland, the differential distribution of resources during the Celtic Tiger years and the banking collapse of 2008 had increased the number of homeless and drug-addicted people living on the streets. She connected Beckett's indigent subjects with these "lives lived outside of the social contract of the city, those marginalised and disenfranchised" (Scaife 2017). Placing Beckett's plays in neglected spaces of the city would allow each to comment on the other, defamiliarising and rendering visible and material the conditions of deprivation encoded in the Beckett plays and physically encountered in the sites. Scaife's Company SJ embarked on the Beckett in the City project in collaboration with actor Raymond Keane from Barabbas Theatre Company, presenting a number of Beckett's short, later plays in carefully chosen sites on the margins of the city. The first production of the Beckett in the City project was *Act Without Words II* which premiered in 2009, and was then combined with *Rough for Theatre I* in 2013. These were followed by the *Fizzles* project in 2014, and *Beckett in the City: the Women Speak* (2015) which comprised *Not I*, *Footfalls*, *Rockaby* and *Come and Go* (see Scaife 2018 and McMullan 2018). *Fizzles* took place in a historically resonant site: Henrietta Street off Parnell Square at the north end of O'Connell Street. This area is a palimpsest of layers of history from the era of Anglo-Irish privilege in the 18th century to the crowded slums of the late 19th century and early 20th century. It

remains a deprived area of the city on the edges of more commercial or gentrified areas.

Scaife chose three of the prose texts from *Fizzles* as the basis of the performance: 'He is barehead', which evokes a body crawling through tunnels in what seems to be a maze-like vault; 'Still', a cubist-like series of perspectives on a man seated in a wicker chair, staring out of a window facing south, or a window facing east: "trunk likewise dead plumb right up to top of skull seen from behind including nape clear of chairback" (Beckett 1984: 183). After establishing the scene, the text focuses on the single movement of the man raising his right arm from the chair rest and meeting his lowered head. The final *Fizzle* was 'Afar a Bird', which evokes a double self, split between a figure 'he' who trods a 'ruinstrewn land' all night long, and a formless internal subject, the I: "I'm inside, it was he who wailed, he who saw the light, I didn't wail I didn't see the light" (Beckett 1984: 195). The texts already present splintered aural and visual perspectives on a divided subject - there is no coherent space or time. Scaife took the fractured self-body-world evoked by the text and used projection and recorded sound to continually re-envision and re-embody those textual invocations through the intersections between the live and the mediatised. The environment of the townhouse in Henrietta Street removed what Scaife terms "the safety net that the contract with the theatre building provides" (2016, 160), a strategy characteristic of much site-specific theatre, defamiliarising the audience, and encouraging an engagement from the beginning with the spatial environment of the house with its historical resonances and ghosts.

The performance took place across three playing spaces in the house, and audience members were led from one to the other by volunteers.[4] The audience were seated in the first spacious downstairs room on benches, and, as the light adjusted, we became aware of the figure of Raymond Keane, huddled in a corner of the decrepit room, like a homeless figure. He was clutching an old tattered book, so the origin of the performance in the text of Beckett's prose piece was obliquely referenced. The presence of the book raised the question of the interrelationship between text, live performance and the digital. Keane slowly uncurled, discarding the book, and began to move along one of the walls. Words from the text of *Fizzles* were projected on the wall, while a recorded voice spoke the words. Were the words conjuring the voice, space and the body or vice versa? As in many of Beckett's late plays, there is an uncanny blurring between the external space of live performance and textually invoked inner, imagined spaces through the disjuncture between the mediatised voice and the live body of the performer. The recorded voice was digitally mediated by sound artist Tim Martin who modulated the rhythm, quality and tone, giving the sound a hyper-immediate quality.

As the body advanced along the back wall of the room towards a door audience left, hugging the wall, another space with a long corridor facing the audience and an image of Keane moving in that space were projected onto the wall doubling not only Keane but the space itself. The projected scenes were filmed in the Pigeon House - an immense, former power station, now dilapidated and intended for demolition or renovation. The Pigeon House had been the initial choice for the performance but was deemed to be incompatible with health and safety. Scaife was interested in the shifting spatial environments of the faded grandeur of the Georgian domestic interior and the vast, unhomely, industrial space of the Pigeon House. Because of the imposition of the projected space onto the actual space and their shared state of dilapidation, it seemed as if a space had opened up in the wall in front of me as I watched Keane move simultaneously in both real and virtual spaces. The projection played with thresholds, windows and doorframes as the spoken text evoked the progress of a figure along endless passageways. The projected corridor with a window at the end emanating a faint light along which the double of Keane slowly stumbled was also conjured by the spoken text, so that its emergence seemed triggered by the voice, the space and body tangible but also ghost-like, fading in and out of visibility. The intermedial interchange here definitely augmented my perception in disorienting and uncanny ways, and intensified the sense of isolation and desolation of the wandering figure.

As the live and the spoken bodies continued their trajectories, the projection slowly

[4] I saw the performance on September 13th, 2014.

metamorphosed - the tunnel disappeared and another haunted and haunting space appeared which had been filmed in another section of the Pigeon House - equally dilapidated but with stairs flooded with light as opposed to the gloom of the earlier tunnel. The virtual Keane, identically costumed in vest and loose trousers, slowly climbed the stairs, echoing but also contrasting with the earth-bound floor-level figure of the live actor crawling his way along the edge of the room. The two spaces - the industrial and the domestic, the live and the virtual – didn't merge, but interfered with each other, and with how I perceived the interrelationship between them, as they faded into and away from each other. The effect was of an hallucination, a ghostly visitation, splintered across desolate spaces and historical temporalities of dispossession.

Keane edged towards the doorway at the end of the wall facing the audience and the projected space disappeared. We were then led into a second adjacent room and seated facing a wall with two tall Georgian windows. I saw the performance at lunch-time on a sunny afternoon, so when I entered the room the huge floor to ceiling windows flooded the room with a golden light, recalling the elegant days of the Georgian townhouse, contradicted by the crumbling plaster. Scaife had created new wooden frames for the windows, and screens which filtered the light through a grid effect. In front of the audience left window, Keane was seated in a wicker chair, looking out through the window. The room was otherwise bare apart from a few seating banks for the audience. The symmetry of the two windows, separated by a central panel of wall and the effect of the light was painterly, with few indicators of time period. As the recorded voice began to speak the words of 'Still', a projected image of Keane appeared in the central panel, as if seen frontally. This had a strong perceptually disorienting effect as if we were seeing from two mutually incompatible perspectives - or as if we were seeing Keane's reflection in a mirror and yet of course there was a spatial disjuncture which refused to merge these perspectives. And slowly the figure, as in the text, raised his hand in a micro-movement augmented by the double vision - while the head lowered slightly to meet the hand but the two perspectives never quite converged. After the desolation of the first piece, this seemed like a very fleeting, precious glimpse of a moment of being, traced across the different iterations of the movement of the hand: textual, live and projected, no sooner apprehended than over, a sense simultaneously of ephemerality and bridging time.[5] The very real architectural and demographic location of the Henrietta St townhouse was a reminder of the layer upon layer of regimes of dispossession and privilege from the British empire to the disparity of income during the Celtic Tiger era, intensified by austerity, that had produced materially dispossessed bodies such as those encountered outside or in the actual doorways of Henrietta street, that theatre goers might ignore or hurry past.

Conclusion

Intermediality as an inter-sensual experience can therefore defamiliarize and draw attention to different modes of perception / participation in diverse embodied or mediated performances, not only in order to generate new creative languages or practices, but to examine the relations of power, agency or its lack in the interchange between the audience member, the performer and the mechanisms and networks of production. Moreover, intermediality, as in Company SJ's *Fizzles* project, can evoke in an immediate and sensory way, the juxtaposition of different temporalities, bringing the present into relation to its pasts, and, as David Lloyd suggests in *Irish Times: Temporalities of Modernity*, calling into question: "the historicist narrative that understands modernity as the progress from the backward to the advanced" (3), bringing audience members into dialogue with the forgotten and the dispossessed of both past and present.

Nicholas Johnson has argued that adapting Beckett or indeed using Beckett's texts as a springboard for original creation allows more scope for experimentation in theatre and performance than that circumscribed by the current constraints on staging Beckett managed by his Estate. Johnson argues that while Beckett is now a "national commodity with real economic value in terms of tourism and international branding", that does not constitute the

[5] 'Afar a bird' did not include projection so I am not discussing it here.

entirety of his legacy. In order to ensure that living legacy, Beckett's works "must be performed taught, delivered, questioned and reconsidered through time" (Johnson 2014: 38). I've suggested that intermediality is one way in which Beckett's work in diverse media is being re-encountered and re-mediated for live performance by contemporary practitioners, using the technologies and the concerns and challenges of our time.

Works Cited

Auslander, Philip. 2008. *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture* London: Routledge.

Balme, Christopher B. 2004. "Rethinking the Relationship between Theatre and Media." In Christopher B. Balme and Markus Moninger (eds) *Crossing Media: Theater – Film – Fotografie – Neue Medien*. Munich: ePodium: https://epub.ub.uni-muenchen.de/13098/1/Balme_13098.pdf [accessed 31 May 2019]

Bay-Cheng, Sarah, Chiel Kattenbelt, and Andy Lavender eds. 2010. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Beckett, Samuel. 1984. *Collected Shorter Prose*. London: John Calder.

Beckett, Samuel. 1986. *The Complete Dramatic Works*. London: Faber & Faber.

Bignell, Jonathan. 2009. *Beckett on Screen: the Television Plays*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bolter, Jay David and Richard Grusin. 1999. *Re-mediation: Understanding New Media*. Camb, Mass: MIT Press.

Brater, Enoch. 1987. *Beyond Minimalism: Beckett's Late Style in the Theater*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Causey, Matthew. 2006. *Theatre and Performance in Digital Culture*. London: Routledge.

Causey, Matthew. 2016. "Postdigital Performance." *Theatre Journal* 68.3, 427-441.

Chapple, Freda and Chiel Kattenbelt eds (2006), *Intermediality in Theatre and Performance*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006.

Gontarski, S.E.. 2006. "The Singing Detective Plays Beckett (Again)." *Journal of Beckett Studies* 15.1 & 2, 242-247.

Herren, Graley. 2007. *Samuel Beckett's Plays on Film and Television*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Higgins, Dick. 1965/2001. "Intermedia". *Leonardo*, *34* (1), 49–54: https://muse.jhu.edu/article/19618/pdf [accessed 31 May 2019]

Houston Jones, David. 2016. *Installation Art and the Practices of Archivalism*. London: Routledge.

Johnson, Nicholas. 2014. "A Theatre of the Unword: Censorship, Hegemony and Samuel Beckett." In *Ireland Ireland, Memory and Performing the Historical Imagination*, eds by Christopher Collins and Mary P. Caulfield, 36-54. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Johnson, Nicholas. 2016. "'The Neatness of Identifications: Transgressing Beckett's Genres in Ireland and Northern Ireland." In Trish McTighe and David Tucker, eds. *Staging Beckett in Ireland and Northern Ireland*, 175-202. London: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama.

Laws, Catherine. 2013. *Headaches among the Overtones: Music in Beckett / Beckett in Music*. Leiden: Brill.

Lloyd, David. 2008. *Irish Times: Temporalities of Modernity*, Dublin: Field Day / Notre Dame.

McLuhan, Marshall and Quentin Fiore. 1967. *The Medium is the Massage*. London: Penguin Books.

McMullan, Anna. 2017. "Staging Ireland's Dispossessed: SarahJane Scaife's *Beckett in the City Project*." *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui* 29, 361-374, Open Access:https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Anna_Mcmullan/publication/320997485_Staging_Ireland%27s_Dispossessed_Sarah_Jane_Scaife%27s_Beckett_in_the_City_Project/links/5bade44c45851574f7ebeaa8/Staging-Irelands-Dispossessed-Sarah-Jane-Scaifes-Beckett-in-the-City-Project.pdf [Accessed 31 May 2019]

McTighe, Trish. 2013. *The Haptic Aesthetic in Samuel Beckett's Drama*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Paraskeva, Anthony. 2017. *Samuel Beckett and Cinema*. London: Bloomsbury.

Petho, Agnes. 2011. *Cinema and Intemediality: The Passion for the In-Between*. Newcastle upon

Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
Scaife, SarahJane. 2003. “Mutual Beginnings: Marina Carr’s *Low in the Dark*.” In *The Theatre of Marina Carr: “before rules was made,”* eds. Cathy Leeney and Anna McMullan, 1-16. Dublin: Carysfort Press.
Scaife, SarahJane. 2016. “Practice in Focus: Beckett in the City.” In *Staging Beckett in Ireland and Northern Ireland*, Eds. Trish McTighe and David Tucker, 153-167. London: Bloomsbury.
Scaife, SarahJane. 2018. ‘Situating the Audience-Performer Encounter in *Beckett in the City: The Women Speak’*, *Contemporary Theatre Review* 28.1, 114-126.