



Wolf Hall

An interview with DoP **Gavin Finney** BSC

One of the most talked about dramas of the year has been *Wolf Hall* – hugely enjoyed by many viewers and yet a talking point with others due to its naturalistic low lighting and the decision to shoot largely handheld. As a great fan of the Hilary Mantel books, as well as the TV series, cameraman Steve Adams was delighted to chat in detail to DoP Gavin Finney for Zerb about how he and director Peter Kosminsky arrived at the vision that captured so well the atmosphere of that particular period in history, taking advantage of the very latest camera technology.

Can I first of all say that, having loved the books, for me this series perfectly realised them artistically. I am interested above all to explore the marriage of technology and artistic vision that enabled you to achieve this. Had you read the ‘Wolf Hall’ books before the series came up?

No, I hadn't. I was obviously aware of them as a big literary thing; I knew what they were about but they were still on my list to read. When my agent told me the production was looking for someone, it was: *Wolf Hall*, tick; Peter Kosminsky, tick; Mark Rylance, tick; seventeen-week shoot, definite tick! I did a lot of prep before I met Peter. I was sent the script and started to read the books. They're actually not the easiest read – rather like the TV show and play, they polarise people. People either really like them or really don't – it's a bit of a Marmite thing.

I absolutely loved the books. Did you speak to Hilary at all?

No. She kept her distance but she was very involved with the Peter Straughan adaptation and gave him lots of information and detail. She understood that the TV show was going to be different from the book, just as the play is. She only came on set once or twice as far as I know. I think she just wanted to know it was in the right hands.

How did your role develop with Peter? Did he already have strong visual ideas and then you worked together to realise them?

I think he saw a lot of people – everyone wanted the job! Across the crew he used some people he's used before and some new. His main thing, and I knew this from his previous work, which I loved, is that he has a very documentary approach to his drama. When we first met he mentioned that he wanted the DoP to operate and for it all to be handheld, so right away that's a big factor. I love operating although I often work with an operator, but he was quite clear that this was how he wanted to play it. I was immediately intrigued: taking a high-end drama like *Wolf Hall* and treating it this way was going to be interesting.

So you clicked stylistically from the start. What did you do in terms of research? Do you, for instance, look at paintings of the period?

Absolutely. I think everyone does this. Whatever the period, you look for references. If it's 20th century, you might look at photographs and film but for anything earlier the witnesses were the painters. For this, we were less interested in trying to copy any particular painter's style but more in asking "What did that painter see?"

Obviously, you look at the Rembrandts, Caravaggios and Vermeers but there was also a painter called Gerrit van Honthorst, who painted a lot of candlelit scenes very, very realistically. This is how those people saw the world – and it wasn't 'pretty pretty'. You have strong shadows and sometimes not the most flattering – but that's how it looked. That's what a single candle or lantern looks like. Similarly, for daylight, if you look at the portraits, they're often set by windows because that's where the light was coming from. This suggested how we would stage things: when the light is from the window, you stage near the window and when it's

“

Peter wanted it to look as if we had just dropped in to Cromwell's world with our camera and started filming.

from candles, you stage it near them – because everywhere else is dark.

Peter wanted it to look as if we had just dropped in to Cromwell's world with our camera and started filming.

Technically, I suppose the first question was camera choice. Was there any debate about the choice of the ALEXA?

Yes, absolutely. Peter had never shot digital before. He likes 16mm and hadn't really been convinced about digital. However, I said, "Let's start from scratch, look at every system available, including cameras and lenses, and see which ones we like." I encouraged him to keep a completely open field. We started with no favourites in terms of workflow, codec, camera, sensor, resolution etc. We just wanted to see what was out there and test them all with real people, lit by candles and daylight, in the sort of setups we would be doing.

The only limitation to what we tested was that the camera would be on my shoulder for 17 weeks, so some (such as the Sony F65) were ruled out, because I'm not going to carry that for 10 hours a day. So we tested the ALEXA and also a prototype AMIRA, which ARRI lent me to play with, plus the RED EPIC, RED DRAGON, Sony F55, Canon C500 and even a 5D Mark III.

Action is often staged near the realistic light source of a window as in portraits of the time



Lens-wise we looked at Zeiss Master Primes, Ultra Primes, Cooke S4s, Leica Summilux-C and Canon K35s. We knew we needed fast glass and something that would work with 250 candles in shot. This proved to be interesting because different lens/sensor combinations threw up various problems with multiple reflections. What we discovered is that the light will bounce off the sensor, hit the back element of the lens and then hit the sensor again as a ghost. Even without any filters in front, you can get double reflections. This is more or less prevalent depending on the design of the sensor and rear element.



Daylight was controlled with a row of 4kW HMIs outside the windows

So what was in your final lens bag?

What we liked best on the ALEXA for the way they resolve candlelight and because they give very few internal reflections were the Leica Summilux-Cs. They're incredible wide open; a lot of lenses fall off at 1.4 but these really hold up with sharpness edge to edge. They have extremely low aberration, with almost no visible chromatic aberration, so virtually none of that 'magenta green' you can get on hotspots. They give a sort of 'painterly' look, a richness. They are great for people as well as objects, with the darkness falling off naturally.

Part of the testing process was to take it all the way through to post-production, so we took the footage from each camera into Lip Sync in Soho, where we would do post, to see how much manipulation would be needed, how easy the files were to handle, whether the colourist liked the images and how much latitude there was. In fact, this cut a potentially very long period of testing short. The files out of the ALEXA were the easiest to grade straight out of the box; they look good right from the start without a lot of processing.

Did you shoot ARRIRAW?

No, we shot ProRes 4444. Obviously, ARRIRAW gives you the ultimate in quality, but at a cost. The recorders and cameras are more expensive, the storage is higher and it all needs more processing. For TV broadcast without a lot of special effects or blue screen, I don't really see the benefit. If you're doing a movie on a big screen, you can see a difference between the two but for HD broadcast, ProRes 4444 is indistinguishable from ARRIRAW.

That's really interesting. I think it's going to surprise a few people.

I've looked at it on a big screen and, even then, if you go A, B, between ARRIRAW and ProRes, on a very busy scene with a

lot of trees moving or grass blowing, you may start to see the compression in the ProRes, but you really have to look for it.

Obviously your ultimate end game was how it would be delivered, so that helped make your choice.

Exactly, and you have to make a compromise somewhere. Actually, I don't think it was a compromise at all to shoot ProRes. But you have to think, "Where are we going to put the money?" I'd rather spend it in front of the camera in this case.

What about filtration?

I tested all the filters as well, as you can imagine. I own quite a lot but I also tested all the new Tiffen filters: Satin, Silk, Glimmer Glass, Pearlescent etc, which are all lovely. But with candlelight, even the weakest 1/8 strength filters were too much. When you're working at very low levels – usually T1.4, 1600 ASA for the night scenes – even the lightest filter blows too much, and we weren't seeking a fluffy, chocolate-boxy look. We were looking for a much more real, penetrating vision.

The Summilux lenses, although they're very sharp and incredibly high resolution, also have a nice 'softness' about them, giving a bloom around the candle flame, which comes from the lens and sensor. This was very natural and just enough. I didn't need any more than that in terms of filtering.



The files out of the ALEXA were the easiest to grade straight out of the box; they look good right from the start without a lot of processing.



Anne Boleyn's trial – candles were the only light source

For daytime we did filter to a degree but again it was very light. I used Tiffen Black Diffusion/FX and Tiffen Gold Diffusion/FX, in 1/4, 1/2 and one strengths (they go up to five). That was mainly to help with makeup and hair. There were a lot of hairpieces for both men and women: beards and so on for the men and wigs and hair lace for the women. These filters help to smooth out makeup and hair. If very lightly used, everything still looks sharp and not diffused. You'd only notice if I took them out.

Again, I'm getting the sense of a real focus on the style and look that came across so well. The colour temperature of a candle is pretty low. Did that give you any issues in getting the colours correct?

No, not really. It all depends on the wick and what you're using. We used beeswax candles. We tested a lot of candles.

So, you've become a candle expert!

Yes, exactly. We had to choose a candle that looked correct for the period but also didn't smoke too much and would provide a stable flame. Beeswax turned out to be best. The colour temperature is around 1800 to 2200 kelvin, which is warm. If you balance the camera close to that, the colours come out fine. The spectrum is different from daylight but if you're slightly limiting the rendition, then that's natural. You'll get a broader base in daylight, but we didn't have a problem with it. It was pretty much all candlelight with very little additional light. It wasn't a problem matching sources to the candles because my supplementary lighting was mostly candlelight as well.

Wow. That was an interesting job for your gaffer.

Yes. It was an interesting demarcation. In the old days of ACTT, it would have caused a problem because you've got the art department, who deal with the candles in shot, but the candles are also a lighting source. When they're lit, who's responsible for them? The lighting team were great and helped the art department. When you have to light 250 candles and then keep them at the right length for continuity, that's a lot of trimming wicks. Everyone helped out, which was great.

The gaffer Andy Long made up some candle trays with a steel base and reflective sides, which would hold 20 to 30 church candles. We used these as extra lighting, a bit like in a church where they light candles for offerings. They could be brought in on a stand to create fill or additional light.

Of course there are very strict rules around where you can put candles in a building. Everything had to be at least 90cm away from any wall or surface. There was always a curator on hand with a measuring stick making sure this was adhered to! I did occasionally use a Dedo 150 dialled right down on the dimmer and also the new Kino Flo Celeb LED fixture, because that can dial down to 1% without the colour skewing too much. We used this literally between 1% and 3%, often plus diffusion and CTS. That gives you an idea of how dark it was.

Yes, some of the actors have said how dark it was. Were there any issues in terms of monitoring and playback?

Absolutely. It was so dark that the only way I could light was through the camera. The camera saw significantly more than your eye could. Quite often, until we got used to it, Peter would come on set and say, "Urrmm, are you serious?" Then, he'd look at the camera feed and say, "Oh, my god, that's extraordinary."

We did have video assist, primarily so costume and makeup could keep an eye on their work; this was always outside the room. Because I was operating, I never looked at a monitor. We had an HD wireless transmitter to Peter's handheld monitor and he was always in the room near the camera. Continuity was also in the room with their own wireless



A lot of hardware was used in order to make interiors look naturally lit!

picture. There was only a small crew inside with the actors: myself, the focus puller Chris Reynolds, the boom operator, Peter and continuity – that was it.

Do you think this helped the performance?

I do, and Peter certainly believes it does. If you're acting in full costume (and the costumes themselves are a whole other story, the accuracy with which they were made is extraordinary) and you are in a 600-year-old room that Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn actually walked through, lit by candlelight, a very small crew fades into the background leaving only the very real sense of history. Also, we gave the actors a lot of freedom to move; they could go anywhere. It definitely made it more real for them. In one of the final scenes, Anne Boleyn's trial, when Claire Foy walked into the large hall lit just by candles, all she could see was the other actors and she just gasped. It was extraordinary. She was absolutely in the moment.

That must have been amazing to witness. You operated the A camera. Was it entirely handheld or did you use any rigs?

Peter didn't want any Steadicam. He felt it would break the feeling of handheld and look too modern. We did have one crane shot, for Catherine of Aragon's funeral, where the camera comes up towards the coffin and then goes over the top. This was a specific shot Peter wanted and you couldn't really do it any other way.

We also tried to use a crane to get up to horse height but it didn't really work, so the grip Tony Sankey made a kind of bicycle contraption (a bit like an ice-cream seller's cart). Tony would cycle along with me standing up behind Mark Rylance astride his horse for handheld 'horse-level' shots. Tony made several 'vehicles' like rickshaws and so on; if I couldn't actually walk the shot, he would pull me along, but still handheld. There was one shot for which we did use track but with a flatbed dolly on skateboard wheels, with me sitting on a box, still handheld.

I think the only time we used sticks was when I was using the long zoom, the 45–250 Alura. You just can't hold that, it's too heavy – that was in the jousting sequence in episode 6. It was on an O'Connor head with a 'halo rig'. That's basically like a small inner tyre with two metal discs on the bottom and top. You put it between the camera and head and it lets you wiggle the camera a bit as though it's handheld. The other

time we used a head was if I was up high and it wasn't safe to have it on my shoulder – then I'd put it on a ladder pod.

Do you think it was advantageous to have operated the whole thing yourself?

We did have a second camera – for about 20 days – so we used this on all the big dining and ballroom scenes. Obviously that helps when you need a lot of coverage but generally this was a very intimate piece. You're always with Mark Rylance as Cromwell, very close to him, so the camera needs to be able to move fluidly. I don't think I could have done that with an operator.

A good operator's great, and I've worked very successfully with operators. You get an extra input, another set of eyes and someone to discuss the frame with, so there are often benefits, but in this case, with the way Peter works, it wouldn't have helped at all. It would have been another person in the room and I would have been disconnected from what I was trying to do. As I was lighting in a new way, with in-shot sources, I really needed to be on camera to light through the lens. I needed to design the shots and how the actors were in relation to the candles and vice versa. We'd move the candles to the actors to light them. Literally, there are scenes where actors are holding a candle and that is the only source. If the candle blows out, it's totally dark!

Did using candles mean you were more dependent on shooting at the correct time of day as you weren't flooding it with lots of controllable light?



When you have to light 250 candles and then keep them at the right length for continuity, that's a lot of trimming wicks. Everyone helped out.

Sometimes we shot at night, but mostly we blacked out as we were shooting in the summer months. This was another reason we needed to use candles – they were actually a solution to how we were going to film. I don't like moonlight coming through to my interiors because it doesn't really work like that. If you're inside, even though you can see moonlight for real, it doesn't light up a scene and it's usually in the wrong place. When you're blacked out, you don't even have that option, so candles are your only source.

When you're working pretty much freestyle on a 25mm lens or wider, handheld, often roving through 300 degrees, there's nowhere to put a film light. Candles were an actual solution. Apart from making it look very real, this is about the only way you can do it anyway because we couldn't rig anything. In a Grade I listed building, you can't even clamp to the wood so putting a rig up is often very difficult and extremely expensive.

dedolight
PRECISION LIGHTING INSTRUMENTS

THE DLED RANGE

VERSIONS:

- Ledzilla 2 (8w) - Daylight or Bi Colour
- DLED2 (20w) - Daylight or Bi Colour
- DLED4 (40w) - Daylight, Tungsten or Bi Colour
- DLED9 (90w) - Daylight, Tungsten or Bi Colour
- DLED12 (225w) - Daylight, Tungsten

DMX, STUDIO, LOCATION & 12v options

For info and demos please contact us at: www.cirrolite.com



A range of inventive ways of keeping everything handheld and yet steady were used. Left: tricycle rig built by key grip Tony Sankey; Top: soft balloon tyres smooth the ride over gravel – the camera is resting on a Cine Saddle; Bottom: Flowcine Gravity One on an Easyrig for a low angle shot

Now, post-production. What generally, and more specifically for Wolf Hall, is your role in a grade?

The grade's absolutely vital. It's an amazingly powerful resource and the DoP must be there if at all possible. I wouldn't do a job if it wasn't possible and I've turned down work in order to be at a grade. In fact, I had to leave a shoot early to come back for the *Wolf Hall* grade. You can save time on a busy schedule if you know what you can do in post. For example, you might see a wall that's too hot which you'd like to flag down but this will take 20 minutes – sorting it out in post might be the best option. It's not really 'fixing it in post', just finessing. If the colours don't quite balance and you need to do some subtle colour matching, I know this can be done in post rather than spending an extra 5, 10, 15 minutes on set.

What software did you use for the grade?

We used Baselight.

Do you work with a regular colourist and are you technically very knowledgeable in that area yourself?

I do understand the process, yes, and we actually graded the rushes on set as well. The DIT Rob Shaw and I would meet every lunchtime and he would do a transcode of the ProRes material to Avid's DNxHD 36 using DaVinci Resolve, which is what went to the edit suite. I would grade it close to where I wanted it so that the director, editors and producers only saw pretty much what I intended upstream. If people only see the straight, unfiltered output of the camera, you have to field questions: "Is it going to look like that? Is the green going to be that way? Is it going to be that dark?" This way, I sort those problems out before anyone sees it.

Then, when you go to the online, you start from scratch again although, in fact, you could import the grade from DaVinci straight into the post suite. Most colourists like to start from their own point of view though and everyone has their own way of working. The colourist will watch the offline edit so they know what I've been doing and then start from scratch in Baseline.

I do have regular colourists I like to work with but in this instance, they weren't available. Instead we used Adam Inglis, who had just worked on *Mr Turner* with Dick Pope. He'd done a great job on that and Dick had told me is a very good

colourist. I met him, we had a chat, and he clearly got what I was trying to do. He did a fabulous job – very, very subtle. There were a lot of power windows and shapes, especially in the big night-time interiors. Because there was candlelight everywhere and it was all handheld, it was very difficult to flag, so you effectively have to track every shape and power window. In the latest Baselight you just pick one pixel in a frame and it auto-tracks the whole shot in real-time.

Wow, that's powerful.

Very. You can have multiple windows if you want, all with secondary colours and density adjustments, auto-tracking a handheld shot. Adam was brilliant at making that invisible. His skill is that you look at the finished work and it doesn't look as if anything has been done, while in fact we've done quite a lot.

Did Peter get very involved in the grade?

He was there every day, which is unusual, because often the director is still working on the edit for other episodes, or in ADR with sound or music recording sessions. Peter cleared his diary for two weeks so that he could sit in on the whole grade, which is great. Some directors just want to see what I've done at the end of the day but Peter wanted to be there throughout and was very particular. He sits in on all the recording, all the ADR, all the music sessions, every part of the edit, so he's very on top of every single element. He has an extremely perceptive eye. Things I, or even Adam, might have missed, he would spot. Having three very keen sets of eyes in the room was useful.

Is there anything extra you would like to add on the technical side?

I used Easyrig a lot – it's a device that takes the weight off your shoulder and transfers it to your hips. We would run each scene throughout and they might be six or seven minutes long. Easyrig helped a great deal with that. Also, it's very good for holding the camera low at waist- or hip-height, which we did a lot. You can hold the camera very steady and Peter wanted everything to be handheld and yet as steady as possible. Even the static wide shots were handheld.

You can't really walk with an Easyrig because the string pulls the camera, so it's absolutely not a poor man's Steadicam, but we had a new rig called the Gravity One, which uses ball bearings and the camera's inertia to partially stabilise the system. If you want to tilt the camera up or down, you're normally fighting the pull of the string but the Gravity One takes all that off, so you can tilt down, looking deep over someone's shoulder.

The biggest problem with Easyrig is that it looks a bit stupid – but it does a good job.

Yes, Steadicam looks inherently cool and people go "Wow" when you come on set. With Easyrig they tend to just look at you and go, "What's that?" – but you just have to get past that because it's a great tool.

I also used a Camera Comfort Cushion, which is a kind of wide piece of foam that you strap onto your shoulder. There's a foam shoulder piece on the ALEXA but it's not very good. It's quite narrow and hard, so we took it off. I just had the broad base of the camera and that went straight on my shoulder, which made it a lot more stable.

When I watched the series, I really got the connection between what you were doing visually – both painting the scene with light and the way the camera moved. For instance, the scene where Cromwell is sitting by the fireplace and his sister-in-law comes in and turns the candles out one by one – it would be interesting to know how that came about visually. For me, it was a perfect union of the technical craft, visual art and emotional sense of the scene.

Thank you very much. It's very kind of you to say so and it is one of our favourites. It was in episode 2 and, in fact, most of the extreme candlelight work is in that episode.

The candles were my only light source. When I first read the scene and it says, "Joanne goes around the room turning out the candles", I thought, "Oh, shit. There goes my lighting source." But having done the testing with the candles, we knew it would work. What was good was that as she's going around turning out the candles, she's standing by each one in turn, so there's a reason for her to be lit. Then, as she turns it out, she goes dark briefly, but then comes to the next candle. The positioning of the candles was critical – the art was in placing the candles so that they look right from both production and storytelling points of view and as a source of illumination. You can't put in too many; you can't put 100 candles in a domestic room because it would just look wrong. We had to get just enough to look correct but also allow you to see the actors.

Also, it's where you place the people. Obviously, it's completely natural for Cromwell to be by the fire; that's where you would sit because it was cold. It's also natural for him to have a candle on his table because he'd use that for work or reading. Then, it was simply a case of giving Joanne a journey

around the room that would be visually interesting, turning the lights out. For the last one she's actually silhouetted against the wall. You just see her outline as she goes to the last candle in the room. What was great was that Peter and the editor used the wide shot a lot, much more than you normally would in a scene like that.

It was effectively a wide lock-off, wasn't it?

Yes, well an 'on-my-shoulder' lock-off.

A very steady lock-off with the Easyrig!

Yes, exactly. I was standing on an apple box with the Easyrig for the whole scene. Peter and the editor both got that it works so well in the wide. They went in occasionally to make a point but then back to the wide again. I was delighted they did that and also that they went to it for the end, until the very last line from Rylance. You really get the effect of it getting darker and darker and darker, until it's just Rylance with one candle and the firelight.

There is one artificial light in that scene, through the window. On the wide, you can see some very weak moonlight on the floor. We used a Kino Flo Flathead, which is an eight-tube lamp, on a crane. I think we turned all but one or two tubes out. All the lighting in the room is the candlelight you can see. There's nothing else in the room, no supplementary at all.

Wolf Hall camera crew

| | |
|---------|----------------|
| DoP | Gavin Finney |
| Gaffer | Andy Long |
| Grip | Tony Sankey |
| 1st AC | Chris Reynolds |
| 2nd AC | Clare Connor |
| DIT | Rob Shaw |
| Trainee | Laura Booth |



The Easyrig helped stabilise the camera on long scenes

I'm convinced that scene is going to be used by people teaching film for a very long time to come.

I hope so. What it also shows is what new technology can do for you and for the drama.

There was a lot written about this show. Obviously it was a big show with Mark Rylance and the literary aspect – but they were talking about the lighting in the mainstream press. Was that strange for you?

It was, because you're right, it's very rarely talked about. They'll talk about the costumes or locations or design and

very occasionally – more on movies – a film critic will mention the cinematography, but on TV it's unusual. There was a bit of a 'Candlegate' moment, when they tried to make something of the way it looked in the way they did with the sound on *Jamaica Inn*, which again I think was unfair. What happens is a few people will try to start a viral story and it will either pick up or not. What was interesting in this case was that for each of the few people who wrote "It was so dark I couldn't see anything", a whole load more would say they thought it was brilliant and looked exactly right.

Were you pleased there was a debate?

Absolutely. Initially I thought, "Oh my god, what have we done?" But it's good to be able to put the record straight. Of course we didn't want it so dark you couldn't see. We were filming in stunning locations with the best actors and fantastic costumes. It would be crazy not to see that. When we were grading, we made absolutely sure using Grade 1 monitors and waveforms that you could see what was going on. I can say, categorically, that the light level on the actors' faces at night is often at least as bright or even brighter than during the daytime interiors. We know that because we measured it; it wasn't a subjective thing. We also had a cheap telly in the grade, one you could get in a supermarket, next to where we were working so that we could check what it looked like on a common domestic LCD just to make sure we weren't doing things that would fall apart at people's homes.

I think what people aren't used to with candlelight is that the room does fall off into darkness. Where there is no candle, it's dark – and there are parts of the image that are very, very dark. I think people just aren't necessarily used to watching that. The whole 'Candlegate' story came out of, I think, about 12 tweets only.

One of them was by Alastair Campbell: "Not entirely persuaded by the lighting strategy" and then there was another from the comedian Jason Manford.

What was interesting – you see this with social media – some people want to kick up a viral story because it gives them attention. When I saw the story I was worried and called the producer who told me that something like 4.5m watched the first episode (rising to around 6m over the seven days) and there wasn't a single complaint to the BBC. They didn't log one call, so I thought, "Okay, I'll probably live to fight another day!"

If you're going to do an interesting drama, you have to take risks, to a degree, because otherwise it's boring and no different to anything else. I think you're doing something right if it kicks up a bit of dialogue.

Do you think *Wolf Hall* sets a new benchmark for naturalistic lighting that we're going to see again and again?

First of all, I'm aware that I'm by no means the first to do this. John Alcott lit *Barry Lyndon* using candles back in 1975. Stanley Kubrick had used his contacts to get satellite surveillance lenses from NASA. I think they were T0.7 or 0.8 – insanely fast lenses. They had to use a special camera because the lenses wouldn't fit a normal PL or PV mount. I think they were the first to shoot this way – but they had double- and triple-wick candles and they used a lot of them. It's beautiful but sometimes it looks like there's a bonfire on the table!

I'm sure others have lit with candles too, but I don't know of anyone who's literally only used them – to this degree, this many times and for so many scenes.



One of the few times the camera wasn't on the shoulder, due to the weight of the ARRI 45–250mm; the Halo rig can just be seen between the head and the camera

What's very nice to hear is that a lot of people believe the day scenes were shot with natural light, which is not the case at all. You just can't do it. A scene might take most of a day to shoot and the sun moves and clouds come and go, so you have no continuity. We had a lot of very big lights and cranes outside the windows to simulate natural lighting. It's nice that people actually thought it was real though!

Absolutely. Gavin, thank you, it's been really fascinating and you've surprised me by a lot of things you've said. I'm really excited to hear about your approach, the mixture of the artistic and the technical, and the way it all came together. Having been a fan of the book, it was just the perfect TV realisation. I hope they ask you to do the next one.

Thank you, yes, we're all waiting for Hilary to write it. We know what it's called, but she won't be hurried, and quite rightly, too.

Fact File

Since graduating from the Cinematography course at The National Film & Television School in the UK, **Gavin Finney BSC** has photographed many feature films and major TV dramas. He won the BAFTA, RTS and BSC best cinematography awards for *The Fear* in 2013, the first time all three have been won by the same person. He also received the RTS Award for *Going Postal* in 2010 and *Gormenghast* in 2000, and BAFTA nominations for *Going Postal* in 2011 and *Hogfather* in 2007, plus an RTS nomination for *The English Wife*. Gavin was invited to join the prestigious British Society of Cinematographers in 1998 and was its President from 2006–08 when he received the ARRI / John Alcott Award. In 2014 he photographed *Wolf Hall*, which became the highest rated drama on BBC2 since current records began. Website: www.gavinfinney.com

Steve Adams has reached his quarter century in the TV industry, a career that runs from gardening shows to the jungles of Borneo, sailing across the Atlantic to the 2012 Olympic Games. He says: "No matter what the job is, it's a privilege to dip in and out of other people's lives to tell their stories". Steve is one half of the ExtraShot podcast: www.extrashot.co.uk