

ACTORS' ROUNDTABLE

ACTING SHAKESPEARE: A Roundtable Discussion with Artists from the Utah Shakespeare Festival's 2015 Production of *King Lear*

Michael Don Bahr
Utah Shakespeare Festival Education Director

Featuring: Tony Amendola (*King Lear*), James Newcomb (Earl of Gloucester), Melinda Pfundstein (*Goneril*), Saren Nofs-Snyder (*Regan*), Kelly Rogers (*Cordelia*)

B*ahr:* Welcome to the culminating event in our 2015 Wooden O Symposium, the Actors' Roundtable Discussion on *King Lear*. We are grateful to have you here and especially grateful to have actors you had the opportunity to see last night onstage. [*Applause*] First, I'd like to ask the actors to introduce themselves, starting with Saren. Next, we'll have them talk about the roles they play, how they came here to Utah, and where home-base is. Then I'll open it up to you for questions. Saren, would you begin?

Nofs-Snyder: As Michael said, my name is Saren Nofs-Snyder. This is my second season at the Festival, although my first was in 2002, so it's been thirteen years since my first season. Last night you saw me as Regan in *King Lear*. I also play Lady Percy and Doll Tearsheet in *Henry IV, Part 2*, and Salieri's wife, Teresa, in *Amadens*. I originally came to the festival in 2002 right out of graduate school at the University of Missouri-Kansas City. At that time the casting director, Kathleen Conlin, traveled to many graduate programs to audition students; I believe that's still a tradition at the

festival. Students with master's degrees are highly sought after for the Shakespeare work here, and I was chosen for that season. The interesting thing about this year is that I didn't audition. Artistic Directors David Ivers and Brian Vaughn knew me from past work here and from work outside the festival and gave me a call. When I saw the message on my voicemail, I recognized the area code and thought, "That's Cedar City! I know Cedar City's area code." Brian's voice said, "I'd like to talk to you about the season," so I quickly went online to look up the season's plays and said, "If they're not offering me Regan or Goneril this year, I don't know if I'm interested in going." Regan has been a bucket-list dream for years and years, so I'm just thrilled to be playing her this year.

Rogers: I'm Kelly Rogers. You saw me last night as Cordelia, and I'm also playing Amy Spettigue in *Charley's Aunt*. I'm currently based in New York. How did I get here? I first auditioned for David and Brian when they came to my BFA Program in 2010, and I came to visit also in 2010 when one of my directors directed *Merchant of Venice*. This year she sent me an e-mail saying that she was directing this year's *Lear* and that it might work out for me. I'd been trying to get an audition with Utah for the past three years in New York and hadn't even been seen, so I finally got seen, then got the call, and now I'm here.

Newcomb: My name is James Newcomb. I play the Earl of Gloucester in *Lear*. This is my fourth season, and I drove here. [Laughter]

Pfundstein: I'm Melinda Pfundstein. I was Goneril last night and also playing Kate in *Shrew*. This is my 18th season. I started as a student at Southern Utah University.

Amendola: I'm Tony Amendola, and I play Lear. I was here in 2010 as Shylock in *Merchant of Venice*. I had worked with Sharon Ott, who directed both *Lear* and *Merchant of Venice* here, at Berkeley Rep for a number of years. I live in Los Angeles now.

Babr: Any questions from the audience? [Silence]. All right, then I'll start. First question—starting with Tony: This is a big play for you as an actor, so when you say, "I'm going to be doing Lear," what do you have to do as an actor to prepare for a role of such breadth?

Amendola: I had a lot of friends who, when they found out I was playing Lear, said, "Well, why didn't you tell us? Why didn't you?" So how do you open a conversation? "Hi, it's great to see you. I'm doing Lear." [Laughter] How do you say that without

sounding like you're inflating your tire? You just buckle down. It's awkward because you have to realize that it is one of the great plays. If there's a masterpiece of youth it's *Hamlet*: examination of youth and becoming a man, becoming/coming of age. The perspective reverses with *Lear*: The mistakes you've made, the regrets, and how you can finally become human as an old man—which shouldn't be the case; we should be so evolved, right? Old people should not need love; they should not need validation. *Lear* was daunting, but I knew I had to do it while I still had the physical ability and the memory so I wouldn't inflict infirmities upon the other actors.

Babr: Is this your first *Lear*?

Amendola: Yes, my first *Lear*. I had done a little bit of workshop on it, but never, never. I worked on a version a little bit 30 years ago that was an hour long, if you can imagine. It was not a good experience. [Laughter] Anyway, you just read a lot. Then when you know what role you'll be playing, all of a sudden the actor's eye goes to the gentleman in the back who's slouching on his chair because he could be a *Lear*. They say every older man is *Lear*. All at once your body becomes a sponge for *Lear*-isms and mannerisms and vocal ticks and all of those things; you need a sort of ladder to get away from "the big role" because "the big role" idea will paralyze you. It becomes this nebulous sort of thing. I envy scholars because you can write and it's there and it's done. An actor has to imagine and then do, and it's a very difficult step. In other words, I had this image and I had the three daughters, and the three daughters are treating me this way so I can respond that way. If you're writing a paper, depending upon your perspective—be it a daughter or be it *Lear*—it happens, it's done. That's not the way it happens in a rehearsal hall. I have to absorb the various personalities that the daughters are creating and make that part of it. So there are a lot of things. You read a lot. You remember back to anyone that you had seen do it, and maybe there was a moment you liked. Why did you like it? You steal it, if you can, because these classic plays are built on the backs of each other. There are histories—I can tell you what Henry Irving did with this role. Every so often someone wipes the slate clean—for example, Peter Brook, not with *Lear*, but with *A Midsummer Night's Dream*—and then all bets are off and you start again. But you just get as much information as you can, and observe life, and good luck.

Babr: Anyone else have comments on that question? Did you have a question?

Audience Member: This is the first time I've actually seen *Lear*. I thought it was great, so thank you very much. As I went in to see it I was thinking of a movie that must have come out fifteen or twenty years ago called *The Dresser*. Was it the movie that has the great Shakespearean actor who says, "I've done 250 *Lears*," and it's almost like it's killing him? Do you think that's an exaggeration, the idea that repeated performances of *Lear* drain you?

Amendola: The role will take as much as you can give it—as much voice, as much physical, as much wherever you can get emotionally. If you ever thought you were contained by a role, it won't happen in *Lear*. But, as I said, you don't want to get lost. It's like kingship to me: that's not really the important issue in *Lear*. That may have been the important issue in Shakespeare, but to our audience I think it's about being a father. It's about giving up power; being a CEO, then not being a CEO. But, yes: You can be exhausted after the show. It's a wonderful exhaustion, though. You can take yourself on a sort of mental, physical journey, then all of a sudden, when I look across at Poor Tom, I see the immigrants trying to escape into Greece, into Italy, and now into Hungary. That's what I see, and it can get to you. Yet I don't want to give you the wrong impression: If you act correctly, it's really liberating and not neurotic because you're getting to release all of it.

Audience Member: This is for James and Saren. How do you prepare yourselves for the gouging scene, which is such a violent act? At one point, I thought I was actually going to have to close my eyes, even though I knew it was coming. How do you get yourself ready to do a scene like that, that you know is going to disturb members of the audience?

Newcomb: In the second part of our play, Gloucester is more demanding physically than in the beginning. I have one big scene with Edmond and then it gets exponentially more difficult so that by the time you get to the gouging, I'm actually relatively pumped up. Those scenes are technically specific, so we spent a great deal of time working technically on exactly what happens—who's where, where my head is, what the blood delivery system will be, making sure those details are consistent. Only when you have all that in place can you let yourself go emotionally into what happens. The people around me who are doing the gouging and helping with that have been terrific. It's a kind of irony that this is

happening to me, but I'm not aware of what it looks like because the blood is—I'm hoping it's in the sock, that it looks effective, and that it's stomach-churning. [*Laughter*] But an interesting feature of the process of acting is that it's a schizophrenic experience. There you are, playing the character and engaging in what's happening emotionally, but also technically needing to make the language clear—using the language, connecting with your scene partner, responding to what's being given that particular night. There's always a variation even though it's in a context of the familiar. But all the time you're doing it, there's a little voice in the back of your head going, “Yaba yaba yaba yaba— Boy, I landed that one!” [*Laughter*] “What is that guy in the front row wearing?” “Is that my line?” When you first start acting, you are so self-conscious that all the voice is saying is, “They're looking at me, they're looking at me, they're looking at me.” But after a while you relax, and the more you can let that voice go—that voice that's sort of monitoring the craft of the performance—the better. I know that for Tony, too, these big roles—I've done Richard III and Iago—they're a Sisyphean endeavor because you face the demand of Lear that night and—if you're going back to *The Dresser*, he comes off stage and says, “Where was the storm?”— you think, “I was that *close*. I was *that* close. I had it in my grasp.” And always—it's just out of reach. Truly, the nobility is in the attempt.

Nofs-Snyder: That's a really great question, actually because of what Jamie [Newcomb] was saying, that it is technically the tightest moment onstage, to keep everyone safe. We work with a fight choreographer who has choreographed very specific moves so that everyone feels safe and in control. That scene is one of two touchstone moments for me as Regan, the first being the prologue where the sisters and the Fool are on stage while the audience is coming into the space. That's a moment for me to be able to ground into a character. It's an unusual experience, but I really enjoy it because I have ten minutes of emotionally warming up to who Regan is and what her experience is at this given moment. It's kind of like a car. I feel like I get a chance to idle the engine a little bit before we really dive into that first scene—which is a doozy. Then the second scene that's really touchstone for me is the eye-gouging because it's so technically specific. For me, my Regan is really lost, adrift at sea, in the first half of the play. I feel an obligation to my older sister who, I think, has better ideas than I do. I have an obligation to my husband who, in our production, is

very controlling and has a lot more of the power lust than I do. So I feel Regan's adrift and following other people's examples. Once that gouging comes, because it's so tightly wound, the second it's done, and after I stab the servant and we've gouged out that second eye—this is going to sound so strange—but I release and relax because once that's happened there's nowhere else to go for Regan. She has jumped off the cliff, and the rest of the play for me is kind of this lovely, relaxed cakewalk. But that's a great question and because we've worked that so intensely, it allows me to have an entirely different Regan for the second half of the play.

Audience Member: This relates to the ensemble and I'd like to hear from all of you. You do your homework and you have some idea of the character you're going to be portraying, and the director does her homework and has an idea of the production she wants to get out there—talk a little bit about the modification effects of the ensemble as you go through the initial readings to the presentation we see.

Newcomb: You get hired to do a part in a play, and you show up at the first read-through. You might have gotten some information about what the period was going to be, what the look was going to be—but more often than not, you don't. You show up and the first read-through is when you see everybody who's reading those parts and the director who's talking about her vision for the play. You get a good indication—especially now that I've been doing this for quite some time—of what the dynamic of the process is going to be. All directors have different processes. Some are architects who have it all planned out from the beginning to the end—how it's going to look, how they want to pace it, how they want to stage it. Others are craftsman and it's pretty much technical. They're not that interested in complexity of interpretation, but mostly just getting it out. So you're always adapting as an actor within the context of that process. In order to do the best you can with your interpretation and the other people's take on the play, it truly is a collaborative effort. Sometimes the processes are smooth, and sometimes they're not. That doesn't necessarily mean that the smooth ones always turn out to be good, nor do the complex ones or the conflicting ones. I've seen both. What I do know is that doing a production with an ensemble is like going to war in the sense that we don't do this for you. Our performances are for us, for the ensemble, for the group. One

reason we panic about going up is that we don't want to let our fellow actors down. We want to give a good show, we want you to get your money's worth, but in my opinion it's all about the actress to my right and the actors to my left and not wanting to let them down. So however frustrating the process might be when you're working with the director, that's the core of it: you want this group of people to give the best show that they can and you adapt.

Bahr: Anyone else want to add to that?

Pfundstein: When I heard I was playing Goneril, what I heard from everyone was, "Oh, the evil one," "That evil sister," or "Who's playing Regan?" Always paired together, Regan and Goneril are this evil pair. When we came in, I thought that's so boring: If they're all evil when we walk in, the audience knows what it's going to be at the end; we all know where it goes. So the sisters and I sat down with Sharon [*Ott, the director*] a few times to talk about how we are different and how we are individuals, what the relationship with our father was like that helped lead to who we are as sisters, helped shape us into the individuals we are and what we think our expectations are when we see the map laid out on the ground. We all had different ideas of what we expected to come out of Lear's mouth. None of that, of course, is in the text, but it gives us all context to work with as we're building moments together. That was all very collaborative; we still talk about the intricacies of those relationships, especially among the sisters. And as for being an ensemble, Jamie's absolutely right. The fear comes because we are working as a team and we don't want to let our teammates down, and we have to lift each other in order to make the scenes fly. So when one thing goes wrong, everybody starts to shift around to help fix the dynamic, or help to alter the dynamic into something that is usable for us and useful for the audience to get a good, clear story. That's where the pressure and the victory come from working as an ensemble.

Amendola: I agree completely. I have to tell you a story. I did two plays in Rep at La Jolla. It was an ensemble and in the morning I would hear all the actors saying, "If that guy doesn't stop telling me what to do, I'm going to strangle him." Then at the afternoon rehearsal, a completely different play, the same actors would say, "If that woman doesn't start telling me what to do, I'm going to strangle her." It's a strange dance with the director. Ideally, all I ask is to be heard. I often will talk privately. It's not something to be done in rehearsal because you don't want to get into a contest

of who knows more about a role or more about the play. It's completely useless, particularly for the actor, because you have no power really in the framework that it is. You try to negotiate and advocate for your character, so if they ask you to do something, ideally, it's great if you do it. Sometimes you say, "Hmm, no, it really doesn't—and here's why it doesn't feel good." That's a negotiation. The problem is many actors think directors should be acting coaches, and it's wonderful when they are, because if the director has the skill to coach the actor as well as direct the play, that's very comfortable for us. But you can't put it on directors. All directors have a completely different vocabulary. So it's a strange dance. For example, when I was here five years ago, Sharon Ott, our director, wanted to take the intermission before the "Hath not a Jew eyes" scene. She was convinced that's where it should be. As an actor, all I could see is the people coming back from the john in the middle of the "Hath not a Jew eyes" speech. Coming back, zipping up, "Oh, am I late?" People coming in with their coffee. I advocated once and she said, "No, no. Really"; I advocated again, gently, and finally I was able to convince her. That was a small victory, but a wonderful one. That said, in this play, she wanted to take the intermission, because the play actually splits this way, after the blinding. But that is more than two hours into the play—far too long for our bladders. So we pushed it back, first to after the trial scene, and then she wanted to move it to where Lear is coming off the "reason not the need" and then needs to go out into the storm. She asked me, "Would you mind terribly if we took the intermission there?" and I said, "No, of course not." It's good for the play. So you have that conversation, if you're lucky. Other times, it's just the way it is; it's my way or the highway. As Jamie says, you're here to do a job. If you want the contract take it; if you don't, there are plenty of others behind you.

Newcomb: George Bernard Shaw said that the relationship of an actor to a director, and a director to an actor is directly analogous to a mongoose and cobra. [*Laughter*] He's absolutely right. It's about negotiation and compromise and diplomacy.

Rogers: Cordelia is an interesting part because I really interact only with Lear in this play, even though in the first scene I feel I'm directed much more by the people who are in the scene with me. At this point, I don't remember everything that happened in the rehearsal room, but I try to open myself up to what everyone else in the room is doing and what happens when I look at them,

especially Tony. He throws me very different things every night. Sharon was a professor of mine in school and the first experience I had with her was her telling me not to be so mean in an audition. From a very young age, 18, I learned how not to get my feelings hurt by her. Now I understand that the director leaves after opening night and we have to continue to make this thing happen every night. At this point, I'm very disconnected from what happened in the rehearsal room because my information comes from the people around me. Tony is my director every night.

Audience Member: I spoke to Melinda last night about the repertory system, and she gave me a great technical answer. Several of you mentioned being in two, maybe three productions. I'm interested in how that changes your mental landscape or mental furniture when you're preparing roles. Are you just professionals and able to segregate all the parts? Do pieces bleed? Melinda, you're playing two bad (or bad-ass) older sisters in the two productions. So if there's bleed-over, how does that change your process in repertory versus a stand-alone, seven or eight shows per week production?

Rogers: I'm really loving it. I don't know if any of you have seen *Charley's Aunt* yet, but it's a hysterical farce. I play a somewhat ridiculous young woman who is optimistic and eager and gets what she wants at the end and survives, you know? [*Laughter*] I joke that I was always laughing in *Charley's Aunt* rehearsals and always crying in *Lear* rehearsals. I mean it's written into the text, "Wipe thine eye if be your tears wet." Okay, Shakespeare, I get it: I'm crying all the time. So balancing the comedy and the tragedy in the season has been so healthy for me because I want to be grounded by *Lear* and I want to be released in *Charley's Aunt*. Every single time I do *Lear*, I've had a matinee of *Charley's Aunt* in the afternoon—that's how our schedules worked out. It's been really great. I don't think they're actually that different though. The stakes are just as high in the comedy as the tragedy; just the consequences are different. Does Cordelia leak into Amy Spettigue? No. I don't think that there's really any leakage other than they both care a lot about what happens.

Nofs-Snyder: I adore working in the repertory system if only because it gives you a chance to step away from a role for a time. It's not every day that I was working on Regan. I got to go to two other rehearsals and look at two other entirely different worlds. I found that some of the most informative moments for Regan, for

example, would happen in the rehearsal for *Amadeus* just because I could let go of the actor brain that's constantly working: "Am I doing this right? Am I making good choices? Is this okay?" When you can step away from it and look at a different role, for some reason it really helps to inform opposite things. It's also like a good lasagna: You get to bake it and put it away for the night, and then the next morning it's in much better shape. So if I could put Regan away for a little bit, I could come back a day or day and a half later with a fresh pair of eyes. And purely in the performance, it's really lovely to not have to gouge out eyes eight times a week. It is exhausting. I know there was that question about *The Dresser*: Does it? The shows do exhaust you. I think there's much less fatigue in going back and forth between characters. It's also just a damn delight to be able to play, in my case, five different characters a week. I wish the repertory system were more prevalent in American theatre. I think it's perfect for me. It's a really easy way to work.

Babr: Any other comments on the repertory system?

Amendola: It's what we were trained to do. At most of the schools we went to, that was the ideal, and then it disappeared. Now so many people train for repertory and then go to LA or New York and someone hands them an audition for a commercial. That's part of the reality of our world. Another thing is that *these* plays were not meant to be done eight times a week. They weren't. To actually perform them eight times a week, people pay a price for that, and generally they have to pull back mid-week—because your body does ache. My body aches right now. You know that scene with Nick Nolte at the beginning of *North Dallas 40*? Nolte has a scene where he wakes up and the first three minutes are all in silence about him dealing with his body. For me at my age, I feel it in my neck, back, voice—but I'm so grateful to have the opportunity to do it. It's not a burden. I don't want you to feel sorry for me or anything like that, or any of us. We're sort of the top five percent in our profession right now.

Audience Member: I want to comment about what Melinda said about the two evil sisters being grouped together. This production did a really good job of distinguishing Goneril from Regan. Part of it was that Goneril was crowned by her father, but you [*points to Nofs-Snyder*] weren't and for a minute I saw them as distinctly different. But what I really wanted to discuss was Tony's comment at the beginning about when you see an older man in the audience, immediately that's your Lear, someone you

can relate to. But you were an incredibly robust Lear. When you made the comment about creeping to death, I thought, “Bullshit,” and people were laughing in the audience. You’re vigorous, robust, physically powerful, violent (you knock furniture around), your daughters are frightened of you, not just because of the horrible things you say to them, but the physical part of it. That made, of course, the demise of Lear, both physically and mentally as you struggle through the play, so much more extreme. I don’t think I’ve ever seen a Lear that was so robust at the beginning of the play. I get that you want to retire early, but the idea that you’re really going to sort of creep up to death doesn’t work. I see Lear as far more frail when I read the text.

Amendola: First of all, all these characters in Shakespeare—they’re exceptional—they are not us. They’re larger than life. So he’s 80. Do you know how long the play would be if I played him realistically as an 80-year-old man? To me, that whole line about “crawl towards death” is sarcasm, and there’s a sense of, “Oh yeah, you’re listening. I know some of you want me out and think they can do the job better, and probably could. This one [*points to Pfundstein*] without question.” But I think Lear’s a man who abruptly made up his mind; he’s a very rash man. He loves rash men. He loves chaos in Kent. He loves that kind of guy. Also, he hunts. He’s going to go out carousing because, although he’s probably been a carouser, his carousing has been dented by his kingship, so he’s going to go out carousing. Consequently, I chose not to play up the age. Again, it can be done that way, but you have to remember, Lear is often done as kind Lear. He’s a kind, old man inflicted on by his daughters. You inherit these images and you read them from criticisms and scholarship and you ask, “Am I reading the same play they were?” So you want to start there. There’s a tradition now, and this is something I really played with, of dementia in the role. Statistically, there’s probably something going on. I think one out of six, if you reach 80, has some level of dementia. But I wanted to be very careful. Although I knew it was there, I think this has to be the journey of the man or woman—us. If we in any way could say, “Oh it’s the disease,” that’s why he’s mistreating these girls—it’s that. Then it lets the character off the hook and there’s nothing for him to learn. So I thought of my own father. I’ve thought of many, many people who had humungous hearts when you finally got to it, but there were a lot of layers because of their particular life, and I think the same thing is true

of *Lear*. I think it's an awkward situation to have three daughters. He tries to make them bend in a kind of way that is the only way he can relate, and Shakespeare purposefully doesn't give Jamie or myself a lot to go on. The need for love, the need for this display—there's a hole in it somehow. So much has been written.

Rogers: If you want a younger perspective, I particularly enjoy working here because in New York I tend to work with my peers a lot. In college you do plays in which your father is someone two years older than you are. There's something really beautiful about standing onstage with someone who *could* be my father. And going to panels like this reminds me how little I know, how young I am. That's important because in my life, in New York where I'm based, it's really easy to think, "Everyone's young and everyone's running around and everyone's going to live forever," because that's what New York does to you. But this experience grounds me so much. It's humbling to be the young one in the room, and that's something important to learn.

Babr: Any other comments?

Amendola: I know exactly what Jamie's talking about and that realism is in the play. The Great Truth is spoken by a madman in our scene. But his words are the truth. I love the play in part because it's generational. Although it's the first time I've done it, you can grow up in this play. Kelly can play every single sister and in our society, eventually you could play *Lear*. It's been done. As painful as the journey is, I love doing it. Certainly in these tragedies—I think it's great to do *Othello*, but in the Scottish Play, in *Lear*, and in *Hamlet* there is a feeling if the production is good or bad it doesn't make a difference. I remember sitting through terrible productions, and when the play was over I always felt like I'd been somewhere. I think this play does it. It's just a reminder of what's to come; it's a harsh lesson because the man is very old. I mean he needs to be shaken and he needs to have this lesson of humanity, and yet I think it's a very, very oddly beautiful and elevating experience.

Audience Member: I've read the play. I've never seen it before. As a reader of Shakespeare, I have to make decisions about interior lives and interior motives. Often I have a little anxiety that maybe I'm putting more of myself into the characters, that it's more about me as a person than about what Shakespeare is writing. As actors, you've talked about how you created these back

stories that aren't in the text, but inform what you're trying to do as an actor. I loved what you said, Tony, about "Have I read the same play? What are you guys talking about?" So do you have those same anxieties about saying more about yourself than the character, and if so, how do you negotiate where that boundary might be?

Amendola: You can read all these plays at home. You don't need to come to the Utah Shakespeare Festival or anywhere else. You can read them. So the reason you come is to hear the subtext, to see those choices, and no matter how bad the choices are, the text is still not destroyed. Thank God. Yet you can see it eight times because—just the relationships with the daughters alone, you can see what they're trying to get at. It's the subtext that goes on between the actor, the director, and the designers to present this world-view.

Pfundstein: It's what we do. All we have to pull on is our own reference points and experiences. This body. This voice. This imagination. Anything I can imagine outside of what I have experienced. In that way, to try not to bring yourself to the role, I think, would be cheating. That's where I always start. That's what we have to work with. Eventually the imagination kind of fills in the gaps or you go really far and then sort of step it back to what a real human being would do. I guess the way we keep it *not* about ourselves is what Jamie talked about: making it about the other people on the stage with us. If we're thinking, "This is how I'm reacting here. This is what I'm doing here," that lines up with what you're talking about, when it's about us. But our job as actors is to make it about the other. That's acting 101 for us. Making things happen for the other person and giving, throwing things against the people that are on stage with you. So I guess that's the way we deal with trying to check ourselves as actors.

Babr: Great. Anybody else want to add to that?

Rogers: I think also that anxiety about whether or not you're serving the text can always be checked by going back to the text. There's a lot to find there.

Babr: Saren, I saw you nod your head.

Nofs-Snyder: The thing about humanity is that all of us have inside a lover or a scorned lover. We all have jealousy. All the emotions that happen are universal. So what I have to do is pick and choose. At this moment Regan is not most a lover. So, I get rid of a little bit of Saren's sets of love and compassion

and increase the jealousy. I've also been incredibly jealous, had moments where I probably wanted to injure people. You draw upon that from your own personal experience. You highlight the ones that serve the play more, and let go of some of the things that don't serve. But it absolutely comes from you as a person. I happen to be an oldest sister, not a middle child, but I went into the experience of what my middle brother acts like and used some of that. But it has to be from the self, and not only from the self, but also from the people you are playing with onstage. I don't ever come into a rehearsal having really memorized any of my lines (which can be dangerous as we get near performance), because I can't decide who this particular Regan is until I know who my father is and until I know who my sisters are. I've played Titania numerous times. Just when I think I know that character, I'm put in a room with entirely different actors and my Titania becomes entirely different every time, just as my Regan is different every night. Sometimes she gets a little more blood-thirsty. Sometimes she's really terrified of her sister and her father. It shifts because it's me onstage. There's no magic wand that's waved. I do not transform. I am always myself onstage and that's where it comes from. Jamie you figured something out, didn't you?

Newcomb: What I was trying to articulate was that this is a definitive production of *Lear*. Every production is definitive because it's this group of people, at this venue, at this time doing it. It will never be repeated, can never be repeated. So by definition it is definitive in the way that we do it every night.

Babr: And that is a great place to close. Please thank these wonderful actors for their performance and the audience for their enthusiastic and informed participation. Thank you very much.
[Applause]