

Spring 2015

In the Mind of the Manipulated Man: A Reflection on A King's a King: A Brecht Retelling of Macbeth

Michael Lazarus
Bard College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.bard.edu/senproj_s2015

 Part of the [Acting Commons](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).

Recommended Citation

Lazarus, Michael, "In the Mind of the Manipulated Man: A Reflection on A King's a King: A Brecht Retelling of Macbeth" (2015). *Senior Projects Spring 2015*. 154.
https://digitalcommons.bard.edu/senproj_s2015/154

This Open Access work is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been provided to you by Bard College's Stevenson Library with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this work in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@bard.edu.

In the Mind of the Manipulated Man:

A Reflection on *A King's a King: A Brecht Retelling of Macbeth*

Senior Project submitted to

The Division of Arts

Of Bard College

By

Michael Lazarus

Annandale-on-Hudson, New York

May 2015

With special thanks to

Jean-Paul Zuhur

Kate Brashear

Annarose Stewart

Eileen Goodrich

Omar Forrest

...and last, but certainly not least

...the Bard, himself

William Shakespeare

Contents

<u>Introduction:</u>	1
<u>1 – Beginnings:</u>	3
<u>2 – Mr. M:</u>	7
<u>3 – Lady M:</u>	16
<u>4 – Death:</u>	18
<u>5 – “What’s done is done”:</u>	20
<u>Bibliography:</u>	23

Ever since I first heard of it, I feel like I have always had a strong admiration for William Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. I first encountered it when I was six years old, performing a children's showcase of Shakespeare's work. It was here that I first saw a performance of the famous prophecy scene in Act IV.I, with the witches chanting the iconic "Double, double, toil and trouble" rhyme, and the apparitions warning of Macbeth's death. Despite the show's wooden performances and laughable costumes, what I remembered most was the dialogue, most specifically whenever the name "Macbeth" was spoken. To me, it was honestly a name that demanded respect, and rolled off the tongue with such force. It was not until high school that I was fortunate enough to see a full performance of *Macbeth*, and most fortunate to see a production starring Patrick Stewart in the title role. While I was still too young to fully understand the dialogue from one scene to another, the dark environment that accompanied the play fascinated me. It was also at this performance where I first learned of the superstition behind uttering Macbeth's name in a theater, something that to this day I never do, not out of superstition, but more out of respect; respect for those who may be superstitious, and respect to a sense of tradition borne out of *Macbeth*.

In the years that followed, my interest in performing Shakespeare finally peaked in my time at college. Virtually no other Shakespearian role interested me more than *Macbeth*. How poetic that the first Shakespearian play I was introduced to would become the basis of my senior project. But as I learned in the many theater courses I

took at Bard, anyone can get up onto a stage and recite dialogues, pretending to feel emotions and carry out actions. This amateur approach towards acting is unsuitable,

especially when taking on such an iconic piece as *Macbeth*. And while I felt confident in taking this role and representing it in a respectful manner, I knew that it would make new demands and challenges that I would have to face as an actor. I can gladly say that *Macbeth*, both the play and the character, proved to teach me things that I had not previously realized, force me to give into my own vulnerabilities, and test the range of my limits as a performer.

Prior to coming to Bard, my interest in Shakespeare's work was small. Like almost every high school student, I was required to read at least one of Shakespeare's plays for an English class. Luckily, the play I was assigned to read was *Hamlet*, though I had trouble reading it without first looking at the scene-by-scene summaries provided within the school's edition. I was glad I had finally read it, and my appreciation for it only grew with time. In one of my following years at high school, I auditioned for a production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Frankly, my audition was pitiful, as I did not know what any of the dialogue I was speaking meant. But fortunately, that same year, I was in an acting class where one of the assignments was to perform an assigned Shakespearian monologue. I was assigned one of Lewis's monologues from *King John*, which I was a role and a play I was unfamiliar with. I found Lewis's dialogue more or less understandable and did my best in performing the man's frustration with John making peace with Rome. After a couple presentations to the class, I received moderate feedback on my performance from the teacher and the students, boosting my confidence as a capable Shakespearian actor.

In my gap year between graduating high school and entering Bard College, I was enrolled into Bard High School Early College in Queens to acquire some college credits. It was here I performed in my first Shakespeare play: *Twelfth Night*. For auditions, we were required to prepare a Shakespearian monologue. As Julie Taymor's film adaptation of *The Tempest* had recently been released, I was intrigued to pick up a copy of the play.

I read through it quickly, prepared one of Caliban's monologues for my audition, and was accepted into the production. Previously unfamiliar with *Twelfth Night*, I was

recommended the role of Malvolio by a friend of my mother's. After going through a casting process with the rest of the actors, I received the role, which proved most rewarding. I enjoyed Malvolio's pompous behavior matched with his carefully chosen words of dialogue, and especially enjoyed performing the humiliating treatment he received by the end of the play. (I never had assumed that performing in yellow stockings would be so much fun.) I was glad to have finally been able to add a Shakespearian production to my resumé, and hoped to add more in the near future.

Once I came to Bard, and signed up for Liz Smith's "Performing Shakespeare" course, I realized how amateur of a Shakespearian actor I was. I had originally figured that all it takes to put on a Shakespearian performance, or any performance, is a modest understanding of the text and a lot of charm, something that seemed to get me through my high school performances. Of course, as was proven to me in my freshman year, that was far from acceptable. It was in this course that I realized the amount of time it can take to really hone your craft when performing a Shakespearian piece; over, and over, and over again. Also, with the assistance of Barry Edelstein's *Thinking Shakespeare*, this course taught me the tradition and necessity of performing Shakespeare in verse, which is something I wish was taught to me earlier. I realized that there is a reason the plays are written in iambic pentameter, as they were meant to have a rhythm when performed. Looking back at my past attempts at performing Shakespeare, the rhythm was

inconsistent, echoing a term I learned in class known as “The Dreaded Shatner Trap”,¹ (i.e. “And ye come now to tell me... that John... hath made... his peace... with Rome? What... is that peace... to me?”). This was an acting habit that I quickly abandoned, and transitioning from the “Voice for Majors” course during my first semester to the “Speaking Shakespeare” course for my second only added determination. Every task we were assigned and every monologue I had to perform was a new challenge. And every time I performed for this course, I was constantly reminded of what I did not take advantage of and how it could have been much better. It was this very course where my interest in performing Shakespeare’s work beyond my time at college reached new heights.

During my junior year at Bard, I took “Shakespeare: Director/Text” with Jonathan Rosenberg my first semester, and the “Shakespeare” literary course with Benjamin La Farge my second. In Jonathan’s class, I learned how to analyze Shakespeare’s plays through the view of a director, and see the many different iterations that can be drawn from them. It was fascinating to see how other students viewed the plays and what kind of creative input they would offer in their own productions. In the literary course, we looked at Shakespeare’s work strictly as pieces of writing, as opposed to performance pieces. This was a great opportunity to get acquainted with more of Shakespeare’s plays, as well as once again focus on the verse and how poetic rhythm was prominent in the

¹ Barry Edelstein, *Thinking Shakespeare*, Spark Publishing, New York, NY, 2007, 114

texts throughout. I am sure that Mr. La Farge was very appreciative of how I was more acquainted with the plays as an actor than a literary student, as it allowed me to bring my own outputs to class discussions, such as my personal admirations for previous performances of Shakespeare's work in both film and stage, as well as my own performativity when reading the texts aloud in class.

When Omar Forrest approached me and offered the role of Macbeth for his new adaptation, I was more than excited. The role gave me multiple opportunities and challenges. Looking at it as one of Shakespeare's most iconic roles, (next to Hamlet and King Lear), there was the sense of a universal depiction of the character, but enough leeway to introduce my own, as well as Omar's interpretation. This would require me to determine what familiar qualities I would have to bring to my performance, and what personal qualities I would have to present. How insane would I want to depict Macbeth? Would he even have a firm grasp on his own conscience? How affectionate would he be towards his wife? How obedient would he be towards Lady Macbeth, as opposed to his kingdom?

It was a great experience to be able to work with Omar again. We previously collaborated when he directed me in his production of *The Tempest* during the winter of 2013. We both have a great appreciation for the works of William Shakespeare. I admire Omar's approach to the story of Macbeth, and how he views it as a story about a man with no control of his own destiny. I was grateful that he approached me with the project during the second semester of my junior year, when I was scrambling for a thesis for my own senior project. I knew I wanted to make my senior project relate to Shakespeare in some way. When I was asked to portray one of Shakespeare's most famous anti-heroes, I knew this would be a fun and equally challenging experience.

Shortly after taking the role, I asked Omar how I should look as Macbeth. As Shakespeare's work has lent itself to numerous time periods and fashions, I merely

needed to know how our Macbeth would appear. Omar opted for a timeless feel, with a slightly modern touch in terms of costuming. For my character, he requested that I stay clean-shaven, and have a military-style haircut. As I am one who will gladly alter his appearance for a performance, I did as he requested. Out of curiosity, I also asked if Omar wished for Macbeth to have an accent, seeing that the character is Scottish. Omar believed that adding a foreign accent would be too distracting and merely asked that I perform with my own accent. I assume he might have gotten this notion from the “Speaking Shakespeare” course, where we were encouraged to maintain our own accents when performing Shakespeare; use an English accent if you are English, use an American accent if you are American.

There was a sense of intimidation taking on this role. Macbeth, for many reasons, is an incredibly difficult role to succeed in. It is all the more intimidating when you hear that many talented Shakespearian actors have taken on the role, (i.e. Ralph Richardson, Paul Scofield, Eric Porter, etc), and delivered what are regarded as failed performances. I’ve read a couple of claims that attribute to what makes this role so difficult to accomplish, even by accomplished actors. One claim is that the role itself is to blame for the multiple failed performances/productions, since Macbeth the character becomes less important as the play unfolds. There is an argument that following his famous dagger soliloquy, Macbeth becomes less of a participatory character and more of an object of conflict for the surrounding characters. This leads to the climax, or as some claim, the

lack of one in the play’s finale. As Kenneth Tynan wrote in *Curtains; Selections From the Drama Criticism and Related Writings*:

“Instead of growing as the play proceeds, the hero shrinks; complex and many-leveled to begin with, he ends up a cornered thug, lacking even a death scene with which to regain lost stature. Most Macbeths, mindful of this, let off their big guns as soon as possible, and have usually shot their bolt by the time the dagger speech is out.”²

In response to this, another argument is that audiences and actors do not realize that the character of Macbeth is weak and hesitant, as the play of *Macbeth* is about inefficacy and impotence. Speaking for myself when I initially took on this role, it was easy to be led with the idea of depicting Macbeth as a strong character. He is after all a soldier, and one who forcefully achieves the throne. But then there are the forces that drive him: the witches, the prophecy, Lady Macbeth. His actions are proceeded by the claims and choices of others, not his own. Therefore, Macbeth is not a strong person, because he lacks control of himself.

With these details in mind, however, Omar’s adaptation worked to focus more on the character of Macbeth through the exclusion of the supporting characters. Of the four

characters presented in our production, whereas the Witches’ roles were expanded upon and given new material, Macbeth was the least altered. The absence of characters such as

² Brett Gamboa, “Dwelling ‘in doubtful joy’: *Macbeth* and the Aesthetics of Disappointment,” *Macbeth: The State of Play*, Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, April 24, 2014, 37

Malcolm, Duncan, Banquo, and even the literal characters of Ross, Macduff and Lady Macbeth made our production primarily focus on Macbeth and his descent into madness and inefficacy. There was no longer a revenge plot, a second half of the play concerning Lady Macbeth's guilt, nor a scattered anti-climax. Our show, from beginning to end, focused on Macbeth's arc. It can be said that this somewhat took away the challenges that other actors have faced with the role, but it can also be said that this adaptation opened new challenges for the role, given the complete focus on the character, and the restrictive amount of time to perform. While performing, there was the task of trying to establish this character's entire arc within twenty-five minutes. Easily the biggest shift in mood was the scene immediately following the murder of Duncan, when Macbeth is now insecure and worried about losing the throne he just received. I had to establish, beat-by-beat, Macbeth's status in the play's opening, his doubt in his own fate in the next moment, and his mental breakdown only a few minutes later. It all had to unfold in quick succession.

It should also be noted that this new adaptation borrowed elements from the work of Bertolt Brecht. After I was initially cast, Omar suggested that I seek out Brecht's *The Threepenny Opera*. When I inquired as to what Omar used from this text when developing his new adaptation of *Macbeth*, he informed me that this Macbeth would bear similar character traits to that of Macheath, or "Mack the Knife." Upon inspecting the character of Macheath, it is evident within the text that he too is a man who is motivated

by the demands of others. For example, within his first scene, after he is “married” to Polly Peachum, Macheath makes aggressive demands of his gang in an effort to please her:

POLLY (*crying*): All those poor people, just for a few bits of furniture!

MACHEATH: And what furniture! Junk! You’re right to be angry. A rosewood harpsichord – and a Renaissance sofa. That’s unforgivable.

And where’s a table?³

And in the following act, despite initial rebuttals, Macheath finally accepts Polly’s request for him to flee before her father can have him arrested. To an extent, this relationship mirrors that of Macbeth and Lady Macbeth. Macheath displays efforts of wanting to please his wife’s every call, similar to how Macbeth is convinced to commit treason for his wife’s pleasure. Seeing that our Lady Macbeth/Witch 1 convinces Macbeth to commit all of his actions in attempt to gain what she ultimately desires, these similarities are all the more prominent.

One question Omar approached me with early in the production was whether or not Macbeth was in control of his own actions. This of course is a question that has been debated in the play and is open to interpretations. As the show plays with a man who is told through a prophecy that he will become a king, there is the question of whether

³ Bertolt Brecht, *The Threepenny Opera*, Grove Weidenfeld, New York, 1960, 16

Macbeth *would* only have been king after killing Duncan, or if he *could* only become king after killing Duncan. Was Macbeth destined to seize the throne through treason or was it a future that he had to decide to take? This power-play between fate and choice is emphasized throughout the play, perhaps most primarily during Macbeth's "If it were done when 'tis done" soliloquy. This soliloquy has been analyzed as Macbeth questioning his own faith in his actions, whether they are his own or predestined:

"In spite of the conditional 'If' with which he begins this soliloquy, Macbeth primarily concerns himself with questions of action and performance: 'th'assassination' must be 'done' as a 'blow' to his desired end (the 'end-all'). Instead of waiting for the prophecies to resolve themselves in the future, he believes that immediate fulfillment, their being 'done quickly', will provide an ideal resolution ('twere well'). Rejecting his faith in 'Chance' and focusing solely on the promised ending, Macbeth seeks means, or a course of action in a prophecy that does not prescribe one, convincing himself that acting on predictions is necessary to reintegrate his split self and ensure his future rule. Thus, Macbeth identifies the 'nearest way' to the throne that Lady Macbeth thinks he

cannot 'catch' because he is 'too full o'th' milk of human kindness'
(1.5.16– 17): the murder of the king.”⁴

However, because this adaptation heavily edits the original text and creates a scenario where only Macbeth and the three Witches are present, Macbeth is put in a position where he has absolutely no choice in his actions. The Witches in Omar's adaptation are never absent from Macbeth's world and act as puppet-masters, taking the roles of Lady Macbeth, Macduff and Ross to further his actions towards their desired outcome. With this knowledge in mind, while Macbeth had absolutely no real choice or control of his actions, I had to make him believe that he did.

At the beginning of the play, I felt Macbeth had to have an immediate look of self-assuredness. Following the telling of the prophecies, his confidence would slowly start to diminish with each event: becoming Thane of Cawdor, contemplating killing Duncan, committing the murder, etc. With each event, my Macbeth became increasingly weaker, so that by the time he had killed Duncan, he was a nervous wreck. And once the next set of prophecies were told, Macbeth became a shaking, doubtful, scared child of a man, completely unsure of himself or his own security. Every new development had to slowly break him until he was absolutely inefficient.

⁴ Debapriya Sarkar, “ ‘To crown my thoughts with acts’: Prophecy and Prescription in *Macbeth*,” *Macbeth: The State of Play*, Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, April 24, 2014,

Perhaps the best feedback I received after one of our performances was that my portrayal of Macbeth made him more sympathetic for the audience. This surprised me, as I originally went into this role without that intent. Prior to accepting this role, I always labeled Macbeth as a villain. I often found myself comparing him to another of Shakespeare's characters, Richard III, a man who villainously backstabs his way to the crown. It was after I reported this compliment to Omar that he told me he never intended to make Macbeth a villain. For him, Macbeth was always the victim of manipulation by Lady Macbeth and the Witches. This revelation shed new light on the character for me, and made clear what Omar's intent was when adapting this play.

I feel my portrayal of Macbeth became more human, and therefore more sympathetic, after I was told to stop trying to play a character and try acting more like myself in the performance. My previous attempt at portraying Macbeth was stern, expressionless, army-like, and villainous. This gave the impression that he believed he always had clear intentions, and was too comfortable with the act of killing to suddenly turn distraught as the play continued. But when Omar told me to drop that and become less of a caricature and more of myself, my own vulnerability and inefficacy began to bleed into the performance. This of course was most important for the scene where Macbeth kills Duncan, as something is supposed to drastically change in his character at this moment:

“Macbeth has killed in order to put himself on a level with the world in

which murder potentially and actually exists. Macbeth has killed not only to become king, but to reassert himself. He has chosen between Macbeth who is afraid to kill, and Macbeth who has killed. But Macbeth who has killed is a new Macbeth. He not only knows that one can kill, but that one must kill.”⁵

Prior to this scene, my portrayal of Macbeth was calm and conservative, comfortable with his status in life. But after committing the murder, my performance now shifted to confused, timid, and clearly sinking deeper into despair. This succeeded in making him a victim of manipulation, as his actions were not altogether his choice, and his guilt continued to get the better of him.

⁵ Jan Kott, *Shakespeare, Our Contemporary*, Doubleday & Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, 1964, 80

3 – Lady M

One criticism our performance received was the unclear relationship between Macbeth and Lady Macbeth. This, of course, is a relationship that has been portrayed in multiple different forms. In Trevor Nunn's 1976 stage production starring Ian McKellen and Judi Dench in the titular roles, Macbeth and Lady Macbeth displayed a lustful relationship, implying Lady Macbeth's sexual manipulation over her husband. Conversely, in the West End 2007 production directed by Rupert Goold and starring Patrick Stewart, Macbeth was portrayed as a substantially older man married to a young Lady Macbeth, portrayed by Kate Fleetwood, showing little affection towards one another. Regardless of the different interpretations of this relationship, it must be addressed that Macbeth and Lady Macbeth have had a lustful relationship, at least prior to Duncan's murder:

“In this particular union, in which there are no children, or they have died, Lady Macbeth plays a man's part. She demands that Macbeth commit murder as a confirmation of his manhood, almost as an act of love. – These two are sexually obsessed with each other, and yet have suffered a great erotic defeat.”⁶

With our production, we attempted to have Macbeth and Lady Macbeth have a visibly affectionate relationship, while maintaining the image of a marriage driven by lust for power. Omar had our leading actress, Annarose Stewart, and I develop our own history

⁶ Kott, 79

between the characters, deciding that Lady Macbeth was a trophy wife that Macbeth acquired from a conquered land. This backstory also motivated our Lady Macbeth to attain the throne as revenge for her fallen land, and drive Macbeth mad by the end of the play to reign it herself.

Unfortunately, in portraying the relationship between Macbeth and Lady Macbeth, we only had two brief scenes: Lady Macbeth convincing her husband to murder Duncan, and the murder's aftermath. In the first scene, Annarose portrayed Lady Macbeth as headstrong and determined, doing all she can to convince me to kill Duncan, through ridicule and guilt. We also wanted to imply that Macbeth and Lady Macbeth had a child that did not live long, as hinted when she says "I have given suck, and know how tender 'tis to love the babe that milks me" (Act I.VII.54-5), and Macbeth suddenly freezes in place and displays a look of regret and sorrow. This is followed by Annarose using another tactic: stroking my hand to comfort me into committing the murder, and hinting at their unseen, intimate relationship. This sense of physical/sexual comfort between the two was meant to carry on into the next scene, where I reenter, covered in blood and clearly distraught, with Annarose grabbing my hand to stop my uncontrolled shaking. It is hard to say how we could have performed these scenes differently in an attempt to make their supposed affection more prominent. Perhaps if I had allowed Macbeth to display more vulnerability when his wife is present, it would have shown how easy it was to be manipulated into committing the murder at all.

In constructing our production, one scene I was most looking forward to was my death scene. According to the folio, Macbeth and Macduff exeunt while fighting, briefly reenter, then Macbeth is slain and carried offstage, where his head is chopped off. I was familiar with Macbeth's death in Nunn, Goold, and Tiffany's individual productions. In Nunn's production, Macbeth, (McKellen), is last seen fighting Macduff before the scene cuts away, leaving his death up to interpretation. In Goold's production, Macbeth, (Stewart), is last seen being thrown into a descending elevator and repeatedly stabbed by Macduff, who later reenters the stage with Macbeth's severed head in hand. And in Tiffany's show, Alan Cummings, playing an inmate in a psychiatric ward reciting the entirety of *Macbeth*, performs the final lines leading to Macbeth's death before submerging himself in a full bathtub, bringing the play to an end.

Because our version of *Macbeth* excluded all of the side characters and had the witches take their places, I was excited to see how they, not Macduff, would cause the death of Macbeth. I enjoyed the fight sequence, as it pitted Macbeth not only against Macduff/Witch 2, but the other two witches as well. Macbeth believed that he had some advantage when only facing Macduff, but the interference of the others, (i.e. Witch 3 preventing Macbeth from fleeing and Witch 1 throwing Macbeth onto the ground), added to Omar's idea that Macbeth has no control. And in constructing the final blow that kills him, I gave my own input. Originally, after Macbeth unintentionally slayed Witch 3, he froze in place as Witch 2 retrieved the dagger, stabbed Macbeth, and he falls

back dead onto the casket. Firstly, I felt that Macbeth could not just hold still and wait to get stabbed, as there was way too much air leading up to his death after he stabbed Witch

3. So I suggested to Omar that the blood on his hands distracts him long enough to allow Witch 3 to stab him. My last suggestion was for Macbeth to fall down then feebly attempt to climb back up onto the crate, cowardly crying, “Hold!” (I suppose these ideas were in one way or another inspired by Toshirô Mifune’s death scene in Akira Kurosawa’s *Macbeth* adaptation, *Throne of Blood*.) This gave Omar the idea to have Witch 1/Lady Macbeth be the one who adds the final blow as she presses the syringe/dagger into Macbeth’s gut, and achieves her goal for the throne.

5 – “What’s done is done”

Overall, I am happy with the finished production. This was the first time I performed theater in the round. It introduced new challenges to me as a performer. I

could no longer face in one direction so that the audience would not see my back, like in traditional theater. I now had no choice but to turn my back to one quarter of the audience while addressing another. This forced me to be just as present with my back turned than when facing them. Also, this made me have to be more aware of where my voice was carrying in the performance space. When rehearsing, Omar would remind us that when we speak, we need to make sure our voices carry behind us, not only in front of us.

I am also glad with the effect that the use of paint had in our show. This is a visual effect that Omar wanted to include from the beginning. In *Macbeth*, blood is an important image:

“Blood in *Macbeth* is not just a metaphor; it is real blood flowing out of murdered bodies. It leaves its stains on hands and faces, on daggers and swords. – But this blood cannot be washed off hands, faces, or daggers, *Macbeth* begins and ends with slaughter. There is more and more blood, everyone walks in it; it floods the stage. A production of *Macbeth* not

evoking a picture of the world flooded in blood, would inevitably be false.”⁷

⁷ Kott, 76-7

How exciting that through the use of red paint, we would evoke this image of blood spilling all over the stage, and into Macbeth's own little world. While we had a good idea of what to do with the paint, and what it would look like, it was only within the week of our performances that we finally began using it. Thankfully, it turned out as well as we had anticipated. The white floor and Macbeth's white clothes really brought out the colors. The contrast of the red paint on the floor, on my clothes and face, and in the syringe/dagger added to the visible image of the blood that Macbeth is unable to wash away from him and his world; an image often invisible to the audience.

As for my performance as Macbeth, I am glad that I got the chance to take on the role in a production. Omar's ongoing gratitude for my performance is much appreciated, as are the compliments I received from friends and fellow theater majors who saw the show. This is easily the most important role that I have yet had to take on, not only as a final performance before graduating but also as a role that has lasted as long as it has. Almost everyone has heard of *Macbeth* and knows of his rise and fall from grace. To have been given the chance to use all of my training as an actor to best serve this character was itself a rewarding experience. And I am also thankful that I gained even more training in this performance, thanks to the character's complexity and multidimensionality.

However, now that it is over, I do often find myself looking back and asking, "What could I have done better?" Could I have begun my performance with a grander entrance? How could I have appeared more affectionate towards Lady Macbeth? How could I make the dagger speech better than it was? Should I have been in more agony,

both physically and mentally? These are many thoughts and questions that I would take into account were I to perform this show again. But as I have experienced in my many years as an actor, I am rarely fully satisfied with a performance once it ends. There is always something that I wish I could have done differently, to somehow strengthen the performance or just experiment with the audience's reaction. And when taking on roles that have been in existence for years and have been praised and analyzed over and over again, especially the works of William Shakespeare, I am most positive that I will always think to myself, "I could have done something better." But in light of that, there is always the hope that I can get another chance to take on this role. What I feel that I would most like to take away from this project is the experience of having at least tried out this very difficult Shakespearian role, and hopefully use that experience to better my performance for the next time I play Macbeth, should that ever happen. And if that happens, I can rest assured that I have a firmer grasp of the character already established in my head, but am also willing to open myself to new interpretations and experiments. So, with everything said and done, I am immensely happy to have had this experience as an actor, I very much hope to be able to take part in more Shakespeare adaptations in the future, and if I am lucky enough, I hope to one day get another chance to play Macbeth, for better or for worse.

Bibliography

- Brecht, Bertolt, *The Threepenny Opera*, Grove Weidenfeld, New York, 1960
- Edelstein, Barry, *Thinking Shakespeare*, Spark Publishing, New York, NY, 2007

- Gamboa, Brett, “Dwelling ‘in doubtful joy’: *Macbeth* and the Aesthetics of Disappointment,” *Macbeth: The State of Play*, Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, April 24, 2014
- Kott, Jan, *Shakespeare, Our Contemporary*, Doubleday & Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, 1964
- Sarkar, Debapriya, “ ‘To crown my thoughts with acts’: Prophecy and Prescription in *Macbeth*,” *Macbeth: The State of Play*, Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, April 24, 2014