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Part of an Extraordinary, Brilliant Humanity

By Bruce C. Lee

Not long ago I had an interesting experience that I believe, for me, put some perspective on some of the events swirling around me (and perhaps you) lately. I spent three days attending the annual design meetings at the Utah Shakespeare Festival. The meetings are an exciting and eye-opening series of discussions among the design teams of this year’s Festival plays. Directors, designers, and master craftsmen meet to explore ideas about how best to present Mary Stuart, Scapin, To Kill a Mockingbird, and the other upcoming plays. It was engaging, fascinating, and exhilarating.

Then, in the evenings, I went home and watched the television news, mostly centered around the upcoming national elections. It made me cringe to realize how tragically unaware many of us are about humanity and the world and issues around us.

Now, before you think I am being elitist or partisan, I assure you that I include myself in this group of the unaware—and I see this problem in all political parties and in all groups of people.

It is a complex world, and it is difficult to keep up on everything. But, most importantly, I also saw some answers to this state of affairs. As I listened to discussions of classic plays, I remembered that all good art strives to make us think, and, if we think and examine, this unawareness will be lessened, at least. As I listened to discussions of Titus Andronicus, I gained some understanding about why men and women seek revenge—and, more importantly, how it ultimately harms or even destroys them. As I sat in on the Les Misérables discussions I saw stark contrast between ourselves as beings in a larger social context and as individuals who privately love and hope. As I heard discussions of The Merry Wives of Windsor, I realized again that we are all very human and we want to have friends, family, and happiness.

These are the things that great theatre can do for us, keeping us aware of who we are and who those around us are, as well as keeping us aware, keenly aware, that we all are part of an extraordinary, brilliant humanity.
Festival SHOWCASES

Challenging, Rewarding Season

By Leonard Colby

The Utah Shakespeare Festival has scheduled what is probably its largest season ever for the summer and fall of 2012. David Ivers and Brian Vaughn, artistic directors, have put together a slate of plays they see as the most challenging and potentially the most rewarding in the fifty-one year history of the Festival.

The season, coming on the heels of a very successful and popular fiftieth anniversary in 2011, will feature eight plays and will run June 21 to October 20, 2012.

Tickets are on sell and are nearly always available. The Festival is expecting record crowds this year, but, because it offers three or four plays every day, there are almost always tickets available.

"However," said R. Scott Phillips, Festival executive director, "we always encourage people to buy their tickets early to get the best seats to the shows they want on the days they want."

In the Adams Shakespearean Theatre

The Merry Wives of Windsor, by William Shakespeare, features that loveable rogue, Falstaff, in a battle of wits with two of Windsor’s most clever women.

Titus Andronicus has been produced at the Festival only one other time. This vicious tale of revenge is one of Shakespeare’s earliest tragedies and was one of his most popular plays during his lifetime.

Mary Stuart, by Friedrich Schiller, is a political intrigue telling the dynamic story of Mary Queen of Scots and her conflicts with Elizabeth I, Shakespeare’s queen. Written in 1800, it is compelling and highly charged Elizabethan drama. Because it deals with the intrigues of Shakespeare’s queen, Elizabeth I, Festival Founder Fred C. Adams calls this the play Shakespeare would have written, if he had dared.

In the Randall L. Jones Theatre

To Kill a Mockingbird is a classic and potent stage adaptation of Harper Lee’s immensely popular and important novel. This much-read story is extremely relevant today as its beloved characters—Scout, Jem, Dill, Atticus, and others—come alive on the Festival stage.

Les Misérables, one of the world’s most popular shows and Broadway’s third longest running musical, is a timeless story of revolution and love which has touched lives around the world with the powerful story of Jean Valjean and his life-long struggle for redemption.

"I am thrilled we are finally able to produce Les Misérables on the Randall L. Jones stage," said Phillips, Festival executive director. "It is the one show that our guests have requested over and over for many years, and for the past ten years we haven’t been able to secure the rights, due to its twenty-fifth anniversary national tour and our scheduling, until now. I am confident this show will sell out, so get your tickets now."

Scapin is a modern adaptation of Molière’s hilarious comedy. It is irreverent, pun-filled, thoroughly modern, and filled from top to bottom with comic madness.

Hamlet, perhaps the greatest play in the English language, comes to the indoor Randall Theatre this year for a new look at William Shakespeare’s vision of murder, betrayal, family, love, and loss.

Stones in His Pocket, an audience favorite at the Festival, will return with David Ivers and Brian Vaughn once again playing a host of characters in this tragic, comic, and ultimately surprising tale of two Everymen.

For more information or to order tickets, please call 800-PLAYTIX or visit www.bard.org.
before S.3 do the rhyming pairs appear together: once in 2.2, and once in 5.1. Because of the scarcity of rhyme in the first four acts of the play, its abrupt emergence in the final scene is shocking. During the banquet portion of the scene, fifteen rhyming lines join in harmony and embody the most lyrical lines in the entire play:

[Titus kills Lavinia.]

Saturninus: What hast thou done, unnatural and unkind?

Titus: Killed her for whom my tears have made me blind. I am as woeful as Virginius was, And have a thousand times more cause than he To do this outrage; and it is now done Saturninus: What, was she ravished? tell who did the deed.

Titus: Will't please you eat? will't please your highness feed?

Tamora: Why has thou slain thine only daughter thus?

Titus: Not I: 'twas Chiron and Demetrius, They ravished her and cut away her tongue, And they, 'twas they, that did her all this wrong.

Saturninus: Do fetch them hither to us presently.

Titus: Why, there they are, both baked in this pie, Whereof their mother daintily hath fed, Eating the flesh that she herself hath bred. 'Tis true, 'tis true; witness my knife's sharp point!

[He stabs the Empress.]

Saturninus: Die, frantic wretch, for this accursed deed!

[He stabs Titus.]

Lucius: Can the son's eye behold his father bleed? There's need for meed, death for a deadly deed!

[He stabs Saturninus.]

(5.3.48–66)

Because of the erratic placement

of rhyme in Titus Andronicus up to this point, most audience members probably aren't aware that there was any rhyme in the play. When they suddenly hear these fifteen lines of structured, rhyming verse, however, they immediately sense the importance of the scene. And because we associate rhyme with harmonious unions, its appearance in this scene heightens our awareness of the action onstage because we have the dissonance of rhetorical harmony amid the chaos. Interestingly, the characters most involved in the power struggle throughout the play become entangled in the rhyme, as if in rhetorical competition with each other while they vie for power. The rhyme sequence begins with Saturninus, who took power away from Titus (as is demonstrated with the first shared line). The shared lines throughout this sequence then show the power struggle evident in the entire play, culminating with the final shared lines that illustrate the power shift from

Vice and Verses in Titus Andronicus

By Cheryl Hogue Smith

Although T.S. Eliot once claimed in “Seneca in Elizabethan Translation” that Titus Andronicus was “one of the stupidest and most uninspired plays ever written” (Selected Essays [New York: Harcourt, 1964], 67), all we need to do is look at the rhetorical sophistication of the play to see that it is anything but “stupid” or “uninspired.” In fact, if we examine in the script the intricate orchestration of rhyme and meter that cleverly mirrors the complex plot of the play, we can see that the rhetoric underscores and heightens the script’s tragic elements. In essence, what Shakespeare’s lines say is intensified by how they are said, which makes clear the absurdity of Eliot’s remark.

Rhyme is one of the most important rhetorical devices that Shakespeare uses in many plays to enhance what actors say onstage, with the most structured use of rhyme appearing in Titus Andronicus in S.3, the bloody last scene of the play. In a script with 2,621 lines, only 120 rhyme (5 percent), and in only two instances
Saturninus to Lucius. The rhyme in this scene mirrors the on-stage action. In one of the most disturbing scenes in the play, the rhyme intensifies the audience’s emotions as the scene is simultaneously rhetorically distressing and emotionally draining.

The rhetoric also guides audiences towards an acute awareness of meter in the play, at least as it pertains to Titus. As Russ McDonald argues, “The speakers deliver a thumpingly regular iambic pentameter. Most lines are free of the metrical variations … that would later enter [Shakespeare’s] repertoire. Such poetic uniformity … offers the virtues of directness and rhythmic inevitability” (Introduction, Titus Andronicus, The Pelican Shakespeare, Ed. Russ McDonald [New York: Penguin, 2000], 4). In other words, the meter is rigidly regular throughout the play. However, this is only partially true for Titus. In the first two acts, when Titus’s life is still in control, Titus’s lines are voiced in regular, iambic pentameter, with an occasional irregular beat entering his speech. In 1.1, for example, Titus speaks 132 lines, only five of which (3 percent) are irregular. And in the twenty-four lines Titus speaks in Act 2, none is irregular. However, in the third act, Titus’s meter begins to change, where 10 percent of his lines in 3.1 and 18 percent in 3.2 become irregular.

But this makes sense: In 3.1, when two of Titus’s sons are killed, Lucius is banished, Lavinia’s rape and mutilation are discovered, and Titus’s hand is severed, Titus begins his literal and rhetorical descent into insanity. In subsequent acts, Titus is clearly mad, which is most evident in 4.3 when he shoots arrows towards Saturninus. Likewise, as Titus loses his sanity, his meter never becomes fully rational, his rhythm becomes more regular. Yet just as he never fully regains his sanity, his meter never becomes fully regular again, forcing audiences not only to witness Titus’s mental degeneration, but to experience it viscerally as well.

In the end, the orchestration of rhetoric in Titus Andronicus heightens the audiences’ awareness of the tragic elements in the play and cunningly orchestrates their responses. In short, the rhyme and meter offer us deeper and more profound clues about what Shakespeare’s lines are saying by allowing us to feel them for ourselves.

In a play that appears “thumpingly regular,” the significance of Titus’s irregular lines becomes startlingly clear.

Not surprisingly, while preparing the brothers for their grisly fate, Titus speaks forty lines about his revenge, during which he is remarkably lucid in his thoughts. Similarly, the meter in this forty-line speech is quite regular, for only two of the forty lines include irregular beats. As Titus’s actions become more rational, his rhythm becomes more regular. Yet just as he never fully regains his sanity, his meter never becomes fully regular again, forcing audiences not only to witness Titus’s mental degeneration, but to experience it viscerally as well.
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Ace G. Pilkington

Robert Bolt, says in his “Introduction” to Vivat! Vivat Regina!, a play about Mary Stuart and Elizabeth I, “The writer of an historical play is a kind of playwright, not a kind of historian. But I think he is obliged to be as accurate, historically, as he can” ([New York: Random House, 1971], v). If Friedrich Schiller were held to that standard for his play about the same characters, it would have to be admitted that though he researched his material thoroughly and got much of it right, he is not entirely successful. As Lesley Sharpe points out, “The queens are much younger than their historical counterparts. Schiller suggested that on stage Mary should appear about 25 and Elizabeth 30, whereas … Mary was 45 and Elizabeth 53. … The meeting of the queens, the figure of Mortimer, the assassination attempt, and the romantic involvement of Mary and Leicester are all invented” (“Introduction” to Friedrich Schiller, Don Carlos and Mary Stuart, tr. by Hilary Collier Sy-Quia and Peter Oswald [Oxford:
There is also the question of Mary’s culpability in two much-disputed crimes, the murder of Mary’s husband Darnley and the Babington plot to assassinate Elizabeth I. Schiller suggests she was complicit in the first but not the second, when the truth is the other way round. John Guy in his recent (and very weighty) biography argues, “Not a single piece of uncontaminated evidence has ever been found to show that Mary had foreknowledge of Darnley’s incriminated, not exonerated her.” Subsequent investigations have further strengthened the case against Mary at her trial. Walsingham had more than enough evidence to convict Mary in the Babington conspiracy, Cecil and his agents were on Mary’s trail almost from the start of the conspiracy, and a vast amount of evidence against her was discovered in and around the Babington plot.

As for the Babington conspiracy, Cecil and Walsingham had more than enough evidence to convict Mary at her trial. However, the more difficult part of writing a historical play is creating believable characters who resemble the real people they are based on. Now admittedly, Shakespeare’s characters are sometimes so extraordinary that nobody really cares that his John Falstaff, for example, is not much like the historical John Oldcastle. Indeed, most audience members would cheerfully blot Oldcastle from human memory in order to keep his irresistible fictional double. But Schiller, good as he is, is not Shakespeare, and we are unlikely to find ourselves forgiving his trespasses because of his transcendent creations. He is a philosopher, a historian, and a romantic poet, and like many of the romanticists of his time (Byron, Shelley, Keats, and Pushkin to list a few), he ended by writing romantic plays. As Dobson and Watson say in England’s Elizabeth: An Afterlife in Fame and Fantasy, “In 1800 the Queen of Scots gave up suffering in unmerited distress and now embodied powerful, if thwarted, transgression. A proud, guilty, and deadly seductress, she became a card-carrying Romantic with a little help from Friedrich Schiller.” Maria Stuart . . . confronted the two queens with each other only to claim paradoxically that the imprisoned Mary achieved romantic grandeur and freedom by deliberately rushing on her fate, leaving Elizabeth grasping at an empty and meaningless victory” (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, 107-108). While that is an oversimplification of Schiller’s complex drama, there is no question that there are such romantic motifs in the work. Part of this is no doubt caused by the very nature of any play that pairs the two queens and then looks for meaning in their struggles. In Robert Bolt’s account of his journey through the same process, he says, “When I put the two together a theme seemed to emerge with uncanny clarity. . . . Power, the pressures and the penalties of Power, the gap between the fine appearance of Power and the shameful shifts by which it is sustained. Above all the unnaturalness of Power” (vii).

Of course, it is not merely power in the abstract but power wielded by two women in the Renaissance, and in Schiller’s case, it is the romantic vision of those women. As his two queens struggle with each other, they are, almost of necessity, fitted into contrasting categories as women and as politicians, both of them, to some extent, unnatural. Mary Stuart becomes an irrepressible seductress who is unfit to be a queen, while Elizabeth becomes an implacable ruler who is unwilling to be a woman. So Shrewsbury pleads with Elizabeth for Mary’s life, “A woman’s heart was not created hard,” and they who built this kingdom, by decreeing/ That female rule/ Should be tender/ (“You have never worn the secret crown/ Of female rule/ Is when two hearts bewitched by passion/ Confronted”) (2.6.532-534). Inevitably, Mortimer condemns Elizabeth for her unwillingness to submit to emotion, “The one reward acceptable to life/ Is when two hearts bewitched by one another/ Surrender self-awareness/ And let the ecstasy of the sky” (2.6.530). And he continues, “The one reward acceptable to life/ Is when two hearts bewitched by one another/ Surrender self-awareness to delight” (2.6.532-534). Inevitably, Mortimer condemns Elizabeth for her unwillingness to submit to emotion, “You have never worn the secret crown/ Of female rule/ Is when two hearts bewitched by passion/ Confronted” (2.6.532-534). Elizabeth, herself, in her unhistorical meeting with the Queen of Scots, dismisses Mary’s charms by telling her, “Beauty, to purchase common approbation, / Needs only to be common property” (3.4.327–328). There is a more positive statement of Elizabeth’s position as well, and not surprisingly, she speaks it for herself. In the context of a threatened marriage, she says, “I have ruled this Kingdom like a man/ Or so it seems to me, yes, like a King” (2.2.89–90). She admits that “to disfavour nature’s laws/ Is to slight God” (2.2.91–92) but suggests just the same that “one who tirelessly and endlessly/ Attendeth the gravest of all human duties,/ Ought to be kept apart from nature’s use,/ Whose purposes make half the human race/ A helpless service to the other half” (2.2.97–101).

In the end Schiller’s play is not history, but his characters carry with them something of the numinous shapes of their powerful originals. And though it is not difficult to find the patterns in his work, those patterns shift and dissolve as his characters speak and argue and even suffer with each other, bringing back a little of the vanished time that Schiller had long studied and then struggled to recreate just five years before his own death.
of the Garter Initiation at Windsor Castle on April 23, 1597, when George Carey, the son of his chief patron, Henry Carey, Lord Hunsdon, was inducted into the society in the presence of the queen. After being promoted to the post of Lord Chamberlain, Hunsdon was a generous supporter of Shakespeare’s first theatrical company; the Lord Chamberlain’s Men, which was sponsored after his death by his son George and later came to be known as the King’s Men following the accession of James I in 1603. Enough allusions to the Order of the Garter exist in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* to suggest a connection between the play and this well-known installation ceremony, including references to the society’s motto (“honi soit qui mal y pense”), the “chairs of order” (stalls assigned to the knights in St. George’s Chapel), the Garter’s “crest” and “blazon” on the knights’ coats of arms, Mistress Quickly as the Queen of the Fairies (an antonym for Elizabeth as the “Fairy Queen”), and, of course, the bucolic town of Windsor, seat of the yearly heraldic festival.

That Queen Elizabeth is at the center of both these legends is instructive, since the play has much to say about the aristocratic hierarchy of Shakespeare’s time. In fact, beneath the script’s charming frivolity lurk some intriguing insights about the social spectrum of Elizabethan England and the way it dealt with stratification and subversion within its ranks. Looming over this social order is the image of the queen who, although she doesn’t appear in the play itself, has been indelibly linked to it by rumor and textual allusion. Beneath Elizabeth is Sir John Falstaff, who through his avarice, drunkenness, and lust stands as a parody of proper chivalric behavior in obvious contrast to the true gentility of Shakespeare’s patron, Lord Hunsdon, and others of similar eminence. Parallel to Falstaff in social status is the unnamed German lord of 4

In a Class by Themselves: Social Consciousness in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*

By Michael Flachmann

Although the surface of Shakespeare’s *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is a confectionary delight filled with laughter, humorous character types, and the triumph of virtue over vice, its deep structure contains important truths about Renaissance social norms that four centuries of scholarship have tried to explain principally through legends. Chief among these, of course, is the rumor that Shakespeare wrote the play to satisfy Queen Elizabeth’s desire to see Falstaff resurrected from his demise in the Richard II–Henry V tetralogy and transplanted to Windsor, where his urban appetites would be in sharp contrast to the pastoral values of a small town nestled in the English countryside. In 1702, dramatist John Dennis revealed that the queen was so anxious to see the play acted that “she commanded it to be finished in fourteen days.” While this tidy scenario has gained some authority through hearsay, it is undercut by the fact that Dennis’ claim was recorded over a hundred years after the fact at a time when he had just written his own adaptation of the script, which was in dire need of publicity.

Somewhat more likely is the conjecture that Shakespeare wrote the play for an occasional performance at the Royal Order
mature, pastoral values of his “merry wives” and their working-class husbands easily defeat such alien intrusions as ill-mannered knights, big-city con men, verbally challenged foreigners, and insipid suitors. The only aristocrat to succeed within the play is Fenton, whose genuine love for Anne redeems the stigma of his noble birth and his former dalliance with the wild Prince of Wales. Just as Falstaff is driven from their midst at Herne’s Oak like a ritualistic scapegoat adorned with a cuckold’s horns, so too is Windsor purified from the deviations that seem to threaten all such idyllic societies. Anne’s union with Fenton will keep the Windsor gene pool uncorrupted, while Falstaff’s humiliation will hopefully redirect him into conformity with the world around him.

This sense of an insular, well-ordered, home-spun “community” at the core of the script is nowhere more amply demonstrated than in the panoply of accents on display, which function like a linguistic demolition derby where the last speaker standing at the conclusion is the winner. The fractured English of Caius, the bombastic jargon of Pistol and Nym, the Host’s rambling epithets, Mistress Quickly’s malapropisms, Slender’s affectations, Evans’ pedantic Latin, and Fenton’s aristocratic monologues all shape a world in which the plain-spoken Fords and Pages are in a class by themselves: They are the moral and ethical heart of the play, the dramatic gyroscope that keeps all discourse and action on an even keel.

In the final analysis, work centers and ennobles us, the author seems to say, while the indolence afforded by undeserved inheritance and elevated rank breeds only a “slender” acquaintance with reality. If we are more like the Fords and Pages of this world, shunning the behavior of such deviants as Falstaff, Caius, Pistol, and the rest, we will be happy and successful in whatever we do.
Scapin: Serious Comedy

By David G. Anderson

If you take your comedy seriously, heart-attack seriously, then Scapin is simply not to be missed. In fact, if you find comedy merely entertaining or even if you are semi-ambivalent, you still need to add Scapin to your repertoire of theatre adventures. “Tragedy tomorrow, comedy tonight!” to quote another hysterical play with a similar plot, A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum.

At various times in our lives we remember, or think we remember, things for no apparent reason; then Eureka! The epiphany hits, like finding a huge nugget of gold in that immeasurable desert we mine so often. So it is with the eponymous, rascally Scapin. You swear you’ve never heard of him, yet there is something very familiar or déjà vu(esque) about this scamp and the play named after him.

To jog your memory, this version of Molière’s formulaic comedy, Les Fourberies de Scapin (The Escapades of Scapin) circa 1671, adapted by Bill Irwin and Mark O’Donnell, retains the structure of Molière’s Italian farce, but liberally stirs in earnest silliness. The adaptation allows for sprinkling the script with colloquial references that give us instantaneous connection to the play.

Ironically, the only line in the play strictly Molière...
is flished from his next play, La Comtesse d'Espardagnes: but is as fitting as a pair of well tailored trousers, “On the contrary . . . a comedy requires this sort of thing” (2.8.27, Scapin, Dramatists Play Services, Inc.). Fashioned after the commedia dell’arte clowns and farceurs, Molière’s Scapin is endowed with all the distinctive characteristics of the exemplar trickster—servant: silver-tongue, nimble-wit, and copious duplicity. The play rounds up all the usual suspects and devices: shipwrecks, long-lost daughters, name changes, even imaginary terrorists.

The plot of Scapin, with its tangled exploits, zany disguises, and mistaken identities, is only slightly less tangled than Canadian football. Molière has given us such accomplished studies as Tartuffe, The Misanthrope, and The Imaginary Invalid; but in this elementary, coincidence-driven farce, our hero assists two adult yet lAME-brained sons of tight-fisted, bourgeois fathers, to marry girls of their choice. Two improbable beauties have captured the sons’ hearts, and the boys need money to resolve various complications associated with each girl. Realistically, the only place to obtain the necessary funds is from the two wealthy, but parsimonious, fathers. Octave, Argante’s son, is committed to a prearranged marriage to his neighbor Geronte’s unseen daughter, but he has secretly already married an orphan named Hyacinth. Leander, Scapin’s charge, and son of his master Geronte, needs money to ransom his love, Zerbinette, from gypsies who abducted her as a child. Our Quixote wannabe, Scapin, needs a Sancho and recruits Sylvestre, Octave’s servant. You know this play: it’s the crafty slave out-smarting the gezzer owners, while exacting a bit of self-indulgent revenge. Ah! It’s reminiscent of the 2003 Festival’s The Servant of Two Masters. Confused? Don’t fret; this morceau ends with some amazing coincidences that clarify everything. Perhaps it’s theatre that account for the déja vu, for Scapin is as much about theatre as it is the ancient intrigue of the scheming servant outwitting the misery master to rescue young love. The hero never lets us forget we are in a theatre viewing a play. Demolishing the fourth wall of drama, Scapin orders music from the invaluable George (a complete invention of the co-adaptors not included in Molière’s play), whose job it is to provide well placed music and pull levers dropping signs from the ceiling revealing things like “Exploitation” and “Unbelievable Coincidence!” Literally suspending action in the play, Scapin often consults with audience members such as polling them in matters of legal representation. Naturally, this effectively lures the audience as co-conspirators into his scam. He has even been known to masquerade as an affluent female donor/ patron of the Utah Shakespeare Festival. “I suppose you could say that in a way he is a low-rent Hamlet,” said co-adaptor Irwin, “Hamlet in a farce...” Sir! They say when you are deep in the charade-gilded deceptions of the patriarchs, the script is full of hysteries: Scapin’s tongue-in-cheek compliment to Argante vis-à-vis his romantic escapades, “Sir! They say when you chased them they stayed chaste” (1.5.40–41). Or Octave’s He will disown me leaving me as poor as . . . some person without money” (1.2.121–122), and “You wouldn’t want love to be smooth, ma’am, it’s the bumps that make love interesting” (2.1.48–49). The hilarious running gag of everyone’s inability to remember the girls’ names, Hibiscus? Hyperbole? Zamboni? Zerbenia? tickles ribs throughout.

The fun can be divided into perfect four-part harmony: Half the hilarity is in classically trained actors running amuck in such an outrageously funny comedic romp; half in the dynamic script with familiar modern innuendos; half in the endless possibilities of directorial choices; and half in the audience participation; the magical arch connecting actor with audience that is customarily essential in triumphant plays—heck—the audience is in on it. Oops, that adds up to four halves. Well in this case, wholly appropriate, twice the merriment to form a hole to chase Alice into this frenzied world of shenanigans. Perhaps the memory stirrings are of our old favorites, Laurel and Hardy, Buster Keaton, Charlie Chaplin, Marx brothers, and others. They are the recurrent typecasts for productions like this. Irwin/O’Donnell have created a modern-day vaudeville. “Unlike Molière’s more famous comedies, Tartuffe and The Misanthrope, Scapin contains no biting social commentary or insights into the human condition. A vintage farce, its only purpose is to delight” (J Cooper Robb, Scapin, Philadelphia Weekly, 16 December 2009).

You know this play. Its bricolage is epoch high-jinks, perfect for audiences in both the seventeenth and the twenty-first centuries. It is exhilarating to rediscover such a goldmine of comedy. There are those who will scour the vast theatrical desert in search of this commodity called comedy. We fairly scream, “It’s here, right here at the Utah Shakespeare Festival.” To our delight, we discover the ‘nugget’ is pure gold. Molière, but very Lou Costelloesque—no? [2012]
Atticus Finch: A Hero beyond the Pages of To Kill a Mockingbird

By Olga A. Pilkington

Before Jack McCoy, Denny Crane, or Ally McBeal, there was Atticus Finch. Harper Lee’s famous character has been revered by both legal and literary communities for decades. According to the American Bar Association Journal, he is “a legal deity” (“The 25 Greatest Fictional Lawyers (Who Are Not Atticus Finch)” July 23, 2010, http://www.abajournal.com/magazine/article/the_25_greatest_fictional_lawyers_who_are_not_atticus_finch/). Apparently, the real practitioners of the profession respect this particular fictional colleague so much they regard him as beyond comparison, “We’ve withdrawn Atticus Finch from this particular literary comparison, allowing our panel of experts to rank their favorite fictional lawyers without the heavy lifting required by a demigod” (“The 25 Greatest”). The same article describes Lee’s character as “unflappable, unforgettable Atticus Finch” and continues to suggest that he single-handedly reformed the poor image of a lawyer that had been circulating since Shakespeare’s times, “Atticus, the lawyer—once the criminal mouthpiece, the country club charlatan, the ambulance-chasing buffoon—was now an instrument of truth, an advocate of justice, the epitome of reason” (“The 25 Greatest”). Finch represents the gold standard for the legal community. “To lawyers, he was the lawyer they wanted to be. To nonlawyers, he fostered the desire to become one” (“The 25 Greatest”).

Atticus’s popularity certainly does not end once we cross from the realm of the law to that of literature. From the beginning, Harper Lee’s book was a success, and it was so well received partly because of Finch. While the literary critics have yet to anoint him into sainthood, they agree that Atticus Finch is an extraordinary character who does the right thing. For example, Rogers et al. in their book Alabama: The History of a Deep South State, describe Finch as, “a right-thinking Alabama attorney” and his defense of Tom Robinson is “the courageous effort” ([Tuscaloosa, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1994], 587). In fact, the word “courageous” is used often to refer to Finch and to describe his actions. Charles J. Shields in Mockingbird: A Portrait of Harper Lee, refers to “Atticus’ courageous moral stance” ([New York: Henry Holt and Co, 2006], 4).

High morals and courage in the face of injustice earned Finch the respect of the business community as well. Ronald R. Sims in Teaching Business Ethics for Effective Learning, encourages his readers to look up to Atticus because “he displays the virtues of honesty, perseverance, fairness, and compassion” ([Westport, Connecticut: Quorum Books, 2002], 146).

However, the literary community praises Atticus not only because of his legal skills and social views but also because he is a good father. As Chris Crowe points out in “Young Adult Literature: Atticus, David, and Raymond: Role Models for YA Males,” fathers usually keep “a low profile” in young adult literature ([The English Journal, Vol. 88, No. 6, July 1999], 120). And the mere presence of such a figure may

“For the apparel oft proclaims the man.” —Hamlet

“See where she comes, appareled like the spring.” —Pericles
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Les Misérables: A Revolutionary Musical for the People

By Lawrence Henley

Circa 1985, British theatrical impresario Cameron Mackintosh undertook a modest gamble in producing a new French musical. Much like Jesus Christ Superstar, the French language version of Les Misérables was initially recorded as a concept album. Authored by composer Claude-Michel Schönberg and lyricist Alain Boublil, the first production had been a sellout in Paris, staged in a small sports arena (the Palais des Sports). In 1982, Mackintosh, still riding high from the success of Cats, was persuaded by a director from Hungary to give the soundtrack an attentive listen. Immediately connecting with the musical score, he heard its extraordinary potential. Eventually, Mackintosh would make the decision to bankroll his revamped English version of the show that stormed the planet.

Les Misérables, nominally co-produced with the Royal Shakespeare Company, opened at London’s Barbican Centre on October 5, 1985. Directed by the great Trevor Nunn with John Caird, and with new English lyrics by Herbert Kretzmer, its initial reviews weren’t terribly favorable. However, thanks to tremendous word of mouth and Mackintosh’s genius for promotion, tickets for the initial London and New York productions rapidly disappeared. The opinion of the theatre-going public, not the critics, paved the way for Les Misérables to become one of the most successful musicals ever produced.
Today, the tenth and twentieth anniversaries of Les Misérables have come and gone, celebrated with lavish London concert versions. A major motion picture will be released in December 2012, and “Les Mis” has become the third longest running show in the history of Broadway, the longest running musical on London’s West End, and the second longest running musical anywhere in the world. It has toured constantly with multiple companies for more than two decades. Only the words “musical juggernaut” can adequately describe this leviathan!

Why has Les Mis been so monstrously successful? It differs radically from other “mega-musicals” from the past quarter century. Unlike Phantom of the Opera, Miss Saigon (two huge Mackintosh productions) and Sunset Boulevard, Les Misérables’ romantic subplots have love interests both requited and unrequited, and yet love isn’t the dominant theme. In contrast with shows such as the Lloyd Webber/Mackintosh Cats and Stephen Schwartz' Wicked, it contains plenty of theatrics and spectacle, yet doesn’t rely on magic or a world set in fantasy. The score is better-than-epic, and yet you certainly wouldn’t tag it as a “toe-tapper” loaded with stand-alone hits. And, although a few major stars (Lea Salonga, Patti LuPone) have appeared in Les Mis, it has never been a star-driven vehicle.

This quasi-operatic musical’s primary theme focuses on systemic injustice and the indefatigable power of ordinary citizens to overcome its effects. Les Misérables never fails to click with audiences because it presents the best and worst sides of humanity, illustrating the bitter, ongoing struggle for freedom. It is truly a musical of, and for the common man, one of the greatest stories of human courage, both to maximum effect.

Set in France, the play is framed against the highly explosive imagery of an era that began with the final exile of the Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte, progressing through the ill-fated restoration of the Bourbon dynasty of kings (Louis XVIII, Charles X), and the last act is set during a period that contained two significant civil rebellions. Although lesser known than the 1789 French Revolution (yet equal in importance), the July Revolution of 1830 and, in particular, the June 1832 Rebellion create a striking canvas on which to conclude Les Mis. These conflicts resulted in a new era of limited monarchy (Louis Philippe and the House of Orleans), which lasted until the next French rebellion in 1848.

Post-Napoleonic France lends to this musical a solid framework with which to tell its story, but Victor Hugo’s immortal 1860s tale of a noble savage named Jean Valjean, one of the greatest in all of literature, makes Les Mis epic. Les Misérables was, arguably, the most highly anticipated European novel of the nineteenth century. Perhaps the equal of Dickens during the Romantic period, Hugo was renowned for flame-throwing graphic frankness, and fearing the wrath of life’s inequities the ruling classes with his bold depictions of dictator Napoleon III, the French author lived in exile for two decades on the French legal system would likely view as a highly unjust sentence. In particular, the June 1832 Rebellion create a striking canvas on which to conclude Les Mis. These conflicts resulted in a new era of limited monarchy (Louis Philippe and the House of Orleans), which lasted until the next French rebellion in 1848.

The hero Valjean’s early life, one of poverty, suffering, and imprisonment, is the residual of what today’s observer would likely view as a highly unjust French legal system. In Les Misérables, Hugo mockingly depicts his native country’s law enforcement, judicial, and penal systems, all symbolized brilliantly by the tough, stoic, and impassive Inspector Javert, Valjean’s prison overseer.

For the petty crime of stealing a loaf of bread to feed his sister’s starving child, Valjean is sentenced to a decade of hard time in prison, and we are privileged to see the residual of what today’s observer would likely view as a highly unjust French legal system. In Les Misérables, Hugo mockingly depicts his native country’s law enforcement, judicial, and penal systems, all symbolized brilliantly by the tough, stoic, and impassive Inspector Javert, Valjean’s prison overseer.
That the stolen silver was actually a gift, the bishop circumvents the police from apprehending Valjean. In exchange for this mercy, the bishop asks only for Valjean’s pledge to forever live as an honest man.

Despite Valjean’s savage appearance, the humane bishop treats the haggard man with decency, as one capable of reason and love, possessing the potential to perform worthwhile deeds. For Valjean, this is an epiphany: that a man of the bishop’s standing would lavish compassion on such a desperate and wasted soul. This revelation inspires him to grasp at the only true escape from hopelessness. Willfully, the ex-convict violates parole, creating a new identity: Madeleine. In this new persona, through honest, hard work and charitable giving, Valjean’s life becomes that of a much-loved entrepreneur, philanthropist, and mayor of his adopted city.

As a man of wealth and compassion, it is Madeleine’s sincerest desire to repay the bishop’s trust. In turn, he dedicates his life to protecting the innocent: saving the lives of little Cosette, his beloved ward (the famed Les Mis logo), and her fiancée, Marius Pontmercy, a young freedom-fighter. Still, no matter whom he serves or how unselfishly he lives in his post-prison years, the eternal specter of his nemesis, Inspector Javert, forever haunts Jean Valjean. The tenacious policeman’s obsession with apprehending the elusive Valjean is insatiable. Javert’s inability to capture his rival, the only fugitive to escape his charge without being returned to custody, will eventually drive the officer to the brink of insanity. Throughout Les Misérables, the thrilling conflict between the pursuer and the object of his pursuit rages on. Which of these invincible men will be the victor? The scintillating musical answer awaits you at the Utah Shakespeare Festival in 2012.

Stones in His Pockets: The Things We Carry

By Don Leavitt

My daughter, Emma, is a collector. Her room is a veritable treasure trove of seashells, sticks, leaves, dried flowers, and rocks of every shape and kind that she has collected through the years. She bristles if you call her a hoarder or refer to her treasures as junk. She sees great beauty in the simplest things, and she protects her treasures as if they are the most valuable jewels on earth.

Many years ago, our family embarked on a hike along one of our favorite trails. After several minutes, I noticed that little Emma was lagging behind. Several moments later, I realized she had fallen so far behind we could no longer see her from our position on the trail. I jogged back to see what was keeping her, and found her sitting on a fallen tree, crying.

“Are you hurt?” I asked her.

“No, you left me,” she replied.

“I’m sorry, kid, I didn’t realize you weren’t keeping up,” I said. Then, thinking her little legs must be tired, I said, “Would you like me to carry you for a while?”
“No, dad,” she said. “If I don’t walk, I won’t be able to find rocks for my collection.”

She then proceeded to pull handful after handful of rocks from her pockets. A few were quite beautiful, but most were just plain, ordinary rocks, the kind she could easily find in our backyard. There certainly wasn’t anything special or collectible about most of them. When I pointed this out to her, she argued that they were special to her. “How else am I going to remember this hike?” she asked.

I explained to her that it was slowing her down to stop and pick up rocks, and told her it would make it hard to walk with the weight of all those stones in her pockets. I asked her to pick out the stones she thought were especially beautiful and then offered to help her find one or two more when we reached the spot we were hiking to. She agreed to this, but her heart wasn’t in it. When I threw the excess rocks to the ground, tears streamed down her little face.

I’d thought about that experience many times over the years—about the things we humans collect and stubbornly carry around with us even though the weight slows us down or stops us in our tracks. They come in all shapes and sizes, and we gather them to remind us of moments of pleasure, pain, success, disappointment. Sometimes dreams we’ve fulfilled, and some are dreams never realized.

Some are quite ordinary, while others are truly extraordinary. Some are down right ugly. We seem to hold most tightly to those—the angry grudges we cling to when we seem to hold most tightly to those—those we choose to impose upon ourselves. They come in all shapes and sizes, and we gather them to remind us of moments of pleasure, pain, success, disappointment. Some are dreams we’ve fulfilled, and some are dreams never realized. Some are quite beautiful, while others are ordinary old rocks. Some are downright ugly. We seem to hold most tightly to those—the angry grudges we cling to when we could so easily toss them aside.

These are the things I think about each time I read or see Stones in His Pockets, the marvelously entertaining play by Marie Jones. Every time I experience it, I come to the same conclusion—this is one of the saddest comedies I’ve ever seen. That’s not to say I don’t laugh; sad does not mean not funny. The award-winning hit is certainly enjoyable, it just happens to also be incredibly illuminating. The humor is dry and intelligent—a rarity these days, I know—and peppered with moments of anger and joy, hope and despair, all of which is anchored by a central tragedy that takes place in the periphery but still manages to feel uncomfortably real. Like the best art, it is an exploration of what it means to be human, and it reveals to us a wide range of the burdens that weigh us down—those imposed upon us by outside forces, and those we choose to impose upon ourselves.

Stones in His Pockets is the product of Irish playwright Marie Jones, a Belfast native who has made a name for herself writing about the Irish experience. The play relates the tale of a Hollywood film production that has descended on an economically depressed rural Irish village. Local residents are cast as extras: for some, it is an opportunity to relive past glories; for others, it’s a path to fame and fortune; for almost all of them, it represents an escape from everyday life. Yes, they resent the Hollywood exploitation of their culture, but as reviewer Charles Spencer points out, they also face “the nagging realization of their diminishing options in a rural Ireland afflicted with unemployment and bankruptcy” (www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/theatre/ theatre-reviews/9868005/Stones-in-his-Pockets-Tricycle-Theatre-London review.html). The play has been nominated for four Tony awards and has won the Theatre World Special Award; the Olivier and the Evening Standard awards for Best Comedy; and awards from the Drama Desk and the Outer Critics Circle. It has been produced around the world and was last seen at the Utah Shakespeare Festival in 2005. The play explores a variety of themes, from Hollywood exploitation to Ireland’s place in a global economy; from the gap between dreams and reality to the very thin line that exists between hope and foolish aspiration. But the theme that resonates most strongly with me is the idea of being weighted down by the memories, emotions, and experiences we choose to carry with us. Each character in the play has his or her own pocketful of stones, and the difference between the two main characters is that one clings to his anger while the other simply refuses to. In the end, it is the choice to discard the stones in his pockets that gives one character the glimmer of hope that perhaps things might be better.

Ironically, the play almost became a stone in the pocket of the playwright, who was sued in 2001 by a former partner who claimed to be a joint author of Stones in His Pockets. Ms. Jones won that case, and later talked about the need to not let the burden of the experience weigh her down. “I didn’t feel victorious,” she said. “I just felt relieved that I could have a large vodka and tonic and get on with my life” (www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2004/aug/11/theatre. edinburghfestival20045). Oh, that we could all be as wise. •
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Stones in His Pockets is the product of Irish playwright Marie Jones, a Belfast native who has made a name for herself writing about the Irish experience. The play relates the tale of a Hollywood film production that has descended on an economically depressed rural Irish village. Local residents are cast as extras: for some, it is an opportunity to relive past glories; for others, it’s a path to fame and fortune; for almost all of them, it represents an escape from everyday life. Yes, they resent the Hollywood exploitation of their culture, but as reviewer Charles Spencer points out, they also face “the nagging realization of their diminishing options in a rural Ireland afflicted with unemployment and bankruptcy” (www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/theatre/theatre-reviews/9868005/Stones-in-his-Pockets-Tricycle-Theatre-London-review.html). The play has been nominated for four Tony awards and has won the Theatre World Special Award; the Olivier and the Evening Standard awards for Best Comedy; and awards from the Drama Desk and the Outer Critics Circle. It has been produced around the world and was last seen at the Utah Shakespeare Festival in 2005. The play explores a variety of themes, from Hollywood exploitation to Ireland’s place in a global economy; from the gap between dreams and reality to the very thin line that exists between hope and foolish aspiration. But the theme that resonates most strongly with me is the idea of being weighted down by the memories, emotions, and experiences we choose to carry with us. Each character in the play has his or her own pocketful of stones, and the difference between the two main characters is that one clings to his anger while the other simply refuses to. In the end, it is the choice to discard the stones in his pockets that gives one character the glimmer of hope that perhaps things might be better.

Ironically, the play almost became a stone in the pocket of the playwright, who was sued in 2001 by a former partner who claimed to be a joint author of Stones in His Pockets. Ms. Jones won that case, and later talked about the need to not let the burden of the experience weigh her down. “I didn’t feel victorious,” she said. “I just felt relieved that I could have a large vodka and tonic and get on with my life” (www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2004/aug/11/theatre. edinburghfestival20045). Oh, that we could all be as wise. •
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Hamlet and the Doctrine of the Humours

By Diana Major Spencer

Hamlet to Horatio: Since my dear soul was mistress of her choice
And could of men distinguish her election,
Sh’ hath seal’d thee for herself, for thou hast been
As one suff’ring all that suffers nothing,
A man that Fortune’s buffets and rewards
Hast ta’n with equal thanks: and blest are those
Whose blood and judgment are so well commedled,
That they are not a pipe for fortune’s finger
To sound what stop she please
For to wear him that Fortune’s buffets and rewards
Would make of men distinguish her election,
As in their birth—wherein they are not guilty —
By the o’ergrowth of some vice—
Or by some habit that too much
Exemplifies a perfect balance of qualities and humours —
Passion may alter the degrees of heat/cold and moisture/dryness.
If griefed, as Hamlet was, the reduction of body heat, combined with the loss of moisture through weeping,
Could also change through diet, drink,
Blood-letting, pining for love, sitting is the sun, and so forth.
Depending upon the elemental content of food and drink, any humour could intensify, affecting one’s disposition.
Ill humour could likewise be cured by a compensatory diet.

When Hamlet honors Horatio’s psychological balance, he invokes the ancient Doctrine of the Humours, which, briefly, embraces the following assumptions: Four elements comprise the universe, each with its characteristic quality of temperature or humidity earth/cold, water/moist, air/dry, and fire/hot.

As these combine to produce various life forms, they form four life-carrying fluids, the humours. From Greek Hippocrates to seventeenth-century William Harvey (who discovered the circulatory system of the blood the same year Shakespeare died), medical theory recognized four humours: blood (hot/moist), phlegm (cold/moist), choleric (hot/dry), and melancholy (cold/dry). Each person contains all four of each category—elements, qualities, and humours—but the proportions vary.

Perfect physical and mental health resulted from a balance of the humours. Fortune blesses few individuals with the perfect blend, but Hamlet believes Horatio is one whose natural disposition exemplifies a perfect balance of qualities. The rest of us, alas, are “passion’s slaves.” A preponderance of any one humour produces an identifiable character type: The melancholic is pale, reflective, brooding, and fretting (Hamlet); the phlegmatic shows apathy and indifference (Ophelia); and the choleric is easily angered and vindictive (Laertes). The plump, ruddy, good-natured and devil-may-care sanguine character makes no appearance in Hamlet, though Falstaff fills the bill in The Merry Wives of Windsor.

Passion may alter the degrees of heat/cold and moisture/dryness. If griefed, as Hamlet was, the reduction of body heat, combined with the loss of moisture through weeping, produces a cold, dry temperament: melancholy. Conversely, Polonius’s diagnosis for Hamlet, the passion of love, generates heat, which vaporizes the humours and dissipates the hot, moist blood through sighs and tears, leaving cold and dry as death: melancholy. The same humour could stem from different passions. Further, jealousy could heat the melancholic, producing choleric; and if a melancholic withheld his tears, he might become phlegmatic.

The relative proportions of humours could also change through diet, drink, blood-letting, pining for love, sitting is the sun, and so forth. Depending upon the elemental content of food and drink, any humour could intensify, affecting one’s disposition. Ill humour could likewise be cured by a compensatory diet. Altered states originating with diet, passion, exposure, and so forth, were classified as unnatural dispositions, in contrast to the natural disposition with which one was born. In a rather difficult passage, Hamlet distinguishes natural from unnatural causes of humourousness:

So, oft it chances in particular men,
That for some vicious mole of nature in them,
As, in their birth—wherein they are not guilty —
Since nature cannot choose his original—
By the o’ergrowth of some complexion,
Of breaking down the pales and forts of reason,
Or by some habit that too much o’erleavens
The form of plausible manners—that these men,
Carrying, I say, the stamp of one defect,
Being nature’s livour, or fortune’s star,—
Their virtues else—be they as pure as grace,
As infinite as man may undergo——
Shall in the general censure take corruption
From that particular fault.

Paraphrased: “It often happens in individual men, that because of some evil (the root of vicious is vice) blemish of nature in them . . . these men, carrying the imprint of one defect . . . , their other virtues . . . shall in the common opinion take corruption from that single fault.” Lines 25–30 identify three possible sources for the blemish which colors one’s reputation: first, birth, one’s inherent disposition; second, “the
Hamlet illustrates clear-cut examples of choleric, phlegm, and melancholy in Laertes, Ophelia, and Hamlet, respectively. Ophelia’s madness seems phlegmatic: consistently attracted to her element (water: tears, the brook), she is phlegmatic: consistently attracted to her element (water: tears, the brook), she is too lethargic and dull to act in her own interest. Gertrude’s observation that she was “like a creature native and indued” (Laertes, Ophelia, and Hamlet, 3.1.261–62); the spleen houses the choleric humour. Laertes then plots with Claudius a violent revenge on Hamlet with an unabated sword, sharpness characterizing the weapon of choice for choleric.

Similarly, Hamlet’s transformation is noted throughout, rendering his textbook melancholy “unnatural.” “The head and source of all your son’s distemper” and “This . . . matter in his heart . . . puts him thus from fashion of himself” (Claudius, 2.2.55; 3.2.173–75). “My too much changed son” and hopes that Ophelia may “bring him to his wonted way again” (Gertrude, 2.2.36; 3.1.40); and Ophelia’s impassioned cry, “O, what a noble mind is here o’erthrown!” (3.1.150).

Even so, the appearance of a person dressed in black and using words like “sable,” “dark,” “dank,” “witching hour,” and so forth, denotes melancholy. If he also broods and frets in lengthy indulgence of his anger—in contrast to the choleric’s immediate flare-up—he substantiates the diagnosis of melancholy. Add “fitful sleep,” “fearful dreams,” “distemper,” “melancholy”; his “nighted colour,” “the dejected ‘haviour of the visage” (downcast eyes), and “mad” with his “antidisposition,” and alternatives vanish.

Hamlet, the Melancholy Dane, greets news of the approaching players with assurance that “the humourous man shall end his part in peace” (2.2.322–23)—and they do—but Horatio, “whose blood and judgment are so well commedled,” must “abstain” [himself] from felicity a while, “And in this harsh world draw [his] breath in pain” / To tell [Hamlet’s] story” (5.2.347–49). “The rest is silence” (5.2.358).

The Utah Shakespeare Festival prides itself on what we call The Festival Experience. Grounded in our mainstage plays, the experience at the Festival becomes much more varied, engaging, and entertaining by adding any of the multitudes of other activities we offer, many of them free. The Greenshow is the perfect way to spend time before the show. On the lovely green surrounding the Adams Theatre, this pre-show entertainment features spirited song and dance. Add Elizabethan sweets, and you’ll have a fun-filled frolic to prepare you for the main stage performance.

Literary Seminars offer the opportunity for patrons to discuss the previous day’s plays. These freewheeling discussions invite participation and questions and are led by theatre experts.

Props Seminars offer the opportunity for patrons to learn some of the secrets behind the props used in Festival productions. Properties Director Benjamin Hofman conducts the seminars and explains how props are designed, acquired, and built.

Costumes Seminars allow visitors to take a close-up look at the Festival’s renowned costumes. Costume Director Jeffrey Lieder leads this seminar and explains how costumes are designed, constructed, and maintained.

Actors Seminars let you hear from the actors themselves and learn what it’s like to be onstage at the Festival. Question-and-answer sessions provide a fascinating glimpse into the lives and experiences of Festival performers.

Play Orientations are offered before each play for audience members desiring a quick overview of the upcoming plays, as well as information about the Festival and the Cedar City area.

Backstage Tours offer our guests a change to take a peek behind the scenes at the Festival! Tours provide the perfect opportunity to look behind the curtains and under the stages of both the Randall L. Jones and Adams Shakespearean theatres and into Festival production areas.

Repertory Magic highlights one of the most magical (and difficult) aspects of repertory theatre: the twice-a-day scene change. Lighting, scenery, props, costume, and sound technicians must rapidly change everything from the matteine to the evening show. And you can witness the scene change, and ask questions as it happens!

The New American Playwrights Project (NAPP) highlights three playwrights who have been invited to take part in this summer’s series. At the end of a rehearsal and revision period, Festival audiences are invited to attend a staged reading of the new plays and to discuss the work they have just seen.

Curtain Call Lunches are your chance to get up close and personal while discussing a play and the Festival with an actor, designer, director, or other Festival luminary over a delicious meal. Curtain Call Lunches are sponsored by the Guild of the Utah Shakespeare Festival.

## 2012 Season Calendar

### All Performances of *To Kill a Mockingbird*, *Scapin*, *Les Misérables*, *Hamlet*, and *Stones in His Pockets* are in the Randall L. Jones Theatre. 
### Evening Performances of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Titus Andronicus*, and *Mary Stuart* are in the Adams Shakespearean Theatre (inclement weather, Auditorium Theatre).
### Matinee Performances of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* are in the Auditorium Theatre.
### Backstage Tours begin in the Randall L. Jones Theatre lobby Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays at 10:15 a.m. from July 3 to September 1 and Thursdays and Saturdays at 11 a.m. from September 27 to October 20.
### Repertory Magic begins in the Randall L. Jones Theatre lobby Mondays and Thursdays at approximately 4:30 p.m. from July 2 to August 30 and Fridays at approximately 4:30 p.m. from September 28 to October 19.

### The Greenshow is performed in the courtyard surrounding the Adams Shakespearean Theatre Mondays through Saturdays at 7 p.m. from June 21 to September 1.

### The New American Playwrights Project presents plays August 9, 10, 16, 17, 23, 24, 29, 30, and 31 at 10 a.m. in the Auditorium Theatre Literary Seminars discussing the plays from the previous day are in the Adams Theatre Seminar Grove (inclement weather, the Adams Theatre) June 22 to September 2 and in the Randall Theatre Seminar Grove September 8 to October 20, beginning at 9 a.m. One hour is devoted to the plays in the Adams Theatre then one to play in the Randall Theatre.

### Props Seminars are in the Randall Theatre at 11 a.m. Mondays and Thursdays from July 2 to August 30 and Wednesdays and Fridays at 10 a.m. from September 21 to October 19.

### Costume Seminars are in the Randall Theatre at 11 a.m. Tuesdays and Fridays July 3 to August 31.

### Actor Seminars are in the Seminar Grove at 11 a.m. Wednesdays and Saturdays from June 30 to September 1 and in the Randall Theatre Seminar Grove Thursdays and Saturdays from September 20 to October 20.

### Play Orientations are in the Auditorium Theatre at 1 p.m. for matinee performances and 6:45 p.m. for evening performances June 31 to September 1 and at 1:30 and 7 p.m. on the laws of the Randall Theatre September 7 to October 20.

### Photo: Jacqueline Antronian as Mistress Quickly in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
<th>SATURDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>26</strong> The Merry Wives of Windsor (Matinée), 2 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>27</strong> The Merry Wives of Windsor (Matinée), 2 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>28</strong> The Merry Wives of Windsor (Matinée), 2 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>29</strong> The Merry Wives of Windsor (Matinée), 2 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>28</strong> The Merry Wives of Windsor (Evening), 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>29</strong> The Merry Wives of Windsor (Evening), 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>30</strong> The Merry Wives of Windsor (Evening), 7:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>30</strong> The Merry Wives of Windsor (Evening), 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>31</strong> The Merry Wives of Windsor (Evening), 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>32</strong> The Merry Wives of Windsor (Evening), 7:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August 7</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong> The Merry Wives of Windsor (Evening), 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>32</strong> The Merry Wives of Windsor (Evening), 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>33</strong> The Merry Wives of Windsor (Evening), 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>34</strong> The Merry Wives of Windsor (Evening), 7:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Les Misérables</em></td>
<td><em>Titus Andronicus</em></td>
<td><em>Mary Stuart</em></td>
<td><em>Mary Stuart</em></td>
<td><em>Mary Stuart</em></td>
<td><em>Mary Stuart</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>To Kill a Mockingbird</em></td>
<td><em>To Kill a Mockingbird</em></td>
<td><em>To Kill a Mockingbird</em></td>
<td><em>To Kill a Mockingbird</em></td>
<td><em>To Kill a Mockingbird</em></td>
<td><em>To Kill a Mockingbird</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hamlet</em></td>
<td><em>Hamlet</em></td>
<td><em>Hamlet</em></td>
<td><em>Hamlet</em></td>
<td><em>Hamlet</em></td>
<td><em>Hamlet</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Stones in His Pockets</em></td>
<td><em>Stones in His Pockets</em></td>
<td><em>Stones in His Pockets</em></td>
<td><em>Stones in His Pockets</em></td>
<td><em>Stones in His Pockets</em></td>
<td><em>Stones in His Pockets</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Othello</em></td>
<td><em>Othello</em></td>
<td><em>Othello</em></td>
<td><em>Othello</em></td>
<td><em>Othello</em></td>
<td><em>Othello</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Getting Tickets to The Festival Is As Easy as 1, 2, 3 . . . 4

Getting tickets to the Utah Shakespeare Festival is easy—and great seats are always available.

First, you can order via the internet: Visit our interactive Ticket Office site at www.bard.org, and place your order electronically anytime, seven days a week, twenty-four hours a day.

Second, you can order by telephone: Call 800-PLAYTIX (800-752-9849) or 435-586-7878.

Third, during the season, you can order in person: Visit the Ticket Office windows in the Randall L. Jones and Auditorium theatres near the corner of 300 West and Center streets in Cedar City.

Fourth, you can order your tickets by mail: Write down your dates, seating preferences, and plays, and then mail them, along with payment in full, to Ticket Office, Utah Shakespeare Festival, 351 W. Center Street, Cedar City, UT 84720.

Ticket Office hours are as follows:

Through June 20: Mondays through Fridays; telephone service only, 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.

June 21 to September 1: Mondays through Saturdays, 10 a.m. to 8 p.m.

September 4 to October 20: Mondays through Saturdays, 10 a.m. to 7:30 p.m.

Remember the Online Ticket Office is always open at www.bard.org.

The Utah Shakespeare Festival offers various discounts to groups, schools, senior citizens, etc. For information call the Ticket Office. Discounts are not available online.

The Festival accepts American Express, Discover, Mastercard and Visa. All plays, times, and prices are subject to change without notice.
To qualify for and redeem reward, you must bring this coupon to a Mountain America branch, sign up for eStatements at account setup and initiate a monthly direct deposit such as payroll, pension, unemployment, Social Security or other government benefits within 60 days of coupon redemption. Reward will be deposited into account within 30 business days after eStatement setup and initial direct deposit posting. Account must remain open for minimum of six months from reward date, or it will be debited from account at closing. Limit one reward per person, per household. Offer not available on account conversions or in combination with any other offer. Employees of Mountain America not eligible. Reward is considered interest and will be reported on IRS Form 1099-INT. Variable annual percentage yield (.10% as of 4/1/12) available with interest-earning reward and $1,000 minimum balance; APY may change after account opening, and fees could reduce earnings on account. Membership required—based on eligibility. Available for a limited time. Subject to change without notice. Federally insured by NCUA.

Note to FSR: During application process, enter coupon code “MACUCC” into promotion code field.