Some thoughts surrounding 2016 production of *The Tempest*

UMEMIYA Yu

The following note shows the result of an on going research on the play by William Shakespeare: *The Tempest*. The 2016 production at the Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC), one of the leading theatre companies in England, demonstrated another innovative version of the play on their main stage in Stratford-upon-Avon, followed by its tour down to Barbican theatre in London in 2017. It did not include an extraordinary interpretation or unique casting pattern but demonstrated the extended development of technology available on stage. This note introduces the feature and the reception of the production in the latter half, with a brief summary of the play and a survey of the performance history of *The Tempest* in the first half.

**The story of *The Tempest***

Compared to other plays by Shakespeare, *The Tempest* is a rare example that follows the classical idea of three unities of time, place and action, deriving from Aristotle, then prescribed by Philip Sydney in Renaissance England\(^1\). The similar structure has already practiced in *The Comedy of Errors* in 1594\(^2\), but while this early comedy is often described as a simple farce, *The Tempest* contains various complications in terms of plots and theatrical possibilities.

The story of *The Tempest* opens with a storm at sea, conjured by the magic of Prospero, the main character of the play. He is manipulating the tempest from the nearby island where he lives with his daughter, Miranda, and shares the land with two other fantastic creatures, Ariel and Caliban. Prospero was once the Duke of Milan, but exiled by the plot of his own brother, Antonio, who succeeded in doing so in conspiracy with Alonso, the King of Naples. The shipwreck has a purpose of bringing the two to the island so that Prospero can fulfill his revenge. Antonio and Alonso were on their voyage with other passengers and all became the causalities of
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the storm.

Apart from the past usurpation by Antonio, the play shows one possibility of action by Sebastian to slay his brother Alonso starting from act 2, scene 1. Additionally, in act 3, scene 2, Caliban claims to the two comical drifters, Stephano and Trinculo, that the island was deprived by Prospero when Caliban’s mother, Sycorax, died. However, unlike other Shakespearean tragedies, none of these actions result in fatal consequences and everyone finds their peace, Prospero forgives his brother’s past wrongs and leaves the magical island to return to his own country.

PROSPERO. I’ll break my staff,
Bury it certain fathoms in the earth,
And deeper than did ever plummet sound
I’ll drown my book. (5.1.59-62)

These lines, placed in the final act, suggest that Prospero abandons his ability of magic and heads off to return to Western world. For some critics, this image is linked to Shakespeare’s own voice in retiring from the theatrical profession. The recognition may even more strengthened by observing the happy reconciliation, which is different from Shakespeare’s series of revenge tragedies. What is more interesting is that the play contains various types of distinct relationships, from that of brothers, father and daughter, or servants and master. Especially the latter two have attracted many academics to the enthusiastic discussions.

Since The Tempest was written around the time when England was colonising the American continent, it is possible that Shakespeare had this current circumstances in mind. Caliban and Ariel, both being the natives in the magical island, serving the outsider Prospero with the occasional ill treatment, enhance the reading in the context of colonial imperialism. As a result, Caliban has frequently appeared as black, initially played by white actors. The first black actor, Canada Lee, who took the part in 1945, and ‘wore a scaly costume and grotesque mask, moved with an animal-like crouch, and emphasized Caliban’s monstrousness’. Since then, Caliban has been portrayed in various ways on stages, from black slave to American Indian, to show his otherness to Prospero’s Western Caucasian world.

On the contrary, by maintaining a fair relationship with Prospero, native sprite Ariel is often depicted as a happy and loyal servant, similar to Puck from A Midsummer Night’s Dream who calls himself the ‘merry wanderer of the night’
However, unlike Oberon, the fairy King, Prospero is a living human with magical power, rather than a supernatural being himself. Besides, Prospero chains Ariel by using his past liberation of the sprite from the imprisonment. Together with Ariel’s constant plea for freedom, it is recognisable that the character fundamentally shares the same nature with Caliban.

In terms of brotherhood, Antonio is depicted as a typical villain who tempts Sebastian to plunge into fratricide. From the text itself, it is rather unclear why Antonio is written as such an ambitious, envious and greedy person. The simplest explanation is that he is the second-born rather than the first, and, as seen in plays such as *As You Like It*, Shakespeare has the tendency of demanding a difficult life for the second- or the third-born child. This uneven treatment among brothers and sisters can be the reflection of Elizabethan and Jacobean patriarchy. More than the inequality between ages, that of gender, implied through the relationship between Prospero and Miranda, father and daughter, has become closely attached to the idea of feminism.

The dramatic features mentioned above do not restrict their presence in the field of academia, but certainly expressed in various modes in the stage productions.

### Early performance of *The Tempest*

The rare surviving record of an early performance of the play reads that ‘Hallowmas night was presented at Whitehall before the Kings Majesty a play Called the Tempest’ (modernised by me). This suggests that the play was staged at the court of James I on 1st of November 1611. During the winter of the following year, the play was once again called to the court, with the masque inserted, to celebrate the betrothal of Princess Elizabeth to the Elector Palatine. From these historical facts, the play is often connected to court performances with the involvement of the royal family in the masque scene placed in act 4, scene 1. John G. Demaray argues that Shakespeare had court performance in mind while composing the play by observing the usage of ‘all of theatrical arts – song, speech, scenery, dance and costume iconography’.

E. K. Chambers opposes to this idea seeing the relation of the court performance of *The Winter’s Tale* on 5th of November, 1611 with the show at the Globe on 11th of May in the same year. For Chambers, it is not rare for one specific play to be performed both at court and at public playhouse. Keith Sturgess claims that the play’s ‘delicate strategies and carefully mounted shows
would have been blown away in the open air at the Globe, but the machineries involved especially in the masque scene, used for ascending or descending the actors, as well as the trap door, may suggest that it is a play for the public theatres owned by the King’s Men, the Globe and, most likely, the Blackfriars Theatre.

After the Restoration, until William Charles Macready revived Shakespeare’s original text on to the stage in 1838, the majority of productions were based on the adaptation by William Davenant and John Dryden: *The Tempest, or The Enchanted Island*, which appeared in 1670. Other than this version, the operatic play by Thomas Shadwell with music by Henry Purcell dating from 1674 was highly appreciated. The popularity of these works, especially Davenant and Dryden’s version, can be seen from the fact that most plays that followed were based on the prior adaptations rather than Shakespeare’s original. The anonymous opera from 1756 holds the name of Dryden on the title page, although it contains some passages which are not in the previous work. Similar involvement of Davenant and Dryden’s hands is noticeable in another anonymous play that appeared in 1780 under the title of *The Shipwreck*, as well as in John Philip Kemble’s version from 1789. Whether it is Shakespeare’s original, or an adaptation created by these successors, the feature of those early performances was to have elaborate theatrical machinery with spectacular stages filled with music. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, however, it is said that the mode of representation was divided in two different ways: one maintaining luxurious sets, and the other, a simple bare stage. This shift of interest in terms of theatrical expression allowed people to consider the play’s context in depth for more unique representation.

**Unique casting of *The Tempest* on modern stage**

Having female actors to perform on stage was banned in Shakespeare’s time, and the roles were presented by boy actors, as shown in the scene of the mechanicals in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. The new custom was introduced from the continent right after the Restoration in 1660, and the emergence of female actors might have prompted Davenant and Dryden to expand and add the enrolment of the female characters in their adaptation. Affected by this arrival of the new theatrical manner, Ariel was once played mostly by female actors, even though the role has become male dominant in the present time. The effect of casting a female as Ariel allows us to consider the relationship with Prospero in a different way, first
as an obedient girl, then possibly as a contrast to his daughter Miranda.

The movement of exploring the figure of female actors even encouraged the directors to cross-cast the character of Prospero. As a result, in 2000, Vanessa Redgrave performed the role of Prospero at Shakespeare’s Globe in London. This production was noteworthy, especially because of its casting, as Ariel was played by another female actor, Geraldine Alexander, and Kananu Kirimi, who has a Kenyan heritage, took the role of Miranda. Thus, the production, directed by Lenka Udovicki, seems to have pushed the boundaries of transposing gender roles and added the variety in ethnicity.

In 2010, a film by Julie Taymor cast Helen Mirren as Prospera in a fantastical adaptation. Six years later, Harriet Walter played Prospero as the conclusion of the all-female production trilogy at Donmar Warehouse in London. Walter played Brutus in *Julius Caesar* (2012), the title role in *Henry IV* (2014), and finally Prospero in 2016, under the direction of Phyllida Lloyd, who had set the three plays in a women’s prison. The productions, that Walter herself claimed as the reflection of the cultural change, can be regarded as having an extreme importance in the theatrical landscape of the past twenty years. Even though Walter’s performance received both positive and negative criticism, the whole project has shone a light on the ‘fertile possibilities of breaking free from conventional ideas about casting’.

**Performance history at the Royal Shakespeare Company**

Unsurprisingly, the RSC, with its long legacy of producing Shakespearean performances, has not been an exception in exploring new forms of representation. The company has not yet radically cast a female Prospero, but the study of their previous performances may allow us to understand how they have dealt with the play. Throughout the history of the RSC, originally founded at the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre, that opened with a performance of *Much Ado About Nothing* in 1879, there have been 36 productions of *The Tempest*, dating back to 1891. The seasons were organised in the style of festivals that lasted, at the beginning, for a few weeks, to half a year towards the 1950s. Producers such as Frank Benson, W. Bridges-Adams, and Ben Iden Payne took charge of those festivals to exploit the sentimental value of productions in Stratford-upon-Avon. However, according to Michael Mullin, ‘even their best work would probably seem rough and ready by today’s polished standards’.
From the time when *The Tempest* was first performed by the company in 1891, the trend of casting female actors as Ariel has been present. The custom started with the involvement of Miss Johnstone, and up till 1952, when Margaret Leighton played the role alongside Ralph Richardson’s Prospero in the production directed by Michael Benthall, the role of Ariel was mainly dominated by female actors.

Caliban is often portrayed as the figure that would counterpart the character of Ariel, ‘opposite in size, sex, attitude and colour’\(^{35}\). Although I have hinted the possible similarity between the two, the stage version seems to aim for much clearer distinction with the involvement of the difference of external appearances. The fact that even blacked make-ups were used for the white actors who took the role in the early stage suggests that it was the choice available.

When it comes to the significance of this casting pattern in the RSC, the 2002 performance directed by Michael Boyd is worth mentioning. This production featured Kananu Kirimi as Ariel, the first female to play the role ‘on the main stage at Stratford since 1952’\(^{36}\). It also incorporated the first black actor, Geff Francis, to play Caliban\(^{37}\), and together with the feature of West Indian female Ariel, the production obviously strongly emphasised the colonialism and the issue of race.

Prior to Boyd’s production, James Macdonald had already experimented with the impact of this new casting pattern for his touring production in 2000. Here, Macdonald appointed Gilz Terera as Ariel, and Nikki Amuka-Bird as Miranda. It did not show the cross gender representation of the characters, but both Ariel and Miranda were played by black actors, and therefore, it might have added an extra dimension to the impression attached to the relationship between Prospero and Miranda, as well as that of Prospero and Ariel.

Since Boyd’s expansion of the possibility of further exploration at the main stage of the RSC, several productions have ventured to present something unique. In 2009, Janice Honeyman directed the play with Antony Sher taking the part of Prospero at the Courtyard Theatre while the main theatre was under construction for the refurbishment. In this production, two natives of the magical island, Ariel, played by Atandwa Kani, and Caliban, by John Kani, both appeared as black characters, clearly connecting the theme of the play with the problem of colonial discrimination.

The director, Jonathan Miller had already touched the subject, preceding the RSC, with his casting in 1970 at the Mermaid Theatre, and in 1988 at the Old Vic. Former productions had been realised by the casting of Norman Beaton as Ariel.
and Rudolph Walker as Caliban\textsuperscript{38}, and for the latter, Walker returned to the same role but Ariel was played by a Nigerian actor, Cyril Nri\textsuperscript{39}. Christine Dymkowski suggests that Miller had the intention of casting black female actor for Ariel, but failing to do so, Dymkowski thinks Miller had missed ‘a real chance to explore parallels between colonisation of blacks by whites and women by men’\textsuperscript{40}. Limiting the black actors to perform the characters in the island could make Prospero’s harsh treatment, resentment, anger, outrage and frustration imposed on mainly Caliban and partially on Ariel more meaningful, by taking the surrounding environment of slavery into account.

Although it is less radical when compared to the production of 2009, another interesting representation appeared at the stage of the Swan Theatre in 2011. The one directed by Peter Glanville incorporated a puppeteer, Jonathan Dixon, to maneuver the life-sized green monster Caliban. Casting a West Indian actor, Anneika Rose, in the part of Miranda might be a reflection of the production in 2000. It is certainly difficult to claim that this version made a significant impact, but Glanville’s effort can be understood as how far the play requires the production team to further explore the possibility of new representations.

\textit{The Tempest directed by Gregory Doran}

In 2016, Stratford-upon-Avon, as well as the whole country and many parts of the world, celebrated the 400\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of Shakespeare’s death. As the main production to honour the great legacy of Shakespeare, the RSC produced \textit{The Tempest} at their main theatre by the direction of the current artistic director, Gregory Doran. Having a two-year partnership with Intel, a world-renowned processing company, the RSC seems to have opened the door to a new theatrical experience. The stage design, resembling the frame of a ripped ship, and the flooring with numerous uneven lining, seems rather un inventive, but they are occasionally ornamented by the use of projection lighting. Similar technology has been incorporated in the production of \textit{A Midsummer Night’s Dream}, directed by Julie Taymor originally opened in 2013 at Theatre for a New Audience in Brooklyn, New York, which was filmed and broadcast around the world in 2014\textsuperscript{41}. However, with the additional assistance from the Imaginarium Studios, which specialises in performance capture technology, known for their involvement in the film industry such as \textit{The Planet of the Apes} series (2011, 2014), \textit{The Hobbit} series (2012, 2014),
Avengers (2015), and Star Wars: The Force Awakens (2015), the RSC’s modern production seems to have gone an extra step forward.

Ariel, played by Mark Quartley, does not appear in a single form. In order to fulfill the nature of a sprite, he transforms from ‘a nymph o’ th’ sea’ (1.2.354) to ‘the figure of this harpy’ (3.3.94), not by changing his costume or adding several external materials. The production, with cutting-edge technology, created an avatar of Ariel by attaching multiple sensors to Quartley for the ‘live performance capture’ of the Imaginarium Studios, processing the movement through the system developed by Intel, and projecting the live image to a screen set on the stage. The difference between an ordinary projection system and the latest one is that the animated image is not pre-recorded but live streamed. The Imaginarium Studios designed various shapes of Ariel based on the physique and movement of Quartley and allowed the actor himself to add the motion on the live stage. The technology even captured the facial expression of Quartley which gave a convincing impression to the digitally animated avatar.

Especially in two scenes, the production realised a spectacle that had never been achieved in the past due to theatrical restrictions. In the middle of act 1, scene 2, Prospero reminisces about the time when he saved Ariel:

PROSPERO: thou wast a spirit too delicate
      To act her [Sycorax’s] earthy and abhorred commands,
    Refusing her grand hests, she did confine thee
      By help of her more potent ministers,
    And in her most unmitigable rage,
       Into a cloven pine, within which rift
  Imprisoned thou didst painfully remain
       A dozen years: within which space she died,
    And left thee there, where thou didst vent thy groans
       As fast as mill-wheels strike. (1.2.320-9; square brackets mine)

The description suggests that Ariel was encased in the tree and left alone for twelve years. Certainly, it is not a requirement to show the actual imprisonment on stage. However, by the use of the avatar technology, the growing tree, projected at the pillar shaped drape with the sheer white cloth from the ceiling, conceals Ariel
and then releases with the cue from Prospero. The effect reassures the pain of Ariel from the past, and functions well as a reminder of the beginning of the master-servant relationship between the two.

In act 3, scene 3, the Folio, the only text deriving from the time of Shakespeare, contains two significant stage directions.

Thunder and lightning. Enter Ariel] (like a Harpy) claps
his wings upon the Table, and with a quaint device the
Banquet vanishes. (B₁′)

He vanishes in Thunder: then (to soft music) Enter the
shapes again, and dance (with mocks and mows) and
carrying out the table. (B₁'; both modernised by me)

The directions I have quoted above imply that the stranded nobilities are frightened by the emergence of Ariel. There are two key words which may challenge the directorial decisions on stage productions, such as ‘Harpy’ and ‘vanish’. The latter might be realised by the use of the trap door placed in the centre of the stage floor even in Shakespeare’s time. When it comes to modern stage, there might be other means of creating the same effect. In order to transform Ariel into a convincing monster with half-woman and half-bird figure, past productions have, for example, incorporated elaborate costumes with gigantic wings, possibly hoisting the actor from above. This way of portrayal has not yet extremely advanced from 400 years past when most of the stage effects were relied on the costumes of the actors. It is probably because of the nature of stage drama to require the indispensable presence of living human bodies.

In the production of 2016-17, Ariel appears at the right hand side of the stage in his usual green painted form. While he maneuvers, imitating the movement of a bird, the projected Harpy flies, hovering over the stage. This means of representation does not necessarily make the audience believe that the real Harpy has arrived at the stage, but is a convincing way to demonstrate Ariel transforming into the shape of the monster. Quartley himself mentions in the interview that the simplest usage of harness enables the actors to perform the character that the normal human body cannot. However, if a person can actually sense the feeling of transformation to different creatures, it would provide the role to have another dimension.
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The two scenes could not be more visually appealing if the RSC did not have the supports from the most advanced technologies from the field of film. However, in terms of theatrical experience, it might be rather too soon to fully accept the involvement of live motion capture, such as that which created the avatar of Ariel. Since the nature of projection is to illuminate the screen with images, they can become distorted depending on which angle the images are seen. Certainly, when the projection is observed from the front, it might even create a three-dimensional effect, but most of the auditorium has a wide seating space.

Before the completion of the reconstruction in 2010, the main theatre of the RSC was a large proscenium arch stage, designed by Elizabeth Scott in the 1930s, which resembled a cinema. The former Shakespeare Memorial Theatre was also in the same structure but much smaller, with a capacity of 800. Two early theatres equally provided cinema-like experiences, and Jonathan Bate suggests that ‘the world of the play was separated from the world of the audience’. This feature can be regarded as a defect of the large proscenium stage, but since the projection technology is similar to film broadcasting, the old auditoriums might have allowed Dorran’s version to show its full capability.

Nevertheless, it is also true that the company has long been considering the way of narrowing the gap between actors and audiences, and through the recent renovation, the main stage was transformed into a thrust stage, the grander version of RSC’s other theatre placed next door: The Swan Theatre. The capacity became 1,046 seating, plus 14 standing, with the audience surrounding three sides of the stage to secure a more intimate experience, much closer to Shakespeare’s original practice in the Elizabethan theatre. Unlike the proscenium arch style, the actors do not necessarily project their lines facing forward, but show a natural angle of exchanging words especially for the scenes of conversation. Unfortunately, the advantage that can be acquired from the unique structure of the Elizabethan type of auditorium seems to have worked against the production in question, or at least did not work in its absolute favour.

Reception of the 2016 The Tempest

Dominic Maxwell criticised the production in Stratford-upon-Avon saying ‘[t]here are some big pluses from the digital element of the evening, but the terrible, charmless trickery of the motion-capture technology is not one of them’.
The characteristics that were most praised from the production were the physical presence of a leading actor and the mixture of modern technology and the human body. As Michael Billington puts it: ‘the kaleidoscopic visual spectacle pales besides the show’s human values and its moving affirmation of forgiveness’. For Billington, the digital projections in the production did not upstage the actor, Simon Russell Beale, who returned to the RSC after a twenty-three-year absence, coincidentally after playing Ariel in 1993. Christopher Hart, on the other hand, values the delicate acting of Joe Dixon as Caliban, and claims that the visual effects are ‘just moderately nice to look at, as well as sometimes distracting your attention from the verse being spoken down below by those primitive carbon-based life forms known as actors – where the true magic lies’. For a reviewer, Caliban, embodied by a British actor with South African parents, seemed ‘old-school’ among the fascinating modern technology, but, it is clear that most of the audiences cherished the verbal portrayal by the actors rather than the sensational spectacle.

In addition, one specific voice from the general audience should be taken into account here to consider the problem with this new theatre technology. An independent reviewer posted an article on his webpage, severely criticising the visibility of the effects. He writes that all he could see were the bright blinking Cyclops eyes of an army of projectors firing simultaneously into life from all quarters of the theatre, announcing that some privileged members of the audience were about to have some blurry images projected onto various randomly-appearing diaphonous screens. The reviewer even accuses the production by saying ‘[a]ny drama production which values only a minority of the audience is – whatever its qualities for that minority – a failure’. Receiving a fine seat for his second visit to the theatre as a complimentary gesture from the company, the reviewer admits that he had a positive impression compared to his prior experience.

As it is a live viewing from various angles and levels, the auditorium, unavoidably contains several seats with unsatisfactory perceptions. Most of the theatres clearly indicate the seats with restricted views and so as to compensate the dissatisfaction from the audiences, they lower the ticket price. The RSC is not an exception, and remarks that as ‘[t]he nature of the thrust stage in the Royal Shakespeare Theatre auditorium means that it is almost impossible to guarantee every seat will hold a clear view of every aspect of the production at all times’.

From these points, it is understood that no matter how the company prepares a
production with thorough consideration to audiences’ accessibility, the show could receive a level of some complaints about visibility of the stage. However, it is also true that Doran’s use of hi-tech projection only had its full effect once seen from certain angles in the auditorium. Since this stage machinery only recently became available, having a margin of improvement is not surprising. The significant thing to be noticed here is that the production showed the future possibility of theatre representations, as well as the importance of live actors on stage, and the complicated nature of the Shakespearean plays.

5 Bate and Rasmussen eds. p.102.
7 Vaughan. pp.189-98.
15 Vaughan and Vaughan eds. p.7.
16 Bate and Rasmussen eds. pp.101-2.


Bate and Rasmussen eds. p.102.


Vaughan and Vaughan eds. p.30.


Dalya Alberge. The Guardian. ‘Actresses are driven to play men by lack of female roles – Walter’. 17.11.16.

Susannah Clapp. The Observer. ‘Such stuff as dreams are made on’. 27.11.16.

Dominic Maxwell. The Times. Review. 24.11.16.


The production records for the RSC performances are collected from the archive held in the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust webpage. [http://collections.shakespeare.org.uk/search/rsc-performances]. Web. 21.9.17.

Ellis. pp.129-57.


By 1952, there are 18 records of different casting productions. Judging from the name there are only two incidents that the role is performed by male actors: David O’Brien in 1946, and Alan Badel in 1951.

Bate and Rasmussen eds. pp.121-2.

Ibid. p.123.

Ibid. p.122.


The detailed information concerning Julie Taymor’s production can be found on the webpage. [http://amidsummernightsdreamfilm.com]. Web. 21.9.17.

Some thoughts surrounding 2016 production of *The Tempest*

Details of the production are from the programme of *The Tempest*, sold for the performances between 30th June to 18th August 2017, at the Barbican Theatre in London.

A clear image of the scene from the production can be seen at the top of the article by Intel, *Royal Shakespeare Company Reimagines The Tempest*. [https://iq.intel.com/royal-shakespeare-company-reimagines-the-tempest/]. Web. 21.9.17.


Ibid. p.132.


Ibid.

2016年公演『テンペスト』を巡る周辺事項の一考察

梅宮 悠

英国劇作家ウィリアム・シェイクスピアの『テンペスト』には内容を解釈する上での問題と上演時の問題の両方が含まれている。古来よりのコンセプトである三一致の法則に従う稀有な存在でありながら、似た形式で書かれた初期喜劇『間違いの喜劇』とは複雑性において全く次元の違う作品として仕上がっているだろう。本研究ノートでは、物語の概要とそこに内包される問題について確認し、それらを如何にして舞台化するかについて考察する。

シェイクスピアの時代から現代舞台に至るまでの期間にあって、他の作品と同様に『テンペスト』にも数多くの上演実績がある。当初の少年俳優による女役の担当は、王政復古後に女優がイギリスでも誕生したことによって、女役の台詞量が加筆される翻案が行われている。現代舞台の走りの時期には男役に女優を起用するなどして、キャラクター間の新しい関係性を探る流れもあった。この傾向は近年でも続き、主人公の性別までも変化させている例が今では挙げられる。

こうした斬新な配役を積極的に取り込んでいる昨今にあって、2016年に王立シェイクスピア劇団が『テンペスト』の制作を行った。現芸術監督のグレゴリー・ドーランが演出を担当した本作品は配役などに特殊性はなかったものの、観客に新しい劇場体験を提供していた。上演史の中からドーラン版の立ち位置を検証し、観客からの評を交えながら、最新の『テンペスト』がどのようなものであったか紹介する。