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I. **Introduction**

When thinking about depictions of magic and magical creatures, the first things that spring to mind are the sorcerers, such as Gandalf from *The Lord of the Rings*, who have long beards and use magical implements, the black-clad witches, such as the Wicked Witch of the West from *Oz the Great and Powerful*, who brew potions in cauldrons, and the winged fairies, such as Tinker Bell from *Peter Pan*, who are significantly smaller than humans, that are omnipresent in the visual culture of the twenty-first century. In fact, all of these examples were taken from twenty-first century movies that have been based on twentieth century books, which demonstrates that, in the visual media, many present-day representations base the magical appearance of their characters upon the written descriptions offered in older literary works. Nevertheless, though these examples have been provided by a person from the twenty-first century, similar examples could as easily have been given by the people of the Renaissance, given that, during this period, increasingly more plays and the visual arts, such as woodcuts, paintings, engraving, etc., depicted the magical creatures and characters the common people believed in and feared (Bailey 149). As a matter of fact, this increase can be explained by the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries “rise in [witch] trials” (Bailey 152), by which it became more and more common to include magic into plays. Also, the “development of printing” (Bailey 136) enabled artists to reach a bigger public with their works, as a result of which many people became familiarised with the same interpretations of specific magical creatures, which enabled them to better visualise and imagine many of the popular beliefs and fears that dominated their every-day lives. Consequently, the magical aspects that were repeated in almost every rendering of these magical creatures became embedded into the mental imagery of the public, which were then passed on from generation to generation. As a result, since the twenty-first century visualisations of magic portray sorcerers, witches, fairies and other magical creatures as they would have been represented during the Renaissance, it is
apparent that many of the nowadays stereotypical elements associated with certain magical characters have survived in the public’s collective memory for centuries.

However, even though this twenty-first century list demonstrates that, in more recent literature and visual media, many of the ‘newly’ created magical characters are still being based on the widespread stereotypical visualisations of, for instance, sorcerers, witches, and fairies during the Renaissance, it fails to demonstrate whether the depictions of specific magical characters from particular Renaissance plays are still being visualised in the same fashions today as they would have been during the early modern period. Actually, this failure has also been exhibited by the academic field of literary research, given that very few to no articles actually examine present-day illustrations that portray the magical characters of certain Renaissance plays, such as Shakespeare’s *Midsummer Night’s Dream*, *Macbeth*, Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus* or Ben Jonson’s *The Alchemist*. Instead, numerous academic articles have been written on the ways in which various twentieth and twenty-first centuries novels and movies utilise the stereotypical Renaissance images of magic to create ‘new’ magical creatures and characters on the page and on the screen. Nevertheless, some academic articles on magic in the Renaissance have been written, but, unfortunately, these mainly look at how the incorporation of magic in certain plays helped to disperse the stereotypical notions of witches, magicians, and other magical creatures amongst the people of the early modern period. In addition, almost all of these articles use these plays’ source texts as the main focus of their investigation and do not look at the ways in which these plays would have been represented on the actual Renaissance stage nor how the mediated representations’ physical appearance corresponded to the imagined appearance in the imagination of the audience during the early modern period and later centuries. One of the main reasons why his field of research has been so underrepresented may be the fact that there hardly exist any detailed written records of Renaissance stage performances or the public’s response to these
performances. In addition, most academics consider engravings a medium that lacks “in ‘fidelity’ to the original works” (Fischlin and Fortier 4), which, according to them, could impossibly be used to investigate how magic was seen by the entire population, since these only reflect the artists’ personal beliefs and interpretation of magic (Bailey 149). Consequently, the few articles that actually analyse contemporary productions of these plays, such as Nicoleta Cinc̦oe’s “(Ship)wrecked Shakespeare in Romanian Tempests”, or Lois Potter’s “What happened to the mighty line?: Recent Marlowe Productions”, mainly focus on the more general changes in the adapted language of the source texts and disregard the ways in which the visual aspects differ from, or are similar to, how these play would have been interpreted on the Renaissance stage.

These observations clearly demonstrate that the visual culture has been undervalued by almost the entire academic field of literary research, which is exactly the reason why this dissertation is going to address the evolution of depictions containing certain magical characters and creatures in the visual culture from the Renaissance onwards. In fact, I am going to look at visualisations of the predominant magical characters from three of the most well-known Renaissance plays, Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus and Shakespeare’s The Tempest and Macbeth, which are not only very popular today, but also, to a greater or lesser extent, were well-known amongst the people of the Renaissance. As a matter of fact, given their popularity, these plays were performed very frequently, as a result of which the common people had more opportunities to go watch the play, and the literate audience members had more opportunities to write down their own impressions on paper, which some even did whilst they were still enjoying the play (Stern 55). Additionally, these popular plays also inspired numerous artists, especially with regards to Shakespeare’s plays, to create paintings, engravings, woodcuts and drawings, which not only incorporate elements that demonstrate how these plays were presented on the Renaissance stage, but also elements that refer to the
popular beliefs of their time (Dobson 135). Additionally, this dissertation is also going to look at twentieth and twenty-first centuries theatre productions and movie adaptations, which, despite the fact that production companies have been adapting these plays to make them more “relevant for modern audiences” (Rowe 307), still try to portray the magical aspects as closely to how they would have been portrayed on the Renaissance stage and to how they would have been imagined by the audience members. Nevertheless, before examining these visualisations, it is necessary to first examine how magic was understood by the English people in the centuries leading up to the Renaissance and the plays by Shakespeare and Marlowe, given that this knowledge is imperative to understand and recognise the influence the popular beliefs and fears have had on these engravings and theatre productions. Only then will I be able to analyse how the visual representations of magic in *The Tempest*, *Macbeth* and *Doctor Faustus* have evolved from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries onwards and look at how these depictions also reflect the changes in the popular beliefs and technology, which will be discussed in the remainder of this dissertation. Thus, I am not only going to investigate how the interpretation of these plays’ magical creatures and characters changed throughout the centuries, but also the reasons why these changed.

II. **Methodology**
Since this dissertation addresses a highly underrepresented area in the academic field of literary research focussing on visual representations, it will use methodologies that enable the analysis of the evolution of magic in visual renderings of *The Tempest*, *Macbeth* and *Doctor Faustus* throughout the centuries, whilst looking at the textual descriptions provided in the early modern source texts. Therefore, this dissertation will draw upon the visual culture of later generations, which provide their own takes on, and interpretations of, the meaning of magic, in order to give descriptive and analytical accounts of how the changing beliefs of magic and the supernatural have influenced the representation of these play’s predominant magical characters. Before turning to the visual analyses of these plays, I will first examine
the anthropological history of magic during the Renaissance and the centuries leading up to
this period (see chapter three), which will largely be based on a book that, like the larger part
of the secondary sources used throughout the dissertation, dates from the last fifteen years, to
provide up-to-date contextual information. In fact, this chapter will not merely investigate the
ways in which, according to medievalists, magic was represented in literature during, for
example, the Middle Ages, or how it was seen by the more educated people of pre-early
modern British societies. Instead, this chapter will also provide a reconstruction of how magic
was understood and seen by the common people, who not only conceived magic as being real,
but also believed that the imagined processes and practises related to magic actually occurred
in their community on a daily basis. Furthermore, the origins of their inherent fears will also
be looked at, given that this knowledge is imperative to be able to investigate how the visual
depictions of The Tempest’s Prospero, Ariel and Caliban, Macbeth’s the Weyard Sisters and
Doctor Faustus’s Faustus and Mephistopheles reflected the Renaissance people’s popular
beliefs and fears in magic and the supernatural.

The remainder of this dissertation is then going to examine the different ways in which
specific elements have been able to convey to the audience that a certain character is magical,
and how these elements have changed throughout time. The fourth chapter will discuss the
actor’s use of clothing, body language and voice, and is divided into three parts, in accordance
with the three plays, which are then divided again according to the characters. By contrast, the
fifth chapter will examine the use of special effects, properties (props), hand gestures and, in
some cases, music, and is only divided into three parts, which correspond to the three plays.
In these chapters, the secondary sources are solely used to provide more general background
information about certain concepts of the Renaissance stage. Nevertheless, in order to
investigate the fashions in which these aspects enhance the magical appearance of these
particular characters, I am not going to solely look at the source texts of these three plays, as
these, especially Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* and *Macbeth*, do not provide enough information to enable a coherent and in-depth analysis of these visual aspects. Instead, I will mainly use eighteenth and nineteenth centuries engravings, as a starting point, given that these offer a better indication of, for instance, the clothes and the body language of the actors on the stage. All these engravings, I will analyse using the same method, even though, historically, they have not all been used in the same manner, given that some were created as independent works of art, whilst others were solely produced to be incorporated in specific eighteenth and nineteenth centuries printed editions of *The Tempest*, *Macbeth*, and *Doctor Faustus*. These particular engravings, or illustrations, which the publishers of these particular editions ordered artists to make, can therefore be considered as non-verbal paratextual elements, which had the purpose of mediating the text and, without doubt, helping the reader, and by extension the actors, envision the characters of these plays more clearly (Genette viii-1-7-16). In fact, all of these engravings have been taken from The British Museum, which are provided in the appendices, as these are of a very high quality, which enables the examination of even the smallest details. Also, The British Museum possesses most of the existing engravings that portray these magical characters, by which it is possible to more clearly distinguish the artist’s personal ideas from the contemporary popular beliefs. Consequently, this also makes it possible to determine which of the magic enhancing elements were already stereotypical during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and, undoubtedly, would have been incorporated into Renaissance stage productions. Thus, as these elements already demonstrate, many of these engravings will be read as text-like sources of information, which not only allow to reconstruct how Prospero, Ariel, Caliban, the Weyard Sisters, Faustus and Mephistopheles would have been interpreted by actors during the early modern period, but also by actors during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.
However, these chapters will not only investigate the ways in which these engravings reflect the popular beliefs of the people and indicate how these magical characters would have been represented during the Renaissance and the two following centuries, but also how these characters have, more recently, been depicted in twentieth and twenty-first centuries productions. And, this will be examined in each part of both chapter four and five, immediately after the analyses of the engravings, given that this facilitates a more apparent understanding of the ways in which the renderings of these magical characters have changed since the Renaissance. In these parts, I will look at both movie adaptations and theatre productions, which mainly date from the second half of the twentieth century onwards, as most of these, at some point, have been released on DVD, which facilitates a closer examination of the visual aspects. Though pictures would actually suffice to discuss the clothing, body language and certain props; the use of special effects, hand gestures, props, the voice and music by twentieth and twenty-first centuries production companies and actors, can only be discussed after having watched these productions several times. This is exactly the reason why I have included a DVD that contains some of the discussed scenes, which most clearly visualise how these elements are used and how the special effects have evolved during the last centuries. Additionally, these productions also reveal the ways in which the technological advances and changing popular beliefs have influenced the use and appearance of these magic-enhancing elements. In this regard, the twenty-first century productions are especially interesting, given that these, in some respect, reinvent how magic should be portrayed by using new technologies and machines to portray and create certain magical effects. Also, like the engravings, these movie adaptations and theatre productions will be considered as paratextual elements, which mediate the source text to the audience (Genette xviii). And from these, as with the engravings, descriptive and analytical accounts will be given in order to demonstrate what aspects in the magical appearance of Prospero, Ariel,
Caliban, the Weyard Sisters, Faustus and Mephistopheles have changed, and what aspects have persisted throughout the centuries. Lastly, after I have analysed the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries engravings, and the twentieth and twenty-first centuries theatre productions and movie adaptations, I will come to some careful conclusions.

III. The anthropological history of magic
Though the Renaissance, without doubt, can be characterised as a period wherein the people believed in, and feared, the presence of witches, sorcerers and other magical creatures in their communities, these beliefs and fears were not created overnight. As a matter of fact, the perception of magic gradually began to change in the course of the Middle Ages, especially during the High and the Late Middle Ages, which comprises the period between the years 1000 and 1500. Nevertheless, significant changes in the common people’s perception of magic already occurred during the Early Middle Ages, as a result of the Germanic and Celtic beliefs that influenced the prevalent Christian notions of magic in Roman Britain of the fifth century (Bailey 59). Actually, initially these Catholics did not condemn benevolent magic, which would be used to heal, but only rejected magic that invoked demonic forces, as a result of which it was not uncommon for mothers to turn to “ritual remedies and herbal medicine” in order to try cure their sick children (Bailey 50; Jennings 70). However, during the fifth century, there was a significant influx of Germanic people, who created new kingdoms in England and influenced the established ideas and beliefs towards magic. As a matter of fact, the Germanics believed in the existence of some type of specialists, usually women, who possessed the ability to perform very powerful spells, as they claimed to have the necessary experience and knowledge to do so (Bailey 61). Though these women, and sometimes men, were already seen as people who should not be meddled with, as they ‘possessed’ such powerful magic, they were not the only people that used magic in these Germanic communities. To enumerate, almost every Germanic person would eventually learn how to
use some simple magical rite, such as a protective charm, which could have been used to prevent diseases or injuries (Bailey 61-62). Nevertheless, despite the fact that almost everyone used magic, these Germanic tribes would take measures, which, most likely, consisted out of counter-magic, against the specialists that, in their eyes, became too powerful and dangerous, (Bailey 62). In addition to the Germanic people, the Romans’ beliefs in magic were also influenced by the beliefs of the Celtic tribes, which persisted on the borders of Roman Britain. For instance, in these tribes druids were not only believed to possess astrological skills, but also the ability to perform benevolent and protective rituals (Bailey 62-63). Nevertheless, as a result of the consolidation of different cultures, the Roman British authorities eventually deemed all Germanic and Celtic magic, whether it was believed to be used for benevolent or malevolent reasons, as dangerous (Bailey 65). And, consequently, “legal proceedings or remedies” (Bailey 62) were used to punish the people accused of performing ‘dangerous’ magic.

While it is true that the people who were accused of performing harmful magic received penalties, these were not as severe as the punishments given in later centuries. As a matter of fact, during the sixth century, “handbooks of penances” (Bailey 66), only prescribed very mild punishments for the use of simple magic rites, because the authorities saw this as foolish behaviour instead of an actual harmful crime. Additionally, in cases when the accused was suspected of having used magic to badly harm, endanger or kill someone, these punishments would have been more severe, but it would still not have resulted in their death, given that the use of this type of magic was also considered, by the authorities, as the foolish error of uneducated people who had been tricked by demons (Bailey 67-73). And, during the High and the Late Middle Ages, one of the harshest punishments that would have been employed to penalise the use of harmful magic, would have been banishment from the community (Bailey 111). Moreover, there also existed penalties and fines for people who
unrightfully accused someone of using magic, as a result of which the people usually thought twice before they actually incriminated someone (Bailey 62). However, unlike the authorities, the common people did make a distinction between the benevolent and malevolent magic of these Germanic and Celtic tribes, given that, like their Germanic ancestors, they continued to use protective rites during the High and the Lade Middle Ages in order to, for instance, shield their crops or prevent injuries (Bailey 90). And, they did not believe that the magic they were familiar with, and personally used, would or could be considered demonic or a crime by the authorities, their neighbours, or the other people of the community. Furthermore, they also continued to believe in the existence of experts, who were very powerful and could use their magic to help or harm the people of the community (Bailey 90). In fact, common people frequently sought help from sorcerers who used “a wide variety of charms, amulets, herbal potions, and unguents” (Bailey 80) to heal people and also from malevolent sorcerers, to, for instance, undo a negative spell or arouse discord between friends (Bailey 81-82; Jennings 70). Nevertheless, even though it may be true that the people occasionally sought help from a person who was commonly believed to use harmful magic, and would not have been severely punished by the authorities, the common people did sometimes lynch these suspected malevolent sorcerers when, for instance, “hailstorms” (Bailey 69) and other kinds of natural phenomena damaged their homes and crops.

The eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries saw the rise of the learned magician, and the notion of truly demonic magic, as a result of which the punishments became increasingly more severe. In fact, during these centuries, the disintegration of the Roman Empire, and its culture, enabled increasingly more people to get an advanced education, who then formed part of an educated elite that decided to study magic (Bailey 91). Therefore, many of these learned people were believed to be actual magicians, as they studied astrology, alchemy, demonology, and were suspected of voluntarily and deliberately engaging in the
forbidden and dangerous practice of necromancy, which supposedly enabled them to summon the spirits of the dead, who were commonly believed to be demons instead, by means of a magic circle filled with particular symbols that enhanced the sorcerer’s powers (Bailey 97-102). Needless to say, this type of magic was condemned, and the learned men who were suspected of dabbling in these demonic powers would have been severely punished, though not with death, given their high status and the fact that they claimed to use these demons for benevolent reasons (Bailey 106-108-111-120). Also during these centuries, several accounts began to express a sexual motif associated with the summoning of demons, which would lead to the common belief that, especially, female witches had intercourse with the Devil in order to gain command over a demon (Bailey 113; Herrington 469). And, as a consequence of these suspected threats to the community, “specialised officials” (Bailey 112) were deployed to find the people that were believed to be practitioners of magic, especially the ones who were supposedly able to command demons. Thus, during the eleventh century, someone who was suspected of using magic, would have been brought before the court by these officials in order to determine whether the accusations were true. However, as a consequence of the common belief that magical activities were inherently secretive and, thus, difficult to actually prove, the courts often used “judicial ordeals” (Bailey 116), which, for instance, entailed that a suspect was bound and dunked in water to see how quickly they returned to the surface, to determine whether someone was guilty (Bailey 116). Also, these ordeals were performed in public, and the people who witnessed these and knew the accused, would have helped the authorities determine whether that person was, in their opinion, actually guilty or innocent (Bailey 117). Nevertheless, at this point in history, these trials did not occur very often, since the accusers could “face legal retribution” (Bailey 117) if the accused was eventually acquitted of the charges.
However, from the fourteenth century onwards, both the common people and the authorities became more concerned about the use of demonic magic, which gave rise to the use of other procedures to determine whether a specific person, who was believed, by the common people, to have performed demonic magic, actually possessed the ability to use magical powers. As a matter of fact, between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries, judicial ordeals were no longer used in court, and people were free to suspect anyone they wanted without any consequences, as a result of which a lot more people were accused of having the ability to command demons (Bailey 117-118). Additionally, most cases were brought before court by inquisitors, who actively investigated the rumours of supposed magic use and were allowed to use torture when they did not have sufficient evidence to prove someone’s guilt or innocence (Bailey 117-118). Furthermore, the authorities began to suspect and believe that almost all types of magic “relied on the power of demons” (Bailey 125) and, therefore, as dangerous as the practice of necromancy, as a result of which the authorities no longer believed in the possibility to use the powers of demons for benevolent reasons. As a consequence, even some of the learned elite were investigated and put on trial to determine whether they had used the demons for benevolent or malevolent reasons (Bailey 120-126). Also, the fear of demonic magic became even stronger during the fifteenth century, because of which the names of the people who filled a basic need in the communities, such as the people who used charms, herbs and plants to heal, and were also considered as dangerous, were given to the authorities (Bailey 128-130). Also, at the beginning of the fifteenth century, the initial step was taken towards the well-known witch trials of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, given that the authorities began to believe that people who performed harmful magic did so in “concert with other men and women” (Bailey 130). Consequently, the common people began to fear the existence of “diabolical cults” (Bailey 130), whose members summoned and worshipped demons in order to gain magical powers (Bailey 131).
As a result, the common people began to fear the presence of several groups of sorcerers who used demons to inflict harm upon the other members of the community.

During the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, when Shakespeare and Marlowe wrote their plays, these fears reached their culmination, which resulted in the persecution of a lot more people than at any other point in history. As a matter of fact, in 1563 the English Parliament made witchcraft, or the use of demonic powers, a capital crime, whereby officials were allowed to kill the accused (Bailey 158). One of the reasons why more people might have been accused is that as a result of the belief that witches were members of cults, the presence of one alleged witch supposedly indicated the presence of other witches as well, whose names would have been forced out of the accused through all means necessary (Bailey 147). In fact, most, but certainly not all, of the accused were women, most typically spinsters and widows, given that these did not have the same legal status as their husbands and fathers, and therefore were a lot more vulnerable (Bailey 148). These older women, for instance, would have acquired knowledge of medicine and human psychology throughout the years, as a consequence of which the rest of the community began to mistrust and consider them as witches (Bailey 130; Jennings 93). And, in most cases the fate of these accused women would depend on whether they had male children to protect them, or whether any non-blood related man would try to defend them (Bailey 148). Another reason why so many may have been persecuted during this period was the result of the “little ice age” (Bailey 161) that occurred during the sixteenth century and “reached its peak during the 17th century (OED Draft additions 1997), caused crops to failure, diseases to break out and many other hardships (Bailey 161). Consequently, when there was an excessive amount of misfortune, the people would have blamed it upon demonic magic and would have searched for the people who, according to them, could have caused it (Bailey 161). Additionally, it would not have been uncommon for feudal families to accuse one another when one of the families’ children
became unexpectedly sick (Bailey 150). Furthermore, these centuries also saw the rise of “highly intellectualised forms of elite magic” (Bailey 181), which was based on the magical traditions of the learned elite of the Middle Ages. However, unlike the learned magicians of the Middle Ages, they also studied the recently discovered sources of antiquity, by which they felt that they reached a greater knowledge of the more ancient systems of power and the universe (Bailey 181). Thus, all these elements portray that the common Renaissance beliefs and fears in magic were the result of a long evolution, and a lot of changes, in the people’s appreciation and perception of magic.

IV. Chapter 1: the representation of magical characters in print and on the stage

During the Renaissance, multiple playwrights decided to incorporate society’s popular beliefs in magic and the supernatural into many of their plays, regardless of their personal beliefs, since they undoubtedly knew that by doing so, their plays would have a greater appeal to the public. Therefore, it would not have been uncommon for three or more plays, which contained sorcerers, witches and other magical creatures, such as fairies, nymphs, spirits or demons, to be performed for the first time within a short period of each other. For instance, in the seventeen years between the ending of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century, Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, *Macbeth* and Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus* were put on stage for the first time. And, even though these three plays contain sorcerers, witches and other magical creatures, they do not portray these magical elements in the same uniform way, but instead provide the audience with slightly different interpretations and renderings of the magical beings they believed in. Consequently, as a result of the repertoire of magical representations in these plays, Shakespeare and Marlowe, consciously or subconsciously, ensured that more Renaissance people would go to the productions of their plays, given that the audience would have been able to compare the depiction of, for example, a sorcerer in *The Tempest* to the portrayal of a sorcerer in other plays.
Although *The Tempest*, *Macbeth* and *Doctor Faustus* represent magic in different ways, the audience still had to be able to recognize and believe that a certain character was magical, which actors could convey, for instance, by means of their body language, the way they spoke or the costumes they wore during their performances on stage. The costumes were especially important as these enabled the audience members to recognize a certain character at first sight, which is the reason why many Renaissance theatre companies spent ample money on new clothes (Bate and Rasmussen, “*The Tempest*” 151; Taylor 12-13) and why “contemporary costumes” (Bate and Rasmussen, “*The Tempest*” 151) were used by actors in order “to construct characters” (Lennox 669). However, magical characters were not only portrayed differently from one play to another during the Renaissance, but also from one performance to the next from the eighteenth century onwards, which is the result of the fact that the beliefs in magic and the ways in which society envisioned magic has undoubtedly changed in the course of the last three centuries. Therefore, in order to understand the ways in which the interpretation and presentation of certain magical creatures, and other characters closely related to magic, has evolved in the last three hundred years, I am going to compare the depiction of these characters in *The Tempest’s*, *Macbeth’s* and *Doctor Faustus’* source texts to engravings dating from the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, since no, or very few, detailed records exist of these play’s theatre productions during the Renaissance. Additionally, I am also going to compare the portrayal of these characters in the source texts and engravings to later interpretations in contemporary productions.

1. *The Tempest*

Ever since *The Tempest* was performed for the first time in 1611 at the English court, of which there are, unfortunately, no detailed records, theatre companies and actors have had the difficult task of depicting the play’s magical characters, such as Prospero, Ariel and Caliban, in a way that corresponds to the contemporary audience’s personal beliefs in magic. And, this task has been complicated even more because of the fact that the source text does not contain
exhaustive descriptions of these magical character’s clothing, their appearance or how the actors should compose themselves throughout the play, which is the result of the fact that Shakespeare expected his fellow actors to “fill in those obvious blanks” (Taylor 4), given that he wrote these characters based on their skills (Stern 46). As a consequence, during the last three centuries, Prospero, Ariel and Caliban, which are the main magical characters of this particular play, have been interpreted and presented in a variety of ways by numerous actors. Therefore, by comparing the few descriptive elements of Prospero, Ariel and Caliban that are present in the source text to depictions of these characters in the early modern period, and productions from the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, the evolution of these magical characters and society’s popular beliefs will become more apparent. And, though there have not survived any detailed description of the Renaissance productions of this particular play, this evolution can still be analysed, given that artists in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries “started to make pictures” (Dobson 135) of Shakespeare’s works, which also incorporated the popular beliefs in magic albeit through a different medium.

a. **Prospero and the magical appearance of the sorcerer.** Despite the fact that the source text does not provide the reader with a clear description of Prospero’s physical appearance nor the type of clothes he wears during his exile on the island, the appearance of the sorcerer undoubtedly changed throughout the centuries. Nevertheless, many eighteenth and nineteenth centuries artists depicted the sorcerer in a similar way, by which they also reveal the popular beliefs of the Renaissance with regards to magicians. For example, in one of the oldest engravings that depicts Prospero, “Miranda” (see fig. 1.), which dates from circa 1782 and was made by Carolina Watson, who produced the engraving of R. E. Pine’s painting, the male figure on the left can immediately be recognized as being a magician, regardless of his staff or magical cape (see chapter 2). As a matter of fact, the engraving portrays Prospero as the traditional learned magician of an older age who, without doubt, devoted a large part of his life to the study of the liberal arts and “secret studies”
Moreover, Prospero is wearing a dark coloured robe, which is “a long outer garment of a particular form or material worn to denote a person's … profession” (OED meaning 2.a), as a result of which people unfamiliar with the source text should, and would, still have been able to determine that Prospero is a magician. Although this particular representation of a sorcerer has been used in most engravings of Prospero, some artists decided to portray him whilst wearing the more traditional clothing of Milan. For instance, in William Sharps’ engraving (see fig. 2), which appeared in the paratext of the *Lowndes edition to Shakespeare’s plays* in 1783 and mediates a few lines from act 1 scene 3 to the reader, Prospero is depicted with a beard, which refers to his age, but he appears to be of a younger age than Watson’s Prospero. Moreover, Prospero’s overall appearance is not that different from Ferdinand, which refers to the popular fear of the Elizabethans that any man in society could be a sorcerer. Thus, this illustration portrays Prospero in a more humanized way and reflects the fact that, upon his exile, Prospero was not yet a powerful magician and that, therefore, the “rich garments, linens, stuffs and necessaries” (Shakespeare 1.2.191) Gonzalo gave him, would not have included robes but rather clothes more befitting the Duke of Milan.

William Sharp’s engraving not only incorporates the Elizabethans’ fear of not being able to discern a sorcerer in society, but also the movement amongst the “intellectuals and ruling elite” (Bailey 207) towards the disbelief in magic, which arose during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In fact, this powerful class of society started to judge magic as an “empty and foolish superstition devoid of real power and incapable of producing real effects” (Bailey 207), which William Sharp’s engraving (see fig. 2) demonstrates by portraying Prospero without his robe, the garment usually associated with a sorcerer, and at a slightly younger age than the typical Renaissance rendering of the sorcerer. However, in later years, some artists decided to distance themselves completely from the popular beliefs of the public. For example; in Samuel Davenport’s engraving, which mediates the occurrences in act 5
scene 1 and appeared in the paratext of Smirke’s ‘Shakespeare’ (see fig. 3) in 1829, thirty-six years after Sharp’s etching, Prospero, in the middle, is depicted as a young man without a beard, which was also typically associated with practitioners of magic. Also, the sorcerer comes across as being too young to already have lived on the island for twelve years with his teenage daughter, who is not depicted in this etching, as a result of which Prospero does not come across as a father figure but rather as a potential husband or lover for Miranda.

Furthermore, Prospero is not wearing a robe, but a costume reminiscent of the clothes Ferdinand was wearing in Sharp’s engraving (see fig. 2). Thus, by making Prospero younger and portraying him without his robe, Sharp and Davenport’s etchings demonstrate that the beliefs of the social elite in magic and the supernatural were starting to dwindle in the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth century.

However, the age difference and the high-quality clothing Prospero wears in Davenport’s engraving are not the only elements present by which Davenport demonstrates that the ruling class of the English society started to interpret magic as a mere superstition. Actually, Prospero’s body language also provides the audience with a lot of information as to the amount of power the sorcerer was believed to have. As a matter of fact, in all the etchings wherein Prospero is depicted as the typical old aged sorcerer, he is placed in the foreground and is easily recognizable as a sorcerer since, next to his robe and beard, he seems to be very confident and in full control of the situation, as in Watson’s engraving from 1782 (see fig.1), Francesco Bartolozzi’s engraving from 1793 (see fig. 4), which portrays the paternal Prospero wearing a Greek Orthodox patriarch’s mitre, and Richard Rhodes’ engraving from 1812 (see fig. 5). Furthermore, in these engravings, Prospero’s apparent confidence is enhanced by the fact that he has a straight back and that he is standing with one foot in front of the other, by which Prospero takes up more space and, as a result, comes across as an even more prominent figure who, without doubt, is a very powerful magician. However, not all engravings depict
Prospero in the same way, as Henry James Richter’s’ print from 1829 (see fig. 6) demonstrates, given that, Richter’s Prospero does not appear to be a sorcerer at all, but a paternal Pope who, in addition to wearing a three-tiered papal tiara and a papal gown, rather than the robe of a sorcerer, is depicted as sickly and coming to the end of his life, which sorcerers were believed to be able to prolong. As a result, in this print, Prospero appears to have as much, or even less, magical powers as he had in Davenport’s etching, in which he is not portrayed as being in control of the situation at all, as he is kneeling in the centre (see fig. 3), which is very different from the source text wherein Prospero states with authority “[a]nd to thee and thy company, I bid/ [a] hearty welcome” (Shakespeare 5.1.16-17). Consequently, by making Prospero a Pope, Richter’s print implies that some of the social elite “labeled both [magic and religion] as superstitious” (Bailey 207), whilst the rest of society still maintained the older popular beliefs.

In the course of the twentieth century, this disbelief in magic had become more widespread amongst the public, which sometimes resulted in radical new interpretations and representations of Prospero. Nonetheless, most actors returned to the source text and decided to portray the sorcerer as close as possible to how he would have been interpreted on the Renaissance stage, albeit with some minor modern alterations. As a matter of fact, during the last century, an increasing amount of actors appeared on stage wearing modernized costumes made out of modern fabrics instead of the traditional Elizabethan clothing, which were being used in Shakespearean theatre productions up to the nineteenth century (Gay 160-167). Nevertheless, by wearing clothes made out of modern fabrics, the modern actors did not break with the tradition of the Renaissance stage, since these actors also wore contemporary clothes, which made the character more accessible and recognizable for the audience (Taylor 13). For example, Michael Hordern’s interpretation of the sorcerer (see fig. 13), in John Gorrie’s 1980 BBC Television adaption of the play, wore a long robe, which closed with a zipper and was
made out a flowing, silk or satin-like material, in black, as dark colours were, and are traditionally associated with magicians. Though Hordern’s Prospero was not depicted as the typical bearded magician of the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, there is no doubt that he is in fact a very powerful sorcerer, given that he comes across as very confident and Hordern says each word with a sense of underlying power. Moreover, throughout the Television adaptation, the audience does not doubt that Prospero is in full control of every situation and that the sorcerer has a lot more power than he implements. Thus, this twentieth century adaptation portrayed Prospero as a powerful magician, which is reminiscent of the traditional Renaissance depictions of the sorcerer, in an age when the public no longer feared magic but instead began to enjoy and appreciate the fantastical aspects of it.

Even though Hordern succeeded in combining traditional Renaissance and modern elements in his depiction of the sorcerer, other actors, especially in the twenty-first century, preferred to depict Prospero in more colourful ways. As a matter of fact, in 2010, two actors, Helen Mirren and Simon Keenlyside, portrayed Prospero in fundamentally different ways without dismissing or undermining the magical traits of their character. For instance, in Julie Taymor’s movie, Helen Mirren’s rendition of the sorcerer (see fig. 19) demonstrates that although adaptations are almost always “a distortion of its source” (Fischlin and Fortier 17), the distortion can be very minimal. Though the transition from Prospero to Prospera may initially shock the audience members familiar with the play, Helen Mirren’s rendition, nevertheless, succeeds in staying very true to the source text. In fact, aside from having changed the gender of the magician, the depiction of Prospera is not that different from Hordern’s interpretation of Prospero, given that Prospera’s contemporary clothes are also made out of modern fabrics and she has a confident body language, which is heightened by the fact that Mirren, like Hordern, says each word with a great sense of power. Although she does not wear a traditional robe, it is apparent that she wears a robe-inspired tunic and pants,
which not only enhances the masculine aspects of her character, but also indicates that she is very powerful. By contrast, in Thomas Adès’ opera rendition, Simon Keenlyside portrays a much younger Prospero (see fig. 27), who, next to being a father figure, explores “the contradictions within the text to reveal a complex, demanding character (Bate and Rasmussen, “The Tempest” 105). Even though he is a lot younger, Keenlyside’s Prospero does not make the audience question his relationship with his daughter, unlike Sharp’s engraving (see fig. 2), nor his magical abilities. Also, Keenlyside does not wear a traditional robe, but a dark coloured “disheveled military cape [, robe type garment] slung over one shoulder” (Tommasini), which Prospero apparently made out of the clothes he was wearing when he was exiled. Moreover, this garment, in addition to the colourful tattoos on his upper torso, the dark eye make-up, the power with which he sings and his unmistakable confidence, makes him come across as a very prominent figure and a very powerful magician. Thus, as a result of comparing the depictions of Prospero in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to renditions of the sorcerer in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, it becomes evident that the character has undergone some changes in appearance, which have made the character more appealing to the modern audience, who no longer fears magic. Nevertheless, in essence, the traditional and modern depictions of Prospero are more or less the same, as they demonstrate that Prospero is a very powerful magician who primarily uses his body language to bring this power across to the audience and the other characters of the play.

b. Ariel and gender issues.

Though Shakespeare’s The Tempest does not describe the magical creature Ariel in extensive detail either, certain tendencies in the development of the spirit’s portrayal, throughout the centuries, can be discerned. In fact, despite the lack of detail, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries artists were still able to deduce some fundamental elements from the source text concerning Ariel’s physical appearance, which enabled these artists to interpret and represent this “spirit of the air” (Todd 61). For example, in Watson’s engraving from 1782 (see fig. 1),
Ariel, in the upper right corner of the etching, and invisible to the other characters, is depicted as neither male nor female, given that the spirit clearly possesses characteristics of both genders, which is illustrated by the non-gender specific clothes Ariel is wearing. In addition to his clothes, which could be worn by both males and females, his hairstyle is not long enough to be considered feminine, nor short enough to be considered masculine. Furthermore, by representing Ariel as neither male nor female but androgynous, Watson’s engraving refers to the fact that the play only contains one masculine pronoun with reference to the spirit, “Ariel and all his quality” (Shakespeare 1.2.223), which Ariel utters himself. And, this also refers to the fact that the spirit assumes female shapes throughout the play, such as the form of a harpy, in act 3 scene 3, or a nymph, in act 1 scene 2 (Steele Brokaw 26). However, most artists did not agree upon a monotonous portrayal of the spirit, which is the reason why Ariel was depicted slightly different by almost every artist that decided to incorporate Ariel into their works. For instance, Richard Rhodes’ etching, which appeared in Thomas Tegg’s The dramatic works of William Shakespeare in 1812 and was made after John Thurston’s painting (see fig. 5), provides the audience with a different interpretation of the spirit. Unlike Watson’s Ariel, Rhodes’ Ariel is portrayed whilst flying (see chapter 2) and also appears to be a lot younger, as a result of which Rhodes’ depiction of Ariel evokes the image of the angelic cherubim and refers to the fact that, during the Renaissance, the androgynous spirit would have been performed by adolescent boys. This not only was the case because Renaissance women were prohibited from performing onstage, but also because these adolescent boys could more easily be perceived as androgynous, given that their bodies and voices were still changing (Gay 155). And thus, this engraving clearly demonstrates that Rhodes incorporated the traditional Renaissance onstage portrayal of the spirit into a different medium.

Not only did many artists represent the spirit as an androgynous adult or as a young child, by which they incorporated the source text’s ambiguous references to the spirit’s
gender, but also as a spirit whose gender is more clearly distinguishable. Though Bartolozzi’s engraving (see fig. 4), which dates from 1793 and was made after Henry William Bunbury’s painting, depicts Ariel in a similar fashion to Rhodes’ androgynous spirit, Bartolozzi’s depiction of Ariel also incorporates female characteristics, whereby the spirit appears to be slightly more feminine than androgy nous. In fact, the soft curvature of the spirit’s arms and legs, and the way in which the long garment clings to Ariel’s legs, reveal the spirit’s rather feminine bodily curves. However, other artists decided to ignore the androgynous gender of the spirit altogether and instead portrayed Ariel as an unmistakable female spirit, which refers to the fact that from the eighteenth century onwards, the “part of Ariel [became] a coveted female role” (Bate and Rasmussen, “The Tempest” 121), as women were allowed to perform on stage from 1660 onwards and, consequently, increasingly did so. As a matter of fact, William Sharp’s engraving from 1783 (see fig. 2) clearly depicts Ariel as a female spirit, since Ariel’s facial features appear to be very similar to Miranda’s, and the spirit is portrayed with uncovered breasts and butterfly-type wings, which are reminiscent of fairy wings and, unlike the wings in Rhodes’ etching, come across as very feminine. Nevertheless, once more, certain artists disagreed with these interpretations of the spirit and presumed that Ariel had to be masculine, given that the only personal pronoun that occurs in the source text with reference to the spirit is masculine, and the amount of magical power Ariel possesses should have a masculinizing effect on the physical appearance of the character. To illustrate; Edward J. Portbury’s etching, which dates from the period between 1810 and 1848 (see fig. 7), depicts Ariel as a “male, athletic” (Steele Brokaw 24) spirit of the air, who has no wings and only wears a light piece of fabric, which moves in the air and reveals that the spirit, nevertheless, does have the ability to fly without wings. Thus, the analyses of these engravings demonstrate that the people of the Renaissance society did not have a fixed image of the spirit in their minds.
Like these eighteenth and nineteenth centuries artists, twentieth century theatre companies and actors did not reach a consensus neither on whether Ariel should be represented as a male, a female or an androgynous spirit, which resulted in various interpretations of Ariel on stage. Nevertheless, before the mid-twentieth century, Ariel would mainly have been interpreted by women, who frequently portrayed the spirit by highlighting the feminine aspects of their bodies. In fact, this is exactly how Margaret Leighton (see fig. 11) depicted Ariel in 1952, given that she wore very feminine make-up and a revealing costume that not only emphasized the curves of her body, but also, in combination with the airy hairstyle, referred to the spirit’s magical powers. Though Leighton’s Ariel no longer had wings, which made Ariel stand out as a spirit in previous centuries, her physical appearance incorporated elements of the nature Ariel inhabits, which clearly indicate that Ariel is not human. Thereafter, from the mid-twentieth century onwards, Ariel has mainly been interpreted by male actors, who portrayed the spirit either as a “hyper-masculine” (Steele Brokaw 24) spirit or as the androgynous spirit from the source text. For example, in 1951, Alan Badel’s (see fig. 12) depiction of Ariel has a very muscular, unmistakably masculine body, without wings, and is almost entirely naked, which most actors saw as the best way to depict the spirit, since it allowed the actor to expose his vulnerability, which refers to the fact that Ariel is in service of Prospero and has to do whatever the sorcerer asks him to do (Steele Brokaw 24). In later years, most actors decided to depict the spirit as the androgynous spirit from the source text, which David Dixon demonstrated (see fig. 15), in the BBC Television adaption of the play in 1980, by using his body in a fashion that incorporated both masculine and feminine characteristics of movement. However, Dixon’s Ariel did also incorporate elements from Badel’s and Leighton’s depiction of the spirit, such as the fact that he does not have wings to indicate that he is a spirit, but instead uses his movement and the similarity
between the colour of his almost naked body and the surrounding dirt and rocks to demonstrate the spirit’s powers over, and his affinity with, nature.

Though more and more twentieth century male actors portrayed Ariel as an androgynous half-naked spirit, whose physical appearance incorporates elements from the surrounding nature, certain actors decided to drastically change the spirit’s physical appearance in their interpretations on the stage. For example, Julian Bleach’s Ariel (see fig. 17), in the 2006 Royal Shakespeare Company production by Rupert Goold, wore a black robe that completely covered his body from the neck down, which makes it impossible to determine his gender, given that this robe appears to combine the feminine characteristics of a dress with the masculine characteristics of a monk’s robe and, consequently, makes Ariel come across as an androgynous spirit (Steele Brokaw 31). Nevertheless, this depiction of the spirit is, without doubt, very different from the previous interpretations of Ariel, as he has “white skin and [wears] black robes” (Attwell) instead of light, airy clothes or being almost naked, which, in combination with the fact that he is more aggressive than the spirit in the source text and the fact that he does not appear to be in contact with nature at all, cause him to come across as a more ghost-like creature. Additionally, the heavy black robe almost makes him appear as merely being a floating head, which also enhances the apparent ghostliness of the spirit (Steele Brokaw 32). However, this is only one exception to the many depictions of Ariel as an androgynous half-naked spirit who is eager to please his master and has a very close relationship with nature, which Audrey Luna demonstrated in Adès’ 2010 opera rendition (see fig. 29). As a matter of fact, Luna’s portrayal of Ariel shows that women are also capable of interpreting the androgynous spirit without making him come across as a woman, given that the audience does not even notice that, instead of Luna, a male stunt double spins on a chandelier during the opening scene of the opera (see scene 5). Furthermore, her costume is made to look like her skin and she uses her body in a way that
combines the elegance of female movements with the strength of male movements, by which Luna’s Ariel appears to be very similar to Dixon’s androgynous interpretation of the spirit. Thus, the depiction of Ariel has evolved from the androgynous representation by adolescent Renaissance boys, which is reminiscent of the cherubim, to a more fairy-type spirit who could be male, female or androgynous in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, which, in the following centuries, evolved to the predominant representation of an almost naked, androgynous wingless spirit.

c. Caliban and the representation of his magical lineage. Even though, unlike Prospero and Ariel, Caliban does not have the ability to use any magic and, consequently, cannot command the elements of nature or any of the magical creatures Caliban has lived among his entire life, on the island, Caliban’s physical appearance has been determined by magic, which, throughout the centuries, has been interpreted in different ways by numerous artists and actors. For instance; in Watson’s engraving (see fig. 1), which dates from 1782, the depiction of Caliban, who is standing on the far left of the engraving, incorporates the few physical descriptions of Caliban the source text provides, which clearly created the image of Caliban as “a misshapen knave” (Shakespeare 5.1.302) and a “half-man monster […] but with human head and limbs” (Harding 69-84) in the minds of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries artists, given that Watson’s Caliban is portrayed as a dark skinned individual, who appears to be a normal, muscular human man from the neck down, but unfortunately has a slightly egg shaped head and pointy ears. Thus, this engraving demonstrates that Caliban’s physical appearance has been altered as a consequence of the fact that he is the product of the union between the maleficent witch Sycorax, who was exiled from Algiers, instead of being executed for her crimes as she was pregnant with Caliban, and the Devil, which refers to the popular belief of the Renaissance that certain women did have “sexual relations with […] the Devil” (Herrington 469). Additionally, Sharp’s engraving (see fig. 2), from 1783, contains a very similar representation of Caliban, who is depicted on the
right side of the engraving, given that his skin is also dark coloured and his body, from the neck down, also appears to be that of a normal male human being. Nevertheless, Sharp’s depiction of Caliban is not identical to Watson’s Caliban, since his facial features, such as his nose, lower teeth and ears, show even more signs of deformation, by which Caliban’s face looks like the strange combination of a boar’s face and the face of a human.

While it may be true that some artists represented Caliban as a male human being whose magical parentage caused the distortion of his facial features, other artist depicted him either as a monstrous creature, whose entire body is distorted, or as a normal looking human being, who does not have any distorted features at all. Actually, in William Bromley’s engraving (see fig. 8), which dates from 1794 and was made after Reverend William Peter’s painting, Caliban, on the right, is depicted as a “rough, rustic peasant” (Thomson 137) whose skin colour is white, which refers to the fact that not all Renaissance actors, who were “homogenously Anglo-Saxon” (Taylor 11), would have blackened their bodies in order to play this role. Additionally, his physical appearance does not seem to reflect any parental relationship with the Devil and, therefore, the identity of Caliban can only be ascertained because he is the only person kneeling and carrying a bushel of wood on his shoulder, which reveals that he is the servant of Prospero. Also, the fact that Caliban looks tired, overworked, and he only wears a piece of cloth to cover his body, which is reminiscent of the clothes Caliban wore in Watson’s and Sharp’s etchings, also indicate that he has to do whatever Prospero commands him to do. Nevertheless, these three engravings do not portray Caliban in a way that causes the audience to feel sympathy for the creature. In fact, it was not until the beginning of the nineteenth century in print, and the middle of the nineteenth century in theatre, that artists and actors started to offer more “sympathetic conceptions of Caliban” (Thomson 137), which, consequently, resulted in more monstrous depictions of the creature (Bate and Rasmussen, “The Tempest” 102; Thomson 137). This can, for example, be seen in
Henry James Richter’s’ print from 1829 (see fig. 6), wherein Caliban is represented as a serpentine monster, with claws, scales all over his body and horns on his forehead. Though this print does not evoke much sympathy for Caliban, Thomas Stothard’s drawing (see fig. 10), from circa 1798, does, given that this drawing portrays a more “apish Caliban” (Bate and Rasmussen, “The Tempest” 103), with hair all over his body, claws and pointy teeth, who is being attacked by “adders” (Shakespeare 2.2.13), which are spirits that Prospero, through Ariel, ordered to torment Caliban. As a result, this engraving demonstrates that the society of the nineteenth century slowly began to question Prospero’s claim on the island and started to feel sorry for the creature Caliban.

Nevertheless, the tendency of interpreting and representing Caliban as a sympathy evoking, apish looking creature continued to dominate the stage until the second half of the twentieth century, when actors decided to modernize Caliban’s appearance and make him more appealing to the audience. In fact, one of the last animalized depictions of Caliban (see fig. 16) appeared in John Gorrie’s BBC Television adaption of the play, which dates from 1980, wherein Warren Clarke portrays a Caliban whose monstrous physical features have already greatly decreased. Unlike Richter’s and Stothard’s Calibans, Clarke’s Caliban no longer has claws, pointy teeth or any distorted facial features, which, in combination with the fact that he makes minimal animalistic movements, make him appear very similar to the other characters on the screen, even if his body is entirely covered with hair and he does not wear any clothes. Furthermore, he uses his body and voice in a fashion that evokes sympathy and demonstrates that society began to interpret Caliban as a “noble savage” (Bate and Rasmussen, “The Tempest” 104) instead of a mere monstrous animalized creature. Additionally, increasingly more productions and actors began to depict Caliban as a black skinned individual, by which they compared the situation on the island to the American history of slavery and, consequently, evoked sympathy for the character (Bate and
Rasmussen, “The Tempest” 103-104). As a matter of fact, in the 1978 Royal Shakespeare Company production, David Suchet (see fig. 13) interpreted Caliban as a black person, who is wearing African-tribal inspired pants, which seem to have been assembled by Caliban himself using pieces of cloth and vines, which he found in nature, as thread. Also, since Suchet is a Caucasian man, he had to alter his skin colour by blackening it, very much like the actors in the Renaissance frequently did (Taylor 11). Therefore, by portraying Caliban in this manner, Suchet immediately evoked sympathy through the image of the black African-American slave, who is a “victim of oppression” (Bate and Rasmussen, “The Tempest” 102) and only wants to be left alone on the island, which he inherited after the death of his mother Sycorax.

Although this particular representation of Caliban as an African-American dominated the stage, twenty-first century actors decided to portray Caliban in a manner that not only evoked sympathy, but also incorporated his magical parentage without animalizing him or making him look monstrous. Undoubtedly, in the 2010 movie adaptation by Julie Taymor, Djimon Hounsou demonstrates (see fig. 23) that it is possible to unite these elements into a single character without making him seem apish or monstrous, or come across as a creature who deserves to be punished by Prospero. To illustrate; Hounsou’s Caliban’s upper layer of skin clearly resembles that of an African-American, but the places where the skin has dried up, and peeled off, reveal that he is the child of two magical creatures, as those spots are unnaturally bright and resemble the colour of bleached bones. Also, Hounsou “demonstrates a propensity for shouting his lines as loudly as humanly possible” (Beames)(see scene 4), which shows that the magic in his blood has masculinized him, and that he has only inherited the aggressive masculine features of the Devil and none of the female characteristics from his mother, who is only palimpsestically present in Caliban. By contrast, in Adès’ 2010 opera rendition, Alan Oke (see fig. 33) rendered an entirely different Caliban, given that he was portrayed as a Native-American, who not only wears the colourful attire of a Native-
American chief, but also has war paint on his face, which reveals that Caliban is struggling with his servitude and would do anything in order to be free. Also, he wears a second-skin like costume, which resembles the fur of an ape or bear, because of which he may come across as half man-half animal, even if it is a costume Caliban made in order to protect himself from the weather and, or from animals, who would refrain from attacking him on account of this costume. Consequently, by depicting Caliban as a Native-American, Alan Oke referred to the tragic history of this particular minority in America, which, like Hounsou’s and Suchet’s interpretations of Caliban, once again caused the audience to feel sympathy for the character. Thus, the portrayal of Caliban has undergone a lot of changes from the Renaissance to the twenty-first century, as he is no longer portrayed as a man whose facial features have been distorted as the result of his magical parentage, nor as an animalized monstrous creature, who needs and deserves to be tormented, but as a noble savage, who does no longer have any monstrous features and is part of an ethnic minority group, which consequently evokes sympathy and a feeling of guilt.

2. Macbeth
Contrary to The Tempest, detailed records do exist of certain Renaissance and eighteenth century theatre productions of Macbeth, which was first performed in 1606, in the court of James I of England, who was a fervent believer in the existence of magic and witchcraft, which may have been one of the main reasons why Shakespeare included witches into his play. Not only have these records verified the fact that certain elements of the popular beliefs of the Renaissance influenced the play, but they have also shed some light on how the Weyard Sisters would have been portrayed during Shakespeare’s life and how they would have been depicted immediately after Shakespeare’s death, when the play was adapted by Middleton, in “about 1616” (Taylor 18), given that these records more or less indicate when, and to what degree, the witches’ physical appearance changed. Nevertheless, even though Middleton’s rewriting of the original text became the new standard, despite attempts to “restore the
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[original] Shakespeare text” (Gay 158), depictions and renderings of the witches continued to be subject to change, which can be discerned by comparing the rewritten source text, wherein Banquo describes the witches in act 1 scene 3, to engravings made in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, which also incorporated society’s popular beliefs and offer a more detailed visualization of the witches’ physical appearance. Lastly, by comparing Banquo’s description and these eighteenth and nineteenth centuries engravings to twentieth and twenty-first centuries productions of the play, it is possible to determine in what ways the representation of these witches has evolved and to what degree the popular beliefs have influenced it throughout the centuries.

a. The Weyard Sisters and the representation of witches.
On account of the extant detailed records, which describe how the Weyard Sisters would have been interpreted on the Renaissance stage, before and after the play was adapted, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries artists were able to portray and incorporate the original Shakespearean physical appearance of the witches into their works. For example, Antoine Jean Baptiste’s engraving (see fig. 35), which appeared in the paratext of an unidentified edition of Shakespeare’s works and was made in circa 1818 after Georg Emmanuel Opiz’s painting, portrays three female figures, in the background, who do not appear to be witches at all, by which Baptiste refers to a theatre production, which was performed in 1616, not long before Shakespeare died, wherein the witches were portrayed by boy actors as “fair nymphs” (Taylor 18), which Simon Forman reportedly witnessed (Braunmuller 57; Taylor 18). Not only do the three sisters in Baptiste’s engraving resemble nymphs, who are Greek spirits “imagined as taking the form of a maiden inhabiting the sea, rivers, mountains, woods, trees“ (OED, meaning 1), given that they are standing in close proximity of a tree and are wearing semi-transparent Greek robes, but also the Greek Moirai, or Fates (Kranz 370). However, practically all the other eighteenth and nineteenth centuries engravings that depict the Weyard Sisters reveal how the witches would have been presented on stage after Middleton rewrote
the play, shortly after Shakespeare’s death in 1616. One of these engravings, which was made by John Keyse Sherwin in 1778 (see fig. 36) after John Michael Rysbrack’s painting, depicts three old haggard women in rags, which no longer cover their breasts, and of whom the two sisters on the right appear to be wearing the remnants of an undergarment. Without doubt, this engraving was based on Banquo’s description of the Weyard Sisters in scene 1 act 3 of the adapted source text, wherein he states that the witches are “[s]o withered and so wild in their attire” (Shakespeare 1.3.41) and do not appear to be women as “[their] beards forbid [him] to interpret/[t]hat [they] are so” (Shakespeare 1.3.47-48), as a result of which Renaissance male adult and boy actors would have been able to interpret the role of the Weyard Sisters on the stage (Taylor 18). Even though Sherwin’s witches do not have beards, which is how they were “familiar to the Elizabethan public” (Curry 395), his engraving does demonstrate that the Weyard Sisters’ physical appearance drastically changed in the early seventeenth century productions.

Nevertheless, in contrast to Sherwin’s undeniably female witches, most eighteenth and nineteenth centuries artists demonstrated that it was certainly possible to incorporate a more masculinized interpretation of the witches into their engravings without giving them beards. In fact, Charles Taylor’s engraving (see fig. 37), which was made after Henry Singleton’s painting in the period between 1784 and 1823, portrays the Weyard Sisters wearing a robe and a cape, which cover most of their bodies and make it impossible to distinguish any female body features. Also, the witches’ facial features, especially the face of the Weyard Sister in the foreground of the engraving, not only incorporate features usually associated with old women, but also features usually associated with men, which demonstrates that as a result of using magic for many years, the witches have become “somewhat masculinized” (Magnarelli 377). However, this masculinization of the witches is even more apparent in Robert Thew’s engraving from 1802 (see fig. 38), which was made after Sir Joshua Reynolds painting, given
that the witches, in the lower right corner, do not resemble women at all. As a matter of fact, in this engraving, the two outer Weyard Sisters are depicted with humorous distorted faces and muscular arms whereas the middle of the Weyard Sisters has the face of an old man, which, in combination with the fact that she, in contrast to the other sisters who are wearing dark-coloured garbs, is wearing a sophisticated white robe and headdress, causes her to come across as the most powerful Weyard Sister, whose enormous magical powers have changed her physical appearance into that of a man. Nevertheless, instead of interpreting the middle figure as the most powerful one of the witches, she could also be interpreted as being Hecate, the Greek goddess “presiding over witchcraft and magical rites” (OED meaning 1.c), who, even though she was added by Middleton, should not appear in the scene portrayed by this engraving (Taylor 18). Furthermore, through the somewhat comical masculine representation of the two outer witches, Thew refers to the fact that the witches had mainly been interpreted as comical figures for most of “the play’s performance history” (Braunmuller 31), which would last until the early twentieth century and enabled the audience to laugh with, instead of fearing, witches and magic.

Even though there was a long tradition of portraying the witches as comical characters in theatre productions of the play, most twentieth century theatre companies decided to depict them in a more serious fashion. As a matter of fact, in the 1974 Royal Shakespeare Company production of the play, which was directed by Trevor Nunn, the Weyard Sisters (see fig. 41 and 42) are rendered by three actresses, whose physical appearance is reminiscent of homeless women, as they are wearing old, raggedy clothes and look as if they have not bathed in months. As a result, Nunn’s witches appear to be depicted in a very similar fashion to the witches described by Banquo in the source text and portrayed in Baptiste’s engraving (see fig. 22), even though, unlike Baptiste’s witches, Nunn’s witches are not presented with bare breasts. Additionally, the three actresses are of a different age, which they use in order to
demonstrate what the effects of using magic are on the human mind and the body. For example, the youngest sister, in the middle of fig. 42, appears to be mentally instable or brain-damaged, as excessive amounts of saliva dribble out of her mouth whilst she speaks (see scene 9). Also, she acts in a very childlike manner and frequently stares at nothing, especially when she first appears on stage, which illustrates that the incantations she and her sisters say have an immense impact on her body, which cannot handle all this power yet. Therefore, contrary to the youngest sister, the two other sisters, appear to be very confident and very powerful, especially the eldest sister, on the right of fig. 42, who is the leader of the group and whose body has had many years to grow accustomed to the effects of powerful magic. Furthermore, their body language and the calm manner in which they speak immediately reveals to the audience that these witches are not “‘natural’, but created, created- violently and with absolute evil- by forces” (Braunmuller 83), as a result of which the play demonstrates that twentieth century depictions of the Weyard Sisters had become more “fearsome and demonic” (Braunmuller 31) than the portrayals of the witches in the previous centuries. Also, by portraying the Weyard Sisters as evil and demonic instead of comical, Nunn’s production incorporated the twentieth century society’s growing fascination with magic, as they no longer feared or believed in it.

In later years, and especially in the twenty-first century, many actresses not only decided to portray the Weyard Sister as the fearsome witches that appeared in Trevor Nunn’s production of the play, but also to further enhance the fearsome qualities of the witches and make them come across as truly terrifying magical creatures, which these actresses conveyed through their physical appearance and body language. For instance, in the 2010 movie adaptation of the play (see fig. 44), which was directed by Rupert Goold and based on the Chisester Festival Theatre production of the play, the appearance of the Weyard Sisters is frightening to say the least. Unlike Nunn’s witches in rags (see fig. 41), Goold’s witches are
presented as “military nurses” (Braunmuller 67) who, correspondingly, are wearing dark grey and white coloured nurse outfits, which not only cover their hair, but their entire bodies, including the neck area up to the chin, leaving only their hands and faces uncovered. Consequently, these outfits have a rather masculinizing effect on the Weyard Sisters’ physical appearance, given that the style of these outfits neutralize most of the witches’ female bodily curves and characteristics, making the witches seem more muscular. Furthermore, especially in act 4 scene 1 of the play (see scene 12), the actresses move their bodies in twitching, jerking motions, which enhance the notion that they are not normal human beings, but instead demonic creatures or, possibly, women who are possessed by demons. Moreover, the actresses use their voices in a threatening fashion, since they say all of their lines with an underlying sense of anger and aggressiveness, which, in combination with the Weyard Sisters’ rather masculinized physical appearance and twitching body movements, causes Goold’s witches to come across as immensely frightening and terrifying creatures. Thus, whereas Nunn’s Weyard Sisters appeared to be somewhat frightening and devilish, Rupert Goold’s portrayal of the witches raises the hairs on the back of the audience member’s necks and causes the people who are unfamiliar with the play to wrongly consider that the sisters themselves could and would kill Macbeth and the other characters at any moment. Therefore, this twenty-first century production demonstrates that the witches have gone through an enormous evolution, since they are no longer interpreted as the nymphs, who appeared on stage before Middleton’s adaptation in 1616, nor as the comical bearded women that were frequently depicted in seventeenth century productions and enabled the audience to ridicule the witches instead of fearing them. Moreover, the Weyard Sisters are no longer depicted as the beardless, but still masculinized and comical witches, as they appeared in theatre productions up till the early twentieth century, but instead as the fear inspiring and truly
demonic witches, who occasionally are presented in rags and cause the audience to fear them, even though they no longer believe in magic or witchcraft.

3. **Doctor Faustus**

Despite the fact that Shakespeare’s plays have become increasingly popular in the course of the last centuries, his plays did not receive the same praise during the Renaissance, given that one of the Renaissance people’s most beloved plays was Cristopher Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*, which was performed for the first time in 1594 and was presumably written in the period between 1588 and 1592 (Taylor 18; Halpern 455-458). Without doubt, the people of the Renaissance not only became intrigued with the play after they learned that *Doctor Faustus* was based on the sixteenth century German “learned magician” (Bailey 187) Johann Faust, who was believed to have sold his soul to the Devil, but also because there were a lot of suspicions that Marlowe might have been a wizard himself (Bailey 187; Wilson 39). However, in contrast with the popularity of Marlowe’s play during the Renaissance, there only exist a few Renaissance engravings that depict Faustus as he would have been interpreted on stage, and a few records of Renaissance theatre productions, which unfortunately do not contain elaborate descriptions of the physical appearance, the costumes or the body language of the actors who interpreted Faustus and Mephistopheles. Furthermore, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries artists were more interested in Shakespeare’s plays than they were in *Doctor Faustus*, as a result of which hardly any to none drawings were made in the course of these centuries. Nevertheless, the source text contains a few elements and stage directions, which make it possible to compare the source text to the few existing Renaissance drawings, and to the twentieth and twenty-first centuries theatre productions of the play, in order to understand how the portrayal of the magician Faustus and the demon Mephistopheles changed from the Renaissance onwards.
b. **The visualisation of Faustus and the demon Mephistopheles.**
From the first performance of Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus* onwards, the play became one of the Renaissance people’s most beloved plays, which is undoubtedly one of the reasons why the publishers of ‘The History of the Damnable Life, and deserved Death of Dr. John Faustus’ decided to embellish the paratextual title-page with a woodcut (see fig. 47), which, according to the custom that perpetuated for many centuries, does not mention the name of Marlowe (Genette 42). As a matter of fact, in this woodcut, which was presumably made circa 1592, Faustus is depicted in contemporary “Elizabethan clothes” (Taylor 13), given that he is wearing a dark, almost black, coloured scholarly robe, which closes at the neck, as it cannot be buttoned down, and whose sleeves, and part of the front piece, are made out of a lighter coloured fur. Furthermore, in addition to the fact that Faustus has shortly trimmed hair and a moustache, he also wears a plumed scholarly hat and a ruff, which is the typical “detachable article of neckwear characteristic of Elizabethan and Jacobean costume” (OED meaning 2.a). As a result, this woodcut undeniably depicts Faustus as a scholar, which refers to the prologue of the source text wherein the chorus states that “[t]he fruitful plot of scholarism graced/ [t]hat shortly he was graced with doctor’s name” (Marlowe Prologue 16-17). Nevertheless, the woodcut not only portrays Faustus as a scholar, but also as a magician, since he appears to be wearing another robe, which is reminiscent of the typical robe associated with sorcerers, underneath his scholarly robe, and he appears to be very confident and in full control of the situation. In addition, this woodcut also depicts Mephistopheles at the moment when he is being summoned by Faustus, before the magician orders him to “[g]o, and return an old Franciscan friar” (Marlowe 1.3.25), as he is too ugly. To enumerate, Mephistopheles is portrayed as a demonic creature, who is entirely covered in black-coloured skin and also has horns on his forehead, arms that can be used as wings, claws on his hands and a tail. Therefore, this woodcut demonstrates how Doctor Faustus and Mephistopheles could, and
most likely would, have been interpreted by actors on the Renaissance stage from the first performance of the play onwards.

Though the woodcut portrays the sorcerer in the prime of his life, some seventeenth century artists decided to depict an older Faustus who has used magic and commanded Mephistopheles for many years. One of these engravings was made by Rembrandt (see fig. 48), in circa 1652, and reveals a Faustus who is coming to the end of his life and will soon be dragged to “ugly hell” (Marlowe 5.2.114) by Lucifer and Mephistopheles. As a matter of fact, in this engraving, the sorcerer is no longer depicted in an adorned scholarly robe, but instead in a more tattered version of that same scholarly robe, as it has lost all the fur and has become grey-toned instead of black. And, since the fur sleeves of his robe have disintegrated, Faustus’ arms are only covered up to his elbows, as a result of which the lower parts of his arms reveal that he is also wearing a black coat and white shirt underneath this tattered robe. Also, instead of a plumed scholarly hat, he is wearing a cap, which is a hat without “a brim, and […] being usually of some soft material” (OED meaning 4.a), which also refers to Faustus’s age, as he appears to use this cap in order to keep his head warm. Moreover, Faustus comes across as a confident magician who is in complete control of the situation, even though he is standing in a slightly hunched over position in order to read his book, and his facial features demonstrate that the very powerful magical “utterances” (Cartwright 342) he has expressed during his life have had an impact on his physical health, as his cheeks and the area around his temple appears to be sunken in. As a result, this engraving not only reveals that Faustus is still a scholar when he approaches the end of his life, but also that the years of saying magical utterances and commanding Mephistopheles, who is not incorporated into this engraving, have had an impact on his physical health and appearance, which seventeenth century actors could have demonstrated though the use of stage make-up.
Similarly to Rembrandt’s engraving and the woodcut, which depict Faustus in contemporary Elizabethan scholarly clothes, most actors, in the course of the twentieth century, decided to portray Faustus and Mephistopheles as they are described in the source text, although with some modern alterations. For example, in director Nevill Coghill 1967 movie adaptation of the play, which he based on “his Oxford Playhouse production” (Potter 63), Richard Burton, who interpreted Faustus (see fig. 49 and 50), and Andreas Teuber, who interpreted Mephistopheles (see fig. 50), wore costumes made out of modern fabrics, inspired by the clothes nineteenth century German scholars and monks wore, which reflects the fact that Faustus lives in the German city Wittenberg. In fact, throughout the play, Burton’s Faustus wore a nineteenth century German black scholarly robe and a maroon vest, which has gold embroidery around the edges, a nineteenth century shirt and various necklaces, which he wore underneath his robe. As a result, these elements caused the audience to immediately realize that Faustus is a respected learned scholar, since most audience members would have been familiar with these types of costumes, which were, without doubt, used in earlier productions of other plays. Therefore, Coghill’s movie adaptation not only seems to follow the Renaissance tradition of wearing clothes made out of contemporary fabrics, in order to make Faustus and Mephistopheles more accessible and recognizable for the audience, but also breaks with the Renaissance stage tradition, given that the characters are not wearing contemporary but, predominantly, eighteenth century German inspired costumes (Taylor 13; Gay 167). Furthermore, although Faustus is initially portrayed as an older scholar, which reveals that he could only have acquired all of his knowledge after years and years of study, Faustus’ physical appearances changes into that of a young scholar once he signs his contract with the Devil (see scene 15), which refers to the popular Elizabethan belief that magic has the power to rejuvenate people and give them the opportunity to relive the prime of their lives. Additionally, whereas Burton’s Faustus loses his initial confidence throughout the movie,
Dekeyser’s Mephistopheles, who is portrayed as a bald Franciscan monk and appears to be wearing a Benedictine instead of a Franciscan inspired robe, maintains his confidence. As a result, Coghill’s movie adaptation demonstrates that actors in the twentieth century chose to provide the audience with a modern interpretation of these characters, instead of trying to depict them as they might have been interpreted by actors on the Renaissance stage.

Nevertheless, contrary to Nevill Coghill’s movie adaptation, wherein Faustus and Mephistopheles are portrayed in eighteenth century dress, some twentieth century actors depicted these characters as Marlowe most likely would have envisioned them. As a matter of fact, in the first performance of Marlowe’s play at the Globe, which took place in 2011 and was directed by Matthew Dunster, both Faustus and Mephistopheles (see fig. 53, 54 and 55) were wearing Renaissance inspired costumes (Hitchings). For instance, at the beginning of the play, Paul Hilton’s Faustus (see fig. 54) is wearing a black cap and a black coat, with a white shirt underneath, which is reminiscent of the coat and shirt Rembrandt’s Faustus wears underneath his robe (see fig. 48). However, in the scene where Faustus returns to Wittenberg, after his journeys, Hilton’s costume changes into a black, satin-like robe (see fig. 53), which has fur around the edges and demonstrates that Faustus has become a well-praised learned scholar. In addition to this, he also wears a “maroon skull cap[]” (Coveney), which not only is identical to the one Arthur Darvil’s Mephistopheles (see fig. 58) wears when he is summoned by Faustus, but also implies that Faustus would never have become highly respected without Mephistopheles. Furthermore, the importance of Mephistopheles is also demonstrated by certain elements of his own costume, given that he is wearing highly detailed satin, or silk, embroidered vests, and matching pants, in black and red, and a cape, as a result of which Darvill’s Mephistopheles comes across as a member of the Renaissance aristocracy, who has a lot of magical power. Additionally, through the fact that Hilton’s Faustus used his voice in a very specific way and used it to emphasize specific words, which appear to entice his
curiosity or desire, Faustus is portrayed as a confident and “lonely, restless, curious scholar, intoxicated by risk and knowledge” (Hitchings), which he enhanced even more by means of his body language. By contrast, Darvill’s Mephistopheles used his voice and body in a fashion that depicted him as a “suave, sardonic and ambiguous” (Hitchings) demon who possesses very powerful magic and is patiently awaiting the moment when he can finally take Faustus’s soul to hell. Thus, Dunster’s theatre production used contemporary fabrics in order to recreate Renaissance costumes and, by extension, the physical appearance of Faustus and Mephistopheles as they would have been portrayed on the Renaissance stage, as a result of which Hilton’s Faustus is interpreted very similarly to how the woodcut (see fig. 47) and Rembrandt’s engraving portrayed him. Also, this theatre production demonstrates that the portrayal of Faustus on stage has not evolved in a significant way since the Renaissance, given that he is still wearing Renaissance contemporary clothes made out of modern fabrics in twenty-first century productions of the play. And, because of this, Dunster, like Coghill, not only followed the stage tradition of Renaissance theatre companies, but also broke with it.

4. Preliminary conclusion.
By comparing the Renaissance source texts of Shakespeare’s The Tempest, Macbeth, and Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus to eighteenth and nineteenth centuries engravings, and twentieth and twenty-first centuries productions of these plays, it has become apparent that the physical appearance of Prospero, Ariel, Caliban and the Weyard Sisters have significantly changed throughout the centuries. As a matter of fact, in present-day productions of The Tempest, actors no longer portray Prospero as a very old, learned sorcerer, who has a beard and wears a traditional wizard’s robe, but instead they interpret him as a middle-aged sorcerer, who has no beard and wears a modernized costume. Furthermore, the portrayal of the spirit Ariel has undergone even more changes, given that, in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, Ariel is presented as an almost naked, androgynous, wingless spirit instead of the male, female or androgynous interpretations of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries fairy-type spirit, or the
original portrayal of the spirit by adolescent, androgynous looking, Renaissance boys, who were reminiscent of the cherubim. Nevertheless, Caliban’s physical appearance has evolved the most, since he is no longer portrayed as a man who, because he is the child of the Devil and the witch Sycorax, has distorted facial features or as a monstrous creature, who behaves like an animal, but instead as a noble savage, who does not have any monstrous features and appears to be a member of an ethnic minority, through which these actors caused the audience to feel sympathy for Caliban. However, unlike these three characters, Macbeth’s Weyard Sisters were rewritten shortly after Shakespeare died, as a result of which the Weyard Sisters were no longer portrayed as nymphs, but as comical bearded witches in Renaissance productions of the play, and masculinized, yet beardless comical witches in theatre productions up till the early twentieth century, which evolved into the portrayal of fear inspiring and truly demonic witches in the twenty-first century. With regards to Doctor Faustus, it is, unfortunately, impossible to discern significant changes in the physical appearance of Faustus and Mephistopheles, given that there are almost no existing engravings of these characters and most present-day productions try to portray them as they, most likely, would have been portrayed during the Renaissance.

V. Chapter 2. The use of properties, special effects and other elements to enhance the depiction of magical characters in print and on the stage.

Throughout the performance history of Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus, and Shakespeare’s The Tempest and Macbeth body language, voice and costumes have always played an important role in the portrayal of credible magical characters on the stage. Nevertheless, in addition to these elements, which already indicate the magical features of certain characters at first glance, other elements, such as music, certain special effects, hand gestures and properties (props) can enhance the magical appearance of these plays’ magical characters even more. Though Renaissance theatre companies were not able to utilize sophisticated light installations or other machines, which, in the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries, enabled
many theatre companies to create visually stunning productions of *The Tempest*, *Macbeth* and *Doctor Faustus*, they kept searching for new and convincing ways to represent the sorcerers, spirits, witches and other magical creatures that appear in these plays. As a result of these limitations, the people of the Renaissance and later centuries could and, without doubt, would have used their imagination to “suppose or imagine what [could not] be represented in performance” (Dessen 9), which they were able to do because they believed in, and feared, magic and the supernatural. Consequently, the audience would have aided the actors in creating productions that could immerse the spectators into the magical worlds of these plays. However, in the course of the last centuries, the popular beliefs changed and the audience members became increasingly less willing and capable of imagining the things that could not be reproduced on stage, as a result of which the music, scenery, special effects and the props also changed. Therefore, in order to shed a light on the ways in which the elements used to enhance the magical appearance of specific characters have evolved in productions of *The Tempest*, *Macbeth* and *Doctor Faustus*, I am going to compare the source texts, which contain some stage directions and references to props, and the very few existing records of some of these plays’ seventeenth century productions, to eighteenth and nineteenth centuries engravings, which offer a visual representation of, especially, the props and hand gestures used by these magical characters on the stage, and contemporary productions.

1. **Elements used to enhance the magical atmosphere of *The Tempest***.

Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* is one of the most magical plays he wrote, given that it not only presents a sorcerer and a spirit on the stage, but also nymphs, reapers and other magical creatures, as a result of which, for centuries, actors have had the difficult task of depicting these characters as separate identities, who possess different magical powers and are part of the same magical community on the island. Therefore, from the play’s first performance in 1611 onwards, most theatre companies decided to use music, certain hand gestures, special effects, props and certain stage-features to enhance and convince the audience of these
character’s magical properties. And, the type of theatre wherein the play was performed could reinforce the magical properties of the entire performance of the play, and by extension the characters, as, for example, the Renaissance indoor theatre Blackfriars, where Shakespeare was “granted the right to perform” (Stern 54) in 1608, demonstrates. In fact, here the yellowish candlelight and the smoke of tobacco and wicks already created a magical atmosphere even before the play started (Stern 54). Furthermore, certain props, which had to be small enough so they could be “carried on and off the stage” (Taylor 16) by the Renaissance actors, have had a symbolical meaning for centuries and are still able to instantly indicate that Prospero is a sorcerer, or Ariel a spirit, in contemporary productions. Nevertheless, throughout the centuries, many of these elements have, undoubtedly, developed and been altered. Therefore, it is possible to compare the source text to eighteenth and nineteenth centuries engravings, which often also portrayed these elements, and to present-day productions of the play, in order to determine in what ways the technological developments and changing popular beliefs have influenced the portrayal of Prospero’s, Ariel’s and, to a lesser extent, Caliban’s magical properties.

Even though the first scene of The Tempest does not contain any magical characters, it already demonstrates the magical atmosphere of the play through the storm Prospero orders Ariel to create. Whereas the stage directions in the source text only describe the storm in terms of “a tempestuous noise of thunder and lightning” (Shakespeare 1.1), Charles Warren’s engraving (see fig. 9), which dates from 1805 and was made after Henry Thomson, reveals the devastating nature of this magical storm. As a matter of fact, on the right side of the engraving, the tempest is mainly rendered as a multitude of waves, dark clouds and lightning bolts, which emanate from a single opening in the black clouds and, consequently, appear to be thrown by the god Jupiter, who, according to Ariel in act 1 scene 2 of the source text, is under the spirit’s control. Additionally, the shape of the engraving’s lightning bolts refer to
the fact that, from the seventeenth century onwards, theatre companies would either have represented these as “cut-out zig-zags” (Lennard 97), which would have been shown to the audience for a brief period of time, or as flares, which would have been created by throwing rosin powder at candles (Harris 465; Lennard 97). Further, these companies would also have been able to recreate the sound of thunder by using a thunder sheet, by letting a cannon-ball roll down a wooden trough-like contraption or, less likely, by means of squibs, which not only produced flashes of light, but also made a lot of noise and a foul stench (Harris 465-466; Lennard 97). And, theatre companies would also have been able to recreate the sound of strong gusts of winds, usually associated with a storm of this magnitude, through the use of stage hands who “vocalised sounds” (Dessen 17) or turned a loose length of cloth on a wooden wheel. In addition, the illusion of waves would have been created through the use of a wave machine, which, as the outdoor theatre stage did not use backdrops to indicate a specific place, would have been used to point out that the actors found themselves on a boat in the middle of the storm (Brown; Sofer, “The Stage Life of Props” vi; Taylor 14). Nevertheless, these effects would have been more potent in the indoor theatre, where the fumes from the fireworks, the light effects and the sounds would have been experienced more intensely by the audience (Harris 466). Undoubtedly; these elements would immediately have immersed the audience into the magical atmosphere of the play.

Next to illustrating the magic induced storm, Warren’s engraving also contains other elements that demonstrate the magical character of the play. As a matter of fact, the rendering of Prospero is pointing his left hand in the direction of the storm and appears to be using his magical powers to command Ariel, who, despite the fact that he is the mayor force behind the storm, is not depicted in this engraving. In fact, by omitting Ariel, Warren’s engraving not only refers to the source text wherein Ariel is regularly ordered to “[b]e subject to no sight but thine and mine: invisible” (Shakespeare 1.2.355), but also refers to the fact that Ariel would
not have appeared on the Renaissance stage at this point in the play neither. Also, in addition to the commanding hand gesture, Prospero is holding an elongated staff, which seems unnaturally straight and polished for a staff the sorcerer most likely made during his exile on the island. Actually, Prospero is holding the staff in his right hand, in order to draw a certain amount of power from it and control the spirit with his left hand, by which the engraving refers to the fact that the staff was commonly believed to be an instrument that centres the powers of a sorcerer. Consequently, this engraving demonstrates that Prospero’s staff would have been one of the most significative objects used by actors on the stage, to portray Prospero’s close bond with magic. However, this bond would have been emphasised even more by the sorcerer’s “magic cloak” (Shakespeare 8), given that this object was popularly believed to boost and strengthen the sorcerer’s magical powers. Consequently, when the audience saw the cloak, which Prospero only wears at the beginning of the play, when he commands Ariel to create the storm, and at the end of the play, when Prospero commands the spirit to bring the people who exiled him to a magical circle, wherein they are entranced and rendered motionless, the audience immediately would have known that Prospero would conjure up something complex that required a lot of magical power. However, since Prospero is depicted without his cloak, Warren’s engraving demonstrates that this object had a lot more significance for the audience members than most of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries artists, who paid more attention to the staff.

Though Warren’s engraving only focusses on Prospero and his staff, some eighteenth and nineteenth centuries artists decided to incorporate more than one prop into their works, in order to further enhance the magical properties of the sorcerer. As a matter of fact, unlike Warren’s engraving, Watson’s engraving, which dates from circa 1782 (see fig. 1), portrays Prospero whilst holding his staff in the same hand he uses to perform his magic, by which the staff appears to be a channelling device, which not only concentrates and enhances the
magician’s powers, but also enables Prospero to direct his powers in a more precise direction. Also, in his other hand, the sorcerer is holding a piece of paper, which appears to have astronomical writings on it and not only refers to the rendering of an intricate armillary sphere, which is partially covered by Prospero’s magical cloak, but also the depiction of a telescope and, most likely, astronomy books in the left corner of the engraving. Actually, by incorporating these objects, Watson’s engraving refers to the popular Renaissance belief that every star has a specific effect on the world and that, therefore, sorcerers would make sure to use specific magical powers “in conjunction with a particular planet” (Woodman 28). However, these particular props would not have been utilized on the Renaissance outdoor stage because they would have impeded the scene to scene transitions, as it would have taken too much time to bring these onto the stage (Dawson 241). Instead, Watson’s engraving displays some of the props that would have been used in seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries indoor theatres, wherein “multiple sets” (Dawson 241) could also be used, to indicate and enhance the fact that Prospero is a sorcerer. Nevertheless, some eighteenth and nineteenth centuries engravings reveal the fact that the use of props did not need to be so extensive to convey Prospero’s propensity towards magic. In fact, Potbury’s engraving, which dates from the period between 1810 and 1848 (see fig. 7), represents Prospero in a similar fashion to Watson’s engraving, but instead of a piece of paper, the sorcerer is carrying a magic book. By visualising this book, the engraving refers to the fact that even though some theatre productions would have let the concept of the book take on a “reality all the greater” (Mowat 32) by not showing it to the audience at all, like the magic book in the source text, many “[could] and [would have] staged” (Kearney 434) this very important magical prop in order to enhance the magical appearance of Prospero.

Not only did many of these eighteenth and nineteenth centuries engravings incorporate elements that refer to Prospero’s powers, but also elements that indicate the close bond
between Caliban, Ariel and magic. For example, in the engravings made by Watson (see fig. 1), Sharp (see fig. 2), Portbury (see fig. 7), Bromley (see fig. 8) and others, the depiction of Caliban is placed in a subordinate position to Prospero and the other characters. Actually, in each of these, the rendering of Caliban is placed closer to the ground than any of the other characters, by which these engravings not only immediately make clear that Caliban is a servant, who is seen as a lesser being, but also refer to the way in which the actors who represented Caliban would have moved on the stage. Additionally, underneath this stage there usually was an area “known as ‘Hell’” (Stern 51), which, by means of a trap door, would have been used by certain actors, who were understood by the audience members as usually being demonic in nature, to enter and exit the stage (Stern 52). Consequently, these engravings demonstrate that by placing Caliban closer to the ground, the audience would already have related Caliban to hell even before they knew that he was the child of the maleficent witch Sycorax and the Devil. However, contrary to the depiction of Caliban, most eighteenth and nineteenth centuries engravings placed Ariel in a higher position than Prospero and the other characters. Though Portbury and Sharp’s engravings depict Ariel as a spirit with wings, which shows that the actors who interpreted the spirit on the stage might have worn wing-typed back-pieces in order to convey to the audience that Ariel has the ability to fly, Watson and Tegg’s (see fig. 5) engravings demonstrate that these wings were not instrumental for the actors to indicate that the spirit possesses this ability. As a matter of fact, given that Blackfriars and the Globe, since 1608 or 1609, owned a flying machine, which was made out of a system of pulleys and string, and allowed for the actor to be lowered from the internal roof, which was also called ‘the heavens’, actors were able to convey this ability without wearing any wings (Dobson and Wells 143; Stern 51). As a result, these engravings demonstrate that the fashion in which Ariel and Caliban appeared on the stage could already reveal most of their magical aspects to the audience.
In addition, some artists decided to enhance the magical appearance of Ariel even more by incorporating other elements that refer to the spirit’s magical powers as well. For instance; in the upper-right corner of Watson’s engraving (see fig. 1), Ariel is sitting on top of the clouds, which not only appear to act as a type of veil, which obscures the spirit from the other characters’ sight, but also demonstrates that Ariel has the ability to become invisible and look down upon the other characters on the island, when Prospero commands him to do so. Although it would have been impossible for the actor portraying Ariel to actually turn invisible on the stage, the use of a specific cloak, which not only might have enveloped the entire actor’s body, but also his head and face, enabled the actor to create this illusion nonetheless (Bate and Rasmussen, “The Tempest” 151). Consequently, when the actor wore the cloak, he became a ghost-like figure who wandered on the stage and was only visible to Prospero and the members of the audience. Furthermore, in Watson’s and Bartolozzi’s (see fig. 4) eighteenth century engravings, Ariel is playing the lyre, which is “[a] stringed instrument of the harp kind” (OED meaning 1.a). Though the source text does not specify a specific type of instrument, these engravings seem to suggest that Ariel uses this lyre to create music and accompany the songs he uses to lure certain characters in a chosen direction. As a matter of fact, by incorporating the lyre, these engravings refer to the popular Renaissance belief that there exists a close association between music and magic and that a certain type of music possesses occult power (Austern 191-196-206). Consequently, when the actor who interpreted Ariel appeared on the stage with his lyre and started to perform a song, the audience would immediately have realised that the spirit was using magic to bring a certain character to a specific place. Nevertheless, this magical music had to sound different from everyday, purely entertaining music in order to reveal that this magical music can have a particular influence on the body. Thus, these engravings demonstrate that the lyre and the cloak, used to create the illusion of invisibility, were, in addition to the wings or flight
machine, also able to convey the magical characteristics and powers of Ariel to the audience on stage.

Even though, in later centuries, theatre productions continued to use most of these props, the rapid technological advancements, especially during the latter half of the twentieth century, changed how many of the magical effects were achieved. Particularly in movie adaptations, production companies were able to enhance the magical character of the play through the use of new machines and computer generated special effects. For instance; in the opening scene of John Gorrie’s 1980 BBC Television adaption of the play, the magical storm is manufactured through the use of rain machines, which create the effect of a downpour, through the use of thunder sound footage, which is added to the background of the scene, and by moving and tilting the camera in order to create the effect that the ship is being severely rocked by the waves. Nevertheless, after this initial scene, the camera immediately turns to Michael Hordern’s Prospero, who is standing on top of a cliff, very similar to Warren’s Prospero (see fig. 9), and is still wearing his magical cloak, which cannot be distinguished easily as it has the same colour as his robe. Though, similar to the source text, Prospero does not bring his magical book onto the stage, he is holding his elongated staff (see fig. 14), which seems to be created from a piece of wood he found on the island and has a more rustic appearance than it had in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries engravings. In fact, like Warren’s Prospero, the sorcerer uses the staff as a device that concentrates and enhances his powers, given that he not only uses his staff, but also his other hand to perform magic, which he demonstrates through specific hand gestures. This is demonstrated, for instance, in act 1 scene 2 of the movie, wherein Michael Hordern uses both hand gestures and his staff to create the illusion that he is performing a spell, as a result of which the actor who plays Ferdinand bows and drops his sword. Furthermore, as David Dixon’s wingless Ariel, who only wears a wing-like cape when he impersonates a harpy in act 3 scene 3, does not appear to be able to
fly, computer effects are used to let him appear and disappear from one second to another, by which Ariel comes across as a spirit who has a lot of power. Lastly, by giving Warren Clarke’s Caliban a skin colour that is the darker version of Ariel’s light brown earth-toned skin colour, Caliban appears to be the opposite of the spirit and closer related to the Devil.

This twentieth century movie adaptation used very convincing techniques and props to immerse the audience members, who were no longer capable and willing to “suppose or imagine what [could not] be represented in performance” (Dessen 9), in the magical world of the play. Nevertheless, as the technological possibilities grew, so did the people’s expectations, as a result of which the companies had to change the appearance of the props and use even more convincing, life-like and mind-bending techniques to enhance the magical atmosphere surrounding the play and its magical characters. And, this is exactly what Julie Taymor did in her movie adaptation of the play, which dates from 2010. For instance; in the opening scene of the movie (see scene 1), the magical character of the storm is already apparent at first glance, given that the computer created storm is limited to a certain area (see fig. 18), as the water surrounding the storm in no longer tumultuous, but perfectly still, and the black clouds, which illuminate when the lightning strikes the ocean, seem to go towards the ship in a whirlwind motion. Additionally, for the scenes on the ship, rain and wind machines have been used to create the effect of the pouring rain and the strong gusts of wind usually associated with a tempestuous storm. Furthermore, after this initial scene, the camera immediately turns to Helen Mirren’s Prospera (see fig. 20), who not only wears a magical cloak that “resembles a flow of glittering lava” (Morrow) and reflects the surrounding landscape, but also screams and widens her eyes, through which it is it is apparent that she had to use a lot of magical powers to create the storm. In addition, above her head, in two hands, Prospera is holding her staff, which has detailed carvings at the rounded top, as a result of which she can also use it as a walking stick or a blunt weapon if needed, and appears to be
made out of material she found on the island. Nevertheless, when Prospera uses less demanding magic, she holds her staff in the same hand she uses to perform her magic with, as a result of which she is able to direct the magic in a more precise direction. For instance; in act 1 scene 2 (see scene 3), Helen Mirren’s Prospero targets Ferdinand and moves her staff in a small circular motion, as a result of which he and his sword drop to the ground. And, by utilizing her staff in this fashion, which is reminiscent of a sorcerer’s wand, she convincingly comes across as a very powerful sorcerer who should not be meddled with, which is enhanced by the fact that the movie also portrays her magic books.

With reference to Ben Whishaw representation of Ariel, a lot more computer-generated special effects were used to create the illusion of a magical creature that possesses a lot of magical abilities. As a matter of fact, when the spirit enters the scene in act 1 scene 2, he is first seen as a spirit or nymph of the water who has a semi-transparent body, which remains semi-transparent once Ariel has come out of the water (see scene 2), whereby the background can be seen through the spirit, and makes him come across as an ethereal being (see fig. 21). In fact, throughout the movie, Ariel’s body only ceases to be semi-transparent in act 3 scene 3 when he appears before Alonso, Sebastian and Antonio as a harpy (see fig. 22), the spirit’s body is entirely covered in pitch black make-up, including his teeth and gums, and he is wearing wing-like sleeves, which appear to be made out of crow feathers and add to his terror inspiring appearance. Though Ben Whishaw’s Ariel, like David Dixon’s Ariel, is actually wingless, despite the fact that he appears to have wings in act 3 scene 3, he does possess the ability to fly, which is a computer-generated effect and, like all of his movements, combined with the effect of motion blur, which is “the blurring of the image of a moving object in photographs, film, or video, which occurs when the motion is rapid in relation to film speed” (OED compound). Also, the spirit is able to appear and disappear whenever he pleases and can chose what characters are able to see him, given that when he wakes Gonzalo in act 2
scene 2, only the audience members can see the spirit. Aside from these props and special effects, Dixon’s Ariel uses a specific type of music that not only directs certain characters in the direction of his choosing, but also demonstrates that he is a magical creature, as it has an ethereal and dreamlike character to it, even though it contains both high and low notes. With reference to Djimon Hounsou’s Caliban, by contrast, this production does not use any special effects nor props to enhance his relation with magic. Nevertheless, by moving his body close to the ground (see fig. 24; see scene 4) and regularly banging his fists on the ground, he comes across as the opposite of Ariel, which reflects his magical parentage. And, by using all of these elements, Julie Taymor’s movie adaption successfully creates realistic and very convincing magical characters for an audience that no longer believes in magic and is unwilling to use their own imaginative powers.

Not only did the technological developments allow for the creation of complex elements that are able to enhance the magical atmosphere of the play on the screen, but also on the stage. As a matter of fact, unlike Warren’s engraving (see fig. 9), the opening scene in John Gorrie’s and Julie Taymor’ movie adaptation, Adès’ 2010 opera rendition of the play clearly shows that Ariel generates the magic induced storm. Actually, at the beginning, the stage only contains a miniature ship and a chandelier (see fig. 25; see scene 5), which is then whirled by a stunt-double, who is dressed like Luna’s Ariel and performs acrobatic stunts, and lifted from the ground in order to represent storm clouds in the sky. Additionally, drums and other orchestra instruments are used to create the sounds of thunder and wind gusts, light effects are used to create the illusion of lightning, and a large piece of fabric is brought onto the stage to create the movement of the tumultuous water (see fig. 26). In fact, the ways in which this opera rendition creates the illusion of thunder, wind and waves on the stage, could and would, also have been used in seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries productions of the play. And, immediately after this scene, Keenlyside’s Prospero appears on
the stage wearing a robe-cloak-like garment (see fig. 27), which seems to be made out of the clothes he wore when he was exiled to the island. In addition to the cloak, he is also carrying a very long staff, which, like Hordern and Mirren’s staff, could be used as a walking stick or as an instrument to threaten Caliban with, has a rustic appearance and is clearly designed to look like a thick tree branch Prospero found on the island, as it not only contains natural branch knots, but also smaller branches that are twisted around the centre and small leaves around the top. However, contrary to the traditional representation of the sorcerer, Keenlyside’s Prospero does not need his staff, nor magic book, to perform magic at all, given that he, for instance in act 1 scene 2, only uses a simple hand gesture to stop Ferdinand in his movements (see fig. 28; see scene 7). This particular effect is created by a stagehand’s arm, clad in black, which holds Ferdinand’s sword, once the spell is cast, in order to create the illusion that Ferdinand is unable to move it. Though Prospero’s staff does not have a very important magical function, it still acts a symbol for the audience, since it refers to the traditional image of a sorcerer embedded in the contemporary collective memory of the audience. Consequently, the fashion in which Keenlyside’s Prospero uses these props reveals that the traditional image of the sorcerer is beginning to be altered.

Additionally, special elements were also used by the production company in order to convey the magical powers of Audrey Luna’s Ariel, who, like Whishaws’s depiction of the spirit, is visualised as a wingless spirit, who, nonetheless, possesses the ability to fly. In fact, when Luna enters the stage for the first time, in act 1 scene 3 of the opera, she is standing on a wooden catwalk (see fig. 30) that appears to be lowered and raised by means of pulleys, but actually runs on electricity, and creates the illusion that she is moving in the air. Also, when Prospero commands the spirit to be invisible, Luna’s Ariel positions herself on this wooden catwalk, which is then placed over the heads of the other characters and, similar to the clouds in Watson’s engraving (see fig. 1), acts as a type of veil. However, this is not the only fashion
in which the spirit’s ability to fly is demonstrated to the audience, as, in act 1 scene 5 of the opera, the spirit appears to be able to float through the air on her stomach and in a seated position (see fig. 31; see scene 6). However, even though, from a distance, the actress appears to be flying, she is, in fact, being carried by stagehands, who are walking behind the stage and are completely clothed in black bodysuits, which almost entirely erase their presence, since the background is also black. Additionally, when Luna’s Ariel appears before Alonso, Sebastian and Antonio in a harpy-typed costume made out of a chandelier (see fig. 32), which is suspended from a chord and raised by a pulley, she appears to be flying once again. Nevertheless, next to Ariel’s ability to fly, the music and songs also reveal that Luna’s Ariel is a very powerful spirit, given that every time Ariel sings, she produces “blistering high notes” (Salazar), which give the music a certain out-worldliness and supernatural character, even without the use of a lyre. And because of this, Luna’s Ariel comes across as a non-human creature who can manipulate the body by means of his voice. By contrast, Alan Oke’s Caliban is portrayed as the opposite of the ethereal Ariel and an “outsider among the rest of the characters” (Salazar). Although, like previous depictions of Caliban in engravings and movie adaptations, Alan Oke’s Caliban positions his body very closely to the ground, he also crawls underneath the stage to hide from and taunt Prospero (see fig. 34; see scene 8), as a result of which, as the area underneath the stage has been related with hell for centuries, Oke refers to, and indicates, Caliban’s magical lineage without using any specific props or special effects. Thus, this opera rendition demonstrates that it is possible to combine technological advancements with stage elements and techniques that have been used for centuries in order to enhance the magical character of both the play and the characters.

2. The elements used in Macbeth to enhance the magical appearance of the Weyard Sisters.

Unlike The Tempest, in which Prospero, Ariel and Caliban are the most prominent characters of the play, Macbeth’s Weyard Sisters only appear for a very limited time on the stage, as a
result of which, from the first performance of the play in 1606 onwards, theatre companies have had the difficult task to represent the witches in a fashion that enabled the audience to identify their magical characteristics at first glance. A few ways in which this would have been achieved was by incorporating particular props, hand gestures, specific special effects and music into productions of the play, which, without doubt, would have been very similar to those used in stage productions of *The Tempest*, as *Macbeth* was performed for the first time only five years before *The Tempest*. Nevertheless, many of these objects and techniques would have been combined with elements that were not used in *The Tempest*, as a result of which they were able to create a completely different magical atmosphere in *Macbeth*. In addition, the portrayal of the witches would also have been influenced by the type of theatre in which the play was put on stage, given that the Globe only used very limited scenery and no artificial lightening, whilst Blackfriars used candles and elaborate stage machinery to convey the magical character of the Weyard Sisters (Dawson 236). Additionally, the technological advancements and the people’s changing beliefs in magic and the supernatural of the latest centuries, have also had a mayor influence on the manner in which the Weyard Sisters have been represented on the stage. Therefore, it is possible to compare the source text to eighteenth and nineteenth centuries engravings, and present-day productions of the play, in order to shed a light on the extent in which these elements have changed throughout the last three-hundred years, and how these have influenced the portrayal of the Weyard Sisters’ magical powers.

Even before the play starts and before the Weyard Sisters appear on the stage in act 1 scene 1, the magical character of *Macbeth* is already made clear through the use of “thunder and lightning” (Shakespeare 1863), which not only signal the beginning of the play, but also the entrance of the witches on the stage. Though the stage directions in the source text are very limited, Charles Taylor’s engraving, which dates from the period between 1784 and 1823
and supposedly mediates act 1 scene 3 of the play (see fig. 37), provides a clear visualisation of this initial scene and depicts the Weyard Sisters standing on a flat surface whilst being surrounded by a multitude of lightning bolts and clouds of dark smoke, which bellow around them up to the witches’ torsos. By depicting the witches in this fashion, Taylor’s engraving refers to the fact that theatre productions often used certain types of fireworks, such as rosin powder, which would have been thrown, by stagehands, into the candles in order to create lightning flares, and squibs, which would have been used to produce flashes and loud thunder-like bangs, in order to recreate the effect of lightning and the sound of thunder (Harris 465-466; Lennard 97). However, as Taylor’s engraving and the source text portray, these fireworks also created “fog and filthy air” (Shakespeare 1.1.12), which not only smelled like “brimstone, coal, and salpeter”, but also signalled the audience of the witches’ diabolical nature (Harris 465-466-475). Even though these fireworks worked very well to emphasise the magical character of the witches, the effect of thunder is utilized every time the witches come on the stage, as a result of which the stench might have been too strong, and even unbearable, for the audience members in indoor theatres, like Blackfriars, as it would have lingered throughout most of the play. Therefore, instead of using fireworks, theatre companies could also have recreated the sound of thunder through the use of a thunder sheet, drums or by letting a cannon-ball roll down a wooden trough in the backstage area. Though, contrary to the reproduction of thunder, the options to effectively represent lightning were more limited, theatre companies could have replaced the rosin powder by several “cut-out zig-zags” (Lennard 97), which stagehands would have made visible a few seconds at a time. And, although Taylor’s engraving clearly refers to the use of rosin powder and squibs on the stage, it is impossible to know whether these fireworks were actually the most commonly used items to recreate the effects of thunder and lightning on the stage.
Even though this engraving only focusses on the thunder and lightning that harbinger the arrival of the Weyard Sisters on the stage, other eighteenth and nineteenth centuries artists decided to enhance the magical appearance of the witches by incorporating a prop into their works. For instance; in John Keyse Sherwin’s engraving (see fig. 36), which dates from circa 1778 and was made after John Michael Rysbrack’s drawing, the Weyard Sisters are moving towards a large stone whereupon a small basin-like cauldron is being heated by a fire, whereby the engraving refers to act 4 scene 1 of the play, wherein the Weyard Sisters not only “dance around the cauldron” (Shakespeare 1895), but also use it to create a powerful brew. However, this scene was not included in the original Shakespearean text, since it was first referred to in the “Padua promptbook” (Braunmuller 61), which dates from the period between 1625 and 1635, and therefore must have been added by Middleton in 1616, shortly after Shakespeare died. In addition, Sherwin’s engraving also refers to the fact that theatre productions would have used a cauldron in act 4 scene 1, in order to convey and enhance the magical appearance and powers of the witches. As a matter of fact, this cauldron would have been brought onto the stage by either the actors who interpreted the Weyard Sisters, because of which the cauldron could not be too big or heavy, or by the stagehands, who would have ascended the cauldron through the trap door, which emphasised the “hellish connotation” (O’Connel 77) of the cauldron and the witches’ magical powers (Taylor 16; O’Connel 77-78). Nevertheless, not only did the manner in which the cauldron entered the stage differ from one production to the next, but also the appearance of the cauldron, as Allen Robert Branston’s woodcut (see fig. 39), which was made after Samual Williams and dates from the period between 1810 and 1827, demonstrates. As a matter of fact, in Branston’s woodcut, the cauldron is represented very differently from the cauldron in Sherwin’s engraving, as it has a ring on the side, by which it can be moved, appears to be a lot bigger and deeper than Sherwin’s cauldron, and has feet at the bottom, as a result of which Branson’s cauldron is
reminiscent of a bath-tub. Nevertheless, James Fittler’s engraving, which dates from 1806 and was made after Henry Howard’s painting (see fig. 40), demonstrates that the shape of the cauldron continued to change, as it portrays the more traditional, well-known cauldron usually associated with witches.

Nevertheless, contrary to these works, which only contain a single prop, some artists decided to incorporate several props into their works, in order to enhance the magical character of the witches to an even greater extent. In fact, by doing so, these artists demonstrated how the magical character of the witches would have been represented in the indoor theatre, where productions contained interludes, during which the candles “were trimmed and replaced” (Bate and Rasmussen, “The Tempest” 146) and stage hands were able to bring several props and scenery on the stage. For instance; Robert Thew’s engraving from 1802 (see fig. 38) contains an elaborate number of elements that refer to the witches’ magical powers, such as the apparitions on the left of the Weyard Sisters, that appear to be surrounded by lightning bolts and smoke, which refers to the fact that the smoke created by the squibs, on the stage, would have worked as a “sign of diabolical activity” (Harris 466-475). Aside from the smoke and lightning, the engraving also contains numerous props that signal the Weyard Sister’s demonic character, such as the sturdy looking throne, whereupon the middle Weyard Sister, who is wearing a white robe, is sitting, and which appears to be made out of human bones and three human skulls that adorn the top of the chair. In addition, the presence of the monstrous looking bat, which is flying immediately above the throne, reinforces the hellish appearance of the throne, since this is an animal that has been associated with the devil for centuries. Actually, it is possible that this bat, instead of the middle Weyard Sister, represents the Greek goddess Hecate, given that the engraving still portrays the three additional witches, which come onto the stage together with Hecate, for a very brief period of time, and disappear by the time Macbeth arrives on the stage. Furthermore, in the right lower corner, Thew’s
engraving also visualises other animals, such as a toad, cat and hedgehog, by which the engraving refers to the fact that theatre productions might have put live animals on the stage to represent the witches’ familiars (Bate and Rasmussen, “Macbeth” 179). Moreover, the presence of these familiars also enhance the magical nature of the witches, as they are “minor devils” (Elloway 6), commonly believed by the people of the Renaissance to assist the witches in their “demonic designs” (Braunmuller 30) and to have been acquired “from the Devil by selling [their] soul[s]” (Herrington 469). Therefore, the props, animals and special effects visualised in Thew’s engraving clearly insinuate that the witches are very powerful and dangerous magical creatures.

Though many indoor theatre productions used elaborate props and special effects to demonstrate the Weyard Sisters’ close bond with magic, nineteenth and twentieth centuries theatre companies decided to reduce these elements to their bare minimum in order to simplify the scene to scene transitions (Dawson 241). Also, the rapid technological growth enabled these companies to achieve new and more convincing ways to emphasize the magical appearance of the witches (Rowe 306). As a matter of fact, contrary to eighteenth century productions, the 1974 Royal Shakespeare Company production of the play, which was directed by Trevor Nunn, only used a small circular part of the stage and a very limited number of special effects. In fact, at the beginning of the play, thunder and lightning are not used to signal the appearance of the witches on the stage, but to signal the actual start of the play once the witches have entered the “circled ‘acting’ space” (Braunmuller 83), and to accompany their words. Furthermore, instead of using fireworks, the effects of thunder and lightning are recreated through the use of a giant thunder sheet and a light effects machine, which were positioned on the stage and enabled the audience to see how these specific effects came about (Braunmuller 83). Also, given that Nunn’s Weyard Sisters did not use an elaborate amount of props, the eldest Weyard Sister was able to carry most of the witches’
props, such as “the pilot’s thumb” (Shakespeare 1.3.29), in “a handbag” (Wells 284) (see fig. 41). This handbag also contained a small pouch, which was used in act 4 scene 1 of the play (see scene 10), and holds the ingredients for the witches’ magical brew (see fig. 43). To elaborate, in this scene, the Weyard Sisters’ put these ingredients in a small, “old kettle” (Wells 284) and accompanied the mixing of their brew, which, unlike the brew in the source text and the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries engravings, does not need to be brought to a boil, with a musical version of the magical incantation from the source text. Moreover, by using a “magical charm” (Austern 197), Nunn’s witches demonstrated that the Weyard Sisters want to “unite with aspects of the greater spiritual worlds” (Austern 197) in order to increase the effectiveness of their brew.

Despite the fact that Nunn’s production succeeded in demonstrating the magical nature of the witches, through the use of a limited number of special effects and props, later productions, especially in the twenty-first century, have been representing the witches as truly diabolical creatures, through the use of several props and special effects. For example, in Rupert Goold’s 2010 movie adaptation of the play, which was based on the Chisester Festival Theatre production of the play, the Weyard Sisters are not the first characters to speak, given that the wounded messenger who informs Duncan about the battle actually says the first words of the movie. Additionally, the presence of the Weyard Sisters is not announced by any thunder nor lightning either, as they are initially presented as normal nurses, as a result of which they come across as fear-inspiring creatures who cannot be easily discerned. In fact, it only becomes apparent that these three nurses are actually the Weyard Sisters once Duncan has left the scene, the messenger has died from both his wounds and the type of venom the witches injected him with, the lights have turned off and the witches have removed the messenger’s heart “to serve in their spells” (Smith 98), which almost all occurs even before the witches have spoken their first words (see scene 11). Also, all of the props used by the
Weyard Sisters are related to the medical profession (see fig. 44, 45 and 46), which demonstrates that the witches can use their powers to inflict harm and, therefore, should not be trusted or meddled with. Furthermore, in act 4 scene 1, the Weyard Sisters do not use any cauldron to make a brew, but instead speak their incantation, in a mortuary, over corpses in body bags (see fig. 46; see scene 12), which are not only brought back to live by the Weyard Sisters, but also act as the apparitions that appear before Macbeth. As a matter of fact, in this scene, computer effects are used to alter the movements of the witches, whereby some of their movements are altered by the effect of motion blur, whilst others are sped up and, then, immediately followed by a slight slowing down of the action. Consequently, these specific special effects convincingly enhance the notion that these witches are demonic creatures, or, perhaps, women who are being possessed by demons. Additionally, the fact that, unlike the incantation in Nunn’s production, Goold’s witches do not sing the incantation, but instead say their magical charm in a rhythmic fashion, refers to the diabolical nature of the magic the Weyard Sisters are using, as it appears to have a great influence on their bodies and voices. Furthermore, computer-generated special effects are also used to create the illusion that the witches can appear and disappear at a moment’s notice (see fig. 45). Thus, this movie adaptation portrays that through the adaption of the traditional props and the incorporation of technological advancements, Goold’s witches are represented as even more fear-inspiring and demonic creatures than the depictions of the Weyard Sisters in previous centuries.

3. The magical atmosphere surrounding Doctor Faustus.
Contrary to Shakespeare’s The Tempest and Macbeth, which have been performed both in outdoor and indoor theatres, such as the Globe and Blackfriars, Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus was written for, and exclusively presented on, the indoor stage, which gave theatre companies the opportunity to use more elaborate props and special effects. As a result of the fact that the Renaissance indoor theatres were smaller and a lot darker than the outdoor theatres, theatre companies were more capable of not only reinforcing the supernatural character of Faustus,
Mephistopheles and, by extension, the play in its entirety, but also visualising the Renaissance people’s popular fears in magic. Even though there only exist a few detailed written records with regards to Renaissance theatre productions of the play, these do provide some descriptions of the magical atmosphere surrounding the play and the props used on stage. In addition, a handful of sixteenth and seventeenth centuries engravings and woodcuts reveal what the stage and the props, used to enhance the magical appearance of Faustus and Mephistopheles, might have looked like in Renaissance theatre productions. Unfortunately, hardly any to none engravings were made during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as the play had lost a lot of its popularity by then, which makes it very difficult to shed a light on how the use of specific effects and props developed during these centuries. Nevertheless, during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, some theatre and movie companies decided to revive the play, with the use of modern technologies and machines. Therefore, given that the source text also contains certain stage instructions, it is possible to compare the source text to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries engravings and woodcuts, and to the twentieth and twenty-first centuries adaptations of the play, in order to demonstrate how the props and special effects are not only capable of intensifying the magical character of Faustus, Mephistopheles, and the entire play, but also how the technological improvements and changing popular beliefs have influenced these throughout the centuries.

One of ‘The History of the Damnable Life, and deserved Death of Dr. John Faustus’ most iconic scenes is act 1 scene 3, wherein Faustus summons Mephistopheles and begins to negotiate a deal with the Devil. And, this particular scene already foreshadows the ultimate demise of Faustus, which may have been one of the reasons why the publishers of the play decided to embellish the title page with a woodcut that iconotextually interprets this scene (see fig. 47). In fact, this woodcut, which dates from circa 1592, portrays Faustus’ study in a fashion that immediately reveals the fact that he is an educated scholar, as there are several...
thick manuscripts on a shelf in the background and a globe, which has longitude and altitude lines on it, is hanging from the ceiling. Also, Faustus is carrying two very significant props, a magic book and a staff, which are not described in the 1604 A-text of the play, but play a significant role in the 1616 B-text of the play, which, most likely, was the version of the play used in the Renaissance Rose theatre, where it was performed for the first time in 1594 (Halpern 466). Actually, the magical staff, which Faustus is holding in his right hand, and the hieroglyphs, which are positioned in a circle on the ground, refer to the B-source text wherein Faustus uses his magical staff to draw a circle, which not only contains “Jehovah’s name” (Marlowe 1.3.8), but also “[t]h’abbreviated names of holy saints, [f]igures of every adjunct to the heavens, [a]nd characters of signs and erring stars” (Marlowe 1.3.10-12) in order to enhance his magical powers and allow him to perform more demanding spells. In addition, Faustus is holding a magic book in his left hand which, given that it is a manuscript, refers to the popular belief of the Renaissance that the magician’s magic book had to be handwritten as it would not retain any magical powers once printed (Mowat 6). Furthermore, the right side of the woodcut portrays the result of reading the incantation from Faustus’ magic book, since Mephistopheles is being summoned and appears to be coming out of the floor. By portraying the summoning in this fashion, this woodcut demonstrates that the actor rendering Mephistopheles, without doubt, would have entered the stage of the Rose theatre from the area underneath the stage, which was understood as being a demonic region (Stern 52) by the members of the audience and, thus, immediately indicated that Mephistopheles should not be trusted.

Even though this woodcut perfectly illustrates the essence of the play, given that Faustus is represented as a scholar who uses magic in order to summon a demon, certain seventeenth century artists decided to depict a learned, older Faustus who is nearing the end of his life, in the study where he spent a lot of time studying the secrets of the world. For
instance; in Rembrandt’s engraving, from circa 1652 (see fig. 48), Faustus is reading a book, which is positioned on a reading desk, and taking notes on a small piece of paper that is lying next to the reading desk. Additionally, on the right side of the table, a large amount of books are stacked on top of each other and a globe, unlike the globe in the woodcut (see fig. 47), is standing on the ground. Furthermore, the background of Rembrandt’s engraving depicts a huge adorned window, which provides Faustus with the light he needs to read, and a curtain or drapes needed to cover the window and darken the room. Also, on the left side of Faustus, the engraving visualizes another curtain, which could be used to “enclose a bed … [or] to separate one part of a room from another” (OED meaning 1.a). And, on the right side of this curtain, a human skull is positioned in the same direction as Faustus’s head, by which, given that this is an “emblem or reminder of death or mortality” (OED meaning 1.d), the engraving signals that Faustus’ death is near and that Mephistopheles and Lucifer will drag him to “ugly hell” (Marlowe 5.2.114). Moreover, the slightly visible apparition, which is standing in front of the window, could be interpreted as being Mephistopheles or the Bad Angel, who, in act 5 scene 2 of the B-source text, visits Faustus and taunts him with the fact that he will spend an eternity in hell. This particular illusion, Renaissance actors could have recreated by covering only part of their body with the “robe for to go invisible” (Bate and Rasmussen, “The Tempest” 151; Halpen 458). By contrast, the illuminated disc on the left of the apparition, which has the inscriptions INRI and refers to “Jesus of Nazareth” (Perlove and Silver 63), may have been sent to Faustus by the Good Angel in order to reveal to Faustus that he could have been saved, if he had “affected sweet divinity” (Marlowe 5.2.107). Thus, Rembrandt’s engraving demonstrates how the contrast between Faustus’ normal study and the magical creatures, such as Mephistopheles, the Good or the Bad Angel, could and, without doubt, would have enhanced the audience’s understanding of how Faustus’ magical powers shaped his life.
In the course of the twentieth century, theatre companies and movie directors decided to let contemporary audiences rediscover the play in a way that not only incorporates modern technologies, used to create new and improved special effects, but also tries to portray how the play might have been depicted on the Renaissance stage. For instance; at the beginning of the 1967 movie adaptation of the play, which was directed by Nevill Coghill, the camera slowly moves around the table in Faustus’ study in order to set the tone of the movie and let the audience take in the magical atmosphere that already surrounds this specific desk and the barely lighted study (see fig. 49; see scene 13). In fact, the first element the audience sees is a human skull, which, like the skull in Rembrandt’s engraving, already refers to the fact that Faustus will die and spend eternity in hell. Consequently, it is understandable that a similar recreation of the study and magical atmosphere of the play in the Rose Theatre would have caused the audience members and actors to see “unaccountable devils” (Halpern 471) appearing on the stage (Sofer, “ Conjuring Performatives” 2; Halpern 472). Additionally, this scene also emphasizes the fact that Faustus is a scholar, since his desk is filled with paraphernalia he appears to be using for his studies, such as a miniature Venus de Milo-typed statue and several pages which contain handwritten notes, and there are several bookcases filled with numerous manuscripts standing against the walls behind, and next to, his desk. Nevertheless, unlike the woodcut (see fig. 47), Faustus does not summon Mephistopheles in his study, but in a graveyard (see fig. 51), which, at first glance, immediately indicates that Faustus is about to use very powerful magic to summon a demon. In fact, in this scene, which is based on act 1 scene 3 of the A-text, Faustus does not utilize the magic book nor the staff he uses in the B-source text or the woodcut, and computer effects are used to make Mephistopheles slowly embody a hanging skeleton, which then transforms into a rotting corpse. Even though Renaissance actors would not have been able to come on the stage in the same manner, they could have used stage make-up to create the illusion of a rotting corpse.
(see scene 14). Furthermore, at the end of the movie, the floor-boards of Faustus’ study crack open to reveal stairs leading down to a smoky red hell (see fig. 52; see scene 16), which refers to the fact that in the Renaissance, as Henslowe’s, the owner of the Rose theatre, papers reveal, a “[h]ell mought” (Halpern 458), used to drag Faustus to hell, would have been positioned over the trap door of the stage.

Though the computer-generated special effects and numerous props used in Coghill’s movie adaptation are able to emphasize the magical atmosphere of the play, and by extension Faustus and Mephistopheles, some twenty-first theatre companies decided to depict the play as closely to how Marlowe most likely would have envisioned it. For instance; Matthew Dunster’s 2011 performance of the play, which was based on the B-text of Doctor Faustus, not only incorporates elements from the indoor theatre, given that the play was written for this type of theatre, but also elements from the outdoor theatre, as it was performed on the outdoor stage of the Globe. In fact, contrary to Coghill’s movie adaptation, the stage is well illuminated and Hilton’s Faustus’s study is not visualized in a very elaborate fashion, given that it only comprises a chair and a small desk with a few props on top of it (see fig. 55). As a matter of fact, at the beginning of the play, Faustus is seen using his desk to write down notes, from a small manuscript, on a piece of paper with a feather pen and blue ink, which severely stains his hand. However, aside from the small manuscript, he also possesses larger manuscripts, which are standing in a bookcase made out of stagehands and other actors, who also translate the Latin passages Faustus reads from these manuscripts (see scene 17). As a result of these elements, it immediately becomes clear to the audience that Faustus is, in fact, a learned scholar who continues to study in order to learn about the world. Nevertheless, when the source text indicates that Faustus “picks up a book of magic” (Marlowe 189), Hilton’s Faustus returns to the desk and picks up the small manuscript he was taking notes from before, as a result of which, it becomes apparent that Faustus has been studying magic and
that next to being a scholar, he is also a magician. Furthermore, next to the props related to study, there is also a human skull positioned on top of his desk, which Faustus briefly picks up and stares at before he begins to reflect on the subjects he has been studying, and which, like the skull in Rembrandt’s engraving and Coghill’s movie adaptation, not only heralds the fact that the play will not have a happy ending, but also the fact that Faustus will die and end up in hell.

Nevertheless, aside from the fashion in which the play portrays the magician’s study and the props it contains, the play also utilizes numerous other elements that are able to enhance the magical appearance of not only Faustus, but also Mephistopheles. For instance; in act 1 scene 3 of the play, Hilton’s Faustus enters the stage carrying a small leather satchel, which contains all the ingredients needed to summon Mephistopheles, such as a candle to burn a fragrant herb, holy water and a small pouch of earth (see fig. 56). And, aside from the pouch, like the woodcut also demonstrates (see fig. 47), the magician uses a magic staff, which, in this case, has the shape of an ordinary stick, to draw the circle of symbols on the ground. Actually, the magic Faustus uses in this scene is very powerful, which Hilton reveals by grasping at his left chest, by which he not only indicates that the incantation is very straining on his body, but also that this action will result in his death. Also, Mephistopheles, once summoned, does not enter the stage through the trap-door, which would have been used in the Rose Theatre, but through “the aperture for ‘discoveries’” (Stern 52). In fact, when this area opens, it reveals a life-sized goat skull (see fig. 57; see scene 18), which is carried outside by two stagehands, who, after Faustus orders Mephistopheles to change shape, is split in two in order to reveal Darvill’s Mephistopheles. Consequently, the audience immediately understands that Darvill’s Mephistopheles should not be trusted, as this goat skull refers to the popular belief that the Devil often “appeared in the shape of a goat” (Guiley 217). Furthermore, at the end of the play, this discovery area is used to represent the ‘mouth of
hell’, which is rendered in such a fashion that even though, unlike the Renaissance productions of the play, Dunster’s production does not use an actual ‘mouth of hell’ prop, through which Faustus would have been dragged into the area underneath the stage, the audience immediately believes that the area behind the discovery area represents hell (see fig. 59). To enumerate, drums, cymbals and guttural throat-sounds are used to announce the opening of hell and Faustus’ demise, and a smoke machine is used to recreate the steam usually associated with hell, which in the Renaissance would have been created through the use of squibs. Furthermore, from this area come stagehands wearing masks, covered in blood, and carrying puppets, which represent souls that are being tormented in hell for all eternity (see scene 19). Though this production does not use many modern devices to recreate elaborate special effects, it does succeed to represent the play in a fashion that enhances the magical appearance of the play, Faustus and Mephistopheles, through the use of a few well-chosen special effects and props, and reveal how the play might have been depicted in the Renaissance.

4. Preliminary conclusion.

Through the comparison between the Renaissance source texts of Shakespeare’s The Tempest, Macbeth, and Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus to eighteenth and nineteenth centuries engravings, and twentieth and twenty-first centuries productions of these plays, it has become clear that due to the changing popular beliefs and the technological advancements, the elements used to enhance and emphasise the magical atmosphere of these plays have changed throughout the last three hundred years. As a result of the fact that the people of the twentieth and, especially, the twenty-first centuries, no longer believed in magic and, consequently, are no longer capable of imagining the magical things that do not exist in real-life, theatre and movie companies continually continued to look for new and more realistic and life-like effects capable of immersing the audience into the magical atmosphere of the worlds depicted by these plays. For example; with reference to the thunder and lightning used in these plays,
Rosin powder and squibs are no longer used, but instead most contemporary productions utilize lighting machines and musical instruments, or thunder sound footage, to recreate these effects in a more convincing fashion. Also, the illusion of invisibility is no longer created through the use of a specific ‘invisibility cloak’, given that twentieth and twenty-first century actors either pretend to not being able to see, for instance, Whishaw’s semi-transparent Ariel or Richard Burton’s Faustus, or computer-generated special effects are used to vanish a character on the screen, such as the Weyard Sisters in Goold’s movie adaptation of the play. Nevertheless, aside from the special effects, the magical appearance enhancing props have also evolved throughout the centuries. For instance; the shape of Prospero’s and Faustus’s staff has evolved from an unnaturally straight and polished staff to a more rustic staff, which appears to be made from a branch or stick found in nature. And, thus, the use of props, special effects, specific hand gestures and a certain type of music are certainly able to aid the actor’s body language, voice and costumes in portraying and enhancing The Tempest’s, Macbeth’s and Doctor Faustus’ magical characters in a way that enables the audience to immediately recognise these characters’ magical powers and characteristics.

VI. **Final conclusion.**
The analysis of clothing, body language, props, hand gestures, music, special effects and, to a lesser extent, the voice in eighteenth and nineteenth centuries engravings and twentieth and twenty-first centuries theatre productions and movie adaptations has, undeniably, revealed that the depictions of The Tempest’s Prospero, Ariel and Caliban, Macbeth’s the Weyard Sisters, and Doctor Faustus’ Faustus and Mephistopheles, have undergone significant changes throughout the centuries. In fact, most of these differences can be explained by the changing beliefs of the audience members, who, especially in the course of the twentieth century, no longer feared magic, but instead began to appreciate and enjoy the imaginative aspects of it. Additionally, the advancements in technology have also influenced the representation of these characters, since these enabled theatre and movie companies to create visually stunning
effects for an audience who, unlike the people of the Renaissance, could no longer “suppose or imagine what [could not] be represented in performance” (Dessen 9). Consequently, given that this was the result of their disbelief in the world of magic, they have needed increasingly more life-like visualisations in order to be able to immerse themselves into this fantastical world. For instance, in *The Tempest*, the initial magic induced storm is no longer created by means of rosin powder or squibs, even though these fireworks are able to enhance the magical atmosphere of the entire play from the first seconds onwards, as the smell and the smoke created by these immediately would have indicated to the audience that the storm was the product of magic. And, present-day productions now use complex lightning machines, thunder sound footage, or musical instruments, which create the effect of a realistic storm on the screen and the stage. Furthermore, in these productions, Prospero is no longer interpreted as an older, learned magician, who has a long beard, wears a traditional wizard’s robe, uses an elongated staff, which appears to be unnaturally straight, to perform magic, nor has a magic cloak to enhance his magical powers. Instead, actors nowadays represent Prospero as a younger sorcerer, who, nevertheless, still comes across as a father figure to Miranda, wears a modernised costume, has a more natural and rustic looking staff, which he may or may not use to perform his magic or threaten Caliban with. However, even though his appearance has significantly changed throughout the centuries, the traditional and modern representations of the sorcerer are the same in essence, given that the actors who interpret this role still mainly use their body language in order to convey their power to the audience, and the other characters of the play.

The visualisation of Ariel, on the other hand, has changed in more significant manners, as computer-generated effects and other machines can, today, be used to portray the spirit’s magical powers. In addition, his overall appearance has also changed in a significant way, given that adolescent, androgynous looking, boys, who were reminiscent of the figure of the
cherubim, are no longer used to represent the spirit on the stage or on the screen. Actually, from the eighteenth until the middle of the twentieth century, Ariel was a “coveted female role” (Bate and Rasmussen, “The Tempest” 121) and these women mainly interpreted the spirit as an androgynous, or very feminine, fairy-type creature, who, in some cases, wore wing-typed back-pieces, which could be used in addition to, or instead of, the flight machine, to emphasize the spirit’s ability to fly. Nevertheless, from the mid-twentieth century onwards, the spirit has typically been interpreted by men, who predominantly have been representing Ariel as a naked androgynous wingless spirit, who, nevertheless, possesses the ability to fly or move through the air. Furthermore, the special cloak, which was used during the Renaissance to indicate to the audience that Ariel was, in fact, invisible, disappeared in twentieth and twenty-first centuries productions. Instead, on the stage and the screen, the fellow actors have been pretending not to see Ariel, and movie adaptations have, in addition to this, also been using computer-generated special effects to let the character vanish before the audience’s eyes. Also, even though, in contemporary productions, the spirit no longer carries a lyre, the fact that Ariel uses a specific type of music, which possesses magical powers and can be employed to lure certain characters in a chosen direction, is one of the aspects that has persisted throughout the centuries. Caliban’s appearance has also changed in a significant fashion, since modern actors no longer interpret him as a man who has distorted facial features, which reflects the popular Renaissance fear that witches had intercourse with the Devil, as Caliban is the child of the Devil and the witch Sycorax, nor as a monstrous creature neither. Instead, he is now depicted as a noble savage, who seems to be a member of an ethnic minority, which evokes feelings of sympathy amongst the members of the audience. Also, modern actors do not use any special effects nor props to underline Caliban’s magical parentage, given that they can easily indicate this by moving their bodies closely to the floor,
or by moving in the area underneath the stage, which was already associated with hell during the Renaissance.

With reference to *Macbeth* and the visualization of the Weyard Sisters, significant changes can also be discerned. As a matter of fact, like the magic induced storm in *The Tempest*, squibs and rosin powder are no longer used to herald the appearance of the witches on the stage, and, by extension, enhance the magical appearance of the entire play, which would have been very potent in the indoor theatres, given that the smoke and stench created by these fireworks would have lingered in this type of theatre for most of the play. Instead, most present–day productions use thunder sound footage, or a thunder sheet, and lightning machines to introduce the witches to the audience and underline the fact that these women are magical. Also, unlike the characters of *The Tempest*, the physical appearance of the Weyard Sisters already underwent significant changes during the Renaissance, as Middleton changed the original nymphs that appeared in the Shakespearean source text into witches, in 1616, closely after Shakespeare’s death, which demonstrates that the public’s fear of witches has been able to influence the play in a substantial way. As a result of this adaptation, the Weyard Sisters were presented as comical bearded woman in rags, which gave the audience the opportunity to ridicule the witches instead of fearing them, as they already did on a daily basis. Middleton also added the iconical cauldron scene in act 4 scene 1 of the play, which became a stereotype of witches from that point onwards, even though the appearance of the cauldron has changed in shape throughout the centuries. In addition to the appearance of the cauldron, the appearance of the witches also continued to change, as it evolved from this comical masculinized interpretation to a beardless, but still masculinized, representation of the Weyard Sisters, which persisted up till the early twentieth century, when they were transformed into fear inspiring demonic witches, who either wear rags or normal clothes, whereby they cannot be recognized easily. For instance; in Goold’s 2011 movie adaptation,
this demonic aspect is especially clear, given that the witches are not depicted as normal human beings, but instead as demonic creatures, or women who have been possessed by demonic creatures. Also, in this adaptation, the computer-generated special effects are very important, because these enhance the twitching movements of their bodies and the threatening aspects of their voice, which raise the hairs on the back of the audience’s neck, even though they no longer believed in witches.

Unlike Shakespeare’s plays, almost no visual representations of Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus* have been created during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, since the play had already lost most of its popularity by then. One of the reasons why it lost its popularity may have been the fact that, unlike Shakespeare’s plays, it depicts “highly intellectualised forms of elite magic” (Bailey 181), which was one of the few forms of magic that did not concern the common people, as only a few people were believed to be able to use this type of magic. Though *Doctor Faustus* had been underrepresented in the visual arts, twentieth and twenty-first centuries theatre and movie companies decided to revive and try to re-establish the popularity of this play. Nevertheless, instead of creating new interpretations of Faustus and Mephistopheles, they attempted to reconstruct the original appearance of the play, and its magical characters, in order to reacquaint the modern audiences with this forgotten play. As a consequence, present-day productions still depict Faustus as a praised learned scholar, who, depending on which text the adaptation is based upon, uses a magic staff to draw a magical circle and summon Mephistopheles. And, the appearance of Faustus’ staff, like Prospero’s staff, has undergone some changes, as this magical prop is no longer portrayed as an unnaturally straight staff, but instead as a rustic staff, which appears to be made from a branch Faustus found in nature. Despite the fact that the appearance of these characters has not evolved in significant ways, the use of special effects to visualize their magical powers has.

Especially with reference to the summoning of Mephistopheles, movie adaptations have used
several computer-generated special effects to visualize this part of the play, as Coghill’s movie adaptation demonstrates. For instance, in this movie, Mephistopheles slowly embodies a skeleton, which hangs behind Hilton’s Faustus and appears before him as a rotting corpse, which not only startles Hilton’s Faustus, but also the members of the audience. Thus, by looking at the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries engravings and examining how present-day adaptations mediate particular scenes of Shakespearean and Marlovian drama on the stage and the screen, it has become apparent that most of the changes in the appearance and the elements used to enhance the magical aspects of Prospero, Ariel, Caliban, the Weyard Sisters, Faustus and Mephistopheles have been caused by the changing preferences, beliefs and fears of the audience members on the one hand, and the technological advances on the other hand. However, it is remarkable that the representations of magic in The Tempest and Macbeth have undergone more significant changes than the portrayal of magic in Doctor Faustus. Nevertheless, further research would be needed to determine whether this is solely the cause of the type of magic it depicts or the fact that this play was unpopular for several centuries.
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