

*Cahiers Elisabethains* 44. 1993. 23-31.

Balz Engler

**Else my project fails: Applause and the authority of Shakespeare's texts**

A monologue has been brilliantly delivered; it is followed by the slightest of pauses. Then applause brings the house down. The actors freeze, wait for it to die down, then continue. We are all familiar with such situations; they are part of what makes theatrical performances memorable. Yet applause has met with remarkably little interest among scholars, not even in theatre studies.<sup>1</sup> This reflects a general lack of interest in the behaviour of the audience—most strikingly in semiotics<sup>2</sup>—which, in turn, is due to certain notions of the work of literature and of the role of the audience in the theatre.

Where scholars have shown some interest in the audience, this has usually been from the perspectives of sociology or reception aesthetics. The sociology of the audience has led to lively debate in Shakespeare studies in the past decades. Positions were far apart, between Shakespeare's theatre as an anticipation of democratic conditions and as the expression of a strictly hierarchical society. New studies, like those by Andrew Gurr, here have led to a more balanced view. In recent years studies of the audience have usually started from the model of reception aesthetics.<sup>3</sup> This model was originally developed with fiction and the reading process in mind. Where it is transferred to the theatre, it assigns the audience an important but narrowly defined position. The spectators produce the meaning of the performance in their minds. They fill the gaps and resolve the indeterminacies that the

performance leaves at their disposal.

This model is particularly popular in the so-called 'performance criticism' of Shakespeare's plays, which is usually practised by people with a strong commitment to the theatre, but trained in drama and literature. They tend to be interested in how the author's text is interpreted on stage, but not in what audiences do in the theatre; in other words, they are interested in productions rather than performance.

The consensus among these critics is neatly summarized by Klaus Lazarowicz, who distinguishes three steps in the theatrical process:

The author devises a literary sign system of a special kind, a play, which is not addressed to readers, but to actors and spectators. The actors, usually instructed and controlled by a director nowadays, transform the literary sign system into a scenic one, which consists of verbal as well as non-verbal elements. The contribution of the spectators...consists in registering the information offered by the scenic sign system, in structuring it while apperceiving it, and in understanding, interpreting and experiencing it, thus making it part of their aesthetic experience.<sup>4</sup>

This model makes three assumptions: that spectators passively 'receive' a performance,<sup>5</sup> that 'reception' happens in the mind of the single spectator, and that the author's text is the source and origin of the performance. All three need to be questioned. Spectators actively contribute to the performance by their actions, expressing approval and disapproval; they do so not as individuals but as members of a group (either others join in when we applaud or we feel embarrassed and stop); and the text is just one element among many in a production, the use and authority of which may have changed in the course of history.

The implications of this and the conclusions to be drawn from it will be discussed in the following, using the

epilogue to *The Tempest* for illustration.<sup>6</sup>

In the theatre the action of Shakespeare's *Tempest* is wound up in a familiar manner. The wicked are punished, or regret their crimes. Prospero renounces his magic, and is ready to leave the island for his own dukedom. He invites his guests to sit down with him and talk about the strange events they have experienced. Exeunt omnes.

At this moment we can expect applause to begin. The speaker of the epilogue may, if he has not left with the others, prevent it by immediately addressing the audience; or he can wait for a moment, and then, spreading his arms, ask for silence—for the 'Epilogue spoken by Prospero'<sup>7</sup>

Now my charms are all o' erthrown,  
And what strength I have's mine own,  
Which is most faint. Now 'tis true,  
I must be here confin' d by you,  
Or sent to Naples. Let me not,  
Since I have my dukedom got,  
And pardon' d the deceiver, dwell  
In this bare island by your spell,  
But release me from my bands  
With the help of your good hands.  
Gentle breath of yours my sails  
Must fill, or else my project fails,  
Which was to please. Now I want  
Spirits to enforce, art to enchant,  
And my ending is despair,  
Unless I be reliev' d by prayer;  
Which pierces so, that it assaults  
Mercy itself, and frees all faults.  
As you from crimes would pardon' d be,  
Let your indulgence set me free.

Prospero no longer wields the power of his magic. It is now for the spectators to decide, whether he should remain a prisoner or return home, and he implores them not to keep him on the island by their magic, but to free him with their hands—i.e. with their applause. They have the power to do so,<sup>8</sup> in the same manner that they have created the magic circle in which Prospero, and in which the actors could perform.

The epilogue raises questions that do not seem to be directly linked with the issues discussed. Who speaks? Is it Prospero or the actor who has played his role and is still wearing his costume?<sup>9</sup> Or should we reckon with another speaker, one of many possible combinations or fusions between figure and actor? Just because of these ambiguities a further possibility suggests itself, one that has become a cliché of post-Romantic Shakespeare criticism: Is the author of the play speaking, presenting himself allegorically in the figure of Prospero, or of the actor? Editors have seen this view of the epilogue supported in the serious allusions to the Lord's prayer.<sup>10</sup> Further, is this strangely wooden text, in which rhymed verse and the syntax uneasily run beside each other, really by Shakespeare, or, like other epilogues, by some hack associated with the company? Some critics have been of this opinion; at least one expressed his hope that it is not by Shakespeare, because "these sorry lines" are "nothing more than a series of wire-drawn conceits".<sup>11</sup> Finally, a question that is implicit in the other two: Is the epilogue really part of *The Tempest*, or is it, as the typography in the Folio seems to suggest, a kind of afterword?

In analyzing the epilogue we can ponder various possibilities concerning authorship, the speaker, and the status of the text; we can even try and settle on a single solution. But it is more important in the context of my argument that we ask ourselves these questions. We do so because the epilogue is no longer part of the fiction of the play; it rather crosses the threshold between play and non-play, between performance and non-performance. In other words, we find ourselves precisely in that area of transition which scholars have so studiously avoided. The epilogue thematizes the performance as a process—with an ending, and thus also a beginning. It thematizes the

performance as an occasion of which the audience is part.

Applause makes visible thresholds as a problem, between the performance and what is not part of it. When actors pause during the action and only continue when the applause is getting weak, is this part of the performance, or does the performance pause too? Is the applause at the end of a performance part of it, or does the performance end with the last words spoken?<sup>12</sup>

Applause is not, as it is commonly understood, just a gesture showing approval; it is first of all one of gaining distance.<sup>13</sup> We free ourselves from emotional tension, and only gradually our attitude transforms itself into one of critical distance. The members of the audience communicate to each other and the actors how they feel about what they have experienced.<sup>14</sup> Applause inspires, as those know who have ever acted in a play. Applause at a particular moment changes the shape of a performance, as those know who have seen the same production on succeeding nights.

Applause breaks the magic circle which has made possible the fiction of the story performed. The final applause makes the performance visible as a process that does not begin with the first word spoken and end with the last—it is no coincidence, for example, that arranging the curtain call is part of the director's responsibilities in contemporary theatre.<sup>15</sup>

If repeated such processes soon harden into rituals, as demonstrated by the curtain call. These rituals fix certain kinds of behaviour, and at the same time reinforce the effect of deviation, as demonstrated by applause during action. During the curtain call, especially in today's theatre, there is applause even if there is no emotional tension, even if nobody feels like encouraging the actors to

do things again in the same manner.

For all we know the behaviour of Shakespeare's audience was more straightforward, also more violent than today, but not essentially different. People in Shakespeare's Globe theatre kept moving in the pit; seating arrangements have since made it increasingly difficult for audiences to express themselves freely.<sup>16</sup> Above all, today's audiences are usually literate and middle-class; they value highly virtues like self-discipline and reticence.

Shakespeare's audience took an active part in the performance, and was often loud and undisciplined.<sup>17</sup> Objects were thrown onto the stage, in order to hasten the beginning of a performance, or even, in extreme cases, to force the company to perform another play. However, audiences cannot have been too rowdy. One of the most frequent complaints concerns the cracking of hazelnuts during performance, noise that could not be too disturbing in a crowded theatre. There must, therefore, have been at least moments of intense silence. Approval was shown both by clapping hands and by shouts; also the epilogue to *The Tempest* indicates such shouting: "Gentle breath of yours my sails / Must fill, or else my project fails."<sup>18</sup> Rejection was shown with various noises, hissing, clicking one's tongue, mewling, and whistling—from here the word catcall is derived.<sup>19</sup> There are also indications that the audience, at least at court, was continually exchanging commentaries; there are the familiar examples from the performances in Shakespeare's plays, especially in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (V.1.108-362), *Hamlet* (III.2.136-270), and *The Tempest* (IV 1.60-141).

In the evidence we possess the function of applause is understood entirely in terms of judgement. Shakespeare's contemporaries Ben Jonson and Thomas Dekker say so

explicitly, and the end of *The Tempest* is suggestive of this.<sup>20</sup> Jonson and Dekker also insist that members of the audience should judge for themselves and not 'by contagion'.<sup>21</sup> They reject the social dimension of applause mentioned earlier; Shakespeare's epilogue, on the other hand, is silent on this.

However, the references to audience behaviour (except where the authorities had to intervene) are not neutral accounts. They usually come from dramatists and are contributions to a debate in which they were one of the parties. They request behaviour appropriate to their own contribution to the performance, the text. They try to establish their authority in the theatre against other forces trying to control performance, especially against the audience, but also against actors who see themselves as serving the audience rather than the text. Hamlet warns the clowns against saying more than the author has put down for them (111.2.39-40); the clowns obviously felt encouraged to do so by the audience.

This debate between authors and audiences can best be understood in the larger context of the tensions between literacy and orality, between authors who, by definition, promote literate culture, i.e. the reactions of the literate individual, the reader, and the audience that to a large part still consisted of illiterate people;<sup>22</sup> between those who themselves would like to determine as much in advance as possible, and the audience that does not want to give up its traditionally powerful role in defining the event.

What we know about Elizabethan audience behaviour, and the source from which we have it, both suggest definite conclusions. The occasion of performance is shaped by the collaboration of several contributors, whose interests may clash, as the conflict between dramatists and the audience suggests. These were mentioned earlier already; I am

listing them again, programmatically, in reverse order: the audience, the actors, the author.<sup>23</sup> Moreover, this order should be understood as one of weight rather than causality. By no means can the text of the author claim some kind of natural authority over the actors and the audience. By no means is the text the ultimate source of the performance event.

Here attention has mainly been focussed on die relationship between the audience and the author's text. But some other elements that play an important role should at least be mentioned—significantly they have been collected in theatre semiotics, which tries to turn even the *mise en scène* into a text: Intonation (Can the epilogue be spoken ironically?), facial expression, gesture (Does Prospero extend his arms?), movement (Does he step forward? Are the others waiting in the background?), make-up (Is Prospero an old man?), hair-do (Has he long or short hair<sup>?</sup>), costume (Is he dressed as a Renaissance or as a fairy-tale duke?), properties, space, scenery, lighting (Is it gradually getting bright in the auditorium?), music and noise.<sup>24</sup> Depending on the type of theatre, the historical period, and their respective audiences, different elements may dominate the relationship with the others. In a literary culture, for example, the dominant element may well be the text.<sup>25</sup> But even here the audience plays the crucial role; as the epilogue to *The Tempest* suggests it is the audience that makes everything else possible.<sup>26</sup>

This claim has wide-ranging implications I can only touch upon the one that presents the most formidable problem. It concerns the status of the author's text, which, after all, seems to give us direct linguistic evidence on the play, unlike the other elements I have mentioned. The text is determined by the audience in at least two ways, how it is constituted, and how it is understood.



The situational variability characteristic of oral cultures, and represented, in this case, by the audience, will always prevail, even in the preparation of texts for scholarly editions. The attempt to find Shakespeare in his texts led to the assumption, valid for a long time, that there must have been one correct text from Shakespeare's hand, a single source from which all other texts are derivations or corruptions.<sup>27</sup> For some years now, however, we have learnt to reckon with the possibility that there may be more than one 'correct' text, that Shakespeare may have revised his own plays. We can only speculate on the reasons for this, but they would certainly have to do with the adaptation of the plays to new occasions and different conditions of performance.<sup>28</sup> The decision on which text we should choose as editors, even whether we can choose a single one, depends on the concepts of authorship and of the text that we apply, concepts about which the text itself is silent.

Even where we have a single text as with *The Tempest*, this text has been determined by the occasion, and therefore an audience, even before its words have been put on the page. They determine the horizon of expectation which authors take into account when writing a play, and thus the choice of material, the manner it is dealt with, the definition of parts, etc.<sup>29</sup> It does not matter whether authors are trying to serve these expectations, or struggling against them, whether they are trying to educate their audience, like Ben Jonson, or whether there is no sign of this as with Shakespeare. In the end the authors must make sure that their intention is understood and accepted by the audience. The epilogue to *The Tempest* puts this quite simply. "My project ... was to please."<sup>30</sup>

Our understanding of the text depends on the meanings we associate with its words, on the nature of the language that

we have learnt, on the kind of knowledge at our disposal, and on which aspects of it we consider pertinent. Our understanding is limited by the boundaries of what is acceptable and possible to imagine in our culture.

In other words, which text we choose, how we see the relationship between the audience and the theatre, how we assign meanings to a text—all this cannot be derived from 'the text itself'. It is rather defined by how texts are used, by the occasion as part of which it serves a specific function. To give just one example: Romantic critics like Charles Lamb were convinced that Shakespeare's plays should be read rather than performed, that everything we see and hear in die theatre distracts from the heroism of the figures and their inner conflicts.<sup>31</sup> Nowadays, the contrary opinion has become orthodoxy. Shakespeare's plays are thought to acquire their full life only in performance. Neither view can be proved from the texts; if we seem to find evidence, it is because we use the text in a manner which makes visible what we observe. This explains why critics have always been, and will always be, able to use texts as evidence, no matter how contradictory their views.

If the text does not possess the authority usually ascribed to it, we have offer a different explanation for the agreement on what texts mean. The continuity of understanding is due to traditions of using texts, traditions passed on orally. These traditions determine which texts are assigned the highest authority, which attitudes authors expect from their audiences, which use of the text is considered appropriate, and which meanings are available in interpretation.

The epilogue to *The Tempest* is a good illustration of how the text serves as part of an occasion. As we have seen, the speaker asks the audience to free him from the spell cast

on him, from the role in which they have imprisoned him. The power of the audience, described as royal, even divine, has created the magic circle in which Prospero's magic could develop its force.

The authority of the audience also affects the allegory of Prospero, of the author as magician. It presents the author's fragile dream of a kind of authorship which, with the help of magic, has authority in the theatre against all other forces. What other dramatists like Jonson and Dekker formulate in criticizing audience behaviour, appears as a utopia in the epilogue to *The Tempest*. It can only become reality if the audience, in the narrow sense of the expression, plays along.

Under these circumstances the metaphor of the text as the source from which everything else flows is no longer appropriate. Another offers itself, one that we find in the epilogue to *The Tempest*. The text is a boat which floats on the sea of oral tradition, which is tossed about by changing winds and currents, but which also needs both to get ahead. It was built to survive under the circumstances that could be anticipated. Its crew sets sail and tries to steer it in a specific direction. But it may also be becalmed or sink.

I have tried to show how important applause, how important audience behaviour in general is for understanding Shakespeare and his theatre (but not only his). The audience does not receive passively, but actively contributes to performance, in a manner familiar from oral culture. Orality remains dominant even where there are fixed texts. As evidence for my thesis I have used the epilogue to *The Tempest*, a text which moves across the threshold between the fiction of the story performed and the world of the audience.

At this point I might conclude if I did not have to reckon with the objection that the epilogue to *The Tempest* has been ascribed precisely the kind of authority that has been denied to texts in general. This would be unfair. I have acted according to the traditions of using a text valid in our culture; and what I have said is subject to the authority of an audience in the same way that it was the case with Shakespeare's texts and his audience.

---

<sup>1</sup> There, some work has been done on organized applause, the claque, and during the late sixties and early seventies, on theatre scandals. Cf F.W.J. Hemmings, 'Applause for the Wrong Reasons: The Use of Applications for Political Purposes in Paris Theatres, 1780-1830', *Theatre Research International*, 14 (1989): 256-70; A. Paul, *Aggressive Tendenzen des Theaterpublikums: Eine strukturell-funktionale Untersuchung über den sog. Theaterskandal anhand der Sozialverhältnisse der Goethezeit*, Diss. (Munich, 1969).

<sup>2</sup> Semiotic studies frequently neglect the activity of the audience (e.g., E. Fischer-Lichte, *Semiotik des Theaters*, 3 vols., 2nd ed., Gunter Narr (Tübingen, 1988); E.W.B. Hess-Lüttich, 'How does the Writer of a Dramatic Text Interact with his Audiences?', in R. Sell, editor, *Literary Pragmatics*, Routledge (London, 1991), 225-41; K. Elam, *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*, Methuen (London, 1980) devotes one and a half of 220 (95-97), E. Aston und G. Savona, *Theatre as Sign-System: A Semiotics of Text and Performance*, Routledge (London, 1991), devote five out of 180 pages (120-22, 158-61) to the activities of the spectators. P. Pavis, *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*, Routledge (London, 1992), is also remarkably silent on this. 'Interaktionsforschung', which thematized this twenty years ago, has lost much of its impetus. Cf. especially the studies of Arno Paul.

<sup>3</sup> Cf the discussions of the audience in A. Harbage, *Shakespeare's Audience*, Columbia University Press (New York, 1941); A.J. Cook, *The Privileged Playgoers of Shakespeare's London*, Princeton University Press (Princeton, 1981); A. Gurr, *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*, Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, 1987); J. Hilton, *Performance*, Macmillan (London, 1986); S. Bennett, *Theatre Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception*, Routledge, (London, 1990).

<sup>4</sup> K. Lazarowicz, 'Der Zuschauvorgang' in K. Lazarowicz and Ch. Balme, editors, *Texte zur Theorie des Theaters*, Reclam (Stuttgart, 1991), 130-4: 133. My translation.

<sup>5</sup> In one, admittedly extreme, experiment spectators were connected to electronic measuring gear, which showed, among other things, that actors' and spectators' rhythms of breathing became synchronized in intensive moments (H. Schälzky, 'Empirisch-quantitative Methoden in der Publikumsforschung', Institut für Publikumsforschung der Oesterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, editor: *Das Theater und sein Publikum* (Vienna, 1977).

<sup>6</sup> Shakespeare will be quoted from G.B. Evans, editor: *The Riverside Shakespeare*, Houghton Mifflin (Boston, 1974). Epilogues in which a figure begs for applause may also be found elsewhere in Shakespeare,

e.g., in *As You Like* and *All's Well That Ends Well*. A close parallel to *The Tempest* is to be found in Jonson's *Epicoene*, where applause and healing are linked with each other.

<sup>7</sup> The Folio text clearly marks off the epilogue from what has preceded it; it is not printed as being part of the last scene.

<sup>8</sup> Noise may destroy the magic, as we know from the masque in IV. 1.59.126-7. Prayer as the use of violence is a common notion during Shakespeare's period. Cf. Claudius's monologue in *Hamlet* III 3 36-72; F. Kermode, editor: *The Tempest*, The Arden edition of Shakespeare's Works, Methuen (London, 1958): 133-4, quotes the proverb 'Prayers like petards break open heaven gate' (M.P. Tilley, editor: *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, University of Michigan Press (Ann Arbor, MI, 1950), P557). George Herbert writes in 'Prayer I' (5-6): 'Engine against th' Almighty, sinner's towre, /Reversed thunder, Christ-side-piercing spear,' (C.A. Patrides, editor: *George Herbert, The English Poems*, Dent (London, 1974), 70). Patrides also refers to one of Donne's sermons (G.R. Potter and E.M. Simpson, editors: *John Donne, Complete Sermons*, 10 vols. University of California Press (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1953-62), vol. 5, 364): 'Prayer hath the nature of Violence; In the publique Prayers of the Congregation, we besiege God, saies *Tertullian*, and we take God Prisoner, and bring God to our Conditions; and God is glad to be straitned by us in that siege.' (Some of these references were given to me by Louis Schwartz through the Electronic Shakespeare Conference).

<sup>9</sup> The epilogue of *As You Like It* V.4.18 makes explicit that it is the actor who is speaking.

<sup>10</sup> This is suggested by Kermode (1958): 133-34.

<sup>11</sup> Stoll E E (1932) 'The Tempest', *PMLA* 47 (1932), 704.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. T. Hawkes, 'Telmah', in *That Shakespeherian Rag: Essays on a Critical Process*, Routledge (London, 1986): 95

<sup>13</sup> B.O. States, 'Phenomenology of the Curtain Call', *The Hudson Review* 39, 371-80.

<sup>14</sup> Again, the audience in applauding need not be homogeneous, even though it acts socially during the performance; if some whistle this may well provoke others to applaud.

<sup>15</sup> But these transitions too are embedded in a more extended process, which, according to R. Schechner, 'Toward a poetics of performance,' in *Performance Theory*, Routledge (London and New York, 1988), 153-86, begins with the actors and the audience preparing themselves for the performance, and with their gathering; and it ends with their dispersal and their return into their daily lives.

<sup>16</sup> A. Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage. 1574-1642*, Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, 1970), 154, argues that the darkness customary in theatres since the second half of the nineteenth century is responsible for the muted reactions of the audience. There is little to support this; Andreas Kotte reminds me of his experience with youth theatre. When it gets dark, the *tohuwabohu* begins.

<sup>17</sup> Gurr (1987) demonstrates this in detail; the reference to the audience forcing a company to do another play is on page 46. There were differences, however, between various types of theatre, e.g., between the Globe and the Blackfriars. In the open amphitheatres audiences tended to be more riotous than in the hall theatres.

<sup>18</sup> Breath meaning 'voice, words' is frequent in Shakespeare, e.g., *Troilus and Cressida* II.2.74, *King John* V.2.83.

<sup>19</sup> References in Gurr (1970), 153-154. *To mew* was obviously not considered to be a pleasant sound (see *1 Henry IV*, III.1.127. *Catcall*, according to the *OED* first occurs in Pepys' diary 1659) as a kind of whistle imitating the cry of a cat and used in the theatre.

---

<sup>20</sup> Note also the beginning of Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*, where a contract between the author and the audience is devised; and Dekker's *The Gull's Hornbook*.

<sup>21</sup> F.E. Schelling, ed.: *Ben Jonson, The Complete Plays*, 2 vols (London, 1970), vol. 2, 181.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. T. Hawkes, *Shakespeare's Talking Animals: Language in Drama and Society*, Arnold (London, 1973).

<sup>23</sup> In recent years this has increasingly been acknowledged also by editors, especially by S. Wells and G. Taylor, editors, *The Oxford Shakespeare*, Oxford University Press (Oxford, 1986). They try to offer the version of the text closest to production (xxxv). They acknowledge that the participation of specific actors, the occasion of performance, expected audience reactions etc. (xxxvii) may have led to changes. But they still take it for granted that such changes were made in advance by the author, that the author is the sole responsible source of the text. Cf. B. Engler, 'How Shakespeare Revised Othello', *English Studies*, 57 (1976), 515-21, on the possibility that not all passages in Shakespeare texts need be Shakespeare's own.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. T. Kowzan, 'The Sign in the Theatre', *Diogenes* 61 (1968), 52-80; quoted in Elam (1980), 50.

<sup>25</sup> Note the custom of reading the text before seeing a Shakespeare play, thus measuring the performance against what one has read.

<sup>26</sup> Samuel Johnson put it succinctly in his prologue on the opening of Drury Lane in 1747: 'The Drama's Laws the Drama's Patrons give, / For we that live to please, must please to live.' (D.N. Smith and E.L. McAdam, editors: *Samuel Johnson, Poems*, Oxford University Press (Oxford, 1941): 55).

<sup>27</sup> An influential study based on this assumption is W.W. Greg, *The Shakespeare First Folio*, Clarendon Press (Oxford, 1955).

<sup>28</sup> Wells and Taylor (1986), who print two versions of *King Lear*, still take it for granted that literary texts should have their source in one author. This assumption too needs to be questioned. Cf. B. Engler, *Poetry and Community*, Stauffenburg (Tübingen, 1990, 170-180; also J. Stillinger, *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius*, Oxford University Press (New York, 1991).

<sup>29</sup> The relationship between the shape of Shakespeare's late plays and changing theatrical conditions, for example, has often been discussed.

<sup>30</sup> The horizon of expectation cannot, however, as critics have supposed, simply be derived from literary texts (e.g., H.R. Jauss, 'Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory', in *New Directions in Literary History*, editor R. Cohen, Routledge (London, 1974). It is complementary to, not inscribed in them. Each change of the audience's tastes, which is affected by a multitude of factors, also affects the horizon of expectation.

<sup>31</sup> Charles Lamb, 'On the Tragedies of Shakespeare', in D.N. Smith, editor, *Shakespeare Criticism, 1623-1840*, Oxford University Press (London, 1963), 190-212.