A reader of materials concerning reception theory/reader-response criticism and social network theories.

Christian Jaque Stub
Aarhus University, June 2017.

Table of content

1.0. Introduction to the reader

This reader is constructed with four parts that hopefully will give the user of the reader a certain overview of material that is relevant for the ITN projects.

The first part consists of introduction materials that may give a quick overview of the basic theories and concepts. Three out of four materials included in this section engage with literary theory given that reception theory and reader-response criticism originally arose in this academic field and still is the field referred to in general within reception studies faute de mieux.

In immediate continuation of the first section, the second section of the reader deals with the "Classics" of reception theory with materials originated from the Constance school, especially Hans Robert Jauss and Wolfgang Iser, as well as a single work of Stanley Fish representing the American reader-response paradigm. Second section deals, as well, with influences and precursors in which Wayne Booth, Louise M. Rosenblatt, and Hans-Georg Gadamer are included. The materials in the "classic" section are in general more commented compared to the rest of the reader, as these materials are more comprehensive to tackle.

The focus of the third section is on materials that apply reception theory to actual studies. The materials are chosen based on two parameters. First, they must engage with theoretical considerations, and second, they must explicable use the presented theory to the actual material. Most of the materials are from the field of classical studies because the work process and theoretical problems which emerge in the study of reception are similar to the field of systematic theology.

Finally, the material in the fourth section is concerned with social network theory. The articles included focuses on the actual use of network theory and is chosen because of its application of theory on antique materials. The books, on the other hand, contains comprehensive introductions and reviews of different types of network theory as well as considerations of methodical issues which may emerge.

A few things need to be said to understand the reader.
First, through the reader, the word "text" is used in its post-modern meaning and may refer to other "authorities" in any given formats.
Second, the year written in the brackets of the materials refer to the publishing of the first edition.

Finally, any of the mentioned materials can be found in the Endnote library created in relation to this reader. The Endnote library contains, besides the references to the materials, the mentioned articles as attached PDF files.

2.0.   Introductions to reception theory/reader-response criticism

2.1.   Davis, Todd F. & Womack, Kenneth. *Formalist criticism and reader-response theory* (2002)

A short introduction (less than 200 pages) to formalist criticism and reader-response theory. The book is divided into two main parts in which part one treats theoretical accounts within the topics of "twentieth-century formalism," "Russian formalism," and "reader-response theory." Part two consists of readings within the paradigms of formalist criticism and reader-response.

2.2.   Habib, M. A. R. *Modern literary criticism and theory: a history* (2008)

A broad introduction to modern literary criticism. Chap. 6 contains a discussion of reader-response and reception theory with the presentation of Wolfgang Iser and Stanley Fish. Other topics treated are literary criticism within postmodernism, feminism, cultural and film studies and several more.

2.3.   Holub, Robert C. *Reception theory: a critical introduction* (1984)

A short introduction (less than 200 pages) to Reception theory. Holub´s focus is the German Constance School. The book covers the overall topics of; "the change in paradigm and its socio-historical function" (chap. 1), "influences and precursors" (chap. 2), "the major theorist" (chap. 3), "alternative models and controversies" (chap. 4), and finally "reception theory (chap. 5). The book deals solely with reception as a literary theory.

2.4.   Knight, Mark. *Wirkungsgeschichte, Reception History, Reception Theory* (2010)

In this short article, Mark Knight introduces the concepts "Wirkungsgeschichte" (Gadamer), "reception history" (Jauss), and "reception theory." The article is written in the context of New Testament exegesis but serve well as an introduction (at least the first part), as it introduces the history of the concepts and identifies key differences between them.

3.0. Classics

3.1. Influences and precursors

3.1.1. Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (1961)

Booth is included in this reader because his creation of a communicative model for understanding the reading process is an important step towards the foundation of actual reader-response theories.[1]

In the study Booth distinguishes and focuses on the relation between the "real author" and the "implied author," and likewise between the "actual reader" and the "postulated reader." According to Booth, the "implied author" functions as the real authors "second self."[2]

> `The author creates, in short, an image of himself and another image of his reader,´ Booth writes in *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. `He makes his reader, as he makes his second self, and the most successful reading is one in which the created selves, author, and reader, can find complete agreement´(138).[3]

Booth´s project does, compared to the later development in the Constance school, not add anything useful to the project of reception. Nevertheless, Booth´s project is, equally to Rosenblatt´s, important, as it functions to give an understanding of the literary trends in which the later reader-response theories developed.

3.1.2. Rosenblatt, Louise M. *Literature as exploration* (1933)

Louise Michelle Rosenblatt´s work *Literature as exploration* is included on this bibliography because she, a lot earlier than the Constance school or any other reader-response theory, began to focus upon the reader's reception of a literary work. Instead of looking for the one "true" meaning of a text, she advocated for an approach to literary study that took the dialectic relationship between text and reader into account. In the foreword to *Literature as exploration* Wayne Booth writes that:

> Although she insisted, like all serious teachers, on close attention to texts, fully respecting their unique powers, she shifted the emphasis dramatically toward a close reading of the responses of close readers. What she later called the "transactional" theory allowed her to preserve a respect for the author´s intentions and the text´s powers while moving beyond the arid explication de texte of too many journals in the fifties.[4]

Todd F. Davis describes the project of Rosenblatt as:

---

[1] Davis, Todd F., and Kenneth Womack. 2002. *Formalist criticism and reader-response theory*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 55-56

[2] Ibid., 56

[3] Ibid., 56

[4] Booth Wayne, "Foreword", ix in: Rosenblatt, Louise M., and Wayne C. Booth. 2005. *Literature as exploration*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.

> Attempting to reframe our conception of the reading experience, Rosenblatt contends that ´reading is a constructive, a selective process over time in a particular context. The relation between reader and signs on the page proceeds in a to-and-fro spiral,´ she adds, `in which each is continually being affected by what the other has contributed´(26).[5]

In many ways, Louise Rosenblatt should be regarded as part of the later movement of reception studies as she indeed was ahead of her time. Rosenblatt is recognized as the founder of reader-response theory by a few reader-response critics, but this is not even close to a broad recognition. The inclusion of Rosenblatt in this bibliography should most be seen as a historical reference.

3.1.3.   Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and method* (1960)

Gadamer`s major philosophical work *Truth and Method* is an – perhaps the most – influential work before the formation of reception studies. As a pupil of Gadamer, Jauss several times makes references to Gadamer and his hermeneutical work. The influence of Gadamer in relation to the development of reception studies is never the less paradoxical, as Gadamer didn't understand the hermeneutic activity as a scientific method which could bring forth the "truth", but rather as an attempt to understand "what the human sciences truly are, beyond their methodological self-consciousness, and what connects them with the totality of our experience of world." [6]

In fact, Gadamer distanced himself from the view that a particular method may bring forth the truth. Jauss nevertheless uses Gadamer´s hermeneutic to create a method, which, according to Jauss, enables the reader to approach and understand the meaning of a text.

Gadamer's main project in *Truth and Method* is to explain understanding as such, "not in relation to particular discipline, but conceived as the essence of our being-in-world."[7] Doing this, Gadamer builds upon the prior work of Heidegger in *Sein und Zeit (1927)* and repeat Heidegger's thought that being in itself is time.[8] By placing all beings in time, the lifeworld (Lebenswelt) is no longer possible to ignore – and nor should it. Instead of being an obstacle, the historicity is, because of the recognition that being in itself is time, transformed into the very factor that enables understanding. The readers' understanding and interpretation of a text are affected by the prejudices of the reader. Prejudice should not be understood as anything negative, as prejudice "… is not a hindrance to understanding, but rather a condition of the possibility of understanding".[9] In opposition to prior hermeneutical work Gadamer therefore states that "A truly hermeneutical thinking must "take account of its own historicality",[10] and is, therefore, further, only ""a proper

---

[5] Davis, Todd F., and Kenneth Womack. 2002. *Formalist criticism and reader-response theory*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 54

[6] Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1991. *Truth and method*. New York: Crossroad, xiii

[7] Holub, Robert C. 2010. *Reception theory: a critical introduction*. London: Routledge, 37

[8] Ibid., 40

[9] Ibid., 41

[10] Gadamer, *Truth and method* 267, as cited by Holub 41

hermeneutics" when it demonstrates "the effectivity of history within understanding itself""[11], i.e., "effective history" (Wirkungsgeschichte).[12] The horizon of the subject "moves" with the subject in time and history and the real meaning of a text is only achieved if the text and the reader's subject are united in a "mediation between then and now, between the ´Thou´ and the ´I.""[13]

Once again, Jauss use of Gadamer is highly paradoxical, but Gadamer is never the less the perhaps most important influence.

3.2. The Constance School. Reception aesthetics and aesthetic response

3.2.1 Jauss, Hans Robert. *Toward an aesthetic of reception* (1982)

Towards an Aesthetic of Reception contains five essays by the prominent member of the Constance school Hans Robert Jauss. The essay-collection gives an insight of an aesthetic of reception as presented by Jauss. The first essay, *Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory* is particularly interesting, as the essay appeared in a slightly different version in the magazine *New Literary History* I (1969)[14] and almost functioned as a manifest of the aesthetic of reception.

In *Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory* Jauss puts forward seven theses that will be outlined below. Jauss distinguish the theory from formalistic and Marxist tendencies that were prevalent at the time, as they hold the canonical conception that the text transcends history as it contains its "meaning" as a form of essence. Jauss argues against this, as he states that reception theory is about the relation between the text and the reader, which manifests itself respectively in a historical and an aesthetic aspect. Aesthetic, as the reader confronted with a text always will compare the aesthetic value of the text with texts prior known. Historically, because the reader subsequently will pass on his own understanding of the text to the following generations.

The text is not to be understood as a constant unit. Consequently, the text will give a different experience reader to reader. Moreover, the meaning of the text will change over a period of time.[15] This basically means that the realization of the text is an ongoing process between "the receptive reader, the reflective critic, and the author in his continuing productivity."[16]

At first encounter, a literary text produces a series of prejudices, or as Jauss puts it; the reader's "horizon of expectation" based on prior knowledge to the specific genre, similar

---

[11] Ibid.
[12] Ibid.
[13] Ibid., 44
[14] *New Literary History.* Vol. 2, No. 1, A Symposium on Litterary History (Autumn, 1970), pp. 7-37.
[15] Jauss, *Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory, Toward an aesthetic of reception* 1982, 21
[16] Ibid.

texts, etc. If it shall be possible to understand a subjective analysis of a text is it, therefore, necessary to investigate the horizon of the reader, as it affects the analysis.[17]

A text´s aesthetic value is judged upon whether it can change the horizon of the reader. The change of horizon happens if the reader changes his own horizon and adjust it according to the text. This change will not happen if a given text solely fulfills existing prejudices. Obviously, this is of great importance, as this means that changes in the milieu, as well as historical changes, affects how we understand and produces the meaning of a text. The ability to change the horizon of the reader ultima means that literature has a socially formative function, as the reader´s understanding of the world may be changed, which have consequences for his social behavior.

Jauss finds it possible to reconstruct the "works original horizon" by examining the texts, which the original reader is supposed to have known. By doing this, it is possible to understand the intended meaning of the text at the time of writing. Instead of seeing the text as a "mere fact" as the formalist does, the text should be seen as an "event." By doing so, it is possible, even if the initial reception and virtual significance of the text are denied, to recognize the real significance of the text later in history, as the horizons changes. This aspect further creates the possibility of renaissances in which new dimensions are discovered in former works. The relation between text and history is not just a relation to "general history," but also a relation to "special history," as the literary experience is able to affect the reader´s "social work," why there must be a relation between the text and the reader's "real world."

The seven theses to describe the theory goes as follows:

> Thesis 1. A renewal of literary history demands the removal of the prejudices of historical objectivism and the grounding of the traditional aesthetics of production and representation in an aesthetics of reception and influence.[18]

> Thesis 2. The analysis of the literary experience of the reader avoids the threatening pitfalls of psychology if it describes the reception and the influence of a work within the objectifiable system of its appearance, from a pre-understanding of the genre, from the form and themes of already familiar works, and from the opposition between poetic and practical language.

> Thesis 3. Reconstructed in this way, the horizon of expectations of a work allows one to determine its artistic character by the kind and the degree of its influence on the presupposed audience. If one characterizes as an aesthetic distance the disparity between the given horizon of expectations and the appearance of a new work, whose reception can result in a "change of horizons" through negation of familiar experiences or through raising newly articulated experiences objectified historically along the spectrum of the audience´s reactions and criticism´s judgment (spontaneous success, rejection or shock, scattered approval, gradual or belated understanding).[19]

---

[17] Ibid, 23-24
[18] Ibid., 20
[19] Ibid., 25

Thesis 4. The reconstruction of the horizon of expectations, in the face of which a work was created and received in the past, enables one on the other hand to pose questions that the text gave an answer to, and thereby to discover how the contemporary reader could have viewed and understood the work. This approach corrects the mostly unrecognized norms of a classicist or modernizing understanding of art, and avoids the circular recourse to a general "spirit of the age." It brings to view the hermeneutic difference between the former and the current understanding of a work; it raises to consciousness the history of its reception, which mediates both positions; and it thereby calls into question as a platonizing dogma of philological metaphysics the apparently self-evident claims that in the literary text, [Dichtung] is eternally present, and that its objective meaning, determined once and for all, is at all times immediately accessible to the interpreter.[20]

Thesis 5. The theory of the aesthetics of reception not only allows one to conceive the meaning and form of a literary work in the historical unfolding of its understanding. It also demands that one insert the individual work into its "literary series" to recognize its historical position and significance in the context of the experience of literature. In the step from a history of the reception of works to an eventful history of literature, the latter manifests itself as a process in which the passive reception is on the part of the authors. Put another way, the next work can solve formal and moral problems left behind by the last work, and present new problems in turn.[21]

Thesis 6. The achievement made in linguistics through the distinction and methodological interrelation of diachronic and synchronic analysis is the occasion for overcoming the diachronic perspective – previously the only one practiced – in literary history as well. If the perspective of the history of reception always bumps up against the significance of older ones when changes in aesthetic attitudes are considered, it must also be possible to take a synchronic cross-section of a moment in the development, to arrange the heterogeneous multiplicity of contemporaneous works in equivalent, opposing, and hierarchical structures, and thereby to discover an overarching system of relationships in the literature of a historical moment. From this the principle of representation of a new literary history could be developed, if further cross-sections diachronically before and after were so arranged as to articulate historically the change in literary structures in its epoch-making moments.[22]

Thesis 7. The task of literary history is thus only completed them literary production is not only represented synchronically and diachronically in the succession of its system but also seen as "special history" in its own unique relationship to "general history." This relationship does not end with the fact that a typified, idealized satiric, or utopian image of social existence can be found in the literature of all times. The social function of literature manifests itself in its genuine possibility only where the literary experience of the reader enters into the horizon of expectations of his lived praxis, preforms his understanding of the world, and thereby also has an effect on his social behavior.[23]

---

[20] Ibid., 28
[21] Ibid., 32
[22] Ibid., 36
[23] Ibid., 39

3.2.2. Jauss, Hans Robert. *Aesthetic experience and literary hermeneutics* (1982)

In *Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics* two main questions which derived from *"Toward an Aesthetic of Reception"* is answered. First, what kind of nature literature has, since it is said to have a social formative power, and second, what role political ideologies means for the reception of literature on a specific time in history. The latter is only partly answered while Jauss in Essay A-D answers the former. The study is made in the overall framework of an investigation of aesthetic pleasure.

In the process of reading a text, the reader is reading in the light of his own ideas and values, and, based on these, constructs the "meaning" of the book. In other words, the reader is an active participant in the reading operation.

> … the reader has a real experience of the imaginary, not an imaginary experience. Though aesthetic pleasure does free him from "the practical compulsion of work and the natural needs of the everyday world" (30), the reader is only relatively free from these concerns.[24]

Because of the reality of the experience, it has social and personal effects because of the aesthetic pleasure. How the aesthetic pleasure gains these effects is hereafter investigated by Jauss, as he identifies three aspects.

First Poiesis, which refers to the author's pleasure of his own creation. Poiesis may as well refers to the later editor of the work, or even to the reader, who as an active participant participates in the construction of meaning.[25] Second, aesthesis, which "… embodies the receptive side of that experience. Aesthesis involves "sensory perception and feeling" and refers to the "aesthetic pleasure of cognizing seeing and seeing recognition.""[26] The function of aesthesis is described by Jauss as:

> One´s own and alien mode of perception can be mediated by aesthesis: to one´s own manner of seeing, which abandons itself to aesthetic perception as it is led along by the text, there opens up, along with an alien manner of seeing, the horizon of experience of a differently viewed world. This hermeneutic function of aesthesis is due to the fact that the human glance is interested by its very nature. It is not satisfied with what directly presents itself, is lured by what is absent, and reaches out for what is still hidden.[27]

Third catharsis, which is the communicative efficacy of aesthetic experience. The main question in connection with catharsis is how the literature executes the social function. Jauss writes:

> I derived the communicative efficacy of the aesthetic experience from this threefold root and defined catharsis as the enjoyment of affects as stirred by speech or poetry which can

---

[24] Mallioux, Steven, "Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics" in *Minnesota Review,* 21,1, page 133-138, 1983, p. 134
[25] Ibid., 135
[26] Ibid.
[27] Jauss, Hans Robert, Michael Shaw, and Wlad Godzich. 2008. *Aesthetic experience and literary hermeneutics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 64

bring about both a change in belief and the liberation of his mind in the listener or specta-tor.[28]

3.2.3   Iser, Wolfgang. *The implied reader: patterns of communication in prose fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (1974)

In *The implied reader* from 1974, Iser attempts to lay the "foundations for a theory of literary effects and responses based on the novel."[29] The book is a collection of essays which is centered around the central theme of discovery. Iser writes as follows in the introduction:

> Linking all these essays is one dominant, and it seems to me, central theme: discovery. The reader discovers the meaning of the text, taking negation as his starting-point; he discovers a new reality through a fiction which, at least in part, is different from the world he himself is used to; and he discovers the deficiencies inherent in prevalent norms and in his own restricted behavior.[30]

Especially the last essay, chap 11. "the reading process: a phenomenological approach" is interesting regarding a theory of reception. In this essay Iser distinguish between the two "poles" of a literary text, respectively an artistic and an esthetic pole. Iser writes:

> … the literary work has two poles, which we might call the artistic and the esthetic: the artistic refers to the text created by the author, and the esthetic to the realization accomplished by the reader. From this polarity, it follows that the literary work cannot be completely identical with the text, or with the realization of the text, but in fact must lie halfway between the two.[31]

The process of bringing the meaning of the text to light is thereby an active process by the reader, and is an action of realization (konkretisation), as "the convergence of text and reader brings the literary work into existence."[32]
This "active fusion" between the text and the reader is, needless to say, the basis of the later development of later theories within the reception and reader-response realm.

Iser, Wolfgang. *The act of reading: a theory of aesthetic response* (1978)

In *The act of reading*, Wolfgang Iser continues the work from *The implied reader* (1974) of a theory of aesthetic response, as he is extending and strengthening the theoretical

---

[28] Ibid., 92
[29] Iser, Wolfgang. [1974] 2011. *The implied reader: patterns of communication in prose fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, xi
[30] Ibid., xiii
[31] Ibid., 274
[32] Davis, Todd F., and Kenneth Womack. 2002. *Formalist criticism and reader-response theory*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 61

arguments.[33] According to Iser, the meaning of a text arises out of the process of actualization, which is why the reader/interpreter perhaps should be more concerned with the process than the product.[34] This is the basic concern in *The act of reading.*

In the study, Iser is focussing on the reading process within the relationship between the text and the reader. Iser thinks that in the process of producing meaning the text and reader merge into a single situation:

> "However, if meaning is imagistic in character, then inevitably there must be a different relationship between text and reader from that which the critic seeks to create through his referential approach. Such a meaning must clearly be the product of an interaction between the textual signals and the reader´s acts of comprehension. And, equally clearly, the reader cannot detach himself from such an interaction; on the contrary, the activity stimulated in him will link him to the text and induce him to create the conditions necessary for the effectiveness of that text. As text and reader thus merge into a single situation, the division between subject and object no longer applies, and it therefore follows that meaning is no longer an object to be defined but is an effect to be experienced."[35]

Contrary to Jauss and the aesthetic reception, Iser´s main focus is the aesthetic response, which Iser himself explains as:

> It is called aesthetic response because, although it is brought about by the text, it brings into play the imaginative and perceptive faculties of the reader, to make him adjust and even differentiate his own focus."[36]

As a further distinction between aesthetic response and aesthetic reception is, according to Iser, that:

> A theory of response has its roots in the text; a theory of reception arises from a history of readers´ judgments.[37]

A primer similarity between Iser and Jauss is the denial of an objective meaning of a text hidden implicit in the work.

3.3. Reader-Response criticism

3.3.1. Fish, Stanley. *Is there a text in this class?: the authority of interpretive communities* (1980)

Stanley Fish is included on the reader as his position is much more radical compared to the general field of reader-response theorists.

---

[33] The ideas Iser is develloping in *The act of reading* are a detailed consideration of problems outlined in the essay *Indeterminacy and the reader´s responce in prose fiction* first published in 1971.
[34] Wolfagang Iser 1978, *The act of reading,* The John Hopkins University Press, 18
[35] Ibid., 9-10.
[36] Ibid., x
[37] Ibid.

According to Fish, the meaning of a text is created in "interpretive communities" which is made up by those who share interpretive strategies:

> Interpretive communities are made up of those who share interpretive strategies not for reading (in the conventional sense) but for writing texts, for constituting their properties and assigning their intentions. In other words, these strategies exist prior to the act of reading and therefore determine the shape of what is read rather than, as it usually assumed, the other way around.[38]

In continuation hereof, this means that the interpretive communities are governed by cultural and institutional norms:

> … these norms are not embedded in the language (where they may be read out by anyone with sufficiently clear, that is, unbiased, eyes) but inhere in an institutional structure within which one hears utterances as already organized with reference to certain assumed purposes and goals. Because both my colleague and his student are situated in that institution, their interpretive activities are not free, but what constraints the mare the understood practices and assumptions of the institution and not the rules and fixed meanings of a language system.[39]

Using the communities as a starting point of interpretation obviously have consequences for the overall framework of interpretation, as the hermeneutic approach, and therein the historical awareness, which is primary for both Jauss and Iser is insignificant according to Fish. This does not mean, however, that Fish´s method results in a subjective realism as the interpretive community always represents the "best" interpretation. A valid critic of Fish is, nevertheless, that the text is at risk of becoming insignificant, as the interpretation only depends on the interpretative community without any concerns about the history of the text itself.

---

[38] Fish "Interpreting the Variorum" in Fish 2000 *Is there a text in this class?*, Harvard University press, 171
[39] Fish "Is there a text in this class?" in: Fish 2000 *Is there a text in this class?*, Harvard University press, 306

4.0. Applied theory, Reception.

4.1. Articles

4.1.1. Bakogianni, Anastasia. *The Taming of a Tragic Heroine: Electra in Eighteenth-Century Art* (2009)

A study of how the reception of texts, in this case illustrations of the Greek tragedy *Electra*, is created in the light of the artist´s own historical time. The article contains an analysis of illustrations depicting Electra drawn respectively by John Flaxman´s (1755-1826) and Angelika Kauffman (1741-1807). Flaxman, e.g., depicts Electra in the light of the ideal woman in 18th century Britain. Bakogianni writes:

> Flaxman´s Electra does not break free of eighteenth-century conventions of a good female ´sweet and innocent,´ who finds herself in highly affecting circumstances. The drawings thus simplify the complex nature of Aeschylus´ characterization of the heroine. His Electra may be more conventional than Sophocles´ and Euripides´ heroines, but she still comes to pray for vengeance and matricide. Flaxman marginalized this aspect of Electra in favor of a more sentimental and decorous view of her as a mourner and a loving sister. Even when Flaxman attempted to illustrate Sophocles´ more passionate heroine, eighteenth-century notions of decorum dictated that her desire to avenge her father´s murder be suppressed. He again drew an image of her as a mourner and a loving sister.[40]

4.1.2. Bakogianni, Anastasia. *What is so 'classical' about Classical Reception? Theories, Methodologies and Future Prospects* (2016)

Bakogianni considers in this article how reception theory within her own field of research, classics, have developed. She especially finds it interesting that recent research begins to question the relationship between source text A and reception text B, and instead suggests the possibility of an indirect reception:

> … we are beginning to question the most fundamental relationship in classical reception studies that between source text A and reception text B. … we should work towards complicating the notion of a pure source text and dissolving hard boundaries between text, reception, tradition, and interpretive communities. … my conclusion is that we must challenge the hierarchical relationship A -> B implicit in traditional theories of reception.[41]

Bakogianni further asks, whether the intention is necessary for reception of a text, or if there may be a form of indirect reception here as well. The overall framework of the article is a study of the reception of "Electra" in Michael Cacoyanni's movie "Electra" from 1962.

---

[40] Bakogianni. *The taming of a tragic heroine: Electra in eighteen century art*, 33
[41] Bakogianni " *What is so 'classical' about Classical Reception? Theories, Methodologies and Future Prospects*", 101

4.1.3. Greenwood, Emily. *Reception Studies: The Cultural Mobility of Classics* (2016)

Greenwood suggests a new model within reception studies – "omni-local." The model is created with the aim to recognize the fact, that every "text" is impacted locally as it is both written and read in a specific context and culture. Greenwood writes:

> The omni-local substitutes a horizontal, two-way relationship in place of a vertical, hierarchical tradition. In the context of classical reception studies, the focus on the local dimensions of classical adaptation applies equally to the classical "source" text and reminds us that in their original context the classics were themselves "local," insofar as they worked with, read, and received existing myths and other works.[42]

And:

> Here the focus on reception is crucial since the receiving community makes or shapes the meaning of the classics being received. The omni-local model recognizes the fact that while a classics might circulate virtually among very different interpretative communities, as soon as it gets taken up and adapted it becomes specific and local, opening an inevitable translation gap between the adapted text and the adaptation. The idea that a text is inert without readers to give it meaning is a given in reception studies, specifically the reader-response theory exemplified by the work of Wolfgang Iser, who argued that "the convergence of text and reader brings the literary work into existence." To label a classic omni-local is to acknowledge its local, historical origins, some of which are untranslatable, while simultaneously crediting it with a strong degree of cross-cultural adaptability that is virtual and indeterminate – to be determined by the receiving reader and audiences.[43]

The suggested model is exemplified by a case study of Jack Mapanje´s play *The Island* (1973), which is a reception of Sophocles´ *Antigone.*

4.1.4. Laborde, Cécile. *The Reception of John Rawls in Europe* (2002)

A reception study of Jon Rawls *A theory of justice.* In the study, Laborde keeps the reception theory in focus, and she considers continuously how the theory is best applied to the actual study and, in this process, she brings up the methodical challenges and considers how to solve these. Laborde presents six approaches to the study of reception: 1) themes, 2) politics, 3) areas, 4) channels, 5) temporality, 6) geography.

4.1.5. Moser, Stephanie. *Reconstructing Ancient Worlds: Reception Studies, Archaeological Representation and the Interpretation of Ancient Egypt* (2015)

Moser´s study encompasses two main parts. First of all, an overview of the development within reception studies as a research specialization in the academic areas of history, art and film studies. Second, a case study of how visual representations have affected the reception and understanding of ancient Egypt. Moser suggests that the development of ideas about ancient Egypt both results from scholarly work as well as from mainstream media.

---

[42] Greenwood, 43
[43] Ibid., 44

4.1.6. Thompson, Martyn P. *Reception Theory and the Interpretation of Historical Meaning* (1993)

Thompson presents the theoretical differences between substantialist theory (e.g., Rezeptionsgeschichte) and pragmatic text theory (e.g., the "new" history of political thought). "Among the former, readers create meaning; among the latter, authorial intended meanings are fundamental,"[44] Thompson suggests that the two different approaches may not be mutually exclusive but actually sheds light on different aspects of the text.

4.2. Anthologies

4.2.1. Hardwick, Lorna & Stray, Christopher. *A companion to classical receptions* (2008)

Anthology with an overall focus of reception in the framework of "classical studies." The anthology contains 35 contributions in a wide range of themes from a classic understanding of reception, to new developments within performing arts, Film and "Cultural Politics. The anthology is characterized by a good balance between theory and application.
The contributions are organized in the following themes:

I)   Reception within Antiquity and Beyond.
II)   Transmission, Acculturation and Critique.
III)   Translation.
IV)   Theory and Practice.
V)   Performing Arts.
VI)   Film.
VII)   Cultural Politics.
VIII)   Changing Contexts.
IX)   Reflection and Critique.

Especially Porter's contribution, *Reception Studies: Future Prospects,* seems interesting as it identifies the main problem of the use of reception within classical studies, which according to Porter, is the lack of a theory made for the study of classics, and not literature. This lack is indeed present in the field of systematic theology as well. Porter writes:

> Yet while so much of the new scholarship in reception is theoretically sophisticated, as the essays collected in Martindale and Thomas (2006) amply demonstrate, to date no theory tailored to the specific exigencies of Greek and Roman reception exists. The theory of reception as developed by the Konstanz School (Iser, Jauss, and others, following the earlier models of Gadamer and Ingarden), and its later American offspring, reader-response theory, are frequently cited as precursors to classical reception study (see Martindale 1993; Hardwick 2003a; Martindale 2006: 1-13). Reception theory in this vein is hardly irrelevant,

---

[44] Thompson, *Reception Theory and the Interpretation of Historical Meaning,* 248.

especially in its emphasis on the subject´s constitutive role in the production of its inter-pretative objects. Still, recourse to a theory that was developed as a general model of textual interpretation is really a move *faute de mieux*, governed more by metonymy (a similarity of names) than by point of reference.[45]

… For example, because the past is actively produced as much as it is passively received, Greek and Roman reception theory must take into account the ever-changing nature of its objects. Traditions of reception are dynamic processes that flow in two directions at once, both forward and backward. We are still a long way off from a satisfactory theory that might describe, let alone explain, how this process works, though we know that it somehow does work and that classicists and the Classics would not be here if it did not work.[46]

4.2.2.   Machor, James L. & Goldstein, Philip. *Reception study: from literary theory to cultural studies* (2000)

An anthology containing 18 essays. The anthology is divided into five parts within the overall framework of the development of reception theory from a literary approach, to the use of reception within a broad range of cultural studies. The anthology is divided into the following parts: *1) Theoretical accounts of reception. 2) Literary critical studies of reception. 3) Reception studies and the history of the book. 4) Reception study, Cultural studies, and mass communication. 5) Limitations and difficulties of reception study.*
First part attempts to present the theoretical frame from ”… Jauss´s traditional, modern form to Bennett´s radical, poststructuralist approach”.[47] The second part focuses on the application of reception theory within literary-critical studies. The third part focuses on methodology. Fourth part on developments of reception studies within ”cultural studies,” ”media,” and ”mass-communication.” Finally, a fifth part focuses on the challenges and objections which have been pointed out within the theory of reception.

4.2.3.   Martindale, Charles &Thomas, Richard F. *Classics and the uses of reception* (2006)

An anthology containing 22 contributions organized in two parts; part one: *Reception in theory* (essays 2-11) and part 2: *studies in reception* (essays 12-22). The overall frame-work is reception theory within the field of classics.

5.0.   Network theory. Both applied and works of theory

5.1.   Articles

---

[45] Porter, James L, Reception Studies: Future Prospects, in Hardwick, *a companion to Classical Receptions,* 474.

[46] Ibid.

[47] Machor, James L. & Goldstein, Phillop ”Introduction”, in: *Reception Study, from literary theories to cultural studies,* XIV

5.1.1. Alexander, Michael C. & Danowski, James A. *Analysis of an ancient network: Personal communication and the study of social structure in a past society* (1990)

In this paper, Alexander and Danowski make use of network theory in a study asking whether knights and senators had the same social status in the Roman Empire. The study is interesting because of its quantitative analysis of the antique material, which normally isn't considered to be extensive enough for this kind of examination.

5.1.2. Clark, Elizabeth A. *Elite Networks, and Heresy Accusations: Towards a Social Description of the Origenist Controversy* (1992)

Elizabeth Clark applies network theory on Jerome and Rufinus in the aim of an overall study of the Origenist controversy. By doing so, Clark is able to suggest that much of the conflict stemmed from personal ties revolving around Jerome and Rufinus:

> Analysis of the factions and progress of the debate, however, reveals that dispassionate reason and theological abstraction were not the driving forces. Rather, the social description shows that much of the conflict stemmed from personal ties and loyalties revolving around Jerome and Rufinus.[48]

5.1.3. Duling, Dennis C. *The Jesus Movement and Social Network Analysis (Part I: The Spatial Network)* (1999)

In this paper, Dennis Duling lays the foundation for an analysis of the early Jesus movement in terms of social network theory which is conducted in part two. After a brief description of social network analysis, Duling then "building on Graph Theory, Central Place Theory and Urbanology about population centers... summarizes the central places around the Sea of Galilee".[49] This analysis is finally used to suggest that the "Capernaum-based lake towns [functioned] as major spatial context for Jesus´ social network."[50]

5.1.4. Duling, Dennis C. *The Jesus Movement, and Social Network Analysis: Part II. The Social Network* (2000)

Part two of Duling's study continues the study of the early Jesus movement from part 1. Dueling starts "with a more detailed discussion of social network concepts, and then analyses the Jesus Movement discussed by Theissen as an "Ego-centered network."[51] The article offers a good account of how Social Network analysis can be used in practice.

5.1.5. Duling, Dennis C. *Paul's Aegean Network: The Strength of Strong Ties* (2013)

In this paper, Duling considers how social network theory may shed light on the type of relation Paul established during his office. Starting with István Czachesz´s thesis, that "new, innovative information spread through a network ["weak ties"], not through one´s

---

[48] Clark. *Elite networks and heresy accusations: towards a social description of the origenist controversy, 79*

[49] Duling *The Jesus Movement and Social Network Analysis (Part 1: The Spatial Network),* 156

[50] Ibid.

[51] Duling The Jesus Movement and Social Network Analysis (part II. The Social Network), p. 3

intimate family and friends ("strong ties")[52], Duling tries to counterbalance this thesis with "the SNA theory that strong ties are necessary for reinforcing risky behavioural change".[53] The article presents the used theory and shows the application of it.

5.2. Books

5.2.1. Carrington, Peter J. Scott, John. Wasserman, Stanley. *Models and methods in social network analysis* (2005)

Models and methods in social network analysis is intended as a complement to Wasserman and Faust *Social Network Analysis*. "It presents the most important developments within quantitative models and methods for analyzing social network data that have appeared during the 1990´s."[54] Similar to Wasserman & Faust (2007) is *Models and methods in social network analysis* a comprehensive "how-to guide." The book will seem impassable for most readers not educated in social science.

5.2.2. Kadushin, Charles. *Understanding social networks: concepts, theories, and findings* (2011)

Kadushin offers an introduction to the basic ideas underlying social network theory. The book is not meant as a "how to" but as a broad introduction. In chap 12, Kadushin offers a quick overview of the "ten master ideas of social networks." An interesting definition of a network is found in Kadushin:

> A network is simply a set of relations between objects which could be people, organizations, nations, items found in a Google search, brain cells, or electrical transformers. … We are concerned with *social* networks, and what passes through these networks – friendship, love, money, power, **ideas**, and even disease.[55]

5.2.3. Scott, John & Carrington, Peter J. *The SAGE Handbook of Social Network Analysis* (2011)

An anthology containing 38 contributions organized in three sections. Section I "General issues" (Essay 2-7). Section II "Substantive Topics" (Essay 8-22) and finally section III "Concepts and methods" (Essay 23-38). In the introduction of the book it says:

> The *SAGE Handbook of Social Network Analysis* is the first published attempt to present, in a single volume, an overview of the social network analysis paradigm. It includes accounts of the history, theory, and methods of social network analysis, and a comprehensive review of its application on the various substantive areas of work in which cutting-edge research is taking place.[56]

---

[52] Duling, *Paul´s Aegean Network: The Strength of Strong Ties*, p. 135
[53] Ibid.
[54] Carrington & Wasserman. *Models and methods in social network analysis,* "Half title". Scott & Carrington. *The SAGE Handbook of Social Network Analysis*, p. 1
[55] Kadushin. *Understanding social networks: concepts, theories, and findings,* 3-4. Bold added.
[56] Scott & Carrington, *The SAGE Handbook of Social Network Analysis,* 1

5.2.4. Wasserman, Stanley & Faust, Katherine. *Social network analysis: methods and applications* (1994)

Wasserman´s and Faust´s *Social Network Analysis* offers a comprehensive introduction to social network theory. The book reviews and discusses methods for the analysis of social networks with a focus on the application of these methods.