

**How to Cite:**

Singh, R., & Pratima, P. (2022). Jauss' theory of reception: A critical view. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S6), 2151–2162. <https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS6.10261>

## **Jauss' theory of reception: A critical view**

**Raj Singh**

Research Scholar Maharishi University of Information Technology Lucknow

**Dr. Pratima**

Associate Professor Deptt of English RBS College Agra

**Abstract**---This chapter tries to look at the reception theory from a lot of different angles. Background: This chapter talks about things like reader response criticism, the Konstanz school of criticism, Hans Robert Jauss, reception theory, and a lot of other things about the theory. Trying to look at Jauss' reception theory in a different way is also a goal. Reception Theory is a novel approach to the reader's role in connection to the principles of interpretation, as well as one of the most significant contributions to the history of literature and a fresh viewpoint on literary experiences. It set a new standard for writers and theorists. Although it is impossible to fully comprehend how strong and revolutionary this paradigm shift was at the time, it is evident that the notions that emerged from Reception Theory are today integral to our attempts to comprehend literature, art, and the world.

**Keywords**---criticism, reception theory, novel, literature.

### **Introduction**

This chapter tries to look at the reception theory from a lot of different angles. Background: This chapter talks about things like reader response criticism, the Konstanz school of criticism, Hans Robert Jauss, reception theory, and a lot of other things about the theory. Trying to look at Jauss' reception theory in a different way is also a goal.

### **Criticism from the Reader**

Those who study modern literature look at the books from the point of view of the people who read them. This group of critics and philosophers is called "reader response criticism." It emphasises how important it is for the reader to understand, make sense, and enjoy a text. They pay attention to the reader as an individual and how they fit into groups, such as gender, nationality, ethnicity, religion, class, age, and so on, and how they react to a piece of literature. The goal of reader response criticism is to show how different and different people are when they read a piece of literature and how they react to it. It also wants to find

out how people who read or watch literature react to it. As long as you only look at the text's creator or author, you're a classist. If you think that there is no beauty without someone to look at it, you're a reader response theorist. There is a book called "N Krishnaswami, 64" by this author.

There is a person who thinks about what happens when people read. Criticism thinks that the reader is an important part of the text's meaning-making process. He or she completes the text and brings it to life in the real world. They think of literature as a kind of performance art, where everyone who reads a book does something related to the text. They don't like new critics who don't let the reader play a role in recreating the work of literature and only look at the text as a complete and objective, fixed text. They also don't agree with the formalist view, which says that only the form of a text can be used to make meaning. Formalists, who are critics of this school, think that text isn't important because it's not the same for everyone who reads or writes it. Reader response criticism focuses on how a text is put together. It comes from a branch of philosophy called phenomenology, which is about how things look. The phenomenological idea of knowledge says that reality isn't found in the outside world itself, but rather in how we think about things that are outside of us. A person's actual knowledge is what he or she knows about the world and what he or she thinks about it. Reader response criticism is based on the idea that a reader is always connected to the text and author who make up a piece of literature. People don't get the full picture of a work until they make a deal with it by taking it in and making it real with their own knowledge and experience in mind. It's said that Joseph Chandra, 90, is a very old man.

People use the term "reader response criticism" when they talk about a group of critical theories that have been around since the 1960s. All of these theories focus on how the reader reacts to a piece of literature rather than the text itself. Reading a text in response criticism means that it isn't seen as an object with a single "correct" meaning. Instead, it is seen as a process that happens inside the reader's head. In this way, the reader is actually a part of making the text. Reader response critics, no matter what they think, agree that the meaning of a text is made up by each person who reads it. Reader response theorists often ask this question: What are the specific things that make people respond to a piece of text? How does the text make sense, if there is any at all? Who has the power to make the reader feel a certain way about the text? He says that (Manoharlal Shah, 171)

This type of criticism was popular in the 1960s and 70s in both the United States and Germany, but it didn't become popular until the 1980s. Norm Holland, Stanley fish, Wolfgang Iser, and Hans Robert Jauss are some of the school's most important early founders. Louise Rosenblatt is also thought to be the first person to start this school. Her book *Literature as Exploration* and an essay called *Towards a Transactional Theory of Reading* give some examples of Reader-Response Theory. *Surprised by Sin*, written by Stanley Fish in 1967, is thought to be the beginning of modern reader response criticism. His work tries to answer some questions about reader-centered theories. Who is the reader, what types of readers are there, how the reader should respond to a piece of literature, and how true judgement should be done. He comes up with the term "interpretive

community," and he puts a lot of different ideas in the same direction. The idea of an interpretative community makes the reader part of a group. According to Fish, interpretive communities are made up of people who agree on how to interpret things. He says that if people belong to the same interpretive community, the meaning stays the same. There is a book by N. Krishnaswami called 67. He says that no reading, no matter how crazy it looks, is impossible.

It is hard for him to agree with both the Socialists and the Formalists in his text. He talks about "an act of reading" instead of "individual reception." According to him, reading happens in a specific situation, and the reader doesn't see the text's meaning the same way it did when it was written. Jauss says that the reader uses different criteria at different times, which he calls "Horizon and Expectation," to decide how literary a text or genre is. These are called "Horizon and Expectation." According to him, "no work is universal." This means that what appeals to our generation at one time may not be interesting to someone else at another time. A literary work is not a thing that stands on its own and gives the same face to everyone who reads it, or that has the same essence for everyone. Jauss' approach to Reception Theory is very different from Iser's. In this way, the idea of history is very important to the horizon of expectations. This is also what Jauss says. Literature and society can be connected by the horizon of expectations, he says. Jauss says that "The social function of literature comes to light only when the literary experience of the reader enters the horizon of expectation." In Jauss, 39, he says that.

Jonathan Cullar wrote a critical work called structuralist poetics. In it, he tries to figure out how people read and what they do. He also agrees that the reader uncovers the text and its meaning, and he says that the theory of reading should explain how people read. He also says that the theory of the structure of a text or genre is hard because there isn't a specific kind of skill you can learn. Reader response critics say that the reader has a place in the reading and understanding process, but there are some limitations. For example, text-oriented critics think that letting readers evaluate and interpret the text as they want is a lawless subjectivism, and sometimes readers can use amateur or professional procedures for their own benefit. Reader response critics shine a lot of light on how a piece of literature is made and how people think about it. They also try to show how meaning is made, the role of the reader, types of readers, reading strategies, and how the author text and the reader work together. As a new school of thought in literary history and theory, this one puts the reader at the centre of how things are made sense to them.

### **School of Reception Aesthetic: The one in Konstanz**

In Germany, there are two people at the University of Konstanz who are teachers. Hans Robert Jauss and Wolfgang Iser Both of the theorists are interested in how readers understand the power of a text and how readings change over time. ([www.library.utoronto.ca/utl/glossary](http://www.library.utoronto.ca/utl/glossary)) The Konstanz School of literary studies came up with the idea of a "reception aesthetic" in the 1960s to deal with a split in literary studies. The Konstanz school said that literary studies had been mostly about making a history of the best literary works that had helped people think about their own national identity as they made their way to it. They thought that

the relationship between literature and history, at the expense of its art, was just copying or commenting. There were also people who tried to figure out how creation and interpretation worked together. ([www.books.google.co.in](http://www.books.google.co.in))

### **Hans Robert Jauss**

Among other things, Hans Robert Jauss is a German literary theorist. He is best known for setting up the field of Reception Aesthetics. His work with his friend Wolfgang Iser led to a big change in how Anglo-American critics think about what people read. Jauss was born in Goppingen, Germany. He went to school in Esslingen and Gesslingen. At the start of the war in 1939, he went to the army. He served on the Russian Front. He is briefly held as an enemy combatant at the end of the war, which means that he can't go to university until 1948. When he was in high school and college, he studied at the University of Heidelberg. He graduated in 1957 with a dissertation about Marcel Proust. Between 1959 and 1966, Jauss worked in Munster and Giessen, where he lived and went to school. In 1966, he is asked to join the new university of Konstanz and help set up the field of literary studies. It is called the Konstanz school because he does this with help from a lot of other people. In 1967, Jauss gave his first lecture. It was called "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory," and it was a big part of what he called "reception aesthetics." History of literature is interested in how people read and write together. To get an idea of what an aesthetic of reception would look like, he wrote "Toward an Aesthetic of Reception" in 1982. "Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics" and "Question and Answer" are also important (1989). ([www.oxfordindex.oup.com](http://www.oxfordindex.oup.com))

### **Reception Theory**

If you want to learn more about Hans Robert Jauss' work in the field of theory of reception, you can start with his lecture at Konstanz University in Germany called "Literary History and Literary Theory." The theory of reception isn't as well known in the United States as it is in Germany. "To the foreign ear, the question of reception may seem more relevant to hotel management than to literature." This word, "horizon," is important to know if you want to fully understand the reception theory.

### **The Horizon of Expectations**

Jauss came up with the term "horizon of expectation" when he was writing about how people should look at things. There is a lot of information about each person who reads this. Jauss uses the term to describe the criteria that people use to judge literary texts in any given time. In his dictionary, Cuddon says: Jauss came up with this term to describe the criteria that readers used to judge literary texts in any given time. It is an important part of Jauss' aesthetic of reception, and the term refers to the shared set of assumptions that can be attributed to any given generation of readers. The criteria help form readers' opinions of, for example, a poem in a way that isn't just based on their own feelings. The poetry of one time is judged, valued, and interpreted by people who live in the same time. However, the views of that time don't always set the meaning and value of poetry in stone. Because the expectations of each generation will change, the meaning and value

of things are not set in stone. A literary work is not an object that stands on its own and gives the same face to everyone who reads it at the same time. Jauss says this: It is not a monument that talks about itself in a monologue. The poetry of each time and place is reinterpreted by the people who live there. "Aesthetic distance" is how far a work is from the "horizon of expectations" of its first readers. This is how literary value is measured. (Cuddon, 387) This is how it looks like:

In his essay "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory," Jauss tries to come up with a theory of aesthetic reception based on socio-historical context and a way to figure out how texts are read and judged. According to Ian Maclean, the concept called "Horizon of Expectations" can be seen in how textual strategies (like genre, literary illusion, and the nature of fictional and poetic language) help readers understand what they should expect from a text. In this way, the value of literature is measured by how far away from the reader you are. This creates a spectrum on one end of which there is "culinary" (totally consumable) reading and on the other, works that have a big impact on their readers. A lot of people say that (Cuddon, 388)

### **Historiography of Jauss' Reception Aesthetic**

The numerous significant changes that occurred in Germany throughout the 1960s aid in comprehending and explaining the origins and context of Jauss' reception theory. Academic dissatisfaction was increasing in tandem with economic discontent. This is exemplified by Jauss, Iser, and other philosophers' "Memorandum for the Reform of the Study of Linguistics and Literature," which argues for methodological and structural improvements in universities. German literary studies had reached a crisis point within the paradigm by which it was being done, with the techniques and values of teaching literary contexts being called into question. The difficulty with the historical critical and aesthetic formalist approaches was that they obscured and hid the reader's responsibility. While the reader is an indispensable component of any act of interpretation, the reader's function has been discussed infrequently. The literary tradition is established solely through the experiences of individuals who read, interpret, and apply the message of the texts. As a result, Jauss sought a theory that did justice to the dynamic process of production and reception from author, work, and audience, and that would steer the study of literature away from the positivist dead ends of literary history. (127) ([www.thesis.nottingham.ac.uk](http://www.thesis.nottingham.ac.uk))

In the 1960s, there is a renaissance in the study of literary hermeneutics; Jauss was prompted to ask this question by Gadmer's research in this field. Insofar as it is a historical marker and a necessary prerequisite for the possibility of experimental knowledge, the idea in question is that of horizon, which constitutes all meaning structures associated to human action and main forms of word comprehension. (128, [www.thesis.nottingham.ac.uk](http://www.thesis.nottingham.ac.uk)) Jauss has a background in mediaeval literature. His interest in these aesthetics originated from his academic pursuits. His study of mediaeval literature presented him with issues concerning the possibilities of direct aesthetic comprehension through the text itself, the role that the text's original horizon initially played in its comprehension, and the possibilities of historical reflection through background information.

In his presentation titled "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary History," Jauss attempted to address deficiencies in existing literary theories and presented his conclusion. In an interview, Jauss states, "I attempted to conceive of a new literary history, one that opened the closed circuit of author and work in the direction of the receiver and was intended to make this receiver, whether a reader or the public, the intermediary between the past and the present, the work and its effects." Such a history would have to contend with the concept of objectivity promoted by the old, discredited literary history as well as the demands for precision posed by those sociologists and structuralists who derided historical comprehension. (128) ([www.thesis.nottingham.ac.uk](http://www.thesis.nottingham.ac.uk)).

### **The destruction of Literary History**

Jauss focuses primarily on the connection between literature and history. During the 1960s, literary history is viewed as an obsolete type of knowledge since it is chronologically confined and does not approach literature from an aesthetic perspective. It was a challenge for Jauss to reformulate and modify the notion of literary history. This is the valid critique against which the response must succeed and prevail. This crisis in literary history has its roots in the positive history of the nineteenth century. The adoption of scientific methods by positivist historians removed a distinctive framework from literary history. As a result, literary history gets consumed by general history. In two respects, this method does not do credit to the history of literature. First, it does not account for the categorical distinction between literary effects and There is a relationship in writing between the author who generates the meaning and the reader who realises it repeatedly. This relationship is missed by positivistic history since it compares works and writers to one another. In addition, it served the communication process between the author and the text, but not the recipient. This is the same argument that Gadmer makes on a positivistic approach to history; by objectifying the text, you have rendered it impotent. (129) ([www.thesis.nottingham.ac.uk](http://www.thesis.nottingham.ac.uk)). As a result, the text becomes divorced from the creative act, leaving only remnants or relics of the creative thought. As with other silent relics of the past, the particular text has no intrinsic worth and serves solely as a source, i.e., as a material imparting knowledge of the past historical context.

### **Marxism**

According to Jauss, two viable schools of thought offer solutions to the dilemma in 20th-century literary history. Marxism considers art (literary) as a form of human world appropriation. It emphasises the notion that art and literature are not separate forms, but rather integral components of the living process, and that only when this is taken into account does history cease to be a collection of dead facts. As opposed to other theories, Marxism does not take a relativistic or uncritical stance towards tradition. Jauss's critique of Marxism focuses mostly on East German Marxist philosophy. He writes: "The essential challenge of Marxist literary theory, which is always renewed, is that it denies art and the associated forms of awareness of ethics, religion, and metaphysics their own histories. The history of literature, like the history of art, can no longer maintain the "appearance of its independence" once it is understood that its production

presupposes the material production and social praxis of human beings, and that even artistic production is a part of the real-life process of appropriation of nature that determines the history of human labour or development. Only when the active living process is depicted does history cease to be a collection of Thus, literature and art can be viewed as a process "only in relation to the praxis of historical human beings" in their "social function" (Werner Krauss), conceived as one of the coeval "kinds of human appropriation of the world and represented as part of the general process of history in which man overcomes his natural condition in order to become human (Karl Kosik)" (Jauss, number 10)

The primary point of argument between Jauss and Marxism is the function of production. According to Jauss, in order to comprehend the intrinsic inadequacy of Marxist literary theory, one must comprehend the dual nature of literature. Literature not only reflects but also produces reality. His opinion is that the text's expression of reality and the reality it creates are intrinsically linked. Literature not only produces social influence and serves as a reservoir of culture, but it also has a formative effect on society. Literature is a product of social processes, not an agent of social change, according to Marxist ideology. ([www.thesis.nottingham.ac.uk/nottingham/132](http://www.thesis.nottingham.ac.uk/nottingham/132)) By moving beyond Marxist literary theory, Jauss hopes to incorporate the literary work's effect and reception into literary history. "The realisation that the historical essence of a work of art consists not only in its representational or expressive function, but also in its influence, must have two implications for a new foundation of literary history," he explains. If the life of the work emerges "not from autonomous existence but rather from the reciprocal connection between the work and humanity," then this ceaseless effort of knowledge and active replication of the past cannot be confined to a single piece. In contrast, the link of work to work must now be incorporated into this interaction between labour and humanity, and the historical coherence of works among themselves must be understood in the context of the relationship between production and reception.

### **Formalism**

Formalism as a literary movement and principally as a Russian linguistic trend began with the 1916-1919 publication of Roman Jakobson's *Studies in the Theory of Poetic Language*. By the conclusion of Formalism, many of its proponents were pressured by Marxist critics to unrestrict their beliefs. Formalism has endured in literary practises for a long time despite harsh criticism. It exerts a significant influence on the Prague School of literary ideas. After the release of Viktor Erich's book, *Russian Formalism: History and Doctrine*, and the translation of some of the original formalist works in 1955, it became well-known in Germany, Anglo-American literary and biblical studies. Hans Robert Jauss attempts to recover the beneficial principles of formalism and reintroduce them to literary studies and theory.

Further, according to Jauss, the formalist school of literary theory introduced the diachronic perspective to literary research and established new concepts such as literary forms, functions, and genres, which is a significant contribution. Formalism corrects the positivistic idea that the study of literary works is a closed system connected at most by a broad outline of history, the works of an author, a

particular style, or a particular genre. It attempts to compare one text to another in order to determine their evolutionary connections. A writer can choose from a variety of genres and linguistic styles when producing her piece. Genres are transformed or new ones are developed by the author's inventiveness and use of literary conventions in her works. However, once a text has been produced, it becomes a literary fact and is incorporated into the literary tradition, which in turn influences the opportunities for future authors. Elements of defamiliarisation that were novel and unexpected for the initial audience have "levelled out" and become part of the horizon of expectation for succeeding generations of readers, such that they no longer serve to disturb their expectations. (<http://www.thesis.nottingham.ac.uk/content/136-137>) As the dialectical self-production of new forms, it necessitates teleology, as Jauss says; the works that so differ from or replace one another would appear as a moment in a process that no longer needs to be formed as going toward some endpoint. 136, *www.thesis.nottingham.ac.uk*

The lack of a historical and social viewpoint is criticised by Jauss as a flaw of formalism. In addition, he critiques formalism for considering the text as autonomous and studying solely the text's internal and intertextual structure. Formalism's programme of explanation does not provide a sufficient foundation for constructing literary history. According to Jauss, "formalism must be opened up in order to analyse the relationship between the text and the questions left by earlier works, as well as the questions left by the text itself. Thus, Marxism and formalism overlook how literature influences culture and historical progression." (16-20 Jauss) Jauss suggests that formalism be updated to incorporate an aesthetic of reception that examines the original horizon of expectation in which the text first appeared, the horizon of the reader, and the text's interior features. 137) [www.thesis.nottingham.ac.uk](http://www.thesis.nottingham.ac.uk); By placing the reader at the heart of the discourse, Jauss argues that the reader, the listener, and the audience – in short, the audience element – play a very little part in both literary theories. If at all, orthodox Marxist aesthetics addresses the reader identically to the author, inquiring about his social position or attempting to locate him within the structure of a portrayed society. The formalist school merely requires the reader to be a perceiving subject who follows the text's instructions in order to differentiate the (literary) form or find the (literary) procedure. Jauss views the reader as an active agent who plays a significant role in moulding literary history; he also urges the reader to be engaged and play a significant role in literary theory. He writes: "The historical existence of a literary work is inconceivable without the participation of its intended audience." For it is only through the act of its mediation that the work enters the shifting horizon of expectation of a continuity in which there is a constant inversion from simple receipt to critical understanding, and from established aesthetic norms to a new production that exceeds them." (19 J. Auss,)

According to Jauss, neither the approach to which the literary work is primarily directed recognises the reader's function. For critics who think of his work in light of positive or negative norms of an earlier work and literary historians who classify a work within his lineage and explain it historically are also readers before their reflexive relationship to literature may become productive once more, he argues. In the triangle of author, work, and reading audience, the latter is not



a passive element nor a simple sequence of responses, but a force capable of shaping history. A literary work's historical existence is inconceivable without the engagement of its audience. For it is only through the process of its communication that the work reaches the ever-changing horizon of experience, in a continuum of change from simple reception to critical comprehension, from passive to active reception, and from established aesthetic norms to a new production that exceeds them. The historicity and communicative nature of literature presuppose a relationship between work, audience, and new work that takes the form of a dialogue and a process, and that can be understood in terms of the relationship between message and recipient, as well as the relationships between question and answer, problem and solution.

In order to find a new solution to the problem of understanding the historical sequence of literary works as a literary history, the circular system of production and of representation, within which the methodology of literary criticism has primarily moved in the past, must be expanded to include an aesthetic of reception and impact. (8 Jauss & Benzinger). Further, Jauss says that the aesthetic of reception is important because it bridges the gap between passive reception and active understanding, norm setting experience and new ideas. History of literature can be seen as a conversation between work and people. This means that the contrast between its aesthetic and historical aspects is also always being filtered through. History had cut off the thread that went from the work's past appearance to its current experience, but now it's back together again. Juss and Benzinger, 8, say that

### **Critical Viewpoint**

In his aesthetic of reception, Jauss views literary history as requiring literary theory to revisit the unsolved disagreement between the Marxists, i.e., the Socialist school, and the Formalist school. Formalism is a literary theory that originated in Russia in the early 1920s. Its adherents or practitioners, known as formalists, emphasised the study of poetic language or literary text as a form. In fact, the Formalist eliminated the distinction between Form and Content. Socialism was primarily concerned with Economic, Political, and Philosophical concerns and developed an explanation for the capitalist theory and manner of production. They did not build a literary or cultural aesthetic. The socialist critic wrote from the distinct perspective of Marx's philosophical views and his view of history, in which class conflict is crucial, or in terms of sociohistorical elements. They are concerned with reconstructing the part on the basis of historical facts in order to determine the extent to which a text is a truthful and accurate reflection of social reality at a certain time.

At the outset of his article, Jauss makes it apparent that he intends to bridge the gap between literature and history, between historical and aesthetic approaches, at the point where both schools converge. My attempt to bridge the gap between literature and history, between historical and aesthetic approaches, begins when both schools cease to exist, according to Jauss. In accordance with the circular aesthetic system of production and representation, their methodologies interpret literary facts in terms of the literary fact itself. In doing so, they deprive literature of a quality that is inextricably linked to both its artistic nature and its social

function: reception and influence. In these literary theories, the reader, listener, and observer - in short, the audience - have an exceedingly limited role. (7) Jauss and Benzinger In addition, Jauss adopts Walter Bulst's assertion that "no text was ever intended to be read and understood philologically by a philologist, nor historically by a historian." (7) Jauss and Benzinger

Hans Robert Jauss occupies the position of compromiser in his argument; he is neither a socialist admirer nor a formalist. According to him, he explains "the act of reading" rather than "individual reception"; reading occurs in a particular environment, and the reader does not see the text's meaning in the same way as when it was first written. Jauss contends that the reader utilises different criteria, which he refers to as "Horizon and Expectation," at different times to evaluate the literary quality of a piece or the genre to which it belongs. According to him, "no work is universal"; what appeals to our generation at a specific time may not be of interest to future generations. A literary work is not an item that stands on its own and presents the same face to every reader in every era or possesses a timeless essence.

Literature is viewed "from the perspective of the reader or consumer" and "as a dialectical process of production and reception" according to Jauss' theory. In addition, Jauss develops seven theses that offer a comprehensive aesthetic approach to rewriting literary history. In his sixth thesis, Jauss uses advancements in linguistics to undermine the dominance of the diachronic technique employed in conventional literary history. A literary historian should not only view a literary work of art in the context of its diachronic tradition, but also in the context of its synchronic tradition, which aids in comprehending the shifting aesthetic attitudes and general relationship in literature of a certain historical period. According to Jauss, the accomplishments established in linguistics through the differentiation and methodological interrelationships of diachronic and synchronic analysis provide the impetus for overcoming the diachronic perspective - previously the only one used in literary history - in both disciplines. If the perspective of the history of reception always encounters the functional connections between the understanding of new works and the significance of older ones when considering changes in aesthetic attitudes, it must also be possible to take a synchronic cross-section of a moment in the development, arrange the heterogeneous multiplicity of contemporaneous works in equivalent, opposing, and hierarchical structure, and thus discover an overarching trajectory. From this may be derived the concept of depiction of new literary history, if other cross-sections diachronically before and after were arranged to articulate historically the shift in literary structures at their epoch-making moments. (Jauss, number 36)

In his last thesis, Jauss shows that literary history is not the same as general history or a mere chronological compilation of previous facts, but that it is a distinct history with a unique relationship to general history. In order to comprehend the social role of literature, literary historians must view literary history as a subset of general history and consider its relationship to the larger historical narrative. "The mission of literary history is therefore only complete when literary production is not only represented synchronically and diachronically in the succession of its systems, but also viewed as "special

history" in its own distinctive relationship to general history," he argues. This relationship does not end with the fact that a typified, idealised, satirical, or utopian image of the social function of literature manifests itself in its genuine possibility only where the literary experience of the reader enters the horizon of expectations of his lived praxis, preforms his understanding of the world, and consequently has an impact on his social behaviour." (Jauss, page 39). Jauss argues that literary historians should abandon the traditional, objective, and positivistic approach to writing literary history, in which the function of the reader is either overlooked or mistaken for that of the author. These concepts, according to Jauss, serve as the foundation for bridging the gap between literature and history, between historical and aesthetic approaches.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, it is evident that Jauss's theory is concerned with reader participation and understands the significance of an individual's expectation horizon. Reception Theory is a novel approach to the reader's role in connection to the principles of interpretation, as well as one of the most significant contributions to the history of literature and a fresh viewpoint on literary experiences. It set a new standard for writers and theorists. Although it is impossible to fully comprehend how strong and revolutionary this paradigm shift was at the time, it is evident that the notions that emerged from Reception Theory are today integral to our attempts to comprehend literature, art, and the world. The theory liberates the work of art from preconceived notions such as "text is a rigidly articulated form" or "text is a particular historical entity" and places it under the reader's control and expectations.

### **References**

1. Abrams, M H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms. VII ed.* Earl McPeck. New Delhi, 2016.
2. Ami, Upadhay. *The Indian Poetics.* Prakash Book Depot. Bareilly, 2015.
3. Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory, an Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory.* Viva Books, New Delhi, 2014.
4. Chaudhary, Satya Dev. *The Glimpses of Indian Poetics.* Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, 2010.
5. Cuddon, J A. Ed. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory.* Maya Blackwell Doaba House, New Delhi, 2008.
6. Cullor, Jonathan. *Literary Theory, a Very Short Introduction.* Oxford University Press, New York, 2010.
7. Devi, G N. *Indian Literary Criticism: Theory and Interpretation.* Orient Longman, Hyderabad, 2012.
8. Ghosh, Manmohan. *Natyashastra.* Trans. The Royal Asiatic Society, Kolkata, 2000.
9. Holub, Robert C. *Reception Theory: A Critical Introduction.* Methuen, London, 2004.
10. Iser, Wolfgang. *The Act of reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Responses.* John Hopkins University Press, Biltmore, 2008.
11. Jauss, Hans Robert and Elizabeth Benzinger. *Literary History as a Challenge to literary Theory.* New Literary History, Vol. 2 No. 1, A Symposium on

- Literary History (Autumn, 2000) 7- 37. Johns Hopkins University Press. [www.jstore.org/stable/468585](http://www.jstore.org/stable/468585). 17/10/2013.
12. Jauss, Hans Robert. *Towards an Aesthetic of Reception*. Trans. Timothy Bahti. University of Minnesota. Minneapolis, 2002.
  13. Kane, P V. *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, New Delhi, 2001.
  14. Masson, J L. M V. Patwardhan. *Aesthetic Rapture*, 2Vols. Poona Deccan College, Poona, 2000.
  15. Masson, J L. M V. Patwardhan. *Shanta Rasa and Abhinavgupta's philosophy of Aesthetics*. Bhandarkar oriental Series, Poona, 2009.
  16. Patnaik, P. *Rasa in Aesthetic*. D K Print world Ltd.; New Delhi, 2014.
  17. Rangacharya, Adya. *Introduction to Natyashastra*. Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.; New Delhi, 2015.
  18. Seldon, Raman. Peter Widdowson. Peter Brooker. *A Reader's Guide to contemporary Literary Theory*. Pearson Education Ltd. New Delhi, 2016.
  19. Shah, Manoharlal. *Fundamentals of Literary Theory and Criticism*. Swastic Publishers and Distributors, Delhi, 2015.
  20. [20] Sinha, M P. *Research Methods in English*. Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi, 2017.
  21. Arnawa, I.K., Sapanca, P.L.Y., Martini, L.K.B., Udayana, I.G.B., Suryasa, W. (2019). Food security program towards community food consumption. *Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems*, 11(2), 1198-1210.
  22. Gede Budasi, I. & Wayan Suryasa, I. (2021). The cultural view of North Bali community towards Ngidih marriage reflected from its lexicons. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(3), 1484-1497
  23. Gustiani, R., Hakimi, M., & Suryaningsih, E. K. (2022). The implementation of referral system in postpartum hemorrhage cases by midwife. *International Journal of Health & Medical Sciences*, 5(3).  
<https://doi.org/10.21744/ijhms.v5n3.1917>