

# DOWNLOAD PDF LITERATURE IN THE READER : AFFECTIVE STYLISTICS

## STANLEY E. FISH

### Chapter 1 : Affective Stylistics – Literary Theory and Criticism

*The aim of this essay is to illustrate the concept of reader-response criticism as presented by Stanley Fish in Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics. I shall define the main ideas that this type of interpretation has brought to literary.*

The text is examined closely, often line by line or even word by word, in order to understand how stylistics it affects affective the reader in the process of reading. Although there is thus a great deal of focus on the text, which is why some theorists consider this approach transactional in nature, many practitioners of affective stylistics do not consider the text an objective, autonomous entity—it does not have a fixed meaning independent of readers—because the text consists of the results it produces, and those results occur within the reader. Some of the finest examples of this procedure have been produced by Fish. That Judas perished by hanging himself, there is no certainty in Scripture: Even if we notice that the sentence does say something—it says that Scripture gives us no clear indication of whether or not Judas hanged himself—his point is that the sentence tells us only that it is unable to tell us anything. What this passage about Judas does, Fish notes, is move the reader from certainty to uncertainty. We thus begin with a feeling of certainty that leads us, without our being quite conscious of it, to anticipate a number of possible ways the sentence might end, all of which would confirm our certainty that Judas hanged himself. Fish offers these three examples of the kinds of endings the first clause leads us to expect. That Judas perished by hanging himself is an example for us all. That Judas perished by hanging himself shows how conscious he was of the enormity of his sin. That Judas perished by hanging himself should give us pause. Now the reader is involved in a completely different kind of activity. In such a situation, the reader will tend to read on in hopes of finding clarification. This response is then used to show that the meaning of the text does not consist of the final conclusion we draw about what the text says; rather, the meaning of the text consists of our experience of what the text does to us as we read it. For a text is an event that occurs in time: We desire sure knowledge. We pursue it, and we expect to get it. But this text teaches us that we cannot be certain of anything. For example, most practitioners of affective stylistics will cite the responses of other readers—of other literary critics, for example—to show that their own analyses of the reading activities provided by a particular text are valid for readers other than just themselves. A critic might even cite an extreme divergence of critical opinion about the text to support, for example, the contention that the text provides an unsettling, decentering, or confusing reading experience. Thematic evidence from the text itself is also usually provided to show that the text is about the experience of reading. Of course, reading materials or acts of reading described in the story work especially well for this purpose. For example, the tattered book that Marlow finds abandoned in the jungle, which he is unable to read, is emblematic of his, and our, inability to decipher what we see before us. As noted above, the textual evidence at this point is thematic:

# DOWNLOAD PDF LITERATURE IN THE READER : AFFECTIVE STYLISTICS

## STANLEY E. FISH

### Chapter 2 : CiteSeerX " Citation Query Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics." New Literary Histor

*Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics* The aim of my essay is to illustrate the concept of reader-response criticism as presented by Stanley Fish in *Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics*.

Tompkins was extraordinarily insightful and educating on the essential features of reader-response criticism. Giving me an inside look into the writings of well-known figures in this school of literary criticism, such as Stanley E. Holland, and Wolfgang Iser, Tompkins allowed me to better understand what this school was all about. Tompkins states the following about her book: I also enjoyed his metaphor regarding the process of reading on page 57, which says the following: Furthermore, within this book, Iser debates the fundamental questions: Although all scholars always have a plethora of questions, they all agree when it comes to interpretation of texts and the fact that all readers interpret in different ways. Fish is one of the best-known contemporary American literary theorist. And what the sentence does is give the reader something and then take it away, drawing him on with the unredeemed promise of its return. A secondary source that describes Stanley Fish and his contributions to reader-response school of literary criticism is the Bedford St. They state the following regarding Fish: This replaced the individual reader of reader-response criticism with a variety of readers that share the same set of interpretive strategies. This theory caused him to be one of the most influential and most cited theorists of his time, maybe because of his refusal to settle down on one position or stance. On page 2, he describes his viewpoints by saying the following: Holland agrees with Fish and Iser in that readers interpret things in several different ways. From Formalism to Post-Structuralism Criticism: We work out through the text our own characteristic patterns of desire. What was the status of that description or the cause of the experience it described? Furthermore, a term that was introduced by W. It begins by trying to derive the standards of criticism from the psychological effects of the poem and ends in impressionism and relativism. In fact, Wimsatt and Beardsley and their famous term are praised by Stanley E. The John Hopkins UP, Is There a Text in This Class?: The Authority of Interpretive Communities. From Reader Response to Literary Anthropology. The Johns Hopkins UP, Definition of Reader-Response Criticism.

# DOWNLOAD PDF LITERATURE IN THE READER : AFFECTIVE STYLISTICS

## STANLEY E. FISH

### Chapter 3 : Project MUSE - Stanley Fish's Reading of Seventeenth-Century Literature

*Affective stylistics is derived from analyzing further the notion that a literary text is an event that occurs in time*—“that comes into being as it is read”—rather than an object that exists in space.

Andreea Paris Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics The aim of my essay is to illustrate the concept of reader-response criticism as presented by Stanley Fish in *Literature in the Reader*: I shall define the main ideas that this type of interpretation has brought to literary criticism, point out the essential oppositions to new criticism and try to display its strong points as well as its weak points. To begin with, I would like to specify that up until the time when reader-response criticism began, around the s, the reader was barely ever taken into consideration while analyzing a literary work. To support this statement, Louise Michelle Rosenblatt has given the best example: On a darkened stage I see figures of the author and the reader, with a book — the text of the poem or play or novel — between them. The spotlight focuses on one of them so brightly that the others fade into practical invisibility. Throughout the centuries, it becomes apparent, usually either the book or the author has received major illumination. This concept appears in complete opposition to the New Criticism, which focuses only on the text and eliminates any other external factor that could influence the interpretation. Returning to the text, Stanley Fish poses one question in the middle of this concept — what does the word, phrase, sentence, paragraph, chapter, novel, play, poem, do? This suggests an idea that the text is a succession of words written in a manner that is meant to generate a reaction. Such a reaction goes beyond mere feelings one may have towards a literary text, to any and all 73 of the sentiments that can be brought about by a series of words. The key approach here is taking into account that a reader reacts according his to temporal flow of reading, as Fish calls it, 2 and not to the whole utterance Furthermore, the temporal character of this concept comes to emphasize the opposition to the formalist point of view, which was a spatial one. The approach mentioned above implies slowing down the reading experience so that it allows a better understanding of the meaning conveyed by the text. A more careful reading will naturally channel a better comprehension of the literary work. Therefore the meaning is always present in an utterance, but finding this meaning consists of deriving it from the utterance. I would like to add a few points, with respect to what Fish calls the Affective Fallacy Fallacy. He argues that a text is a concrete object, thus an objective interpretation should be applied. The text reveals itself to the reader and the message it sends seems to be right in front of the said reader; naturally, the text appears to be self-sufficient. Indeed, the high level of veracity and substantiality make the text so obviously real and palpable, whereas an interpretation of other sorts requires more of an analyst — which is contrary to what the New Criticism stood for. Although the text allegedly makes available all that may be needed for its interpretation, a proper analysis comes from the fact that a reader must be aware of the literary work as an entity that is prone to change in time and equally aware of the changes that may occur to himself. Here, Fish defines literature as a kinetic art , thus encouraging the idea that in the process of analyzing literature, one must look beyond what is physical in order to truly comprehend what one is analyzing. One must not be led astray by the material forms in which a text is available. Somehow when we put a book down, we forget that while we were reading, it was moving pages turning, lines receding into the past and forget too that we were moving with it To support this claim, I believe that when we read, it is impossible to avoid getting affectively involved, to some extent. As Fish suggests, the concept of the reader is interesting as it can be defined as the person who is discussing or analyzing a text from this perspective, thus making themselves a surrogate of the readers everywhere who share few characteristics and differ in a multitude of ways, or as the reader that consists of the wide group that is formed by the readers everywhere, thus enhancing the singularity of a human being On the basis of these arguments, I believe that a reader-oriented criticism, as it is sometimes referred to, is highly above the perspective of New Criticism, as a text interpreted only through its apparent objectivity does not lead to a complete interpretation. In addition to 3 this, the reader-response analysis provides a far more complex comprehension of the meaning of the text.

# DOWNLOAD PDF LITERATURE IN THE READER : AFFECTIVE STYLISTICS

## STANLEY E. FISH

From my humble experience, I have come to the conclusion that in life “so not just in any field, but in all fields one can think of “everything comes with more than one side to it. One element depends on another, and any and all of these are prone to change, be it spiritual and abstract, or material and concrete. Conversely, I do not support this type of analysis as the one and only correct and right way to reach the inner meaning of a text. I reckon it greatly augments an interpretation, yet there is no singular method. One method should always be used in relation to others as to give a result that eventually accomplishes the true purpose of literary criticism, which is providing a good interpretation of the literary work, in order to guide future readers to an enhanced comprehension of the text and enable them to provide themselves with a personal but proper, legitimate interpretation. Literature in the Reader:

# DOWNLOAD PDF LITERATURE IN THE READER : AFFECTIVE STYLISTICS

## STANLEY E. FISH

### Chapter 4 : School of Literary Criticism: Reader-Response | kaitlynderry ENG

*Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics. Author(s): Stanley Fish Reviewed work(s): Source: New Literary History, Vol. 2, No. 1, A Symposium on Literary History (Autumn).*

Types[ edit ] There are multiple approaches within the theoretical branch of reader-response criticism, yet all are unified in their belief that the meaning of a text is derived from the reader through the reading process. One can therefore draw a distinction between reader-response theorists who see the individual reader driving the whole experience and others who think of literary experience as largely text-driven and uniform with individual variations that can be ignored. The former theorists, who think the reader controls, derive what is common in a literary experience from shared techniques for reading and interpreting which are, however, individually applied by different readers. The latter, who put the text in control, derive commonalities of response, obviously, from the literary work itself. Jeffrey Berman has encouraged students responding to texts to write anonymously and share with their classmates writings in response to literary works about sensitive subjects like drugs, suicidal thoughts, death in the family, parental abuse and the like. A kind of catharsis bordering on therapy results. American magazines like *Reading Research Quarterly* and others publish articles applying reader-response theory to the teaching of literature. He analyzed their selections in light of their goals in reading. In an appendix, "Literature in the Reader", Fish used "the" reader to examine responses to complex sentences sequentially, word-by-word. Since , however, he has turned to real differences among real readers. He explores the reading tactics endorsed by different critical schools, by the literary professoriate, and by the legal profession , introducing the idea of " interpretive communities " that share particular modes of reading. In , Norman Holland drew on psychoanalytic psychology in *The Dynamics of Literary Response* to model the literary work. Each reader introjects a fantasy "in" the text, then modifies it by defense mechanisms into an interpretation. In , however, having recorded responses from real readers, Holland found variations too great to fit this model in which responses are mostly alike but show minor individual variations. Holland then developed a second model based on his case studies *5 Readers Reading*. An individual has in the brain a core identity theme behaviors then becoming understandable as a theme and variations as in music. This core gives that individual a certain style of being and reading. Holland worked with others at the State University of New York at Buffalo , Murray Schwartz, David Willbern , and Robert Rogers , to develop a particular teaching format, the "Delphi seminar," designed to get students to "know themselves". Richard Gerrig in the U. He has shown how readers put aside ordinary knowledge and values while they read, treating, for example, criminals as heroes. In Canada, David Miall , usually working with Donald Kuiken , has produced a large body of work exploring emotional or "affective" responses to literature, drawing on such concepts from ordinary criticism as " defamiliarization " or " foregrounding ". Two notable researchers are Dolf Zillmann and Peter Vorderer , both working in the field of communications and media psychology. Both have theorized and tested ideas about what produces emotions such as suspense , curiosity , surprise in readers, the necessary factors involved, and the role the reader plays. Jenefer Robinson, a researcher in emotion, has recently blended her studies on emotion with its role in literature, music, and art. Uniformists[ edit ] Wolfgang Iser exemplifies the German tendency to theorize the reader and so posit a uniform response. For him, a literary work is not an object in itself but an effect to be explained. But he asserts this response is controlled by the text. For the "real" reader, he substitutes an implied reader, who is the reader a given literary work requires. Within various polarities created by the text, this "implied" reader makes expectations, meanings, and the unstated details of characters and settings through a "wandering viewpoint". In his model, the text controls. Another important German reader-response critic was Hans-Robert Jauss , who defined literature as a dialectic process of production and reception *Rezeption* the term common in Germany for "response". For Jauss, readers have a certain mental set, a "horizon" of expectations *Erwartungshorizont* , from which perspective each reader, at any given time in history, reads. Reader-response criticism establishes these horizons of expectation by

reading literary works of the period in question. Both Iser and Jauss, and the Constance School they exemplify, return reader-response criticism to a study of the text by defining readers in terms of the text. In the same way, Gerald Prince posits a "narratee", Michael Riffaterre posits a "superreader", and Stanley Fish an "informed reader. Objections[ edit ] Reader-response critics hold that in order to understand a text, one must look to the processes readers use to create meaning and experience. Traditional text-oriented schools, such as formalism , often think of reader-response criticism as an anarchic subjectivism , allowing readers to interpret a text any way they want. Some reader-response critics uniformists assume a bi-active model of reading: Others, who see that position as internally contradictory, claim that the reader controls the whole transaction individualists. In such a reader-active model, readers and audiences use amateur or professional procedures for reading shared by many others as well as their personal issues and values. While readers can and do put their own ideas and experiences into a work, they are at the same time gaining new understanding through the text. This is something that is generally overlooked in reader-response criticism. Extensions[ edit ] Reader-response criticism relates to psychology, both experimental psychology for those attempting to find principles of response, and psychoanalytic psychology for those studying individual responses. Post- behaviorist psychologists of reading and of perception support the idea that it is the reader who makes meaning. Increasingly, cognitive psychology , psycholinguistics , neuroscience, and neuropsychology have given reader-response critics powerful and detailed models for the aesthetic process. In researchers found that during listening to emotionally intense parts of a story, readers respond with changes in heart rate variability , indicative of increased activation of the sympathetic nervous system. Intense parts of a story were also accompanied by increased brain activity in a network of regions known to be involved in the processing of fear, including amygdala. Gombrich , and even to history Hayden White. In stressing the activity of the reader, reader-response theory may be employed to justify upsettings of traditional interpretations like deconstruction or cultural criticism. Since reader-response critics focus on the strategies readers are taught to use, they may address the teaching of reading and literature. Also, because reader-response criticism stresses the activity of the reader, reader-response critics may share the concerns of feminist critics, and critics of Gender and Queer Theory and Post-Colonialism.

# DOWNLOAD PDF LITERATURE IN THE READER : AFFECTIVE STYLISTICS

## STANLEY E. FISH

### Chapter 5 : Literature in the Reader Affective Stylistics | Ada M - [www.nxgvision.com](http://www.nxgvision.com)

*AFFECTIVE STYLISTICS AND ITS MEANING* Affective Stylistics is a term used by Stanley Eugene Fish to describe the necessary reliance of the critic upon his or her affective responses to stylistic elements in the text.

I want to look at something closely related, his sense of machine and mechanism. Hence any adequate analytic method must describe that essentially temporal pattern. Of the proposed method, Fish asserts: It is as if a slow motion camera with an automatic stop action effect were recording our linguistic experiences and presenting them to us for viewing. We thus know that he knows about computers and has thought about them. After quoting a passage in which Halliday analyses a single sentence from *Through the Looking Glass*, Fish remarks p. The procedure is a complicated one, and it requires many operations, but the critic who performs them has finally done nothing at all. On page 4 of the transcript he says this: Now writing in a book called *The Companion to the Digital Humanities*, digital humanist Hugh Craig acknowledges the force of my criticism in the s, but asserts that the more sophisticated techniques now available make possible a new stylistics with what he calls another motivation. And he defines it, the motivation, quote, to uncover patterns of language use, which because of their background quality-- that is, how deeply embedded they are-- or their emergence on a super humanly wide scale, would otherwise not be noticed, unquote. But if the problem with the old stylistics was that you could not generalize, except illegitimately, from the data, the problem with this new up-to-date stylistics is that it is by no means clear why you should be interested in the data it uncovers at all. Maybe the patterns that have not been noticed before, patterns like the frequency with which particular words appear in the titles of 19th century books through the decades, should have remained unnoticed, because they are nothing more than the artifacts of a machine. I suspect that he means the latter. For an intentionalist, the fact that data mining can uncover hidden patterns undetectable by the mere human reader is cause not for celebration, but for suspicion. A pattern that is subterranean is unlikely to be a pattern that was put there by an intentional agent. Can that be right? Can we disentangle agency from mechanism? Consider that Halliday machine that he examined way back in *People are intentional agents who use language but, by and large, are not aware of the kinds of patterns linguists attribute to their usage, any more than they are aware of the functioning of their liver or gall bladder. Does it make sense to rule their examination out of order? I find it hard to imagine that Fish would simply deny the existence of unconscious patterns in language. Moreover, it is by no means obvious to me that he could meaningfully disentangle grammatical and morphological pattern as mechanical from semantic meaning as intended. But texts of various kinds, and certainly literary texts, have large-scale patterns that are as seemingly mechanical and as hidden from casual, uncurious inspection as those of sentential syntax. Ring-composition is known among classicists, Biblical scholars, and medievalists, but is otherwise all but unknown. I was alerted to it by the late Mary Douglas, whose *Thinking in Circles* Yale is a good introduction to the form. Ring composition is often depicted by a simple verbal formula: But the second most vigorous response comes at the structural center [5]. Surely that is of interest, no? But that paper says little or nothing about affect. What happened to that? I am suggesting then that we cannot separate human agency from mechanism, meaning from mechanical pattern. We are embodied beings and as such, agency is entangled in mechanism, where mechanism is understood in a broad sense. It is an impoverished and impoverishing conception. Does the question of disentangling mechanism from agency involve a category error? The cognitive unconscious was mechanistic in the broad sense, and many models and proposals about its operations were computationally inspired. He might well have read some linguistics e. It was foreign, Other. The idea that perceiving, speaking, and reading agents, beings with intention, the idea that they were constituted of largely unconscious mental processes would have been foreign to him. In his conceptual universe these intending agents have no differentiated internal processes. They read and write, but those actions have no internal character. They are simply undifferentiated intention. I believe it was originally published in *The Circle of Grace: Technics of Power and Grace*, July , 37 pp.*

# DOWNLOAD PDF LITERATURE IN THE READER : AFFECTIVE STYLISTICS STANLEY E. FISH

## Chapter 6 : Stanley Fish | American literary critic | [www.nxgvision.com](http://www.nxgvision.com)

*Stanley Fish's Reading of Seventeenth-Century Literature* William E. Matchett asked me to review Stanley Fish's *Self-the Reader: Affective Stylistics*, "in which.

## Chapter 7 : Reader-response criticism - Wikipedia

*Affective stylistics is derived from analyzing further the notion that a literary text is an event that occurs in time "that comes into being as it is read" rather than Slideshare uses cookies to improve functionality and performance, and to provide you with relevant advertising.*