

Curiosity Without Curiosity: Challenging an Absurdity in the Structural Affect Theory

LESLIE T. FRY

Abstract: Placing the outcome at the beginning of a story before the reasoning for that outcome does not necessarily make the reader curious, contrary to what some structural affect theorists posit. Using reader-response theory, this article explores six instances drawn from *Thousand and One Nights* and *The Odyssey* where the outcome appears at the beginning and the details leading up to that outcome are later explained. The main difference between these two in terms of generating curiosity in the reader through structural manipulation is that the author of *The Odyssey* waits an unreasonably long time before addressing the situation again, with the author distracting the reader with unnecessary side stories in the interim. The author of *Thousand and One Nights*, on the other hand, stays focused on the situation first raised when stating the outcome. While one might think that such a difference is only a matter of degree, the difference has a significant impact on the reader's experience inasmuch as the approach in *Thousand and One Nights* generates feelings of actual curiosity in the reader, while that of *The Odyssey* does not. This article represents a pilot study of how readers react to literature, based on the reader-response theory, with a focus on tension between the different notions of curiosity. In essence, the difference in these two types of curiosity resembles the difference between the efferent stance and the aesthetic stance of reader-response theory, with the first focusing on the personal experience of the reader, while the second focuses on pure analysis of the text's structure.

Keywords: Structural affect theory, curiosity, world literature, reader-response theory

1. Introduction

Structural affect theory defines curiosity as an author presenting an outcome of an event before the event occurs (Brewer and Lichtenstein). While it is possible that this literary device evokes curiosity in a reader, it is not necessary or sufficient to ensure actual curiosity. This article contrasts curiosity as a term of art and curiosity using its common definition when analyzing *Thousand and One Nights* and *The Odyssey* in order to challenge the implication of theorists that the first necessarily leads to the second. This article advocates a more common-sense approach to literary theory that adopts common definitions that make sense to lay readers, which can help avoid the paradoxes that modern theorists often trap themselves in (Compagnon) – here, curiosity without curiosity. The byproduct of such analysis should be to convince future authors to do more than rely on this literary device of structural manipulation of the narrative if they hope to actually evoke curiosity in the reader.

This article's thesis is supported by three substantive sections, in addition to this introduction and a conclusion. The next part provides key definitions and delimitations needed to understand this article's thesis and analysis, all of which relate to the definition of curiosity. The majority of the analysis appears in the next two parts, which focus on two masterpieces of world literature that use the literature device of starting with an explanation of the ending. *The Odyssey* squanders any curi-

osity the author hoped to generate from employing this device by immediately launching into background information or side stories that does not obviously relate to the ending, thereby losing the interest – let alone curiosity – of the reader. By the time the author returns to topics relating to the ending, the reader has long forgotten the presented outcome. *Thousand and One Nights*, on the other hand, captures and maintains the reader’s curiosity by keeping the writing much tighter and focused on the presented outcome. This article’s comparison raises serious questions about the validity of the structural affect theory in relation to curiosity.

Critics will point to this article’s confirmation bias in the selection of its examples, as well as the subjective reactions to these pieces, and they will have a point. Nevertheless, as the conclusion explains, eventually interviewing others who have read these works can test these observations and increase their objectivity, all based on notions from reader–response theory that the audience generates meaning (Spiegel). According to reader–response theory, readers generate such meaning by situating themselves in various ways in relation to the text. Some focus on the efferent stance, where the reader tries to extract information from the text that can be “learned and retained after the reading event” (Cox and Many 29; Rosenblatt; Sipe). Others focus on the aesthetic stance, where the reader reads in order to have the personal, lived-through experience from the text (Smith; Sipe; Rosenblatt). A combination of these two stances can lead to the “richest literary understanding” (Sipe 258). This article advocates this sophisticated approach to reader–response theory, even though the analysis is somewhat skewed in favor of the aesthetic stance in order to bring greater balance to the discussion within the structural–affect–theory paradigm.

As highlighted in the conclusion, future researchers will be left to test the veracity of this article’s observations with other parts of these books and in other books. This article is limited to merely suggesting the existence of a paradox and the need for a more common–sense definition of curiosity that focuses on one’s personal experience with a text.

2. Definitions and Delimitations

Certain definitions and delimitations are needed in order to make sense of this article’s thesis and its application to the works analyzed after this part. This part starts with the definition of curiosity as a term of art within the context of the structural affect theory, and then it develops the common definition of curiosity. The purpose is to highlight the differences between the two and the inherent paradox in the term-of-art version that arises from assuming that this literary device necessarily creates curiosity in the reader.

According to the structural affect theory, the narrative order that an author uses when writing a story can evoke curiosity, suspense, or surprise in the reader. In 1982, Brewer and Lichtenstein were the first to present this idea and to explain how the absence of information for fully understanding a story evokes these different emotions (Brewer and Lichtenstein). However, other scholars needed to condense and clarify those ideas before they could have their intended impact on literary theory. In particular, Hoeken and van Vliet winnowed down Brewer and Lichtenstein’s theory to the following: “Suspense is evoked by postponing the story’s outcome, curiosity is evoked by presenting the outcome before the preceding events, and surprise is evoked by an unexpected event” (Hoeken and van Vliet 277). This article is delimited by only looking at the component of structural affect theory that involves curiosity in order to simplify the analysis and to highlight the central paradox. Later structural affect theorists all have explicitly or implicitly adopted Hoeken’s approach to understanding the theory in relation to curiosity, all assuming that this device is sufficient to “make [] the reader curious” (Albuquerque et al. 2). No exceptions have been found in the literature on structural affect theory that suggest that more than structural manipulation might be needed in order to generate actual curiosity in the reader. The logical flaw in this argument is that simply putting the outcome at the beginning does not necessarily make the reader curious, in particular if the missing information is obviously banal or if the explanation for the outcome is not provided within a reasonable period of time.

Applying this argument in an extreme situation to show its logical absurdity, suppose the first sentence of a 12-page story is as follows: “The typewriter’s ribbon eventually ran out of ink from Gilbert the Monkey’s banging: poiqrwr;;lnsdfrn;aluqpr ehloiyoy . . .” This story dutifully provides the outcome at the start – namely, running out of ink. However, any whiff of curiosity quickly dissipates in the split second it takes to grasp the punchline – namely, 12 pages of random banging on a keyboard by a monkey. Try as one might, there is no way for the reader to experience curiosity after that point of realization. Likewise with literature, putting the ending at the beginning does not necessarily make the reader curious, contrary to what structural affect theory asserts.

Instead, one must keep in mind the common definition of curiosity, which varies from the way that structural affect theory uses the term. The Oxford English Dictionary defines it as “a strong desire to know about something.” The Cambridge Dictionary agrees, providing a slightly different definition of “an eager wish to know or learn about something.” Loewenstein discusses the common definitions of curiosity over time, as used by various authors, all of which involve profound emotions, such as “passion for learning” by Cicero, “ocular lust” by St. Augustine, “an appetite for knowledge” by Kant, and “thirst for knowledge” by Freud (Loewenstein 76–77). Structural affect theory improperly focuses exclusively on the author’s mechanical ordering of the story, not on the actual awakening of passion in the reader.

With these definitions established, the next part proceeds to show that putting the end at the beginning in *The Odyssey* is not enough to ensure that the reader feels curious, as structural affect theory posits. At a minimum, structural affect theorists need to acknowledge this limitation.

3. Lack of Curiosity in *The Odyssey*

The Odyssey is replete with examples of how use of the literary device of putting the outcome at the beginning is insufficient to evoke actual curiosity in the reader. This part explores three examples. Before delving into those examples, however, it feels apropos to note how Voltaire expressed his frustrations with Homer’s inability to evoke actual curiosity in the reader when writing about Candide’s observations. In *Candide*, Voltaire addresses the need for a story to be interesting when Candide speaks with Lord Pococurante. When Candide admires Lord Pococurante’s Homer collection, the senator coldly replies that Homer bores him, and he only has the collection because it is required in order to be called an intellectual:

Once upon a time, I was forced to delude myself, believing I delighted in reading Homer. But the constant repetition of battles, every one just like the other; . . . all this produced in me deadly, deadly boredom. I’d occasionally inquire of scholars whether Homer’s poems bored them as much as they bored me. The honest men among them admitted it: the book kept falling out of their hands. But they always had to have it in their libraries, like a monument of antiquity . . .

Voltaire invites the reader to ask deep questions such as “Does God care about me?” and “Why do bad things happen to good people?” It would go beyond the narrow scope of this article to elaborate on how Voltaire’s own writings evoked genuine curiosity, besides these obvious examples. Suffice it to say here that, unlike Homer’s writings, Voltaire’s writings generally invoke genuine curiosity, and his apparent disdain for Homer should not be surprising.

Turning to *The Odyssey* itself, it is useful to highlight here how it is entirely framed in terms of the structural manipulation emphasized in this article. Book I famously starts with a summary of Odysseus’ entire adventure:

Tell me, O Muse, of that ingenious hero who travelled far and wide after he had sacked the famous town of Troy. Many cities did he visit, and many were the nations with whose manners and customs he was acquainted; moreover he suffered much by sea while trying to save his own life and bring his men safely home; but do what he might he could not save his men, for they perished through their own sheer folly in eating the cattle of the Sun-god Hyperion; so the god prevented them from ever

reaching home. Tell me, too, about all these things, oh daughter of Jove, from whatsoever source you may know them.

This relatively concise summary sets out the outcome from the beginning – namely, that Odysseus eventually returns home safely. It also hints at the prophecy about the cattle, which is discussed below, as well as the swings between the positive and negative experiences that Odysseus endured during his adventures. Most important for this article’s purposes, the text immediately after the summary goes to the middle of Odysseus’ journey home, with the minutia of his wrangling with the gods. In short, the reader feels no closer to understanding Odysseus’ safe return home by the end of Book I than they felt after the first paragraph, and that does not improve for many books. It is this kind of extreme delay in getting to the point that frustrates the realization of actual curiosity on the part of the reader.

With the specific examples, the most obvious example in *The Odyssey* of putting the outcome at the beginning not being sufficient to evoke actual curiosity appears in Book VIII, where King Alcinoos, ruler of the Phaeacians, invites Odysseus to dine with him. At this feast, a bard’s song about the Trojan War brings Odysseus to tears. Following the structural affect theory, the author presents the outcome first – namely, the sad outcome of the Trojan War – before providing the reasons behind Odysseus’ tears. In the next paragraph, still on the first page of the story, all traces of curiosity are lost when Odysseus starts the “story of [his] sorrows” with his name, which turns out to be one long side story that lacks any obvious relevance to the main plot. The story continues along this detour for four painful chapters. With every word, the wish grows within the reader that the author would streamline the narrative.

Critics might claim that these growing desires on the part of the reader resemble the passions referred to in the common definition of curiosity. However, this is different because the passion does not relate to Odysseus himself but to a desire for the author to write in a more efficient manner and return to the main story. As quickly as the detour starts, the author swerves back into the present time with Odysseus in King Alcinoos’ company, leaving the reader wondering about the purpose of that significant deviation.

Similarly obvious is the prophecy scene inside of the flashback, where Odysseus goes to see the ghost Teresias. The nature of prophecy is to know the outcome before events transpire, which fits with the literary device being studied in this article. Two aspects of the prophecy are worth noting here. First, the prophecy notes the killing of the cattle of the Sun-god:

If you leave these flocks unharmed and think of nothing but of getting home, you may yet after much hardship reach Ithaca; but if you harm them, then I forewarn you of the destruction both of your ship and of your men. Even though you may yourself escape, you will return in bad plight after losing all of your men . . . , and you will find trouble in your house, which will be overrun by high-land people, who are devouring your substance under the pretext of paying court and making presents with your wife.

Admittedly, one somewhat needs to read between the lines to understand that the prophecy is saying that the cattle will be eaten. However, this is not difficult for the reader to understand because the reader already knows that there is trouble in Odysseus’ house and that he lacks a crew. Interestingly, the content of this prophecy starts off *The Odyssey*, as quoted at the beginning of this section. Such repetitive use of this literary device shows how much faith the author has in its ability to build curiosity in the reader. However, this literary device alone is not enough to make the reader actually curious. After all, Odysseus does not ask any follow-up questions about why his crew will die or otherwise do anything with this prophecy once it is given that would pique the reader’s curiosity. Instead, he immediately asks about his mother’s ghost, he interacts with other ghosts, and he goes back to Circe’s house to bury his friend Elpenor. None of this relates to the prophecy, leaving the prophecy with minimal impact on the reader’s curiosity. As with this prophecy concerning the cattle, the prophecy’s reference to the death of the suitors does little to build the reader’s curiosity because the author does nothing with this information until much later in the story.

In sum, merely using the literary device of giving the outcome first does little to build the curiosity of the reader if the author does nothing significant with this information within a reasonable period of time. As the following part shows, the literary device builds curiosity only if the author does something further with this information.

4. Curiosity in *Thousand and One Nights*

Unlike *The Odyssey*, *Thousand and One Nights* evokes actual curiosity by providing the details leading up to the outcome shortly after providing the outcome at the beginning. It is this shorter period of time that distinguishes these two masterpieces of world literature from the perspective of curiosity. This part explores three noteworthy examples in *Thousand and One Nights*.

Before exploring the specific examples, it is important to note how the entire framework of *Thousand and One Nights* employs the structural manipulation of putting the outcome at the beginning, similar to *The Odyssey*, as explained above. In the introductory chapter, the reader is introduced to the cruelty and hypocrisy of King Shahrayar, who beheads his adulterous wife and her co-conspirators and who then sleeps with and summarily kills a new virgin each night. With all but two virgins of marriageable age having fled the city, the king's trusted vizier has no choice but to bring his own daughters to the king. Before doing so and sealing their fate, the vizier gives Shahrazad (or Shahrazad herself provides, depending on which version you read) a sliver of hope by indicating that she should tell the king strange stories in an effort to pique the king's curiosity and delay her execution. From this introduction, the reader feels an overwhelming sense of doom for Shahrazad and her sister Dinarzad, given the king's past cruelties, while at the same time feeling hopeful that she successful will delay the inevitable.

Immediately in the first chapter, Shahrazad launches into her first tale of the merchant and the Jinnee (or demon). Shahrazad's story is intentionally unfinished at the break of dawn, when the king usually would have murdered his victim: "But morning overtook Shahrazad, and she lapsed into silence, leaving King Shahrayar burning with curiosity to hear the rest of the story." The king is convinced to spare her life one more night in order to hear the conclusion of the tale. This continues on each night, all the while allowing the narrative to maintain the feeling of impending doom for the vizier's daughters, especially with the occasional appearance of threatening tones through references to betrayal and the like. It is difficult to find or even imagine a better example of literature employing structural manipulation to generate curiosity in the reader, with the lack of delay in explaining the revealed outcome intensifying that curiosity.

Proceeding with the specific examples of structural manipulation in *Thousand and One Nights*, the most obvious example appears on the thirty-second night, when the three women open their door to the three dervishes. All three dervishes lack an eye and hair on their heads, which makes their appearance shocking. They then declare that they will explain how they came to look this way. They each tell their own account of what happened, in an incremental but deliberate manner. Curiosity grows in the reader with each dervish's story.

The third dervish's story is a particularly compelling example, who stumbles upon ten one-eyed men entering a palace, along with an old man. The third dervish is "astonished to see that each young man was blind in the right eye, and marvel[s] at this coincidence." They welcome him in, and he observes how they arrange themselves on the couches of the palace. The old man warns the third dervish, "Young man, sit down on the floor and do not inquire about our situation or the loss of our eyes." With this warning, the old man serves them dinner and they listen to the third dervish's tale. The one-eyed men then asked the old man, "Old man, will you give us our due, for it is time to go to bed?" The following is a description of their nightly ritual:

The old man rose, entered a chamber, and came back, carrying on his head ten trays, each covered with a blue cover. He set a tray before each young man and, lighting ten candles, stuck one on each tray. Then he drew off the covers, and there appeared on each tray nothing but ashes, powdered charcoal,

and kettle soot. Then, rolling up their sleeves, every young man blackened his face and smeared his clothes with soot and ashes, beat his breast and face, and wept and wailed, crying out again and again, “We would be sitting pretty but for our curiosity.” They carried on like this until it was close to sunrise. Then the old man rose and heated some water for them, and the young men ran, washed themselves, and put on clean clothes.

Again, the reader is presented with an outcome that has the potential to evoke curiosity – ten one-eyed men in a palace covered in soot.

The third dervish expresses the natural reaction that anyone would have after seeing such a scene: “My lady, when I saw what the young men had done and how they had blackened their faces, I was filled with bewilderment and curiosity and forgot my own misfortunes.” The mystery of how this situation came about deepens when the third dervish keeps asking how this happened, but they refuse to tell:

“Young man, we have kept our secret from you only out of pity for you, so that you would not suffer what we have suffered.” I replied, “You must tell me.” They said, “Young man, listen to our advice and don’t ask, lest you become one-eyed like us.” I repeated, “I must know the secret.” They replied, “Young man, when you find out the secret, remember that we will no longer harbor you nor let you stay with us again.”

They eventually capitulate and tell him that he can go through the ordeal himself, if he actually wants to know. During this ordeal, he loses his own eye due to a demon, and the mystery is resolved, even though it is not clear why this ordeal – involving the losing of an eye and the blackening of the face – was necessary. Regardless, the telling of the outcome at the beginning combined with an explanation of how that outcome came about shortly thereafter leads to genuine curiosity both on the part of the reader and the king, who continues to spare Shahrazad each night.

A final example involves the three women, especially the first woman. Upon inviting the three dervishes to sit down, the first woman retrieves two black female hounds from a cupboard and begins to whip them:

He took them and led them to the middle of the hall. Saying, “It is time to perform our duty,” the mistress of the house came forward, rolled up her sleeves, took a braided whip, and called to the porter, “Bring me one of the bitches.” The porter dragged one of the bitches by the chain and brought her forward, while she wept and shook her head at the girl. As the porter stood holding the chain, the girl came down on the bitch with hard blows on the sides, while the bitch howled and wept. The girl kept beating the bitch until her arm got weary.

After this harsh whipping, she cries with the hounds and kisses them:

Then she stopped, threw the whip away, and, taking the chain from the porter, embraced the bitch and began to cry. The bitch too began to cry, and the two cried together for a long time. Then the girl wiped the bitch’s tears with her handkerchief, kissed her on the head, . . .

The reader does not know why she is whipping or kissing the hounds. At first, the first woman repeatedly refuses to explain what happened, although she eventually gives in after the dervishes tell their own stories in great detail. The woman recounts how her two older sisters killed the man who she loved. A serpent who she saved magically turned the sisters into hounds. The serpent told her that she needed to beat the hounds nightly or else she herself would be turned into a hound. In all of these intriguing excerpts, the outcome is stated upfront, with the explanation of how that outcome happened being provided within a reasonable period of time.

Critics might argue that this gap between the outcome and the explanation for the outcome with the beating of the hounds is similar to *The Odyssey*’s structure, which might diminish the curiosity of the reader. However, this is not the case. In *The Odyssey*, all of the accounts feel like a complete detour, whereas in *Thousand and One Nights*, they are all equally important and interconnected. In other words, the author of *Thousand and One Nights* does a better job of staying on topic, which tremendously helps build actual curiosity on the part of the reader.

5. Conclusion

As this article has suggested, placing the outcome at the beginning of a story before the reasoning for that outcome does not necessarily make the reader curious, contrary to what structural affect theory posits. Using reader-response theory, this article explored six instances drawn from *Thousand and One Nights* and *The Odyssey* where the outcome appears at the beginning and the details are later explained. These two works are similar not only in their unequivocal status as classics in world literature, but they also represent examples of how the author uses tension over the protagonist's fate to keep the reader engaged. The main difference between these two in terms of generating curiosity in the reader is that the author of *The Odyssey* waits an unreasonably long time before addressing the situation again, with the author distracting the reader with unnecessary side stories before returning to the main plot. The author of *Thousand and One Nights*, on the other hand, stays focused on the situation first raised when stating the outcome at the beginning. While one might think that such a difference is only a matter of degree, the difference has a significant impact on the reader's personal experience inasmuch as the approach in *Thousand and One Nights* actually generates feelings of curiosity in the reader, while that of *The Odyssey* does not.

This article represents a pilot study of how readers react to literature, based on the reader-response theory. With more time and resources, future research on this topic should adopt more rigorous qualitative methods in surveying others who have read these books in order to test the validity of the personal reactions to these books' passages contained in this article and to come closer to an objective perspective of the meaning and role of these passages.

Future research also will want to include other masterpieces of world literature concerning curiosity. This article has focused on the more extreme examples of curiosity in order to make this article's point more obvious. Other examples presumably will fall somewhere along a spectrum. Closer to the side of *Thousand and One Nights*, one might consider including Bourges' *Ficciones*, in which he depicts in this short story collection metaphysical concepts in an abstract way to invoke curiosity in the reader. For example, in "The Library of Babel," an infinite library is described as storing books with the same number of pages, lines per page, and letters per page. This library contains all books that ever existed as well as books that make no sense. When first reading this, one might feel that there is an explanation to what Bourges means in his writing but it is hard to wrap one's head around it. Additionally, Bourges discusses the need for a story to be interesting. In his short story "Death and the Compass," the main character Lonnrot rejects Treviranus' conclusion that the murder of the rabbi was the robber's mistake. Lonnrot stated: "It's possible, but not interesting." He rejects the concept only because he finds it too bland. In the end, Treviranus' hypothesis was indeed correct and Lonnrot was incorrect. Critics may say that a piece that is interesting through curiosity may be inauthentic because it does not match reality. Bourges discusses how one may have to give up authenticity in exchange for interest. They both seem inversely proportionate, but Bourges tries to strike a balance between the two, which might be worth exploring in a future publication. On the other side of the spectrum, closer to *The Odyssey*, it might be tempting to include analysis of *Lusiads*, which follows a plot line that is similar to *The Odyssey*. Both *The Odyssey* and *Lusiads* evoke more suspense and surprise than actual curiosity. Neither is especially memorable inasmuch as the reader hardly ever is led to ask why something might have happened because the reason already has been shared. *The Epic of Gilgamesh* would appear somewhere in the middle of these two poles, mainly because it piques the reader's curiosity by occasionally referencing genuinely curious topics like immortality, with the reader being led to ask such questions as "Why does Gilgamesh want to receive immortality?" and "Why did the gods choose to grant Utnapishtim immortality?" This genuine curiosity is in addition to the structural-affect-theory type of curiosity that involves the presentation of an outcome of an event before the event occurs. It is this latter type of curiosity that actually dampens the impact of the more profound type of curiosity in *The Epic of Gilgamesh*. More

systematic and rigorous analysis of these other pieces of world literature is needed in order to better understand the impact of these types of curiosity in these other works.

Even though this article looks at only two pieces of world literature, this article constitutes a strong first step in eventually bringing greater understanding to the topic of how to create curiosity in readers through the careful ordering of a story and the controlled release of information over time, not just through presenting an outcome of an event before the event occurs, as structural affect theory would posit. Indeed, structural affect theorists must not overlook the importance of the personal response of a reader to a story, at least when it comes to curiosity.

Harvard University Extension School, USA

Acknowledgements

The author thanks David Damrosch, Alexander Hartley, Elisabeth McKetta, and Martin Puchner for their encouragement and feedback on earlier drafts of this article.

Works Cited

- Albuquerque, Alexandre C., et al. "The Usage of the Structural-Affect Theory of Stories for Narrative Generation." 2011 Brazilian Symposium on Games and Digital Entertainment, 2011, pp. 250-59.
- Brewer, W.F., and E.H. Lichtenstein. "Stories are to Entertain: A Structural-Affect Theory of Stories." *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 6, 1982, pp. 473-83. doi:10.1016/0378-2166(82)90021-2.
- Compagnon, Antoine. *Literature, Theory, and Common Sense*. Translated by Carol Cosman, Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Cox, Carole, and Joyce E. Many. "Toward an Understanding of the Aesthetic Response to Literature." *Literature and the Language Arts*, vol. 69, no. 1, 1992, pp. 28-33. doi:10.58680/la199224759.
- "Curiosity." *Cambridge Dictionary*, Cambridge University Press, 2024.
- "Curiosity, n." *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, 2024.
- Hoeken, Hans, and Mario van Vliet. "Suspense, Curiosity, and Surprise: How Discourse Structure Influences the Affective and Cognitive Processing of a Story." *Poetics*, vol. 27, no. 4, 2000, pp. 277-86. doi:10.1016/S0304-422X(99)00021-2.
- Homer. *The Odyssey*. Translated by Samuel Butler, William Benton, 1952.
- Loewenstein, G. "The Psychology of Curiosity: A Review and Reinterpretation." *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 116, no. 1, 1994, pp. 75-98. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.116.1.75.
- Rosenblatt, Louise. M. *The Reader, the Text, the Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work*. Southern Illinois University Press, 1978.
- Sipe, Lawrence R. "The Construction of Literary Understanding by First and Second Graders in Oral Response to Picture Storybook Read-Alouds." *Reading Research Quarterly*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2000, pp. 252-75. doi:10.1598/RRQ.35.2.4.
- Spiegel, Dixie Lee. "Reader Response Approaches and the Growth of Readers." *Language Arts*, vol. 76, no. 1, 1998, pp. 41-48. doi:10.58680/la19985.
- The Arabian Nights: Based on the Text of the Fourteenth-Century Syrian Manuscript Edited by Muhsin Mahdi*. Translated by Husain Haddawy, W. W. Norton & Co Ltd, 2008.