Audience and Reception

Rutger Kramer and Graeme Ward*

This chapter sketches a basic conceptual framework for identifying and analysing the audiences and receptions of the kind of medieval biographical collections studied in this special issue. To do so, it sets out the range of approaches taken by the contributors and situates these approaches in relation to previous scholarship on the reception and interpretation of textual sources. Particular attention is given to the dynamic relationships between those who wrote texts and those who read and utilised them, relationships which are especially pertinent for studying compilations. In the process of transmission and reception, old texts were imbued with new meanings as later readers excerpted, copied and compiled them into novel collections. It is argued that by exploring biographical collections in the light of audience and reception, it is possible to uncover some of the different ways that authors/compilers sought to articulate notions of community.

Keywords: audience, reception, transmission, compilation, biography, community, literacy

Whenever a text is being conceived, the moment a quill is put to parchment or a pen to paper, we – the readers – enter the realm of authors and their authority.[1] From there, the leap to the audience can be deceptively easy: it may be construed as either the people an author or compiler had in mind while crafting a text or as the people who ended up reading, editing and using the composition over the centuries.[2] Whatever the case, it is worth asking to what extent the audience of a text (intended or otherwise) can be construed as a community – whether a given text was intended to build a community from scratch, consolidate one in times of crisis or rally its readers to continue to face the unknown together. The texts and compilations under scrutiny in this volume each have their own relation to the communities they addressed; authors both imagined and appealed to a pre-existing community, if only because of the language they used or the discourse they shared with their audience. Crucial aspects and dimensions of community, upon which our assembled biographical collections variously touch, are brought into focus when analysed in the light of fundamental questions concerning the intended and actual audiences of texts and compilations, the manner in which texts were read and received, and the way a given story changed meaning over time, as it was appropriated or repurposed.[3]

---

* **Correspondence details:** Rutger Kramer, Utrecht University, Drift 6, 3512BJ Utrecht, The Netherlands; R.D.Kramer@uu.nl. Graeme Ward, University of Tübingen, Keplerstraße 2, 72026 Tübingen, Germany; graeme.ward@fpg.uni-tuebingen.de.

This article is part of *Medieval Worlds* 15, special issue, *Medieval Biographical Collections: Perspectives from Buddhist, Christian and Islamic Worlds*, guest editors: Daniel Mahoney, Diarmuid Ó Riain and Giorgia Vocino. To read all related articles, please access: dx.doi.org/10.1553/medievalworlds_no15si_2022.

1 Ong, *Orality and Literacy*, 77-114.

2 Foucault, What is an Author?.

3 Gurevich, Historical Anthropology.

Reception and Conception

Reception connects authors or compilers to the audiences of their works. The study of the phenomenon is rooted in literary history and hermeneutics, and its principal goal is to shift the focus of investigation from the author onto the reader, often by way of looking at the material or medium through which this connection would have occurred.[4] According to this approach, the historical meaning of a text was constructed by its audience. Given the plurality of audiences over time and space and in differing historical, social and cultural contexts, meaning thus became ambiguous, multivalent and subject to the way communities ended up remembering the past and recording those memories.[5] Broadly speaking, the key terms when discussing reception are *Rezeptionsgeschichte* and *Wirkungsgeschichte*, and both concepts sprang from German literary theory in the course of the 1960s. They refer to histories of reception and influence/effect respectively. Although, according to Peter Burke, the »distinction between *Rezeption* and *Wirkung* remains unclear«,[6] it is possible to distinguish one from the other. Leidulf Melve, for instance, argued that »*Wirkungsgeschichte* is concerned with large time-spans in order to delineate the changing appreciation (or reception) of a text. *Rezeptionsgeschichte*, on the other hand, is more interested in the immediate reception of a text and thus outlining the ways a given audience interprets it«.[7] There is, nonetheless, an overlap in meaning between reception and ›effect‹, and both *Rezeptionsgeschichte* and *Wirkungsgeschichte* tend to trace influences exerted by canonical works and canonical thinkers, paying particular attention to changes in the ways texts were interpreted.

Although the paradigms of *Rezeptionsgeschichte* and *Wirkungsgeschichte* provide a helpful model to analyse audience and reception after the fact, some of the sources treated in this volume show that it is not always useful to create sharp distinctions between authors/compilers and readers.[8] These are often instances in which the production of sources simultaneously embodied writing and reading in an ongoing process of studying, interpreting and writing ›new‹ sources that continues as long as there is an audience for any given text, in any given context. The compiled texts treated here thus add a third dimension to these two concepts, as the act of creating a collection of previously existing texts represents, with respect to transmission, an end and a new beginning – a new text to find an audience and a vessel that shows how older compositions continued to exert their influence.[9] Seen from this perspective, the case studies in this issue each deal with reception one way or another. We are either dealing with compilations built upon excerpts and paraphrases from earlier

4 See, among many others, Driscoll, Words on the Page.

5 For convenient summaries, see Holub, *Reception Theory*; Thompson, Reception Theory; Burke, History and Theory of Reception (many thanks to Anya Raisharma for this reference). For more emphasis on the Middle Ages, see: Melve, Intentions, Concepts and Reception; Briggs, Literacy, Reading, and Writing; Fentress and Wickham, *Social Memory*, 1-86.

6 Burke, History and Theory of Reception, 25.

7 Melve, Intentions, Concepts and Reception, 388.

8 For a classic statement, see Jauss, *Aesthetic of Reception*, 3-45.

9 See further Comfort, Scribes as Readers, 28-34. Cf. the famous essay by Barthes, Death of the Author, 148: »The reader is the space on which all the quotations that make up a writing are inscribed without any of them being lost; a text's unity lies not in its origin but in its destination«.

texts, or with texts that were themselves known only as a result of later authors continuing pre-existing narratives or scribes copying texts wholesale, as in the case of the *Gesta Sanctorum Rotonensium (GSR)* described by Kramer, the only extant versions of which are copies made centuries after the moment of inscription. Moreover, as the authors and compilers of biographical collections were themselves also readers, composition and compilation go hand-in-hand with interpretation: both are rooted in reception and dependent on the agency of the audience.

The study by Ward and Wieser offers a focused example of the sort of extensive reception history that could be written about the *De viris illustribus* (*De viris*). Jerome's catalogue of celebrated Christian authors would come to be widely disseminated after it was sent out by its author near the end of the 4th century. It was added to and revised at later historical moments for new social and cultural contexts, spawning imitators who consciously and creatively shaped new bio-bibliographical collections in its mould; it also provided material to be utilised in new literary contexts such as chronicles. As such, Jerome's *De viris* became a source for the Milanese *Libellus de situ civitatis Mediolani (De situ)*, the focus of Vocino's study into the intentions behind and effects of a text that aimed to anchor the lofty ideals of Christianity to a single city. The references and allusions built into its ›textual fabric‹ reveal the sources the author had read and utilised when penning the biographies of the bishops of Milan, which in turn also reveal its intended audience. Vocino's essay, furthermore, gives clear examples of the way *De situ* itself, having initially been the product of one author's engagement with their »resources of the past«, had a distinct reception history, dependent upon the needs and concerns of later readers.[10] Remarkably, one context in which the Milanese episcopal biographies ended up – separately and stripped of the introductory panegyric to Milan – was the *Magnum Legendarium Austriacum*, a vast collection of hagiographical texts ordered around the liturgical calendar, in which entries from Ó Riain's Salzburg collection, *De episcopis Salisburgensibus* (*De episcopis*), also appear. Unsurprisingly, this was not a phenomenon restricted to the Christian world. Heiss' diachronic study of South Arabian biographical literature, via a comparison of the collections of al-Janadī and al-Sharjī, shows how texts, by virtue of gaining an audience, become part of an ever-expanding set of resources which subsequent authors, including al-Khazrajī (as discussed by Mahoney), could use to make their points about the present.

10 Ganter *et al.* (eds.), *Resources of the Past*.

Audience(s)
The question of reception is thus intimately connected with that of audience. The audience comprises those who read written texts or listened to them being recited.[11] If texts thus become a conduit through which to engage with people, actual audiences are more difficult to reconstruct, not least because our sources often do not supply us with the necessary information to do so. Figuring out potential audiences remains a central interpretive obstacle that studies into the nature of a composition must struggle to overcome. Audiences could be real or imagined, intended or incidental.[12] They can be approached institutionally or spiritually, i.e. they can be exclusive, defined by a bounded and pre-existing community, or potentially all-encompassing, the text being aimed at everybody who would heed its message. Indeed, often it would be a combination of these categories: the isolated status of small, defined communities, such as monasteries, courts or schools, frequently only exists in idealised scenarios, with the communities they contain often continuing to defy attempts at categorisation by modern scholars. The communities implied in the *GSR* or *De situ* fall into this category: readers and listeners are invited to use their knowledge of a specific pre-existing community or previous experiences to reflect on the ideal presented in a text.[13] Even in such isolated cases, the community would be embedded into a larger social, political or religious context. The audience, subsequently, is encouraged to consider whether they are on the outside looking in, or on the inside looking out.

As the setting of the narrative increases in scale, so do the requirements of the readers. Authors that claim to speak for a political or religious community in its entirety would have to take their audience on faith. Their vision of community would be a projection – an attempt to convince their readers or listeners that they were part of a community that went far beyond the local level. Even if it did not always feel as such, this implied a certain level of inclusivity and community-building as well. The intended audience for Jerome's description of a Christian intellectual elite encompassed the highly educated classes in the Mediterranean, who were part of the growing world of Western Christendom. Reading this compilation allowed Jerome's readers to imagine themselves to be part of that community. On the Tibetan Plateau, the *Singular Volume of the Rlangs* (*Singular Volume*) analysed by Langelaar sailed a more proactive course, arguing for the establishment of a new socio-political order under the leadership of the Rlang clan. At the same time, the description of the deeds of the dynasty's earlier exponents appears to be vying for the audience's acceptance rather than presenting Rlang overlordship as a *fait accompli.* The political message of Mahoney's *al-ʿUqūd al-luʾluʾiyya fī tārīkh al-dawla al-Rasūliyya* (*al-ʿUqūd*), on the other hand, appears to have

---

11 See the helpful comments in Magennis, Audience(s); Foot, Internal and External Audiences; articles in Caillet *et al.* (eds.), *L'audience*; Toorawa, *Ibn Abī Ṭāhir Ṭayfūr*; Hirschler, *Written Word*; Behrens-Abouseif, *Book in Mamluk Egypt and Syria*. On preaching, see Diesenberger *et al* (eds.), *Sermo doctorum*, together with Berkey, Audience and Authority and Bauer, Muslim Exegete.

12 A helpful division into »types« of audience is presented by Rabinowitz, Truth in Fiction, who proposed four audiences: the actual audience (»the flesh-and-blood people who read the book«); the authorial or intended audience (for whom the author makes »certain assumptions about [their] beliefs, knowledge, and familiarity with conventions«); the narrative audience (an »imitation audience« to whom the author is speaking in the voice of the in-story narrator); and the ideal narrative audience (»for which the narrator wishes he were writing«). On this division and its usefulness for the study of medieval narratives, see now Novokhatko and Kramer, Dead Authors.

13 Barth, Anthropology of Knowledge, argues from a trans-cultural anthropological perspective that the experience of knowledge is based in the interconnectedness between canon, communication and social relations.

been directed at a wider audience of educated elites, just as the expanse of the authority of the Rasūlid dynasty in Yemen was waning. Here, the memory of past lives was aimed at consolidation; the inclusion of many of the obituaries of political elites, scholars and members of the broader public filled out and expanded the ways the sultanate had reached and influenced the inhabitants of the region beyond the main chronographic narrative of the text overall.

There are several different ways in which ›audience‹ can be equated with ›community‹. These depend in part on whether we are dealing with the immediate or ›intended‹ audience of a text, or with a later audience standing at a considerable temporal or spatial remove from the original work. The initial ground for writing biographical narratives (in collections or otherwise) may be found in crises of identity as perceived by the author.[14] These would be put in a logical sequence and thereby projected onto their intended audience with a view towards making them part of a community.[15] Such crises, in turn, could be a catalyst for strengthening a community or form the core of a new category of belonging. Similar conclusions can be reached, however, without focusing on crises *per se*.[16] Communities, after all, are not simple, fixed groups but rather are fluid, dynamic and ever-changing.[17] They regularly need to be maintained, reaffirmed and reoriented, and not only in times of heightened stress. Focusing on the moment of inscription of single compositions or the moment of compilation of multiple texts may be a step towards a (comparative) model that takes into account the discrepancies between the original intent of an author and the later uses of his or her writings – even, or especially, if the choices made during the composition of a life story do not reflect the expectations of the audience, setting in motion a renewed cycle of looking for meaning.[18]

When considering audiences as communities, several (overlapping) conceptual models can be applied, each of which focuses on a different starting and end point. Stanley Fish presented the idea of »interpretative communities«, in which he argued that, for any given audience, textual meaning is socially and culturally constructed.[19] From a Western medievalist perspective, Brian Stock influentially wrote of »textual communities«: »micro societies organized around the common understanding of a script«.[20] Constant J. Mews and John N. Crossley edited a collection of essays under the title »communities of learning«, which are understood as »the framework in which ideas are developed and exchanged« and each one of these communities »attached particular importance to some discipline and to some set of texts«.[21] Moving away from looking at the interdependent relations existing between and through texts, sociological approaches such as Robert Wuthnow's »communities of discourse« emphasise the importance of debates as a catalyst for spreading knowledge.[22]

14 Pohl, History in Fragments.

15 See White, *Value of Narrativity*, and White, Question of Narrative.

16 For example, Pössel, Consolation of Community.

17 Pohl, Comparing Communities.

18 Baumeister and Wilson, Life Stories.

19 Fish, *Authority of Interpretive Communities.*

20 Stock, *Implications of Literacy*; quotation here from Stock, *On the Uses of the Past*, 23; see also p. 150, where a textual community is »an interpretive community, but it also is a social entity«.

21 Mews and Crossley, Introduction; see also Vocino's contribution to this volume.

22 Wuthnow, *Communities of Discourse*.

In order to emphasise the social processes of learning, Steven Vanderputten and Micol Long have fruitfully utilised the model of »communities of practice« pioneered by Jean Lave and Étienne Wenger to gauge the extent to which the transmission of knowledge engendered a »continuous and potentially endless process of personal improvement« and to examine how communities are strengthened through the communication practices between peers, students and teachers.[23] In each case, the underlying notions of community have been helpful in linking authors to their audiences, but at the same time the ›fuzzy‹ nature of ›community‹ underpinning these models has sometimes obfuscated the extent to which this factored into the writing or compilation process at all. While this need not be a problem when dealing with single (small-scale) communities or developments within a given large-scale community, it does become an issue when attempting to make comparative statements across cultures.[24]

Texts and Contexts

Given that the collections under scrutiny are in the end ›snapshots‹ of ongoing processes of community or identity formation and actualisation, the question of temporal or indeed geographical distance from their sources and intended audiences becomes salient.[25] This affects our reading and analytical practices in two notable ways. On the one hand, proximity to a community implies that authors would have had an idea about how their texts would be received – and let this affect their style and register. Writing for a literate audience who will read and carefully scrutinise a text is different from writing for an audience whose primary method of partaking in its contents is to listen to the words being read aloud.[26] Between these two extremes, grey areas such as literate listeners or readers with various levels of erudition need to be considered, of course, but depending on the style and register of a narrative it may be possible to parse the author or compiler's appreciation of a potential intended audience.[27] Equally important for our understanding of the choices made by the author is the question of what the audience would be expected to know about the subjects in a given text or collection. How much liberty would an author be allowed to take with the memory of the audience? How much liberty was expected? Would subversions of what actually happened be acceptable if the lessons contained within the story were ultimately deemed to be more important than the ›truth‹, i.e. if the *topoi* and rhetorical devices used produced a result that lived up to what the audience believed anyway?[28] In part, these considerations even play into the idea that any narrative of necessity marks off a series of happenings from its wider context and in doing so embeds it within the larger corpus of collective memory.[29] As this happens, as

23 Long, Communities of Practice, 44; Vanderputten, Commentary, 455-456.

24 Cf. the remarks by Van den Braembussche, Historical Explanation; Conermann and Rheingans, Narrative Patterns; following Hannken-Illjes, Making a Comparative Object, who notes that the ›fuzzy‹ nature of the relation between texts and audiences is precisely what makes it a fruitful comparative issue.

25 See Pohl, Comparing Communities, esp. 23-25.

26 See for instance Innes, Memory; Hirschler, *Written Word*; Ong, *Orality and Literacy*, 71-73.

27 Mostert, Communication.

28 Otter, Fiction in Historical Writing

29 See the introductory remarks (on historiography) in White, *Metahistory*.

it is being read, the audience might make assumptions about – or at least have to reconcile their assumptions with – the intentions of the author. The author, conversely, may try to write towards the expectations of the audience. Reception, on this scale, is what happens at the interface between these intentions and expectations. The community is what shapes the narrative and allows its written version to exist.[30]

Distance, on the other hand, initially raises the question of why a long view had to be developed in the first place; why did authors or compilers opt to reach back into unknowable, mythological pasts foreign to their audience, while at the same time invoking the familiar and thus creating an image of past lives which ultimately deepened bonds among communities in the present?[31] In such cases, the persistence of institutions or political entities rather than small-scale communities may be at stake, as if a proportional relation exists between temporal distance and the size of the potential audience or underlying community. The differing institutional characters of the texts under scrutiny here – addressing face-to-face monastic communities or projecting ideals onto the more ephemeral idea of a universal audience – provide different clues about authorial intention and regarding the group of people to whom a given text applied whether they wanted it or not.[32] The tension between authorial intentions and audience assumptions concerning the meaning of ›community‹ for each party implies that, for every text, the dynamic between author and recipient would be subtly different. Attempts to study these dynamics would thus help showcase the standards to which authors held their respective communities. Life stories collected in support of the archiepiscopal see of Salzburg, the Rasūlid court or the Phag mo gru ruling house invoke a form of ›institutional memory‹, but only to the extent that they called for support to secure their continued existence or impressed upon the audience the need to accept the emotional and temporal nature of their community. In the overlap between religious and secular or even institutional thought, this issue takes on a special meaning within the genre of ›life writing‹, as the death of individuals may be a signal that the foundations of an overarching community are weakening or be used to invoke the memory of these people, thus seeking to strengthen the community implied by the audience.

The Tibetan *Singular Volume* appears most explicit in communicating its combination of worldly and spiritual concerns to the audience: the author seems to have been aware that the audience expected martial prowess as well as religious purity of its potential leaders. The monks listening to the stories in the *GSR*, on the other hand, would be presented with a vision of the wider world as an obstacle between them and their salvation, a series of challenges intended to test their mettle. A diachronic perspective on the South Arabian *ṭabaqāt* shows how priorities shifted from author to author as they each needed to link an essentially immutable series of lives to the concerns of the present. Conversely, the lives of the bishops of Milan or Salzburg could be used to provide a stable bedrock – a timeless foundation which served as a jumping-off point to create a new image of a city, for example by highlighting the spiritual prowess of individual saints to a universal audience.

30 See the opening remarks on belief and falsity in Eco, *Serendipities: Language & Lunacy*, 1-22.

31 Cf. Hen *et al.* (eds.), *Uses of the Past*; Gantner *et al* (eds.), *Resources of the Past*.

32 Lake, Authorial Intention.

As we have seen, variations in the contents and manuscript contexts of these collections arise in the course of their transmission. This, in turn, showcases the versatile nature of the hagiographical or biographical genre. On the one hand, their reception (combined with the perceived intentions of their respective authors) depended on the needs of both author and audience. On the other hand, the fact that people may have been aware of this versatility also raises questions about the way separate stories would be perceived as part of a collective or as narratives of exemplary individuals.

Collective Endeavours

The link between author and audience as defined through the texts themselves is thus an idealised construct, a medium that in a practical sense was shaped by the context of its inception and the social logic behind its communication – which would have included the awareness that different audiences would have differing experiences when engaging with the stories within.[33] Texts could be composed, or later compiled or even serialised, in order to be recited to an assembled group or to be read by individuals within a larger collective. They might be geared towards the moral edification of an audience or designed as reference works to be consulted in the context of private study. The observation that authors and compilers self-consciously engaged with these questions shaped the use of such works – both regarding their intended function and their reception in practice. Depending on how well a compiler succeeded in conveying the intended message or how popular a given reading proved to be, this engagement with the actual compilation – the new narrative as it was repurposed – could end up providing a prescriptive framework for the form subsequent compositions ought to take. The reception (and indeed the survival) of single narratives would be shaped by their place in a larger compilation, whereas the composition of new stories might be influenced by the existence of serialised frameworks rather than hagiographical or biographical genres *per se*. As such, the decision to incorporate single stories into larger, composite stories becomes a central part of how we should consider the transmission and reception of narratives large and small.[34] The existence of purposely made collections affected the discursive role of individual life stories – and *vice versa*.

The reception of *De viris* in the 9th-century West shows how monastic libraries produced manuscripts collecting together all versions of the text (Jerome's original plus his continuators) fully aware that it was itself a collection comprised of smaller texts. In part, the idea was that these meta-compilations together presented an archive of a potential original; but an equally important goal was for them to be used as lists against which to check their institutions' library holdings. Thereby, such collections provided a valuable service in fostering or preserving the self-worth and thus resilience of an institution. As this example shows, compiling – the conscious gathering of life stories – thus stretches not only the concepts of community but also of time and place in the eyes and ears of the audience. Adding multiple

33 Spiegel, Social Logic; Hirschler, *Written Word*; see especially the methodological remarks in Spencer-Hall, *Medieval Saints*, 11-59.

34 ›Appropriation‹ might be part of this process as well, as this too relies on the use and reuse of texts and traditions with a view towards establishing authority: Ashley and Plesch, Cultural Processes of Appropriation.

life stories makes a text as a whole more flexible, more adaptable to specific needs at a given time and thus more likely to be taken as a reflection of a community by its members. By expanding the time described beyond a single life, a history is created. By embedding people from various times and places in a single narrative, the audience is being made part of something bigger than their immediate surroundings. By highlighting the deeds (and deaths) of certain people, they are being confronted with more than one ideal and given more incentive to become part of the network of mutual obligations that is a community. At its most basic, adding more people to a story shows that a community is only as strong as its members: a logical point, perhaps, but one worth keeping in mind.

These points converge whenever a series of lives is also a collection of previously existing narratives. On the one hand, there need not be an essential difference between single texts by individual authors and later compilations with respect to authorial intent and audience perception. On the other hand, collections of older works are not the same as standalone works, and, as has been made clear in the preceding sections, the differences between writing goals and compilation goals need to be taken into account. Nevertheless, the simple observation that compiling, adapting or continuing texts is both an act of reception and of (re)creation bears repeating. For all intents and purposes, there is an audience built into any collection, any *réécriture* and any deliberate continuation of a pre-existing work.[35] Beyond the recognition that the decision to incorporate a given work into a larger textual whole is a form of conservation or archiving, there is the awareness that this action taps into a whole new audience whose perception of any part of the work changes accordingly.[36]

As such, the mere act of compiling calls for a reassessment of the intended audience, now seen in the context not of the initial composition but of the time the decision was made to recast a narrative into a different format. Works such as the *ṭabaqāt*, the different versions of the rise of the Rlang dynasty as well as *De situ*, *De episcopis* or the many adaptations of Jerome's *De viris* thus become a testament to the author/compiler as audience. They provide a lasting proof that people continued to engage with texts in more elaborate ways than rereading or copying them. The various uses of the collective biography of the bishops of Milan provide an especially illustrative example of the ways in which »authorial« intentions could be adapted to new contexts from one manuscript to the next. Conversely, the development of texts such as the *Singular Volume* or *al-ʿUqūd* as a function (or reflection) of their overarching political context shows how the same core of information could be read and represented differently: even if the text or its form stayed the same, it could take on new meaning as the circumstances around it changed.

35 See Goullet and Heinzelmann (eds.) *La réécriture hagiographique.*

36 Dierkens, Quelques réflexions; comparatively, see for example Lee, Role of Buddhist Monks.

The exertion of authority over the audience becomes an apparent factor here. The communal nature of a collection could be made to defend a present by hearkening back to a past full of virtues and wonders, essentially creating a »community of memory« – memories which are then projected onto a better future.[37] On the other side of that same coin, those perceived as threatening the coherence of a community or transgressing its norms could be excluded from remembrance; political or religious opponents could likewise be excised from pre-existing collections, their excision a warning to those who want to belong.[38] In either case, someone needed to make that decision, and enough people needed to accept it for this new version to become valid. The future of a collection would thus depend on being inclusive as well as exclusive: if so many great individuals had come before, imagine how many more might follow. One need not even read the entire work for this message to be impinged upon those willing to accept it: the material and visual aspects of a collection, encompassing the way a single story was embedded in a manuscript containing more of them, evoked a powerful ›vision of community‹ in and of themselves. The choice to keep certain life stories, and to collect and compile these into coherent narratives was thus an attempt to represent the future of a community by bequeathing a collective history to the next generation.[39] And regardless of the discourse underlying the choices made, regardless of whatever (real or idealised) community drove an author to start compiling in the first place, in the end we are looking at narrative constructions that allow us »to glimpse what it meant to experience and engage in contemporary political culture«.[40]

It is the lure of an audience that continues to drive the will to conserve and impart knowledge, and it is the role of an audience to receive and digest knowledge. Nevertheless, in any given case it remains to be determined whether that audience has become a community because a text has been written for them, whether a narrative is constructed because there was a community waiting for it or whether the resulting compilations themselves represent a community better than any individual (text or author) could ever hope to achieve.[41]

Acknowledgements
The research for this article was funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): Project F42-G18 Visions of Community (VISCOM). Many thanks to Johann Heiss for his insightful comments, and to the editors of this issue for helping us bring the article to fruition.

---

37 Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*, 275, talks of an »Erinnerungsgemeinschaft«.

38 Savant, Iran's Conversion; Kloppenborg, *Christ's Associations*, 131-135, points out that such »memory sanctions« were also meant as a warning to those who aspired to remain a part of the community. See also, more generally on the deliberate use and non-use of available knowledge, Dürr, Introduction.

39 Lifschitz, Beyond Positivism.

40 Glenn, Political History, 162; at 163-164, he also helpfully remarks that the historiographer Richer of Reims »was no mere observer of the world around him. And it is too simplistic to suppose that he served as mouthpiece for the man to whom he dedicated his work, expressed some shared set of family or factional ideals, or represented the views of other people within his community or of a larger Frankish nation. He was an individual within a dynamic community.«

41 Cf. for instance Stein, *Reality Fictions*, 210: »Representational practices, too, are real actors in the social world«.

References

Abbreviations
al-ʿUqūd: *al-luʾluʾiyya fī tārīkh al-dawla al-Rasūliyya*
De episcopis: *De episcopis Salisburgensibus*
De situ: *Libellus de situ civitatis Mediolani*
De viris: *De viris illustribus*
GSR: *Gesta sanctorum Rotonensium*
Singular Volume: *Singular Volume of the Rlangs* (*Rlangs-kyi-po-ti-bse-ru*)

Ashley, Kathleen M. and Véronique Plesch, The Cultural Processes of Appropriation, *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 32/1 (2002) 1-15.

Assmann, Jan *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (Munich, 1999).

Barth, Fredrik, An Anthropology of Knowledge, *Current Anthropology* 43/1 (2002) 1-18.

Barthes, Roland, The Death of the Author, in: *idem*, *Image, Music, Text*. Essays selected and translated from French by Stephen Heath (London, 1977) 142-148.

Bauer, Karen, »I Have Seen the People's Antipathy to this Knowledge«: The Muslim Exegete and his Audience, 5th/11th–7th/13th centuries, in: Asad Q. Ahmed (ed.), *The Islamic Scholarly Tradition: Studies in History, Law, and Thought in Honour of Professor Michael Allan Cook* (Leiden, 2011) 293-314.

Baumeister, Roy F. and Brenda Wilson, Life Stories and the Four Needs for Meaning, *Psychological Inquiry* 7/4 (1996) 322-327.

Behrens-Abouseif, Doris, *The Book in Mamluk Egypt and Syria (1250-1517)* (Leiden, 2018).

Berkey, Jonathan P., Audience and Authority in Medieval Islam: The Case of Popular Preachers, in: Katherine Jansen and Miri Rubin (eds.) *Charisma and Religious Authority: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Preaching, 1200-1500* (Turnhout, 2010) 105-120.

Briggs, Charles F., Literacy, Reading, and Writing in the Medieval West, *Journal of Medieval History* 26/4 (2000) 397-420.

Burke, Peter, The History and Theory of Reception, in: Howell A. Lloyd (ed.), *The Reception of Bodin* (Leiden, 2013) 21-37.

Caillet, Jean-Pierre and Michel Sot (eds.), *L'audience: rituels et cadres spatiaux dans l'Antiquité et le haut Moyen Âge* (Paris, 2007).

Comfort, Philip, Scribes as Readers: Looking at New Testament Textual Variants according to Reader Reception Analysis, *Neotestamentica* 38/1 (2004) 28-53.

Conermann, Stephan and Jim Rheingans, Narrative Patterns and Genre in Hagiographic Life Writing: An Introduction, in: *eidem* (eds.), *Narrative Pattern and Genre in Hagiographic Life Writing: Comparative Perspectives from Asia to Europe* (Berlin, 2014) 7-19.

Dierkens, Alain, Quelques réflexions en guise de conclusion, in: Marie-Céline Isaïa and Thomas Garnier (eds.), *Normes et hagiographie dans l'Occident latin (VIe-XVIe siècles)* (Turnhout, 2014) 479-486.

Diesenberger, Maximilian, Yitzhak Hen and Marianne Pollheimer (eds.), Sermo doctorum: *Compilers, Preachers and their Audiences in the early Medieval West* (Turnhout, 2013).

Driscoll, Matthew J., Words on the Page: Thoughts on Philology, Old and New, in: Judy Quinn and Emily Lethbridge (eds.), *Creating the Medieval Sage: Versions, Variability, and Editorial Interpretation of Old Norse Saga Literature* (Odense, 2010) 85-102.

Dürr, Renate, Introduction: Practices of Knowing and Ignoring from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century, in: *eadem* (ed.), *Threatened Knowledge: Practices of Knowing and Ignoring from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century* (Abingdon, 2021) 1-22.

Eco, Umberto, *Serendipities: Language & Lunacy*, translated by William Weaver (New York, 1998).

Fentress, James and Chris Wickham, *Social Memory* (Oxford, 1992)

Fish, Stanley, *Is There a Text in this Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cambridge, MA, 1980).

Foot, Sarah, Internal and External Audiences: Reflections on the Anglo-Saxon Archive of Bury St Edmunds Abbey in Suffolk, *The Haskins Society Journal* 24 (2012) 163-194.

Foucault, Michel, What is an Author?, in: *idem*, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, edited and translated from French by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Ithaca, New York, 1977) 113-138.

Gantner, Clemens, Rosamond McKitterick and Sven Meeder, *Resources of the Past in Early Medieval Europe* (Cambridge, 2015).

Glenn, Jason, Political History, in: Celia Chazelle and Felice Lifschitz (eds.), *Paradigms and Methods in Early Medieval Studies* (New York, 2007) 153-168.

Goullet, Monique and Martin Heinzelmann (eds.), *La réécriture hagiographique dans l'Occident médiéval: transformations formelles et idéologique* (Ostfildern, 2003).

Gurevich, Aaron, Historical Anthropology and the Science of History, in: *idem*, *Historical Anthropology of the Middle Ages*, ed. Jana Howlett (Cambridge, 1992) 3-20.

Hannken-Illjes, Kati, Making a Comparative Object, in: Thomas Scheffer and Jörg Niewöhner (eds.), *Thick Comparison: Reviving the Ethnographic Aspiration* (Leiden, 2010).

Hen, Yitzhak and Matthew Innes (eds.), *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000).

Hirschler, Konrad, *The Written Word in the Medieval Arabic Lands: A Social and Cultural History of Reading Practices* (Edinburgh, 2012).

Holub, Robert C., *Reception Theory: a Critical Introduction* (London and New York, 1984).

Innes, Matthew, Memory, Orality and Literacy in an Early Medieval Society, *Past and Present* 158 (1998) 3-36.

Jauss, H.R., *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, translated by T. Bahti (Brighton, 1982).

Kloppenborg, John S., *Christ's Associations: Connecting and Belonging in the Ancient City* (Yale, 2019).

Lake, Justin, Authorial Intention in Medieval Historiography, *History Compass* 12/4 (2014) 344-360.

Lee, Kyong Rae, The Role of Buddhist Monks in the Development of Archives in the Korean Middle Ages, *The American Archivist* 73/1 (2010) 61-81.

Lifschitz, Félice, Beyond Positivism and Genre: Hagiographical Texts as Historical Narrative, *Viator* 25 (1994) 95-113.

Long, Micol, High Medieval Monasteries as Communities of Practice: Approaching Monastic Learning through Letters, *Journal of Religious History* 41 (2017) 42-59.

Magennis, Hugh, Audience(s), Reception, Literacy, in: Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine M. Treharne (eds.), *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature* (Oxford, 2001) 84-101.

Melve, Leidulf, Intentions, Concepts and Reception: An Attempt to Come to Terms with the Materialistic and Diachronic Aspects of the History of Ideas, *History of Political Thought* 27 (2006) 377-406.

Mews, Constant J. and John N. Crossley, Introduction, in: Constant J. Mews and John N. Crossley (eds.), *Communities of Learning: Networks and the Shaping of Intellectual Identity in Europe, 1100–1500* (Turnhout, 2011) 1-7.

Mostert, Marco, Reading, Writing and Literacy: Communication and the History of Medieval Societies, in: P. Hermann (ed.), *Literacy in Medieval and Early Modern Scandinavian Culture* (Turnhout, 2005) 261-285.

Novokhatko, Ekaterina and Rutger Kramer, Dead Authors and Living Saints: Community, Sanctity and the Reader Experience in Medieval Hagiographical Narratives, in: Mateusz Fafinski and Jakob Riemenschneider (eds.), *The Past Through Narratology* (Heidelberg, 2022) 205-226.

Ong, Walter J., *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London, 1982, reprinted 2002) 77-114.

Otter, Monika, Functions of Fiction in Historical Writing, in: Nancy Partner (ed.), *Writing Medieval History* (London, 2005) 109-130.

Pössel, Christina, The Consolation of Community: Innovation and Ideas of History in Ratpert's *Casus Sancti Galli*, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 65 (2014) 1-24.

Pohl, Walter, Comparing Communities – The Limits of Typology, *History and Anthropology* 26/1 (2015) 18-35.

Pohl, Walter, History in Fragments: Montecassino's Politics of Memory, *Early Medieval Europe* 10 (2001) 343-374.

Rabinowitz, Peter J., Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences, *Critical Inquiry* 4/1 (1977) 121-141.

Savant, Sarah-Bowen, Iran's Conversion to Islam and History Writing as an Art for Forgetting, in: Walter Pohl and Daniel Mahoney (eds.), *Historiography and Identity IV: Writing History Across Medieval Eurasia* (Turnhout, 2021) 81-94.

Spencer-Hall, Alicia, *Medieval Saints and Modern Screens: Divine Visions as Cinematic Experience* (Amsterdam, 2017).

Spiegel, Gabrielle, History, Historicism and the Social Logic of the Text in the Middle Ages, *Speculum* 65/1 (1990) 59-86.

Stein, Robert, *Reality Fictions: Romance, History, and Governmental Authority* (Notre Dame, 2006).

Stock, Brian, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton, 1983).

Stock, Brian *Listening for the Text. On the Uses of the Past* (Baltimore, 1990).

Thompson, Martyn P., Reception Theory and the Interpretation of Historical Meaning, *History and Theory* 32 (1993) 248-272.

Toorawa, Shawkat, *Ibn Abī Ṭāhir Ṭayfūr and Arabic Writerly Culture. A Ninth-Century Bookman in Baghdad* (London, 2005).

Van den Braembussche, A.A., Historical Explanation and Comparative Method: Towards a Theory of the History of Society, *History and Theory* 28/1 (1989) 1-24.

Vanderputten, Steven, Enclaves of Learning: a Commentary on the Papers in the Section on ›Spiritual Communities‹, in: Eirik Hovden, Christina Lutter and Walter Pohl (eds.), *Meanings of Community across Medieval Eurasia: Comparative Approaches* (Leiden, 2016) 451-460.

White, Hayden, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore, MD, 1973).

White, Hayden, The Question of Narrative in Contemporary Historical Theory, in: *idem* (ed.), *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore, 1987) 26-57.

White, Hayden, The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality, in: *idem* (ed.), *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore, 1987) 1-25.

Wuthnow, Robert, *Communities of Discourse: Ideology and Social Structure in the Reformation, the Enlightenment, and European Socialism* (Cambridge, MA, 1989).