



DEATH OF THE AUTHOR : A POINT OF VIEW



Dr. Pramod Ambadasrao Pawar

Assistant Professor & Head

Dept. of English & Director, IQAC

Sant Dnyaneshwar Mahavidyalaya, Soegaon,

Dist. Aurangabad MS INDIA

ABSTRACT

The text is incomplete to the fullest sense of absolutism. It demands for the context for the completion of meaning. No text is perfect in itself. It is a scrupulous question, why does the text mistrust the absence of the author within it? The meaning is found within or without the text. How can one trust and relay much more on all the questions of circulatory meanings in the text ending in a fiasco? The heated debate on the text is not paramount at all the times sensing the author within it. The methodology of reaching the author decenters the text and

throws us in the labyrinth of uncertainties and ambiguity.

The linguistic system necessitates us for the textual analysis to channelize the hidden meaning rapport within the text. Do you really understand the text once you fathom the science behind things? Do we really understand the essence of the text once we get the science behind it? Is it really necessary to comprehend the center in the text, embedded by the writer in the text? All these questions are relative to one and all.

KEYWORDS

Author, science, absolutism, text, meaning

RESEARCH PAPER

In 'The Death of the Author', Barthes argues that writing destroys every voice and point of origin. This is because it occurs within a functional process which is the practice of signification itself. Its real origin is language. A writer, therefore, does not have a special genius expressed in the text, but rather, is a kind of craftsman who is skilled in using a particular code. All writers are like copywriters or scribes, inscribing a particular zone of language.

The text is incomplete to the fullest sense of absolutism. It demands for the context for the completion of meaning. No text is perfect in itself. It is a scrupulous question, why does the text mistrust the absence of the author within it? The meaning is found within or without the text. How can one trust and rely much more on all the questions of circulatory meanings in the text ending in a fiasco? The heated debate on the text is not paramount at all the times sensing the author within it. The methodology of reaching the author decenters the text and throws us in the labyrinth of uncertainties and ambiguity. The linguistic system necessitates us for the textual analysis to channelize the hidden meaning rapport within the text. Do you really understand the text once you fathom the science behind things? Do we really understand the essence of the text once we get the science behind it? Is it really necessary to comprehend the center in the text, embedded by the writer in the text? All these questions are relative to one and all. Belief and science are the two sides of rationality to screen the essence of objects. Belief is thought to be irrational whereas science is a disciplined scientific approach for the interpretation of things. There are some notions unique ideas for interpretations, for example, intuition. It's very difficult to define what intuition is, how it functions. Nobody has ever understood where it lies and how it monitors the system. Its reference is with the biological system in the human body. Man hardly knows about the interrelated functioning of all the entities in the body. The body has emotions, air, mind, intuition, soul within it, but none of these are present if the body is detected. The absence of all these things marks their presence. In a sense, the body is the text and soul is the meaning.

It is often said that Roland Barthes's 1968 essay 'The Death of the Author' marks the transition from structuralism to post-structuralism, and in that essay Barthes says that in the text 'everything must be disentangled, nothing deciphered.' (Peter Barry, p. 76)

The text is full of ambiguities inherent in the text, beyond definition, interpretation and analysis. Can anybody confirm that the ideas which are beyond human understanding are disbelief and wrong in conception? Can we assume that the science behind all sciences is illogical? Do we agree with the notion that things which are unknown to the human mind are not trustworthy and genuine? The human mind can differ the meaning linguistically, but not a philosopher and a transcendentalist. The mind is equipped with restrained, constrained and stereotyped notions of life. The text is full of the meanings without clearing what the text says about itself. There is a method behind the theoretical approach of a critic that every discourse defines the precise position of human mind and natural demarcation of human reach to know the signified. It doesn't mean that there is no signified at all! Yes, the signified which is understood experientially cannot be experimented. For instance : in music, the harmony infatuates us spiritually and the rapture is felt within experientially, not experimentally. To analyze and interpret the text, what the text means to itself is a case of introspective comprehensibility where the words can justify the exact interpretation of the text unlike music. Similarly, there are many objects in the nature, for example, air as the natural element can be felt, but not expressed in words. The emotions and feelings in the body, shifting nature of mind can only be experienced, but not experimented. This is what I mean through transcendentalism and trans-deconstruction that there are many views beyond human comprehensibility. Can we call them invalid, fake and non-scientific? In fact, the true essence of the truth carries the absolute meaning of all meanings for all the discourses. The discourses we are talking about lead to heated debates again as it makes us peep into the unresolved issues of the text and meanings. No immaterial thing can be material unless it is proven.

The absence of the Author (with Brecht, we might speak here of a real "alienation:" the Author diminishing like a tiny figure at the far end of the literary stage) is not only a historical fact or an act of writing: it utterly transforms the modern text (or — what is the same thing — the text is henceforth written and read so that in it, on every level, the Author absents himself). Time, first of all, is no longer the same. The Author, when we believe in him, is always conceived as the past of his own book: the book and the author take their places of their own accord on the same line, cast as a before and an after: the Author is supposed to feed the book — that is, he pre-exists it, thinks, suffers, lives for it;

he maintains with his work the same relation of antecedence a father maintains with his child. (*The Death of the Author Roland Barthes, translated by Richard Howard. P.3*)

The author is dead, how can we say the author is dead? What makes us study a critique of the text from the authorial point of view? To study the meaning closely is to get into the real essence of the text. This is absolutely not a justified way of the interpretation of the text. To study generated meanings in the absence of another is not the concrete interpretation of a text. The interpretation incorporated with almost all the shades of meanings are recurrently interrogated with differences. The demarcation about the subjective and objective analysis of the text is still questioned. No text is subjectively analyzed till the objectivity becomes an inherent part of textual interpretation. Therefore, the text can never be studied in a biased and prejudiced way. Many critics turn to post-structuralism from structuralism at the end of the study because they started thinking again and again for the finalization of meanings. The meaning in a text functions like the circulatory axis of the wheel merging into the author. The meaning is nowhere but a moving body of the text and it moves with the wings of plurality without the signification in a wheel for the signified.

There is the death of the author because the text is in the hand of the reader. The biographical sketch on the author is no more existed in the text. Does it mean that the authorial meaning is completely absent from the text? How can we say that his absence makes the text study in-depth? The analysis of the literary text is independent in isolation. It's true that the focus of the study is made by keeping the author away from the written text.

Literature, then, conveys a certain type of knowledge which is not scientific and factual but has to do with values and meaningfulness and makes use of language that expresses and manipulates emotions. (*Hans Bertens, p. 17*)

However, making the author dead is not enough to avert his presence in the text. His views are codified in objectivity in guise of subjectivity in the text. Every reader is pleased to be in pursuit of understanding what text is all about. Is there any absolute meaning for what was written by the author in the text? The answer is a big no. His work is not a product of intention, biography and history. His literary experience which is subjective by nature is internalized with the essence of the text. The text is independent in carrying its own meanings. In fact, there should not be any restriction upon the text because the text is not always free from all prejudices and biased meanings within the text. The text is always independent, enigmatical and magical in nature.

This ubiquitous note of the text makes the readers study in isolation for the sake of upholding singularity for all the meanings in all the discourses.

The text is free from all the restraints and external forces of pressurization. The death of author means the birth of reader. The meaning is nothing, but futile in nature due to its dependence and interrelatedness. The author and reader stand poles apart in the interpretation of meanings in the text. The text is an artifact; it is neither of the authors nor the readers. One can reach the reconstruction of the meaning emerged from the text. In the reading, the death of the author signifies that the author is no more in the text. Is it really worth-considerable to talk and assume about the death of the author in the interpretation of the text? The meanings have never been stationary in the text. Text is often plural and multiple in meanings. There is, of course, a free play of meanings. Such endless free play of meanings demonstrates the textual vulnerability to reach the signified. Although deconstruction is not all about the abandonment of all restraints, it is in fact the disciplined identification for the sources of textual power. It is a systematic dismantling of the sources of textual power. These days, almost all the critics are desirous to achieve the intellectual event to be discussed and debated at length. It is a disastrous norm about decentering of ideas. It is concerned about decentering of the intellectual universe. But before that the author was acceptable and the existence of a author in almost all the things was taken into consideration for the interpretation. However, deconstruction comes into the existence as a theory and the author gets decentered. Man is at the author of the universe because he thinks much. Most of the times, the intellectual perspectives, social behavior and architecture have centers.

To sum up, whenever I think of the author in the text, I think of the presence of author as marginalized and oppressed. The relativity in textual interpretation thus perishes the notion of time and space as fixed and central absolutes. There are again the intellectual rulers for an artistic regulation of the textual powers. The harmony in music, the chronological sequence in narrative representation of visual world has been discarded in the interpretation of the text. It's interesting to know whether the author in a text is fixed or not. However, the author is not dead, he is still alive in the text through his point of view.

WORKS CITED

<https://ceasefiremagazine.co.uk/in-theory-barthes-4/>

Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory – An introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. New York : Routledge, 2001. Print. p. 76.

<http://writing.upenn.edu/~taransky/Barthes.pdf>

Bertens, Hans. *Literary Theory – The Basics*. New York : Routledge, 2003. Reprint. p. 17.