



Epitome : International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

ISSN : 2395-6968

A POINT OF VIEW OF THE AUTHOR INTO THE TEXT : A DISCOURSE



Dr. Pramod Ambadasrao Pawar

Assistant Professor & Head

Dept. of English

&

Editor-in-Chief, EpitomeJournals.com

&

IQAC, Director

Sant Dnyaneshwar Mahavidyalaya, Soegaon,

Dist. Aurangabad MS, India

Email : drpramodambadasraopawar@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The celebration of any creation in absence of the creator is a literary injustice to the text. This is an unfair practice in the interpretation of the text. Similarly, the binary oppositions like man-woman, light-darkness and presence-absence are always unique, interdependent and inter-textual which must not be studied in isolation. These apparently dissimilar oppositions initially direct towards uniformity, oneness or

absolutism. No creation is studied in the absence of creation by any reader or a researcher. Why is the biographical note not taken into consideration in the research activity? The author and the text are unique entities for a reader.

KEY WORDS

Interpretations, author, text, meaning, Reader

RESEARCH PAPER

Readers must thus, according to Barthes, separate a literary work from its creator in order to liberate the text from interpretive tyranny (a notion similar to Erich Auerbach's discussion of narrative tyranny in biblical parables). Each piece of writing contains multiple layers and meanings. In a well-known passage, Barthes draws an analogy between text and textiles, declaring that a "text is a tissue [or fabric] of quotations," drawn from "innumerable centers of culture," rather than from one, individual experience. The essential meaning of a work depends on the impressions of the reader, rather than the "passions" or "tastes" of the writer; "a text's unity lies not in its origins," or its creator, "but in its destination," or its audience.

The author is the soul of the text; he's never been dead in any interpretation of the text. In fact, he is alive in his own point of view into the text, having been rested forever beneath the super-consciousness of the text. An author stands as a soul in the body whereas the text forms the entire body. How can the ingrained presence of the author be left without any interpretation of the text? If you drop the author and simply focus on the text, it means that you disprove the presence of the creator and celebrate its creation only. This leads to simply mean overlooking the father as a creator and pampering the son as a creation. The celebration of any creation in absence of the creator is a literary injustice to the text. This is an unfair practice in the interpretation of the text. Similarly, the binary oppositions like man-woman, light-darkness and presence-absence are always unique, interdependent and inter-textual which must not be studied in isolation. These apparently dissimilar oppositions initially direct towards uniformity, oneness or absolutism. No creation is studied in the absence of creation by any reader or a researcher.

Why is the biographical note not taken into consideration in the research activity? The author and the text are unique entities for a reader. They are emphatically inseparable entities in the interpretation of the text wherein the authorial points of view do matter especially for the readers. The interviews of the author are hardly taken into the hypotheses of research. Declaring author as a dead being is a textual fallacy. How can intent of the author become informal and trivial in the interpretation of the text? Writing is a species of speech or vice versa. It is a

symbolic manifestation of the self to the world, signs to the signified, words to the world. Writing is not the destruction of sound, but it is a concrete creation of the creator concentrating on the point of view of the author. The sound is misinterpreted in the realizing of the self. The sound which is created and presented in the form of writing is not the sound of the self, but it is an essence of existence rested in your body in the form perpetual silence. *Nada* is different from a mere sound in this regard. The origin of all creations is soul, the unmoved mover of all the textual probabilities. No intellectual discourses, debates and powers can dismantle the extreme supremacy of the soul. The inner voice can be experimented, experienced and trans-deconstructed in writing.

Other research has drawn on “Death of the Author” only to subvert its original ideas of disrupting the singularity of author-centered literary criticism and interpretation by suggesting collaborative methods of authorship that enable plural pathways of knowledge. For example, in a recent attempt to challenge the “individualist author model of scholarship in the humanities,” scholars experimented with forms of peer production and publishing by pursuing an authorial collaboration of writing among scholars. Although the model articulates an authorial stance, it advances Barthes's ideas of encouraging multiple perspectives, interpretations, and ideological positions through the use of language by rendering authorship a pursuit of collective intelligence that calls into question traditional norms of scholarship. Additional studies further this notion with nuanced attention to collective authorship. The first explores having a group of youth with disabilities convey their life-narratives through fictional stories, while the second looks at teacher candidates writing autobiographies with specific attention to their values about teaching. Both take up the idea of a text's potential for dialogic engagement with its constructor of meaning, and how that dialogic process is essential for self-reflexivity and empowerment in the literacy process.

Hence, the writing is an intuitive replica and a mentor of the point of origin. The writing is functional in the practice and pursuit of signification in the text. An idea of the inner self is always codified in writing. It can be termed as a speech-manifesto. The author is a genius who experiments the experience of abstract notions of various points of view in writing. Hence, the

author is a text-warrior who drops the blood stains into the text. An author is often a deep-seated being like a soul into the linguistic super-consciousness of textual tapestry. His presence is the absence of the self and absence is the presence of his point of view ingrained into the text. The text is inadequate in its totalitarian nature to the fullest sense of absolutism. It demands for further contexts for the completion of meaning. Every text retains its perfection in itself till the readers are to divulge its essence to its fullest. This is a scrupulous investigation into the self, how can the text mistrust the absence of the author within it? The meaning is often found within or without the text. How can one mistrust the presence of the author and rely much more on the circulatory meanings in the text ending in a fiasco? The heated debate on the presence of author in the text is paramount at all the times sensing the author within it.

Quite the contrary, the modern writer (scriptor) is born simultaneously with his text; he is in no way supplied with a being which precedes or transcends his writing, he is in no way the subject of which his book is the predicate; there is no other time than that of the utterance, and every text is eternally written here and now. (*Barthes, Roland : THE DEATH OF THE AUTHOR, translated by Richard Howard, P. 3*)

The unique methodology of reaching the author decenters the text and throws us into the labyrinth of uncertainties and ambiguities. The linguistic system compels 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 in the interpretation of the text. Belief and Science are two different entities of human rationality to peep into the essence of inanimate and inanimate objects in the nature. Belief is assumed to be irrational, illogical and superstitious whereas science is experimental, logical and rational. It is a meticulous precise method for interpreting the visible objects in the nature. Intuition is a unique entity in the body which lies beyond human interpretations. It's very difficult to define what intuition is, how it functions in the body. Nobody has ever understood where it lies and how it monitors the entire 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 thoroughly. The absence of all these things does mark their presence in the body. In a sense, the body is the text and soul is the meaning. Text itself is a complete entity for signification wherein the author is neither dead nor alive for the readers. He is always in guise of signifiers' reaching the signified. Text is thus a coded secret of signification in an authorial point of view. It is restructured within the singularity of meanings. It lies in a state of super-consciousness, yet to be fathomed by readers. Neither a reader nor an author can sense its super-consciousness unless it is internally experienced and experimented by them.

The text is a 100% genuine creative literary product created by an author; its 25% purity is misread by the critics as readers. 25% is deeply structured in absences and the rest of 25% needs to be trans-deconstructed to reach the textual super-consciousness and absolutism in the text. What the text means without is found the same within or vice versa. The text is a complete body of super-consciousness which needs to be trans-deconstructed first. The text is full of ambiguities in-built 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 talks about it. There is a unique 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 which cannot be theorized and put into practice. 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 scientifically 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). (*Barthes, Roland : THE DEATH OF THE AUTHOR, translated by Richard Howard, P. 3*)

The presence of the Author into the text is a bio-cultural fact. It is act of self-revelation in writing. The Author is a belief in actuality into the text. His expression through other literary creations is an amalgamation of art for art's sake in its true essence of meaning. This is always conceived to the perpetual presence of the Author in his own point of view into the text.

REFERENCES

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Death_of_the_Author

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Death_of_the_Author

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

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