

Natalia N. BELOZEROVA¹

UDC 81:004.9(079.8)

HOW FAR CAN A DEAD AUTHOR GO?

¹ Dr. Sci. (Philol.), Professor,
Department of the English Language,
University of Tyumen
natnicbel@gmail.com

Abstract

This article centers around the issue of “the death of the author” proposed by Roland Barthes, a French semiologist, in one of his essays. Three novels to a great extent “probabilistic” by two contemporary French novelists are chosen to verify the possibility of the “resurrection” of the author in the blended narratives overloaded with intertextual units both structural and semantic. These novels are: a detective story « La Police des Fleurs, des Arbres et des Forêts » by Romaun Puertolas, a “semiotic” detective novel « Qui a tué Roland Barthes ? La septième fonction du langage » by Laurent Binet and his “would-have-been” « Civilization ».

The methodology rests upon Derridean deconstruction including « diffrance » principle, based upon two ideas: all things *defer* to the same field and *differ* at the same time. Several other approaches used concern the interrelation of the categories of the author, text and the reader. These approaches include theories by M. Bakhtin, R. Jakobson, D. Lodge etc.

The analysis reveals that a vectoral outline of probable regressive or progressive development shapes the narrative chain. Another property is to be found in the fusion of genre forms, each evolving according to its rules. Communication practices in these novels obtain greater importance than physical events... That tendency in its turn has caused the revival of the Syncretic truth.

Keywords

Fusion, regressive, revival, syncretic truth, communication.

DOI: 10.21684/2411-197X-2022-8-1-62-75

Citation: Belozerova N. N. 2022. “How far can a dead author go?”. Tyumen State University Herald. Humanities Research. Humanitates, vol. 8, no. 1 (29), pp. 62-75.

DOI: 10.21684/2411-197X-2022-8-1-62-75

Introduction

The origin of our title is twofold — on the one hand, it presents a paraphrase of the title “How Far Can You Go” from one of the novels by David Lodge [14], on the other, it alludes to Roland Barthes’ essay “The Death of the Author” [3, pp. 142-148].

Roland Barthes insisting that for a reader the author dies at the moment of entering the first word upon a paper [3] had no idea of the narrative twists that contemporary, 21st century novelists enjoy. The Intrusive authors of the 18th and 19th centuries like Henry Fielding in “Tom Johnson the Foundling” or Alexander Pushkin in “Evgeny Onegin” limited their intrusion only to comments. They did not place the action in the sphere of the human subconsciousness like James Joyce, they did not narrate their stories on the part of simpletons the way William Faulkner did, they did not rearrange time sequence modeling their novels after musical genres, as we find in Richard Aldington’s “Death of a Hero” or in the “time plays” of J. B. Priestley. These Men of Letters being highly intrusive by their purpose of writing hid behind their personages. All of them, like Russian Futurists and European surrealists were involved in linguistic and scientific experiments that resulted in the way they presented their « *ouvres* ». The experiment of 21st century novelists is to a great extent “probabilistic”.

To explain these “probabilistic” tendencies, three novels of two French authors overloaded with intertextual units (to fit Barthes’ discoveries), either structural or functional or semantic, are propitious. These books are:

- 1) a detective story « *La Police des Fleurs, des Arbres et des Forêts* » by Romain Puertolas [17],
- 2) a “semiotic” detective novel « *Qui a tué Roland Barthes ? La septième fonction du langage* » by Laurent Binet [5],
- 3) and his “would-have-been” « *Civilization* » [6].

Methodology

To analyze these novels, we choose Derridean deconstruction including « *différance* » principle, based upon the two ideas: all things *defer* to the same field and *differ* at the same time [9]. Several other approaches concerning the interrelation of the categories of the author, text and the reader, (explored in our doctoral theses [4]) are called for.

In this regard, three points seem to be relevant to the purpose of this article:

1. *The relation between the author and the text.* Is the text entirely the product of the author (or by a trinity of authors — M. Bakhtin [1, pp. 227-244; 2, pp. 148-160]) or the fruit of the interaction of the author’s psychology, culture, previously created texts, the episteme and aesthetic codes of the period, that the author only conveys without adding anything new, as Roland Barthes viewed it in his famous essay?
2. *The relation between the text and the reader.* Whether it is the text that creates the reader or it is the reader who creates the text. Can any text exist without a reader? To what extent the reader recreates the author’s text. How many texts are recreated from one [10];

3. *Semantic value of the text.* Whether the semantic levels of production and perception coincide. Whether the textual meaning predominantly rests upon the linguistic means of expression. Whether the text is just a *letter-filled* space between the margins and the extraction of meaning depends therefore on the cultural background of the reader [10].

A different point is made by from David Lodge, a professor at Birmingham university and the author of “an academic novel” who in his book “The Art of Fiction” [13] analyzes fifty-one textual categories that are completely dependent on the choice (conscious or subconscious) of the author [13, pp. 52-56] examining the extent to which the author can appear in the text. For instance, in the chapter “The Reader in the Text”, analyzing an excerpt from “A Sentimental Journey” by Laurence Sterne, David Lodge shows that a writer can not only target a particular reader, but create one. The category of intertextuality, (the cause of the death of the author) [15, pp. 98-104] can manifest itself in texts both regardless of the author’s conscious purpose (Richardson, Fielding), and due to their conscious intention (J. Joyce, V. V. Nabokov, J. T. Conrad, T. S. Eliot). Such were the approaches I used to construct the model of “Intertext Functioning” [4] and I believe they will serve here to analyze the advances of contemporary novelists who die at the moment they start to interweave their texts with earlier artistic produce.

Research results and discussion

Part one: Blended Genre Forms Going Awry

We start with « La Police des Fleurs, des Arbres et des Forêts » by Romain Puertolas [17].

From the semiotic point of view it is a “*text within a text*” (Lotman) with a motive of a *discovered box containing documents* as a trigger for the appearance of a “Bakhtinian” *secondary* author [2, pp. 148-160] to start a story.

« C’est l’histoire d’un homme, un policier donc, l’un des plus brillants de la grand ville. À sa mort, on retrouva sous son lit une boîte à biscuits en fer contenant neuf bandes magnétiques d’enregistrement, une liasse de lettres et quelques feuilles volantes, le tout reuni sous le nom de Affaire Joël » [17, p.14].

Moreover, this motive together with the dialogical form of the prologue that serves as a setting provides not only a “secondary” author, but a reader or listener, ready to comprehend a strange detective story « *sans meurtre, sans suspects et sans policier qui cherche le coupable* » [17, p. 13]. Thus, upon the three pages of an introductory dialogue between anonymous interlocutors, the reader (listener) and the “secondary” author surface. It is evident that the functions of the secondary author are to create a reader, to introduce a strange case, an intrigue « un coup de theatre final epoustoufflant qui remet tout le recit en cause » [17, p. 14] and pretend to be a narrator.

The *primary* Bakhtinian author arrives (making a secondary one step aside) with an intertextual blend of genre forms: a detective narrative is fused with an epistolary novel, consisting of a set of semiofficial report letters to « *Madame la procureur de la République de M.* », each with attached annexes, comprised of magnetic tape tran-

scriptions, performed by a young inspector during a week in a hot summer of 1961 in a remote French village (« *France profonde* ») where the thunderstorm (among other things) cut off all possible connections with the rest of the world. Responsible persons of the village also send letters to « *Madame la procureur* » explaining their own actions and the development of events.

The epistolary exchange is bi-lateral, « *Madame la procureur* » reveals herself in the “reported” instructions within the letters of « *l’officier de police* » whose surname is never mentioned and first name comes only in the love letter and in the final tape « *et vivants, me direz-vous* » [17, p. 45]. Another set of letters forms an additional “story within a story” of true love. The Bakhtinian *biographical author* reveals himself explicitly by his name, as well as in the dedication lines, epigraphs from Heidegger and Jean Teule, and Remerciements (acknowledgements), and of course implicitly in the design of the story.

Thus the category of the author has a clear-cut classical Bakhtinian ‘trinity’ shape: (1) a *biographical author* who seems to be not intrusive and manifests his presence in “quasi” textual markers; (2) a *primary author*, the main character of the story, a police officer aged 25 in 1961, whose name remains unknown up to the end of the story, who manifests his discoveries in report letters to his boss and in the attached tape-transcripts with his commentaries in the mode of first person narrative and who is physically dead at the moment of the story narrating; (3) and a *secondary author* from the introductory conversation between two anonymous interlocutors, who pretends to be an intrusive narrator with his comments but is given by the biographical author only three pages to create a listener and a reader and to provide a setting to his narrative.

The *category of the reader* obtains a two- (even three)-folded representation: on the one hand, a *listener*, one of the anonymous interlocutors from the prologue who is being persuaded to listen to the case of « Joël » (« *Affaire Joël* »). This listener has a definite doubting voice and a definite part in the preliminary discourse. Perhaps, he is in his teens for he agrees to listen to the story only when it is defined as a sort of a game and a riddle. Concerning the revelation of the reader, we confirm the presence of the textual reader of letters (« *Madame la procureur* »), whose voice is presented reportedly and in her reply letters, and a multifaceted reader of the whole novel, who, though accurately created in the prologue, has no voice, nor other definite markers in the main body of the novel.

The present blend of genre forms inherits core features of parent genres: the epistolary novel was to a great extent a sentimental novel (S. Richardson, L. Stern, N. Karamzin) where sentiments, modalities of perception and the emotive function prevailed; a detective story demands strict “Proppian” [16] functional structure, both at the level of characters (sender, detective, helpers, antagonist (s), a victim) and actions (arrival, search, love affairs, fake discoveries, true discoveries, shock of a hero, departure). Somehow such a blend results in the distortion of each stereotype component. To illustrate this point, we selected a few extracts from the official report letters to « *Madame la procureur* » and attachments that reflect the sensual behavioral dominance of the inspector. Every modality of sense perception is verbalized in the report letters:

(1) Modality of taste rendering his impression of the lunch served in his hotel:

« *Si vous passez un jour par P., je vous recommande **la mousse au chocolat**, qui était **particulièrement délicate*** » [17, p. 36];

(2) Auditory modality in the presentation of the rural sounds:

« *Il est incorrect de penser que le silence règne en maître ici. **Les cigales qui font un bruit de clôture électrifiée, le meuglement des vaches, les chiens qui aboient, les clochettes des brebis** qui tentent au loin comme cent églises forment un paysage sonore....Non, madame, il n'y a pas moins de bruit à la campagne qu'à la ville, il est juste différent* » [17, p. 75];

(3) Olfactory modality in the description of the disgusting reek of the pigs' manure:

« *Alors que j'attends le bus depuis un bon quart d'heure un mouchoir appliqué sur le nez afin de **ne pas respirer cette horrible odeur qui flotte dans l'air**,....
...merde? Eh bien de la merde, inspecteur, **de la merde de porc**... Depuis ce matin, ils balancent **du purin** dans les champs pour préparer le semences* » [17, p. 80];

(4) Modality of vision in the description of the starry sky:

« *Il faisait encore nuit. Les étoiles emplissent le ciel et c'était un **spectacle merveilleux**. J'adore ce moment où l'on en vient à croire que l'on est seul sur Terre. Les étoiles **brillent pour nous, les arbres vibrent d'une émotion**. ..* » [17, p. 170];

(5) Modality of sense perception that render the invitation to senses after visiting the cemetery:

« *En sortant du cimetière. ..
J'aime l'atmosphère qui règne dans ces lieux de culte. Une invitation aux sens, même pour les plus athés des hommes* » [17, p. 133].

Such infusion of the epistolary form into the detective story results in the alteration of the structure of the main character [11, p. 89-149] (the inspector), whom the author made act as a sentimental romantic hero, though he enters the location of crime as an ambitious practical-minded officer fresh from police school [17, p. 28]. These structural changes are reinforced by the inclusion of his dream (nightmare) in the narration [17, pp. 145-130]. The sudden passion of the inspector for the florist shop assistant also adds to the sensual focus. Even a typical Gothic detail: a tunnel that connected two distant houses, serving as hiding place for jews, whom the suspect saved during the war, dating place for lovers and as a simple passage that allowed the young inspector to find a true murderer, as well as his own death and delivery of it by a not-so-bright policemen of “flowers, trees and forests” fit into the functional value of the narrative. The “loci clash”, the conflict of urban and rural ways of thinking and acting (« *Ici,*

*c'est la campagne. ... Les choses sont un peu différentes de la grande ville...rural » [17, p. 30]), is not a novelty, it reflects the divergence of natural and cultural human behavior, fixed as early as in Renaissance literature and further on. Nevertheless, in the novel it results in communication dissonance, that has a frame structure and rests upon misinterpretation. The age of the dismembered victim, who was 16 years old, but not young, the absence of his surname, the impossibility to school him, his wild ways, his autopsy performed by the veterinarian, his premature burial in the church yard as well as the main piece of evidence being red flowers with yellow points on the petals perplex the inspector and make the investigation go awry causing the suicide of the innocent suspect who was a man of great heart. To regard this communication dissonance in the terms of the communicative model developed by Roman Jakobson [12], it is possible to observe the defilement of the conative function (« *Ils ont dû me trouver bizarre, oui, je le conçois* » ... « *La rumeur courait que vous posiez de drôles de questions sur Joël* » [17, p. 331] and the metalingual function (« ... *Tout en parlant la même langue, nous ne parlions pas le même langage, eux et moi* » [17, p. 331]). The villagers treat the inspector's questions as be funny, even droll. The oddest questions come during the interrogation of the suspect [17, pp. 47-58] when the inspector arrogantly ignores the very mention of the species of the victim:*

« - *Est-ce que Joël allait à l'école ?*
Le vieil exploitant lâche un petit rire moqueur.
 - *À l'école? C'était un âne, inspecteur !*
 -*Sans vouloir vous vexer, monsieur Nazarian, j'ai connu des gamins tout à fait stupides qui allaient à l'école* » [17, p. 57].

Thus misunderstanding and ill performance of the conative and metalingual functions arise as a result of the discursive discrepancies in the mental context [20] of villagers and a city-dweller:

« ...*ma folie n'ait été de ne pas avoir vu les signes lorsqu'ils se présentaient à moi,oui, ma seule folie à été de l'entête à voir Joël comme ce garçon de seize ans solitaire et sauvage que tout le monde aimait à P* » [17, p. 331].

To create the situation of communicative dissonance in the context of a detective story it was necessary for the biographical author to introduce the figure of a *hoaxer* keen on verbal and other types of mystification. This purely functional personage, a trickster, is presented by the figure of the mayor, a jam factory owner, who asks « *Madame la procureur* » to send the police officer to investigate the murder, invites workers to erect a statue of « *Joël* » and later after the tempest orders not to restore the connection thus causing letters to be sent by post and the epistolary form of the detective story.

Concluding the analysis of this novel let us consider how far Romain Puertolas managed to go: (1) The story within a story is not a novelty, (2) a set of different authors is a Bakhtinian narrative rule; (3) the contrast of rural and urban ways of life and men-

tality has its roots in the Enlightenment philosophy of natural law; (4) the blend of genre forms is a conscious act of the author, yet each form starts developing according to its rules, in a certain way going awry; (5) a donkey taken for a human only seems to be a novelty — it is possible to think of Apuleius' "Metamorphoses" (6) What can be treated as a partial novelty, a contemporary phenomenon is the communicative dissonance, based upon the distortion in the conative and metalingual functions.

Part 2: Laurent Binet as a naughty author

Laurent Binet has made true the major principle of the Abbey of Thelema: *Do What Thou Wilt*. Communicative functions form the major focus in the novel « *Qui a tué Roland Barthes ? La septième fonction du langage* » by Laurent Binet [5].

The genre of the novel can be defined as political and semiolinguistic detective. The starting point of the plot is a real car accident that took place on the 25th of February 1980, at which Roland Barthes was seriously injured and died a month later. Locations where the action develops include Paris, Bologna, Ithaca (USA), Venice, Naples. The political context of the plot is the presidential campaign in France, Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and Francois Mitterrand being the main rivals. The set of characters syncretic and comprises:

1. Men of Politics: Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, Francois Mitterrand, Michel Poniatowski, KGB people (Yuri Andropov, Ivan Kristeff (fictional), father of Julia Kristeva);
2. Semiologists both continental and American: J. Derrida, U. Eco, M. Foucault, R. Jakobson, J. Searle, Julia Kristeva etc.;
3. Fictional personages: the inspector (le commissaire) and his assistant: The functions of le commissaire Bayard are to trace, to solve, to catch. The functions of Simon Herzog (young Sorbonne linguist, snatched from the lecture to assist the inspector) are to explain linguistic, philosophical and semiotic theories — he eventually becomes the central character because of the dangers that he faces;
4. Bulgarian KGB people whose functions were to eliminate Barthes, to get hold of the document;
5. Foucault Arabian gigolos whose functions are: to hide the document, to preserve the contents by learning it by heart;
6. The two Japanese: guardian angels;
7. Female assistants: Anastasia — Russian-born KGB nurse whose function is to help Barthes to die, to destroy adversaries; Bianca — in Italian Intelligence whose function is to guide to the Logos Club; the photocopy assistant in Ithaca library who is the feminist priestess of love;
8. Morris Zapp — David Lodge's invention. A borrowed character. Postmodernist "conferee" of the campus trilogy. His function is to explain the difference between real life (made of things) and literature (made of words).

This novel is remarkable for a phenomenon, that could be defined as the resurrection of the author: performing the narrative functions in Laurent Binet's novel, these characters are completely subjected to the will of the author who seems to have chosen

the mode of his narrative to reject the theory of Roland Barthes about the Death of the Author. All thinkable and unthinkable actions are deeply rooted in the real events of the 1980s. For instance, Umberto Eco explains the possible worlds theory to inspector Bayard before the bomb explosion in Bologna. John Searle makes his dogs kill Derrida and leaps into the river, committing suicide (in 1980¹) and Foucault speaks at the funeral of Jacques Derrida². Actually the reader is immersed in the possibility of the impossible, finding the scenes in the secret logos club where speakers who lose a debate are subjected to getting their fingers (or testicles) cut off, or how Louis Althusser, the Marxist philosopher, smothers his wife Hélène Rytman suspecting her of having stolen the fragment with the 7th function, or watching a feminist sex ritual in the cemetery to celebrate the end of the conference on the linguistic turn.

The plot develops around the two intervened vectors connected with communication (1) At the presidential election F. Mitterand aims to win the debate (and wins!). He replaces the correct piece of the text by a fake one; in search of scholarly assistance he invites J. Derrida to re-write Jakobson's text; (2) F. Sollers (the husband of Julia Kristeva) wants to take the Grand Protagoras' (Eco's) place in the logos club. To achieve this, assisted by the KGB, he organizes the car accident to kill Barthes to obtain the (fake!) text; he loses the debate with Umberto Eco and his testicles are chopped off.

This novel is designed not for a naïve lover of detective stories, as it is the case with « La Police des Fleurs, des Arbres et des Forêts » by Romain Puertolas. The readers, both in the text and of the text, obliged to know at least the names of politicians and scholars, should belong to a narrow academic sphere. In a certain way the novel presents a narrative to explain the following linguistic and semiotic theories: (1) The theory of the linguistic sign by Ferdinand de Saussure; (2) Roman Jakobson's communicative model of six functions; (3) Jacques Derrida's deconstruction theory; (4) J. L. Austin's Speech Acts Theory (*How to Do Things with Words*, Illocution and Perlocution); (5) J. Searle and J. Derrida's controversy over J. L. Austin's theory; (6) Postmodernist text encoding theory (The difference between real life and Literature); (7) Possible World ontology in philosophy / Possible Worlds in Literary texts. The last in the list turns to be an implemented theory: Laurent Binet shows how his fictional personage Simon Herzog (inspector Bayard's assistant) eventually acquires a strong feeling that he is in the novel. Thus, the category of the reader turns the detective story into the academic novel, with the textual parameters characteristic of its development, such as travesty [15], evident at every level, especially in the episode of the conference in American Ithaca, entitled "*Shift into overdrive in the linguistic turn*"³ [7, p. 333]. If travesty academic activity goes back to Shakespeare, Swift, Rabelais, Moliere and of course, to a greater extent, to David Lodge, simultaneous

¹ J. Derrida died in 2004, and John Searle is still alive

² M. Foucault died in 1984

³ The titles of the papers include: "Degenerative Grammar" (N. Chomsky's talk), "Stayin' Alive, structurally speaking" (R. Jakobson's talk), « Le langage, cette inconnue » (Julia Kristeva's talk), "Fake or feint: performing the F words in fictional works" (John Searle's talk), "Fishing for supplement in a deconstructive world" (Morris Zapp's talk).

action is a device borrowed from James Joyce's "Ulysses" (see the Wandering Rocks episode). For instance, TV news on 26/03/1980 on the death of Roland Barthes coincides with the following actions of characters: (1) Bayard and Deleuze wait for the football match; (2) Kristeva cooks dinner; (3) Valéry Giscard d'Estaing sorts out documents etc [15, p. 428].

Another parameter, the shift into the modality of the visible and back into the narrative owes a lot to the profession of the Laurent Binet (television). The novel is a visible story where categories of space and action are dominant, marked by concrete real-life locatives and interdependence of verbal and physical actions. Yet, the necessity to achieve perfection in the verbal action makes the core of the story. The seventh function of the language rests upon the magic power of impact based upon preliminary semiotic analyses of the interlocutor but not upon the usage of rhetorical figures.

Considering how far Laurent Binet has managed to go with the novelty in the "Seventh function of the language", a kind of paradox becomes evident. Though the novel is remarkable for the "resurrection" of the category of the author (highly intrusive in the narrative moves), all the techniques that seem inventions of Laurent Binet, are far from being new. (1) To start with the phenomenon of syncretic truth, as the fusion of fact and fiction, it should be noted that this phenomenon, as M. I. Steblin-Kamensky stated, is a general feature of the transition from myth to literature [19] in every culture; (2) Then regarding the tendency of making fictional characters of real-life persons, politicians or scholars, we should consider it as a well developed trend in European literature; Alexander Dumas' "The Three Musketeers" and its sequel can serve as a good example. What turns this technique into a novelty is the fact that all these real-life persons are practically contemporaries or authors of the theories under scholarly scrutiny to most readers who enjoy this blend of a detective story and an academic novel.

Yet, the most vivid revelation of the "intrusive author" could be found in Laurent Binet's "Civilization" [6], that is remarkable for probable reverse vectors of history's turns: a Viking Queen becomes a spouse of the Inca chief, Columbus does not discover the Americas (1492), The Incas invade Europe (1531) and erect their Temples of the Sun in Wittenberg and Bordeaux. The Europe of the 16th century seems to be familiar to the reader with its inquisition, religious reforms and massacres, the flourishing of printing and the black plague. The favorite device of Laurent Binet — to take a fact from the life of the famous person and twist it is most vividly observed at the end of the novel where one could read how Miguel de Cervantes was saved by El Greco, they both escaped the ritual death of being thrown from the top of a Mexican temple in the center of Bordeaux, then survived the Black Plague, then found themselves practically betrayed by Michel de Montaigne who turned out to be in the service of Mexican rulers, and eventually they fled happily to Cuba, leaving ruined Europe. Being a typical product of postmodern literature, the novel presents a blend of genre forms, including a saga, a captain's journal, and first and third person narratives. That is the novel of the probable vector of development that Europeans escaped.

In this novel Swiftian irony reveals itself with its function to intimidate the reader [18]. If the academic reader of the "Seventh Function" was somehow perplexed

by the narrative moves through which familiar politicians and scholars were made involved by the intrusive author, the reader of the “Civilization”, a rather bloody story, remains shocked by a “would-have-been” perspective of history’s turns.

Conclusion

In search for an answer to the question “How far can a dead author go?”, three novels by two contemporary French novelists were chosen and all conclusions concern predominantly these two Men of Letters. To generalize it will be necessary to consider other works by different authors. Nevertheless, the narrative properties discovered in the « *ouvrés* » under scrutiny conform to the insights of Henri van Lier [21], the Belgian philosopher, who in his theory of the Three Worlds wrote of the vectoral dominance of plot development in the era of high technology. As we have observed in the analysis of the chosen novels, a vectoral outline of probable regressive or progressive development shapes the narrative chain. Another property is to be found in the fusion of genre forms, each evolving according to its rules. Communication practices in these novels obtain greater importance than physical events. Any discursive failure in these novels causes a loss, either in the detection, or of a body part, or in the move of history. This property reflects contemporary media tendency: discursive redundancy, which means that discourse overshadows action, that words (true or false) uttered by different Very Important Persons and not so important ones are tackled as sheer facts. That tendency in its turn has caused the revival of the syncretic truth, a feature typical of early epic forms of literature. Fusing facts with fiction seems to be also a general recent media tendency so when the author carefully creates a suitable reader, this reader seems to be accustomed to this sort of syncretism. Thus the question seems to be aporic — the author may be multi-faced in the Bakhtinian sense or highly intrusive, amusing and intimidating curious and perplexed readers, and yet most techniques used in the texts are far from being novelties.

Acknowledgements

I express my gratitude to Dr. David Cocksey for proofreading this article.

REFERENCES

1. Bakhtin M. M. 1977. “The problem of text in linguistics, philology and other humanities: an experience of philosophical analysis”. *Russian Literature. From the Theory of Literature to the Structure of the Text: Anthology*. Moscow. Pp. 227-244. [In Russian]
2. Bakhtin M. M. 1977. “The problem of the author”. *Questions of Philosophy*, no. 7, pp. 148-160. [In Russian]
3. Barthes R. 1977. *The Death of the Author*. Translated by S. Heath. New York: Hill and Wang. Pp. 142-148.
<https://sites.tufts.edu/english292b/files/2012/01/Barthes-The-Death-of-the-Author.pdf>
4. Belozerova N. N. 2001. “Semiolinguistic aspects of intergrative poetics (on the material of Russian, English and Irish artistic texts)”. *Dr. Sci. (Philol.) diss.* Yekaterinburg: Ural State Pedagogical University. 352 p. [In Russian]

5. Binet L. 2015. « Qui a tué Roland Barthes ? ». La septième fonction du langage. Roman. Paris : Grasset. 495 p.
6. Binet L. 2019. Civilizations. Roman. Paris : Grasset. 320 p.
7. Chamberlain L. 2017. The Seventh Function of Language. <https://lesleychamberlain.wordpress.com/2017/08/21/the-seventh-function-of-language>
8. Derrida J. 1978. Writing and Difference. Translated by A. Bass. The University of Chicago Press. 362 p.
https://monoskop.org/images/8/84/Derrida_Jacques_Writing_and_Difference_1978.pdf
9. Derrida J. 1998. Of Grammatology. Translated by G. Ch. Spivak. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press. 444 p.
https://monoskop.org/images/8/8e/Derrida_Jacques_Of_Grammatology_1998.pdf
10. Eco U. 1979. The Role of the Reader: Exploration in the Semiotics of the Text. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 192 p.
11. Ginzburg L. 1979. "The structure of a literary hero". About a Literary Hero. Leningrad: Soviet writer. Pp. 89-149. [In Russian]
12. Jakobson R. 1975. "Linguistics and poetics". Structuralism: "For" and "Against". Moscow: Progress. 468 p. [In Russian]
13. Lodge D. 1992. The Art of Fiction. London: Penguin Books Ltd. 325 p.
14. Lodge D. 2011. How Far Can You Go? Vintage Books. 256 p.
15. Mulvey M. 2021. A Buddy-Detective Romp through Semiology: The Seventh Function of Language. Vol. 11, iss. 3. <https://h-france.net/ffh/the-buzz/a-buddy-detective-romp-through-semiology-the-seventh-function-of-language>
16. Propp V. Ya. 1928. Morphology of a Fairy Tale. L. Academia. 624 p. [In Russian]
17. Puertolas R. 2019. La Police des Fleurs, des Arbres et des Forêts. Edition Albin Michel. 347 p.
18. Scott A. F., M. A. 1965. Current Literary Terms: A Concise Dictionary of Their Origin and Use. Revised edition. Palgrave Macmillan. 331 p.
19. Steblin-Kamensky M. I. 1984. The World of the Saga. The Formation of Literature. Leningrad: Nauka. 246 p. [In Russian]
20. Van Dijk T. 2009. Teun Society and Discourse. How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 298 p.
21. Van Lier H. 2010. Anthropogenie. Paris-Bruxelles: Les impressions nouvelles. Pp. 703-716.

Наталья Николаевна БЕЛОЗЁРОВА¹

УДК 81:004.9(079.8)

КАК ДАЛЕКО МОЖЕТ ЗАЙТИ УМЕРШИЙ АВТОР?

¹ доктор филологических наук, профессор,
кафедра английского языка,
Тюменский государственный университет
natnicbel@gmail.com

Аннотация

Эта статья посвящена проблеме «смерти автора», предложенной французским семиологом Роланом Бартом в одном из его эссе. Три романа двух современных французских романистов, в значительной степени «вероятностные», выбраны для проверки возможности «воскрешения» автора в смешанных нарративах, перегруженных интертекстуальными единицами как структурными, так и семантическими. Этими романами являются: детектив «La Police des Fleurs, des Arbres et des Forêts» Ромона Пуэртоласа, «семиотический» детектив Лорана Бине «Qui a tué Roland Barthes? La septième fonction du langage» Лорана Бине и его «вероятностная» «Цивилизация».

Методология основывается на дерридовской деконструкции, включая принцип «различия», основанный на двух идеях: все вещи относятся к одному и тому же полю и различаются в одно и то же время. Привлечены также несколько других подходов, касающихся взаимосвязи категорий автора, текста и читателя. К таким подходам относятся теории М. Бахтина, Р. Якобсона, Д. Лоджа и др.

Анализ показал, что векторный контур вероятного регрессивного или прогрессивного развития формирует нарративную цепочку. Другое свойство заключается в слиянии жанровых форм, каждая из которых развивается по своим правилам. Коммуникативные практики в этих романах приобретают большее значение, чем физические события. Эта тенденция, в свою очередь, вызвала возрождение синкретической правды.

Цитирование: Белозёрова Н. Н. Как далеко может зайти умерший автор? / Н. Н. Белозёрова // Вестник Тюменского государственного университета. Гуманитарные исследования. Humanitates. 2022. Том 8. № 1 (29). С. 62-75.

DOI: 10.21684/2411-197X-2022-8-1-62-75

Ключевые слова

Смешение, регресс, возрождение, синкретическая истина, коммуникация.

DOI: 10.21684/2411-197X-2022-8-1-62-75

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

1. Бахтин М. М. Проблема текста в лингвистике, филологии и других гуманитарных науках: Опыт философского анализа / М. М. Бахтин // Русская словесность. От теории словесности к структуре текста: Антология. Москва, 1977. С. 227-244.
2. Бахтин М. М. Проблема автора / М. М. Бахтин // Вопросы философии. 1977. № 7. С. 148-160.
3. Barthes R. The Death of the Author / R. Barthes. Translated by S. Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977. Pp. 142-148. URL : <https://sites.tufts.edu/english292b/files/2012/01/Barthes-The-Death-of-the-Author.pdf>
4. Белозерова Н. Н. Семиолингвистические аспекты интегративной поэтики (на материале русских, английских и ирландских художественных текстов): дисс. ... доктор филол. наук / Н. Н. Белозерова. Уральский государственный педагогический университет. Екатеринбург, 2001
5. Binet L. Qui a tué Roland Barthes ? / L. Binet // La septième fonction du langage. Roman. Paris : Grasset, 2015. 495 p.
6. Binet L. Civilizations. Roman / L. Binet. Paris : Grasset, 2019. 320 p.
7. Chamberlain L. The Seventh Function of Language / L. Chamberlain. 2017. URL: <https://lesleychamberlain.wordpress.com/2017/08/21/the-seventh-function-of-language>
8. Derrida J. Writing and Difference / J. Derrida. Translated by A. Bass. The University of Chicago Press, 1978. 362 p. URL: https://monoskop.org/images/8/84/Derrida_Jacques_Writing_and_Difference_1978.pdf
9. Derrida J. Of Grammatology / J. Derrida. Translated by G. Ch. Spivak. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998. 444 p. URL: https://monoskop.org/images/8/8e/Derrida_Jacques_Of_Grammatology_1998.pdf
10. Eco U. The Role of the Reader: Exploration in the Semiotics of the Text / U. Eco. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979. 192 p.
11. Гинзбург Л. Структура литературного героя / Л. Гинзбург // О литературном герое. Ленинград: Советский писатель, 1979. С. 89-149.
12. Якобсон Р. Лингвистика и поэтика / Р. Якобсон // Структурализм: «за» и «против». Москва: Прогресс, 1975. 468 с.
13. Lodge D. The Art of Fiction / D. Lodge. London: Penguin Books Ltd, 1992. 325 p.
14. Lodge D. How Far Can You Go? / D. Lodge. Vintage Books, 2011. 256 p.
15. Mulvey M. A Buddy-Detective Romp through Semiology: The Seventh Function of Language / M. Mulvey. 2021. Vol. 11, iss. 3. URL: <https://h-france.net/fffh/the-buzz/a-buddy-detective-romp-through-semiology-the-seventh-function-of-language>
16. Пропп В. Я. Морфология сказки / В. Я. Пропп. Л. Academia, 1928. 624 с.
17. Puertolas R. La Police des Fleurs, des Arbres et des Forêts / R. Puertolas. Edition Albin Michel. 2019. 347 p.

18. Scott A. F., M. A. Current Literary Terms: A Concise Dictionary of Their Origin and Use / A. F. Scott, M. A. Revised edition. Palgrave Macmillan, 1965. 331 p.
19. Стеблин-Каменский М. И. Мир саги. Становление литературы / М. И. Стеблин-Каменский. Ленинград: Наука, 1984. 246 с.
20. Van Dejk T. Teun Society and Discourse. How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk / T. Van Dejk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 298 p.
21. Van Lier H. Anthropogenie / H. Van Lier. Paris-Bruxelles: Les impressions nouvelles, 2010. Pp. 703-716.