



**HWA CHONG INSTITUTION (HIGH SCHOOL SECTION)**

**HUMANITIES RESEARCH PAPER 2020**

---

Topic: Novel Ways To Die: “The Death of The Author” and Anthony Horowitz’s “Detective Hawthorne Series”

Slant: Literature

Total Word Count (excluding appendixes, footnotes & references): 5382

Student’s (official) Name: Li Zhuoning

Class: 3i4

Name of Teacher-Mentor: Ms. Phay Choong Siew Josephine

**Declaration**

I declare that this assignment is my own work and does not involve plagiarism or collusion. The sources of other people’s work have been appropriately referenced, failing which I am willing to accept the necessary disciplinary action(s) to be taken against me.

Student’s Signature :

Date of Submission: 20/8/2020

## **Introduction**

### **1.1. General Background**

“The Death of the Author” was an essay written in 1967 by Roland Barthes proposing for literary analysis away from the character of the author. Despite the publication and influence on literary and academic circles, the proposed method of literary analysis is hardly present in mainstream fiction(especially in literary criticism), from examples such as the presence of the Bestsellers’ Theory and J. (K.) Rowling’s Twitter account. Whereas the emergence of the New Criticism in the 60s has limited the power of the author’s empire, it is revived in the 90s from the media coverage of the authors’ life, and the literary criticism centered upon it.

Anthony Horowitz wrote *The Word is Murder* and *The Sentence is Death* in 2017 and 2019 respectively. Not only does he insert his name into the story, it is also written from the first-person perspective of the author, and there are also sections that can be considered as “biographies” of an author’s life. Not to mention, the inclusion of himself in the story means that his character has huge influences over the plot.

## **1.2. Rationale**

The discrepancy in the adoption of the ideas in “The Death of the Author” in academic circles and literary criticism in mainstream fiction sparks curiosity. Given the prospects of the amount of influence mainstream fiction is likely to have, or perhaps that of which it already had, these ideas are likely in the circumstances to be neglected. This research wishes to evaluate the extent to which Barthes’ proposals are relevant in the literary world, and whether or not they should be adopted, through a dialectical process, with Horowitz’s novels representing the antithesis for the ideas to be tested upon.

## **1.3. Research Questions**

1. What is the validity of claims that Barthes used to support “The Death of the Author?”
2. In what ways does Horowitz's inclusion of himself in the novels complicate the matter of the proposed way of literary analysis in “The Death of the Author”(to alienate the traditional author from the text)?
3. What does Horowitz’s inclusion of himself in the novels make us realise about the ideas in “The Death of the Author”?

## **1.4. Thesis Statement**

The thesis statement of this research is that regardless of the author’s conscience, the two novels are the antithesis of the means by which Barthes

elaborates to the author's death. In other words, *The Word is Murder* and *The Sentence is Death* complicate the matter concerning the application of ideas in the essay, therefore challenging the practicality of their application. It also contradicts the various reasons proposed to remove the author.

### **1.5. Delimitation**

All of Barthes' findings, evaluations and conclusions in the article will be put to test. For Horowitz's two novels, this research focuses on the perception of authorship from his inclusion of himself in the works, the interaction "Horowitz"(the character) with the plot in search of metaphors concerning "The Death of the Author"(or perhaps the disposal of it), and various statements about mainstream fiction as found in the works.

### **1.6. Significance of Research**

This research broadens the perspectives on authorship, enabling readers to better evaluate the necessity of "The Death of the Author" in the particular context of reading fiction. If the ideas found within contain valuable perspectives concerning literature or the means by which it is produced, then readers can wish to grow out of the influence of literary criticism in mainstream fiction.

### **1.7. Limitations**

Limitations include the sample size of the antithesis, which "The Death of the Author," is tested upon. The two novels are too narrow in terms of its

representation of the challenge to (the antithesis of) the essay, representing the limitations within, if one wishes to access all ideas in "The Death of the Author." A certain amount of generalisation is therefore present in this research.

Barthes (1967) states that an author "can only write upon influences from sources forever anterior." Being the author of "The Death of the Author," there are therefore sources of influence he has collected in order to write the essay, and being not strictly original (that ideas and thoughts are somehow echoed), there is a prospect that important truths concerning the reasons for "The Death of the Author" are neglected (lost as the messages are passed on indirectly). This is, as Barthes (1967) has stated, one cannot fully understand the intentions of the author. Some aspects of the intrinsic value in the entity of the ideas are therefore likely lost as they are being passed on, therefore leading to the loss of some points and elaboration in the presentation of the latter who adopts them. This therefore annihilates the possibility of bringing all reasons to alienate the author to test.

## **2.Literature Review**

Arthur Schopenhauer's essay "On Authorship and Style", Paul-Michel Foucault's essay "What is an Author?" and a New York Times article, written by Thomas Mallon and Adam Kirsch, "When We Read Fiction, How Relevant Is the

Author's Biography?" will be put into conversation with Barthes' "The Death of the Author."

Schopenhauer(1851) defines the boundaries of what is expected of a traditional author, while Foucault(1969) believes that the author is merely a perception(however subjective) of the reader, and thus, is more of a function than an individual. If Schopenhauer(1851) represents the beginning of Structuralism concerning the expectations of the author, then Foucault(1969) represents the end of it, since the subjectivity of the individuality of the author means that the traditional author( as defined by the real individual behind the text) is dead.

### **2.1.The author-function**

For Foucault(1969), the author refers to a function rather than the true individual behind the work.

Foucault(1969) states that the author-funcion "is not defined by the spontaneous attribution of a text to the author." Instead, it is subject to individual perception much determined by the diverse experience of cognition which consists of both factors *a priori* and *a posteriori*, the author-function therefore varies, by both definition and application. This supports Barthes(1967)'s claim on the accuracy of evaluation of the author, since the argument proves that the evaluation traditional author is subjective and lacks certainty, and that thus, the author-function, even when concerning the same individual, differs.

Foucault(1969) states that the author “does not refer, purely and simply, to an actual individual insofar as it simultaneously gives rise to a variety of egos and to a series of subjective positions.” In this case, the author does not only refer to the author himself, but also sources of influences of his empirical knowledge. This supports Barthes(1967)’s claim about the impossibility of originality strictly from the author, since “he can only write upon influences from sources forever anterior.” Foucault’s statement means that all the anterior influences are part of the author’s possession, accounting for the diverse and distinctive styles and merits, thus requiring some form of commendation.

## **2.2. Reasons to inspect the author**

Foucault(1969) states that the author is “in the legal system.” Since “the law insists on holding individuals accountable for transgressive properties.”

Evaluation of an author(the author-function in this circumstance) serves as a justice system and simultaneously as the metaphor of a Panopticon against the “transgressive” claims.

Schopenhauer(1851) classifies authors into two categories; those who are “writing for subject” and those writing for “writing’s sake”. Writers of the first category see readers as ends at which they wish to communicate with and influence, the writing is therefore sincere, and often present the author’s “true” intentions. The latter sees readers as means to achieve his own end in the form

of wealth and fame, thus having little respect for readers, disregarding the reader's development. Such acts fall under "pandering." Schopenhauer(1851) evaluates that "as long as this is perceived, the book should be thrown away, for time is precious," and they are the "ruin of literature." However, according to Barthes(1967), it is the language, not the author, who is speaking, therefore important ideas can come from works of all range of integrity of the will behind the true intentions. The true will and sincerity behind the writing, contrary to Schopenhauer's claim, does not therefore matter. Yet for those in the second category, it is by the definition "immoral", and the law insists on reparations upon clear evidence of that will. The author's intention has to be evaluated to some extent. As a matter of derived influence concerning the reader however, one does not need to take into account the sincerity for the enjoyment of the text.

Authors can also be classified as Schopenhauer(1851) states, into two categories: those who write "without thinking", "whilst they are thinking" and "solely write because they have thoughts." The first refers to those who write solely based on memory, such as memoirs. The second refers to authors who develop with the course of the content. The third refers to those who echoes the anterior thoughts of others. Schopenhauer(1851) states, "It is only the writer who takes the materials on which he writes directly out of his own head that is worth reading." Though he was particularly warning on regurgitation as he had further

elaborated, this claim is both misleading and troubling, for the sheer amount of empirical knowledge present that influence the writings, and Barthe's(1967) claim that that an author "can only write upon influences from sources forever anterior." All ideas are therefore somehow repeated, but not necessarily in the same "form," due to the subjective cognition concerning readers. The warning on regurgitation means that inspection of the author has to occur to detect plagiarism.

Mallon(2014) states that "writers' drafts, those manuscripts that show, line by line(also considered biography), how writers came to do what they did." This kind of analysis sheds light on the process of writing, crucial as a learning process for inspired writers. Barthes(1967) states that the reader cannot determine the intentions and means of the author, therefore, there is a possibility that the wrong message is sent in this circumstance. An individual, despite the lack of absolute certainty, can find or stumble upon truths, nevertheless, in the means and intentions of the author, and despite the possible discrepancies between the text and historical sources, some aspiring authors love the prospect of success more than that of failure.

### **2.3. Individuality in the text**

Foucault(1969) states that “writing of our day has freed itself from the necessity of ‘expression.’” Yet one can find parts of the author which he subconsciously put in spite of the attempt to remove signs of individuality.

Schopenhauer(1851) states the following:

a book can never be anything

more than the impression of its author’s thoughts. The value of these thoughts lies either in the matter about which he has thought, or in the form in which he develops his matter.(p.28)

The “matter” here refers to the motifs the author wishes to present. The “form” refers to the means of representation that reflects the merits of an author.

Foucault(1969), unfortunately contradictory to his previous claims about expression about the presence of individuality, states that “we find the link between writing and death manifested in the total effacement of the individual characteristics of the writer.” This shows that in the author’s attempts to remove signs of individuality, a “form” by which he attempts to do so, an important factor contributing to the style and merits of the author, is left behind(the will of the author to kill himself paradoxically gives birth to him). Parts of the author are always present in one “form” or another, therefore one cannot wish to remove all individuality.

#### **2.4. Merits in the text**

Kirsch(2014) states that in the case of Shakespeare, “the unknowability of Shakespeare is a key ingredient in his greatness,” an example of how tracing the biography can bring success to the individual. The “unknowability” enforces the argument of the author function subjective to the interpretation of readers, rather than the true individual behind the work. This unfortunately shows that the “ingredient” to success in the case, is not merits inside the work, but the mystery of the author, therefore fame and popularity of the author may not be due to his works, but individualistic characteristics. The will to understand the author’s personal life(the author-function as subjectively perceived) risks creating more inequality in reward in terms of merits.

### **3. Methodology**

The general form of methodology, the research method which brings the objective of this research paper, is the Hegelian Dialectic. To bring in Horowitz’s novels not only puts Barthes’ ideas and claims (in their abstract form as in the essay) to test by introducing a negative which challenges and negates their entity, but also by testing their application in a concrete form— by attempting to apply them in two novels. If Barthes’ essay represents the thesis of which the idea of the removal of the author from his text is first introduced, then Horowitz’s novels *The Word is Murder* and *The Sentence is Death* represent the antithesis since they complicate the matter concerning the application of Barthes’ ideas in

the essay, a reaction that contradicts or negates the thesis. Finally, the research will arrive at the synthesis, a statement through which the differences between the two points are resolved. This refers to the extent to which the ideas in “The Death of The Author” should be adopted in literature. In the synthesis, the research would also present a better view of various benefits and limitations of Barthes’ ideas.

Concerning points or ideas possibly found in *The Word is Murder* and *The Sentence is Death*, the lens of research will focus less on the plot, and instead the interactions of the “author”(“Horowitz” in the story) and the characters and plot, and from these points, discover new perspectives on authorship, then comparing them to(or perhaps putting them into discussion/argument with) the statements and ideas in “The Death of The Author.” Moreover, this research also aims to compare the circumstances when the author’s biography is known to the reader, and that when it is not.

#### **4. Discussion, interpretation and analysis**

##### **4.1. On Identity and Originality**

Barthes(1967) and Foucault(1969) have both argued linear to the fact that “writing of today has freed itself from the necessity of ‘expression.’” *The Word is Murder* and *The Sentence is Death* both, figuratively and literally, constantly reminds us that inspite of the discrepancies between narrator and the true

character of the author, the reader is always, and can only be, reading an interpretation of which is always written by the author. This is due to the fact that even by the means of attempting to alienate oneself from the fiction, the source of knowledge of which is the cognition of the author (an important aspect of his character), and his interpretation of the materials he wishes to present or hide.

Similar to Schopenhauer (1851) who states that:

A book can never be anything more than the impression of its author's thoughts. The value of these thoughts lies either in the matter about which he has thought, or in the form in which he develops his matter. (p.28)

The "form" in this circumstance, is the true voice behind all narrators-- from which the source of interpretation of various matters of influence by the author.

Barthes (1967) states that "the writer can only imitate a gesture forever anterior, never original; his only power is to combine the different kinds of writing, to oppose some by others, so as never to sustain himself by just one of them."

Barthes (1967) has, in this circumstance, referred to knowledge, and all means of acquiring which, by anterior sources of direct influences only. In other words, he commented on the sheer amount of *a posteriori* influence, but missed out on the *a priori*. Whereas it is often argued that we cannot create something out of

nothing, we can, through the virtue of faculty, interpret various anterior sources, and therefore, making inter-connections never done before. This, by part, is of the definition of originality. Whereas Horowitz(2017) has his clear sources of influence(as stated in the text)-- Argatha Christie, and possibly others(by some luck, it is possible that he wrote the two novels after reading “The Death of the Author”), his faculty of connecting these sources of influence led to the materialistic and literal originality-- literally inserting his name into the texts.

In order to evaluate the validity of the claims concerning the lack of originality, and the unnecessary to commend an author on that therefore, we have to follow the never ending debate concerning epistemology, specifically between the Rationalists and the Empiricists.

Locke(1690)’s concept of the *tabula rasa* supports “The Death of the Author,” in the instance with the fact that an author could only “imitate a gesture forever anterior, never original,” that all ideas previously associated with an author is now invalid, as they are merely being repeated in one form or another. Similarly, Locke(1690)’s idea contradicts previous notions that knowledge and behaviours come straight at birth. As Locke(1690) writes:

Let us then suppose the mind to be, as we say, white paper, void of all characters, without any ideas:—How comes it to be furnished? Whence comes it

by that vast store which the busy and boundless fancy of man has painted on it with an almost endless variety? Whence has it all the materials of reason and knowledge? To this I answer, in one word, from experience.

“The Death of The Author,” therefore, can be seen as the representation of the prominence of experience as the only possible means of the acquisition of knowledge. If all sources of knowledge could be deconstructed to the virtue of experience, then of course, the idea of originality is merely an illusion derived from the failure to see past the various states of being and the trajectory concerning which it was achieved.

The negation to the *tabula rasa* is not necessarily found in the extreme end of the opposite spectrum of the debate. Kant(1781) states that there are two forms of knowledge: beside the source of the *a posteriori*, there is the *a priori*. For Kant(1781), all pure mathematics, for instance, is synthetic through *a priori*, as one need not go through the exact same experience concerning various problems to solve it; one simply needs to grasp the concept. The synthetic nature means that whereas experience has a role in one’s reasoning, the virtue of faculty both intrinsic and extrinsic ultimately determines the interpretation of various sources concerning which. The huge range of faculty concerning perception means that it is possible to distinguish between the varying

interpretation or degrees of acceptance of various anterior sources. By practical means, such as the circumstances of literary criticism, this possibility to distinguish would transcend itself into notes of commendation or criticism.

Furthermore, if we were to apply Kant(1781)'s *transcendental idealism* into the various sources of anterior influences, it would mean that the ideas concerning which would not be fully grasped in terms of extent of which, or the meaning. Kant(1781) argues that "Space and time are merely the forms of our sensible intuition of objects. They are not beings that exist independently of our intuition, nor are they properties of, nor relations among, such beings," and that there are discrepancies between the objects in space and time and that concerning the "thing in itself." Suppose an individual were to get influences from a source, then by the mere appearance of itself, the "true" message intended by the author of which would not be transmitted, given the subjective nature of language by its connotation or/and extent.

This is supported by Schopenhauer(1851), who states that "no greater mistake can be made than to imagine that what has been written latest is always the more correct; that what is written later on is an improvement on what was written previously; and that every change means progress." One has to understand that "progress" in this circumstance does not merely refer to the improvements(the adding of material by the knowledge of the interpreter). It also refers to the failure

to completely understand the creator of the source due to the varying experiences concerning the meaning of text to each person. In instances such as the seeming restatement of the ideas, Schopenhauer(1851) states that “the writer often does not thoroughly understand the old books; he will, at the same time, not use their exact words, so that the result is he spoils and bungles what has been said in a much better and clearer way by the old writers; since they wrote from their own lively knowledge of the subject.” Perhaps this cavity in the faculty(in all beings, one could argue) in one’s complete understanding of a text is part of what gives birth to one’s identity or materialistic originality as an author figure.

Therefore, whereas one can never be truly original by the means of acquiring knowledge, we can commend authors by their interpretations that led to original ways of thinking and reasoning which produces innovation.

#### **4.2. On Intentions of Literature Analysis**

Barthes(1967) states that “the space of the writing is to be traversed, not penetrated: writing ceaselessly posits meaning but always in order to evaporate it: it proceeds to a systematic exemption of meaning.” If one were to treat the interpretation of the character of the author itself as an end in itself, then in this case, one cannot traverse and transcend the author-function into something of greater value or utility. The stated greater value or utility as an end, of which

reading the text is its primary means, refers to the reflection of the character of oneself with the subjective derived message from the text itself (independent of the worries between its discrepancies with the author's true aims).

Barthes (1967) deduced that the reader's interpretation (however subjective) of which he has complete control over, is more meaningful than to analyse the text for the sake of knowing its author. Therefore, "The Death of the Author" is an attack on traditional literary criticism that focused too much on trying to retrace the author's intentions and original meaning in mind.

With this stated, Horowitz's inclusion of his "biographies" into the text seems inane if it were to exist as an ultimate end, and not a means to send a message. This is also due to the fact that it has little to do with the plot, of which is concerning a murder mystery.

Gass (1984) has stated that the means of traditional literary analysis means that "when the author detaches himself from the text, he detaches the reader at the same time." Shown in Wooder (2020) and Troyka (2019), the author's empire has seen a revival since the 90s (that it has grown stronger since), Horowitz's inclusion of himself is therefore seen as an attempt to engage the reader, despite its inane nature. Yet Kirsch (2014) states:

Knowledge of a writer's life is a mere distraction from what really matters, the work. This stern impersonality was one of the tenets of modernism: T. S. Eliot insisted on the total separation of "the man who suffers and the mind which creates.

With the discrepancy between the man and the creator, the traditional author figure, therefore, differs from the derived author-function of the reader, proving the dangers of literary analysis too centered around the author by its many possible inaccuracies that affects the fairness concerning appropriation, and commendation and criticism with respect to which.

#### **4.3. On Accuracy of Derived Interpretations**

In the first paragraph, Barthes(1967) has questioned whether it was possible to determine the narrator of a story. In stories such as *The Word is Murder* and *The Sentence is Death*, though the narrator is clearly Horowitz himself, one is inclined to question if this "Horowitz"(as in the story) is the real Horowitz. The source of information or interpretation, from which the narrator emerged, is the source of introspection of Horowitz himself, something that is not prone to inaccuracies. Moreover, besides being who the author thinks he is, the narrator "Horowitz" could also be who the author wants his audience to think he is, as a more pragmatic means for the sake of his reputation.

As Gass(1984) stated, “the writer will surely have imagined marriages more interesting than her own, deaths more dismaying than that of Uncle Charley, or invented characters with more quality than her children.” “Horowitz”(the character) in this circumstance, by the nature of the fictitious events, has proven himself to be a function with more qualities than the real Horowitz(or vice versa), and therefore, it is true that the derived intentions of the author is to some extent, inaccurate.

#### **4.4. The Text Without “Horowitz”**

If one were to alienate these “biographical” parts of the stories, and instead merely focus on the plot of the mystery itself, then one would find oneself reading a classic whodunnit. There would be definitely less commotion concerning these novels without “Horowitz”(the “originality” that brought praise in the first place). In an interview with Simon(2018), Horowitz’s claims have supported this. He was “looking for a way to sort of turn the whole (whodunnit) formula.”

Simon(2018), interviewing Horowitz, writes that “by putting myself into the book, I suddenly realized that everything I wrote would be different, that my view of the landscape would be different, that I would have no knowledge of what was happening, when, of course, normally, the author knows everything.” Yet the “landscape” concerning which is completely centered around the author himself, and even with the author once alienated from the text, the plot concerning the

function of the text could still have its own entity, unaffected by the biography and various perceptions of the author.

However, even in the plot itself, there are things which one would miss out should one completely disregard the biography of the author and his other works.

In *The Word is Murder*, there is this conversation between Horowitz and Hawthorne that says, “Do you support a football team?”

“Arsenal.”

Whereas this is seemingly a conversation without much significance upon the first glance, one who knows the author through various sources of biography or anterior works would likely know that Horowitz is most likely a Chelsea fan. This dialogue, concerning the metaphor of the rivalry between Arsenal and Chelsea, would in this circumstance in the reader’s understanding, be a foreshadowing of the future tensions between these two characters.

#### **4.5. The Author and His Text**

One could say that the two novels are challenging the sensitivity of the mainstream audience. Horowitz(2017) recalled a time when he urged us to “tolerate intolerance,” following the hate mail and death threats to a Christian couple thought to be homophobic; he argued that “we should try to understand their point of view, which was at least based on some sort of religious conviction(even if he didn’t share it).” Immediately, “a couple of teachers wrote to

(him) to say that (his) books would never appear in their school again. Someone else thought all (his) books should be burned.” This proves as an evidence to Weimann(1988)’s warnings concerning the prominence of appropriation, that “the changing context of appropriation can be seen to affect or help constitute changeful modes and functions of representation(of the text).”

One has to acknowledge that in this circumstance, the text, concerning those works, has never by mere appearance, changed. What changed, and led to the animosity against them, was that of the perception of the author. It is therefore in this circumstance that the meaning derived from the evaluation concerning the text has changed from the author function. Foucault(1969) stated that a text “is not defined by the spontaneous attribution of a text to the author.” In this circumstance, this example which Horowitz(2017) has stated both supports the concepts of the author-function and (in Barthes’ case,) the author-figure.

As Foucault(1969) has stated, “Since writing has ‘freed itself from the necessity of ‘expression,’” then claims by Horowitz’s subjects have thus, to some extent, wronged the texts, by the fact that the texts need not represent all aspects of the author’s character, that the text need not complement the certain aspect of the author that the reader loathes.

If a reader sees this as the message(that challenges the sensitivity of the mainstream audience) within the two novels, then they would no longer look like

the antithesis of “The Death of the Author.” Linear to Barthes’ claim concerning the ambiguity of certain texts, one could see Horowitz’s inclusion of himself into the novels as by the means of irony, and a mocking tone to criticise the sensitivity of his audience. The inclusion of “Horowitz” in this circumstance is to mock its required means to censor the works containing a homophobic detective as a main character; the need to constantly assure the audience that he was, in fact, not what he wrote, due to the overwhelming power of the author’s empire. The fact that Detective Hawthorne is still the hero of the story is due to his ultimate goal of finding the murderer and bringing him into justice, something that unites him and the audience, and something that by no means has a relationship with homophobia.

“The Death of the Author,” in this case enhanced, is therefore of paramount importance concerning the contemporary readings in literature by the utility of ideas proposed within. Instead of wishing to completely distance oneself from an author by the author function one could instead focus on the text and find similarities that bridges the gaps, or more importantly, hear important messages and ideas by the reader’s definition that by no means related to the tension in both parties.

Weimann(1988) states in a critique of appropriation that “as the writer’s and reader’s distance from the means and modes of production grows, there

develops new scope for a writer's own individual point of view." If the empire of the author-function centered around the demands of the audience is so powerful today, then the real and traditional author himself by this means, would become the author-function regardless of the truth in his generosity. This reminds the reader of the importance of "The Death of The Author" in contemporary times with the demands not necessarily complementing the freedom of speech.

## **5. Conclusion**

In conclusion, whereas Barthes' statements concerning the author's inquiry of knowledge is true to some extent, the failure to acknowledge the innate *a priori* means that the argument concerning credits and appropriation has to be reconsidered. It has been shown, in various views and examples (even in the antithesis), that the accuracy of which when one wishes to retrace the trajectory of writing in an attempt to understand the author is limited concerning the fact that the act of writing fiction itself has proven itself to be at least to some extent, the alienation of one's true identity and his creation. *The Word is Murder* and *The Sentence is Death's* first person narrative has only complicated the applications of Barthes' ideas on the surface and in theory. If one were to look at the plot itself, then alienation between the author-function and the text is still possible by showing that they are by no means directly related to the development of the plot. Furthermore, the deconstruction of "Horowitz" (by its failure in representation

of the true Horowitz) enhances the means of literary analysis proposed by Barthes. The prominence of the author-function in the reader's perception and reception of the text means that it has been so gratifying to the extent that authors are often willing to kill parts of their authenticity to compensate or to meet the various expectations. The negation of which with other prominents such as the freedom of expression and speech, as well as the expected generosity and truth in an author's expression makes us realise that "The Death of The Author" has to be revived, at least to some extent, given the contemporary circumstances.

### **References and acknowledgments**

Barthes, R. (1967). The Death of the Author. Aspen, no. 5–6

Chambers, R. (1997). Reading, Mourning, and the Death of the Author.

Narrative, 5(1), 67-76. Retrieved March 13, 2020, from

[www.jstor.org/stable/20107102](http://www.jstor.org/stable/20107102)

Cortázar, J. (1964). Continuity of Parks. Editorial Sudamericana

GASS, W. (1984). The Death of the Author. Salmagundi, (65), 3-26. Retrieved

August 9, 2020, from [www.jstor.org/stable/40547668](http://www.jstor.org/stable/40547668)

Horowitz, A. (2017). The Word is Murder. London: Arrow Books Ltd.

Horowitz, A. (2019). The Sentence is Death. London: Arrow Books Ltd.

Kant, I.(1781). The Critique of Pure Reason. Simon&Schuster.

Locke, J.(1690). An Essay Concerning Human Understanding. The University of Michigan Scholar Press, 1970.

Logie, J. (2013). 1967: The Birth of "The Death of the Author". College English, 75(5), 493-512. Retrieved August 10, 2020, from [www.jstor.org/stable/24238249](http://www.jstor.org/stable/24238249)

Mallon, T. & Kirsch, A.(2014) When We Read Fiction, How Relevant Is the Author's Biography? The New York Times.

Russell, B.(2007). A Priori Justification and Knowledge. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/apriori/>

Schopenhauer, A. (1851). On Authorship and Style. Walter Scott, London, 1890.

What is an Author? Summary Essay. (2016, Oct 04). Retrieved from <https://graduateway.com/what-is-an-author-summary>

Simon, S.(2018). Anthony Horowitz On 'The Word Is Murder'. Npr, Weekend Edition Saturday. Retrieved on 3 April from: <https://www.npr.org/2018/06/02/616392736/anthony-horowitz-on-the-word-is-murder>

Stang, N.F. (2016). Kant's Transcendental Idealism. Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy. Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-transcendental-idealism/>

Troyka, N. (2019). J.K. Rowling and the Assassination of the Author. Medium

Retrieved from

<https://medium.com/@natashatroyka/j-k-rowling-and-the-assassination-of-the-author-49a66a756983>

Weimann, R. (1988). Text, Author-Function, and Appropriation in Modern Narrative: Toward a Sociology of Representation. *Critical Inquiry*, 14(3), 431-447.

Retrieved September 19, 2020, from [www.jstor.org/stable/1343697](http://www.jstor.org/stable/1343697)

Willette, J.(2014). Michel Foucault: "What is an Author?" *Art History Unstuffed*.

Retrieved from <https://arthistoryunstuffed.com/michel-foucault-what-author/>

Wilson, A. (2004). Foucault on the "Question of the Author": A Critical Exegesis.

*The Modern Language Review*, 99(2), 339-363. doi:10.2307/3738750

Wooder, J.(2020). Death to Death of the Author. Medium Retrieved from

<https://medium.com/@jonwooder/death-to-death-of-the-author-47a3dc275c60>