

Dealing with Authorship

Dealing with Authorship:

*Authors between Texts, Editors
and Public Discourses*

Edited by

Sarah Burnautzki, Frederik Kiparski,
Raphaël Thierry and Maria Zannini

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Dealing with Authorship:
Authors between Texts, Editors and Public Discourses

Edited by Sarah Burnautzki, Frederik Kiparski, Raphaël Thierry
and Maria Zannini

This book first published 2018

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2018 by Sarah Burnautzki, Frederik Kiparski,
Raphaël Thierry, Maria Zannini and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without
the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-0560-X

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-0560-5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements viii

Introduction ix

Dealing With Authorship

Sarah Burnautzki, Frederik Kiparski, Raphaël Thierry and Maria Zannini

Part I: Theoretical Approaches to Authorship

Chapter One 2

Contemporary French-Language Theories of Literary Authorship

Frederik Kiparski

Chapter Two 21

“Stranger than Fiction”: Producing Postcolonial Inequalities

in the Literary Field

Sarah Burnautzki and Raphaël Thierry

Chapter Three 38

Self-Branding: A Necessary Skill for a Novelist’s Career?

Bertrand Legendre

Chapter Four 49

Authorised Adaptation: Authorial Fashioning as Mediatisation

of Literature

Fabian Zimmermann

Part II: Claiming Authorship

Chapter Five 74

“The Long Awaited Birdsong of one Born Black and Gifted

in Britain”: Andrea Levy’s Debut in the UK Literary Marketplace

Carola Briese

Chapter Six.....	88
Entangled Short Stories: Short Story Collections as a Space of Interaction between Francophone Sub-Saharan African Writers and the Book Market	
Alessandro Rossi	
Chapter Seven.....	106
The Construction of Authorship, Authority, and Authenticity in Testimonial Narration: Re-Reading <i>Me Llamo Rigoberta Menchú</i>	
Anna-Katharina Krüger	
Part III: Crossmedial Self-Fashioning	
Chapter Eight.....	124
Strategies of Authorial Self-Fashioning in Literary Discourse: Kebir Ammi, Yasmina Khadra, Assia Djebar	
Ines Bugert	
Chapter Nine.....	146
Posture of the Moral Witness: Authorship of Scholastique Mukasonga	
Julia Pfeiffer	
Chapter Ten.....	170
Between Author and Narrator: Fatou Diome's Self-Fashioning Strategies	
Diana Haussmann	
Chapter Eleven.....	187
Marcel Proust: Author, Journalist and Marketing Strategist on His Own	
Fabian Schmitz	
Part IV: Questioning Authorship in Cinema and Television	
Chapter Twelve.....	208
The Spectacle of Authorship: Roland Barthes on French Television	
Kathrin Yacavone	
Chapter Thirteen.....	223
The Work of Art: Maurice Pialat's <i>Van Gogh</i> (1991) and the Crisis of <i>Auteur-Cinema</i>	
Codruța Morari	

Chapter Fourteen	237
Remake and Authorship: How to Assume It in the French Public Sphere? Gaëlle Philippe	
Contributors.....	257

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This collection of articles has arisen from the interdisciplinary research project “Literary Authorship and the Public Sphere”, led at the University of Mannheim, Germany, and it especially results from the section “Authorship, the Public Sphere and Commercialization”, held at the *Romanistentag* 2015 in Mannheim. The volume would not have been possible without the support of a number of people.

First of all, we are indebted to all the contributors of this volume, whose engagement and steadiness were its fundamental prerequisite.

Especially we would like to thank Prof. Claudia Gronemann and Prof. Cornelia Ruhe for their continuous engagement and implication in the research project, as well as for their experienced intellectual advice in the preparation and editing of this book.

We also want to express our gratefulness to Dr. Viktoria Adam, Prof. Matthias Kohring and Prof. Stephanie Neu, who are equally driving forces of this research project and who contributed and still contribute largely to its progress.

Thanks also to Stephen Krug for his highly competent correction of the manuscript and to the anonymous reviewer for advice.

Last but not least, our gratitude goes to Cambridge Scholars Publishing, and especially to the editorial team, for their help in bringing this book up to light.

INTRODUCTION

DEALING WITH AUTHORSHIP

SARAH BURNAUTZKI, FREDERIK KIPARSKI,
RAPHAËL THIERRY AND MARIA ZANNINI

Authors between Texts, Editors and Public Discourses

Literature and film generate symbolic as well as economic capital. In other words, aesthetic productions exist in contexts that follow contrasting rules. This leads us to the question of authors' and filmmakers' involvement in this conflictive relation. In his considerations on the emergence of a relatively autonomous literary field during the 19th century in France, Pierre Bourdieu (1992) observed that the economic and symbolic logics virtually exclude each other within this new subfield of France's early modern society. Bourdieu established his observation as a "rule of art" which states that symbolic appreciation can be justified only by the denial of financial interests. However, while pursuing Bourdieu's initial concepts, contemporary researchers call this seemingly strict dichotomy into question¹. In times of a growing tendency towards commodification under the influence of late capitalism, the boundaries between restricted and large-scale production seem to blur more and more. And so, any cultural product (i.e. book, film, artwork) systematically becomes part of a wider market of goods. In that way, authorial autonomy—for any artist—is never an enduring acquisition but rather "a problem in search of a solution" (Brouillette 2014, 18).

Following Georg Franck's (1998, 2009) argumentation, artists' competition for public attention, ensured by (mass-) media coverage, can be seen as a promoter of these dynamics of the literary field. If, as Franck argues, public attention is a precondition for the achievement of both symbolic

¹ See Boschetti 2010, Brouillette 2007 and 2014, Ducas 2013, Joch et al. 2009, Lipovetsky and Serroy 2008, Ponzanesi 2014, Sapiro 2010 and 2016, Tommek and Bogdal 2012, Tommek 2015, Zahner 2006.

and economic capital, the public sphere can precisely be considered as the place where the boundaries between art and commerce become obscure. The growing significance of the public sphere comes along, as highlighted by Antoine Lilti (2014), with the emergence of celebrity, which began in the 18th century. In this aspect, Rebecca Braun and Emily Spiers (2016) propose analysing literary celebrity as a special domain of authorial agency, focused on publicity and based on collaborative networks. Obviously, the issues of celebrity highly influence authors' public practices, although, in our book, the focus on the aesthetic part of authorship has primacy over celebrity. On this point, it is significant that an increasing number of authors and filmmakers tend to stage their authorship not only in texts and films but also in the public sphere (e.g., in our volume, Yasmina Khadra, Andrea Levy, Fatou Diome and Scholastique Mukasonga as well as—earlier on—Marcel Proust). Writing (or filmmaking) is linked by its very nature to the (self-) construction of an author-figure, an invention that follows existing patterns but is foremost an imaginary and, consequently, aesthetic process, as José-Luis Diaz highlights in his study on author-models in French romanticism, *L'écrivain imaginaire* (2007) (e.g., in our volume, on the interference of racialized categories in the imaginary process of constructing the author). From a more sociological point of view, Jérôme Meizoz (2007, 2011 and 2016) analyses these created authorial *postures* as a position-taking inside the literary field, which concerns textual as well as non-textual author practices and which is influenced by the author but also by other agents, such as editors, journalists, scholars, etc. The internal and external dimensions of this textually staged self-fashioning form the centre of interest of this book.

In multiple and complex ways, the self-fashioning of authors and filmmakers interacts with the public sphere, which generates authorial images based on its own logic and primarily focuses on evoking attention. What is more, the production of references to biographical aspects such as “racial”/“ethnic” or social origin plays a decisive role. In this sense, Sarah Burnautzki (2017) shows that Bourdieu's solely class-based differentiation between *l'art pour l'art* and mass-market orientated arts produces blind spots, ignoring fundamental power relations that control access to literary recognition. Referring to Graham Huggan's considerations of exoticising practices in the literature business (2001), and also to Sarah Brouillette's (2007) continuation, scrutinisation and enlargement of Huggan's approach, this book also aims to point out the cultural and political implications of public authorship. The role of the public sphere in its interaction with the publishers, in turn, deserves a closer look, as publishing houses can be seen as privileged sites of transformation of

aesthetical into commercial value. How do journalists and publishers stage the authors' public appearance, and what contributions do they make to the creation of literary and cultural capital? How do authors face and interact with these powerful discourses? Are they subjects or objects to these *deals*? Will commercial success and economic interest end up becoming the sole interest of aesthetic productions?

There are many ways to *deal* with the notion of authorship regarding artistic production in the broadest sense: in the artistic work or on the textual level; surrounding the artistic work; on a paratextual scale; in the *mise en scène* or the "packaging" an editor provides for a particular public; and related to the market, as in media reception. In this book, we approach different, however always linked, *dealings* with authorship. Considering the commercial meaning of "dealing", we look at the market's and the media's influence on authors' (self-) positioning in the literary field, on the negotiations made with authorship. On the other side, we also question how authors *get a handle on* their authorship, how they deal with economic demands or cultural and political hierarchies. Finally, dealing with authorship also means, from a researcher's position, how to *approach*, how to describe authorship in its complex and conflictive relation between texts, markets and public discourses.

For this purpose, we elaborate and discuss the parallels and differences between the more or less clear-cut national contexts, and we aim to elucidate these questions from an interdisciplinary perspective, addressing contributors from literary and cultural studies as well as from film, media, and communication studies. In this volume, we aim for an inclusive theoretical approach in order to avoid the risk of obstructing access to a multifaceted topic by, for instance, selecting an exclusive aspect within the theory of the literary field. We consider authorship as a co-construction involving different actors. Our research on authorship takes place at the intersection of wider reflections, putting together and logically connecting different points of view stemming from a variety of scientific approaches. In this sense, approaching authorship and its diversity from a multitude of angles not only represents an exciting challenge, but also marks a decisive advantage regarding other existing works on the subject.

Theoretical Approaches to Authorship

Since the proclamation of his *return* at the end of the 20th century, the author reappears in a wide range of different scientific approaches: as a textual category, as a media phenomenon, as a civil person, as the subject of self-fashioning processes, and as an object of external determination.

Meanwhile, the growing need of public (self-) representation of authors as well as contemporary literary discourse models, such as autofiction, undermine the separation of these differentiations and increase the complexity of the question: “What is an author?”. Referring to Foucault’s famous text, and in order to enlarge the introduction to the subject of authorship, Frederik Kiparski’s opening article focuses on theoretical propositions to describe the complexity of literary authorship across its textual and non-textual appearances. Starting from the observation of an increased public role or function of the author in the past decades, Kiparski draws the line from Roland Barthes’s and Michel Foucault’s concepts of authorship to contemporary theoretical concepts by Dominique Maingueneau (2004), José-Luis Diaz (2007) and Jérôme Meizoz (2007, 2011, 2016), which take these changes into consideration. The article points out the advantages and limits of these approaches in order to allow a practicable use of the term “author”.

The growing public presence of author’s images not only calls into question new theoretical concepts for their description, but also demands reflection on the process of categorisation of authors as a matter of power relations in a diversified and globalised literary field. Sarah Burnautzki and Raphaël Thierry problematise classification as arbitrary and unequal in the French and Francophone literary field. It is for this purpose that they analyse Francophone African writers’ dominated position within a literary field determined by book markets mainly located in the global North, especially in France, and highlight symbolic as well as material production and naturalisation of hierarchies and cultural *otherness* by publishers’ policies since the postcolonial period.

While Burnautzki and Thierry highlight the power of a society’s and a literary market’s hegemony discourses and their impact on (African) author’s representation, Bertrand Legendre’s contribution allows us to take a look at the author’s complicity, his agency in these processes. From a socio-economic perspective exceeding the issue of supposed pure creation, Legendre proposes an overview of primo novelists’ trending strategies in order to reach a literary legitimacy in the French literary and editorial system. He argues that construction of literary identity depends on the editor’s and the author’s skills and responsibility in a shared process and that, nowadays, authors assume public-relation functions that editors traditionally ensure.

Fabian Zimmermann looks at authors’ agency in the construction of their *posture* from a media-theoretical perspective, based on Niklas Luhmann’s systems theory. In line with Georg Franck’s (1998, 2009) studies on the “economy of attention”, Zimmermann considers media-

related strategies employed by literary authors not primarily as a matter of commodification, but rather analyses them within the particular framework of *mediatisation*. Assuming that the pressure to accommodate journalistic rules and routines arises especially from the specific role the public plays for a certain author, different *mediatisation* mechanisms are discussed. This introductory part leads to different case studies of authorship expression.

Claiming Authorship

What are the conditions and strategies to succeed as a writer, that is to enter the literary field, and how are authorship and authority claimed? These are the questions focused on by the next three articles. Carola Briese's analysis retraces the significant modifications—over the years—of conditions and mechanisms in the marketing of Andrea Levy's debut *Every Light in the House Burnin'* (1994), involving in particular the category of “ethnicity”. This case study shows the changeable politics of representation pursued by trade publishers as well as by Black British first-time authors to gain the recognition of the literary establishment.

Alessandro Rossi's article also focuses on primo authors' strategies to enter the literary field. He analyses the visibility of Francophone African writers and their active interaction with the literary field by looking at their early career and, in relation to short story writing—a marginal genre—their attempts to access the global Francophone book market. With the example of Abdourahman Waberi, Jean-Luc Raharimanana, or also Kangni Alem, Rossi highlights the fact that the strategies employed by these authors obviously manifest regular recurrences and that, nonetheless, short story writing can be considered a key strategy for African authors to blaze the trail for a literary career.

In another context, Anna-Katharina Krüger focuses on the claiming and construction of authorship as an unbalanced and conflictual situation, using the *testimonio* as an example. She shows that testimonial writings like *Me llamo Rigoberta Menchú* mean loss of authority for the indigenous originator. The Western editor ambiguously becomes the official owner of copyright over text and meaning, and the building of authorship consequently rhymes with ‘the death of authority’.

Crossmedial Self-Fashioning

With the development of mass media, its enhancement in the early twentieth century, and its continuous substantiation to this day by the internet, the construction of authorship involves multiple platforms and

exceeds the actual literary text. In this chapter, four essays analyse authors' self-fashioning practices in divergent contexts and across different media, such as literary texts, the press, websites, or social media. As she regards the Francophone context, Ines Bugert's contribution deals with three authors labelled as "Maghrebians", who are actively engaged in constructing their *posture auctoriale*. By means of their literary works, Kebir Ammi, Yasmina Khadra and Assia Djebar react to and transform those conceptions of authorship that are created by the media, their editors, readers, the publishing industry, critics, literary studies, and other actors involved in the literary field.

Julia Pfeiffer, for her part, provides a case study on Rwandan author Scholastique Mukasonga, showing how the use of new social media channels can realise authorial self-authentication. Through her internet presence, Mukasonga legitimises her own writing, creating an author-image as a moral witness of the Rwandan genocide. Furthermore, by producing new texts on the web, she increases her power as an author, thus influencing the reception of her work.

Diana Hausmann's contribution focuses on Franco-Senegalese author Fatou Diome's appearance and statements in public media, enacted in order to ignite public awareness and debate around issues like racism, migration, and women's rights. Hausmann questions whether Diome is taking advantage of the same strategies used by publishers to "market the margins". In any case, the public *persona* generated by this practice makes the border between narrator and author-figure disappear.

Stepping back in time, Fabian Schmitz's paper considers Proust's textual and public *posture* as a historical reference to analyse contemporary practices and strategies of authorship-discourses. Acting as an author, publicist, and marketing strategist of his own work, Proust embodies the interweaving of symbolic and economic aspects of authorship, attesting an early mastering of the literary market place.

Questioning Authorship in Cinema and Television

In this last chapter, we widen our focus, questioning authorship not exclusively as a literary issue but linking it with the audiovisual context. How do television and film contribute to the construction of authorship? How is film-authorship built, on the screen and in the films' paratexts? In a first innovative approach, Kathrin Yacavone explores the important impact that TV has on the public (self-) construction of authorship. While Yacavone takes Roland Barthes's conjunction of authorship, photography, and—more broadly—visual representations of the writer as a starting

point, her contribution revisits Barthes's changing conceptions of the author in juxtaposition with an evolving visual projection of his own authorial *persona*.

Codruța Morari's contribution definitely leaves the literary context behind; it deals with the issue of authorship in the cinematic context. By addressing the socio-economic determinations and collective forces that weigh on individual filmmakers, her essay reconsiders conventional understandings of film authorship. She analyses Rivette's *La Belle Noiseuse* and Pialat's *Van Gogh* (Cannes Film Festival "Palme d'or", 1991), which depict artists in the act of creation, offering a case study to dismantle the long-standing discursive opposition between art and labour asserted by the *politique des auteurs*.

In her article, Gaëlle Philippe analyses the practice of Hollywoodian cinematographic remaking and thus relocates the question of authorship from aesthetical production to processes of reception. Her analysis shows that who is recognised as the author by the majority largely depends on the public sphere, and that there are marked differences between who claims to be the author, who is legally recognised as such, and who actually is the author. Examining the discourses surrounding *The Hills Have Eyes*, *King Kong* and *War of the Worlds*, Philippe highlights three different types of remake authorship.

Bibliography

- Boschetti, Anna. 2010. "L'explication du changement." In *Bourdieu et la littérature*, edited by Jean-Pierre Martin Nantes, 93–111. Nantes: Cécile Defaut.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1992. *Les Règles de l'art. Genèse et structure du champ littéraire*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Braun, Rebecca, and Emily Spiers. 2016. *Literary Celebrity: Special Issue of Celebrity Studies*, 7, 4.
- Brouillette, Sarah. 2007. *Postcolonial Writers in the Global Literary Marketplace*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . 2014. *Literature and the Creative Economy*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Burnautzki, Sarah. 2017. *Les Frontières racialisées de la littérature française. Contrôle au faciès et stratégies de passage*. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Díaz, José-Luis. 2007. *L'écrivain imaginaire*. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Ducas, Sylvie. 2013. *La littérature à quel(s) prix? Histoire des prix littéraires*. Paris: La Découverte.

- Franck, Georg. 1998. *Ökonomie der Aufmerksamkeit. Ein Entwurf*. München: Hanser.
- . 2009. "Autonomie, Markt und Aufmerksamkeit. Zu den aktuellen Medialisierungsstrategien im Literatur- und Kulturbetrieb." In *Mediale Erregungen? Autonomie und Aufmerksamkeit im Literatur- und Kulturbetrieb der Gegenwart*, edited by Markus Joch, York-Gothart Mix, Norbert Christian Wolf and Nina Birkner, 11–21. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Huggan, Graham. 2001. *The Postcolonial Exotic: Marketing the Margins*. London: Routledge.
- Joch, Markus, York-Gothart Mix, Norbert Christian Wolf, and Nina Birkner, eds. 2009. *Mediale Erregungen? Autonomie und Aufmerksamkeit im Literatur- und Kulturbetrieb der Gegenwart*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Lilti, Antoine. 2014. *Figures publiques. L'invention de la célébrité (1750-1850)*. Paris: Fayard.
- Lipovetsky, Gilles, and Jean Serroy. 2008. *La culture-monde: Réponse à une société désorientée*. Paris: Odile Jacob.
- Mangueneau, Dominique. 2004. *Le discours littéraire: Paratopie et scène d'énonciation*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Meizoz, Jérôme. 2007. *Postures littéraires. Mises en scène modernes de l'auteur. Essai*. Geneva: Slatkine.
- . 2011. *La Fabrique des singularités. Postures littéraires II*. Geneva: Slatkine.
- . 2016. *La littérature 'en personne'. Scène médiatique et formes d'incarnation*. Geneva: Slatkine.
- Ponzanesi, Sandra. 2014. *The Postcolonial Cultural Industry. Icons, Markets, Mythologies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Mcmillan.
- Sapiro, Gisèle. 2010. "L'autonomie de la littérature en question." In *Bourdieu et la littérature*, edited by Jean-Pierre Martin, 45–61. Nantes: Cécile Defaut.
- . 2016. "The metamorphosis of modes of consecration in the literary field: Academies, literary prizes, festivals." In *Poetics*, 59: 5–19. Accessed February 9, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2016.01.003>.
- Tommek, Heribert. 2015. *Der lange Weg in die Gegenwartsliteratur: Studien zur Geschichte des literarischen Feldes in Deutschland von 1960 bis 2000*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Tommek, Heribert, and Klaus-Michael Bogdal, eds. 2012. *Transformationen des literarischen Feldes in der Gegenwart. Sozialstruktur—Medien—Ökonomien—Autorpositionen*. Heidelberg: Synchron.

Zahner, Nina Tessa. 2006. *Die neuen Regeln der Kunst. Andy Warhol und der Umbau des Kunstbetriebs im 20. Jahrhundert*. Frankfurt: Campus.

PART I:
THEORETICAL APPROACHES
TO AUTHORSHIP

CHAPTER ONE

CONTEMPORARY FRENCH-LANGUAGE THEORIES OF LITERARY AUTHORSHIP

FREDERIK KIPARSKI

The Author Is Dead; Long Live the Author! Desideratum of a Renewed Theory of Authorship

This paper aims to give an introduction to the research field of literary authorship—especially in the French language—and its epistemological and social changes. For this purpose, it calls to mind the key notions of Roland Barthes’s and Michel Foucault’s fundamental questioning of the *author*. This is followed by an introduction and discussion of the recent author theories¹ of Dominique Maingueneau, Jérôme Meizoz and José-Luis Diaz, which propose different enhancements of Foucault’s *author function* (Foucault 1998) and thus permit the contemporary phenomena of literary authorship to be *dealt* with.

“[T]he image of literature to be found in contemporary culture is tyrannically centred on the author, his person, his history, his tastes, his passions” (Barthes 1967).² This sentence, taken from Roland Barthes’s famous article “La mort de l’auteur”, needs—as a matter of course—to be read in its historical context, which is Barthes’s criticism of the contemporary dominant literary interpretation practice based on biographical details of an author’s life and focussed on an explanation of an author’s

¹ As I focus particularly on author studies in French-speaking contexts (here France and Switzerland), other current author theories will necessarily be disregarded in this paper. Interesting approaches from German literature and art studies are, for example, Kampmann (2011), Kreknin (2014), and Schaffrick (2014).

² The quotations are taken from the English version, translated by Richard Howard. The French version, “La mort de l’auteur” was published in 1968, in *Manteia* 5: 12–7.

intent.³ At the emerging point of an influence of post-structuralism on literature and literature studies, Barthes, in a row with others, successfully aimed at an epistemological turn of text theory, liberating the texts' meaning from the authors' intent and taking into account the importance of the reader in the construction of meaning. Hence, the so postulated "death of the author" always has to be seen in its metaphorical and scientific-political character, as a "terroristic hypothesis" (Lindwedel 2005, 162).

The influence of Barthes's text is based on this metaphor. In fact—and as José-Luis Diaz (Diaz 2007, 12) points out—Barthes only sharpens and culminates a criticism of biographism in literature studies that was expressed by a number of other authors and critics before him, like Mallarmé, Paul Valéry, and, especially, Marcel Proust in his famous *Contre Sainte-Beuve*.⁴ More than just a statement based on the observation of facts, Barthes's declaration was a powerful claim in the context of a theoretical movement—and it did not fail to have an impact. In a similar way—as interpretation based on author's intent dominated (French) literature studies before—Barthes's "La mort de l'auteur" led to an exclusion of nearly any focussing on questions of authorship in literature studies for several decades (Diaz 2007, 13),⁵ and this although Michel Foucault initiated a complex rethinking of the phenomenon *author* in his speech "Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur?"⁶ at the Société française de philosophie in February 1969, only two years after Barthes's article.

Meanwhile, Barthes's initially quoted statement can, nearly fifty years after its pronouncement, perfectly figure as a comment on today's situation of the literary field(s) and its/their market(s). Even though the author was banished from mainstream literary studies for a certain time, we can

³ Barthes continues: "the explanation of the work is always sought in the man who has produced it, as if, through the more or less transparent allegory of fiction, it was always finally the voice of one and the same person, the author, which delivered his 'confidence'" (Barthes 1967).

⁴ On the subject of Proust's own authorship, see Fabian Schmitz's article "Marcel Proust: Author, Journalist and Marketing Strategist on His Own" in the present volume.

⁵ In a more global sense, the "death of the author" and the related focus on often formalistic text-immanent approaches in French academic literature studies (and to some extent in other European literature studies) in the last quarter of the 20th century in Europe respond to the former development of avant-garde art (including literature), starting between the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, and engaging the total separation of art and world (Todorov 2007, 62–8).

⁶ First published in 1969 in *Bulletin de la Société Française de Philosophie* 63 (3), see Foucault (1994, 1998).

suppose that she never lost her importance outside literary studies, in “the image of literature to be found in contemporary culture” (Barthes 1967).⁷ One could rather argue that the interest for the author’s person and the public presence of authors is still growing today. Ute Schneider, for example, observes an increasing personalisation on the book market (Schneider 2013, 247), and Jérôme Meizoz also sees a tendency towards “pipolisation” (Meizoz 2011, 246) in journalistic literature critique. In fact, today’s journalistic criticism dedicates much space to the authors’ person, often starting with a description of the authors’ habits, such as the clothes they wear, their favourite drinks, etc—details that seem primarily unimportant for the understanding of the text.

In an article in *Die Zeit* on February 20, 2014, the author and critic Maxim Biller writes a pessimistic critique of contemporary German literature. He promotes migrant literature as the only way out of the boring state of the art. In this article, he rejects the recently released novel *Vor dem Fest* by Saša Stanišić, a German author with Bosnian origins. Biller argues that Stanišić should better write about his own biographical origins, as he did in his first novel⁸, and avoid primordial German subjects, like the north-eastern German village and its community which are narrated in his new novel. In October 2016, Claudio Gatti caused a sensation with his article “Elena Ferrante: An answer?”⁹ Using methods of investigative journalism, including information about private finances, Gatti treats Elena Ferrante—an Italian author with international success—almost as a criminal and takes the liberty of revealing her civil identity. Literature criticism is thus replaced by methods of the tabloid press. Regardless of their dissimilarity, both examples proceed in a similar way: the authors are placed in front of their texts, which thus disappear out of view.

The high interest in authors’ persons is supplemented by what Bertrand Legendre calls the process of “professionalisation” of authors. Since major publishing houses concentrate their efforts on the support of only a small number of successful authors, many new, young or simply less-selling

⁷ See for example the contribution of Sarah Burnautzki and Raphaël Thierry in the present volume, “‘Stranger than Fiction’: Producing Postcolonial Inequalities in the Literary Field”. They show in regard to the appellation “Francophone writer” that power relations inside the French literary field always were and still are closely linked to the meaningful notion of the *author* and its classifications.

⁸ *Wie der Soldat das Grammofon repariert*. Luchterhand, München 2006.

⁹ The article appeared on the 2nd of October 2016 simultaneously in four different newspapers of four different countries: *Il Sole 24 Ore* (Italy), *Frankfurter Allgemeine Sonntagszeitung* (Germany), *Mediapart* (France) and *The New York Review of Books Daily* (USA).

authors are obliged to take over the promotion of their texts themselves (see Legendre 2010)¹⁰. The web and, above all, social media help to increase this development, as they democratise the access to visibility and publication¹¹. A significant part of these changes is the need for authors to be present not only in the public media but also in public events like book fairs and literature festivals¹². Thus, what is changing is not only the promotional process of literature but also the process of literary communication, i.e. the art itself. Besides books, a number of authors create and maintain (daily) web blogs; instead of readings, festivals invite authors to create transmedial performances, including music and/or visual/video art. Whereas the author is personally absent when the reader opens his book, in these art events the “author is present”¹³, they stage and spotlight the author himself and make him perceptible as an artist and at the same time as incorporated artwork¹⁴ (Meizoz 2016, 25–8). These, in a narrower sense, non-literature author practices thus become part of the *œuvre*. In the context of our reflection, it is not important to decide whether these processes import a veritable performative turn of literature, or rather the return of a former practice of literature distribution, namely public readings (see Meizoz 2016, 28), but to state the augmented presence of the author in public, which crucially influences the reception of literature.

Closely linked to these changes, one can equally observe an increasing presence of authors in the texts themselves.¹⁵ Since the beginning of the millennium, quite a number of novels that put an author’s figure in the

¹⁰ See also Bertrand Legendre’s contribution “Self-branding: a Necessary Skill for a Novelist’s Career?” in the present volume.

¹¹ A rising importance of self-publishing via e-book platforms is taking part in this process, however—so far—without replacing the gate-keeping role of publishers in the pursuit of symbolic capital in the literary field.

¹² On the increasing role of literature festivals in the literary field, see Sapirò (2016).

¹³ I refer to the title of a documentary on the performance artist Marina Abramović, *Marina Abramović: The Artist is present*, 2012. Jérôme Meizoz draws the same parallel in his latest book (Meizoz 2016, 25–8).

¹⁴ A telling example in this context is the French author Michel Houellebecq (see Komorowska 2016).

¹⁵ In my PhD dissertation, “Autoren auf dem Markt. Literarische Reflektionen des Literaturbetriebs” (“Authors on the Market. Literary Reflections on the Literature Business”, working title), I analyse by which literary strategies contemporary authors adapt and undermine these current tendencies of the literary field in their novels. For this purpose I examine the *mise en scène* of author figures in contemporary novels in the German and the French language.

heart of the story have experienced a large success. Many of them pick up the discourse model of autofiction introduced by Serge Doubrovsky.¹⁶ However, without keeping Doubrovsky's essentially autobiographical intent, these new texts explore the literary possibilities of self-fictionalisation (Weiser 2013, 227–8; see also Weiser 2015). Nonetheless, these author novels¹⁷ weave a web of ties between the non-fictional and the fictional world and take part in the inclusion of the author in the artwork.

In literature studies, the author has already “returned”¹⁸ since the early nineties of the past century. These studies propose a critical review of Barthes's “death of the author” and its consequences in literature studies, claiming the need of a reintroduction of the author to a hermeneutic text interpretation. Above all, German literature studies discuss the maintenance of intentionalistic interpretation after—and despite—Barthes's and Michel Foucault's epochal texts (Jannidis 1999; Detering 2002; Spoerhase 2007).¹⁹ Besides these discussions about a possible intentionalism, the scientific “return of the authors” results in the formulation of new desiderata in author studies. As a new scientific interest, the practices of authorial (self-) fashioning in literature have been discovered and examined in a row of

¹⁶ Claudia Gronemann (forthcoming) explains that “[an] autofictional text purports to be both fictional and autobiographical, and thus represents a paradox in the traditional understanding of genre. The neologism stems from a literary text by Serge Doubrovsky. [...] it was defined as ‘Fiction, d'événements et de faits strictement réels, si l'on veut autofiction [...]’ [‘Fiction, of strictly real events and facts, autofiction if you like (...)’], which for Doubrovsky was no contradiction. In fact, autofiction is closely linked to his poetics of an existential writing-about-the-self that developed out of psychoanalysis. The term ‘fiction’ here does not refer to invention in the classic sense, but to the eschewal of intentional subjectivity. His works, labelled as novels, convey the real biographical (writing) experiences of an author named Doubrovsky, who is painfully aware that the self is largely inaccessible and who approaches his own life through infinite ‘fils des mots’ [‘threads/sons of words’]”. Precisely because autofiction “straddles the genres of classic literature and goes beyond its culturally determined norms” (Gronemann, forthcoming), Gronemann (2013, 93–5, forthcoming) as well as Ott and Weiser (2013, 9) propose to see autofiction not as a literary genre but as a discourse model.

¹⁷ Charline Pluvinet (2012) offers a detailed look at the author figure in the contemporary novel.

¹⁸ “The return of the author” is strongly linked to Seán Burke (1992). However, the credo emerges equally in France and in Germany: Chamarat and Goulet (1996), Jannidis *et al.* (1999), Detering (2002).

¹⁹ For a more detailed critical overview on these propositions, see Schaffrick and Willand (2014b).

publications in France and in Germany since the beginning of the new millennium. They began to consider literary texts as stages of the author's (self-) construction and to put these textual constructions in relation to non-textual appearances of authors (see Schaffrick and Willand 2014b, 83–6). Additionally, they started to take the media and its changes into consideration, due to the rising importance of the web.²⁰ Forced by the changing practices of literature, as described above, studies on literary authorship have thus widened their focus, putting literary texts in a social context. The reception of Pierre Bourdieu's field theory (Bourdieu 1992), first in France and later in Germany²¹, contributed to a reinforcement of this line of research.

This renewed interest for the author's (self-) fashioning within and outside of literary texts also leads to a renewal of Michel Foucault's essential question: "Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur?". Putting textual and non-textual aspects of authorship in relation requires an elaboration of Foucault's author function, a reformulation that brings together text theory and social theory. In the following, this paper presents different current theoretical propositions on how to describe the complex phenomenon of the author. However, before coming back to these new theoretical approaches, it seems important to call to mind the still crucially influential key notions of author theory, implemented ultimately after the postulated "death of the author" by Barthes himself and Michel Foucault.

Author's Early Resurrection

Already at the time of Barthes's article, he, as an author himself, was very present in public and academic debate and reached a certain celebrity

²⁰ For relevant publications in the context of this renewed interest in authorship, see in German: Grimm and Schärf (2007); Gronemann, Schwan and Sieber (2012); Joch *et al.* (2009); Joch and Wolf (2005); John-Wenndorf (2014); Jürgensen and Kaiser (2011); Kreknin (2014); Künzel and Schönert (2007); Kyora (2014); Meier and Wagner-Egelhaaf (2011); Schaffrick (2014); Schaffrick and Willand (2014a); Wagner-Egelhaaf (2013); Weiser, Ott and Schönwälder (2013). In French: Alves and Pourchet (2011); Deseilligny and Ducas (2013); Diaz (2007); Loehr and Poirier (2015); Luneau and Vincent (2010); Martens and Watthee-Delmotte (2012); Meizoz (2007, 2011, 2016); Pluvinet (2012).

²¹ Besides Bourdieu's field theory, Niklas Luhmann's considerations on art in the context of his theory of social systems (see Luhmann 1995) have an equally large impact on German literature studies (see Schaffrick and Willand 2014b, 111 and Schaffrick 2014).

status.²² The same can be said about literary authors of the same period, especially those of the broad Nouveau Roman group, like, for example, Alain Robbe-Grillet or Marguerite Duras. On the one hand, these authors were close to Barthes's theoretical ideas and contributed in their literary and theoretical texts to the avant-garde idea of the disappearance of the author from the text; but on the other hand they were very prominent in the Parisian literature culture of their time.

Besides this obvious gap between text theory and market practice, it has often been noticed in the context of the "return of the author" into literature theory that Barthes relativised his metaphorical murder of the author only four years later. It is in the preface to *Sade, Fourier, Loyola* that Barthes, in reference to his text, claims the "amicable return of the author" (Barthes 1989, 8)²³, but "[of] course the author that returns is not the one identified by our institutions [...]; he is not the biographical hero. The author who leaves his text and comes into our life has no unity" (8). Barthes replaces the biographical subject *author*, considered as a source of discourse, with a fragmentary discourse effect without unity, incarnated in what he calls the "biographèmes" (9). Without stepping back behind his theoretical refusal of intentionalistic literature criticism, in this text he concedes the necessity of a valid concept of authorship for text theory; an exigency that is further detailed in his essay *The Pleasure of the Text*:

As institution, the author is dead: his civil status, his biographical person have disappeared: dispossessed, they no longer exercise over his work the formidable paternity whose account literary history, teaching and public opinion had the responsibility of establishing and renewing; but in the text, in a way, I desire the author: I need his figure.²⁴ (Barthes 1975, 27)

Whereas, in the following, Barthes improved these vague theoretical notions²⁵ in his own literary practice, namely in his autobiographical text

²² In her article "The Spectacle of Authorship: Roland Barthes on French Television" in the present volume, Kathrin Yacavone investigates Barthes's personal construction of authorship by examining his TV-presence.

²³ The quotations are taken from the English version, translated by Richard Miller. First published in French as *Sade, Fourier, Loyola*, 1971 by Éditions du Seuil, Paris.

²⁴ The quotations are taken from the English version, translated by Richard Miller. First published in French as *Le Plaisir du texte*, 1973 by Éditions du Seuil, Paris.

²⁵ José-Luis Diaz argues that Barthes's reintroduction of the author in forms of "biographèmes", because of its novelistic character, was at its time more perceived as a "coquetry" than as a serious theoretical proposition. That is why it was not taken into consideration for a long time (Diaz 2007, 14).

Roland Barthes par Roland Barthes in 1975, the required new conceptual ideas of authorship were proposed by Michel Foucault's 1969 speech "Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur?"

Foucault's statement, one year after Barthes's article, has to be seen as a sceptical reaction to Barthes (Diaz 2007, 13; Spoerhase 2007, 38). Even though he does not explicitly mention Barthes, he retraces the historical literary context of the "death of the author" and states: "None of this is recent; criticism and philosophy took note of the disappearance—or death—of the author some time ago." (Foucault 1998, 207). Foucault unmasks the "death of the author" as a "topos of literature theory" (Spoerhase 2007, 55) and points out the discrepancies and contradictions of this topos by examining the categories *Œuvre* and *Écriture* (Foucault 1998, 207–8). During the discussion following his speech, Foucault explicitly denies any agreement with the thesis of the author's death: "[J]e n'ai pas dit que l'auteur n'existait pas ; je ne l'ai pas dit et je suis étonné que mon discours ait pu prêter à un pareil contresens."²⁶ (Foucault 1994, 817). On the contrary, Foucault proposes to "locate the space left empty by the author's disappearance, follow the distribution of gaps and breaches, and watch for the openings this disappearance uncovers" (Foucault 1998, 209), in order to describe the function the author's name fulfils in discourses. This author function is further described by four main characteristics:

- (1) The author function is linked to the juridical and institutional system that encompasses, determines, and articulates the universe of discourses;
- (2) it does not affect all discourses in the same way at all times and in all types of a civilization;
- (3) it is not defined by the spontaneous attribution of a discourse to its producer but, rather, by a series of specific and complex operations;
- (4) it does not refer purely and simply to a real individual, since it can give rise simultaneously to several subject-positions that can be occupied by different classes of individuals. (Foucault 1998, 216)

Foucault has largely been criticised for his reflections on the first and the second point,²⁷ but in our context the characteristics three and four are

²⁶ "I did not say that the author does not exist; I did not say it and I am astonished that my discourse could give reason to such countersense." All of the following translations whose origins are likewise not indicated are mine.

²⁷ Foucault develops a historical chiasmus. He claims the absence of an author function in literature discourses until the 17th or 18th century and, oppositely, the disappearance of this function in scientific discourses at this same moment (see Foucault 1998). This chiasmus has been criticised, above all by Roger Chartier, as

more important. Without being as radical as Barthes, Foucault, within point three, equally proposes to free the category *author* from its unilateral connection between a text and its producer. The *author* is considered as a construction made by discourses, and fulfilling necessary functions in discourses.²⁸

Foucault primarily conceives the author function as a category of reception and not of production (Spoerhase 2007, 54) and indicates the impossibility to locate a singular source of its construction by introducing the fourth characteristic: “It would be just as wrong to equate the author with the real writer as to equate him with the fictional speaker; the author function is carried out and operates in the scission itself, in the division and this distance” (Foucault 1998, 215). In opposition to Barthes’s “death of the author”, Foucault’s programmatic proposition of this “plurality of self” (215) proposes, only one year later, a complex and combining access to authorship, relating different possible appearances of the author in different kinds of discourses or discursive levels. As Diaz notices, though, this programmatic proposition kept the status of “pious hope”²⁹ (Diaz 2007, 15) for a long time, being drowned out by the discursive power of Barthes’s “terroristic hypothesis” (Lindwedel 2005, 162). In particular Dominique Maingueneau, José-Luis Diaz and Jérôme Meizoz propose systematic theoretical extensions of Foucault’s author function. They will be briefly described and compared below.

being inexact and partly wrong (Chartier 1992, 35–67; Spoerhase 2007, 39; Wirth 2014, 374).

²⁸ It is thus obvious that the author function is crucially linked to Foucault’s concept of discourse. However, Carlos Spoerhase points out that Foucault’s speech “Qu’est-ce qu’un auteur?” is situated at a turning point of this concept, moving from a dualistic to a monistic understanding of discourses (Spoerhase 2007, 40). While Foucault’s earlier dualistic discourse concept supposes the existence of a pre-discursive level, where propositions are not yet ordered and restricted by discourse, the later monistic conception rejects this pre-discursive level and contains discourse only. Spoerhase explains that, in correspondence to the later monistic understanding of discourse, Foucault conceives the author function as a construction of a given discourse, fulfilling a function that is a necessary condition of this discourse (30-55).

²⁹ “Pendant des années aussi, les propositions plus systématiques de Foucault restèrent à l’état de *vœu pieux*, tandis que le champ restait ouvert aux mystiques de la mort de l’homme qui tenaient le haut du pavé” (Diaz 2007, 15; italics are mine).

The Trichotomy of the Author in Contemporary Theory

In the context of his analysis of the activity of enunciation in literary discourses, the French linguist and discourse analyst Dominique Maingueneau develops a model of the author that refers to Foucault's considerations on the "plurality of self" of the author function. Questioning the places of the author in the literary enunciation, Maingueneau claims:

[O]n ne peut pas juxtaposer sujet biographique et sujet énonciateur comme deux entités sans communication, reliées par quelque harmonie préétablie. Il est nécessaire de distinguer non pas deux mais trois instances, que l'on conviendra d'appeler *la personne*, *l'écrivain*, *l'inscripteur*.³⁰ (Maingueneau 2004, 107)

La personne stands for the civil individual of the author, possessing "une vie privée"; *l'écrivain* refers to the author as an actor in the literary field; and *l'inscripteur* designates the traces of the construction of an author subject on the textual level (Maingueneau 2004, 107). Maingueneau emphasises that these three entities permanently interact and overlap. He conceives them intertwined as Borromean rings which cannot entirely be separated but at once are "irréductiblement dispersée" (109; "irreducibly divided"). "Author" thus signifies a "unité imaginaire" (109; "imagined unity") of this trichotomy. Maingueneau's concept is part of his wider theory of literature as "discours constituants" (47; "constitutional discourses"). These kinds of discourses are defined, following Maingueneau, by their characteristic to constitute their own legitimation and their own rules and structures, and not to find legitimation in another discourse:

Leur [les discours constituants] énonciation se déploie comme dispositif de légitimation de son propre espace, y compris sur son versant institutionnel, elle articule l'engendrement d'un texte et une manière de s'inscrire dans un univers social. Suivant la logique de 'l'institution discursive', on se refuse ainsi à dissocier les opérations énonciatives par lesquelles s'institue le discours, qui construit ainsi la légitimité de son positionnement, et le mode d'organisation institutionnel que le discours tout à la fois présuppose et structure.³¹ (48)

³⁰ "[O]ne cannot juxtapose biographical subject and subject of enunciation as two separate entities without communication, connected by some pre-established harmony. It is necessary to distinguish not two but three entities, which shall be referred to in the following as *la personne*, *l'écrivain* and *l'inscripteur*."

³¹ "Their [the constitutional discourses] enunciation is deployed as dispositif of legitimation of its own space, inclusive of its institutional aspect; it articulates the

The concept of “l’institution discursive” is built on a criticism of Bourdieu’s concept of the literary field which separates the social structure of the field and the content of literary texts too strictly (37) and additionally considers the literary œuvre as the “reflet d’une réalité sociale déjà donnée” (37; “reflection of a given social reality”). Maingueneau intends to highlight the reversibility of dynamic (enunciation) and static (structure) aspects of the “discursive institution” that means literature. Therefore, Maingueneau prefers to think of an “espace littéraire” (70; “a literary space”), less fixed than a literary field and which cannot definitely be located but is considered as a “paratopie” (72), permanently involved in a process of “négociation entre le lieu et le non-lieu” (72; “negotiation between the place and the non-place”). While the author in Bourdieu’s concept is mainly predetermined by the social structures via the category of the habitus (37), Maingueneau accentuates the constitutive force of literary creation and sees the dislocated and tripartite author as part of this creational act, being simultaneously producer and product of literary discourse in a permanent act of relocation.

The Swiss scholar Jérôme Meizoz (2007, 2011, 2016) adopts Maingueneau’s trichotomy of the author in his concept of the “posture d’auteur”, which thus refers indirectly to Foucault’s author function. For Meizoz, “la posture” means “la manière singulière d’occuper une ‘position’ dans le champ littéraire” (Meizoz 2007, 18; “the singular way to occupy a ‘position’ in the literary field”), and it is influenced by the activity of the author on all three levels of Maingueneau’s trichotomy. Similarly to Maingueneau, but closer to Bourdieu’s conception of the field, Meizoz is interested in the social activity and positioning of an author, even though he also accentuates the “discursive performance” (Meizoz 2005, 182) of the *posture* which permanently modulates this position. Other than Bourdieu and in agreement with Maingueneau, Meizoz thus focusses the active part of the author on her positioning in the field. The formation of the posture includes not only discursive (verbal) but also non-discursive communication of an author, which means his public behaviour, his style of clothing, etc. Also, Meizoz considers the posture as a product of an interactive process, signifying a co-construction between the author and other actors in the field, like journalists, editors, and readers (Meizoz 2011, 83). Within this conception and in addition to

producing of a text and a way to inscribe in a social universe. Following the logic of the ‘discursive institution’, one thus refuses to dissociate the enunciative operations by which the discourse emerges, which thus constructs the legitimation of its positioning and the mode of institutional organisation that the discourse at once presupposes and structures.”