

15

Presentation date: February, 2021

Date of acceptance: March, 2021

Publication date: May, 2021

AUTHOR:

“TO BE AND NOT TO BE”

AUTOR: “SER Y NO SER”

Ulviyya Hasamaddin Rahimova¹

E-mail: ulviyye72@mail.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2595-4973>

¹ Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences. Azerbaijan.

Suggested citation (APA, 7th edition)

Rahimova, U. H. (2021). Author: “to be and not to be”. *Revista Universidad y Sociedad*, 13(3), 135-143.

ABSTRACT

The paper analyzes the scientific theoretical provisions related to the author's concept in the context of artistic craftsmanship of different times. The article mainly focuses on how the author's death metaphor is defined in the theory of threat. It is noted hereby that the aesthetics of romance sought to integrate the individual process of the creative process in the nineteenth century. However, in classical realism, which occurred almost at the same time, objective reality become the main factor defining the ideas and content of the literary-artistic model, the principles of structure, in which subjective beginnings dominate. Certainly, this does not mean that the creative individual disappears completely. It does not disappear, it is pressed and destroyed by individual style. This trend manifests itself in one way or another in all aspects of modernity, and in fact, it disappears in the “new novel”, which is the “last resort” of modernism. Therefore, the history of the literary process, especially in the 19th and 20th centuries can be characterized as the gradual “suicide” of the author. The problem of author's death in postmodernism gave birth to the aphorism of Shakespeare on the new life and death: is an author really “dead” or continue to live a different life in the text?

Keywords: Author's death, metaphor, aesthetics.

RESUMEN

El papel analiza las provisiones teóricas científicas relacionadas con el concepto del autor en el contexto del arte artístico de tiempos diferentes. El artículo principalmente se concentra cómo la metáfora de muerte del autor se define en la teoría de amenaza. Se nota por este medio que la estética de romance procuró integrar el proceso individual del proceso creativo en el siglo XIX. Sin embargo, en el realismo clásico, que ocurrió casi al mismo tiempo, la realidad objetiva se convirtió en el factor principal que define las ideas y el contenido del modelo literario y artístico, los principios de estructura, en la cual los principios subjetivos se dominan. Seguramente, esto no significa que el individuo creativo desaparece completamente. No desaparece, es presionado y destruido por el estilo individual. Esta tendencia se manifiesta de una manera u otra en todos los aspectos de la modernidad y, de hecho, desaparece en la «nueva novela», que es el «último recurso» de modernismo. Por lo tanto, la historia del proceso literario, sobre todo en los siglos XIX y XX, se puede caracterizar del “suicidio” gradual del autor. El problema de la muerte del autor en el postmodernismo dio a luz al aforismo de Shakespeare en la nueva vida y muerte: ¿está el autor realmente “muerto” o continúa viviendo una vida diferente en el texto?

Palabras clave: Metáfora, muerte del autor, estética.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of authorship in the theory of presuppositions is one of the most controversial. According to the “traditional” and classical approach, the author is the initial driving force of the literary process; in essence, the literary process begins with the author’s “attempt” (action) to write the work. Before the reader is fully acquainted with the work, the author is the only one who has full knowledge of the beginning, the culmination, the ending, the peripetes of current events. Classical examples are created and understood on the basis of this problem: “auctor” - creator in Latin- participates in all stages of the literary process in public or in secret and ensures its integrity.

The main purpose of this article is to reveal the internal dialectic nature of authorship to analyze how this aspect is manifested in different creative ways and in different stages of literary development. Also, the arguments that led to the author’s denial are exposed. Therefore, it is important to highlight that it is not correct to speak about the active creative process in the pre-literary mythical creativity period because the problem of authorship had not arisen at all. Such a situation was manifested in epic creativity that is a product of the transition from myth to literature.

Examples of the epic genre were based on stories that were not supposed to have been invented by anyone else, which means they did not belong to anyone. In the process of conveying these stories to the audience, a singer (ozan, aed, scald, etc.) was only able to demonstrate his mastery. The loss of the “copyright” of the performers in the epoch did not mean that the problem of copyright would be eliminated. In this case, a generalized supernatural image of the author was created. Dada Gorgud and Homer are examples of such extraordinary authors. Researchers show that in the process of creating literary and artistic samples in archaic times, the author’s category is linked to the prestige category: the name of the person bearing high authority belongs to the person with the highest authority (Bryan, et al., 2018). This generalized author’s name can be either human or divine. The prestige category was characteristic of ancient Eastern and Medieval moral and didactic literature.

Nowadays, the literature giving great importance to the creative person has been isolated from religious cults and sacral “authorship” traditions in the ancient culture. This process became more widespread in the European Renaissance. Of course, this led to radical changes in the concept of authorship. The word is already a representative of the author’s personality, and the author’s character (the word “character” denotes the image of the seal itself or its image; later, it is figuratively identifying a person with

another), and stamping the work with his name. In this case, the name of the author may be mentioned by him or by his representative. At the same time, the normative conception of literary creativity, from antique classical to European classicalism, submits the author’s personality to an abstract ideal - a kind of completely self-defining genre-. In this case, literary and artistic creativity becomes a kind of “competition” between the author and his predecessors in order to use better the possibilities of the genre, a contest among creators on a predetermined theme.

DEVELOPMENT

Romance declared author a creator of literary-artistic example as “genius”. A great creative author is not satisfied with solving the problems he faced, he puts new challenges to himself and tries to solve them. Such an approach to the author reveals that the author category has unprecedented complex internal contradictions. Romanticism, which examines the entire history of literary and artistic creativity from this perspective, declares that the author is an absolute differentiator. At the same time, the theory of romance unveiled a phenomenon of authorship in the field of myths, folklore and archaic cultures for the first time in the history of literary thought. Therefore, romanticism brought the “man” and “the artist”, which were treated as two different instances in previous aesthetic concepts: Byron and Novalis sought to bring their personalities closer to their romantic literary-aesthetic concept.

Romanticism, both theoretically and in artistic practice, conjures up the possibilities of the viewer’s eye by claiming the author’s ability to contain all the problems of the world. However, romance at the same time noted the existence of a contradiction between the “artist” and the “man” within the framework of the “romantic comic” concept and acknowledged the groundlessness of its author’s concept. At the end of the nineteenth century, in realism, the author hid behind the protagonist, the society in general, and tried not to exaggerate his identity. In modernism, however, the author is generally excluded, and the subject described spoke about himself. A major change in the theory of authorship in the twentieth century is the author’s refusal and functionality to replace the author with the reader, while at the same time trying to overcome this tendency. Western critics link the development of the new author’s theory to the situation arising after declaring the need to “get rid of the author’s bondage”; getting rid of the author gradually turned away from the understanding of the ideological-aesthetic nature of the literary work into a refusal.

However, the author’s denial retains its potential heuristic significance, as the literary myth that the creator of the

literary work remained the main object of literary analysis continued to exist until the end of the twentieth century. From this point of view, the reaction of Vinogradov (1980), and others to the problem of “disappearance” of the author has played a positive role in the development of the author’s theory. Interactions between security guards, replacing each other’s pseudonyms and author’s masks, the features of the “central consciousness”, reflecting the events taking place in the work reflected in James’ creativity in the first half of the last century were the focus of British and American researchers. Although their concept of “point of view” undermined the foundation of the author’s status, it could not move it by anyway.

A new stage in the emergence of radical concepts related to the author’s denial comes across the late 1960s. In modern literature, the author usually “dies” in his works, melts in characters, and hides in plot and composition structures. He does not express his existence in direct ways, but it is felt that the author is “alive” in the system of images, the proportion of time and space, and the choice of facts.

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries philological studies focused on the author’s text, but since the late 1960s to the mid-1980s, interest in the relationship between the text and its real creator sharply declined. Due to this tendency, interest in the author’s position in the text and its expression, as well as the author’s problem as the organizing center for the structure and focus of the text, diminished. As a result, this meant a lower interest in the integrity of the literary text and its intensity”.

This process of neglect against the author began with “the formalists’ departure from biography in literary criticism; the formalists saw the author only as a text producer, as a master of certain word techniques”. Formalism has put the question of the artist’s position on the insulting question, and it is especially typical for non-active theorists, who have not yet taken an active formalist position. The work “Theory of Literature” by Wellek & Warren (1956), reveals that the subject’s problem in art is nothing more than “the problem of the method and the suppressor”. Formalists’ main point are that no single sentence of a literary work can, in itself, be a simple reflection of the author’s personal perceptions and that there is always something other than a play. In this piece, we have no choice to see anything other than artistic method.

Keefer (1995), notes that by declaring the death of the author and the independence of the text, Roland Bart and Michelle Fuco really “liberate” the text, releasing it from the author’s own interpretation, thus creating new readings that the author deliberately did not. Bart has already

announced that the “death of the author” will be accompanied by a reader’s birth: “In order to ensure the future of the writing, you have to overthrow the myth about it - the birth of the reader must pay for the author’s death”.

The author (the original creator) of the literary and artistic model was not simply removed from studies of literary criticism, it was almost entirely replaced by the reader in “Death of the Author” by Fuerton’s (1968), and “Who is the author?” by M. Fuco (1969). At the same time, R. Bart strictly declined the psychoanalytic approach to the author’s problem: the French structuralist rejected the idea of a literary and artistic model to be regarded as the product of the intellectual activity of the creator. R. Bart was very close to the concepts of Bakhtin and Vinogradov in terms of the “author’s death” principles, and he also believed that it is necessary to differentiate the author from each other as a biographical, realistic personality, as a creator and as an element of the figurative structure of the work.

The new radical conception of the novel required R. Bart to address the problems arising from the author’s inclusion in the field of the reader’s communication. The scientist thought that there was a gap between the “vital” and the creative authors. R. Bart identifies namely this abyss as the author’s death. From this point of view, the author’s death is his transition from real life to fictitious realism. The emergence of Bart’s concept was due to the need to go beyond the “author-hero” field, defined by the boundaries of a very narrow, literary-artistic example, and to the “author-reader” area where the ends are invisible; highlighting the reader caused such new complex problems that have at least temporarily prevented the author from getting into the problem of author. Thus, the “author” element, which essentially means to be removed from the “hero-author-reader” sphere that provides the communication of the literary-artistic model, ultimately leads to a distortion of the system of real-literary creative relations.

However, it should also be noted that time played a significant role in the development of such a radical concept by R. Bart. In his view, the author has been stuck in the past in dealing with the reader. The reader, on the contrary, focuses on the future - the endless readings and interpretations of literary and artistic example. Variability of reader comments ensures that the text is multidimensional in content; a reader who has read and finished the work “dies” in relation to the work, but new readers are being created in its place. The text created by the author is immutable, static, canonical, and the reader’s text is dynamic. This is the essence of Bart’s authorship theory, which relies on the reader to replace the writing of the work with his reading. However, the author’s “abolition” resulted in

the cancellation of “literary”, which is the special quality of the literary text. On this basis, Barthes suggested that the notion of “work” be replaced by “text”. Barthes wanted to give up on literature in the name of struggling with the author. It was reflected in the “from text-to-work”: the author’s replacement with the reader led to the replacement of the work with the “text”.

Of course, such a review of the author, who is the true leading figure in the literary process, could not have taken much time away from the literary process. American, German, Canadian and Swiss scholars firmly opposed the concept of Derrida, Foucault, and Barthes already in the late twentieth century, suggesting that the author’s suppression process actually began in the early twentieth century and took place in three stages: formalism, structuralism, and poststructuralism. They stated that the literary and artistic material is being formed in the research process because the representatives of the aforementioned trends are overly interested in functional approaches. This inevitably causes the author to collapse into a collection of methods and ignore the aesthetic nature of the literary and artistic model.

The criticism of Barthes’s conception of the “author’s death” was often attributed to the revision of hermeneutic interpretations, which often denied each other, and the creation of several invariant readings of the same text in the second half of the 1990s. Proponents of the new author’s theory emphasize the author’s intention to understand the idea of a new author, the meaning of a literary-artistic model, the problem of the integrity of the literary text, the study of the author in the center of the text.

In the 1990s, English-American critics began to re-examine the author’s creative process, the author’s consciousness. In this case, the author again becomes a central figure in the creation of a literary and artistic model. But that didn’t mean returning to the pre-conception of the “author’s death” that Barthes put forward. About this, Hadar (2018), emphasizes the importance of the author’s image in its textual activities.

Researcher Rezek (2018), also highlights the problem of author desacrification. In this article, Rezek replaces the author’s “death” with “desacrification”. He considers the author to be a historical actor compiling texts and notes that they have historically been subjected to certain influences that have been established in specific circumstances. Media directly relates to a large number of people managing and distributing media technologies (not just print media); and, as readers who have historically been actively involved are strategically important in navigating the media and communication world.

Contemporary researchers could not keep silent that the author’s and the reader’s dialectical relations were an important factor in the literary process. The tendency for the emergence of a new universal authorship theory is now manifesting itself. This theory draws attention to the solution of the fundamental problems of the aesthetic nature of art and literature and the integrity of the literary-artistic model, provided that the author is a central figure in the literary process. It should be noted that Bakhtin’s (2021), scientific and theoretical views played a crucial role in solving the author’s problem, as in many areas of the aesthetics at the end of the 20th century. Following the uniqueness of the poststructuralist approach to the author’s problem at the beginning of the 21st century, M. Bakhtin’s author conceptualization reveals that it has the potential to solve this problem from a new perspective. From this point of view, Korman’s (1978), ideas about the author can be regarded as the presentation of certain “incompatibilities” in Bakhtin’s (2021), theory of authorship.

Multidimensional theory studied and developed by Korman (1978), from Bakhtin (2021), with and author theory has returned its natural priorities back to the literature. The author was viewed as an embodiment of the objective meanings of the world but through the uniqueness of subjective interpretations. The art work was analyzed not only in the context of historical and literary facts, but also in a free form. The dialectical nature of art emerged in the ability of artistic event to communicate with the reader through the author in his imagination or someone else. Accordingly, the terminological versatility of some definitions regarding the author’s category arises.

Bakhtin (2021), referring to classical approach related to the author’s status, formed since Aristotle, considers it a subject of aesthetic activity: *“the author is creative; as a whole, that is, the expression of a unified individual position, the essence of the work, the form of its being”*. In this definition provided by Bakhtin (2021), on an author, he actually clarified two aspects of its existence, which are in harmony with each other, but are also different from each other: the author is a man who “manufactures” a particular work on one hand, and a creative start on the other. Such an approach to the author’s problem reveals the paradoxical nature of this phenomenon: the author is completely dissatisfied with his work - the author completely dissolves in the work as a creator-, there is no author outside the work. On the other hand, an individual exists as a member of a society and is generally outside of his or her work, but is linked to his creation and responsible for his or her creativity.

From this point of view, the author’s identity (whether he/she is the creator of this or that other literary-artistic example)

is a legal problem, even from a certain angle of view. In this case, the fact that a particular person is the creator of a literary or artistic example is proved by historical documents. As an individual carrying out the creative process, the author has rights that are governed by certain moral, ethical and legal norms, ie. the copyright is regulated by law. The idea of copyright protection rights is formed from the moment when the work is created. However, this problem has not always been relevant.

The “subject of aesthetic activity” (biographical author) is fundamentally different from the “creative principle” (the “creative author”). At the same time, their “interests” overlap in the creative process: after all, the need to explain the meaning of the work is the source of both. Korman (1978), said about this that biographical author and creative author are confused only when it is impossible to separate the author’s life experience from the situations he or she is exposed to.

It is known that, the biographical and creative authors approach in maximum in the face of “I” in the lyrical example and it seems to the reader that in this case the poet eliminates all obstacles between the two beginnings and expresses all the features of the inner world. However, careful consideration reveals that in this case the author aligns himself with the creative endeavors of his biography to remain true to the events and peculiarities of his biography: in this case, the creative author seeks to create an “autobiographical myth” based on the aesthetics laws and on his own life and personality.

Nietzsche opposed the author’s identification of these two different hypotheses - the author with the real empirical “I” - in relation to the work. In his work “The Birth of Tragedy from the Spirit of Music,” he mentioned that the lyrical “I” is different from the “I” bearing a healthy attitude towards life. The philosopher, who identifies his artistic creativity with a dream, states that the lyrical “I” is formed on the base of the sole true and essentially immortal features of the creative personality. Just thanks to the lyrical “I” can the artist-author get to the essence of events.

Nietzsche appreciated the revealing of author’s image as a creative author as an attempt to create his own self-portrait. M. Proust also made similar ideas in his book “*Contre le Corps*” (Against the Body). The French writer has mentioned that it is not right to disprove the universal qualities and features of the author in his work as a private person; the author should be seen as two distinct phenomena established as a creative personality and as an individual. For example, Ernest Renan, a French scholar of the nineteenth-century history and culture school, said that the appearance of the Illiada as a genius is not about

Homer but the magnificence of his time (Bohmer, et al., 2017).

In fact, the concept of the “Death of the Author”, taken from Nietzsche’s phrase “God is dead” in the twentieth century, was gradually implemented. In the early stages, the hero of the literary and artistic model of the XVII-XVIII centuries who was considered equal to the status of the god began to lose its status in the 19th century. An example of this experiment is F. Stendall’s novel “The Chartreuse of Parma” (“La Chartreuse de Parme”). In the “classic” novel the protagonist’s chances of seeing the world in the work get a shocking blow in the “realist” artist Stendall’s novel. It is known that events taking place on the battlefield are viewed and evaluated depending on the position of its participants. In a traditional novel, the author assigns his status as a “hero” to the commander, to completely capture those present on the battlefield. Stendal describes Fabrizio del Dongo, who is not yet aware of the events took place. Therefore, he deprives the protagonist of his work in the novel “The Chartreuse of Parma”, depriving him of his “divine” status.

As if he is brought down from heaven to earth later, the Russian writer L. Tolstoy highly appreciates Stendall’s artistic discovery and uses it in his work “War and Peace”. These moments suggest that attitudes towards the concept “Mü llif-allah” (author-God) will change. In the first stage, the author - man thinks, “I see the whole world” but in the second stage, the author gradually lost his status. In the second stage, the author thinks in terms of ontological polarity that “I see a part of the world”. In the third stage, the author decides, “I see nothing”. In the fourth stage, the author is already beginning to see the world again. Thus, it is necessary to explain the author’s long-standing status of deity, but then gradually lose this status and “die” not only by external social factors, but also by its two-polar ontological state-man. On the one hand, he sees his own limitations in the process of perception of the world, but on the other, he wants to contain the world as a whole, at least in the literary and artistic model of his model. If the current social situation of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries discredited this author to the status of “god,” the problem of self-denial in the 20th century would have to be taken away from the author.

In general, the nineteenth-century novel focuses on the ethical and ideological aspects of the literary-art example. Taking into account this model, literary criticism also focused more on the ethical-ideological point. Russian literary criticism has even commented on the structural elements of the work (including Bakhti’s diology, polyphony and Korman’s biography) in the ethical-ideological context. But the Chicago school, based on the 20th century

modernist novel, embodies purely formal rhetorical elements. Bakhtin (2021), stated in this regard that, when taking any aspect of a work, it is clear that it was created by the author and has a subjective existence. On the other hand, the reader understands the work through the author's personality. This means that the work poses the problem of "author's image" as a whole. It is impossible to determine the principles of implementation non-understanding the essence of this image. It should also be taken into account that the author's work can be viewed from two angles because the author is outside the work and speaks of the features of reality and creates his model in literary and artistic form: the work, on the one hand, is a peculiar reality organized by images and ideas, and on the other hand, it is the object of the reader's perception.

American scientist Jim Phelan stresses that the author is a decisive factor; "In stressing the author's decisive role, however, we are not suggesting that the task of interpretation (or the goal of reading) should be reduced to the discovery of the author's conscious intentions. As we noted in the introduction, we account for the effects of narrative by reference to a feedback loop among authorial agency, textual phenomena, and reader response". However, by highlighting the author's leading role, we do not consider that the purpose of the commentary (or the purpose of the confession) should be to consciously reveal all the author's intentions. ... We, the authors, advocate the impact of a framework linking the feedback chain between text events and the reader's reaction (Herman, et al., 2012). As can be seen, the work must involve processes between the creator and the perceptor. That is why exposing and analyzing individual and non-proprietary elements in the work actually means killing the living organism and turning it into an anatomical theater research object.

There is another approach to the author: it is believed that the author comes true in literary and fiction, but also has sources outside of the text. There are many researchers' attitudes about the problem of the author's image in the literary text. Such an approach leads to the creation of two poles of the author - the creative pole inside the work and the creative poles outside the work. In this case, the historical identity outside the text cannot be considered as this source. On the contrary, as a result of merging only with non-personal sources, the historical personality becomes a creative one. The author become acquainted in this way, due to Bakhtin (2021), as an opportunity to "touch" the work and settle within it not outside the work. Thanks to a holistic work of purposefulness, there is no problem with the search for its author in historical reality. The paradox is that the work is based on reality and addressed to reality

(recipient). But at the same time, the problem posed in the work is solved not beyond it but by its creation.

At the same time, a text-based and "teleological" approach to the exclusion of the text was elaborated and justified by Bakhtin (2021). He believes that such an approach is alien to the nature of a literary-artistic work of dual nature and reveals its controversial nature. The work is a language material on the one hand and it is an aesthetic object on the other hand; in other words, the world is described in such a way that it is not content with self-destruction as it is also based on a different value system. Thus, the organization of the material - the composition - serves the purpose of the aesthetic embodiment of the material. However, the value structure (architectonics in Bakhtin) of the object is self-contained because the work was created only for this purpose. The author's idea of the world and the human is transmitted through this structure to the recipient.

The position of the creative author can be understood through the meetings in the values system organized by him; through the system of values, the purposeful structure of the literary-word material, the issue of interpreting the meaning of the work is connected namely with this. There are sometimes attempts to identify life positions of the creative author and the protagonist of his work. But in reality the author is never hiding behind the hero. The creative author is responsible for the meaning of the hero's personality and destiny; it is responsible not for his words but for his description and for all his works. M. Bakhtin (2021), considered that the work as a whole was the creative author's reaction to the hero's in whole. But the reader can join the author's world only as a participant in the aesthetic event. However, it is impossible to move through the literary process without the reader for this reason; the reader seems to get an adequate idea of the person behind them through the world described in the work, and through the main hero. By refusing to evaluate the work as a private aesthetic event (in which case the reader becomes a participant in the events), we are deprived of the opportunity to answer the question "What is the author?".

The author problem is largely examined from the author's point of view in contemporary literary criticism. Therefore, the focus is on a narrower notion of "author's image". It is well known that the author's image is one of the forms of the author's involvement in literary and artistic form.

The author has two hypotheses, as mentioned above; as a biographical instinct, it is creative and it is beyond the scope of the work, but at the same time it has an opportunity to "paint" and become an organic part of the work. In this case, the author is isolated from the inventor within the

work as the source of the aesthetic reality, the carrier of the concept of the whole work, as the responsible for the whole meaning of the artistic expression. Objectively, the author's image is available only in autobiographical and autopsychological works; in this case, the author's personality forms the subject of his creativity. The image of "lyrical I" may be an example for it in lyric poems.

The author's interpretation of the subject as defined by the act of speech and having no existence outside it ("beyond the biographical text") was formulated and justified in the early 20th century by the concepts of formalism and its subsequent structuralism. V. Vinogradov, who approaches this problem in this way, also described the "author's image" as a "compilation of ideas and styles. There may also be discounts between the real author and the author's image. Thus, researchers like B. Korman and V. Schmit oppose the "real historical identity", the creator of the work, that is, the author's expression in the work: *"As a result of this semiotic act the image of the author represented in the work, not the specific author arises"* (Schmid, 2010, p. 65). In this conflict, the origin of creativity refers to the "real historical identity", the "biographical author", and the effect and consequence of the creative beginning of the work. But in the broader sense of the word, the author's image (which researchers sometimes characterize as the author's "voice") means the parts of the artistic speech that cannot be attributed to the heroes of the work or to the narrator.

The literary understanding of the author's image emerged only in the twentieth century, but the concept of this image has long been felt in the process of perceptions of lyrical examples. Lyricism in written literature conveys the author's personal experience but not what he heard from others. At the same time, the creator's artistic right to artistic consciousness had to be established and consolidated in order to unite with the author's image of speech. It prevented the question of whether the information he gave was genuine. It is well known that in the Middle Ages the recipients were considered by the instigator as the direct participant or direct participant of the events transmitted by the trustee. Therefore, the pseudo-author image has long been preserved in the New Age. In this case, a true author presses on this pseudo-author the responsibility for the authenticity of the transmitted ones and it hides under the mask of "translator" or "publisher" (Cervantes, the original author of the novel, describes himself as his "translator" from Arabic). Thus, there is a case where the word directly relates to a word that distracts the reader from the text and invites him to conscious play by fabricating it.

At the same time, the first person form is created. The form of this threat is no longer tied to the protector but to the

conditional "I" ("we"). Because this conditional "I" has the right to address the reader directly, it does not only inform what is happening in the work, it seeks to convince it of the accuracy and integrity of the information, and to make moral judgments out of place. The conventional "I" is also responsible for the organization of the plot in terms of time and space. Behind the conventional first-person protector, the author of the literature is the author of the society. He has the right to appeal to readers on his behalf.

The author enforces his right by the means and methods determined by the reader's taste of the period. Russian philologist and academician Vinogradov (1980), writes that the author's face is "always felt in a work of art, and the main issue is the reconstruction of this image based on his works". When Vinogradov (1980), refers the author's image in various works, he either understood his personal style or his point of view within the work. This made him remember the image of the ever-changing mythical protagonist with regard to the subject of development.

Literary critics, by examining the creative process, conclude that the author has almost no rights in the fictional art world created by him, the heroes do not obey, and act with the dictates of their own will. If, for example, in romanticism the author of the work preserves at least the style of expression, realists are even deprived from it; they must express themselves in the spoken language or in a similar manner. Bakhtin (2021), stated that, upon taking any aspect of an art work, it becomes clear that it was created by an author and has a subjective existence. On the other hand, the reader understands the work through the author's personality. This means that the work makes a problem of "author's image" as a whole. If the essence of this image isn't understood, it is impossible to determine the implementation principles of explanation.

As it turns out, the work of threat must involve processes between the creator and the perceptor. There is a direct connection between the author's image and the aesthetic qualities of the work. The use of the word 'image', which is purely aesthetic, is not accidental. The author's image is not casual and is a necessary part of aesthetic perception in terms of theory.

Literary and artistic creativity reveals the features of artistic illusion. There are two main features of this illusion. First of all, the purpose of the illusion is to deceive the reader: This is evident in the desire to present the non-existent as being present. The illusory creature replaces the real existence in artistic creativity. The craftsman achieves it on the basis of the laws of life, fictional reality he presented. The world described in the work of art forms a second reality and attracts the recipient's consciousness. In this

process, the recipient is temporarily separated from all, or to some extent, the true reality, and lives as the true to the second (illusory) reality described in the work.

The second important aspect of his aesthetic perception is the impression that the literary and artistic pattern is created by the artist and the identity of each image. From this point of view, if the first point can be regarded as being subject to the artistic illusion of the recipient, the second point may be considered a form of return to reality. Not one of these points can explain the essence of aesthetic practice separately. The ideal aesthetic experience is the organic unity of these two aspects, these two components in the act of aesthetic creativity (which involves the creation of a literary and artistic pattern of the artist as well as his perception of the reader).

However, the dialectical unity of these two points should distract one of the important features of aesthetic perception: the reader “forgets” the author of the work as he moves to the depth of the second (artistic) reality. Really, this impression is not exhaustive, even when we live in an artistic realm, we do not completely lose our connection with reality - the essence of artistic reality cannot overlap with the reality of living-. However, it should be noted that we understand the author’s image only at the moment when we overcome the artistic illusion. The author’s image of this type, created in connection with the recipient’s understanding of the artwork, is a characteristic of all artistic examples. From this point of view, the first characteristic of the author’s image is its universality.

Secondly, the movement of the author’s and non-author’s actions in the work is characteristic: it depends primarily on the depth of the reader’s access to the essence of the work in the reading process. In the early stages of the work, the reader “forgets” some kind of author’s image and focuses on the work. However, to some extent, the author’s “forgetfulness” comes to the point where the author expresses himself explicitly whether or not the author has revealed his or her own work, or in some way, behind the existential experience of a particular hero. Experience happens at the moment we hear; the reader “remembers” the author, and inevitably creates the image of it, which is the product of the reader’s creativity.

After that, the reader is exposed to the spirit of the author in all the elements of literary and fiction. The “authorization” of the work is irreversible from this point on: each artistic element represents the author’s involvement in the context of the work, which in fact is the “author’s character” as all non-author elements of the work pass through the author’s filter.

However, in the nineteenth-century literature, the author’s word has an individual tone and, on the other hand, is free from conventional personalization; as a result, the threat of “I” (“we”) is reduced. It creates an illusion of self-representation in literary and artistic form. Russian literary critic B. Eichenbaum considers this to be the movement of the novel from the narrative to drama.

Indeed, the author’s speech activity in the narrative is entirely addressed to the reader who is the author’s companion; the word of the hero is encircled by the author’s words in every way, and as a result, the effect of the quotation. The expression dominates the description in the narrative, and it is not emphasized that the characters communicate with each other through dialogue. In the classic novel of the nineteenth-century, the author does not narrate the hero, presents it as it sounds, and refuses to interfere with the speech of certain characters. As a result, in the text of the work, the speech becomes more important as the specific weight of the spoken speech is reduced. However, the “dramatization” of the novel does not mean that the author deviates from the threat process as in pure dramatic works. The dialogue of characters in the novel is accompanied by the author’s uninterrupted interpretation. In fact, the author may use various artistic means to enhance this or that moment in the speech of dramatic characters. However, the author is deprived of the opportunity to directly participate in the process and expresses his attitude and position indirectly.

The emergence of a gradual interpretation of dialogue does not only weaken the author’s activism as a result of the development of the novel, but, on the contrary, penetrates all layers of the speech structure. In some cases, the author’s word is not a formal substitute (“I”, “we”), but it secretly carries out its explanatory, coordinating and unifying function. The author responds to the hero’s voice, sometimes disagrees with what he says, sometimes opposes it, or corrects and completes his position. The reader is constantly implicitly feeling the author’s reaction to events and heroes. Bakhtin’s (2021), has deeply studied and classified the “hybrid” made together by author’s voice and the heroic voice. The author’s image is also represented as the author’s mask in postmodernism. This notion, firstly made by the American critic Malmgren (1985), expresses his view on the problems posed by the scientific idea of chaos in the postmodernist world.

The tendency to neutralize the author’s subjective existence is greatly strengthened in the nineteenth-century realist discourse that seeks to embody the realities. Such a compression of the author’s subjectivity leads to the extension of the meeting space; the author, who has innumerable information about the world, describes reality from any

point of view, any time and place, and unites and coheses into the mind of any hero. The extent and character of the author's involvement in the work determine the author's or other image; the author may be sometimes O. Henry or brutal judge, and sometimes soft-spoken, as M. Twain. It is important to remember that, no matter how deep and comprehensive the author's knowledge of the world is, he is aware of all the secrets of the world within his work.

CONCLUSIONS

It is believed that although traditional forms of the 20th century have undergone some changes; they have retained their invariant characteristics. However, a number of other trends are also manifesting themselves. First of all, the image of the author in the work of a number of prominent artists is replaced by a first-person detective. As a rule, it is not only the narrator who transmits it, he actively intervenes in the course of events, and in fact becomes the lead hero of the literary and artistic example. At the same time, he does not lose contact with the undercover author, and enjoys his extraordinary observation.

The concept of "author's death" is mainly associated with the postmodernist period - the acquisition of M. Fukon and R. Bart's role in the literary process-. Surely, one cannot ignore the reader factor that actually recreates the work, however two points need to be taken into account. Firstly, the reader has existed throughout the entire history of the literary process, meaning that the original author has always died in the process of reading, and was immediately replaced by the reader. Secondly, the reader is outside the work as the original author, and his textual reproduction is transcendental. It means that the author's death is not a new phenomenon, and has always existed in the literary process, as demonstrated by M. Fukon and R. Bart.

But why this problem was raised in the postmodern period? It seems that Mr. Cervantes' efforts in Don Quixote's author problems do not occur because of the author's carelessness. In our view, the author's "death" is influenced by immanent factors as well as a transcendental reason. The point is that each literary and artistic example, no matter what literary direction it represents, is a place of conflict with the subject of the objective world: the objective world seeks to integrate multiple points of view to reflect its versatility. From this point of view, the history of the literary process is a continuous conflict of objective and subjective beginnings, sometimes a history of compromise.

REFERENCES

- Bakhtin, M. M. (2021). *The problem of the hero and the author's relationship to the hero*. INFOLIO: University Electronic Library. <http://www.infoliolib.info/philol/bakhtin/1.html>
- Bohmer, E., Kunstmann, R., Mukhopadhyay, P., & Rogers, A. (2017). *The Global Histories of Books: Methods and Practices*. Springer.
- Bryan, J., Wardy, R., & Warren, J. (2018). *Authors and Authorities in Ancient Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hadar, D. (2018). Author-characters and authorial public image: The elderly protagonists in Philip Roth and Nicole Krauss. *Narrative*, 26(3), 282-301.
- Herman, D., Phelan, J., & Rabinowitz, P. J. (2012). *Narrative Theory Core Concepts and Critical Debates*. Ohio State University Press.
- Keefer, D. (1995). Reports of the Death of the Author. *Philosophy and Literature*, 19(1), 78-84.
- Korman, B. O. (1978). *From observations on the terminology of M. M. Bakhtin. The author's problem in Russian literature of the XIX-XX centuries*. Izhevsk.
- Malmgren, C. D. (1985). *Fictional space in the modernist and postmodernist American novel*. Bucknell University Press.
- Rezek, J. (2018). Author. *Early American Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 16(4), 599-606.
- Schmid, W. (2010). *Narratology: An Introduction*. De Gruyter.
- Vinogradov, V. V. (1980). *On the language of artistic prose*. Science.
- Wellek, R., & Warren, A. (1956). *Theory of literature*. Brace & World.