



Author-Function and Modes of Writing in Narration: Reading Alexander Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* and Julian Barnes' *The Noise of Time*

Payam Babaie,¹ (Corresponding Author)

Graduate Student of English Language and Literature, University of Kurdistan, Sanandaj, Iran

Zakarya Bezdoode,²

Assistant Professor of English Language and Literature, University of Kurdistan, Sanandaj, Iran

Article ID

CLS-1909-1025

Article Info

Received Date: 15 July 2019

Reviewed Date: 1 August 2019

Accepted Date: 23 August 2019

Suggested Citation

Babaie, P. and Bezdoode, Z. "Author-Function and Modes of Writing in Narration: Reading Alexander Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* and Julian Barnes' *The Noise of Time*." *Critical Literary Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 2019, pp. 141-158.

¹ payambabaie71@gmail.com

² z.bezdodeh@uok.ac.ir



Abstract

The present study attempts to demonstrate how different texts with various author attitudes depict the oppressed subjects of Stalin's time. For this purpose, Roland Barthes' notion of 'Modes of Writing' and Michel Foucault's concept of 'author' are employed in reading Alexander Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* (1963) and Julian Barnes' *The Noise of Time* (2016). The two novels mainly address the politically subjected characters in the Stalinist regime with different standpoints of author figure. Originating the authors' modes of writing in the mentioned texts, on one hand, and the analysis of author-function, on the other, shall satisfy the comparative tendencies in this research and show how these theoretical frameworks can help a critical understanding of the texts. The subjects described in these novels, although similar in their situations and characteristics and subjected to the same institution of power, are narrated from different author roles and provide a somewhat similar subjectivity. The author figure as a subject of ideology and the text as a created object of an author can be thoroughly analyzed within the proposed theoretical framework; therefore, the main objective of this paper is to explore the depicted subjectivities of similar subjects from different standpoints of distinguishable author figures.

Keywords

Author-Function, Modes of Writing, Author Figure, Subjectivity, Power Institution

1. Introduction

The present paper with a comparative perspective endeavors to study two literary texts that share similarities regarding subjectivity. Here the case studies are



Alexander Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* (1963) and Julian Barnes' *The Noise of Time* (2016) which both deal with subjects of Stalin's time from different author standpoints. The authors of the selected texts develop a somehow similar attitude even though their nationalities differ. Barnes, an English conservative, outside the context of Stalinist regime and Solzhenitsyn, a subject of Stalinism, both depict subjects imprisoned and trapped in the power institution of Stalin yet with different writing modes and viewpoints.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* (1963) represents a subject, a convict of Stalin's regime. It is known that Solzhenitsyn himself was imprisoned and banished by the Soviet Committee; the major character of the novel can be thus related to the author of the text or, in other words, this text could be autobiographical. The extradiegetic narrator describes an entire day of the life of a convict that is why the reader encounters an objective and a realistic narration setting the reader in a position of presuming an author outside the text. Accordingly, Julian Barnes' *The Noise of Time* is mainly concerned with a subject in the late Stalinist regime. 'Dmitri Shostakovich' the famous composer of the Soviet Union as the main character is depicted via an extradiegetic narrator in this novel. Here, the author figure is present in the text but the reader may not presume an author outside the text with an objective perspective.

In the course of this study, the concepts of 'author' and 'text' are of a great significance for the process of the mentioned analysis. This paper, with the main focus on Barthes' notion of 'modes of writing,' a concept developed in his famous book *Writing Degree Zero* (1953), and Foucault's idea of 'author-function,' as introduced in "What Is an Author" (1977), attempts to establish an investigation on the general conception of author figure and demonstrate how the author's *écriture* is related to a specific mode of writing. The two introduced concepts, which will be examined later, function as a basis in the denoting process of the illustrated subjects in the mentioned novels.

It may be useful to mention the reason behind the theoretical juxtaposition of Barthes and Foucault. The two theorists belonging to the same school of thought and members of the Parisian circle were the major proponents of Structuralism and post-Structuralism. Both Barthes and Foucault discuss the notions of author and *écriture*



which relates them together and since their definitions and conceptions are somehow similar, a theory can be formed using their theories alongside each other. However, Barthes' notion of modes of writing functions as the building block of this study. On the one hand, Foucault as the theorist whose ideas in this respect are similar to that of Barthes' and on the other hand, Sartre's idea regarding the commitment of the writer which Barthes is against, are presented in this paper in order to make the theoretical framework, a clear and comprehensive one.

There are some issues that may result in ambiguity and therefore need some brief explanations. One is the use of the term subject instead of character. The reason behind this is that the selected novels depict characters that have social and historical representatives. The main characters or the protagonists of these novels are subjects of the Stalinist regime in its socio-historical sense and they are thus referred to as subjects instead of characters or protagonists. The other issue is related to the provided extracts from the novels as the support for the argument of the paper. The concept of mode of writing, because of its nature and its epistemological essence and morphology, could not be defined or represented by an exact sample or representative. Therefore, the provided extracts may appear irrelevant to the discussion; however, they are tried to be chosen as the fractions of the whole.

Numerous studies and papers could be found related to the selected novels of the present study. Hereafter, the ones with the most relevance to this paper are to be enumerated. In an article entitled "The Subtext of Christian Asceticism in Alexander Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*" (1998), Svitlana Kobets addresses 'The phenomenology of Christian Asceticism' as an important component of Russian literary tradition. She introduces Solzhenitsyn as a follower of the mentioned tradition and brings justifications for her claim in the characters of the novel. Gabriela and Dumitru Tucan, in their article "Denial of Humanity and Forms of Enslavement in the Russian Gulag" (2014) analyze the Early Narratives of Gulag Survivors that is from 1919 to 1940. *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* is among the narratives addressed by the authors and it is regarded as the starting point in the unveiling of the human suffering of the Soviet concentration-camp system.



Michael H. M. Ng in his article entitled “Is Julian Barnes Reliable in Narrating *the Noise of Time*?” (2019) addresses the concept of ‘Unreliable Narrator’ and raises the question parallel to the title of the article. Using Nunning’s perspective on reliability of narration, the researcher concludes, “Barnes is intertextually unreliable in telling the story of Dmitri Shostakovich” (119). In the article “Representation of Trauma as a Political Apparatus in Julian Barnes’s *The Noise of Time*” (2017), Nayeypour explores the function of trauma as a political apparatus and demonstrates how Barnes through his narrative explains trauma systematically implemented by Stalin’s State (7). Additionally, Alex Jones in a review of *The Noise of Time* claims that Shostakovich, the main character of the novel, “suffers a doubly Barthesian misfortune” (2016: 129). His argument refers to Barthes’ “The Death of the Author” where the artist is to become free from his personal history.

2. Theoretical Considerations

The notion of author is a controversial subject in literary criticism and several theorists have discussed this concept with different approaches. The two conceptions of author used here are what Barthes and Foucault describe in their articles on ‘author.’ In the Barthesian approach, the concept of author is mainly described in the article “The Death of the Author” (1967) which is considered the turning point of Barthes thought from structuralism to post-structuralism. Foucault has discussed the issue in his most anthologized essay “What Is an Author?” from the collection of essays *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice* (1977).

Defining what Barthes attributes to the figure of the author is only possible through a thorough reading of “The Death of the Author.” This essay begins with a sentence from Balzac’s *Sarrasine* where Barthes raises the question about the voice behind the narrative and the answer that the voice cannot be designated to a figure. Barthes writes: “writing is the destruction of every voice, of every point of origin. Writing is that neutral, composite, oblique space where our subject slips away, the negative where all identity is lost, starting with the very identity of the body writing.” (1977: 142). Here Barthes puts forth the concept of writing and defines it as a paradigm where the identity is lost and this idea begins with the figure of the author. He then continues that “it is language which speaks, not the author; to write is, through a prerequisite



impersonality (not at all to be confused with the castrating objectivity of the realist novelist), to reach that point where only language acts” (143) which clearly signifies that for Barthes; the concept of language is privileged over the figure of the author.

The concept of ‘author-function’ is the main argument of Foucault’s essay “What Is an Author?” where he asserts that in studying a literary genre or a branch of philosophy, the role of the author and his works are in a priority. In this essay Foucault develops an attitude or a frame of thought regarding the notion of author. He proclaims that he wishes “to restrict” himself “to the singular relationship that holds between an author and a text, the manner in which a text apparently points to this figure who is outside and precedes it” (1977: 115). This approach is mainly concerned with the figure of author as a principle which dominates writing and views the text as a finished product. Furthermore, he continues that writing in this approach transforms into “an interplay of signs, regulated less by the content it signifies than by the very nature of the signifier” (116), that is to say writing as a sign system is controlled by the interactions of the signifiers rather than the content that it tries to convey.

There are some similarities between Foucault’s conception of author and that of Barthes and that is the ‘kinship between writing and death’ (1977: 116). Foucault describes this relationship as that which inverts the notion of writing apparent in Greek narratives and epics where the act of writing was functioning as a guarantee for the immortality of a hero or in a different sense that of *Arabian Nights* where the narration continues as a strategy for postponing death. Foucault claims that the postponing of death or using it as an act for immortalizing the hero in narratives has been transformed to the culture. He writes:

Writing is now linked to sacrifice and to the sacrifice of life itself; it is a voluntary obliteration of the self that does not require representation in books because it takes place in the everyday existence of the writer. Where a work had the duty of creating immortality, it now attains the right to kill, to become the murderer of its author. Flaubert, Proust, and Kafka are obvious examples of this reversal. In addition, we find the link between writing and death manifested in the total effacement of the individual characteristics of the writer... (1977: 117)



Foucault continues that this notion of disappearance or death of the author may have not been fully explored and appreciated in literary criticism. Defining the task of criticism, he argues that criticism is not to reestablish the relationship between the author and his work or the reconstitution of the author's thought and experience through his works (1977: 118). For Foucault, the other significant concept here, is the notion of *écriture* which "stands for a remarkably profound attempt to elaborate the conditions of any text, both the conditions of its spatial dispersion and its temporal deployment" (119). According to his assessments, this concept is the other element that has detained the author's disappearance.

The other concept that functions as a crucial role in this paper is 'the Mode of Writing' introduced in Roland Barthes' *Writing Degree Zero* (1953). This book is divided into two sections of theoretical and historical analysis. The theoretical section mainly approaches the definitions of language and style in relation to the act of writing. It also illustrates how 'a mode of writing' differs from the language and style of a writing. After defining the 'mode of writing,' Barthes analyzes the political, Narratological and poetic modes of writing. The other section is devoted to the concept of writing from a historical viewpoint where for example the bourgeois and the revolutionary writings are analyzed.

The three concepts of language, style and mode of writing -each of which defined separately and in relation to each other and the author- are of a great significance in *Writing Degree Zero*. In defining the concept of language, Barthes writes: "it remains outside the ritual of Letters; it is a social object by definition, not by option" (1970: 9). It can be concluded from the mentioned statement that language is not the personal choice of the author and it is mainly a social phenomenon. Barthes asserts that language is "an abstract circle of truths, outside of which alone the solid residue of an individual logos begins to settle" (9). In Barthes's perspective, language functions appear as a primary prerequisite for the writer who is determined by the social principle.

For Barthes the concept of style is neither a social phenomenon, nor an intentional aspect of writing. He defines the style as:

[...] the writer's 'thing,' his glory and his prison, it is his solitude. Indifferent to society and transparent to it, a closed personal process, it is in no way



the product of a choice or of a reflection on Literature. It is the private portion of the ritual, it rises up from the writer's myth-laden depths and unfolds beyond his area of control. (1970: 11)

Barthes argues that style is an object for the writer which, in a Jacobsonian sense, makes its way through the horizontal axis of language becoming a vertical axis that is not necessarily the intention of the author. He writes:

A language is therefore a horizon, and styles a vertical dimension, which together map out for the writer a Nature, since he does not choose either. The language functions negatively, as the initial limit of the possible, style is a Necessity which binds the writer's humor to his form of expression. In the former, he finds a familiar History, in the latter, a familiar personal past. (1970: 13)

Here according to Barthes, language functions as a history or somehow an identity for the writer where he finds himself. On the other hand, style as the personal aspect of the act of writing, is rooted in the past or in a sense the memory that the writer is entangled with.

3. A Critical Treatment of *Ivan Denisovich* and *The Noise of Time*

3.1. The Author Role

Following the textual approach -what Barthes mainly implies in the essay "The Death of the Author"- helps demonstrating how the narration moves forward and shows the function of the voice talking to the reader as the narrator. In *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* (1963), the extradiegetic narrator describes an entire day of a convict and the reader is facing an objective and realistic narration. In the case of this novel all the events are reported objectively which puts the reader in a situation of presuming an author outside the text, a situation that is radically different when dealing with Barthes' novel.

Barthes privileges language over the author figure and describes writing as a domain of language, empty of the authority of a 'scriptor.' Therefore, the notion of a single meaning of a text is completely put aside as Barthes claims "we know now that a text is not a line of words releasing a single 'theological' meaning (the 'message' of



the Author-God) but a multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash” (1977: 146). In this essay Barthes asserts that designating an author for a text, will limit and close that text. Moreover, he declares that “a text is made of multiple writings, drawn from many cultures and entering into mutual relations of dialogue, parody, contestation” (1977: 148) and continues that this multiplicity is focused on the reader rather than the author.

Finally, Barthes concludes that the unity of the text is in its destination that is the reader. He writes: “[...] this destination cannot any longer be personal: the reader is without history, biography, psychology; he is simply that someone who holds together in a single field all the traces by which the written text is constituted” (1977: 148). He criticizes the classic criticism where the writer is the only person and the reader is forgotten and closes the essay with the somewhat well-known and controversial claim that “[to] give writing its future, it is necessary to overthrow the myth: the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author” (1977: 148). Thus, it can be concluded that in a Barthesian approach, the ultimate standpoint is to eliminate the figure of the author and approach the text just as a reader.

To eliminate the figure of the author as Barthes suggests, is to deal with the language that operates. As discussed before, language in Barthes view is not a personal activity; it rather holds a social aspect. Barthes asserts that ‘the language speaks not the author,’ but he also makes clear that in the case of an objective narration it is not so. Therefore, since we are dealing with a realistic narration, the text is not empty with impersonality and thus the above mentioned text acquires the classical role of the author: “The noise stopped, and outside the window it was pitch dark when Shukhov got up to go to the latrines; it was as dark as night. Then the yellow light from three lamps – two on the perimeter; one inside the camp – fell on the window” (1974: 7).

In *The Noise of Time*, the real author is not a hidden figure behind the words and with his presence in the text he helps the reader to forget about him as a figure outside and dominating the text. In other words, the author function of the mentioned novel does not follow the classical function of the author figure and therefore the relationship between the reader and the author is not a conventional one. On the contrary, in *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*, the classical mode of narration



and the presence of the author figure as a figure outside the text, limits the text and the reader may be overshadowed by the figure of the author. Barthes asserts that in a narrative, language speaks rather than the author and the writer should maintain the impersonality, but in *The Noise of Time* although we have a real-author, the narration remains impersonal and detached from the author. The provided extract can represent this idea:

Destiny. It was just a grand term for something you could do nothing about. When life said to you, 'And so,' you nodded, and called it destiny. And so, it had been his destiny to be called Dmitri Dmitrievich. There was nothing to be done about that. Naturally, he didn't remember his own christening, but had no reason to doubt the truth of the story. (2016: 16)

In relation with Barthes' argument regarding the role of the author, Foucault puts forth the idea of 'author-function' and asserts that the author's name is not just an element of speech, rather it functions as a means of classification. He writes: "A name can group together a number of texts and thus differentiate them from others. A name also establishes different forms of relationships among texts" (1977: 123). For him the name of the author separates a group of texts from others, defines their form and characterizes their mode of existence as a certain discourse and points to its status in a society and culture (123). Another concept that is introduced in "What Is an Author?" is the 'transdiscursive' position of the author. Referring to examples like Freud and Marx, Foucault argues that "the distinctive contribution of these authors is that they produced not only their own work, but the possibility and the rules of formation of other texts" (131) and asserts that these authors establish the ongoing possibility of a discourse.

As discussed before, for Foucault the name of the author functions in various aspects. It separates a group of texts from others, defines the form and the mode of existence of a certain text and shows its status in a society and culture. Therefore, *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* as a realist narrative points to the figure outside it. Thus to analyze the author role in this novel from a Foucauldian perspective is to focus on the author as a principle that dominates the text. The presence of an authorship can be seen throughout the novel particularly when he writes: "There is



no harm in trying, why not go up to the infirmary and aim for a few days off work? Anyway, his whole body ached” (1974: 9). Solzhenitsyn, a subject of Stalinism, narrates a subject in a working camp in the Soviet Union. This narration, pointing to the figure outside it, may reveal the author’s subjectivity as a figure dominating the text.

The name of the author in *The Noise of Time* can help us in analyzing the author-function proposed by Foucault. Here, the author-function demonstrates how Barnes’ text as a discourse is articulated on the basis of the reader’s relationship. The presence of Barnes’ as an author figure in his works, could be considered a definition for his form. His works do not point to the figure preceding the text; rather, they form a group separate from the other texts. Therefore, in this respect it can be concluded that Barnes has achieved a specific *écriture* that is a distinct mode of writing.

Moreover, Foucault addresses the author-function as a notion that would not form spontaneously through the mere attribution of a discourse to an individual. He writes that “it would be false to consider the function of the author as a pure and simple reconstruction after the fact of a text given as passive material, since a text always bears a number of signs that refer to the author” (1977: 129). Foucault concludes, “the ‘author-function’ could also reveal the manner in which discourse is articulated on the basis of social relationships” (137). These arguments and assessments around the concept of author can lead us towards a strict realization of this concept. It additionally may help us proceed to the critical notion of ‘Modes of Writing’ in Barthes theoretical framework of thought; the concept that will guide us to the main discussion regarding the study of subjects in the chosen texts from the angle of their author figure and their modes of writing constructed by their sociocultural provenance.

3.2. The Mode of Writing

In *Writing Degree Zero* Barthes challenges Jean-Paul Sartre’s idea of ‘commitment of the writer’ from *What Is Literature?* (1947). Although Barthes might have an antagonistic approach towards Sartre’s conception of writing, these two books maintain a somewhat similar argument in that the first sections of the two books are entitled ‘What is Writing?’ Moreover, Barthes being under the influence of Marxism and literary-philosophical Existentialism at the time of writing his book (Allen, 2003:



9), could be the best way to demonstrate the strict relationship of the two mentioned books and the two figures as literary critics.

Sartre's main argument in *What Is Literature* is basically related to the notion of freedom and the relation between author and the reader. Regarding the author or the writer, Sartre claims that the writer writes in a way that "[...] free men may feel their freedom as they face it" (1988: 67). The other major part of this book is about the factors that could jeopardize the commitment and the freedom of the writer. Graham Allen in *Roland Barthes* (2003) asserts that "Two interrelated approaches are taken to this crucial issue: a history of the development of literature [...]; a review of the current position of the writer in post-war France" (10-11). In relation to the jeopardizing factors for commitment of the writer, Allen enumerates the development in the history of literature and the social status of the writer as Sartre's approaches in confronting the mentioned issue.

Moreover, Sartre claims that modern bourgeois writers would not write in favor of their class and for their own purposes; thus, they would become alienated and not committed. As a consequence, he considers avant-garde writings a representative of alienation, a claim contrary to that of Barthes. Sartre's notion of commitment is not to follow the literary conventions of bourgeois culture. He, rather, asserts that avant-gardism fails to communicate with the reader and an avant-garde writer is not a committed one. The described situation seems like a deadlock where writing cannot progress and this statement is somehow stated by Sartre himself where he writes: "we have fallen outside history and are speaking in the desert" (1988: 215). Barthes' disagreement with Sartre's notion of commitment is regulated through the concepts of language, style and writing (*écriture*) where he tries to redefine the concept of literary commitment. For Barthes commitment takes place in the writing mode of an author that requires selection and choice and, as a result, 'commitment.'

The author's mode of writing, to borrow Barthes terminology, is the identity of the writer (1970: 13-14). As mentioned before, language and style are not determined by the author's intentions; however, they have roots in the subjectivity of the author as an individual. He writes, "Now every Form is also a Value, which is why there is room, between a language and a style, for another formal reality: writing" (1970: 13). On the other hand, Barthes considers the mode of writing as an interrelated act with history.



Language and style are objects for the writer; however, the mode of writing is a function with a relationship between creation and society (13-14). Barthes writes: "Placed at the center of the problematics of literature, which cannot exist prior to it, writing is thus essentially the morality of form, the choice of that social area within which the writer elects to situate the Nature of his language" (15). This presented statement shows how the mode of writing is produced as a relationship between creation and society.

Following the previously discussed definitions, addressing the writing mode of an author is to put aside the language and style of the writer and focus on how the identity of a writer has formed through his writing. The mode of writing can be analyzed through the relationship between creation and society. The other major element in the study of an author's mode of writing is the influence of history and tradition. Here, Solzhenitsyn's writing regarding his author role discussed earlier, has a strict relationship with the society he lived in and the Russian tradition of realist narratives. Himself as a subject under the pressure of Stalin's power relation can be related to the subject that he narrates.

Solzhenitsyn's form and style have been transformed to his mode of writing in relation to the social intention that he holds. His writing mode becomes a form in relation to the concept of history. However, this mode of writing that is the objective realistic narration is absorbed and contained by literature and cannot grasp a mode of existence. It can be concluded that Solzhenitsyn's depiction of a subject in the acquired mode of writing does not bring about an identity and this mode does not stand out in the history of writing. The mode of writing cannot be chosen from a collection of literary forms; rather, it is constructed by the author's outlook on history and tradition; Solzhenitsyn maintains a mode that may have been regulated by Stalinism. Therefore, although anti-Stalinist in content, the form of this novel is doomed to resolve in history and fail.

On the other hand, Barnes can be considered a committed writer both in a Sartreian and Barthesian sense. Sartre defines a committed writer the one who does not follow the conventions of the bourgeois culture and yet remains communicative. Barnes could be a suitable example for a committed writer in this sense and also in a Barthesian sense where commitment takes place in the mode of writing. The



support for this claim is that Barnes has a distinguishable writing mode and, therefore, it gives him a recognizable identity. Moreover, Barnes' mode of writing is strictly interrelated with the concepts of history and tradition. His tendency to recreate history plays a crucial role in defining his writing mode and it is one of his motifs as presented in the provided example from the text:

He thought about Zakrevsky, and the big house, and who might have replaced Zakrevsky there. Someone would have done. There was never a shortage of Zakrevskys, not in this world, constituted as it was. Perhaps when Paradise was achieved, in almost exactly 200,000,000,000 years' time, the Zakrevskys would no longer need to exist. (2016: 16)

The mode of writing, as Barthes argues, is the way of looking at literature, not an expansion of its borders. In demonstrating how a certain mode of writing is created, Barthes asserts that "it is under the pressure of History and Tradition that the possible modes of writing for a given writer are established; there is a History of Writing" (1970: 16). Providing an example in the last sentences of the section titled 'What Is Writing?' in *Writing Degree Zero* Barthes concludes:

What separates the 'thought' of a Balzac from that of a Flaubert is a variation within the same school; what contrasts their modes of writing is an essential break, at the precise moment when a new economic structure is joined on to an older one, thereby bringing about decisive changes in mentality and consciousness. (17-18)

Another aspect of Barnes' writings is that they stand aside from an easy resolving into literature. His writing cannot simply hold the definition of literature particularly in the case of *The Noise of Time*. This novel in a Historiographical sense is a unification of history and fiction, since the main character is a real person and his calamities with the Stalinist regime are real. Yet it remains fictional because the reader deals with Shostakovich's thoughts and private moments that cannot belong to a historical document or record. In the truest sense, Barnes mode of writing is his way of looking at literature and not an expansion of the literary borders.



3.3. The Oppressed Subjects in *Ivan Denisovich* and *The Noise of Time*

In *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*, we have a prisoner of a working camp narrated throughout one ordinary day in 1950. Ivan Denisovich Shukhov, being under a complete surveillance in the working camp prison, is narrated through an objective and hetero-diegetic narration. The eye that follows him and narrates his day is like the eye of the prison guards that keep him under surveillance. Narration of this kind points to the author figure behind the text; therefore, analyzing the author function will lead to the understanding of the subject narrated.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn narrates a subject from a standpoint that is similar to his own situation. In other words, a subject in the time of Stalin's regime is narrated by an author that has had a somehow similar situation: "There is no point in expecting someone who's warm to understand someone who's cold. [...] The cold was oppressive. A biting, foggy chill enveloped Shukhov and made him cough raspily. The temperature was -27, and Shukhov was ninety-nine. It was one against the other" (1974: 24). Solzhenitsyn, having a critical viewpoint toward the power institution, was imprisoned and sentenced to labor camps where he wrote the mentioned novel. Thus, the subjectivity of the writer can be related to the subjectivity of Shukhov the main character. Here, the author-function could be compared with *The Noise of Time* that somehow narrates a similar subject but with a completely different author standpoint.

They always came for you in the middle of the night. And so, rather than be dragged from the apartment in his pyjamas, or forced to dress in front of some contemptuously impassive NKVD man, he would go to bed fully clothed, lying on top of the blankets, a small case already packed on the floor beside him. (2016: 19-20)

In *The Noise of Time*, Dmitri Shostakovich, a paranoid subject of the Soviet power institution who constantly fears the figure of Stalin, is narrated by an author who is completely outside this situation and unlike Solzhenitsyn's novel does not have any relation to the subject he is narrating. Barnes with a historical approach narrates the life and fears of Shostakovich but he has no relation to it. Like Shukhov, the subject in Solzhenitsyn's novel, Shostakovich finds himself under the surveillance of Stalin and subjected to the dominant power institution. Being a composer whose works and



musical pieces are banned, he is regulated by the power to conduct what is wanted from him rather than following his own preferences in the art he creates.

4. Conclusion

The Noise of Time and *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* are novels with similarities regarding the narration and the subjects they narrate and differences in modes of writing and author-function. *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* with a third person, objective and realist narration depicts a subject as a convict in a labor camp under the power of Stalin's institution. On the other hand, *The Noise of Time* from a different author standpoint and author-function narrates a subject that feels himself under a complete surveillance of the power institution. Solzhenitsyn's mode of writing, because of its nature, does not maintain an identity for the writer and like the other writing modes that follow the conventions of their time is contained in literature. The language and style in the writing of Solzhenitsyn do not help him to come up with a specific mode of writing and therefore his depiction of Shukhov's subjectivity does not bring sympathy for the reader although he, as the author, shares some similarities with his character's situation.

On the contrary, Barnes with his specific style and mode of writing narrates a character that is not in a close affinity with his own subjectivity but it is successful in making the reader sympathetic. Here, the author maintains a role and a function that is not separate from the text and does not precede the writing as an omniscient God. This factor in Barnes' writings can be the reason for his creation to belong to a certain mode of writing that does not follow the literary conventions and remains committed to the act of writing. Barnes with a specific mode of writing narrates a subject from an extra-diegetic viewpoint that may be in some sense realistic but it cannot be considered an objective one. In *One day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* the objective tone classifies the novel in a category with a classic role of the author but in *The Noise of Time* we encounter a narration that belongs to an author's mode of writing that is distinguishable and maintains an author role different from that of Solzhenitsyn's.

Concerning the proposed case of both literary texts under investigation, it could be concluded that the text with an author-function is loosely related to the depicted subject but successful in achieving an authentic mode of writing. This text is more



affluent and authentic than the text with an author-function connected to the narrated subject; the author of *One day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* has not achieved a writing mode and simply follows the language and style that, according to Barthes, he does not have any role in acquiring it. A mode of writing established for an author comes from the pressure of history and tradition: the factors that Solzhenitsyn may have neglected while Barnes has succeeded in achieving them.





References

- Allen, G. *Roland Barthes*, Routledge: London & New York, 2003.
- Barnes, J. *The Noise of Time*, Vintage: London, 2016.
- Barthes, R. *Writing Degree Zero*, Trans. Annette Lavers and Colin Smith, Beacon Press: Boston, 1970.
- Barthes, R. "The Death of the Author" in *Image, Music, Text*, Trans. and Ed. Stephen Heath), Fotana Press: London, 1977, pp. 142-148.
- Foucault, M. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan, Random House: New York, 1995.
- Foucault, M. "What Is an Author?" in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, Trans. Donald f. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, Cornell University Press: New York, 1977, pp. 113-138.
- Jones, A. "A Review of *The Noise of Time* by Julian Barnes." *Philament Online Journal of Literature, Arts, and Culture*, No. 22, 2016, pp. 129-132.
- Kobets, Svitlana. "The Subtext of Christian Asceticism in Alexander Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*." *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 42, Issue. 4. 1998, pp. 661-676.
- Michael H. M. Ng. "Is Julian Barnes Reliable in Narrating *the Noise of Time*?" *English Language and Literature Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 1, 2019, pp. 114-119. DOI:10.5539/ells.v9n1p114
- Nayebpour, K. "Representation of Trauma as a Political Apparatus in Julian Barnes's *The Noise of Time*." *IUP Journal of English Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 2017, pp. 7-24.
- Sartre, J. "What is *Literature?*" and *Other Essays*, Trans. Bernard Frechtman, Harvard University Press: Massachusetts, 1988.
- Solzhenitsyn, A. *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*, Trans. Gillon Aitken, Sphere Books: London, 1974.
- Tucan, D. and Tucan, G. "Denial of Humanity and Forms of Enslavement in the Russian Gulag: Early Narratives of Gulag Survivors (1919-1940)." *Ars Aeterna*, Vol. 6, No. 1, 2014. DOI: 10.2478/aaT2014T0002



پروپوزیشن گاہ علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرهنگی
پرتال جامع علوم انسانی