



The Death of the Author Revisited: Authorship in Hypertext and E-Literature

Ariharan S

Ph.D. Research Scholar

School of Liberal Arts and Humanities

Woxsen University

Hyderabad, Telangana

ABSTRACT

Digital narratives from early hypertext fiction to contemporary interactive media – foreground reader agency and technological mediation. We trace the theoretical lineage from Barthes's and Foucault's critiques of the author to poststructuralist accounts of open texts, then analyze how hypertext ("a galaxy of signifiers") and *ergodic* literature demand nontrivial reader interaction (as per Aarseth). This paper examines how the shift from print to digital media transforms traditional notions of literary authorship. Drawing on Roland Barthes's 1967 dictum that "the birth of the reader must be ransomed by the death of the author" (Vitali-Rosati, 2014) and Michel Foucault's concept of the author-function as a discursive construct, we argue that hypertext and electronic literature enact a new paradigm of distributed authorship.

We show how authorship in e-literature becomes a joint venture: the author as designer (Bolter), the reader as co-creator, and the technology as co-author (Hayles's notion of medium materiality). Case studies such as Michael Joyce's *afternoon, a story* and Shelley Jackson's *Patchwork Girl* illustrate these shifts. (Writing Façade: A Case Study in Procedural Authorship, 2008) Lastly, we contend that Barthes's metaphorical "death" is being *materialized* rather than simply proclaimed: authorship is now a distributed process among writers, readers, and code. This analysis extends Barthes and Foucault into the digital age and offers implications for literary theory and pedagogy in an era of networked texts. (Mazzali-Lurati, 2009)

KEYWORDS:

Electronic Literature, Hypertext Fiction, Authorship, Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, Reader-response, Ergodic Literature, Media Materiality, Distributed Authorship

INTRODUCTION

The transition to digital media has profoundly altered how narratives are authored, read, and interpreted. In the print era, authorship was typically viewed as a singular, stable source of meaning; Roland Barthes famously challenged this in *“The Death of the Author”* (1967), arguing that once a text is written, the author’s intentions no longer govern interpretation and “writing begins”. Today, hypertext and e-literature – which include interactive fiction, multimedia poetry, and networked narratives – concretely realize this post-structuralist decentering of authorship. In hypertext the reader actively navigates multiple pathways; in electronic literature digital tools and algorithms participate in creating meaning. (Bell, 2010)

This paper revisits Barthes’s thesis in the context of these developments, asking how authorship is *reconfigured* rather than simply “abolished” in digital texts. We combine a theoretical literature review (Barthes, Foucault) with analyses of hypertext and electronic works to show that authorship becomes distributed across authors, readers, and machines. (Mazzali-Lurati, 2009). The aim is to demonstrate that Barthes’s “death” is being materialized: the author is no longer the sole authority, but part of a network of signification. Understanding this shift is crucial for contemporary literary studies and pedagogy in a media-saturated age.(Biswas, 2021)

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF AUTHORSHIP

Roland Barthes’s essay (1967) launched the post-structural critique of the author’s authority. Barthes argues that a text is “‘neuter, composite, [and] oblique’” – a multilayered voice into which every authorial identity “escapes”. In his most famous claim, Barthes declares that “the birth of the reader must be ransomed by the death of the Author”. In other words, meaning arises in the interplay of signifiers and readers’ interpretations, not from the writer’s biography or intent. Barthes’s “writerly” text requires active creation of meaning by readers, subverting the traditional author-centered model (Barthes, 1977). Although metaphorical, this idea opened the door for seeing texts as open-ended and decentered.

Michel Foucault built on such ideas by analyzing the author-function. In *“What Is an Author?”* (Barthes, 1969), Foucault argues that “the author” is a historical and institutional category – a *discursive function* that varies across contexts. The author’s name groups texts together and assigns them special status, but this role is neither universal nor inherent. For example, Foucault notes that in many traditions (myths, folk tales, oral narratives) texts had no single author, and that scientific texts eventually detached from any individual author as evidence grew in authority. As Richard Grusin summarizes, Foucault writes: “The author – or what I have called the ‘author-function’ – is undoubtedly only one of the possible specifications of the subject... the existence of this function [is] far from immutable”. In other words, the author-function can dissolve, making way for a conception of text as a field of multiple influences.(Foucault, 2019) Together, Barthes and Foucault lay a foundation for reader-centered criticism and the idea that an author is a *constructed locus of meaning, not a pre-given origin*. Their insights resonate strongly in the digital era, where technology literally entwines author, reader, and text.(Barthes, 1967)

DIGITAL LITERATURE AND HYPERTEXT: A NEW LITERARY PARADIGM

Electronic literature (e-lit) refers to works that originate in digital form and use features of digital media. Hayles notes that traditional literary criticism has often treated texts as immaterial, but digital writing calls for *media-specific* analysis that is “attentive to the materiality of the medium”. Electronic literature typically involves hypertext or hypermedia: linking nodes of text (and often images or sound) into networks. (Angello, 2015)

George Landow characterizes hypertext as text composed of “blocks of words (or images) linked electronically by multiple paths” (Landow. 1992). Features of e-literature include non-linearity (no fixed narrative sequence), interactivity (reader’s choices determine path), and multimodality (integration of text, graphics, audio, etc.). Unlike print, an electronic text can continually change, present different sequences, and incorporate user inputs. Digital hypertext realizes many post-structuralist ideals. Landow observes that Barthes’s model of the “ideal text” – one that is a “galaxy of signifiers” with “no beginning” and “*several entrances, none of which can be authoritatively declared to be the main one*” – is essentially hypertextual. In hypertext each link creates a new entry point into the narrative, so no single linear path is privileged. (Berk & Devlin, 1991) This inherent non-linearity mirrors the post-structuralist notion that meaning is fluid and constructed by the reader rather than being fixed by the author (Modir et al., 2014). Likewise, Derrida’s idea of endlessly deferred meaning aligns with hyperlinking references. Indeed, Landow argues that “*hypertext embodies many of the ideas and attitudes proposed by Barthes, Derrida, Foucault, and others*”. The technology of hypertext provides a practical “laboratory” for testing these theories: reading a hypertext graphically shows networks of signification that print can only metaphorically suggest.

Espen Aarseth coined the term “ergodic literature” to describe texts that require nontrivial effort by the reader to traverse (Aarseth, 1997). Hypertext fictions are prime examples: the reader must make choices (click links, follow paths) to create a narrative sequence. Aarseth’s definition – “nontrivial effort is required to allow the reader to traverse the text” – emphasizes that reading hypertext is an active, even laborious process compared to simply reading printed matter. In traditional novels the reader’s work is “trivial” (turning pages), but in hypertext the reader must decide which link to follow at each node. This effort means the reader is not passively consuming a fixed text but actively co-constructing the story (Aarseth, 1997). For example, Michael Joyce’s *afternoon, a story* offers dozens of fragmented lexia; readers click on highlighted words and gradually piece together the events. This “multilinear” structure shifts agency to the reader: as Landow notes, hypertext “fulfills the goal of literature as work... to make the reader no longer a consumer, but a producer of the text”. In short, hypertext actualizes Barthes’s idea of the reader as the site of meaning. (Bell, 2010) This dynamic engagement fundamentally alters the relationship between author, text, and audience, leading to the “birth of the wreader,” a hybrid role that blurs the lines between reading and writing (Kouta, 2020). This active co-creation fundamentally challenges traditional notions of authorial control, raising questions about whether the author truly relinquishes authority in such dynamic environments (McAdams & Berger, 2001).

RECONFIGURING AUTHORSHIP IN DIGITAL TEXTS

The above changes in reading and text demand a corresponding shift in how we conceive the author. In digital texts the author's role becomes more that of a designer or architect of possibilities, rather than a lone oracle of intent. Jay David Bolter points out that "the author of a hypertext is a *less commanding figure* than the author of a printed work". Unlike traditional novels (which are seen as the product of a singular ego), hypertext is explicitly collaborative: "the author's work is not the product of his ego alone; instead, the author works in collaboration with the readers to create the text" [4]. In other words, the author anticipates multiple readings and offers a structure; the reader enacts the narrative within that structure. Bolter's metaphor of the author as a node within a network of content-discriminations (after Dennett) underscores that in hypertext the author's identity and authority are dispersed.

AUTHOR AS DESIGNER:

With hypertext tools (Storyspace, Twine, etc.), the writer constructs a web of interconnected nodes. As Landow notes, hypertext allows the assembly of contexts in which "the article would now be woven more tightly into its context than [any] printed counterpart". The author / designer chooses what links to include, what text to present at each node, and what media to embed – thus framing but not finalizing meaning. (Understanding Hypertext, 2021)

The author's function shifts from dictating a single narrative line to mapping out a landscape of narrative possibilities (Bolter 1991). This resonates with Foucault's "author-function": the writer provides a recognizable signature or style to a body of work, but the ultimate "authority" over meaning is fractional. (Foucault, 2019)

READER AS CO-CREATOR:

In hypertext and interactive fiction, readers share authorship by making interpretive choices. Each click or decision is a small act of writing, determining which text surfaces next. Jackson's *Patchwork Girl* epitomizes this: Shelley Jackson wove together fragments of text and images, but the reader must "sew [the story] together" by following links between body parts of Mary Shelley's monster (Jackson 1995). Jackson herself observes that "In hypertext, everything is there at once and equally weighted. It is a body whose brain is dispersed throughout the cells".

In practical terms, the reader of *Patchwork Girl* actively composes a version of the text by stitching lexias into a coherent whole. Thus interpretation is not an after-the-fact activity but part of the text's production. Scholarly theorists (e.g. Wolfgang Iser) have long recognized that readers fill gaps in print texts, but hypertext makes this process explicit: the need to "choose" and the visible structure turns reader-response theory into lived experience. (Dillon & McKnight, 1990)

TECHNOLOGY AS CO-AUTHOR:

A further dimension is that the digital medium itself participates in authorship. The algorithmic and interactive features of electronic literature – from random linking algorithms to AI-generated text – mean that software and hardware shape the work. As Hayles emphasizes, the *materiality* of the medium matters: code, interface and machine processing influence what the text can do. The very fact that a text is digital (and not simply a digital facsimile of print) can alter its properties. (McCormack et al., 2023)

For example, a Twine story can include variables and conditionals such that the reader's name or choices alter future passages, effectively giving the computer a role in creating narrative content. In this sense, we might say technology becomes a co-author: the medium enforces rules and affordances (networked connectivity, multimedia embedding, randomization) that no human author could fully predict. As Grusin notes, electronic writing “disperses the subject so that it no longer functions as a center in the way it did in pre-electronic writing”, implying that agency is shared among many factors (writers, readers, machines).

In summary, authorship in digital texts is reconfigured: writers act as designers of narrative spaces, readers act as producers of experience, and technology acts as an agent shaping the text. The text itself becomes a network, and the author's authority is necessarily distributed across that network. (McAdams & Berger, 2001)

CASE STUDIES IN HYPERTEXT AND E-LITERATURE

To illustrate these dynamics, we consider key examples of hypertext fiction and interactive literature.

Michael Joyce's *afternoon, a story* (1987) story often cited as the first hypertext fiction, *afternoon* presents a fractured narrative about a man who may have witnessed a fatal accident involving his son. The text is divided into linked lexias with no fixed order. Readers navigate by clicking on highlighted words; as Jill Walker notes, Joyce's hyperfiction demands that readers “piece together” a story from overlapping narrative segments. Indeed, *afternoon* is explicitly ergodic: as Aarseth observes, “non-trivial effort is required to let the reader traverse the text”. Without choosing links, a reader cannot progress. (Walker, 1999)

Joyce also embedded a “default” path (accessible by repeatedly hitting return) that offers one conventional narrative, but typical readers explore haphazardly. This means each person's version of the story is unique, emerging from their own sequence of link selections. The reader effectively co-authors the narrative by assembling clues; meaning is not handed down but discovered in action. Joyce's work vividly demonstrates how hypertext realizes Barthes's “writerly text” and Foucault's loss of authorial center: the “story” has no single authorial line, only the collaborative result of navigation. (McAdams & Berger, 2001)

In Shelley Jackson's *Patchwork Girl* (1995), Jackson's hypertext novel (written in Storyspace) remixes the Frankenstein myth by having Mary Shelley create her monster through text and images. *Patchwork Girl* is structured as five interlinked chapters (“Graveyard,” “Journal,” etc.), each using a different layout of text and pictures. The narrative is profoundly non-linear: multiple linking words on each page send readers looping through thematic or tangential segments. As one commentator notes, hypertext in

Patchwork Girl exhibits qualities of collage – “appropriation, assemblage, concatenation, and the blurring of limits, edges, and borders” – reflecting how identity and gender itself become “patched”. (Hackman, 2011)

Jackson’s own epigraph captures the ethos: “In hypertext, everything is there at once and equally weighted. It is a body whose brain is dispersed throughout the cells”. The reader must actively navigate (“sew together” the pieces) to make sense of the story. In doing so, the reader imitates the monster’s fragmented embodiment. Authorship is thus layered: Jackson provides the fragments and thematic framework, but the reader’s choices and even moments of serendipity assemble the narrative. No two readers will travel the same path, and the “author” of the final text is effectively shared by Jackson, her software, and each reader’s interactive journey.

More recent platforms like Twine have democratized interactive writing. Twine tools allow anyone to create branching stories or poems with little coding knowledge. The result is a proliferation of hypertextual and interactive works (often distributed online or through social media). For instance, educators use Twine to craft choose-your-own-adventure narratives, and creative communities publish personal interactive essays. (Bell, 2010) These works often blur lines between author and audience: authors sometimes collaborate (sharing link code), and some Twine publications even encourage readers to remix or expand the story. The distributed, collective nature of Twine communities exemplifies the trend: authorship is no longer assumed to be a discrete, proprietary commodity. Instead, it operates in a network of creators and participants. (While we do not analyze a specific Twine title here, the platform’s ethos reinforces our themes: for example, the Electronic Book Review notes that Twine enables “personal storytelling and individual disruption on an increasingly corporate web” – highlighting how hypertext can undermine traditional authorial control (Rettberg, 2017)). Each of these cases shows hypertextual authorship in action: the single “author-genius” model dissolves into a complex, interactive process.

REVISITING “THE DEATH OF THE AUTHOR” IN THE DIGITAL AGE

Given the above, we can re-examine Barthes’s famous claim. Barthes used the “death” of the author as a figurative provocation: he sought to “reverse [literature’s] myth” that tied meaning to authorial intent. In that sense, the digital age literalizes Barthes’s metaphor. In hypertext and e-literature, authorial control is indeed undermined, not just theoretically but practically. Bolter observed that electronic writing “emphasizes the impermanence and changeability of text, and it tends to reduce the distance between author and reader”. Landow explicitly links hypertext to post-structuralist theory, noting that hypermedia “embodies” ideas of Barthes, Foucault, etc. In hypertext the author is dislodged from the center; as Grusin notes, digital texts “disperse the subject so that it no longer functions as a center”.

However, saying “the author is dead” might be an overstatement. Our analysis suggests not a wholesale demise, but a transformation. Authorship becomes distributed: in any digital narrative, authorship is shared among the human writer, the choices of numerous readers, and the affordances or algorithms of the medium. One might call it the “metamorphosis” of the author. The author is no longer the sole origin of meaning, but they are still a participant: they design the world and voice of the text, embed certain constraints and possibilities, and thus steer interpretation within bounds. Readers now serve as co-authors

who realize one of many potential stories. Technology too is a (sometimes unpredictable) authorial force: as Jackson's "everything at once" quote implies, the software environment holds pieces in stasis and lets the reader animate them.

Thus, rather than a literal "death," the author has been de-centered and networked. Barthes anticipated this shift: he described literature as a neuter space where "every identity is lost". That is exactly what we see in digital narratives – the text no longer carries a clear fingerprint of a single individual. (Smith, 2012) In Foucault's terms, the author-function is not abolished, but it is one function among many. The attribution of the work may still bear a name (Joyce, Jackson, etc.), but that name signifies a *position* in a discourse, not an omnipotent origin. In sum, the "death of the author" has indeed been enacted by technology, but what has emerged is a new model: authorship is *relational*. We might invoke Barthes again, noting that the author is "only that someone who holds...all the paths of which the text is constituted". In hypertext that someone includes both the writer and all who navigate the text. Future directions – including AI-generated narrative and massively collaborative storytelling – will likely further blur these lines. For now, our conclusion is that digital practice extends Barthes and Foucault: it shows how authorship can be "distributed" rather than simply vanquished. (Situma, 2015)

CONCLUSION

This study has shown that the shift to digital literature demands a rethinking of authorship. Key findings are that hypertext and electronic texts operationalize the poststructuralist critique of authorial primacy. The author's role shifts from omnipotent creator to *designer of a reading experience*, the reader from passive recipient to *active co-creator*, and the technology itself to a form of co-author.

Barthes's metaphorical "death" of the author becomes tangible: the narrative space is de-centered among multiple agents. This paper extends the theory of authorship by integrating early critics (Barthes, Foucault) with digital media theory (Landow, Bolter, Hayles, Aarseth). It suggests that rather than mourn the author's passing, we should examine the "rebirth" of authorship as distributed and interactive. (Sánchez-López et al., 2020) For literary studies, this means developing analytical tools for non-linear, participatory texts – a media-specific criticism approach in Hayles's terms. In pedagogy, it highlights teaching students to navigate and interpret open narratives, and to appreciate authorship as collaborative. The theoretical contribution is to update Barthes & Foucault: showing that the "death" thesis was not an endpoint but a prelude to new authorial configurations. (Almujalli, 2023)

The landscape continues to evolve with AI authors, collaborative platforms, and social media narratives. Each raises questions about authority and creativity (for example, if an algorithm writes a story, who is the author? Do we speak of "the authorial function" of code?). (Hendricks, 2002) These topics promise rich avenues for further research. Ultimately, the study of authorship in the digital age will remain central to understanding how culture is created and consumed in a networked world.

REFERENCES

1. Almujaalli, H. (2023). Author, Text, and Writing: Roland Barthes and “The Death of the Author.” *Journal of the College of Languages*, 48, 1. <https://doi.org/10.36586/jcl.2.2023.0.48.0001>
2. Angello, A. (2015). To Archive or Not to Archive: The Resistant Potential of Digital Poetry. *Text Matters*, 5, 13. <https://doi.org/10.1515/texmat-2015-0002>
3. Barthes, R. (1967). *The Death of the Author*. https://letras.cabaladada.org/letras/death_author.pdf
4. Bell, A. (2010). The Possible Worlds of Hypertext Fiction. In *Palgrave Macmillan UK eBooks*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230281288>
5. Berk, E., & Devlin, J. (1991). What is Hypertext. *ACM Conference on Hypertext*, 3. <https://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=116408.116410>
6. Biswas, A. (2021). A Critical Analysis of the Post-structuralist Thought with Reference to ‘The Death of the Author’ by Roland Barthes. *International Journal of Linguistics Literature & Translation*, 4(1), 195. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2021.4.1.18>
7. Dillon, A., & McKnight, C. (1990). Towards a classification of text types: a repertory grid approach. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 33(6), 623. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0020-7373\(05\)80066-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0020-7373(05)80066-5)
8. Foucault, M. (2019). What Is an Author? In *Cornell University Press eBooks* (p. 141). <https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501743429-006>
9. Hackman, P. (2011). “I Am a Double Agent”: Shelley Jackson’s Patchwork Girl and the Persistence of Print in the Age of Hypertext. *Contemporary Literature*, 52(1), 84. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cli.2011.0013>
10. Hendricks, C. (2002). The Author[’s] Remains: Foucault and the Demise of the “Author-Function.” *Philosophy Today*, 46(2), 152. <https://doi.org/10.5840/philtoday200246244>
11. Kouta, A. T. M. (2020). Narrative Nonlinearity and the Birth of the Wreader: A Hypertext Critical Reading of Selected Digital Literary Texts. *Critique Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, 62(5), 586. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00111619.2020.1804820>
12. Mazzali-Lurati, S. (2009). Subjects and reading strategies in hypermedia: The re-emergence of the author. *Semiotica*, 2009(173). <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.2009.025>
13. McAdams, M., & Berger, S. (2001). Hypertext. *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0006.301>
14. McCormack, J., Gambardella, C. C., Rajcic, N., Krol, S. J., Llano, M. T., & Yang, M. (2023). Is Writing Prompts Really Making Art? In *Lecture notes in computer science* (p. 196). Springer Science+Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-29956-8_13
15. Modir, L., Guan, L. C., & Aziz, S. B. A. (2014). Text, Hypertext, and Hyperfiction. *SAGE Open*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014528915>
16. Sánchez-López, I., Rodríguez, M. A. P., & Igado, M. F. (2020). The explosion of digital storytelling. Creator’s perspective and creative processes on new narrative forms.
17. *Heliyon*, 6(9). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04809>

18. Situma, J. (2015). A Critique of Foucault's Conception and Predictions of the Author-Function. *Thought and Practice*, 6(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.4314/tp.v6i1.3>
19. Smith, J. L. (2012). *Theorizing Digital Narrative: Beginnings, Endings, and Authorship*. <https://doi.org/10.25772/rxz9-ab10>
20. *Understanding hypertext*. (2021). <https://drjbson.com/papers/kate98.htm>
21. Vitali-Rosati, M. (2014). *Digital Paratext : Editorialization and the Very Death of the Author*. <https://papyrus.bib.umontreal.ca/xmlui/handle/1866/11392>
22. Walker, J. (1999). *Piecing together and tearing apart. Finding the story in afternoon*. <https://jilltxt.net/txt/afternoon.html>
23. *Writing Façade: A Case Study in Procedural Authorship*. (2008). <https://electronicbookreview.com/essay/writing-facade-a-case-study-in-procedural-authorship/>