

**Introduction to Cultural Studies**  
**Dr. Avishek Parui**  
**Department of Humanities & Social Sciences**  
**Indian Institute of Technology-Madras**

**Lecture - 34**  
**Foucault – What Is An Author - VI**

So hello and welcome to this NPTEL course entitled Introduction to Cultural Studies where we are looking at Michel Foucault's essay What Is An Author. And this is the concluding lecture on that essay. So we will finish that text with this particular lecture. Now, this concluding section in this essay Foucault talks about the different discursive configurations which are invested into the formation of the author, the function of the author, the formal properties of authorship etc. So let us take a look at what he says specifically which should be on your screen.

**(Refer Slide Time: 00:53)**

To conclude, I would like to review the reasons why I attach a certain importance to what I have said.

On the one hand, an analysis in the direction that I have outlined might provide for an approach to a typology of discourse. It seems to me, at least at first glance, that such a typology cannot be constructed solely from the grammatical

---

features, formal structures, and objects of discourse: more likely, there exist properties or relationships peculiar to discourse (not reducible to the rules of grammar and logic), and one must use these to distinguish the major categories of discourse. The relationship (or non-relationship) with an author, and the different forms this relationship takes, constitute – in a quite visible manner – one of these discursive properties.

On the other hand, I believe that one could find here an introduction to the historical analysis of discourse. Perhaps it is time to study discourses not only in terms of their expressive value or formal transformations but according to their modes of circulation, valorization, attribution, and

So this is Foucault stating towards the end in the conclusion. To conclude, I would like to review the reasons why I attach a certain importance to what I have said. On the one hand an analysis in the direction that I have outlined might provide for an approach to a typology of discourse. It seems to me at least at first glance that such a typology cannot be constructed solely from the grammatical features, formal structures and objects of discourse.

More likely there exist properties of relationships peculiar to discourse not reducible to the rules of grammar and logic. And one must use these to distinguish the major categories of discourse.

So, again one of the lovely things which this particular essay does is it keeps vacillating between specific arguments and generic arguments. So this is a very good essay if one is to study discourse analysis right. So not just authorship, not just what is an author but also what is a discourse, what are the properties of discourse.

So Foucault quite clearly says over here that you know it is not just sufficient to talk about the formal properties of the discourse or the grammatical properties of a discourse or the typology of a discourse but rather one must really unpack the relationships which are invested in a discourse because these relationships are those which are invested in the function of that discourse. So relationships become very important.

The properties of relationships become very important because that or the relationships those give a degree of organicity to a discourse, right and that organicity makes it more viable, makes it more functional etc. right. So and one must use these to distinguish the major categories of the discourse.

**(Refer Slide Time: 02:29)**

features, formal structures, and objects of discourse: more likely, there exist properties or relationships peculiar to discourse (not reducible to the rules of grammar and logic), and one must use these to distinguish the major categories of discourse. The relationship (or non-relationship) with an author, and the different forms this relationship takes, constitute – in a quite visible manner – one of these discursive properties.

On the other hand, I believe that one could find here an introduction to the historical analysis of discourse. Perhaps it is time to study discourses not only in terms of their expressive value or formal transformations but according to their modes of existence. The modes of circulation, valorization, attribution, and appropriation of discourses vary with each culture and are modified within each. The manner in which they are articulated according to social relationships can be more readily understood, I believe, in the activity of the author function and in its modifications than in the themes or concepts that discourses set in motion.

It would seem that one could also, beginning with analyses of this type, reexamine the privileges of the subject. I realize that in undertaking the internal  
2:29 / 27:27 tonic analysis of a work (be it a literary text, philosophical system,

The relationship or non-relationship with an author and the different forms this relationship takes constitute in a quite visible manner one of these discursive properties okay. So Foucault is interested over here not so much in a formal properties, not so much in a grammatical properties but rather in a relational properties which are invested in the author as a discourse function, okay

right. On the other hand I believe that one could find here an introduction to the historical analysis of discourse.

This is what I meant a little while ago when I said this essay is a really interesting essay not just in terms of looking at the author as a specific discourse function but also discourse as a generic function as something which operates at a matter level at a ideological level etc. So this is a very good essay on discourse analysis generically right. So this is a generic essay as well as a specific essay. So it is a very good study, a very good case study if you will of discourse analysis, this particular essay.

Perhaps it is time Foucault says, perhaps it is time to study discourses not only in terms of their expressive value or formal transformations but according to their modes of existence. So you know the ontology of a discourse, the ontological function of a discourse is something that Foucault is interested in not just in terms of the expressive value or in terms of formal transformations but mostly for their being for the entire modes of existence, entire almost organic quality that discourses have.

The modes of circulation, valorization, attribution and appropriation of discourses vary with each culture and are modified with each. So again we are looking at a very context specific, culture specific function of this course. So you know a discourse or one discourse can vary depending on what context it is situated in. What historical time it is situated in. So that becomes a very key quality of a discourse.

The manner in which they are articulated according to social relationships can be more readily understood. I believe in the activity of the author function and in its modifications than in the themes or concepts that discourses set in motion. So more than themes or concepts, more than grammatical rules, more than typology what Foucault is interested in is a activity of the author function and with activity there is an organicity right.

So he is essentially looking at how discourses become organic in quality, how this ontological quality of discourses become organic and how it gives life to a discourse. So this life-like quality

of a discourse, this organic quality of a discourse is you know is something Foucault is interested in and to that end he is more interested in looking at the activity which pertains to this course rather than just the formal properties or just the thematic properties okay.

**(Refer Slide Time: 05:02)**

On the other hand, I believe that one could find here an introduction to the historical analysis of discourse. Perhaps it is time to study discourses not only in terms of their expressive value or formal transformations but according to their modes of existence. The modes of circulation, valorization, attribution, and appropriation of discourses vary with each culture and are modified within each. The manner in which they are articulated according to social relationships can be more readily understood, I believe, in the activity of the author function and in its modifications than in the themes or concepts that discourses set in motion.

It would seem that one could also, beginning with analyses of this type, reexamine the privileges of the subject. I realize that in undertaking the internal and architectonic analysis of a work (be it a literary text, philosophical system, or scientific work), in setting aside biographical and psychological references, one has already called back into question the absolute character and founding role of the subject. Still, perhaps one must return to this question, not in order to reestablish the theme of an originating subject but to grasp the subject's points of insertion, modes of functioning, and system of dependencies. Doing so means overturning the traditional problem, no longer raising the questions: How can a free subject penetrate the density of things and give it meaning? How can it activate the rules of a language from within and thus give rise to the designs that are properly its own? Instead, these questions will be raised: How, under what

So the activity of the author function is something Foucault spends some time in this particular essay exploring and unpacking that something is highlighting at this point in the conclusion, okay. It would seem that one could also, beginning with analysis of this type reexamine the privileges of the subject.

I realize that in undertaking the internal and architectonic analysis of a work, architectonic is a structural analysis of a work, be a literary text, philosophical system or scientific work in setting aside biographical and psychological references one has already called back into question the absolute character and founding role of the subject. Still perhaps one must return to this question not in order to reestablish the theme of an originating subject but to grasp the subject's point of insertion, modes of functioning and systems of dependencies.

So again look at the almost human quality that Foucault has given to a discourse. The subject of course is a discursive function. But Foucault over here is more interested in looking at the subjects points of insertion, modes of functioning and system of dependencies. So in a very interesting sense this particular section, the conclusion to What Is An Author, it draws on I mean

it is interested in not just looking at the stylistic or grammatical properties of a discourse but also to a certain extent the emotional qualities of a discourse.

So how are these emotional dependencies created? How does a discourse establish an economy of emotions you know which give life to it, which invests life to it, make it more organic, make it more life-like, makes it more active in quality. And Foucault is interested obviously in activity of a discourse per se.

**(Refer Slide Time: 06:56)**

terms of their expressive value or formal transformations but according to their modes of existence. The modes of circulation, valorization, attribution, and appropriation of discourses vary with each culture and are modified within each. The manner in which they are articulated according to social relationships can be more readily understood, I believe, in the activity of the author function and in its modifications than in the themes or concepts that discourses set in motion.

It would seem that one could also, beginning with analyses of this type, reexamine the privileges of the subject. I realize that in undertaking the internal and architectonic analysis of a work (be it a literary text, philosophical system, or scientific work), in setting aside biographical and psychological references, one has already called back into question the absolute character and founding role of the subject. Still, perhaps one must return to this question, not in order to reestablish the theme of an originating subject but to grasp the subject's points of insertion, modes of functioning, and system of dependencies. Doing so means overturning the traditional problem, no longer raising the questions: How can a free subject penetrate the density of things and give it meaning? How can it activate the rules of a language from within and thus give rise to the designs that are properly its own? Instead, these questions will be raised: How, under what conditions, and in what forms can something like a subject appear in the order of discourse? What place can it occupy in each type of discourse, what functions can it assume, and by obeying what rules? In short, it is a matter of depriving the subject (or its substitute) of its role as originator, and of analyzing the subject as a variable and complex function of discourse.

Second, there are reasons dealing with the "ideological" status of the author. The question then becomes: How can one reduce the great peril, the great danger with which fiction threatens our world? The answer is: One can reduce it with the author. The author allows a limitation of the cancerous and dangerous proliferation of significations within a world where one is thrifty not only with one's

And that activity, if you need to unpack that activity what you should be looking at according to Foucault is the system of dependencies, discursive dependencies but also emotional dependencies, also human relation or dependencies that a discourse finds to you know manages to establish if it becomes a successful discourse. Doing so means overturning the traditional problem, no longer raising the questions, how can a free subject penetrate the density of things and give it meaning?

How can it activate the rules of a language from within and this give rise to the designs that are properly its own. So you know these are the traditional questions that Foucault is highlighting. So these are the questions that keep coming up in the discourse analysis but Foucault is more interested in the other question, different questions over here. So what are the questions that Foucault is interested in? Instead, these questions will be raised.

These are the following questions that Foucault is more interested in when it comes to discourse analysis particularly in relation to the author function and these are the questions. How, under what conditions and in what forms can something like a subject appear in the order of discourse? What place can it occupy in each type of discourse, what functions can it assume and by obeying what rules?

In short, it is a matter of depriving the subject or its substitute of its role as originator and of analyzing the subject as a variable and complex function of discourse. So this is a very interesting question. So Foucault is looking at the embedded quality of the subject. So subject is already always embedded in a particular discursive landscape and the question is you know what place can it occupy in each type of discourse.

So what is the situatedness of the subject in a particular discourse? That is the key question for Foucault. What are the conditions under which and in what forms can something like a subject appear in the order of discourse. So what are the conditions and by conditions Foucault obviously means the discursive conditions, the economic conditions, the cultural conditions. Of course, cultural conditions can mean a whole host of things but also linguistic conditions, you know gender conditions.

So all these conditions come into being and the key question over here is what are conditions which inform the situatedness of the discourse. So how does the discourse, how does the subject appear in the discourse. So what are the conditions informing the subject in its appearance in a particular discursive landscape, right. And the conditions can be material, economic, you know abstract in quality etc.

So again we are looking at this very you know cliché phrase that I have been dishing out to you. The asymmetric entanglement of abstraction and materiality okay and that is something which we keep coming back to throughout this particular course and you know Foucault is actually highlighting that. What are the conditions? And the conditions, by conditions he means that entanglement that we have been talking about since the very inception of this course.

So what place can it occupy, what place can the human subject occupy in each type of discourse. What functions can assume and by obeying what rules. So what we preset rules what are the language games if you are to draw on Lyotard. You know what is language games that a subject must abide by, confirm to, perform, reassert in order to be recognized or acknowledged as the subject, right. In short it is a matter of depriving the subject of its role as originator.

So he is not really interested in looking at the subject as an originator of this course, as an originator of something or rather he is more interested in looking at the subject as something which is embedded in a particular discursive field and the question is how does the subject negotiate with the discursive field while being always already embedded inside same field, okay. So the subject emerges as a variable and complex function of discourse.

So we are looking at function as a mathematical principle over here. So the subject is embedded in the particular discursive field and the question is how does the subject emerge as a variable, as a complex function of that particular discursive field. So these are the questions that Foucault is interested in asking. The subjects situated in a particular discursive field. What are the conditions which inform the situatedness and by conditions he means material, economic, abstract, etiological, linguistic all kinds of conditions.

So what are the conditions which inform the situatedness, the location of the subject in a discursive field. You know what are the rules that the subject must obey in a discursive field and of course the rules keep changing all the time depending on the historical context, depending on the cultural context. So in a nutshell, what Foucault is interested in is not looking at a subject as a originator of a discourse but as something which is embedded inside a discourse and he is more interested in the embeddedness of the subject.

And of course the embeddedness can come with a set of variable and complex function. So the subject can become a function within a particular discourse. So he is more interested in the functionality of the subject inside a discourse field. So these are the questions that Foucault is more interested in asking and of course as I mentioned in the beginning of this particular lecture

that you know this is a very useful tool for us, a very useful case study for us in order to do discourse analysis.

So not only he is sort of moving away as you can see from looking at merely the offer as a function but is more interested in looking at the subject as or the discourse as a case study, as an object of study over here, right. And of course when you are establishing a meta theory, when you are establishing a theoretical principle that will be applied potentially to any kind of discourses, any kind of author function, any kind of subject function etc.

**(Refer Slide Time: 12:32)**

reestablish the theme of an originating subject but to grasp the subject's points of insertion, modes of functioning, and system of dependencies. Doing so means overturning the traditional problem, no longer raising the questions: How can a free subject penetrate the density of things and give it meaning? How can it activate the rules of a language from within and thus give rise to the designs that are properly its own? Instead, these questions will be raised: How, under what conditions, and in what forms can something like a subject appear in the order of discourse? What place can it occupy in each type of discourse, what functions can it assume, and by obeying what rules? In short, it is a matter of depriving the subject (or its substitute) of its role as originator, and of analyzing the subject as a variable and complex function of discourse.

Second, there are reasons dealing with the "ideological" status of the author. The question then becomes: How can one reduce the great peril, the great danger with which fiction threatens our world? The answer is: One can reduce it with the author. The author allows a limitation of the cancerous and dangerous proliferation of significations within a world where one is thrifty not only with one's resources and riches but also with one's discourses and their significations. The author is the principle of thrift in the proliferation of meaning. As a result, we must entirely reverse the traditional idea of the author. We are accustomed, as we have seen earlier, to saying that the author is the genial creator of a work in which he deposits, with infinite wealth and generosity, an inexhaustible world of significations. We are used to thinking that the author is so different from all other

So we have in this particular essay is a very interesting technique, a very interesting case study, a very interesting method of discourse analysis which Foucault is offering us; moving away from this specific study of the author to a more general study and more meta study, a more generic study of discourse and that is something which essay does quite complexly and quite successfully in my mind. So second, what is the second factor that Foucault is interested?

Second, there are reasons dealing with the ideological status of the author. The question then becomes how can one reduce the great peril, the great danger with which fiction threatens our world. The answer is one can reduce it with the author. The author allows a limitation of the cancerous and dangerous proliferation of significations within a world where one is thrifty not only of one's resources and riches but also with one's discourses and their significations.



So this is really magnificent. He is quite literarily talking about an economy of discourses and he is saying you know that economy of discourses is not inexhaustible right. So that economy or the economic principles operated not just when it comes to property and wealth and money and riches but also when it comes to discourses. So one and there is a tendency Foucault says, there is a tendency among us to economize our discourses.

To stop any potential proliferation of discourses, any kind of eruption of endlessness of discourses right. So what we have instead is the very primary function, the very practical pragmatic function of economizing discourses, economizing discursive fields and to that end the author function becomes a magnificent tool, a very useful too because you know when you have the author that the particular figure the author operates as a closure to the text.

So it stops the text from running away with endless meanings, running away with the proliferation of meanings that can potentially exhaust the discursive field, right. So the author function operates as a closure, as a the final tie you might say in a discursive field because as Foucault makes it quite clear over here that there was a tendency among us to economize the discursive field.

So to hold it together, to bring it together, to not let it run away with potentially endless meanings because that will be subversive in quality and that might potentially wreck or jeopardize or compromise the discursive field. The ontology of the discursive field might be compromised if it becomes endless in quality.

So there must be a degree of closure and the author offers, the author function, the author signifier offers that kind of a closure, that figure of closure which becomes very handy and practical in discourse analysis especially when he comes to fiction or text, okay. So this is what he say, the author function can reduce it you know that particular potential proliferation. So one can reduce it with the author.

The author allows a limitation of the cancerous and dangerous proliferation. So he is almost medicalizing it you know in a very tongue-in-cheek style as you can see. So the cancerous and you know dangerous proliferation of signification. So significations can become viruses, right. So you can have like significations can become viral in quality.

They can spread endlessly, they can disseminate discursively you know through a proliferation of different kinds of meaning which might be at war with each other and in the process can compromise or jeopardize the discursive field. So the author function emerges as a consolidating function as something which holds it together and that to that end it becomes very pragmatic utilitarian function and that is something which is very handy and convenient for discourse analysis, for the ontology of the discourse.

So the author is a principle of thrift in the proliferation of meaning. So the author, again look at the economic metaphors Foucault is using in terms of looking at you know thrift, profit, you know savings etc. So one must save discourses. One must look at discourses as some kind of a databank or money bank which one must not spend endlessly. So if that happens the discursive field becomes weak according to Foucault.

So the author becomes handy, a very convenient tool you know to be thrifty when it comes to discourses, not to be spendthrift, not to be wasting away discourses. So the author becomes a unifying strategy to a great extent. So the author is a principle of thrift in a proliferation of meaning. As a result we must entirely reverse the traditional idea of the author. So this is a very radical reading as you can see that Foucault is offering.

So you must reverse the traditional idea of the author. We are accustomed as we have been as we have seen earlier, to saying that the author is the genial creator of a work in which he deposits with infinite wealth and generosity an inexhaustible world of significations. So that is the traditional, classical, conventional idea of the author as someone who is outside the text, someone who creates the text, the very benevolent creator of a text.

Of a work which is created with infinite wealth, infinite generosity of imagination of course; an inexhaustible world of signification. So the author can be seen in a classical conventional sense to be the creator of an inexhaustible field of significations, system of significations which is inexhaustible in quality. That could be one, that is one way of looking at the author and that is a more traditional, more conventional, more classical way one might argue.

**(Refer Slide Time: 17:49)**

men, and so transcendent with regard to all languages that, as soon as he speaks, meaning begins to proliferate, to proliferate indefinitely.

The truth is quite the contrary: the author is not an indefinite source of significations that fill a work; the author does not precede the works; he is a certain functional principle by which, in our culture, one limits, excludes, and chooses; in short, by which one impedes the free circulation, the free manipulation, the free composition, decomposition, and recomposition of fiction. In fact, if we are accustomed to presenting the author as a genius, as a perpetual surging of invention, it is because, in reality, we make him function in exactly the opposite fashion. One can say that the author is an ideological product, since we represent him as the opposite of his historically real function. When a historically given function is represented in a figure that inserts it, one has an ideological production. The author is therefore the ideological figure by which one marks the manner in which we fear the proliferation of meaning.

In saying this, I seem to call for a form of culture in which fiction would not be limited by the figure of the author. It would be pure romanticism, however, to imagine a culture in which the fictive would operate in an absolutely free state, in which fiction would be put at the disposal of everyone and would develop without passing through something like a necessary or constraining figure. Although, since the eighteenth century, the author has played the role of the regulator of the fictive; a role quite characteristic of our era of industrial and bourgeois society, of individualism and private property, still, given the historical modifications that are taking place, it does not seem necessary that the author

We are used to thinking that the author is so different from all other men and so transcendent with regard to all languages that as soon as he speaks, meaning begins to proliferate, to proliferate indefinitely. So you know that is again the very classical idea of the author as someone who speaks and produces meanings, meta meanings you know which proliferate endlessly and that proliferation of meaning is something which becomes the sort of the iconic status of the author.

The author who comes and produces meanings, produces a proliferation of meanings which can be potentially endless in quality. That is the classical idea of the author and that obviously is something that Foucault is contesting; is reversing the idea. And you think the author actually is someone who holds the meaning, someone who controls the meaning, someone who closes the meaning, someone who actually gives the meaning of course but someone who becomes an act of closure as well.

There is no meaning beyond the author, the author becomes the controller, the orchestrator, the conductor of the symphony of meanings in a certain sense. So the truth is quite the contrary and this is what Foucault is offering. The author is not an indefinite source of signification that fill a work. The author does not precede the works. He is a certain functional principle by which in our culture one limits, excludes and chooses in short by which one impedes the free circulation, the free manipulation, the free composition, decomposition and recomposition of fiction.

This is a beautiful definition of the author. So the author is not someone who stands outside the text and gives birth to the text and you know makes the text infinite in quality symbiotically speaking. He is not that according to Foucault. The author is actually someone who limits and excludes meanings. The author is someone who maps meanings. The author becomes a mapper of meaning. So the cartographic quality of the author that Foucault is alluding to.

And that cartographic quality, that mapping of meaning, that orchestration, that conduction of meaning you know that conducted quality of the author is used, is very handy because it impedes it stops free circulation. It stops endless circulation. So the endlessness of symbiotic signification is stopped by the author. The author becomes a controlled and orchestrator, a conductor of that circulation and that particular author function also preserves the you know text from being an endless proliferation symbiotically speaking, okay. So that becomes a controlling function, right.

In fact, we are accustomed to presenting the author as a genius, as a perpetual surging of invention. It is because in reality we make him function exactly the opposite fashion, right and he is looking at this discursive hypocrisy, the discursive paradox over here and he is saying that you know we imagine the author to be someone outside the text, someone who is infinitely imaginative, someone who gives meaning to the text endlessly etc.

But in reality, the way everyday life goes, we look at the author as someone who controls the text, okay. So therein lies the discursive hypocrisy of the entire functional authorship, right. Okay, so when a historically given function is represented in a figure that inserts it, one has an ideological production. The author is therefore the ideological figure by which one marks the manner in which we fear the proliferation of meaning.

So this is something which you can quote in even other essays and this is such a magnificent sentence. The author is the mark, the ideological figure by one marks the manner in which we fear the proliferation of meaning. So the author becomes the author of the fear, a marker of a certain effect, a marker of a certain emotion and that emotion obviously is the fear of endlessness of meaning. So the author becomes a controller you know the very convenient tick through which we mark the fear of meaning.

So the author becomes a limiting function to a certain extent. He limits the proliferation of meaning and you know the endless possibility of meaning is limited by the author and that is how we look at the author in real life but we discursively you know look at the author as someone who creates the text outside the text. Therein lies the hypocrisy of the author function as Foucault studies it.

Because in real life in our everyday circulation, in the everyday consumption of authorship, we look at the author as someone who controls the text, someone who conducts the text, someone who is the conductor of a particular discursive field, someone who ensures that the discursive field stays intact etc. Whereas you know we give this pseudo meaning of the author, a pseudo authority to the author being this creator of endless meanings. So therein lies the paradox of the author function, okay.

**(Refer Slide Time: 22:25)**

In saying this, I seem to call for a form of culture in which fiction would not be limited by the figure of the author. It would be pure romanticism, however, to imagine a culture in which the fictive would operate in an absolutely free state, in which fiction would be put at the disposal of everyone and would develop without passing through something like a necessary or constraining figure. Although, since the eighteenth century, the author has played the role of the regulator of the fictive; a role quite characteristic of our era of industrial and bourgeois society, of individualism and private property, still, given the historical modifications that are taking place, it does not seem necessary that the author function remain constant in form, complexity, and even in existence. I think that, as our society changes, at the very moment when it is in the process of changing, the author function will disappear, and in such a manner that fiction and its polysemous texts will once again function according to another mode, but still with a system of constraint – one that will no longer be the author but will have to be determined or, perhaps, experienced [expérimenté].

All discourses, whatever their status, form, value, and whatever the treatment to which they will be subjected, would then develop in the anonymity of a murmur. We would no longer hear the questions that have been rehashed for so long: Who really spoke? Is it really he and not someone else? With what authenticity or originality? And what part of his deepest self did he express in his discourse? Instead, there would be other questions, like these: What are the modes of existence of this discourse? Where has it been used, how can it circulate, and who can appropriate it for himself? What are the places in it where there is room for possible subjects? Who can assume these various subject functions? And behind all these questions, we would hear hardly anything but the stirring of an indifference: What difference does it make who is speaking?

So and this is what Foucault is highlighting you know is looking at the inherent paradox okay. So we conclude the final paragraph of this particular essay and this is again a very generic theorization of discourses, a very an excellent example of discourse analysis that Foucault is offering over here and the final paragraph is this. All discourses, whatever their status, form, value and whatever the treatment to which they will be subjected, would then develop in the anonymity of a murmur.

We would no longer hear the questions that have been rehashed for so long. Who really spoke? Is it really he and not someone else? With what authenticity or originality? And what part of his deepest self did he express in his discourse? Instead, there would be other questions like these. What are the modes of existence of this discourse? What has it been used. Where has it been used? How can it circulate and who can appropriate it for himself?

What are the values, what are the places in which in it in which there is room for possible subjects? Who can assume these various subject functions and behind all these questions, we would hear hardly anything but the stirring of an indifference. What difference does it make who is speaking? So you know this is a very provocative ending as you can see. So Foucault is saying it does not matter really who is speaking.

It matters, the key question over here is the situatedness of the subject in a particular discursive field. That becomes important, the function of the subject in a discursive field. The possibility of the subject in a discursive field. The possible permutations that the subject can attain or achieve in a particular discursive field. These become the key questions rather than looking at authenticity you know originality who is speaking etc.

So you know it becomes more an active negotiation inside a discursive field. So again we are back to this very key concept you know with which we started this course, this relationship between discursivity and identity. So identity is discursive in quality. It is inside a discursive field. So your identity is performed by the navigations, by the negotiations that you make within the discursive field and again this is something that you can connect back to Judith Butler.

Because even in Butler we saw something very similar that discursivity and corporeality are connected in a very intimate organic way. Organic as well as ontologic way as functions. So these are the questions that Foucault ends with, that Foucault gives us and signs off this essay with that. So it is not the question of authenticity or originality or who is speaking you know. These are questions which come, which become irrelevant or become relevant in Foucault's analysis are the modes of existence of the discourse. So what are the modes of existence?

What are the markers of existence? How does the discourse exist. How does the discourse function. What are the apparatus, what are the conditions which permit the possibility or the **or the** function of the discourse, right. Where has it been used? How can it circulate? And who can appropriate it for himself. So how can a discourse circulate? What are the, again the organicity of a discourse.

How does it attain the organic quality, the lifelike quality, the life giving quality with which he can self-circulate. And who can appropriate that particular discourse. It becomes more a question of appropriation rather than authorship; appropriation, using, you know misappropriations. So these become more important and negotiations, situatedness. So what are the places in it where there is room for possible subjects?

Again we are looking at a almost a spatial study of subjects on a particular discourse. How can you make room for yourself in a particular discourse field. That becomes a key question rather than the question of the originator or the inventor of a discursive field who can assume this various subject functions and behind all these questions we would hear hardly anything but the stirring of an indifference.

So this indifference becomes a discursive quality over here and indifferences you know what difference does it make who is speaking. So it does not matter who is speaking. It matters, what matters is who is being situated. Who is negotiating? Who is appropriating. Who is you know navigating the discursive field. These become the key questions in Foucault's analysis with which he ends this essay on What Is An Author.

So as say the beginning of this lecture is not, you know it moves between specificity and a generic quality and that gives the essay its complexity to a certain extent and this becomes really one of the best essays one can combine if one is to do discourse analysis. So it becomes very generic essay in that sense but also looking at a particular discourse function of the author, okay. So with that we end Michel Foucault's What Is An Author and we move on to the next text in the next lectures. Thank you for your attention.