I. *Barthes’ proclamation about the “death of the author” is importantly different from a statement of the Intentionalist Fallacy.*

--Lamarque will examine versions of this proclamation as made by both Barthes and Foucault, as well as its relation to poststructuralism.

II. *Historicist Thesis: “…the idea that written works acquired authors only at a specific time in history…”* (434)

--Lamarque offers 3 possible interpretations of this Thesis: a writer conception, criticism conception, and text conception.

--Writer conception: at a certain historical stage writers came to own what they wrote. “An author so designated is a more weighty figure with legal rights and social standing, a producer of texts deemed to have value.” (434)

--Criticism conception: at a certain historical stage criticism turned toward the author herself.

--Text conception: at a certain historical stage texts attained a higher status, or at least were understood differently, in virtue of being “authored”.

III. *Death Thesis: “The author is dead.”* (435)

--Just as the Historicist Thesis (in any of its 3 forms) states that the author emerged at a certain time, the Death Thesis states that the author “died” at a certain (fairly recent) time.

--Lamarque distinguishes between descriptive and prescriptive versions of the Death Thesis (compare: “God is dead.”).

--Lamarque runs through 3 versions of the Death Thesis, corresponding to the 3 versions of the Historicist Thesis. (The second version is similar to the Intentionalist Fallacy.) (436)
--The 3rd version is the strongest, and the one identified with Foucault.

IV.
*Author Function Thesis:* “…the author function is a property of a discourse (or text) and amounts to something more than its just being written or produced by a person (of whatever status).” (437)

--Lamarque identifies 5 components of this thesis.

--“The author function becomes a property of a text or discourse, not a relation between a text and a person.” (437)

“If we say that a play is by Shakespeare, we mean or connote more than just that the play was written by a particular man (Shakespeare). For one thing we assign a certain honorific quality to it (it is likely to be a play worthy of our attention); we also relate the play to a wider body of work—to Hamlet, King Lear, Twelfth Night, and so on. Being “by Shakespeare” signals not just an external relation but an internal characterization. We move from “X is a play by Shakespeare” to “X is a Shakespeare play” or even “X is Shakespearean.”” (438)

V.
*Ecriture Thesis:* (This is Barthes’ version of the Author Function Thesis.) “Writing is the destruction of every voice, of every point of origin.” (439, quoting Barthes)

--Lamarque’s criticism:
Writing, like speech, or any language “performed”, is inevitably and properly conceived as purposive. To use language as meaningful discourse is to perform speech acts; to understand discourse is, minimally, to grasp what speech acts are performed. In his view of ecriture and of texts, Barthes tries to abstract language from the very function that gives it life.” (440)

--Lamarque also characterizes both Barthes and Foucault as preferring more meanings to restrictions on meaning. Lamarque challenges whether “more meaning” is a valuable goal in itself.