

### **Editorial Introduction**

In 2001, it is sixty years since Virginia Woolf and James Joyce died: an opportunity to play games with (deaths of) writers, authors, names.

The artist, like the God of the creation, remains within or behind or beyond or above his handiwork, invisible, refined out of existence, indifferent, paring his fingernails.

(James Joyce: *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*)

What is such an *artist* and where is s/he posited, doing what? M. Foucault's 'What Is an Author' takes the reader to *author-function* (= product of the text), to authors' names as signifiers (not Shakespeare, Woolf or Joyce as mortal bodies, but "Shakespeare", "Woolf and "Joyce"), or to 'traces' left/woven in the text's fabric.

In 'Authors and Writers' R. Barthes highlights some differences between author and writer. If the latter uses language in order to convey a message, the former is aware of the power of the words; s/he uses language for its own sake; s/he manipulates and is manipulated by language. The author of a novel, for example, lives through the text which bears his/her traces, and which, finally, *digests* its own author within the structure of the language used.

And yet, *if consumed, if disappearing* within the very language which an author used, the same author is expected (by both Barthes and Foucault) to take responsibility for his/her own text. Asked to step out of his/her own product, s/he is the only one able to 'stick' a 'label'/name on it, and the only one responsible for all criticism and appraisal (if any!). What remains finally of the writer-author is his/her own name = signature as the *body* collecting all traces as if into an *abode* which continuously changes its structure (language) and its subject [a flexible position(ing) within this structure]. With 'change' as the main function of his Derridean type of 'signature', the creator is no longer expected to be a fixed centre.

Hence, the 'death' of one *authoritative* voice/power and the 'birth' of *moving centres/creators* = even texts?

Such a 'signature' is Joyce's *Ulysses*, merging into its fabric both text, character and creator.

Paraphrasing Virginia Woolf's words in *Orlando*, we could ask ourselves the same obsessive question: 'What makes the Woolf/Shakespeare/or Joyce etc. in reality be the *Woolf/Shakespeare/ Joyce etc.* of fiction or of poetry?' Perhaps a special *mode* of using language; a particular *mood* of feeling, of desiring to reveal the quality of a thing; a unique *modality* of rendering the power of language; a strange way of 'devouring' *models* and of offering his/ her own texts as *gifts* to be enjoyed (Cmeci, 1999).

How should such texts - and their creators - be *named*, then? (Genette, 1982). Should we consider Stephen Dedalus' s debate on the presence-absence of *Shakespeare* in Joyce's *Ulysses* as an (the) answer?

So, what *remains of the author* live for ever, after all? His/her *name* = presences in/through absence coming to be known through the *traces*, that is texts, left?

The articles in this journal explore different sides of such *Names - Woolf, Joyce* - woven into the fabric of texts between *Acts* through *Time*.

Doina Cmeci  
Stefan Avadanei