



## TECHNOLOGY: A BRIDGE BETWEEN THE AUTHOR AND THE READER

**G. NAGESWARA RAO**

Research Scholar & Asst. Professor  
of English, VFSTR (Deemed to be  
University, Vadlamudi, Guntur AP

**DR. G MOHANA CHARYULU**

Associate Professor of English,  
VFSTR (Deemed to be University)  
Vadlamudi, Guntur AP

### **Abstract**

*20<sup>th</sup> century paved a clear path to the technology to run literature on a grand scale. Various devices of Technology bridged the gap between the writer and the reader. It resulted the sharing of ideas between the author and the reader and exchanging their views on a correct direction. This phenomenon of author –reader interface is a new trend in the present scenario. Once the author released a book, it is not in the hands of the writer but it is in the hands of the reader. The reader identifies himself through the means of electronic media and social networking sites. The present paper titled: “**Technology: A bridge between the Author and the Reader**” examines the role of the technology in bringing the author and the reader nearer and how they examine, analyze and interpret the text with their critical opinions. The technological communication between the author and the reader adds new dimensions to the literary world. It also provides a huge scope of healthy discussions about the treatment and accepting the concepts in literature.*

**Keywords:** Author, Literature, Media, Networking systems, Reader.

### **Introduction:**

Digital India, Digital Space, Digital Money Transfer and other Digital modes are the new technology of the present day life. Today, this mode of technology influences all the corners of the society. Particularly, the revolutionary changes in the Electronic and communication systems bring the life to the global space. Technology impacts our life and one cannot escape from it. Everyone in the world in one way or the other, related with the technology irrespective of education. Even illiterate people in the present day handle various technical devices affectively and surprise everyone with their multi faceted talents in using the technology. Everyone is directly connected to technology. This influence of technology has altered the way in which one can think and live. The cultural, social and economic aspects of everyone are completely changed due to the influence of technology. Literature and culture are two interdependent things to be studied carefully. Technology influences culture means indirectly or directly it influences literature. The revolutionary changes in the use of technology bring changes in literature too. According to the demands of the present day situations, literature is also stepped into technology. Inventions of technology brought many changes in literature. Pen, Paper, Ink, printing, binding and other innovative technologies provoked literature to takes steps into different directions. Various authors impressed in using technology and brushed their creative abilities by using it. For some of the writers technology itself is the subject matter for their literature.



From Anglo-Saxons to the present day authors twisted themselves with the devices of the technology. These authors described technology as a tool to transform their ideas effectively. In the transmission of ideas of the authors, Technology plays a dominant role. As the scope of the paper is so wide the researcher wants to focus only on the positive side of the technology.

“It is very interesting to know, that, from the albuminous white of the egg, the chick in the egg gets the materials for its flesh, bones, blood, and feathers; while, from the fatty yolk of the egg, it gets the heat and energy which enable it at length to break its shell and begin the world. It is less interesting, perhaps, but still it is interesting, to know that when a taper burns, the wax is converted into carbonic acid and water. Moreover, it is quite true that the habit of dealing with facts, which is given by the study of nature, is, as the friends of physical science praise it for being, an excellent discipline.” (Arnold, Mathew: 1882)

The scientific investigation of many things in nature gave good result in the past. Arnold while talking about the influence of Science on literature says that it is inevitable to human beings not to be away from science because it is emerged as a part of culture and life. When Arnold speaks of “letters” he means literary works in poetry and prose, from Plato to Newton. However, Huxley believes, that a general education in science isn't enough to make a practical change in the world. Arnold believes that the “Criticism of life” is found through literature, which makes it possible to know ourselves and the world. Huxley believes there can be no advancement of culture if it not a scientific advancement. The Rhine river is the boundary of the civilized world. The contemporary field of literature and science has its roots in the 1980s. It is often traced specifically to the publication of Gillian Beer's influential 1983 book, Darwin's Plots. If we accept this as a starting point, then this book (completed in 2013) acts as a thirty-year retrospective of the field's most essential criticism. However, tracing the field's lineage back to Beer's study is much more common in British literature and science criticism than elsewhere. The North American field (of science and literature) would just as quickly point to the work of Donna Haraway as a key moment of development, or even to the creation and first conference of the US-based Society for Literature, Science and the Arts in 1987. Whichever point one chooses – and perhaps it would be most accurate to talk of emergence rather than a single starting point – it is clearly the 1980s where the field began to gather momentum. In fact, this can be seen happening from the very start of the 1980s. Trevor Levere's Poetry Realized in Nature was published in 1981, as was Tess Cosslett's The Scientific Movement and Literature. There are also other ways of approaching the relationships between science, literature and culture which the present Reader's Guide does not address. Both science and technology studies and feminist cultural studies confront the interconnections between science, technology and society in fascinating ways which are complementary, but not essential, in the field of literature and science.



Donald MacKenzie and Judy Wajcman's *The Social Shaping of Technology* (1999) gives a sound overview of science and technology studies while the work of scholars such as Carol Colatrella and Brian Attebery exemplify feminist cultural studies that comes closest to the interests of the scholarship in literature and science. In addition, there are also considerable critical traditions in, for example, science fiction and in the relationships between art and science that make a contribution to wider debates about the relationships between science and the humanities. The seductiveness of a text involves it being slowly unveiled to the reader who is trying to grasp the textual and contextual meaning. Wright differentiates between 'structural' and 'post-structural' psychoanalytic theory by putting the former in the context of the reader of both literary and life texts, determined by a history that precedes the reader. So it is the reader who is transformed. This would mean that the objectivity of the text remains and becomes distinguishable from the reader. In the latter analysis, the reader engages in a dialectical play that moves the text to a new meaning, undermining the old power and exposing the text as being self-contradictory

“The reader / writer distinction is no longer valid because making sense of the sign system implicates both: each is caught in a net of signs, is up against language. Reading, writing and criticism are part of a continuum whereby readers write in the act of reading and writers are shown to read in the act of writing.” (11 p.122-123)

The science wars were initiated by Alan Sokal, who, in 1996, wrote a hoax essay for the journal *Social Text* under the title 'Transgressing the Boundaries: Towards a Transformative Hermeneutics of Quantum Gravity'. As may be obvious from the title, Sokal's target was postmodern theory, and particularly the ways in which postmodern theorists attempted to read science as discourse. This was, in part, founded on the distaste that Sokal (and many others) had for so-called 'French' theory, and in particular the theories emerging from literary deconstruction often associated with the French philosopher Jacques Derrida. The acceptance and publication of his hoax essay – a tissue of quotations from postmodern sources which appeared to offer a new reading of quantum physics – Sokal saw as evidence of postmodernism's intellectual vacuity. In 1998 Sokal and his collaborator Jean Bricmont published *Intellectual Impostures: Postmodern Philosophers' Abuse of Science* where they set out their key oppositions to postmodern 'abuses' of science. They saw postmodernism as a 'rejection of the rationalist tradition of the Enlightenment' which disconnected science from any 'empirical test' and instead positioned it in a culturally relativist way 'as nothing more than a "narration", a "myth" or a social construction'. Sokal and Bricmont broke down their opposition to social constructivism into four key areas: 'ignorance of science' (while being prepared to write about it); 'shamelessly throwing around technical terms'; 'manipulating phrases that are meaningless'; and 'importing concepts from the natural sciences into the humanities and the social sciences without giving the slightest conceptual or empirical



justification'. Their final area is clearly significant for literature and science scholarship. It charges critics with, as they later point out, placing too great 'an emphasis on discourse and language as opposed to the facts to which those discourses refer (or, worse, the rejection of the very idea that facts exist ...)'. Science, they conclude is 'not a mere reservoir of metaphors ready to be used' in studies by humanities scholars. Indeed, 'scientific theories are not like novels; in a scientific context these words have specific meanings, which differ in subtle but crucial ways from their everyday meaning, and which can only be understood within a complex web of theory and experiment. 'The interface of science with other disciplines has become a matter of urgency'. At the heart of this interface is 'the approach of the humanities' which is not 'just a curiosity or a diversion, or a parasitic colonization, or a rearguard sniping operation' but a 'central feature of intellectual life'. Shaffer's claims have proved true. It is certainly still the case that the humanities, with literature positioned very much as the central driving impetus, have continued to engage with the sciences in profitable ways throughout the 2000s. Literature and science scholarship has had a key role to play in these engagements.

### **Conclusion:**

Thus, literature and technology have impacted on each other. Literature has been remained as a witness of various changes since centuries. Many things got changed in the course of time. Literature also changed its means of production and reception. But it is having the same cult which had before wider the impact of technology. It is not the question that literature will last or not. The imaginative literature always remained an integral part of the society. Despite various changes literature will serve its purpose as it was served in earlier times. However, it is the big question in front of us, in which form literature will last is uncertain. I think the current book form will be replaced by a digital form.

Hence, Bleich is inadvertently saying that there is no existing standard of right and wrong, with the reader determining the interpretation of the text most suitable to his or her needs. In this case, there is no clear distinction between the objectivity of the text and the subjectivity of the reader. So what is the text? Iser feels that the text only takes on life if it is realized. This is another way of stating Poulet's position. So, if the text is in an object which the subject creates, there is no way one can differentiate the text from the reader. The paradoxical situation that we are encountering now is that there exist no 'text' before there is a reader.

This argument is further complicated by the idea of the implied reader being of a specific kind, an informed one, who can fill in 'textual gaps'. Would that mean that the objectivity of the author (and the text) no longer exists? According to most of the reader-response theories, they do not, except in the realm of the imaginary, until they achieve "Konkretisation", to quote "In Garden" (14). But there exists also an ambivalent attitude of



some theorists who initially tried to draw the line between text and reader, but eventually reached the similar conclusion of the text not being distinguishable from the reader. Perhaps the text would remain only a mere hypothesis. In which case, how would one critique the 'inspired text', such as the *Koran* or the *Bible*? The question remains as yet unanswered by the reader-response theorists.

**Bibliography:**

1. Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory*, 2nd ed. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, 1996, p.3
2. *Readers and Reading*. Ed. Bennet, Andrew. Longman Publishing, New York, 1995, p.20-21
3. Barry, Peter. Chapter One, "Theory Before Theory. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*". Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press. 1995
4. *The Structuralist Controversy: The Language of Criticism and the Science of man*. Ed. Macksey, Richard et. al. John Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1970. p.57
5. Selden, Raman & Widdowson, Peter. *Contemporary Literary Theory*. 3rd ed. University Press of Kentucky, Kentucky, 1993. p.53.
6. Pogemiller, Dwight. *Hermeneutics and Epistemology: Hirsch's Author Centered Meaning, Radical Historicism and Gadamer's Truth and Method Premise*. vol. 2, no. 8
7. Wright, Elizabeth. *Psychoanalytic Criticism: Theory in Practice*. Methuen: London, 1986, p.5
8. Iser, Wolfgang. *The Implied Reader*. John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, 1974, p. 285
9. Bleich, David. *Subjective Criticism*. John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, 1978, p.95