

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Can Computational Codaco-exist with New Criticism and Deconstructive Sharing? Re-Visiting Post Colonial Digital Humanities in the Habeas Corpus of the Reader

Alfred Ndi

Senior Lecturer, Department of English Modern Letters, University of Bamenda, Cameroon

Abstract:

Digital spaces are rapidly emerging as the sites where human knowledge is not only coded but also researched, reproduced, circulated, disseminated, stored and amplified. As the reproduction of digital codal knowledge has accelerated at such a fast pace in the last decades, the exclusions and prejudices that marked the print culture as products of imperial political economy, colonial rule, patriarchy and racism, were reproduced in the digital cultural record. As current and prospective publics check out principally to digital sources for their information and communication, the output they find there is reflexive of these digital politics. More preoccupying is the fact that exegetes approach cyberspace sources with the presumption that the digital scripted or video text is a democratic site where representation is available to all and sundry thanks to access to social media platforms, blogging and other channels. However, this paper reminds us by arguing that we are also living in the age of the reader 'outside' the digital codal realm and New Criticism can illuminate the ambiguous relation that exists between the digital coda and the readership. As a performance practice, codal reading has taken multiple forms in various human societies depending on whether one is referring to the pre-modern times in African and other world oral communities, the Eurocentric Middle Ages, the modernization epoch of yesteryears or the post-modern epoch of globalization and digitization today. The reading process is a dialogical and therefore dynamic act that constructs new meanings irrespective of the metanarrative text being read. In the digital context of Web 1.0, reading is a process of visual and silent appropriation of the textual idea at the cost of reading aloud, which was the practice for comprehending texts read. However, this problem was resolved in Web 2.0 with the incorporation of social media apps like YouTube, videogames and animated designs. This hybridized public space of readership in the contemporary global neo-liberal epoch is now being occupied by new thought leaders who are re-thinking (i.e. re-reading) the old digital texts and their ideas on postcolonial nationalism and economic internationalism with a different habeas corpus such as TED talks in various sectors of life with the support of plutocrats. The sectors of thought leadership include religion (e.g. revivalist evangelism, return to ancestral/shrine worship), identity politics, the free market economy of technological disruption and innovation, mentoring and coaching, etc

But the humanities as a reading process must be taken very seriously because it is deeply ingrained in humans and particularly in the human populations living outside the digital world as a result of the 'divide'. As an act, reading is a historical experience that straddles the biographical and historical periods, the pre-modern times in African and other world oral communities, the Eurocentric Middle Ages, the modernization epoch of yesteryears and the post-modern epoch of globalization today. Therefore, beyond the internet as codal text is a whole universe of reading with its own practices.

Keywords: Web 1.0/ Web 2.0, written/ oral texts, reader response criticism, habeas corpus, critical pedagogy, language, literature and critical discourse, postcolonial digital humanities

1. Introduction

Dobson (2019) asks a question which may look anodyne but is critical for postcolonial digital humanities: can establish humanities methods co-exist with computational thinking? This question was raised because scholars are increasingly adopting complicated data science in their projects and this comes with numerous opportunities and difficulties faced by arts researchers. Even though the study of texts through complicated computational instruments is good for scholarship, the issue is can these scientific approaches replace current humanities frameworks? Scientific validity cannot proxy research in the humanities because, in science, there is a border that is mapped out, whereas in the humanities, there is no horizon that charts out frontiers of investigation. Artistic methodologies are based a permanent protocol of re-reading. But, as a code of research practice, critical readings can be suspicious in the digital methods of computational exegesis. Therefore, there is a need for humanists to consider what possible assumptions and instruments can be embedded in algorithms and codes, and to also consider what issues can evolve from their employment in digital

technology investigations. There is therefore need for a new path of humanistic inquiry that fuses computational science and critical theory.

In the light of this need for new insights on the intersection of both disciplines, this interdisciplinary paper on postcolonial digital humanities (ICT and critical studies) is hypothesized on the premise that the continuum intersecting the coda as building 'grammar', the breaking up stage and the sharing phase (Risam 2018, Liu 2016) is a complex 'reading' process that can be explained by deploying literary methods of interpretation. This co-existential form of reading is possible because the continuum is very fluid, reflexive and undecidable. Now the coda is the latest form of digital labour that requires very sophisticated skills to programme projects, and knowledge of that labour, or the skills necessary to perform it, is not accessible to most people. From this perspective, it can be said that the digital coda is not an ideologically 'neutral' practice (Posner 2013) because it is under the control of the white, male, middle intelligentsia class. Consequently, the digital coda is an act of 'building' something on one's own accord which necessarily sets up barriers at the level of class, gender and race (Ramsay 2011). The risk that has been evident in the digital codais the elitization of knowledge in the sense that it can be used to silence those who cannot code, and, as a result, it has been quite divisive with lack of engagement from the latter (Golumbia 2016). From this premise, new questions of 'breaking up' have emerged such as whose labour is being valued in digital humanities projects, that of coders or that of people generating the technologies, graduate students, project directors, etc? The issue of 'building' and 'breaking' has become so ambivalent that it is unclear where the one starts and the other ends in postcolonial digital humanities. For example, it is now common practice to cut, paste and modify the digital coda and this is referred to as 'building' (Risam 2018: 353). Digital technology as 'building' thankfully offers opportunities for everyone to share knowledge; however, there are power relationships that structure the production of technology and knowledge. Thus, while a few are building (the code), and some are 'thinking' the knowledge, what is the status of others who are busy sharing the knowledge? Should sharing not then become the critical leverage that can replace coding as the 'heart' of the digital humanities since it can reshape representation and discussion of knowledge. How then can this digital power dynamics be 'broken' up globally by sharing and not just in Europe or the US but also in the Third World?

This paper proposes to rethink the reading process from the coda to deformance or 'breaking up' and to sharing in postcolonial digital humanities by deploying insights from New Criticism and post-structuralism. It examines how the coda can be read in terms of 'breaking up' and sharing as an idiom of marketing. In this new scenario of reading dissemination, which is becoming more and more sophisticated in sensitivity and distributive practice, the coda, is a self-contained, self-governing and self-referral ideology enclosed in a digital or any other text, and without 'outsides', as also theorized by New Criticism scholars (Wimsatt and Beardsley 1954). Therefore, what is the signification of intersection of the digital codal text seen from a New Criticism perspective in modernization; but also what is the signified process of re-construction and re-distribution of meaning in terms of the habeas corpus of readership in post-modernization? In the face of huge challenges on how to deal with the advent of new digital technology codes, motivated by an expanding political economy of the free market, the expansion of multinational corporations, and the imperative to achieve nation state and village development projects, global growth, the quest for social progress, etc, what pedagogical insights can we gain from a 'literary' reviewing of the marketing of the coda that builds new products, services and brands, in terms of the habeas corpus of the reader as an act of sharing knowledge through discourse? And what are the sharing practices and distributive qualities that the reading space enforces, despite the digital divide? As an archival space, can the sharing and therefore marketing reader re-think the digital coda and social media in terms of folklore, creative art, myths, home languages, race, ethnicity, sexuality, black bodies, and ideological nationalism? Lastly, how can we understand messaging, Tweeting, likes, etc, as acts of sharing on ICT platforms in terms of these new readings? From this critical perspective of readership as sharing space of the cyberspace, can we know what an audience or a public thinks about when they 'read' the digital code by sharing an oral performance script in an archival project? An extension of that question is: What is it that takes place in the mind of the sharing 'reader' when they interpret the cyberspace in terms of the tacit knowledge of a novel, recitation of a poem, reading a play, etc?

2. from Kingdom of Textual Coda to Biographical/ Historical Criticism

When Samuel Butler observed, and rightly so, that for 'anything' to be stated, there must be a 'sayer' and a 'sayee', he meant that the sayer is as important to the 'thing' being said as the sayee: that is, there is no hierarchy of roles. The internet radiates algorithmic ideas because there is, on the one hand, a coder or a 'writer', blogger, an artist or a producer (the 'sayer'), who creates an algorithm, or a work of art, etc, and, on the other hand, a reader (the 'sayee'), who interprets the work, creates meaning out of it and may then share it. Much attention was often paid to the coder or the blogger, writer/artist and the work, but it is arguable that the reader as sharer is more critical to the 'thing' being said than the former. The analysis of sharing practices of reading takes the form of conceptualization of relationships that regulate the coda text and the reader and also include the process by which meaning is re-created from the programmed code or from any other text. This analysis was carried out in different disciplinary areas such as literary criticism, the linguistics of communication, cultural history and the sociology of practices. What were at stake here were some basic questions raised by scholars in the history of reading, in order to suggest some approaches for understanding the reading process. We are using the term habeas corpus (/ˈheɪbiəs ˈkɔːrpəs/) as derived from Medieval Latin which literally means: 'you have the body'. It is a term popularly associated with law to suggest that a person can report an illegal imprisonment to a law court and request a redress so that a magistrate should order the custodian of the individual such as a prison official, to convey him to court for trial as opposed to detention without trial. Thus, in this paper, we draw inspiration from the idea of mere

exposure effect of the corporal, that is, the 'body' of the reader that should be shown, together with a display of how the 'body' manifests and performs itself in context.

From the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s, a new literary philosophy emerged encapsulated under the appellation of American/ English New Criticism, and the equivalent in French was *Nouvelle critique*. New Criticism portrayed literature and discourse as a code produced through the impersonalization of language functions in creative art. In this critical philosophy, the intention of the author of literature was considered as irrelevant and the principal focus shifted from biographical and historical criticism to the coda or internal functions of the textual machinery. Thenceforth, the coda/ literary text became a self-governing architecture. Wimsatt and Beardsley (1954) are famous for writing in their article 'The intentional fallacy' that there is a difference between external and internal proof for a poem's idea and meaning. But as popular as this hypothesis was, it was also an avowal of weakness of the New Criticism philosophy as the writers themselves acknowledged. We can explain this further: what was considered as being the internal characteristics of a poem's architectural coda for building its structure (for example, its syntax, semantics, lexis, phonology and so forth), are also, paradoxically, the site for its external openings to deconstruction nor 'breaking' of meaning and re-constitution for sharing.

Consequently, the architectural coda of a poem, for example, is both an 'internal' (new criticism) issue of the coder and an external (the habeas corpus) affair of the reader in the sense that the internal characteristics can only be discerned as such via the language employed, and by extension, the reading culture that engendered it, namely, the dictionaries used, the grammatical categories spoken, the linguistic competence of the audience, knowledge of language and sense of political conditions.

The New Criticism philosophy envisions the signifier/signified of a literary coda in respective terms of the internal literary architecture, which can only be accessed by the savant (coder) and the external features of readers, namely, the biography of its author, the human geography, political and historical environment, etc. The external features are alluded to by New Critics as idiosyncrasies; that is, as features that cannot be regulated and have no rules or possible 'grammar' of understanding, given that their conditions of production reside outside the purview of the kingdom of the literary coda. The external features of the textual coda are furthermore seen as non-linguistic factualities and as belonging to the realm of the private, which is the sphere of the market, the domain of the unknowable and the 'undecidable' (to borrow the term from Jacques Derrida). As a result, the application of the New Criticism philosophy prioritizes chiefly the internal markers of a textual coda such as a poem's medium of expression, its stylistics and its meaning. This New Criticism understanding denies recognition of existence of the readerly outside of the literary coda from which the writer and readers of a literary text come. From this New Critical interpretive tradition, the author's intention and biography are seen as a fallacy: the assumptions behind the intention are read as extraneous, and the environmental circumstances that engender a writing coda are denied as neither here nor there. An author's biography is considered as irrelevant. In short, the reader in all their diversity, actuality, and sophistication is erased as unbelonging to the linguistic machinery of the textual coda and its technological architecture.

In addition to exclusion of the authorship and readership of the literary coda, the New Criticism philosophy also envisages the literary coda as an immaterial form of experience, and as the purity of a technological idea that is always identical irrespective of its various external interpretations, readerly appropriations and material formalisms. A number of critical analysts collectively and variously referred to as New Bibliographers, post-Kantian aestheticians, Neo-Platonists, etc, emerged in the 1940s to disincarnate the 'purity' of the literary coda from what was perceived as the 'corruption' of the coda by its externalities. Seen from their prism, it does not matter what material embodiments the coda of literature (or the digital programme) takes; what matters is the abstraction of the textual code, the literary essentials, the idealism of the textuality that is disembedded from its external incarnations (e.g. number of publications, copyright, written words, oral inscriptions, issues, editions, manuscripts, copies, dictations, etc) and alternators (e.g. copy editors, scribes, or compositors). From this light, these externalities are merely 'accidents' and therefore, the readerly role cannot be anything but an external 'misreading' of the coda by the author, the audience or the reader.

The intersection pitting, on the one hand, the internalities (that is, the abstraction and essentialism of literary codism) and, on the other hand, its externalities (the material forms, its historicism and alternations), was developed in the digital humanities by the concept of 'breaking' (as opposed to 'building') and more elaborately by the literary movement called deconstructionism. Deconstructionism does not only oppose word inscription (codism) in the text (internalities) and materiality of writing of text (externalities): that is, the 'grammar' in speech acts versus the re-production of writing, the rules of orality versus the 'betrayal' of writing, etc, but more especially stresses on the (marketing) mechanisms of iterability, 'citationality' or 'archi-writing', [1][2] that is, the (mere exposure) effects engendered by these differentiations in which reading externalities actively or un destabilize or possibly efface the codic characteristics of the literary internalities. The lesson from this exegesis is that the digital coda is very susceptible to the deconstruction of the readerly market.

3. Advent of 'Breaking' Age of the Reader's Habeas Corpus

As we have shown in the previous section, the New Criticism philosophy has been an attempt to enforce the constitutionality of the literary coda and efface the role of the reader; however, particularly from the 1970s, with the increasing emphasis on the dynamism of market productivity and the pre-eminence of unstable meanings by readers of texts, a number of disciplines emerged in literary criticism and in cultural sociology with the chief aim to 'break' the coda, that is, to disembed (i.e. free) the role of readers from what was seen as totalitarian judgments contained in the authorial codification of programmers and what was envisaged as the despotism of the textual architectural machinery through a

number of new propositions. The first proposition was incarnated by the term *erwartungshorizont*, that is, the concept of horizon of expectation which was also referred to by the same name in the poetics of reception. The horizon of expectation is a frame of reference that contrasts poetic/practical language and particular thematics of writings. It challenges the New Criticism philosophy according to which there is a pre-existing objective meaning of the coda, which is self-enclosed, self-centred and self-contained at all times in the digital/literary text and its idea is available always for interpretation. Now, this horizon draws attention to the assumption that there is a dialectical relationship existing between digital/literary text/coda and readerly writings, and that this relationship accounts for why some digital/literary codal textualities are instantly accepted by readerly writings (as current programmes of R, python, etc, world masterpieces, classical texts and so forth) whose expectations are fulfilled while other readerly writings defy previous categorizations (e.g. as outdated) and compel readers to accept a change of horizons (e.g. SQL, NOSQL, the texts *Madame Bovary*, *Don Quijote*). The notion of horizon of expectation simply states that in the course of history, the way a particular literary genre was previously understood changes and this dynamism causes readerly writers to expect a change in the work of a genre type. In a seminal paper entitled 'Literary history as a challenge to literary theory', Jauss and Benzinger (1970) explain that there are certain discrete intellectual and aesthetic categories that regulate how the coda/idea of a literary text is received and interpreted by readers/writers of a given historical period.

The dynamic reactions between, on the one hand, a digital coda/text's idea and the linguistic structures that couch the coda/idea and, on the other hand, the appropriations and interpretations of readers/writers, is the subject matter treated by another structuralist movement called reader-response criticism. According to the reader-response philosophy, the act of reading is a response to the New Critical digital coda and literary text. The aesthetic response, which is different from the aesthetics of reception, is a play of definitions intersecting, on the one hand, perception and imagination, and on the other hand, the faculties, adjustment, differentiation and judgments of the reader and writer (of marketing). Reader-response hypothesizes a dialectical relationship existing between digital coda/literary text, and the interactive reader/writer. Its phenomenology of reading/writing rejects the New Criticism view according to which a digital coda/textual grammar has the capability to imprint itself automatically onto the mind of the reader and of its own and sole accord. Wolfgang Iser's (1978) viewpoint of aesthetic response published in his book *The act of reading* is that a textual idea's linguistic structures and digital coda signifiers eventually wear out their imprinting functionalism in the process of triggering the reader's/writer's understanding. Iser's (1978) *The act of reading*, which he presents as a book of "Germanic phenomenology" is a sequel of two earlier articles, namely, 'The reading process: a phenomenological approach' and 'Indeterminacy and the reader's response in prose fiction' (English version 1971). The reading/writing act motivated by the digital coda/literary text challenges the prospect of a totalizing power by the digital coda/literary text itself exercised on the reader and the market, and it is this waning (crisis of) power that constitutes the starting point for the creative side of interpretation, the *habeas corpus* of reading/writing and the archiving or market effects from them. From the understandings occasioned by the digital coda, signifiers or textual grammar, the reader/writer 'discerns' certain negations and gaps and these disparities may then induce her to carry out certain analyses within the coda/text itself, and also upon the contradictions it betrays given that the reader/writer is required to espouse an autonomous, self-referral and elitist opinion in relation to the integrity of the coda/textual idea.

Stanley Fish (1980) in his work *Is there a text in this class?* proposes an 'interpretive communities' hypothesis to explain the (market) potentialities of the reader/writer's role: to re-invent interpretations that circumvent the codal/textual 'tyrannies' couching the programmes/ideas through the radicalism of their solipsism. [3] The interpretive communities' philosophy of reading/writing addresses itself to the dilemma that intersects proponents of the coda/textual idea and advocates of the reader's/writer' *shabeas corpus*. The philosophy highlights interpretive strategies of the reader/writer which do not have any universal transparency. According to its perspective, any consideration that a reader/writer has for a coda/literary idea is not determined by a constraint existing somewhere in the coda/text itself compelling him to do so, nor is it occasioned by an arbitrary or an independent will either. Rather, the reader's/writer's considerations are prompted by a collective decision that defines what can be considered as digital/literature and its signifiers and what cannot be considered as such. Such a consideration from a collective decision perspective can only materialize as long as there is a community of 'believers' (understood here as market readers/writers) who conform to it. Thus, by 'interpretive communities' is meant a *liaison* of coda/market, object/ subject, text/reader and meaning/writing experience. Specifying the qualities of 'interpretive communities', Stanley Fish points out that this *liaison* is not objective (just as market relationships are subjective) given that it is driven by a variety of interests that promote particular goals, aims and purposes. The *liaison* is not neutral given that it is reasoned and the textual meanings engendered by interpretive communities are subjective because they do not emerge from an isolated, rationalist person but rather from a market public with its own subjective ethics.

From this light, the various interpretive communities of the world (e.g. oral traditional societies, conservative/neo-liberal communities, communist nationalists, Black feminists, neo-patrimonial or pan-African nationalists, etc) have their (archival/market) strategies which determine what coda/text is read and what coda/text is not read, how codic/textual meaning is generated and reconstructed, which codic values and textual norms regulate the selection of programming ideas and the production of meaning, how they relate to the readerly culture and writerly environment. The 'interpretive' strategies are not devised after the act of reading/writing has taken place; rather the strategies are shaped out prior to and during the reading and writing processes of 'breaking'. Strategies of understanding take the shape of readings of gamification, adverts, networking, etc. which endow textual ideas with the profile of their writing, and therefore marketing or sharing (marketing) is the real force re-constructing this reading/writing process.

A similar and related perspective to Stanley Fish's viewpoint is that of Roland Barthes (1967) who published his book *La mort de l'auteur* in the review *Mantéia* and *Aspen Magazine* (O' Sullivan, 2013). In Barthes' view, reading/writing is a location outside of the coda/text where the meaning of the digital/the literary idea is re-created and it also eludes the intention or control of the coder/author. In this light, as Logie (2013) points out, a literary text (digital coda), and the signifiers couched in them, do not possess a singular meaning but, in the eyes of the reader/writer, are comprised of a multiplicity of 'readings/writings' that come from various cultures and that dialogue among themselves thereby creating room for potential breakages and new conflicts, parody, contestations and so forth. The re-'writing' of the digital coda/textual idea is effected not by the author's intention nor in the text itself, as New Criticism scholars would claim, but by the readerly/writerly spaces of the market. The reader is a post-codal/textual space inscribed by a variegation of 'writings'. S/he is the real site of codal/textual unity, the virtual 'originator' of the idea and the destination of the codal/textual signifier. Seen from this light, the birth of the reader is simultaneously the 'death of the author'.

Similarly, online reading can be comparable to an act of poaching; [4] it is not a passive 'consumption' of a codal/literary idea but an active production of yet 'another literary' or textual/ digital idea. The popular assumption often held is that 'reading' a coda/text, or watching a YouTube video, a picture, an animated design or an image online is an example of passive (market) consumption, an act that an itinerant or nomadic voyeur would do. But no! the other position is that reading/writing is a very active and productive act because, beyond the leaps over scripted spaces, the glides across screen pages, the textual changes of folklore effected by audience reception, the expectations of meanings deferred, the nomadic eyes from one digital site to another, there are post-codal textualities produced: that is, new forms of appropriation of meanings of ideas that take the creative forms of oral versions or re-textings such as 'likes' or 'shares', in Facebook, Twitter and Instagram, online negative comments, opinions, messaging, re-blogging, etc.

These are examples of oral and online poaching in which the reader transports themselves into the network of communication, and can even 'pluralize' themselves in it (to borrow the term from Michel de Certeau). Reading is a certain way of relating to a coda/literary text and its grammar; it is a strategic 'art of the weak' that appropriates unapologetically the textual grammar of the coder/'author'. The lieu of this tactic is the readerly space, which is presumably the Other of the codal/textual grammar. The reading tactic may permeate into the digital coda/textual grammar itself, for example, by fragmenting it without appropriating the entirety of the coda/text grammar nor being indifferent to it. The digital codareader is a 'traveller' in the sense that she is a re-writer of the digital coda/textual grammar, by re-creating (breaking) her own online codaspace; she works on the linguistic 'ground' of the cyberspace coder migrating across several virtual texts and textual spaces of the subjective individual and marketer. The digital codal reader poaches across virtual fields that he does not plough but has the capacity to despoil (break) the corporate authority of the coda or the brand name of the cyberspace technology through, for example, the marketing of racial /hate speech, inciting of hatred, defamation, instigation of violence, etc. in order to appropriate a Proustian jouissance of online participation. [5] By reconstructing the Barthesian (Roland Barthes) 'death of the (digital codal) author', the cyberspace reader poaches over and reproduces a new kind of subaltern meaning that is capable of possessing an existence of its own beyond the corporate coda of virtual companies (as author), and their products, services and brands. This explains why digitally codified products, services and brands may take one meaning when they are advertised online and then take a different meaning when consumers react to them and start to appropriate their meaning and power. It may come to a point where online corporate or organizational products, services and brands are withdrawn from the cyberspace business because they are connoted with negative comments/readings that are counter-productive. The original (digital coda/oral) textual grammar can thus only define itself as signifier (together with the grammar, lexis, semantics and content) via the signified meanings generated by readers and writers. Consequently, original corporate coda/signifiers of brands tend to change their forms in accordance with the readings of cyberspace consumers. They are re-ordered to conform with the perception codes of consuming readers that brands do not control. Online corporate coda in Web 1.0, for example, are messages now latching onto the reader's productive exteriority of Web 2.0 where the consumer is absolute 'master'. There is an active interplay of brand coda 'expectations' which may clash with reader market expectations or with the virtual documentation and archiving as forms of the actualization of the corporate codal (authorial) text.

4. Materializing the 'Breakage' in the Reader's Habeas Corpus

The reading process of a digital coda /literary grammar is a dialogical and therefore dynamic act that constructs new significations and meanings. As cultural historians and sociologists of texts (e.g. D. F. McKenzie) have confirmed, readers of the literary grammar do not 'write' as though a textual grammar and its coda exist in and of themselves, but rather as autonomous existences beyond the voices and structures of the coda that convey and disseminate the textual ideas. What causes a coda/textual grammar to attract interest and compel an audience to read it is also the fact that readers engage in the creation of new events (e.g. archiving oral literature, marketing products) and meanings that go beyond the coda /authorial grammar of a digital text or literary idea. A codal text is a 'form' in the sense that it exists as such in relation to multiples of other possible writerly forms. A coda/textual idea can be expressed through a digital app. like Twitter, a novel, a play, a film, cartoon, a poem, big data, or an oral genre like folktale, but these textual 'forms' can only be appreciated differently by various readers and writers even though the coda/idea is same. Seen in this sense, codal textual forms themselves contribute to the re-construction of ideological meaning. McKenzie (1985), in his 'Panizzi lectures' published in *Bibliography and the sociology of texts: the book as an expressive form*, argues that a coded language can speak the same idea as a bibliography but it will be interpreted variously, as sociologists of texts would confirm.

The reading process can take the form of a 'response' to a coded text as elucidated earlier or of a reception of it. But whether as response to a coded text or as reception of it, the reading/writing process typically disembeds (breaks) the

digital coda/textual grammar from the scriptural modalities or historical, social and cultural circumstances that occasioned it. In the reading process, the New Critical determinations of the coda appear to be 'broken' and when this 'breakage' is combined with discrepancies (variations) in the practices of reading, the idea of a codal text becomes susceptible to multitudes of signifiers and meanings, which in their own turn, are also vulnerable to other significations (Ogden and Richards 1952). The reader of a coda whether as online commentator, a village audience appreciating an artist's performance, an isolated appreciator of an authorial style or as a nation responding to/receiving the address of a candidate to the leadership of their country, is an isomorphic entity disembedded from the biographical, psychological, and historical considerations of the source text. He only happens to be a meeting site where different text codes and ideological paths confront each other. His own horizon of expectation and comprehension is trans-subjective, that is, it cuts across several subjectivities and sensitivities (those of the coda, coder, author, his community and of himself) and is therefore hermeneutical because his reading strategies are always deferred (with possibilities of engendering other meanings) rather than stable.

The meanings of a literary idea depend not chiefly on the text itself but on the practices, conventions and competences of the reading audiences which are, in turn, derived from sociological, cultural and historical conditions. Reading is not a monolithic practice in the sense that it takes the same form irrespective of the textual genre, ideological concept or the social and cultural conditions that potentialize it as further confirmed by Pierre Bourdieu (1990)'s 'Lecture, lecteurs, lettrés, littérature, In Other Words). The lector (Bourdieu's term for reader) considers the text and its idea not as an interiority that dictates its autonomous and self-contained meaning but as an object to be perceived, interpreted and performed. The textual idea therefore belongs to the community of lecteurs (in the Fishian sense of the term) with their own socio-cultural features and historical circumstances.

A digital coda/literary grammar cannot come to life on its own terms in the consciousness of the reading and marketing audience; readers typically have to adopt it, make it their own through appropriation, and then, from here, the psychological process of re-reading through a number of practical variations is triggered off because readers themselves have multifarious expectations, shifting attitudes, varied competences and changing habits. Readers respond to or receive a digital code/textual grammar differently depending upon the material form through which it is engendered. Thus, to speak of readership of a digital coda/textual grammar is to hypothesize an actualization of possible new events, meanings, to posit a 'readability site' of new significations, and to locate the lieu of action of reading as a socio-cultural and historicized condition of possibilities. The textual grammar or coda undergoes an unpredictable process of susceptibilities in which the reader's *habeas corpus* is fully materialized through minimization of the identity politics of the codification (e.g. community-spirited life, liberal democracy, communism, neo-patrimonialism, free market capitalism), and subversion of its formalistic features like its programming, editions, printing-house practices, etc. The reader's attitudes tend to ignore the New Critical view that a literary coda is self-contained and generates its own meanings autonomously from the linguistic inscriptions of the textual grammar. Whether unconsciously or consciously, readers typically negotiate the meaning of a work of art and its coda through insinuation of their own understandings, intuitions, shifting strategies of marketing, appreciation, objections to the textual code, and their own new symbolic languages and aesthetic appropriations. In the end, the materializations of readership may break and destabilize the original code embedded in the cyberspace or literary art or, at least, unsettle the text's claim to codal autonomy and expunge the expressive externalities of the text.

Readers actually appreciate by re-writing digital content, books and their themes, oral texts and their philosophy and literary coda and their ideas. Irrespective of the type of readership audience we are referring to in terms of race, ethnicity, sexuality, gender, generation, disability and nationality (e.g. cyberspace Millennials, Generation X or Y, the printing press team, liberal philosophers, Third World engineers, Climate change politicians, Black racists, conservative philanthropists, lesbian drug addicts, Latino American nationalists, cultural film producers, single mother girls, human rights lawyers, disability advocates, etc), readers tend to re-embody online texts, creative art, oral art and their respective ideas variedly because they come from different sociological backgrounds with their own respective historical experiences as pointed out above. In addition, readers are pragmatists who appropriate works of digital production and works of art variously irrespective of whatever the oeuvres incarnate as coda or their (ir) reducibility to meaning. Readers materialize their practical and cultural formats via which texts are re-digitized, seen, read, appreciated or heard by 'looking' at the coda in a social media app, a book, an artistic performance through their online illustrations, the ways they typeset, the manner they re-copy the text, set out its page layouts, the binding style they use, the editions they select, their way of engraving the oeuvres, their footnotes in articles they write about the works of art, the errata they provide in their theses on works of art, their word spellings on the texts and so on. In this way, the re-writings of a literary idea in the horizon of expectation of a reader can never be the same irrespective of the claims to stability of the idealism of the text.

5. New Historicism of the Readerly and Writerly *Habeas Corpus*

As a performance practice of the coda, reading or writing takes multiple forms in various human societies depending on whether one is referring to the pre-modern nation of oral communities, the Eurocentric Middle Ages, the modernization epoch or the post-modern epoch of globalization today. In oral African societies of the patrimonial coda, for example, reading is performed in literature in 'breaking' terms of variations in voice tonalities and intonations, multiplicity of pitch forms, use of alternating hand gestures, facial expressions and bodily kinesics where setting, audience and artist confront each other during an event such as a festival. The artist creates art in accordance with certain rules of composition (the coda) but the audience participates in that creation thereby 'breaking' and re-creating it through 'call and answer' strategies, direct interventions in the course of an oral artistic delivery and even through patronage given to

reward whoever is seen as the best artist. In this way, the folktale, myth, elegy, lullaby, legend, proverb, or dramatic genres, etc. were engendered creatively via artist-audience participation at specific times such as the close of the day at a homestead fireside after the day's farm work. The oral work of art and coda it articulates in oral societies is/is not the property of an artist/'author'; it is the community property of both the artist/audience, the Fishian 'interpretive communities' of readers who develop certain etiquettes to set up standards of production like morality of the text coda, the lesson learned at the end of the performance, and so on. In this way, it is hard to state that the oral work of art and its communitarian ideologies are chiefly the product of an independent, autonomously performing artist, unlike the case of the Eurocentric text whose author's names are conspicuously inscribed on the cover page of a novel, play, travel diary, etc. The oral readership effect is now evident in cyberspace reading practices with rewritings such as 'likes', 'sharing' and comments in Web 2.0 platforms like Facebook, Twitter, Pinterest, etc. In the traditional culture, each oral reader had his particular sensitivity that is not reducible to the sensitivity of the artist or the other readers. This is the reason why the storyline of African folktales, for example, may be stable across a country or a region, in terms of the ideology or lesson learned, but the plot details would typically differ across countries and regions depending on geographical location, economic activities, historical experience, etc. and this differentiation may affect attitudes of readers toward the textual coda. For example, in the oral tale titled 'Why Pig digs into mud with his mouth', Tortoise borrows a bag of groundnuts (or beans, maize or dried fish) from Pig, in one version, whereas in another version, Tortoise borrows a bag of wheat (a cow), and in yet another version he borrows money (a million shillings, a million francs, whatever) and makes an agreement (a covenant, a pact, an (un)witnessed deal, etc) promising to return it in a (month's, week's, year's) time. After the due time, Pig comes to ask for it (whatever was borrowed) and Tortoise who is unable to pay back or return it, arranges with his wife to use him as grinding stone. Pig demands to see Tortoise and the indifference of his wife who is busy pretending to be grinding pepper for her soup infuriates him and he picks up the 'grinding stone' and flings it through the window to the outside. As he curses and presses on his wife to reveal the whereabouts of Tortoise and she starts to cry, Tortoise suddenly opens the door and comes in to ask what is happening (in one version, why his wife is weeping, in another what amorous business Pig has with his wife, etc). Tortoise's wife recounts the incident in the house and Tortoise, now very angry, asks Pig to return his 'grinding stone' or forfeit his indebtedness to him. Embarrassed from that day, Pig has been looking for the 'grinding stone' of Tortoise's wife by scouring the mud for any trace of it. The morale of the tale is that it is not good to take a decision when one is rash. Pig's decision-making is flawed because his anger muddles his thinking and he is unable to see that the so-called 'grinding stone' was actually the trickster Tortoise himself. The tale is performed by an artist, but there are evidences that the oral production (and rewriting or readership) of it is either context-inspired or audience reframed. In a society where the tale is told of Tortoise borrowing, for example, a bag of groundnuts, the attitudes of the reading audience may challenge the morale of the story that favours the desperate Pig and castigates the dishonest Tortoise; they may shift in favour of Tortoise and against Pig, who may be seen as an exploitative capitalist. Remember the artwork portraying the fat capitalist man, who carries an elephant weighing heavily on his head (alias Pig) but strains to bend down to pick up a cricket. In a society where the tale is told of Tortoise borrowing, for example, a million shillings from Pig, readership attitudes may instead shift the other way in favour of the capitalist Pig and against the poor but dishonest Tortoise. In this way, one may state that oral readership is not in the text and the idea it radiates but in the geographical, economic and historical space that is extraneous to text and idea and shapes attitudes. It is, therefore, arguable that the oral text itself, like any other coda and idea, is in the audience readership and this phenomenon characterizes the virtual or written text as well.

In the digital context of Web 1.0, reading is a process of visual and silent appropriation of the coda at the cost of reading aloud, which was the practice for comprehending texts read. However, this problem was resolved in Web 2.0 with the incorporation of social media apps like YouTube and animated designs. Silent reading is a 'modernist' experience that mutates from the oral experience of reading in traditional societies, where the 'reader'/audience assimilates the text by transforming their voice into the corporal text; the audience reader is the 'actor' of the oral textual coda. So, in a way, the online text coda has appropriated the grammatical resources of the oral coda. With modernization, the textual coda could not impose its internal rhythm on the reader: it could no longer manifest itself via the voice, body and kinesics (physical gestures, facial expressions, etc) of the reader. The alienation of the oral reader's kinesics (bodily movements, facial/hand gestures, dress code), which was his per formative habeas corpus given that the artist was both coder/author and reader at the same time, has been replaced by the new habeas corpus of silence in reading. The practice of silence in reading emerged as a result of new practices that were adopted during multiple historical periods by Eurocentric institutions right from the Middle Ages such as monasteries, universities and schools. The various forms of silent readership included memorization, recitation, meditative reading, the cogitation of literary content in low voice, etc, in order to facilitate the decoding of texts like tables, indexes, commentaries, and glosses. Thus, the history of reading is a narration of how the reader captures their freedom through new reading practices either thanks to the verbal, visual, vocal or written media. The internet as coda, breakage and sharing is the culmination of all of these reading practices because it embeds the verbal, visual, vocal and written media and is, therefore, very flexible as a meta-medium of (re-)expression of the coda. This explains why Web 2.0 has become today very popular as a readerly technology of expression and is now threatening to completely replace all prior media technologies, notably, the oral, telegraphy, radio/TV channels, and writing and print (novels, plays, newspaper, etc). re-incarnated as coda. Reading a scroll in the epoch of Antiquity required the mobilization of the entire body: the scroll had to be held up using one's both hands, and the reader, in this case, could not write while reading. The invention and diffusion of the codex, for example, between the Second and Fourth Centuries of the Christian era which, historically, served as the intermediary period, freed the reader who was no longer obliged to hold the book up and could now write while reading. The reader could then distance himself from a book while sitting on a desk or on a

pulpit. The Eighteenth century marked the time when the multiplication of small formats (e.g. the octavos, in-12, in-16) enabled readers to become familiar with books and their ideas and with new practices of reading such as reading while the reader was walking, reading while the reader was in a garden, reading while he was in the countryside, as opposed to and because of, the noisy urban setting, and these practices mutated further into reading while the reader was in bed, reading in prep evening classes, reading while she was in her boyfriend's house, collective reading in holidays classes, etc.

The Renaissance epoch ushered in a reading practice of common placing as intellectual technique which has survived today in terms of 'reading as writing', or the reader as writer often abbreviated as 'wreader'. The wreader rewrites, for example, fragments from mobile phones and unauthored scraps of texts. In the past, the Renaissance practice involved excavating models and universal truths (e.g. rhetorical, sentences, grammatical, etc), facts (natural, historical, sociological, cultural, etc) from texts. The reader's findings were indicated on the pages of a book itself, and they were copied on a routine notepad so that they could be reused in their own essays or compositions. During the Eighteenth century, common placing or marginal annotations started to take a varying signification as they were perceived as mere sentimentalism or as personalized responses to a text and its idea. The cultural meaning of reading started to shift during this historical period as expectations changed. Today, a question that one may ask in this connection is as follows: What happens to the relationship between the 'body' and the text in the digital world when it is keyboard mediated or when the fingers of a wreader move through the text on a screen? The digitalization of reading is a process of segmentation in which reading is appended to the fragment of the work much more than to the oeuvre's totality. This online practice has affinities with the codex, which required the reader to read by skipping passages or pages, leafing through a book, scanning, comparing passages in a text. Online reading also has similarities with common placing, the extracting and copying of citations from a text. It can be said that the literary and writing culture together with the reading experiences that ensued from it were constructed chiefly from the practice of breaking or fragmentation of the coda irrespective of whether it was referred to as *morceauxchoisis*, extract anthologies, commonplace collections, or *esprits* (during the epoch of the Eighteenth century).

The medical discourse that surfaced up during the Eighteenth century, signified reading as an individual malady, a collective epidemic or a potentially dangerous pathology. The employment of terms such as 'uncontrolled reading', 'physical immobility,' 'excessive reading' suggested that these practices could render the reader susceptible to disorders like intestine and stomach inflammation, physical fatigue and nerve derangement. The Eighteenth century was also a moment of major convictional mutations of reading practices. Solitary or excessive reading of an erotic novel, for example, was re-signified as a venue for possible symptoms of affliction like anxiety, paleness, prostration or introverted pleasures, owing to the propensity to reject reality and to prioritization of the imaginary. Thus, according to this reasoning, the appraisal of Rousseau's novels like the *Nouvelle h eloise* had the same physical effects that a physician could diagnose in a patient. Consequently, the Eighteenth-century embodied a historiographical instance when reading as a practice underwent a mutation from the 'intensive' to the 'extensive' phase (Hall 1996). The intensive phase that preceded the Eighteenth century was marked by transition from recitation, re-reading, memorization, generational transmission, hearing-and-learning by heart, sacredness of idea and authority of texts like the Holy Bible. In this era of the Enlightenment, the 'extensive' phase was characterized by rapid and avid consumption of abundantly printed texts, the fleeting, critical and detached gaze and a casual and irreverent mode of reading. With these changing tastes, the reading public extended its magnitude, and reading emerged as more secular and less intense.

With the advent of this new age of reading, the novel, for example, no longer grasped the whole attention of the reader, hypnotizing his focus, and regulating his actions and thoughts, as before; he no longer re-read, cited and recited. The reader was no longer assaulted by the text and its coda, he refused to identify with its heroes by melting his personality into theirs and objected to transcoding fiction into the activities of his own life. The days of intensive reading, and the tears and emotions it generated, were now being supplanted by new access conditions to printed works such as the typographic technology, the distribution of proscribed books, the explosion of reading societies, libraries and periodicals, and increasing possibilities of reading for women. In the emerging Nineteenth and Twentieth centuries, the 'intensive' reader also played into the art of the ironical and was now able to contribute to what is referred to as the paperback or *feuilleton* revolution. This mutation constructed a background from which the digital reader could then migrate on the same screen from one text to another text and, on the same day, could nomad from one screen to another. No more was reading as a solitude practice characterized by removal of the reader from the disturbing environment of urban towns, office, family; it was now an act of sociability, whether of the institutional (university, academics) or societal type such as reading during travelling, reading in the streets and so forth. With time, a thought leadership culture emerged in the public space but with an ambivalence of its own. It was ambiguous because the oral mode of speech delivery (as in African societies, the Ancient Athenian cities, or in the rest of developing nation states) on controversial issues (i.e. ideas) such as political decisions, community development programmes, etc. followed by a reading practice of oral exchanges of opinions (under the Palaver Tree), did not simply disintegrate. The old mode of oral performance and public critique was reproduced in the new public space where opinions and ideas were articulated by written communication and private reading. So, the old mode survived in the new. In the (old/new) formation of this hybridized reading public, characteristics of the two reading practices prospered.

6. Digital Coda and Global Context of Reader

This hybridized public space of readership in the contemporary global neo-liberal epoch is now being occupied by new thought leaders who are re-thinking (i.e. re-reading) the old textualcoda on nationalism and economic internationalism with a different *habeas corpus* in various sectors. The sectors of thought leadership include religion (e.g. revivalist evangelism, return to ancestral/shrine worship), identity politics, the free market economy of technological

disruption and innovation (e.g. Bill Gates, Larry Page and Sergey Mikhaylovich Brin, Mark Zuckerberg, Jeff Besos and Jack Mah respectively in Microsoft, Google, Facebook, Amazon publishing and Alibaba e-commerce), entrepreneurship and ICTs, pan-Africanism, post-global nationalism (BREXIT, FREXIT, neo-American capitalism, Islamic fundamentalism, etc), new sexuality cultures, disability movements and so forth. These developments in readership practice and the new ideas industry remind us of the relevant opinions of two philosophers, namely, Antonio Gramsci (1999) and Immanuel Kant. Gramsci's conception of the organic intellectual did not only articulate the character of the European bourgeoisie and industrial capitalism, but also portrayed the thought intellectual as emerging from working-class conditions, and as one who had the capability and inclination to express their social vision and to organize it into social action. Gramsci envisioned thought leaders (i.e. readers) as sharing a visionary understanding and transforming that experience into an intellectual and social struggle. Today, these intellectuals are emerging as authors, editors, and organizers in the new social media ecosystem. They have shown a greater presence in the public space than at any point in human history and have been willing to expose the prattle of their thoughts through their giftedness in the rhetorics of motivational speaking and coaching, their posture of scholarly detachment from classical academic conventions in higher education, and so on. Immanuel Kant once declared that there is the alliance of the public place and critical deployment of reason by private intellectuals (Onora O'Neill, 1986). Kant was very specific in his conceptualization of this phenomenon in his *Was Ist Aufklärung?* When he asserted that: "By 'public use of one's reason, I mean that use which a man, as a scholar, makes of it before the reading public." Kant proposed a new articulation of the public/private relationship, not merely by comparing the exercise of public reason with judgments that individuals communicated by acting as learned men. Kant referred to the public space as the domain of the universal and defined the private sphere as that of domestic interests. As a result, Kant linked production and reading of texts to the 'public use of one's reason.' The new forms of the intellectual or knowledge society during Kant's time were literary societies, clubs, masonic lodges, and coffee houses, which became congregations of the domestic sphere. The Kantian conception of the 'public' was not necessarily about physical geography and proximity or the city as a body politic; it was also about the scripting of communication and the public as a universal reader. The Kantian public reader created a political public space right from the 1950s which was appropriated by the digital age. The question that one could ask Immanuel Kant today if one had such an opportunity is as follows: is the digital public space of reason a critical readership free from any exploitation or is it simply an alienated reading site?

7. Revisiting the Affect as a form of Readership

Before Sigmund Freud theorized about psychoanalysis, a discipline which deals with the mind (of the reader), the chief authority who wrote about the reader was Aristotle and his writings were restricted to the reading of tragedy and the introspections of the reader about the performance of literary tragedy. Literary criticism sought to understand what the reader is thinking about, the effects that emerge from their reading a text or seeing it performed live. Such a knowledge acquisition attempted to answer questions on issues like educational value of the literature being read, censorship of insights and the status of the reader. In important ways, the role of the reader is both peripheral and central to literature coda depending upon how one sees literature. If literature's coda is seen as a self-contained, autonomous and self-regulating object, then obviously, the reader is peripheral to it. If literature is seen as a form of communication, that is, as a type of 'saying', then it is obvious that literature cannot be a complete process of communication without a reader, the sayee. In a complete communication process, there is a sender (that is, a coda and its coder, writer/artist, producer, etc, who 'says'), a medium of communication (literature, digital technology, newspaper/cartoon, music, film, political system, oral history, etc) and the receiver (the reader who reads the coda and its meaning into what is said). So, without the reader, we cannot 'see' precisely to whom a literary work is addressed. The reader is not a specific 'person': he may be a big audience, a single individual, the writer herself or no person at all.

When people are asked what is the difference between 'literature', 'ideas' and 'emotion', they usually suggest that both are self-evidently inseparable one from the other. For example, the popular thought is that poems narrate feelings of love/grief, folktales memorialize attitudes of guilt, shame, rage or defeat and a play conveys an experience of suspense as a reader flips through the pages. A student may end up after perusing a novel, or a piece of travel literature with exhaustion in awe or an audience may enjoy an oral text in a relaxed mood of optimism. In the past decades, emotions such as love, grief, shame, guilt, rage, defeat, respect or optimism were taken for granted, were considered as self-evident and were ignored because they were envisioned as being indistinguishable from a literary text. This earlier position was held because it was believed that after a reader sets aside his poem, novel, play to devote himself to other daily duties or an audience leaves the venue of the performer and his oral art, these emotions were left behind in the books or in the performance site. But when we consider how a reading/or watching of William Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* overwhelms us and we come off with the feeling that love is intensified and driven to a point where the characters Romeo and Juliet clinch to death, then we need to rethink our position about reading as a passive act. The sphere of the affect draws its insights from different theories, especially in psychoanalysis, linguistics and sociology. Writers like Gilles Deleuze and Jacques Lacan radically revised the Freudian theory of psychoanalysis (Id, ego, superego) to theorize the affect by providing new insights that are being deployed in political analysis. Poststructuralists such as Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault also inspired the development of affect theory to a point where the concept was sometimes referred to as 'affective post-structuralism'.

8. By Way of a Codal-Readerly/Writerly Conclusion?

Today, the orthodox belief that the study of the ICT written or video coda and its ideas is confined only to the classroom of digital elites has collapsed and a new reading of it has emerged to replace it, namely, that readership in all its

forms of habeas corpus can be a distinct experience from what happens within the fortress of cyberspace. This new position upholds the view that even emotions belong to a separate readership domain called 'the affect'. Beyond the digital humanities is literary theory. Literary theories can only serve as readership lenses through which one can see digital texts. Literary theory provides ideas that can serve as various lenses critics employ to talk about and illuminate the creativity of digital art, literature, and culture. The various codal lenses enable critics of texts as readers to consider digital works of art based on guided assumptions within a school of thought.

The history of digital humanities is an exegesis of literature and ideas which is entwined with the rich philosophies of indigenous societies, the philosophy of key thinkers such as Plato, Aristotle, Horatius, Longinus, Socrates, Sartre, Nietzsche, Marx, the thought leadership ideologies of neoliberal global capitalism and the analytical pragmatism of public intellectualism which is critical of how people live and experience life. Literature and ideas are a metaphor for society and life. Some scholars may disagree with this opinion, and it is alright if they do so because they are readers as well of art and ideas. Nevertheless, the prevailing thinking is that literary theory is not reducible to cyberspace literature alone because all things in society and life are being 'read' all the time and are therefore considered as 'textual' codes. The latest of these things is the ICT as codal text. Is Life itself not a gigantic CODAL TEXT with its own internalized narrative mysteries that readers (i.e. religious institutions, scientists, historians, geographers, biologists, mathematicians, artists, politicians, lawyers, astrologists, etc) have pondered about for centuries and tried to uncover by writing about it? So beyond reading of poetry, novels, plays, immigration literature, or diasporic works of art, oral folklore, etc everyone is also reading societally codified 'texts' like politics, the economy, religion, culture, capitalism, climate change, women, international relations, history, law, music, dating and relationships, archeology, and Life/Death itself. We read people's changing needs and attitudes all the time and we read products, services, brands, name it. This paper challenges us to deploy these insights on literary skills of reading to outreach to people and help society to grow healthily. The real challenge of the imperial metanarrative we call the ICTs is not in the digital divide itself, but in the 'readings that such a 'divide' constructs which we then call underdevelopment, the bubble/bust cycles, the unemployment discourses, etc. These are actually 'ways' in which we read; they are simply discourses emerging from externalizations of our (mis)readings of the metanarrative! Literature plays a critical part in these mis/readings.

'Misreadings' are also a kind of 'reading' of texts that this paper inputs into the evaluation of postcolonial digital humanities. As digital methods to scholarship in the humanities multiply, in theory, pedagogy, or praxis, the question that has come to the fore, namely, where is the "human" in digital humanities, should now find the beginning of an answer. The answer suggested here is 'reading'. This question is often expressed as an evidence of anxiety about the greater attention that digital humanities has benefitted from. Timothy Brennan argues that the 'bust' in the digital humanities deprives the humanities of its reason to survive and has transformed humanists into knowledge curators and put critical thinking into a trajectory of planned obsolescence (Brennan 2015). Well, there is evidently no planned obsolescence yet in reading, as even the author suggests a return to philology as a genuine practice of reading. Reading is man's emancipative discourse; it had always existed in the past and it will always thrive rather than run into obsolescence in the future.

9. References

- i. de Beistegui M., 1998. Heidegger and the political, New York: Routledge.
- ii. Bourdieu, P., 1987, *Lecture, lecteurs, lettrés, littérature*, Preface, pp. vii-ix in P. Bourdieu: In
- iii. Choses Dites Paris: Ed. de Minuit, 47-71.
- iv. Brennan, T., 2015. The legacies of Vico: philology, the internet, the posthuman. between, *Review of Comparative Literature* (University of Bologna), 5(10).
- v. Derrida, J., 1981, *Plato's pharmacy*, In: *Dissemination*, translated by Barbara Johnson, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 63-171
- vi. Dobson, J.E., 2019. *Critical digital humanities: The search for a methodology*, Illinois:
- vii. University of Illinois Press Jaus, H.R, and Benzinger, E., 1970, *Literary history as a challenge to literary theory*. *New Literary History*, 2 (1): 7-37.
- viii. Fish, F., 1980, *Is there a text in this class: The authority of interpretive communities*, Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press
- ix. Columbia, D., 2016. Code is not speech. Available at <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2764214> Gramsci, A., 1999, *Selections from the prison notebooks*, edited and translated by Quentin
- x. Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, London: Elec Book.
- xi. Hall, D., 1996, *Cultures of print: essays on the history of the book*, Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press
- xii. Iser, W., 1978, *The act of reading: a theory of aesthetic response*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- xiii. Liu, A., 2016. Are digital humanities a field? —An answer from the point of view of language.
- xiv. *Journal of Siberian Federal University: Humanities and Social Sciences* 7 (2016): 1546-52
- xv. Logie, J. 2013/ 1967., *The birth of 'The Death of the Author'*, National Council of Teachers of English. Retrieved from the University of Minnesota Digital Conservancy, <http://hdl.handle.net/11299/148870>.
- xvi. McKenzie, Donald Francis. 1999 [1985]. *Bibliography and the sociology of texts: The book as an expressive form*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- xvii. Miguel de Beistegui and Franska, H, 2007, *Jouissance de Proust: pour une esthetique de la metaphore*, <https://www.adlibris.com/.../jouissance-de-proust-pour-une-es...>

- xviii. Ogden, C. K., and I. A. Richards. 1952, *The meaning of meaning: a study of the influence of language upon thought and of the science of symbolism*. London: Kegan Paul
- xix. Onora O'Neill, 1986, *The public use of reason*, *Political Theory*, 14 (4): 523-551 O' Sullivan, M., 2013, *La mort de l'auteur*, *The Literary Encyclopedia*. <https://www.litencyc.com/php/sworcs.php?rec=true&UID=10350>
- xx. Posner, M., 2013. *No half measures: Overcoming common challenges to doing digital humanities in the library*. *Journal of Library Administration*, 53(1), pp.43-52.
- xxi. Ramsay, S., 2011. *On building*. *Defining Digital Humanities: A Reader*, New York, NY: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd, pp.243-45
- xxii. Risam, R., 2018. *New digital worlds: Postcolonial digital humanities in theory, praxis, and pedagogy*. Northwestern University Press.
- xxiii. Wimsatt, W. K., and Beardsley, M. C., 1954, *the intentional fallacy*, in *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry*, Lexington: Kentucky University Press, pp.2-18.

[1] *archi-writing* is a neologism, in which 'archi-' refers to telos, that is, to principle, origin, and articulates the idea to go beyond the dichotomy of speech/writing and address the type of writing that precedes the speech act and the mechanisms of writing. Jacques Derrida, a French philosopher, illuminated the concept of *archi-writing* by referring to language, and argued that 'language' is an idea which is already there prior to its employment by people in society. This Derridian 'language' refers to the sphere of genesis, the pre-given, which is also malleable, and therefore unfixed because it is set-up through syntax and words that are themselves unstable in meaning and form. As employed by Jacques Derrida, the term was derived from the French compound word *archi-écriture*, to establish a link between 'speech' and 'writing'. Derrida demonstrated that during the classical era of Plato, speech came first before writing. He went further to argue that in Western civilization, speech was poorly imitated by the phonetics of writing. Derrida pointed out again that, for example, in the writings of the linguist Ferdinand de Saussure and the philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 'writing' had a parasitic placement and 'speech' was prioritized. Jacques Derrida's work entitled as *Plato's Pharmacy*, tried to complicate the link between the terms speech and writing by drawing insights from the Greek word *φάρμακον pharmakon*, which embeds 'poison' and 'cure'. Plato had demonstrated that the craftsmanship of 'writing' was 'poisonous' to the artistic value of memory the 'cure' of mankind. The speech act (which is equivalent to the de Saussurian *langue*, that is, the idea of literature in this paper) is marked by living memory and writing is simply an approximation, a repetition (that is, the de Saussurian *parole*), which is 'not quite' (to cite Homi Bhabha) like the originating memory or idea. Consequently, given that 'speech' and 'writing' depend on repetition, they are indistinguishable one from another.

[2] *iterability* and *citability* sometimes refers to Jacques Derrida's notion of *iterability* from his essay 'Signature Event Context', where he argued that the essential feature of a signature was that it had a recognizable form and could be repeated.

[3] *Solipsism* comes from the Latin word *solus*, which means 'alone', and *ipse*, which means 'self'. It is a philosophical concept which states that the mind of the individual is the only thing that is certain to exist.

[4] *Poaching* means illegal capturing or hunting of wild game in lands with rights to use. It is realized by peasants who are impoverished for the purposes of subsistence and enhancement of their inadequate diet.

[5] *Proustian jouissance*: Proust saw life as a cruel reality that informs our hopes and desires but at the same time reduces them to nothing (de Beistegui 1998, de Beistegui and Franska, 2007). Our illimited freedom of spirit is destroyed by that reality. The ideas we look for end up disappointing us. Reality has a lack, a gap, which we experience and feel; but we also signify that lack and that gap. We 'read' reality's gaps by giving meaning to it, but at the same time, the gaps may deconstruct the meanings and render us frustrated.