

Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 17.12.24

Om leksikonet: https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/om_leksikonet.pdf

Felleskriving

Skriveprosjekter og tekstproduksjon der en gruppe personer skriver sammen. På engelsk kalt bl.a. “collaborative writing” og “co-authorship”.

“Collaborative writing involves two or more persons working together to produce a written document. Also called group writing, it is a significant component of work in the business world, and many forms of business writing and technical writing depend on the efforts of collaborative writing teams. [...] “Collaboration not only draws on the expertise and energy of different people but can also create an outcome that is greater than the sum of its parts.” – Rise B. Axelrod and Charles R. Cooper” (Richard Nordquist i <https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-collaborative-writing-1689761>; lesedato 12.08.24).

Manifester er ofte skrevet av mange forfattere/kunstnere sammen (Ehrmann og Traupmann 2022 s. 11). Nettleksikonet Wikipedia har artikler som kan være skrevet av et høyt antall personer.

Vitenskapelige artikler, f.eks. innen medisin, har ofte mange forfattere, altså forskere som har bidratt til teksten i “co-authorship” (Christoph Hoffmann i Ehrmann og Traupmann 2022 s. 229). Forfatterne kan befinne seg på ulike steder i sin forskerkarriere og arbeide ved mer enn én institusjon.

Den engelske forfatteren Anthony Berkeley Cox grunnla i 1930 en Detection Club i London sammen med blant andre krimforfatterne Agatha Christie og Freeman Wills Crofts. Noen av dem skrev romaner sammen.

“A relatively unexplored category of fiction [...] is the shared-world novel. [...] *The Floating Admiral*, dates from 1931 [...] “A novel by Agatha Christie, Dorothy L. Sayers, G. K. Chesterton and Certain Other Members of the Detection Club.” In fact there are no less than thirteen authors, all writing a single chapter of a mystery novel in a common setting using common characters. This was such a sufficiently difficult trick that no one tried it again for nearly fifty years, until the appearance of *Thieves’ World* (1979), edited by Robert Lynn Asprin and Lynn Abbey, and featuring stories by such well-known science fiction and fantasy writers as C. J. Cherryh, Gordon R. Dickson, John Brunner, Poul Anderson, and Marion Zimmer Bradley. These stories all shared a common background, set in the fantasy world of Sanctuary. The writers were encouraged not only to use the common background

but to write stories involving one another's characters. Though many of the best-known authors dropped out early, the series was popular enough to continue through fourteen anthologies, seven novels, a comic book series, role-playing games, and a MUD." (Harrigan og Wardrip-Fruin 2009 s. 30-31)

Wild Cards er en science fiction-verden skapt (i 1987) av en gruppe forfattere som skriver romaner og tekster til antologier (redigert av George R. R. Martin og Melinda M. Snodgrass). *Wild Cards* "has so far run to fourteen anthologies, three novels, a role-playing game, a comic book series, and a graphic novel. [...] Every third anthology was a "mosaic" novel, in which the contributors braided their stories together into a single narrative that was intended to read like a novel." (Walter Jon Williams i Harrigan og Wardrip-Fruin 2009 s. 31-32)

Da romanen *Invisible Seattle: The Novel of Seattle* ble utgitt i 1987, ble "Seattle" valgt som kollektivt forfatternavn på omslaget. "In 1983, as part of a Seattle arts festival, a group of writers, artists and performers conspired to recruit the entire city to write a detective novel. The project became an inspired investigation into the concepts of city, language, individuality and authorship in a world of flux. Published in 1987, this 246-page paperback includes the entire text of the novel, numerous illustrations and photographs plus an appendix recounting the structure of the festival event itself. [...] A surprisingly good book that emerged from one of the most audacious feats of collaborative writing we have ever heard of: in the 1980s, a group of literary workers, wearing jump suits and helmets, and armed with clipboards and business cards, took to the streets to get the entire city of Seattle to write a novel: a book about Seattle by Seattle." (<http://www.spinelessbooks.com/invisibleseattle/index.html>; lesedato 21.03.11)

"Mange kjenner til Stratemeyer-syndikatet, som på begynnelsen av 1900-tallet begynte å masseprodusere kommersielle serier for barn, deriblant "Hardy-guttene", "Frøken Detektiv" og "Bobseybarna". [...] Slike bedrifter finnes ikke i Norge. Men nylig lanserte Kagge en ny spenningsserie for ungdom, "De4", skrevet av et anonymt forfatterkollektiv som "hver fredag møtes i et rom på en hemmelig adresse i Oslo for å klekke ut nye historier". Ifølge forlagskatalogen har de store planer for serien. Tre bøker er allerede ute, og to er på vei. Jo flere, jo fortere?" (*Dagbladet* 5. september 2015 s. 50)

Den britiske forfattergruppa The Medieval Murderers har både holdt arrangementer sammen og skrevet krimbøker i fellesskap. "The Medieval Murderers are a group of authors available for speaking events. The members are: Bernard Knight, Ian Morson, Michael Jecks, Karen Maitland, Susanna Gregory (aka Simon Beaufort), Philip Gooden and CJ Sansom. [...] It was during a tipsy evening in a pub, just after we had finished speaking at an event in Guildford in 2003, that we first mooted the notion of writing a book together. [...] A relic seemed a suitably medieval theme for us all, and it went from there. Our first book was entitled *The Tainted Relic*, and had chapters by Michael Jecks, Bernard Knight, Ian Morson, Philip Gooden and me [Susanna Gregory]. We enjoyed it so much that we almost immediately began working on *The Sword of Shame*. And we haven't stopped

since.” (Susanna Gregory i <https://www.susannagregory.com/medieval-murderers/>; lesedato 03.08.24)

“The notion that novelists should be solitary creators has long been deeply ingrained. More than twenty years ago, a group of Italian men set out to debunk that idea. They were part of an artist-activist network called the Luther Blissett Project, which took its name, for convoluted reasons, from an English soccer player who’d had a brief, disastrous stint, in the early eighties, playing for A. C. Milan. The L.B.P.’s biggest chapters were in Bologna and Rome [...] At a meeting of about fifty L.B.P. collaborators in 1995, somebody suggested that the Bolognese chapter co-write a novel, as an experiment. Four men – Roberto Bui, Giovanni Cattabriga, Luca Di Meo, Federico Guglielmi – volunteered, and got down to work on what they called a “meta-historical” novel. For inspiration, they looked to past art coalitions in Italy, such as surrealism. The men were all from working-class backgrounds, and had put themselves through their university studies of philosophy or history by doing precarious jobs, from working in the kiwi plantations near Bologna to being mailmen or night couriers. None of them had previously written a novel, but they were used to collective effort as a means of resisting authoritarian and capitalist power structures. It felt natural to them to write fiction together, too. They hoped that a co-written novel might better resist being commodified. They all loved to obsessively research historical periods, so they decided to build on this process to write their first novel, “Q.” They took notes on sixteenth-century Europe – the Reformation, the Peasants’ War – then connected the dots, “improvising on the material during long conversations,” refining characters, scenarios, story lines. They drew on cinematic terms to define the phases of their work, dividing their “script” into “narrative sequences.” They leavened the dense historical material by writing what is, essentially, a thriller: the main character, a religious reformist, is pursued across Europe, during a thirty-year period, by a spy from the Catholic Church. When “Q” was published, in 1999, under the “multi-user nickname” Luther Blissett, it became a best-seller in Italy, sold around the world, and was longlisted for the *Guardian* First Book Award. Afterward, the group added a fifth member, Riccardo Pedrini, and they decided to call themselves Wu Ming – a name sometimes used by Chinese dissidents to sign political tracts, which means “Anonymous” or, if pronounced differently, “Five Names.” ” (Ceridwen Dovey i <https://www.newyorker.com/books/page-turner/can-you-write-a-novel-as-a-group>; lesedato 27.09.23)

“The Wu Ming collective went on to write more meta-historical novels together, among them “Manituana,” set mostly in the American colonies in the lead-up to 1776, and “Altai,” set in the sixteenth century and narrated by a Venetian spy catcher turned fugitive. [...] Today, Wu Ming consists of three members: Wu Ming 1, Wu Ming 2, and Wu Ming 4. They meet once a week, at Wu Ming 2’s house, in Bologna, from 9:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. – while their partners are at work and their kids are at school – and write and rewrite in the days between meetings, sharing their research via e-mail. When they’re deep into a novel, they meet every other day.

They now manage to live off their writing; even though their books can be downloaded for free, physical sales are robust, especially in Italy. The novels are part of a broader Wu Ming ecosystem: they've collaborated with a street artist and a magician; they are the inspiration for the Wu Ming Foundation, which runs "itinerant" factory-storytelling workshops; they participate in other collectives, including one that co-hikes and co-writes narratives critical of the traditional machismo of mountaineering (and also "decontaminates" mountain sites where neo-Fascist clubs have held rallies). They call themselves a "band," and have produced records; they have described their book tours as "almost gratefuldead-esque." But they refuse to be photographed or to go on TV, as they dislike the cult of individual celebrity that surrounds authors. Their novels have been panned now and again, often by more conservative Italian critics. Wu Ming 1 translated lines from the negative review he finds funniest and e-mailed them to me. "In literature, four brains grouped together to write a book equal zero brains, maybe less than that," the reviewer wrote" (Ceridwen Dovey i <https://www.newyorker.com/books/page-turner/can-you-write-a-novel-as-a-group>; lesedato 27.09.23).

"The pleasures of collaborative fiction writing can seem so bountiful that one might begin to wonder why anybody would choose to do it alone. The varied methods of working as a group – a mixture of talking it out in person (what the Wu Ming collective calls "free-form improv") and writing in solitude between meetings – give people with different creative temperaments equal chances to contribute. Many of the co-authors said that brainstorming with their collaborators was a safe space in which no idea was too ridiculous and no suggestion would be disregarded. In place of the loneliness and perpetual self-doubt of the solitary writer, they had camaraderie and encouragement from others. Many of them described being spurred to write better after reading a co-author's excellent scene. They all felt accountable for doing the work, turning up at meetings, not letting the others down. When the group gets writer's block, they see it not as evidence of weakness and failure but as a sign that they're on the wrong path as a group. They cultivate an attitude of "upward compromise," accepting that they need to do something radical to get the creative juices flowing again—"make it crazier," or delete everything, or use an "uncanny element, or a plot device that no one else would." " (Ceridwen Dovey i <https://www.newyorker.com/books/page-turner/can-you-write-a-novel-as-a-group>; lesedato 27.09.23)

"[T]he Wu Ming members, by taking turns, manage to attend around a hundred and fifty events each year to meet their readers across Italy [...] Film and TV scripts depend on many people with different skill sets – producers, directors, actors – to bring the final creation into being; as a result, those scripts are a blend of artistic and technical elements. But novels aren't generally viewed as technical documents that can be broken down into their constituent parts; they're more often imagined as being written from the heart. People tend to doubt the "sincerity" of a group-written novel for this reason [...] People also tend to assume that a committee could never create a consistent voice in a medium that often foregrounds interior states. [...] "The Floating Admiral," which was published in 1931, was written by thirteen

members of the Detection Club, including Agatha Christie and G. K. Chesterton, with each author taking on different sections, without much overlap [...] in 1969, twenty-five *Newsday* journalists published an erotic novel called “Naked Came the Stranger,” under the name Penelope Ashe, with a deliberately inconsistent style—the group’s ringleader wanted to prove an ironic point that any book could succeed if it was filthy enough. (The novel became a best-seller; the hoax aspect, revealed a few weeks after its release, was a boon to publicity.)” (Ceridwen Dovey i <https://www.newyorker.com/books/page-turner/can-you-write-a-novel-as-a-group>; lesedato 27.09.23)

“ “People have a prejudice about literary style,” one of the Wu Ming members has said. “They think each author has his or her own voice, one voice. We think that each author, be it individual or collective, has many voices.” [...] the Wu Ming collective has adopted an approach that has a unifying effect: once a scene has been written by one person in the group, it is rewritten by someone else, then handed on again for rewriting to another member. This continual rewriting breaks down any claims to ownership of characters or scenes, and means that each author has to adapt his or her personal input to the overarching style of the group. [...] “Writing together implies being humble.” You have to accept, they said, that “you aren’t carving your words in stone or marble, you’re writing them in sand with a stick.” ” (Ceridwen Dovey i <https://www.newyorker.com/books/page-turner/can-you-write-a-novel-as-a-group>; lesedato 27.09.23)

Den britiske forfatteren John Simmons har tatt initiativ til en roman skrevet kollektivt: “I’m one of 15 writers engaged in creating a collective novel. The writers’ group comes from a programme called Dark Angels, named after one of my books, which began as a way to improve business writing through the use of literary techniques – imaginatively far beyond the confines of plain English. The three founders of Dark Angels – myself, Jamie Jauncey and Stuart Delves – thought it would be a challenge to write a collective novel. But what did we mean by this? To be honest we didn’t know, but we started exploring possibilities. Our workshops are about taking risks with writing, stretching people while discouraging preciousness. This seemed the right kind of spirit for a collective novel. [...] We then found an evocative place to stay for a long weekend – a country house called Balavil in the Scottish highlands – and invited a dozen writers along to join us in our collaborative writing challenge. [...] We started with characters. Our story outline identified 15 characters by roles: the mother, elder son, doctor, undertaker and so on. Through exercises we then fleshed out our characters so that they gained names, back stories, personalities and motivations. Before long we were each writing short pieces in the voices of the characters we were creating. The effect of collaborating as a group developed essential qualities of empathy – with our fellow-writers and with the sometimes dysfunctional fictional characters we were exploring. It’s good for your humanity to see other people in this way. You might achieve that through solo novel-writing but collective writing seemed to accelerate the process and deepen the experience. There are such surprises along the way too. If two minds are better than one, 15 minds multiply the effect of seeing things

differently. We were often caught by the surprise of an unexpected phrase, a character insight, a story twist.” (Simmons i <https://www.theguardian.com/culture-professionals-network/culture-professionals-blog/2013/jul/26/writing-collective-novel-collaborate>; lesedato 27.09.23) Den felles romanen, *Keeping Mum*, ble publisert i 2014.

En gruppe på seks kvinnelige islandske forfattere kaller seg Svikaskáld. “Svikaskáld, or Impostor Poets, is a female writers collective based in Reykjavík, Iceland. The collective came together early in 2017 and have since then published three collective poetry collections, two individual poetry collections, hosted various events, writing workshops and seminars for the old and the young alike. For two years now, they have hosted the poetry reading series Svikakvöld, Imposter Nights, every third Thursday of the month in the literary center Gröndalshús.” (<https://www.svikaskald.com/english>; lesedato 22.04.22)

En gruppe med fire australske kvinner ga ut romaner under det felles psevdonymet Alice Champion: *The Painted Sky* (2015) og *The Shifting Light* (2017), begge med den kvinnelige hovedpersonen Nina Larkin. Forfatterne er Jane Richards, Jane St Vincent Welch, Denise Tart og Jenny Crocker. De har forklart dette om prosessen: “We perfected our writing system over the four years it took us to produce *The Painted Sky*. It all started as a bit of a fun thing that morphed into a more serious project when we realised we might actually have something that was publishable. Over that period we quickly worked out what worked and what didn’t. We ended up meeting twice a week and would spend one meeting plotting – working out an overarching plan of where we would go from A to B and how we would get there. [...] We would then divide the action into scenes, working out what must happen in a given scene, how the characters would change and react because of that action, whose point of view the scene would be written from etc. We would then divide up the scenes, and each take one or two home to write the first draft of those scenes. We would then each send our written scenes to the others by email. When we next met, we would read out, discuss and mark up each other’s scenes and that scene would then go home with another person to rewrite, add the suggested changes etc. [...] So initially at least, each scene in the book was written, then rewritten, by each one of us over and over again. We believe this technique helps us create a seamless voice. [...] We have become a bit evangelical about group fiction writing. It just makes sense for commercial genre fiction. Group writing is a constant in screenwriting for TV and film and in comedy writing. But writing fiction solo can be a long, lonely, arduous pursuit. You need to lock yourself away or be able to fit your writing in around work hours. [Felles-]writing makes sense – a way to get your ideas fleshed out, improved and put on a page, without having to lock yourself away for a year or more. [...] if you are intending to write literary fiction, forget it. Group writing, as we see it, is perfect for genre, commercial fiction, e.g. sci-fi, romance, crime. Literary works really rest on an individual view – so we don’t think that would work.” (<https://www.writerscentre.com.au/blog/writing-group-alice-champion-discuss-their-new-book-the-shifting-light/>; lesedato 26.10.23)

Forlagsredaktører ved det tyske barnebokforlaget Baumhaus gikk sammen om å skrive barneboka *Die geheime Drachenschule* (*Den hemmelige drageskolen*) under psevdonymet Emily Skye. Den ble utgitt i 2018, og er en fantasyfortelling for barn fra 9 år og oppover (<https://www.lesejury.de/magazin/artikel-2018/2018/wer-ist-emily-skye>; lesedato 28.11.23).

“Barnetimeboka 50 år! Barnas egen bok, Barnetimeboka, fyller femti år i år [2003]. Siden 1953 er det blitt 25 bøker som helt og holdent er laget av radioens yngste lyttere. [...] Gjennom Lørdagsbarntimen ble alle barn invitert til å være med og lage bok. De unge skulle bidra både med tekst og tegninger. [...] De beste historiene ble så sydd sammen og sendt i Lørdagsbarnetime. Hver uke ble barna oppfordret til å bygge videre på fortellingen ved å sende inn nye tekster og tegninger. Til slutt satt man igjen med en god fortelling og masse fine tegninger som det ble bok av.” (https://www.nrk.no/kultur/barnetimeboka-50-ar_-1.867144; lesedato 28.11.23)

Den første setningen i *Hearts, Keys, and Puppetry* (2009) ble skrevet av den engelske forfatteren Neil Gaiman, resten av andre: “120 Twitterers joined in its creation, including its cover art. [...] What followed was an epic tale of imaginary lands, magical objects, haunting melodies, plucky sidekicks, menacing villains, and much more. From mystical blue roses to enchanted mirrors to pesky puppets, this classic fable was born from the collective creativity of more than one hundred contributors via the social network Twitter.com in a groundbreaking literary experiment. Together, virtual strangers crafted a rollicking story of a young girl’s journey with love, forgiveness, and acceptance.” (<https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/10364053-hearts-keys-and-puppetry>; lesedato 12.08.24) Gaiman “tweeted out a single line and asked his followers to help him write a full fantasy story based on that opening line. What followed was a huge selection of these 140-character lines that were eventually created into an official BBC audiobook [...] this “interactive twovel,” as Gaiman called it [...] Certain sections of the story will openly admit they are throwing out random elements of the plot to see what the next person can do to make them cohesive, and then the people next in line will somehow find a way to actually make them consistent with the tone and direction of the story.” (Jamie Lammers i <https://vocal.media/humans/hearts-keys-and-puppetry-review>; lesedato 12.08.24)

Fire amerikanske forfattere som allerede hadde mange bøker skrevet individuelt i sine forfatterskap ga i 2011 ut den felles romanen *His Grace is Sufficient... Decaf is Not*. Alle de fire navnene står på bokomslaget: Sandra D. Bricker, Loree Lough, Trish Perry og Cynthia Ruchti. Krigsromanen *When We Had Wings* (2022) er skrevet av Ariel Lawhon, Kristina McMorris og Susan Meissner. Tre kvinner som kaller seg “Team W”, Beatriz Williams, Lauren Willig og Karen White, har sammen blant annet utgitt romanene *The Forgotten Room* (2016) og *All the Ways We Said Goodbye* (2020).

I Sovjetunionen foregikk det en “tvangskollektivisering” av forfattere (Ehrmann og Traupmann 2022 s. 18). “Collectively authored projects were a staple of creative life in the 1930s, part of the literary and historical landscape in this decade of broad strokes and communal gestures. Jointly authored projects captured the imagination of writers and historians in the United States, England, and the European continent, but nowhere was the concept more compelling than in Stalinist Russia. [...] The 1934 volume on the Belomor Canal, entitled *The History of the Construction of the Stalin White Sea-Baltic Canal (Istoriia stroitelstva Belomorosko-Baltiiskii kanali imeni Stalina*; hereafter *The History of Construction*), is perhaps the only work of Soviet literature that truly was written collectively. The elaborately produced volume was eagerly awaited even before publication, but its enduring reputation has been as one of the most suspect texts in Soviet literature. This is particularly the case since Alexander Solzhenitsyn subjected its creators to scathing criticism for their glorification of a project involving prison camp labor. Solzhenitsyn’s understandable ire on the subject has colored critical appraisal of the volume (both in and outside of Russia) for decades, but the issue deserves renewed attention precisely because of the unanswered questions it raises about readership, publication, and authorship. A unique text, even by the unusual standards of prewar Stalinist Russia, *The History of Construction* was the collective effort of thirty-six Soviet writers under the direction of contributor and editor Maxim Gorky.” (Nicholas og Ruder 2008)

Det sovjetiske Folkets kommissariat for interne saker (NKVD) var sentral i arbeidet med boka om Belomor-kanalen. Denne organisasjonen “availed itself of every means to ensure that the project was completed on time, and the resulting human cost was immense. There are still no precise data on the number of inmates who died while building the canal, though the total runs into tens of thousands out of the more than a hundred thousand inmates who, at one time or another, worked on it. [...] Here, as throughout the Gulag camp system, inmates provided cheap forced labor for large-scale Soviet construction projects in the early 1930s.” (Nicholas og Ruder 2008)

“Stalin’s oft-repeated admonition that Soviet writers should be “engineers of the human soul” must have been on the minds of those who made up the writers’ brigade organized to experience and document the “successes” of the Belomor Canal. On 17 August 1933, 120 writers set out to view first-hand the achievement of the “canal-armyists,” as they were dubbed. The brigade included many of the most popular writers of the time: Mikhail Zoshchenko, Valentin Kataev, Viktor Shklovsky, Alexei Tolstoy, Vera Inber, and others. The six-day trip offered them the opportunity to view the canal and meet with inmates still on site. As sources attest, such meetings were well-orchestrated Potemkin-village affairs, designed to impress visitors while ignoring the deprivation, loss of life, and terror that inmates endured. Reportedly, many writers were duped by the artificiality of the trip, while others understood perfectly what the authorities were hiding and why. Out of the 120 brigade writers, only 36 coauthored *The History of Construction*. [...] The final product was a richly illustrated volume with an embossed portrait of Stalin on its

cover. A first run of 4,000 copies was specially designated for delegates to the Seventeenth Communist Party Congress in January 1934. Titled the Congress of Victors in honor of the achievements of the first Five-Year Plan, it provided the original impetus to produce *The History of Construction* so quickly: the volume was written and published in five months.” (Nicholas og Ruder 2008)

“Wider distribution of *The History of Construction* was further complicated by the purges of 1937, which claimed among its victims NKVD head Genrikh Yagoda, the entire upper echelon of the Belomor construction project leadership, and some of the volume’s authors (including Dmitry Mirsky and Bruno Yasensky), as well as two of its editors (NKVD officer Semyon Firin and literary critic Leopold Averbakh). Consequently, most copies of the volume were pulled from library shelves to be destroyed or placed under a secret classification that was lifted only after the onset of glasnost in 1986. Anyone who possessed a personal copy of the volume either hid it from view or disposed of it. It is unclear how many copies have survived to this day. [...] An English translation, intended to extend the Stalinist message of the volume beyond Soviet boundaries, was published in 1935. It does not exactly coincide with the Russian original, yet it oddly emphasizes collective authorship more strongly. The Russian version, for example, alphabetically lists each author after chapter titles, while the English translation omits direct authorial references, apparently reinforcing the collaborative structure of *The History of Construction*.” (Nicholas og Ruder 2008)

“The Russian edition of *The History of Construction* opens with the names of its three editors: Maxim Gorky, Semyon Firin (NKVD officer and head of the Belomor construction project), and Leopold Averbakh (literary critic and activist). Subsequent pages list the names of the collective authors, as well as one Belomor camp inmate, the incarcerated writer Sergei Alymov. Of the fifteen chapters in the volume, only three were not written collectively. The introduction and conclusion were penned by Gorky (who did not travel to the canal with the writers’ brigade), and chapter 12, “The Story of One Reforging,” was written by famed Soviet Russian humorist Mikhail Zoshchenko. The remaining twelve chapters were each produced by four to ten writers, whose names are listed after the chapter titles at the conclusion of the work. Archival documents demonstrate that the writers and editors used principles of montage to construct *The History of Construction*. Passages were woven together such that a section authored by Sergei Budantsev, for example, was blended into a section penned by Viktor Shklovsky, whose contribution then flowed into Sergei Alymov’s section. [...] Viktor Shklovsky, who unequivocally viewed participation in the Belomor volume as the price he needed to pay to extract a much-desired result from the authorities: the release of his brother from the Belomor camp, a wish that subsequently was granted. Still other writers participated in the trip or the volume in the apparent hope that it would serve as a hedge against future requests that might be made of them by the literary or political establishments.” (Nicholas og Ruder 2008)

Sovjet-myndighetene ville også ha en fellesskapsskrevet bok om arbeidet med Moskvas første tunnelbane. “[T]he Belomor volume draws into even sharper relief the contributions writers made to publicize another Soviet construction site: the first lines of the Moscow subway system. The initiative to chronicle this project dates primarily from early 1934 to the middle of 1935. Initial hopes were for multiple volumes devoted to the history of subway construction, and the plan was to capture the authentic perspective of workers as they built what would eventually become one of the most important showcases for Soviet accomplishment and one of the world’s largest public transportation systems. [...] Despite the optimism of those early plans, only two collections devoted to the Moscow Metro eventually appeared in the series “History of Factories and Foundaries”: *Tales of the Metro Builders* (*Rasskazy stroitelei metro*) and *How We Built the Metro* (*Kak my stroili metro*). Both appeared in 1935 under the general editorship of Aleksandr V. Kosarev. Of the two, *Tales of the Metro Builders* was clearly the most significant to Gorky’s original project, and consequently it was the first to appear, in an impressive press run of 100,000. *How We Built the Metro* was also an important publishing event [...] Reviewer A. Cherniavskaia emphasized that on the subway project, as on the Belomor Canal, even reluctant individuals could be remade into exemplary Soviet workers. [...] The importance the volume held for the regime is clearly indicated by its lavish production values. A large number of photographs grace the final collection, including formal portraits of the featured authors, as well as on-site shots of ongoing construction. Well-executed “lubok” (woodblock-style) illustrations are used throughout, along with maps, fine paper, and an extravagant page layout. This kind of luxury in an era of continuing paper shortages lent special metaphorical and literal weight to both *Tales of the Metro Builders* and *How We Built the Metro*. A planned third volume, to which popular Soviet writers like Il’f and Petrov contributed essays, never saw the light of day, for reasons that reveal much about early Soviet authorship, readers, and publishing.” (Nicholas og Ruder 2008)

“The writers were to provide literary guidance; the workers would offer diary accounts of life in the tunnels; and party organizers, with a large staff of literary consultants, editors, secretaries, and other help, would guide the project to completion. [...] Workers were to be treated to edifying excursions to the theater and museums, and the leadership was tasked with organizing “creative evenings, debates, lectures, consultations” and with arranging meetings with “Soviet writers and literary members of the Writers’ Union.” Such events, it was hoped, would create a “permanent connection” with the best published authors and provide subway laborers with “help in creative work.” Promising workers were to be “freed from other duties.” [...] Fairly quickly, however, it became clear that enthusiasm would not suffice in constructing a collective history of the subway. Not all workers were interested in participating: the crushing physical burden and danger of their work kept most on the edge of permanent exhaustion. Housing shortages, overcrowding, and difficulties with supplies made life off site an additional challenge that absorbed most workers’ scarce free time. Even those eyewitness

accounts that made it past the censor to appear in the two published volumes make it clear that work in the tunnels was grueling, as laborers struggled with poor equipment, nightmarish conditions, and enormous psychological and physical pressures. [...] Typical comments from an editor of the workers' manuscripts suggest how difficult it was for these largely unskilled laborers to construct cogent written accounts of their contribution to the building process. On occasion, workers submitted manuscripts that were notable for their "literacy" (GARF, f. 7952, op. 7, d. 225, l. 11), skilled use of "literary language" (op. 7, d. 225, l. 14), and such "sincerity and authenticity" that the diaries became "valuable material" (d. 225, l. 20). Other manuscripts submitted by the worker-authors, however, elicited damningly frank evaluations: "needs fundamental reworking," "material very raw," (op. 7, d. 223, l. 2), or even "could be taken as an example of how not to write" (op. 7, d. 225, l. 11)." (Nicholas og Ruder 2008)

"Soviet functionary Leopold Averbakh was perhaps drawing on his Belomor experiences when he commented in January 1934 that the work of every author should be "directly merged with the masses, so that every writer is an organizer of a group of literary activists" (d. 240, l. 13). [...] writers agreed to participate in this process of compiling Soviet "history" despite their lack of professional qualifications for the task. Even some of the most eccentric and talented sought out participation in this kind of collective endeavor precisely because it offered a way to respond to monumental events and because it afforded a kind of anonymity that a single-authored work would not. A writer could operate "below the radar" with the protection that a collective offered. If one need not ascribe one's name to a particular text, then one could not be held singly responsible if that text was less than satisfactory. In addition, collective literary enterprises offered an opportunity for nonconformists to participate in the grand documentation of Soviet state building, a space where skeptical authors could retain suspect views while bending just enough to avoid any appearance of deviation from the cause. Work in a collective also helped writers bridge the widening gulf between the intelligentsia and a newly literate working class still rooted in lowbrow culture. Writers accused of bourgeois tendencies and elite sensibilities could demonstrate their populist sympathies by rubbing elbows with workers in collaborative literary projects." (Nicholas og Ruder 2008)

Vitenskapelige artikler publisert i tidsskrifter har ofte mange forfattere, som har bidratt på ulike måter til både innholdet i artikkelen og utformingen/skrivingen av den. Det har ofte oppstått strid om hvem som har rett til å få sitt navn oppført som medforfatter av artikkelen. "Examples of unjustified co-authorship:

Gift authorship: a person that does not fulfill the criteria for co-authorship, but has such a strong position within the research group that he/she can expect or demand authorship.

Guest authorship: prominent people that are asked or pressurised to be on the by-line because this is expected to strengthen the project and the chances of

publication. For the same reasons, persons can also be put on the by-line without being asked.

Ghost authorship: persons that fulfil the criteria for authorship, but are left out of the author list, either with or without their consent. This is especially a problem with regard to authority within a research community. A supervisor might not always protect the rights of the younger researchers in the group.

[...] Conflicts concerning co-authorship are not uncommon. A study of articles in six prestigious medical journals found that every fourth article had at least one unjustified author, while every tenth article failed to include authors that should have been on the list (Wislar et al., 2011). Another study has shown that more than two-thirds of corresponding authors disagreed with their co-authors regarding the contribution of each author (Ilakovac et al., 2007). [...] Most journals and scientific communities have established ethical guidelines that regulate co-authorship. These have been more clearly defined in recent decades to prevent controversies and ethical misconduct.” (<https://www.phdontrack.net/share-and-publish/coauthorship/>; lesedato 12.08.24)

“To us, co-authorship represents both credit for work done on the project and also, just as importantly, responsibility for the contents of the resulting paper. This does not mean that every co-author should necessarily have a detailed understanding of each method or technique, but it does mean that they should have a broad understanding of the contents of the paper and the major decisions that were made to produce the results. On highly collaborative projects, each co-author may have a deeper or shallower understanding of certain parts of a paper, based on their contributions. [...] we find that the general guideline that a person should to contribute to at least two key aspects of any project/paper to be a good starting point for discussions about inclusion as a co-author [...] That said, if any project component would not have been possible without the contributions of a particular person, or if they have made a very significant investment in any one project component, then that may be reason alone to include them as a co-author, assuming they are willing to hold responsibility for the contents of the paper. Regardless of contribution, all co-authors are always expected to read and approve the submitted version of the manuscript. [...] Typically, but not always, the first author is the project lead and is generally the person that writes the initial draft of the manuscript. [...] Determining co-author positions and roles can be difficult as many projects often have more than two people that significantly contributed to that project and so discussions of author order should occur early in the process. However, author order is never set in stone and further discussions should happen any time there is any change in co-author contributions, such as when a particular co-author may contribute more or less than what was initially discussed.” (Kate Laskowski m.fl. i <https://laskowskilab.faculty.ucdavis.edu/2022/09/30/authorship/>; lesedato 19.06.24)

“Medforfatterskap kan være en kilde til konflikter. Derfor er det viktig å avklare medforfatterskap og diskutere hva de respektive medforfatterne skal bidra med

allerede tidlig i publiseringsprosessen. Man kan også gjerne diskutere dette på nytt når man begynner å nærme seg et ferdig manuskript. Når det gjelder medforfatterskap og forfatterrekkefølge er det få lover og regler som gjelder. Vancouver-anbefalingene er en av få retningslinjer man har å holde seg til, og det er det i stor grad opp til medforfatterne å bli enige seg imellom. [...] Rollen som medforfatter sier i utgangspunktet ingenting om hva man har bidratt med. De siste årene har derfor flere tidsskrift begynt å samle inn informasjon om bidraget til de forskjellige medforfatterne av artikkelen som skal publiseres. Hvis man publiserer i et slikt tidsskrift, fylles medforfatternes respektive bidrag ut når man sender inn manuskriptet, og denne informasjonen publiseres gjerne sammen med artikkelen. [...] Vancouver-anbefalingene slår fast at fire kriterier må være oppfylt for at man skal ha fortjent medforfatterskap på en publikasjon: Man må i stor grad ha bidratt til forskningen som publiseres, enten med planlegging av forskningen, datainnsamling, analyse eller tolkning. Man må enten ha vært med på å skrive førsteutkastet til artikkelen, eller ha vært involvert i å revidere det intellektuelle innholdet. Man må ha vært med på å godkjenne manuskriptet før publisering. Man må godta å stå ansvarlig for alle aspekter ved forskningen som publiseres, og å sørge for at spørsmål rundt nøyaktigheten eller integriteten til forskningen blir undersøkt og besvart. En medforfatter skal også ha god nok oversikt over arbeidet som ligger bak en publikasjon til å vite hva de andre medforfatterne har bidratt med. Ifølge Vancouver-anbefalingene må alle de fire overnevnte kriteriene være oppfylt for å være kvalifisert til å stå oppført som medforfatter på en publikasjon. Det kan også sees motsatt – de som oppfyller kriteriene ovenfor, skal også inkluderes som medforfattere. I enkelte tilfeller vil man ha en situasjon der noen tilfredsstiller én, to eller tre av kriteriene ovenfor, men ikke alle fire. I slike tilfeller sier Vancouver-anbefalingene at de det gjelder skal anerkjennes for bidraget sitt i artikkelen, men at de ikke skal stå på forfatterlista.” (<https://i.ntnu.no/wiki/-/wiki/Norsk/Medforfatter>; lesedato 19.06.24)

“Økonomiprofessor John Hudson ved Universitetet i Bath har undersøkt karaktertrekk ved titlene til 155 000 vitenskapelige artikler publisert i Storbritannia. Studien viser blant annet at vitenskapelige artikler med lange titler siteres sjeldnere enn artikler med kortere titler. [...] Mens mange medforfattere kan bidra til flere siteringer, kan det også føre til lengre titler med mindre tydelige poeng. Den effekten avtar med det Hudson kaller “hyperforfatterskap”, artikler med svært mange forfattere, fordi det gjerne innebærer at det i realiteten kun er noen få forfattere som gjør det meste av arbeidet, og dermed tar beslutninger om tittel.” (*Forskerforum* nr. 1 i 2017 s. 12)

Se også <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/parskriving.pdf>

Litteraturliste (for hele leksikonet): <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/litteraturliste.pdf>

Alle artiklene i leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>