



**Epitome : International Journal
of Multidisciplinary Research**

ISSN : 2395-6968

DECONSTRUCTION AND TRANS-DECONSTRUCTION



Dr. Pramod Ambadasrao Pawar

Assistant Professor & Head, Dept. of English,
Sant Dnyaneshwar Mahavidyalaya, Soegaon,
Dist. Aurangabad (MS), India

Editor-in-Chief, Epitome Journals, Aurangabad (MS)

<http://www.epitomejournals.com>

For Trans-deconstruction, I fundamentally believe in the redemption of all the human souls in the universe from the cyclic pattern of birth and death. Human life is the only life through which the redemption is possible. The plural meaning is a symbolic manifestation of a singular text within and without. A meaning begets meanings, meanings lead to further interpretations and interpretations demand much more interpretations. In this way, a chain of signs is formed which demonstrates only one signified, the Truth, the Absolute.

Life is a text. It spreads its octopus like tentacles all over the universe through different ideologies at different times. The varied religious inclinations, different opinions about the existence of individuals, God and Nature will ultimately take us to the ONLY ONE BEING FOR ALL THE ENTITIES. Who Am I? The amalgamation of individuals, God and Nature will let

you know the crux of life. It is a spiritual union of the soul with the super-consciousness which can be attained through Samadhi, a deep meditation of the self with the supreme soul.

Trans-deconstruction is a theory beyond theories of interpretation and analysis of the text. It makes you think; rethink about the word, text and meanings beyond the realms of deconstruction or post-structuralism. ONENESS begets multiplicity or plurality in the interpretations of the text wherein ambiguity is the stubborn nature of language without any signification. **All the signs lead to ONLY ONE signified where all the meanings reside into the ultimate Truth, Absolutism or the finalization of the text.** For instance : A text is like a pendulum. It is fixed in one place, while rotating immovably shading different meanings. As it comes to its prior position, it is manifested as ONE with multiple imaginary shades or threads of interpretations. Its centre is like a text, often fixed but functional.

What does Literature apply? It applies sense to the readers. Theory makes sense by inculcating the practice of reading into the mind of the reader where the text is read with a centre in the text within and without. How it changes radically as per the perspectives of the readers and multiplicity of the meanings engages the readers to reach the signified to fathom the essence of the text. **There is a centre in the text which is fixed but functional.** The essence of the text is ubiquitous by nature all over the world. It prevails everywhere within and without the text. No reading is misreading to the readers. It reads what is meant. Reading is an exercise of the mind resulting into the accumulation of knowledge and revelation of truth. It is an endless process of decoding encoded words within the text. The text is a mute speaker of her endless miseries and concerns. The text is full of signs; signs are simply embedded with meanings and all the meanings head towards ONLY ONE meaning. A few can understand this; others might debate on the issue till they get immersed into the world of uncertainties, ambiguities and multiplicity. They become directionless and find themselves in utter darkness of impossibilities, suspicion and material. The text is interpreted, re-interpreted to fathom the meaning. But, it demands further interpretations. There is an incessant chain of interpretations by scholars, critics till the discourses end into the essence. The essence is never multiple or plural. It is mono-lingual. That is the essence of the text, truth and the Absolute.

Deconstruction is a reading practice of philosophical and literary analysis. It is principally derived from work begun in the 1960s by the French philosopher Jacques Derrida. He simply

questions the conceptual distinctions or oppositions in Western philosophy through a close examination of the language and logic of philosophical and literary texts.

"Deconstruction is not synonymous with "destruction", however. It is in fact much closer to the original meaning of the word 'analysis' itself, which etymologically means "to undo" -- a virtual synonym for "to de-construct." ... If anything is destroyed in a deconstructive reading, it is not the text, but the claim to unequivocal domination of one mode of signifying over another. A deconstructive reading is a reading which analyses the specificity of a text's critical difference from itself."

J.A. Cuddon, *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*, 1991)

The term 'Deconstruction' is applied to work by Derrida, Paul de Man, J. Hillis Miller, and Barbara Johnson during 1970s. It deals with radical theoretical enterprises in field of the humanities and social sciences in the 1980s. It also encompasses the field of philosophy, literature, law, psychoanalysis, architecture, anthropology, theology, feminism, gay and lesbian studies, political theory, and historiography and film theory. In the late 20th-century, deconstruction was used disapprovingly to suggest nihilism and playful skepticism. The term also means a critical dismantling of tradition and traditional modes of thought.

Deconstruction n. a method of critical analysis applied *esp* to literary texts, which, questioning the ability of language to represent reality adequately, asserts that no text can have a fixed and stable meaning, and that readers must eradicate all philosophical or other assumptions when approaching a text.

Deconstruction challenges oppositions which have been inherent in the Western philosophy since the time of the ancient Greeks. These oppositions are usually binary and hierarchical in nature. A pair of terms is binary in nature in which one member of the pair is primary and another is derivative. For examples :, presence and absence, inside and outside, literal and metaphorical, intelligible and sensible, nature and culture, speech and writing, mind and body and form and meaning.

To deconstruct an opposition is to explore the contradictions between the hierarchical ordering assumed in the text and its meaning. It works on the indirect or implicit meanings which depend on figurative or performative uses of language.

Both Miller and Bloom concern with intertextuality. However, it seems as if Bloom emphasizes more on the competitive relationship between the strong poet and his precursor, while Miller pays more attention on how present poem incorporates previous text to achieve its greatness. Different from Miller's idea on poem as a parasite and a host to the previous text, Bloom's strong poet is more like a parricide instead of a parasite.

Anyway in their opinion, deconstructionism is both deconstructive and constructive.

In analysis, the opposition is a product of construction which needs to be deconstructed. For instance, society and culture are defined as corrupting and oppressive forces in the writings of the French Enlightenment philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau, which progressively develop out of a relaxing state of nature wherein humans exist in self-sufficient and peaceful isolation from one another. Nature is prior to culture for Rousseau. However, culture is undoubtedly prior to nature. The notion of nature is a product of culture. In this context, the nature/culture opposition should be inverted which helps culture to remain the first to nature. Rousseau opines that the single term cannot be one-sided and unidirectional. The deconstructive analysis is to restructure the opposition rather than simply reversing it. For Derrida, the opposition treats writing as secondary to speech. As Derrida argues, spoken words function as linguistic signs. The texts describe speech as a form of writing. The term the speech/writing opposition should be inverted. Writing is prior to speech or vice versa. It is essential to know the differences between the binary opposition between speech and writing. Most interestingly, no term seems to be primary. According to Derrida, speech and writing are both forms of arche-writing (archi-écriture), which encompasses not only all of natural languages but any system of representation.

The privileging of speech over writing is based on what Derrida studies a picture of meaning in natural language. His argument is an extension of an insight by the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure. For Saussure, the linguistic signs and their meanings are only arbitrary. They are related to the structural reality based on the language. Hence, the meanings can be sorted out on the basis of the specific contrasts and differences in a text amidst the plurality of meanings. Derrida asserts that the linguistic meaning is determined by the free play of differences between words. It is an unending play of words without signified. The word is infinite and indefinite. Derrida coins the term difference which means both a difference and an act of deferring. The meaning is created through the play of differences between words. The meaning of a word is

always a free play, plural. It is indeed an endless chain of signification. It is deferred in meanings, each of which contains the traces of the meanings.

Derrida resists that the opposition between speech and writing is a manifestation of the logocentrism of Western culture. There is a realm of truth existing prior to its representation by linguistic signs. Logocentrism makes linguistic signs as different from the phenomena they denote. The logocentric conception of truth and reality as existing outside language derives from prejudice in Western philosophy, which Derrida typifies as the metaphysics of presence. This is the propensity to regard philosophical concepts such as truth, reality, and being in terms of ideas such as presence, essence, identity, and origin—and in the process to ignore the crucial role of absence and difference.

To sum up, Trans-deconstruction believes in the existence of only one Supreme Being. It is a rational-cum-spiritual theory on Monism, based on ONENESS of all the signs and beings in this universe. This is the cessation of an incessant chain of signification. It is beyond the interpretations laid down by the deconstructive reading of the text. It denies the existence of duality of meanings in the text, such as between God and the world, presence and absence and darkness and light. There exists ONLY A SINGLE THING, the Universe which is arbitrarily divided into many things. A multiplicity of existing things can be interpreted in terms of a single reality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

J.A. Cuddon, A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory, third ed. (London: Blackwell, 1991)].

https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-137-06095-2_1

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/25723618.2017.1339515>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dI1c01Oy8Gg&t=84s>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3rI6sITtGog>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vkcZUMx-xvw&t=221s>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MLGk3hdkrXw&t=20s>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=egBfZebR66w&t=349s>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mbMNzkh9e_A&t=229s

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mx39epz8wgI&t=358s>

http://www.epitomejournals.com/VolumeArticles/FullTextPDF/362_Research_Paper.pdf

http://www.epitomejournals.com/VolumeArticles/FullTextPDF/128_Prasad_Pawar_Review.pdf

http://www.epitomejournals.com/VolumeArticles/FullTextPDF/9_Research_Paper.pdf

<http://www.nyaandpartners.com/index.php?page=Vmlldy9wYWdlcy9ib29rRGV0YWls&idr=28>

<http://www.epitomejournals.com/Contact.aspx>