



## **MONISM : A CRITIQUE**



**Dr. Pramod Ambadasrao Pawar**

Assistant Professor & Head  
Dept. of English & Director, IQAC  
Sant Dnyaneshwar Mahavidyalaya, Soegaon,  
Dist. Aurangabad MS INDIA

### **ABSTRACT**

*Trans-deconstruction is mostly used as a reading practice of literary works in which the text is ultimately justified and singularity of the text is assessed from diverse critical point of view. The centre in the text then gets transferred to the analysis for the ultimate conclusion of the text. Any construction of the text has never been the object to the practice of reading. In fact, the central unified artistic literary product is not fragmented, dismantled and divided for the free play of meanings within the text. After this free play, the finality of the meaning presented as the conclusion is never asked for further interpretations.*

### **KEYWORDS**

*Trans-deconstruction, Monism, text, meaning, interpretations*

## **RESEARCH PAPER**

The text has indeed guaranteed facts from which the meaning is generated. The textual interpretations are made by critics in moderation. There is no demarcation for the textual super-consciousness in trans-deconstruction to ascertain the fixed centre in the text for generating the multiplicity of meanings.

Monism and dualism are essentially the same. The difference consists in the expression.

As the dualists hold the Father and Son to be two, the monists hold them to be really one.

Dualism is in nature, in manifestation, and monism is pure spirituality in the essence.

Along with the demand for the intellectual conformity, the limited reach of textual interpretation hardly takes a stew. The validation of the interpretation peeps into mostly neglected subconscious portion of the text. It becomes difficult for us to prove absences in the presence of the text. Trans-deconstruction is the critical reading of the textual super-consciousness in-built in the text. The text demands no further interpretations as the center underlines its singularity, stability and uniformity in the process of interpretations. Trans-deconstruction is not merely a philosophical or transcendental analysis of the text, but a ubiquitous analysis of the textual super-consciousness undermining the multiplicity and open-endedness of the text. Its reading process is like breathing in what the text is truly said. It is the critical reading against the text itself along with deeper consideration of textual conscious, unconscious and super-conscious nature centering on the singularity for all the diversified discourses at the end. On the whole, its process of reading wears the crown of the centre which is often fixed and functional after every analysis of the text. The centre in the text is always identified and remains justified forever for every reader. Trans-deconstruction is not a simple reconstruction of the deconstructive readings, but a major focus on the singularity of textual super-consciousness in-built in the text for all the discourses in human sciences. In this theory, the binary opposition never makes the difference of privileged and sub-ordinate meanings and postpones them. In fact, all the discourses are uniformly settled down with the justified conclusions made by the eminent critics of the text.

The difference between dualism and monism is that when the ideal is put outside [of oneself], it is dualism. When God is [sought] within, it is monism.

Trans-deconstruction is mostly used as a reading practice of literary works in which the text is ultimately justified and singularity of the text is assessed from diverse critical point of view. The centre in the text then gets transferred to the analysis for the ultimate conclusion of the text. Any

construction of the text has never been the object to the practice of reading. In fact, the central unified artistic literary product is not fragmented, dismantled and divided for the free play of meanings within the text. After this free play, the finality of the meaning presented as the conclusion is never asked for further interpretations. The reach of the absolutes and the identification of the centre should be properly made in analysis from the critic's point of view. If the reading is properly made, all the binary opposition held in the text seemed to be binary or dual in nature. However they are not binary or dual, but the text is observed to be one, unified. There is a ubiquitous quality of the text having the centre fixed and functional. The reality gets embedded into the text which has to be understood in its context and references. It is outside of the essence of the text where the authorial nomination is unconsciously felt in the text. Even it is not the part of critical analysis, the author is not dead. He is still alive in the text in guise of centre or interpretations. Through his experience and sensory perceptions, he ingrains ideas into the text. There is something outside the text. Most importantly, we deal with the text on the contextual, biased and prejudiced mode for the interpretation of the text. We make continuous references to sum up and mean the text with reality. The centre of the text despite all the multiplicity/plurality in meanings points out the singularity of the text for all the discourses.

Derrida coined the term *différance*, meaning both a difference and an act of deferring, to characterize the way in which meaning is created through the play of differences between words. Because the meaning of a word is always a function of contrasts with the meanings of other words, and because the meanings of those words are in turn dependent on contrasts with the meanings of still other words (and so on), it follows that the meaning of a word is not something that is fully present to us; it is endlessly deferred in an infinitely long chain of meanings, each of which contains the "traces" of the meanings on which it depends.

All the reality is not linguistically formulated. Sometimes, it is essential to read between the lines for the absolute interpretations. The binary oppositions pose the problems of diversity in the interpretation of text. To sum up, it is difficult for the writer to know the real world and therefore the text is nothing but the reflection of what the writer encoded in the text. If the real world is not with the author, how can it be then reflected in the text? I am very little in the real world without linguistics and grammar. The questions please the text and underline the best method for the

interpretation of text. It is clearly stated that any text can be wholly understood once the centre in the text is comprehended from a critic's point of view.

Where exactly can anyone find out the real world? It is assumed that the real world is not linguistically formulated. It lies beyond the language. A critic is in pursuit of gaining the complete knowledge, a detailed knowledge of the text. It is found to be failed even through the extensive reading of the text applying many methods. A critic is not satisfied with text because he is on the hands of dilemma and puts himself into the labyrinth of circulatory meanings without any signification. He is in a chaotic state like the astronaut which has lost himself in Einstein's space forever. Hence, a critic is lost amidst the continual chain of signs, signifiers, and the uncertain signified. What is the perfect method for interpreting the text? The absolute signified in the text is unknown to many scholars, academicians and critics. Although there is much debate over this, still the problem has not yet been solved. The language needs supplements, replacement as an additional assistance for the completion of the meaning. The reality in parts never forms the complete truth. Language and reality stand poles apart in the interpretation of the text. Language is not the means to know the reality in the text, but reality does exist in the text. It is relative and partially known to the text, but not as a whole. The partial implication of the language to detect the reality in the text is highly debatable. On the other hand, the text needs to know its own digestive system to know the signified and the centre. The reality can be known through the real world penned by the author subconsciously into the text. How can one say that the role of the writer is over and he is dead? He is alive forever in the guise of the text. It is the writer who writes unambiguously and logically about his own presentable life. The theory of trans-deconstruction can be studied through the analysis of the experiences of the author ingrained into the text in terms of words, grammar, syntax and semantic structure. How can a critic declare that he is dead even after having his inevitable presence in the text? The author has his subconscious nature reflected in the text and therefore a critic is to reveal the author and separate him from the sub-consciousness of the text in the absence of the biographical self. The linguistic system is governed by the biological sketch of the author. The system talks about the relationship of the author and the text. If the text is structured for the centre to fathom the absolute reality, the reader is interested in the textual analysis. The author is there in the text that anyone can distinguish his binaries of the self and the text, the duality of linguistic nature. Language is in its non-ambiguous nature. Its unique structure is systematic to demarcate the

binaries of the day and the night which seem to be totally different from each other semantically, but both are the same. Once history, biography and culture are critically read by the critic, the text is dismantled in parts through the signifying structure. The text is a literary product of the author and the text demands critical readings and stable interpretations till the finalized meaning is reached. Reading doesn't mean understanding what the writer said in the text. It never means what language the writer has used in the text. It doesn't mean how the writer presents his ideology through the text. It doesn't mean how the writer has expressed his experiences through the text, but in fact reading is a deeper understanding of the content through the context and references. Reading is between the lines that can be transparent for every reader. It leads us beyond the existed words on the page. It is not simply a reproduction of the ideas which have already been thought and expressed in the text. In fact, reading is the amalgamation of the recollected memories of the text. The text is critically read and represented for analysis. The integration of ideas demands for further interpretations to reach the signified. However, Derrida opines :

The center is no the center, for the idea of the centered structure is just that an idea and a metaphysical one at that. The function of the imaginary center is to express a desire, a longing and a reassuring certitude that even the greatest philosophers fall victim to. The structure becomes an object itself, literally a thing itself that guarantees a unity of form and meaning, is conceived on the basis of a (imaginary) full presence, which is beyond play, guaranteeing unity within the structure.

To sum up, the interpretation is always complete in itself. The critic asks for much more interpretations in order to reach the signified that is the only reason why the integration of ideas through multiple discourses needs the textual interpretation.

Discourses organize the way we see the world for us. We live and breathe discourses and function unknowingly as links in a good many power chains. ((Hans Bertens, *Literary Theory – The Basics*, p. 157.)

## **WORKS CITED**

<https://vivekavani.com/swami-vivekananda-quotes-advaita-monism/>  
<https://vivekavani.com/swami-vivekananda-quotes-advaita-monism/>  
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/deconstruction>

<https://arthistoryunstuffed.com/jacques-derrida-the-center/>

Bertens, Hans. *Literary Theory – The Basics*. New York : Routledge, 2003. Reprint. p. 157.