



**IDENTIFYING THE WORD AND THE WORLD : MEANINGS WITHIN
AND WITHOUT**



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>

ABSTRACT

Every text is plural with contradictory meanings. We externalize the internals and internalize the external which leads to difference. Derrida states that difference is a core to language. The final meaning is circulatory, unstable and often complex. No signifier can take us to the ultimate signified we always want to. A remark, from a commentator: We now know or have no excuse for not knowing that deconstruction is not a technique or a method, and hence that there is no question of 'applying' it. We know that it is not a moment of carnival or

liberation, but a moment of the deepest concern with limits. We know that it is not a hymn to indeterminacy, or a life imprisonment within language, or a denial of history: reference, mimesis, context, historicity, are among the most recurrently emphasized and sensibly scrutinized topics in Derrida's writing. And we know though this myth perhaps dies hardest of all that the ethical and the political are not avoided by deconstruction, but are implicated at every step.

KEYWORDS : *Deconstruction, text, word, meanings, within, without*

RESEARCH PAPER

In the beginning was the **Word**, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.
(John 1:1, NIV)

Word is a symbolic manifestation of the universe. It is the demonstration of presence and absence of inherent things existed within and without in the universe. It is neither of the speech nor writing, but an entity of living and non-living beings illuminated transiently in the universe. All the languages merge into the self and spring out subsequently in the guise of sound and writing. Word is the universe demonstrating the sound within and without. It is not a mere sound within which can be easily sensed, heard, experienced. One needs to close the eyes, put his hands tightly on the ears and listen to the sound within. The sound is NADA, the NADABRAHMA. It is the rotating sound of the universe which continues to sound within till the hands are removed and eyes opened. The sound within and without is the same. There are two Brahmandas I perceived at dawn, one is within the body and another surrounds us. The way to the Brahmandas within is as difficult as the way to the world outside. I experienced the universe within and without at 3.00 a.m. at dawn. I was in a sound sleep wherein I experienced the NADA rotating within me till I woke up and continued thereafter. I was conscious when I woke up with the same vision all around me. My deeply-felt senses were frozen with hands numb, hair got straight on the body out of fear but I was fully conscious with eyes open to confirm that I was not dreaming. I got almost all the answers of questions about life. Is it illusion or a dream of overthinking or the extreme level of perception? I do not know what exactly the experience meant to me and you.

“The word” is the Word of God. It can just be meant in the literal sense I.e. this is something God said. It refers to scripture as a whole, which is the word of God, because it is inspired by the Holy Spirit. Finally, in the Christian scripture (Gospels / New Testament) it refers to Jesus Christ, who is the “Word made flesh”. When God speaks, his word is creative. E.g. God said let there be light, and there was. Likewise, when Jesus speaks (he says to the waters of the lake ‘be still’ and they are. Thus, “the Word’ is far more than the written word, but rather the ‘Logos’ the creative power and intelligence which give being to all things.

-Michael Grace, Catholic Priest (Dec 27, 2017)

The term 'Deconstruction' is coined by Jacques Derrida, a French critic and philosopher. It is a high time to study the Eastern and Western notions of Deconstruction. Deconstruction is inventive or it is nothing at all; it does not settle for methodological procedures, it opens up a passageway, it marches ahead and marks a trail; its writing is not only performative, it produces rules - other conventions - for new performativities and never installs itself in the theoretical assurance of a simple opposition between performative and constative. Its process involves an affirmation, this latter being linked to the coming [venir] in event, advent, invention.

For Derrida, 'there is nothing outside of the text'. In the original French, Derrida wrote: 'Il n'y a pas de hors-texte' [There is no outside-text]. Language is a constant movement of differences and everything acquires the instability and ambiguity inherent in language (Callinicos 2004). The implications of Derrida's reading based on his work *Of Grammatology* (1976) have impacted everything in the humanities and social sciences, including law, anthropology, linguistics and gender studies, as the meaning of the text is not only inscribed in the sign (signifier and the signified), but everything is a 'text' and meaning and representation are how we interpret it.

Deconstruction is an approach to follow the meaning of a text in a rational sense. But the meaning becomes unstable, complex or almost impossible. It needs further re-construction and re-interpretation. In the Eastern critical perspective, we feel like turning to Derrida's Deconstruction repeatedly whereas in the Western critical perspective, we turn away from Derrida's Deconstruction. Can the interpretation be ultimate or it further demands clarification and justification? The question remains unsolved. Theories thus need to be trendy at all in the period of globalization and post-modernism. As literature is the species of philosophy or vice-versa, how far is it possible for all of us to bridge a gap between literature and philosophy? Absence always attracts us. Hence, we had better understand what is not deconstruction rather than what it is. In fact, it is not easy to define Derrida's Deconstruction. It is not a method, a critique, an analysis or a dismantling of the structure of a text, but simply deconstructing itself.

The text demonstrates what it is not. Then, what is the text? Consider for a while, the meaning of a text is the body and the Word is a spirit. We say, 'This is my body.' We use 'my' as a possessive because it belongs to us. It means your body differs from yourself. If such is the case, then, who are you? What is the ultimate meaning then? To reach at the ultimate meaning is as

difficult as reaching at the self. It simply shows that both body and spirit are separate entities. Hence, the meaning belongs to the Word or the Word is the meaning. However, the Word is not a meaning but meanings. What is a meaning or meanings? Interpretation is always given not for meanings but a meaning. Hence, it needs to be interpreted first. Although interpretation aims at the ultimate meaning but the interpretation leads to another interpretation, hence, it is circulatory. 'I know I do not know,' we say. It means something is there in our body that is found to be unknown and unidentified but still known! Likewise, we say that, 'I said it but I didn't want to say it.' The *differance* is the product of internalization and externalization of the self. Studying Eastern and Western critical perspectives of Derrida's Deconstruction, One can conclude that it is a key aspect to bridge the gap between literature and philosophy for further studies. To deconstruct a text, a study of the deconstructive theories put forth by Paul de Man, Jacques Derrida and J. Hillis Miller need much attention. Most importantly, the theories of Structuralism and New Criticism are the predecessors of deconstruction. In France in the period of 1950s, the structuralist movement in anthropology explored various cultural phenomena as the systems of signs which developed into *metalanguages* of terms and concepts in which the different sign systems could be generated. Structuralist methods were applied to the areas of the social sciences and humanities. Deconstruction gave a powerful critique of the possibility of creating detached, scientific metalanguages and was categorized as "post-structuralist." Anglo-American New Criticism seeks to know the verbal works of art as complex constructions made up of different and contrasting levels of literal and nonliteral meanings. It focuses on the role of paradox and irony in these artifacts. On the contrary, deconstructive readings treat works of art not as the harmonious fusion of literal and figurative meanings. However, for example, there are the obstinate conflicts between meanings of different types. They observe the individual work not as a self-contained artifact but as a product of relations with other texts or discourses, literary and nonliterary. In conclusion, these readings place distinct emphasis on the ways in which the works themselves offer inherent critiques of the categories that critics used to analyze them. Deconstruction plays a key role in the animation and transformation of literary studies by literary theory in the United States during 1970s and 80s. It deals with questions about the nature of language, the production of meaning, and the relationship between literature and the many discourses that structure human experience and its histories.

Its influence amplifies to include a variety of other disciplines. The texts are often read deconstructively. In psychoanalysis, Sigmund Freud draws attention to the role of language in the formation of the psyche. He shows how psychoanalytic case studies are outlined by the kinds of psychic mechanisms to analyze the text. His writings are themselves organized by processes of repression, condensation and displacement and interrogate the logocentric presuppositions of psychoanalytic theory. Some strands of feminist thinking engross in a deconstruction of the opposition between man and woman and critique essentialist notions of gender and sexual identity. The work of Judith Butler challenges the claim that feminist politics involves a different identity for women. He argues that identity is the product of action rather than the source. They embrace a performative concept of identity modeled on the way in which linguistic acts bring into being the entities. The perspective was influential in gay and lesbian studies, or queer theory. Deconstruction was applied to legal writing in the Critical Legal Studies movement in the United States. The purpose behind it is to have an effort to reveal conflicts between principles and counter principles in legal theory. The movement explored essential oppositions such as substance and form. Deconstruction contributes to an increased awareness of the role that anthropological field-workers play in shaping historical connections to colonialism. Finally, the influence of deconstruction spread beyond the humanities and social sciences to the arts and architecture. Combining deconstruction's interest in tension and oppositions with the design vocabulary of Russian constructivism, deconstructivist architects such as Frank Gehry challenged the functionalist aesthetic of modern architecture through designs using radical geometries, irregular forms, and complex, dynamic constructions. Deconstruction has greatly influenced all the fields. It calls attention to rhetorical and performative aspects of language use. It motivates scholars to re-consider what a text says focusing on the relationship, conflicts it holds. It is a reading of what a text says and what it does.

Deconstruction explores the unexplored such as basic oppositions, critical terms and signified goals. It appeals to post-structural and post-modern thinking constantly interrogating established intellectual categories and skepticism about the possibilities of objectivity. As a result, its dissemination meets with opposition. The philosophers in the Anglo-American tradition dismiss it as an obscure wordplay in the text leading to trivial or false assumptions of the text. For others, it is simply about ahistorical and apolitical thinking. Some philosophers opine it as a nihilistic

certification of radical relativism. Despite many attacks on deconstruction, it maintains its intellectual innovativeness in deconstructing the text.

Who am I? Who cries within? What makes us suffer? What happens after death? ...etc are a few questions all the human beings have. Who am I? I am the soul stuck in the cyclical pattern of birth and death. I need redemption, stillness, permanence and to have a spiritual union of the self with the super-consciousness. I say, 'This is my body.' Then, 'who am I?' When Hydrogen is treated with Oxygen in presence of sunlight, there is the formation of H₂O which means water. Looking at a single drop of water, a chemist starts dancing in his laboratory undergoing experimentations of Nature resources and then comes up with the conclusion that he has created the drop. Just look at the ocean, how many chemical reactions do incessantly go in the ocean and who does them after all? In God, G stands for Generator, O= Operator and D= Destroyer which means Lord Brahma, Lord Vishnu and Lord Mahesha respectively. The sound AUM is made up of three sounds A, U and M. The sound 'A' springs from within, that is the beginning, creation. The sound 'U' looks after the universe, omnipresent and the sound 'M' is the destroyer. God is ubiquitous presence which is always omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresence.

Human mind has demarcations wherein the divinity cannot be surpassed. Everything is to be internally experienced. What comes first? Is it a hen or eggs? A hen comes from eggs and vice versa. Who cries within? What makes us cry? ...etc are the questions of introspection. If we step on the thorns, tears roll down the cheeks. Why? It is all about senses. Sensation means sense in motion. *Mam vedana plus tav vedana is equal to sanvedana.* It means that I suffer and you suffer is equivalent to sensations. If a mother is in America and a child is in India, the mother senses the cry of the child. What makes us suffer? The suffering is deeply rooted into disobedience which emerges out of ignorance of the self. If we disobey our elders and parents, we are bound to suffer. It is a product of sin committed by the individual in each life. Suffering is good as it redeems the individual from the cyclical pattern of birth and death. To have a human life is a great chance for redemption. Sant Tukaram says, '*Janmojanmo aamhi bahu panya kele, tevha ya vithale krupa keli.*' It means it is not easy to get a human life. It is a fruit of benevolence and philanthropy. One is born as a human being on account of *punyaj* gained in each life. Evil and greed are the most destructive entities in life which makes us suffered.

What happens after death? After death, a man goes on taking rebirths till his soul is redeemed from the cyclical pattern of birth and death. Human life is the only life through which man can redeem himself from the birth-death cycle. Things do exist beyond the entities which are perceived and often more powerful than the non-destructive Word. The Word is the world which is an enlightened experiment for the one who experiences the Absolute, the ultimate Truth. This is simply felt rather than expressed. Early 11th century, there was a Sanskrit philosopher named *Bhruhtrahari* who studied Word, Sentence and Meanings in his books entitled *Vakyapadiya*, *Shrungarshatak*, *Neetishatak*. A Word is not a word, but it is a world within. The Word is *Shabdabrahma*, the Absolute. *Bhruhtrahari* was fed up with the material life and therefore he experienced the self within by means of his deep *Samadhi*, a spiritual union of the self with the Absolute, the Truth. The Word 'AUM' is made up of three sounds A, U, and M. This is the most vital thing to know that the sound 'A' represents the Lord Brahma, the originator of the universe. The sound 'U' signifies the Lord Vishnu, the protector of the universe and 'M' connotes the Lord Mahesh, the destroyer of the universe. All the planets in the universe rotate in a rhythmical pattern creating Nada, the sound. This rotation of the universe can be internally and externally felt and experienced. The sound of Nada is immense i.e. the loudest one than the sounds we hear. There are two *Brahmandas*, the one is inside our body and the second one surrounds us. The human reach at these *Brahmandas* seems to be almost impossible for those who never feel the inside and outside universe. To enlighten ourselves internally is equally difficult as the external one. One can simply feel and listen to the sound of Nada within us by keeping our both hands on our ears tightly and closing our eyes firmly. The sound we listen to and feel is nothing but Nada. We cannot express Nada, the sound externally which leads to *differance*, Derrida's term. The Nada takes us to Sphota theory leading to further interpretations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

<https://www.quora.com/What-is-the-meaning-of-The-Word-in-the-Bible>

<https://www.quora.com/What-is-the-meaning-of-The-Word-in-the-Bible>, -Michael Grace,
Catholic Priest (Dec 27, 2017)

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309344443_Deconstruction_the_end_of_writing_'Everything_is_a_text_there_is_nothing_outside_context'

<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>