



**TRANS-DECONSTRUCTION: A SEARCH FOR THE ABSOLUTE MEANING
IN THE HUMAN DISCOURSES**



-Dr. Pramod Ambadasrao Pawar

Assistant Professor & Head

Dept. of English & Director, IQAC

Sant Dnyaneshwar Mahavidyalaya, Soegaon,

Dist. Aurangabad MS INDIA

ABSTRACT

Text is body, mind is the centre and soul is the truth or singularity of all the discourses in human sciences. The body has a soul and the intellect is the critic. There is a spiritual mingling of the mind and the soul to have a spiritual communion with God. In a critical sense, there should be a mingling of the centre and the text to reach the

transcendental signified. The reader is a human being and the entire multiple or plural circulatory meanings are illusions prior to the spiritual communion with the absolute truth.

KEYWORDS

Monism, Post-structuralism, Language Trans-deconstruction, Singularity of meanings

RESEARCH PAPER

Despite all the theoretical differences, my newly coined term “Trans-deconstruction” arrests your attention for the reemergence of Monism. Post-structuralism is nothing but a continuation of structuralism in guise of rebellion against the notion of structuralism. The focus of the theory is primarily on a meaning rather meanings for all the discourses, that is singularity of the discourse amidst the labyrinth of multiplicity or plurality of meanings. Language as a system is often challenged and further demands debated interpretations in the discipline of singularity of meanings which is ultimately embedded into the text within and without. The linguistic system is trans-deconstructed wherein language seems to be in great suspicion to retain its oneness of meanings while the reader gets drenched in the shower of meanings ingrained into the text. Language is a manifestation of the world through words. Word is the prime utterance of uniformity which is generated into the universe spreading like its octopus like tentacles all over the text. Is there any centre in the text? Of course, it is in the text. In addition, the centre in the text is always fixed and operational in creating various shades of meanings within and without the text. All the meanings finally reach onto the signified, the Absolute, the Truth. Trans-deconstruction is like a seed bearing its sweet fruits hanging all over the branches of the tree. All the diverse discourses in every discipline of knowledge head towards profundity and in-depth analysis of a singular mother discourse.

Structuralism derives ultimately from linguistics. Linguistics is a discipline which has always been inherently confident about the possibility of establishing objective knowledge. It believes that if we observe accurately, collect data systematically, and make logical deductions then we can reach reliable conclusions about language and the world. Structuralism inherits this confidently scientific outlook : it too believes in method, system, and reason as being able to establish reliable truths. (Peter Barry, *Beginning Theory – An introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*, pp. 60 and 61)

Even the world is full of uncertainties in the interpretation of meanings in the text; the final meaning is fixed, stable and productive. There is a language beyond linguistic structure which needs to be trans-deconstructed. Word, Text and a Meaning / Meanings have been the essence of literary theory and practice. All that is moving is stable and all that is stable is moving. This is something like *an unmoved mover*, which rotates round its own axis. The multiplicity of meanings is like a wheel rotating all around the centre in a rhythmic pattern. By and large, all the

discourses uniquely merge into one meaning. The singular meaning is like Newton's gravitational force within the earth that takes back the stone thrown high in the sky or the apple falls down instead of going up – all is due to fixed, stable and operational gravitational magnetic force in the earth. In this story, Newton just thinks over the whole process of falling apple on the ground with a conclusion what trans-deconstruction makes you do so. The dichotomy between the centre and the margin is a symbolic manifestation of uniformity, singularity and uniqueness. To sum up, a centered-universe needs to be decentered. Deconstruction begets trans-deconstruction when a reader is haunted by his endless search for one meaning in the crowd of the multiplicity of meanings. The binary oppositions like presence-absence, light-darkness, day-night, hen-eggs, and seed-tree are all merged into the Absolute, the Truth where no entity is privileged over another. All rest in silence!

Post-structuralism is much more fundamental: it distrusts the very notion of reason, and the idea of the human being as an independent entity, preferring the notion of the 'dissolved' or 'constructed' subject, whereby what we may think of as the individual is really a product of social and linguistic forces – that is, not an essence at all, merely a 'tissue of textualities'. Thus, its torch of skepticism burns away the intellectual ground on which the Western civilization is built. (Peter Barry, *Beginning Theory – An introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*, p. 63.)

There are major distinctions between structuralism and post-structuralism. Language is a system of communication. It is a stimulus response between the speaker and listener. This is simply a process of coding decoded words and decoding coded words. There is a language of intuitive perception beyond the language of senses which can be termed as a Trans-language. Structuralism is a product of Linguistics which disciplines a scientific study of language. In this context, knowledge is bifurcated as objective knowledge and subjective knowledge. It will be exaggerations if one says that he or she reach trustworthy conclusions regarding the interpretations of word and the world. The mere collection of data, observations and logical interpretations are not enough to measure the absolutism in the text. The text thus needs to be trans-deconstructed to reach the signified.

Post-structuralism is a product of philosophy where the ceaseless chain of interpretations demands further signs of interpretations. However, no interpretation dares to claim for a stable, statistic and finalized meaning of the discourses. This philosophy needs to be trans-deconstructed

to uproot the roots of plurality/multiplicity in the interpretation of all the discourses. Knowledge has never been postponed; in fact, it is a web of linguistic complexities inherent in the text. No facts form the originality but only interpretations. The text is full of ambiguities, paradoxes and unconscious by nature. The reader unconsciously trans-deconstructs the text within and without. Philosophy is an organized study to achieve knowledge about the universe. It interrogates the theoretical assumptions in a skeptical mode for the existed and non-existed things what they really are. What I know is Science and what I do not know is philosophy. The uncertainty, irony, ambiguity, paradox and extreme human reasoning make many questions of interpretations unsolved in the text. Structuralism is valid, scientific, rational and particularized in the study of the text whereas post-structuralism becomes skeptical by temperament, emotive, illogical and mostly generalized on account of embedded words within the text with the unproven facts aiming at the Truth in all its singularity. Thus, a study of trans-deconstruction is essential to prove the unspoken and recurrent facts in the universe by taking us to the unresolved issues of deconstruction, that is, trans-deconstruction. The text is always unconscious ingrained with the notions of plurality underlining singularity in all the discourses of human sciences. Trans-deconstruction deals with enigmatical, etymological and transcendental singular meaning of all the human discourses.

The world needs to be trans-deconstructed through Word in a language. The ultimate aim of all the human discourses is to know the unknown. The world is full of uncertainties, ambiguities, irrationalities wherein no human discourse seems to be destined to deeper understanding of absolutism and existentialism. The text needs to be trans-constructed in a ubiquitous manner by all the critics to reach up to the ceaseless chain of all the signs moving randomly without any signification ultimately head towards the Absolutism and merge into the Truth.

Poststructuralism is deeply subversive. It deconstructs all those binary oppositions that are central to Western culture and that give that culture its sense of unique superiority. In deconstructing those oppositions it exposes false hierarchies and artificial borders, unwarranted claims to knowledge, and illegitimate usurpations of power. Its focus is on fragmentation, on difference, and on absence, rather than on the sameness, unity, and presence that are so pervasive in the way we think about ourselves and the culture we are part of. (Hans Bertens, *Literary Theory – The Basics*, p. 147.)

All the discourses are in pursuit of reality, but it is difficult to fathom reality by means textual analysis, interpretations, experimentations, observations, relativism, individual perceptions and human senses. This is to be fathomed through the internalized experience of the self through the innate powers of intuition within. The externalized reality without is the same within. Therefore, within and without has no differentiation. Without any differentiation, no debate is prolonged to know the fixed centre in a text. The world is constructed through language, but can we have any access to the language to the reality through the linguistic formulation held in the text? Are we satisfied with whatever the linguistics expressions are given to us by God in order to understand reality? How do we really need intuitive powers to understand the reality? The oneness of all the meanings for all the discourses makes us directionless. In understanding the true essence of the text, everybody wants to know the facts which are later analyzed, debated and augmented because something lies beyond human comprehensibility. Why is the language used to ascertain the general function of language? Is it to make us think and perceive what is to be embedded in the text or remain systematized to find ourselves in one situation where the sense of orderliness becomes the systematic way of language, independently existed without ending in a fiasco?

To sum up,

Discourses work like Gramsci's hegemony and Althusser's ideology : we so completely internalize them that they even 'induce pleasure'. 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

Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory – An introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. New York : Routledge, 2001. Print. pp. 60 and 61.

Ibid., p. 63.

Bertens, Hans. *Literary Theory – The Basics*. New York : Routledge, 2003. Reprint. p. 147.

Ibid., p. 157.