



TEXTUAL SUPER-CONSCIOUSNESS : A PERSPECTIVE



Dr. Pramod Ambadasrao Pawar

Assistant Professor & Head

Dept. of English & Director, IQAC

Sant Dnyaneshwar Mahavidyalaya, Soegaon,

Dist. Aurangabad MS INDIA

ABSTRACT

This is interesting to know the fact that the text has a centre and it can be understood once the textual super-consciousness meets with the absolute on the fixed point. This can be clarified on the basis of a very common example that all the human beings have. Here I think how the different religions worship the same absolute, the invisible power. In this context, one can state that there is the unity in all its diversity. The unity is nothing but a symbolic manifestation of the unification of all the diverse religious spiritual contemplations. Finally, all the diversified approaches of discourses in

human sciences rest into ultimate oneness. The centre in a text is like the presence of God in the body. God symbolizes generation, operation and destruction of the entire universe. To know the centre in the text is like the spiritual union of the conscious and unconscious mind of a man merging finally into the super-consciousness state of absolutism. It thus means that there is a spiritual union of the mind, the body and the soul with the super-consciousness.

KEYWORDS

God, super-consciousness, absolutism, text, meaning

RESEARCH PAPER

Deconstruction was both created and has been profoundly influenced by the French philosopher Jacques Derrida. Derrida, who coined the term deconstruction, argues that in Western culture, people tend to think and express their thoughts in terms of binary oppositions (white / black, masculine / feminine, cause /effect, conscious /unconscious, presence / absence, speech writing). Derrida suggests these oppositions are hierarchies in miniature, containing one term that Western culture views as positive or superior and another considered negative or inferior, even if only slightly so. Through deconstruction, Derrida aims to erase the boundary between binary oppositions—and to do so in such a way that the hierarchy implied by the oppositions is thrown into question.

There has been a great debate on this issue to ascertain the presence of the centre in a text or not. Presenting the literary theory of trans-deconstruction, I claim that the text has the centre around which the meaning rotates like a pendulum sharing different shades of multiple meanings. Finally, they are tied up to only one point, that is, a singular point for all the discourses as a scientist does in the practical experimentation in Physics. The debates and ceaseless argumentation and discussions mistrust the text. This is interesting to know the fact that the text has a centre and it can be understood once the textual super-consciousness meets with the absolute on the fixed point. This can be clarified on the basis of a very common example that all the human beings have. Here I think how the different religions worship the same absolute, the invisible power. In this context, one can state that there is the unity in all its diversity. The unity is nothing but a symbolic manifestation of the unification of all the diverse religious spiritual contemplations. Finally, all the diversified approaches of discourses in human sciences rest into ultimate oneness. The centre in a text is like the presence of God in the body. God symbolizes generation, operation and destruction of the entire universe. To know the centre in the text is like the spiritual union of the conscious and unconscious mind of a man merging finally into the super-consciousness state of absolutism. It thus means that there is a spiritual union of the mind, the body and the soul with the super-consciousness. In this context, I simply mean that the text has a centre, a fixed point from which all these shades of meanings are generated. The entire text with nuisance rests into utter silence in the end. It is something like how different rivers struggle to rest into the ocean. Despite the clarification, such examples are hardly taken into consideration. The linguistic analysis, textual interpretations search for the centre in the text

persistently. Such considerations are valid, authentic and trans-deconstructive in nature. The theory of trans-deconstruction relates to the notion of textual super-consciousness engrained with meanings where the text is in its subconscious state aspiring for its textual union with the centre. The critic raises the textual super-consciousness in order to fathom absolutism, the truth of all the discourses.

Deconstruction resists the idea that language follows a straightforward formula as it creates meaning. Instead, language is strange, funny, disturbing, and paradoxical. Tell yourself that deconstruction does not involve finding the “one true meaning” of a work of literature. You might find that a text means two opposite things at the same time. This does not mean that the text is wrong or that you have misread the text: look at the text as presenting a multiplicity of truths.

The multiplicity of meaning is something like the different shades of colours perceived in a rainbow. It looks beautiful from a specific distance and remains uniformed. But still, there is uniformity in all its diversity. We live in the centered universe where the relative centre in a text makes all the differences to the critics. It leads us to the diversified and intuitive approach to fathom the reality inherent in the text. However, no reality is diversified in totality. All the realities get unified into one entity at last unless it is assumed that reality is a not relative term differing from person to person. Such relativity about the reality cannot be understood unless the human experience and experiment are unified into oneness in order to fathom the singularity of the text. One thing is very conspicuous that every text is structured, ordered and centered. However, the structure becomes logical and scientific once it gets a scientific base on which centered ideas of all diversity are unified for singularity. The center in a text is fixed but functional. The center is trans-deconstructed hierarchically in the unique structure of the text in which there is no discrimination and differences for the generated meanings. The light and darkness, for instance, are the same, but the binary opposition is made them distinctive and diverse in a post-structural point of view in the interpretation of the text. To be precise, the same distinction is trans-deconstructed and demonstrative as a single, centered, stable and unified entity for the interpretation of the text. Such a uniformed approach with the authorial point of view is justified to ascertain a centre in the text. Trans-deconstruction analyses decentered approach to reach absolutism, an inherent part of all the discourses. All these discourses, discussions, debates head us finally towards singularity of the text. One becomes directionless in

understanding the centre in a text. We are removed from the textual reality and the reality is not the formation of relativity. Such reality should not be understood in parts, but it should be understood in wholeness. A free flow of ideas in the text is a symbolic manifestation of unified approach to textual super-consciousness.

On the contrary,

So the deconstructionist practices what has been called textual harassment or oppositional reading, reading with the aim of unmasking internal contradictions or inconsistencies in the text, aiming to show the disunity which underlies its apparent unity.

(Peter Barry, p.69)

Human mind is not able to understand the things beyond his intellectual sphere, therefore whatever he does not understand is not written in the text. The search is in vain for the absences in the text which are not yet understood by human beings. The centre in the text is like a centre in the human body. Like the centre in the text, the centre in the body exists in an invisible lotus form, in which someone dwells, that is, the Soul, the truth, beauty. We believe in such concepts or not, that is again the theory of relativity and the reality is not relative in a sense. It is different from person to person. All experiences are relative and distinctive from the post-structural point of view for the objects we see, perceive and sense. There is a very famous story about the elephant and four blind men sensing the same object differently. The story is the best example of relative reality. The partial reality cannot be whole or vice versa. The blind men diversely interpret the elephant as the same object based on their sensing, physical touch of hands to the same object. They simply understand and explain what they have experienced through touch. Even the experience varies for the same object can be trans-deconstructed in terms of understanding the whole truth of four blind men that the relative reality is fragmented in four parts. All these parts can be unified to sense the same object as the whole in trans-deconstruction. On the whole, this experience is considered to be partially valid for the wholeness of the four parts dispersed relatively. If you combine all the parts and put them together, the entire reality can be sensed again. It becomes a relative aspect of the perception but the perception of reality is not relative in terms of absolutism. The perception of reality is unconsciously analyzed, textually debated and verbally misinterpreted. One can attain complete immersion of the mind with the word in the text to reach the central idea embedded in the text. The author is dead or alive is the thought of relativism. How can one make the author dead in the interpretation of the text? And

what difference it makes to declare him dead for the interpretation of the text. It's true that text should be objectively studied rather than subjectively. But, the subjectivity in the textual analysis cannot be removed by simply declaring the author is dead. The author has retained his presence in every word of the text written and uprooting the author from the text is injustice in the interpretation of the text. The deeply rooted base of the text is emerged from the supreme power. You believe it or not! And from which the multiplicity of the meanings are generated from one seed of stable singularity in meaning for all the entire discourses in the human sciences. The centre of the text has not yet been erased from the trans-deconstructive point of view.

Deconstruction has come in for a good deal of criticism. It has been argued, for instance, that ultimately all deconstructionists are similar, because they always lead us to difference, to the impossibility of final meanings. (*Hans Bertens, p.133*)

Trans-deconstruction can be understood by visualizing a picture of the seed grown up in multiple fruits. The presence of the author simply does matter in the interpretation of the text to know much more about textual super-consciousness embedded into the text. The text means images that cannot be ignored. His biographical sketch marks his unconscious presence into the text that can help a critic in assimilating the desired centre of the text. Is the author not subconsciously reflected and engrained his views into the text? And this sub-consciousness helps to attain super-consciousness of the text. All the texts where the centre can easily be had are ubiquitous. The demise of the author is not the absence of the author from the text. The author is still alive in the text either subjectively or objectively. His either presence or absence does matter in the interpretation of the text. Super-consciously, every reading trans-deconstructs the text for a stable singularity central meaning inherent in the text. It means that every text underlines textual super-consciousness. The author is unconsciously present in the text despite critic's ceaseless interpretations without any guarantee facts.

WORKS CITED

<https://literariness.org/2016/03/22/deconstruction/>

<https://www.wikihow.com/Deconstruct-a-Text>

Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory – An introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. New York : Routledge, 2001. Print. p. 76.

Bertens, Hans. *Literary Theory – The Basics*. New York : Routledge, 2003. Reprint. p. 133.