CHAPTER -V

COMPARISON OF STRUCTURALIST AND POSTSTRUCTURALIST APPROACHES AND CONCLUSION

This module is to focus on comparative study of ‘Structuralism and Post-structuralism’ approaches and ends in conclusion with various facets of both the minds i.e. Structuralism and Post structuralism.
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5.0. Preliminaries:

There are various approaches towards literature, which normally readers come a cross like literature is a social phenomenon. But one cannot feel contented at single approach or meaning in the world of today. Just there is no single reader, or audience, or society receptive to literature; naturally, there is no single critical approach. Different readers and critics agree with different approaches. The object of criticism is to communicate the interpretation, evaluation and judgment to readers. It serves to carry out the real purpose of the literature by narrowing the national, cultural, social, political and economical boundaries of between the countries.

It has been observed that literature has been defined differently from the time infinite. It has been attached with different purposes time to time. To Plato
literature was nothing but a medium of spreading falsehood. But to his disciple, Aristotle the aim of literature was to achieve catharsis. For Horace literature was entertaining and pleasing and it is equally useful. Kant’s opined that literature is the medium of providing pleasure. Here, he resembles Horace in his opinion but he further added the phrase ‘without interest’. Arnold went further saying that the purpose of literature is to replace religion and philosophy. Where as, the father of Marxism i.e. Marx ended up in saying that the purpose of literature is to increase social awareness. For Schopenhauer, It was an intoxication, which intended to reduce the will to live. According to him it frustrates by offering realities of life than inspire an individual to live his life. Nietzsche concluded by saying it provides a safety valve. The modern Psychoanalyst, Freud, the purpose of literature is to express psychological trauma. To Eliot the purpose of literature is to express beauty and truth and to Derrida the purpose of literature is to be itself.

Literary criticism began in the nineteenth century. It hovers between description and evaluation. We come across the application of two models; the critic as scientist i.e. explanation and the critic as historian i.e. comprehension. Traditional criticism tends to be author-centred but the popular view of literature is determined to a large extent by Romantic notions of uniqueness and individuality where authors are praised for developing new strategies, or for anticipating future techniques known as modernity.

It is nature of human being or a society that it always longs for new knowledge and this thrust of knowledge causes the earlier gained knowledge to turn old. Socrates, Plato, Aristotle etc, all above mentioned critics brought several theories to prominent like biographical approach, sociological approach, Formalistic approach, etc. These all literary theories or approaches are nothing but the different measures to fathom the meaning of literature. Likewise two new theories were brought to prominence to uncover the hidden meanings. Saussure’s linguistics gave rise to Structuralism in 1960’s. And Structuralism faded away when another new theory after structuralism i.e. Post-structuralism was celebrated.
These two theories brought several arguments to an end at the same time its pronouncements created new chaos of opinions about the authenticity of meanings and put a question mark to the existence of author.

The present study is an attempt at studying two modern literary theories i.e. Structuralism and Post structuralism. It reflects on the comparison of these two theories on the basis of its origin, pronouncements and limitations and outlines the merits and confines of the same approaches to literature. Criticism is a science where interpretation, evaluations are conducted as a means to reach judgment which we have presumed to be the real end of criticism. The present study purposes to apply the two literary theories i.e. Structuralism and Post structuralism in detail and to see how it gives different shades of meaning when applied to a particular work of art.

5.1. What does it mean by comparative study?

What is Comparative Study?

Comparative study implies the reading of the interrelationships of literature with other cultural practices and with other disciplines: philosophy, psychology, and politics; all problems in the field of literary criticism and theory; the study of broad currents of thought and style and of major literary schools; the study of literary genres and forms; the study of motifs and themes; the study of the presence of a work of literature, an author, a whole literature, or even a country, region or culture in another national literature, region or culture; the study of authors writing in different languages, but linked by contacts and intertextualities.

The method of comparative study has developed new areas of study, such as those of marginalized and post-colonial literature, women's writing, and the empirical study of literary response. And shortcoming of one theory or approach produced another theory.
Comparative study deals with the literature of two or more different linguistic, literary, scientific, cultural or national facts, assumptions, thought, theories, views thesis or even hypothesis. But when most frequently practiced with works of literature, it may also be performed on works of the same writer, poet, critics, linguists, psychoanalyst etc. comparison between two theories, laws, assumptions, facts, notions, concepts etc. leads to the several new conclusions or saves humanity and society from misbelief or misguidance.

Comparative study requires a good level of competency in particular field as one is expected to reach to the conclusion, which should be, at least, acceptable.

The need of Comparative Literature:

The need for Comparative study is modest but growing steadily, and students, readers and critics of literature are recognizing the advantage of extending the scope of their interests and competence. It takes the readers to the conclusions, which is nothing but satisfaction of understanding the meaning. Comparative Study has one advantage over the other fields of studies in that it broadens enormously the students' and readers’ intellectual horizon and as such can be of great benefit to the readers in particular to a society or nation in general. It also serves a purpose of the criticism to create critics.

Why Comparative Study?

In an increasingly complex and inter-related world, Comparative Study provides a valuable opportunity to study, the interconnectedness of literatures, theories and approaches, from a variety of perspectives. It serves as a broader frame of reference for readers understanding.

More broadly, Comparative Study offers readers the chance to explore other layers of the meaning that normal reader fails to get. Comparative study discovers the correlation between innumerable topics like; literature and psychology, philosophy, history, science, or anthropology.
The study of ‘Comparative Study’ allows readers to improve their analytical and critical thinking skills through the exploration of literary texts and enables them to touch the infinite layers of the meanings. This allows students to not only gain perspective on the world, but also a renewed interest in their own culture.

Comparative study relies on experts, as one has to tread a less certain path. The possibilities of unexpected results or emergence of new ideas and conclusions are more. New contexts stimulate new ideas. Literature is often used propagate one’s own ideas hence it is needed that one should check the intentions behind it. The aim of many critics is celebration, entertainment, or satisfaction of personal vanity than reader’s satisfaction. Hence comparative study serves as balancing pillar.

One of the objectives while opting for comparative study was the modern society or post Darwinian world which has given rise to approaches and present world of information technologies where man has decided to just enjoy what you get or understand no longings for reality or to away from the self satisfaction. As Eliot in his poetry ‘The Hollow Men’ has depicted the modern man as a form without structure and shadow without colour. The following are the outlooks of the society swallowed by industry and technology.

**The de-centred author:**

Interest in the author has been diminishing during the twentieth century. Same is the impression of modern literary theories.

- Author is no longer seen as 'major' and 'minor'.
- The term 'originality' is now seen as unhelpful.
- The reader must have the freedom to formulate a response irrespective of questions of influence.
- 'Borrowings' have little effect on quality.
- The text is of greater importance than its creator. This scientific approach has turned the world of literature upside down.
- The study of literature must move away from promoting an outworn humanism.

5.2. How are ‘Structuralism and Post-structuralism’ different?

Structuralism and Poststructuralism: Background summary and Analysis

In a post-Darwinian world, it seems more likely that such concepts and categories of human experience are historical, i.e. subject to change - contingent.

Summary of Saussure's Structural Linguistics:

Ferdinand de Saussure studied language from a formal and theoretical point of view, i.e. as a system of signs, which could be described synchronically (as a static set of relationships independent of any changes that take place over time) rather than diachronically (as a dynamic system which changes over time).

According to Saussure, the basic unit of language is a sign. A sign is composed of signifier (a sound-image, or its graphic equivalent) and a signified (the concept or meaning). So, for example, a word composed of the letters p-e-a-r functions as a signifier by producing in the mind of English-speakers the concept (signified) of a certain kind of rosaceous fruit that grows on trees, i.e. a pear.

According to Saussure, the relation between a signifier and a signified is arbitrary in at least two ways. First, there is no absolute reason why these particular graphic marks (p-e-a-r) should signify the concept pear. There is no natural connection or resemblance between the signifier and the signified (as there would be in what Saussure calls a symbol, i.e. an iconic representation such as a descriptive drawing of a pear). After all, it's not as if the word "pear" looks or sounds anything like a pear! In fact, a moment's reflection makes it clear that the connection between the signifier and the signified is due to a contingent historical
convention. It didn't have to happen the way it did. In principle, the word "pare", "wint", or even "apple" would have worked just as well in associating a word with the concept pear! But given that the word "pear" has come to signify the concept pear in English, no one has the power to simply change it at will. In other words, the relationship between a word and a concept is arbitrary in one sense (in terms of its origin) but not in another sense (in terms of its use).

Saussure makes a second point about the arbitrariness of the sign. He points out that the relation between the sign itself (signifier/signified pair) and what it refers to (what is called the referent, i.e. the actual piece of fruit—the physical object) is also arbitrary. This claim is less plausible than the former. For example, one might object; the concept in the mind of the speaker is formed by actual pears either directly or indirectly. Ideally then we would expect it to be the case that the properties of actual pears would be causally related to our concept of a pear—that the characteristics of pears produce in one's mind the concept of a pear either directly through experience with pears, or indirectly through pictures of pears, descriptions, or some such thing. Thus, the concept pear might be thought of as some basic information and set of beliefs about actual pears, e.g. what they look like, how they feel and taste, what they're good for, etc.

Saussure's way around this obvious objection is to say that his interest is in the structure of language, not the use of language. As a scientist, Saussure limited his investigation to the formal structure of language (langue), setting aside or bracketing the way that language is employed in actual speech (parole). Hence, the term structuralism Saussure bracketed out of his investigation any concern with the real, material objects (referents) to which signs are presumably related. This bracketing of the referent is a move that enabled him to study the way a thing (language and meaning) is experienced in the mind. In this sense, his motivation was similar to Husserl's. And in the end, Saussure never offered a method for investigating how language as a system hooks up to the world of objects that lie outside language. As we shall see, this was to have far-reaching effects.
Thus, according to Saussure's structural linguistics, each sign in the system of signs, which makes up a language gets its meaning only because of its difference from every other sign. The word "pear" has no meaning in itself or in the intention of the speaker, but only due to the fact that it differs from other possible graphic images such as p-e-e-r, p-e-a-k, f-e-a-r, b-e-a-r, etc. In other words, it doesn't matter how the form of the signifier varies, as long as it is different from all the other signifiers in the system (langue). To the structuralist, meaning arises from the functional differences between the elements (signs) within the system (langue).

An economic analogy helps to illustrate Saussure's theory of meaning. The signs of a linguistic system are like the coins of a monetary system or currency. Thus, a system of signs (words of a language) is analogous to a system of values.

A quarter has a certain monetary value determined by its exchange value. Quarters can be exchanged for other things because they have a designated (but flexible) value. Quarters can be used to buy goods or commodities. But they also have a fixed value in relation to other coins. So, for example, a quarter is equal to two dimes and a nickel; it is more than a penny; it is less than a dollar, etc., etc.

Linguistic signs also have values in relation to other signs. For example, the word "bachelor" can be "exchanged" for the term "unmarried man". This is, in many ways, an equal exchange. That's what it means for words to be synonymous - they have the same meaning or linguistic value. They can be substituted or exchanged for one another just as the quarter can be exchanged for two dimes and a nickel.

The Significance of Structuralist Theory:

The first thing to notice is that, according to structuralist theory, meaning is not a private experience, as Husserl thought, but the product of a shared system of signification. A text is to be understood as a construct to be analyzed and
explained scientifically in terms of the **deep-structure** of the system itself. For many structuralists, this "deep-structure" is universal and innate.

If we consider the application of structuralism to art and extend the monetary analogy, we can think of paintings as comprised of many languages or sets of conventions that play a role in the exchange of signs. For example, the language of western academic painting can be contrasted with the language of African sculpture or Japanese brush painting. Just as one word in the English language is paired with a concept, so a visual image, icon, or symbol is paired with a concept or idea that it is said to "express". Such a study of signs in the most general sense, whether visual or verbal, is called **semiotics**. In the West, art schools are the institutions that have the function of passing on these visual conventions.

Second we should note that in structuralism, the individual is more a product of the system than a producer of it. Language precedes us. It is the medium of thought and human expression. Thus, it provides us with the structure that we use to conceptualise our own experience.

And third, since language is arbitrary, there is no **natural bond** between words and things; there can be no privileged connection between language and reality. In this sense, reality is also produced by language. Thus, structuralism can be understood as a form of **idealism**.

It should be clear from what we've just said that structuralism undermines the claim of empiricism that what is real is what we experience. It can also be seen as an affront to common sense, esp. to the notion that a text has a **meaning** that is, for all intents and purposes, straightforward. This conflict with common sense, however, can be favourably compared with other historical conflicts. In other words, things are not always what they seem. Thus, the idealist claim of structuralism can be understood in the following way: Reality and our conception
of it are "discontinuous". This view has important implications, as we shall see below.

What do Structuralists think?

1. According to structuralist theory, a text or utterance has a "meaning".

2. But this meaning is determined not by the psychological state or "intention" of the speaker, but by the deep-structure of the language system in which it occurs.

3. In this way, the subject i.e. individual or "author" is effectively killed off and replaced by language itself as an autonomous system of rules.

4. Thus, structuralism has been characterized as antihumanistic in its claim that meaning is not identical with the inner psychological experience of the speaker.

5. It removes the human subject from its central position in the production of meaning. And one should accept that ‘since language pre-exists us, it is not we who speak, as Heidegger was to say, but "language speaks us".

Phases of Structuralism and Poststructuralism:

The shift from a pre-structuralist to a structuralist theory of language and the implications drawn from it by poststructuralists is represented in the following diagrams:
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- **Signifier**
  - "refers to"
  - P-E-A-R
  - *(word)*

- **Signified**
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1. Pre-structuralist theory assumes that there is an intimate connection between material objects in the world and the languages that we use to talk about those objects and their interrelations.

2. As we saw above, Saussure puts this connection between the material object and the word in brackets, i.e. he sets it aside in order to study the very structure of language. Thus, According to Saussure's structuralist theory of language, the meaning of a term (a word or expression) does not begin and end with the speaker's experience or intention (as it does in Husserl's theory). The act of speaking and intending presupposes a language already in place and upon which the speaker must rely in order to say anything at all. Concepts or meanings are picked out (signified) because of the differences in the network of words (sound- or graphic-images) that make up the language (langue). Thus each word, each structural element of the language finds its own relative position or node within the network of differences.

![Diagram: Signifier and Signified](image)

In other words, the meaning of a particular term in a language is due to its relative difference from all other terms in the language. A signified, i.e. a concept or idea, is properly understood in terms of its position relative to the differences among a range of other signifiers (words with different positions in the network (langue) and, hence, different meanings).
3. Poststructuralist theory denies the distinction between signifier and signified. According to the poststructuralist, **concepts are nothing more than words**. Thus, signifiers are words that refer to other words and never reach out to material objects and their interrelations. To indicate this shift in theory, the French philosopher Jacques Derrida introduces the word "**différance**" to indicate the relation between signifiers as one of difference and deferral.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signifier</th>
<th>&quot;differs to&quot;</th>
<th>Signifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(word)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(word)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a word's meaning is solely the result of its difference from other words, then the meaning (the concept or signified) is not an additional thing "present" in the sign itself. On the contrary, "meaning" (if it can be called that at all) is the ever-moving play of difference from signifier to signifier; a slipping from word to word in which each word retains relations to ("traces" of) the words that differ from it.

Thus, according to poststructuralists such as Derrida, the specification of meaning is an infinite and endless process! Meaning, to some extent, always escapes one's grasp-it is always just out of reach, ungrounded, with no origin in the intention of the speaker, contrary to what Husserl thought. In other words, when a speaker uses certain words ("This is a pear"), then according to the theory she does not have a **nonlinguistic** object or concept in mind-there is no additional thing or "object" outside of the language (i.e. no "meaning") that could be transmitted or made "present" to her listener or reader. There is nothing there in her speech but language, i.e. a **network of signification**.

Thus, "meaning" is the result of a play of **différance**-a movement, which brings about both difference and deferral. (It may help here to bring in the
traditional distinction between the denotation and the connotation of a term. The connotation may be thought of as the aura of suggestion, the echo or trace of other words to which it is related by such things as association, common usage, similarity, etc. The denotation, the relation (reference) between the word and the actual thing denoted by the word, from structuralism on, is bracketed and never brought back. Its absence, however, leaves its own "traces" in the form of problems for a poststructuralist theory of language.

So the poststructuralist draws the following consequences from the study of language:

1. Meaning is never fully present in any one signifier, but is infinitely deferred or suspended.
2. Meaning is contextual, i.e. affected by related words.
3. There is always an excess of meaning.

But there is another, more radical, consequence that can be drawn from our analysis. If the meaning associated with an expression is not present in the expression itself, and if the speaker must make his own presence felt by communication through words, then it follows that the speaker is never fully present in the act of using language. And if, as a human being, we can only think and experience a world through language, then "we" and "our presence" are as much deferred as the meanings we attempt to grasp when we try to understand and explain ourselves. In other words, I am never present even to myself. Rather, it is language that speaks, not a unified and autonomous ego or self.

Here are some final notes from Literary Theory, (page no. 60) Eagleton makes use of the following argument:

1. All experience depends on language.
2. Since, to have a language is to be part of a whole form of social life, there is no possibility of a private language.
3. Therefore, all experience is social experience, i.e. there are no private experiences.

This argument presupposes the notion in Saussure that language is constitutive of experience.

Notice the central role played by the premise that experience itself "depends on" or is structured by language. Without this assumption, the slide into the de-centered self is not so easily motivated. Derrida himself says that consciousness is an effect of language. This poststructuralist view of language undermines the theories of Descartes, Husserl and most of western metaphysical thinking about the primacy or centrality of the subject and reinforces the notion of the "decentered self" as characteristic of the human condition.

**Structuralism as challenge to poststructuralist:**

What alternatives can we imagine as a challenge to the poststructuralist position? One strategy would be to start by agreeing with Kant that we must have categories or concepts of some kind to organize human experience. But we might also disagree with Kant over the nature and a priori character of those concepts. While thinking of this, we could make use of Heidegger’s view that the categories of human experience are historical in nature. And they are potentially in flux-not fixed and universal. But Heidegger's emphasis on the linguistic nature of these concepts is questionable by drawing on Gestalt psychology to argue for the existence of certain "structural" and hardwired components of human perception and thought of a prelinguistic nature. This is just one tentative direction one might take in challenging the view presented by the form of poststructuralism that we have been considering.

Other problems are raised if we consider language not simply as an object but as a practice. Take this example, suppose I say to you, "Open the window" in a situation where there is no window in the room. You might ask, "What do you mean?" This would be to question my "intentions" - what am I trying to
accomplish by saying what I have said? Perhaps I am making a point about the fact that there is no window in the room. So this paradoxical statement is inexplicable in Saussure's structuralist term. This is because understanding is recognizing what effects one might seek to bring about through the use of certain words. My obscure command might be a request that we move to a room that has a window.

In other words, speech is not just an object, it is a form of behaviour, and as such it can only be understood contextually, i.e. in a situation. This realization of the pragmatics of language signals; a shift from language to discourse as well as related change in emphasis away from a text's meaning to its function.

In the end, we may want to say not so much that reality is linguistic but that language is real, and not necessarily all there is to human reality and experience.

5.3. Difference between Structuralism and Post-structuralism?

Post-structuralism emerged in France in the 1960's and is an extension and critique of structuralism, especially as used in critical textual analysis, which emphasizes plurality and deferral of meaning and rejects the binary oppositions of structuralism. It is also defined as the variety of postmodernism defined by its reaction against structuralism in France, and associated with writers such as Derrida, Foucault, and Kristeva.

Difference on the basis of Genesis of the theory:

During the 1960's, Structuralism began to be replaced by the antinomian movement known as Post-structuralism in France. Later, Poststructuralism would become known as Postmodernism. Indivisible from the political affairs of 1968, students and workers alike rebelled against the state and nearly caused the downfall of the French government; poststructuralism itself allegorises a drastic
dismantling of some of the key hypothesis underlying Western culture and philosophy.

Two key figures in the emergence of poststructuralism were Roland Barthes (1915-1980) and Jacques Derrida (1930 - 2004). Towards the end of the 1960’s Barthes work had begun to change from a structuralist nature to that of poststructuralism. In 1968 Barthes released The Death of the Author in which he declares this metaphorical event to be the affirmation of the autonomy of the literary text and the imperviousness of its meaning to being united or restricted by any concept of what the author might have intended. The death of the Author, he said, was the birth of the Reader, of the proliferation of meanings of the text. However, various people argue that the beginning of poststructuralism may well have been Jacques Derrida’s 1966 lecture Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Science. In this thesis Derrida observes a certain intellectual ‘happening’, which constitutes a drastic rupture from previous ways of thinking. The event is in relation to the ‘decentering’ of our intellectual cosmos. Instead of progress or divergence from an identified centre all we have is ‘play’.

**Difference on the basis of Theory:**

By the direct sense of the word, Post-Structuralism has moved past ‘Structuralism’ Post-Structuralism, in turn, rejects binary opposition (which is famous within Structuralism) and concludes that meanings within text are unstable and always shifting.

**Post-structuralism is generally considered to have three main features:**

1. Every critic must be able to theorize every position and critical practice to have an understanding. By studying different styles of theory, it creates an understanding of different meanings and interpretations thereby contributing to a greater understanding of the text and the shifting meaning.
2. Post-Structuralism questions the grounding of human beings by calling into question our perception. The post-structuralist view of subjectivity regards the ‘self’ as being separated and illogical which makes us ‘Decentered’ this rejects the idea of the traditional view of a coherent identity. This has created many different view and standing points on what exactly a human being is.

3. The importance has been shifted from the meaning the author intended to the meaning that the readers interpret from the text. Post-Structuralism rejects the idea of a literary text having one purpose, one meaning or one singular existence.

   For example, a writer could have written a single word like ‘dog’, imagining a strong German Shepherd, but due to individual experience the reader may envisage a small frightened Chihuahua. Although there are many other aspects of post-structuralism, it is these three characteristics that are the foundations of this style of criticism.

**Structuralism/Post-structuralism Differentiation:**

   Post-Structuralism has been described as a ‘rebellion against’ Structuralism, as it was believed Structuralism did not go far enough in its ideas. Structuralism was based on linguistics and focus on texts where they were structured by language. Although Structuralism did encourage questioning these structures, its approach remained more logical and scientific, using observation and reason to come to what they would call the ‘right’ conclusions. On the other hand Post-Structuralism took a more philosophical approach where everything including Linguistics could be questioned. Also focusing on a more emotional approach and in a sense begins to show some ideas of Modernism and Post-Modernism. Post-Structuralism can be described as having been influenced by both the Liberal Humanism and Structuralism movements that went before it, adopting and adapting ideas from each movement and combining them with others. Post-Structuralism reflected that in the past Liberal Humanists focused too much on the
authority and meanings of the author, while Structuralism focused too much on the structure of the text, and not enough on the message.

**Historical versus descriptive view of Structuralism and Post-structuralism:**

Where structuralism attempted to find a level of generalisable and self-sufficient metalanguage capable of describing configurations of elements variously anthropological, literary, linguistic, historical, or psychoanalytic and analyse their relations without being caught up by the identity of these elements as such, post-structuralism is said to share a concern for identifying and challenging hierarchies implicit in identification of binary oppositions which generally characterise not only structuralism but Western metaphysics. Re-evaluation of the structuralist interpretation of Ferdinand de Saussure's distinction between the historical (diachronic) and the descriptive (synchronous) views is the most that can be credited as a common point of critique which generally led post-structuralists to assert that structural analyses are generally synchronic and thereby suppress historical or diachronic analyses. It has accordingly been claimed that post-structuralism has been concerned with reasserting the importance of history, and in so doing, developing new theoretical understandings of the subject. Not entirely apart from this are claims that post-structuralism consists in an emphasis on reinterpreting the work of Sigmund Freud.

**What do Post-Structuralists do?**

1. Poststructuralists are concerned with the way a text is constructed by criticism and concerned with structure.

2. They read a text in a reflective and self-conscious way looking at its values and motivations.

3. Poststructuralists find in the text unconscious and unintended meanings, which may be directly contrary to the surface meaning.
4. They bring to the foreground the root meanings of words and similarities in sound.

5. Poststructuralists affirm a texts plurality and they fragment and disperse it, instead of unifying it.

6. They go against their grains of what common sense is and show how a text comes to embarrass its own ruling system of logic.

7. Poststructuralist critics identify a unit, such as a phrase, a sentence or a couple of sentences and analyse it so intensively that the language produces multiplicities of meaning and become impossible to sustain a univocal reading. Lastly, poststructuralists look for fault-lines, which are shifts and breaks in meaning hidden within a text.

8. The most prominent post-structuralists were first counted among the so-called; "Gang of Four" of structuralism par excellence: Jacques, Lacan, Roland Barthes, and Michel Foucault. The works of Jacques Derrida, Gilles Deleuze, and Julia Kristeva are also counted as prominent examples of post-structuralism.

5. 4. Structuralism/Post structuralism and Other Disciplines:

Structuralism influenced a horde of disciplines a few of which are discussed in short.

1. **Myth and Tale:** Claude Levi Strauss adopted the structuralist methodology to analyse myths. He argued that the individual myth/tale (Saussure's parole) did not have a distinct or inherent meaning, but may be interpreted only in terms of its relation with its relation to other elements-myths in the entire cycle of myths (the langue).

2. Levi-Strauss' "Structural Anthropology" was the earliest adaptation of structuralism and Saussure to another discipline.

3. **Psychoanalysis:** Psychoanalysis, especially in the early work of Jacques
Lacan,

4. **Marxism**: Marxism in the work of Louis Althusser and the culture-critic Colin MacCabe also adopted structuralist principles.

5. **Fashion**: Roland Barthes writing on the fashion system also analysed the dress codes through linguistic principles.

**Post structuralism and Relationship with Other Disciplines:**

Deconstructive thought has been enormously influential in a number of other disciplines.

1. **Marxism and Feminism**: We have already noted the Lacanian and Deleuze-Guattari extension of the poststructuralist thought. Gayatri Spivak has yoked deconstruction with Marxism and feminism, and more recently postcolonialism, to develop extraordinarily powerful critiques of patriarchy, class relations, the issue of democracy and the welfare state. French feminists such as Luce Irigaray, Helene Cixous and Julia Kristeva have also adopted techniques and modes of reading from poststructuralism.

2. **Sociology**: Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe in *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* have employed poststructuralist concerns in their analysis of family and civic spheres of power relations.

3. **Architecture**: In architecture the work of GHR Tillotson (notably in his *Paradigms of Indian Architecture*, see especially Tillotson's Introduction to the volume) shows signs of poststructuralist influence.

4. **Science, Medicine, History and Geography**: The work of Michel Foucault has inspired a range of theoretical readings of the discourses of science, medicine, history, geography, sexuality and gender. Edward Said, the acknowledged initiator of postcolonialism, owes a great deal to Foucault. In a sense there is no "post" -poststructuralism, since newer approaches like postcolonialism and New Historicism owe much to poststructuralist thought.
Poststructuralism and deconstruction destabilised traditional unities of the text and the subject. With their turn towards the inherent instabilities within language and the intensely self-conscious critical practice, deconstruction reworked traditional critical studies.

5.5. Conclusion and Suggestions for Further research:

Structuralism and Post-structuralism:

The terms 'structuralist' and 'post-structuralist' are labels imposed for convenience on modes of thought; each term in fact encompasses a heterogeneous array of often conflicting or divergent theoretical positions. The prefix 'post' suggests that 'structuralism' has now been supplanted by a new theory: indeed it has been confidently asserted that Derrida had 'brought the structuralist movement to an end' by his work on deconstruction in the late 1960's and early 1970's. From this perspective, the concepts 'structuralism' and 'post-structuralism' take on a relationship of binary opposition in which the latter term is privileged: the outmoded 'structuralism' has been replaced by the new, improved 'post-structuralism'. Apart from the fact that such binary oppositions are anathema to post-structuralists, it is in fact somewhat misleading to claim that a radical break took place and that the earlier phase was thereby invalidated.

Developments certainly occurred from within the original structuralist position and divergent tendencies gradually arose, but these were in part continuous or re-appraisals of lines of thought already inherent in earlier stages. As Derrida notes, 'we are still inside structuralism in so far as structuralism constitutes an adventure of vision, a conversion in the way of putting questions to any object'. Furthermore, writers such as Barthes do not fit neatly into a single category (and would not wish to) and others (Lacan, Foucault) may be described as structuralist in one text and post-structuralist in another (Sturrock classes them as the former, Selden and Lodge the latter).
Major Differences between the two approaches:

It is possible, however, to identify certain major differences between the two approaches: namely, where structuralism sought to establish a science or poetics of literature (or cultural signifying practices as a whole), post-structuralist thought, following Derrida's critique of the metaphysics of presence, has taken an anti-scientific stance and, pursuing the infinite play of signifiers, has resisted the imposition of any organising system.

In addition, a range of post-structuralist approaches are a synthesis of deconstruction and other theories derived from Marxism, feminism or psychoanalysis which produce a more historically and socially orientated critique of the text than was the case with the more ahistorical forms of structuralism. These latter developments contrast with the ostensibly apolitical brand of post-structuralism called `deconstruction', largely practised in the USA, which does not relate literary criticism to wider social concerns any more than did New Criticism.

A further tendency discernible in the later phase of structuralism and in post-structuralism is that the onus is increasingly placed on the reader or critic to produce meanings, rather than solely on the text itself.

Because post-structuralism chiefly evolved out of a critique of particular structuralist assumptions, it is first necessary to outline their shared foundation in Saussurean linguistics. This is where a central post-structuralist development occurs which departs from the initial structuralist position.

It was Saussure's linguistic theories, in particular his concepts of the bipartite linguistic sign, its arbitrary relationship to reality, and the diacritical nature of language which have specific relevance for all subsequent variations of structuralist and post-structuralist theory. According to Saussure, language is a system of signs, each of which consists of a signifier (sound image or written word) and a signified (the concept evoked by the signifier). Referents (actual entities) form no part of this relationship: the signified is not a thing but the mental
concept of one, and the relationship between the sign and its referent is completely arbitrary, as is the connection between signifier and signified. The link between the sound image/word `cup' and the concept of a cup is a conventional (not a `natural') one. It is language which articulates the two continua of `jumbled ideas' and `vague sounds' to link signifier and signified, forming the units of meaning we term words. The signifier/sound image `cup' has meaning only in that it is phonetically distinguishable from `cap', `cut', cop', and so on; the signified `cup' depends on its semantic difference from related terms such as `beaker', `wineglass', `mug', `tankard' etc to produce its meaning. It is in this respect that language is said to be diacritical: it depends on a structured system of differences for its meaning.

This differential system organises all aspects of language in various relationships. The sequential or combinatory relationship between the three phonemes which comprise the sound image `cup' or that between the syntactical units of the sentence `the cup is overflowing' is termed `syntagmatic' by Saussure. Those relationships of absence, which are brought into operation at the level of both signifier (the phonemes `cup' not `cut' etc) and signified (`cup' not `mug', `tankard' etc) are termed `associative' (later known as `paradigmatic'). Thus any sign can be regarded as the conjunction of a range of elements, linked to the wider system of language both by what is present and what is omitted. Because linguistic elements only acquire meaning according to their paradigmatic or syntagmatic relationships within the overall system and not as a result of a link between the sign and the referent or external reality, language is thus a closed, independent and self-sufficient structure of relations and can be studied as such.

This gives rise to Saussure's other major distinction: between `langue' (the complete system of language) and `parole' (the individual utterance which derives from it). `Langue' is the proper area of linguistic study, enabling one to identify the underlying principles by which language functions in practice.
Finally, Saussure's methodology had further implications for structuralism in that he advocated the synchronic investigation of language. During the nineteenth century, the opposite procedure had prevailed: linguistic study had been diachronic, in that the history of language was traced back through time to discover phonetic variations or etymologies. Saussure regarded this type of research as speculative: it was his contention that, while the diachronic approach should not be relinquished completely, only by adopting a synchronic mode of analysis whereby language was studied as a system of relationships functioning at a given period of time (not as it evolved) would linguistics be placed on a scientific basis.

Structuralism was founded on a similar methodological and scientific basis. It set out, following Saussure, to identify the signifying patterns, codes and conventions underlying all human cultural practices. Benveniste, for example, says structuralism constitutes its object as `a system whose parts are all united in a relationship of solidarity and dependence' and asserting the `predominance of the system over the elements', defines the structure of the system `through the relationships among the elements'. Not only language and literature, but myth, fashion or kinship systems could be examined from a synchronic, ahistorical perspective to explain their functioning, rather than by diachronically tracing their historical development.

The early aims of structuralist literary criticism were to found an analytical discourse or `metalanguage' which would operate scientifically, identifying the systems of codes and organisational principles of all literary texts to create a `second order' level of understanding. For Barthes, in his Elements of Semiology (1967), it was the discourse of semiology, which could perform this metalinguistic function, so as to analyse the connotative systems of `first order' `natural' language or any other `cultural artifacts'. In the case of literature, the connotative potentiality of the first order language can be exploited by the critic who actively engages with the text to articulate one or more of its plural interpretations: in Barthes' words, the literary "work is `eternal', not because it imposes one meaning on different men, but because it suggests different meanings to one man."
STRUCTURALISM:

Shortcomings & Similarities to Poststructuralism

1. Anti-historical—remote from concrete differences of human history. What about labour, sexuality, political power, etc.? What Poststructuralism attempts to correct by emphasizing utterance/discourse over the abstract system of language, stressing difference, and examining the development of discursive regimes. This tendency was, early on attacked by Mikhail Bakhtin, a Russian linguist who is now very influential. Perform activity of language is ignored, what J.L. Austin attempted to analyse with Speech Act Theory which is a proto-Poststructuralist theory. Antipathy to notion that there is an overall pattern in history. Poststructuralists are also inclined. But Marxists would ask the following question: What historical conditions themselves influenced this extreme foregrounding of language itself?

2. Shuts out the material world—we only have our sign systems that are not correspondent with reality. This devaluing of material reality also occurs in Poststructuralism.

3. Leads to formalism in aesthetics—and notion that work of art is an organic unity; promotes art as a closed system of signification with no inherent connection to the real world. What happened to the concept of art and literature as social practice?

4. Brackets off the objective and in doing also brackets off the human subject (anti-Existentialist); anti-Humanist, anti-metaphysics. (This also defines most Poststructuralist thought which attacks notions of causality, of identity, of the subject, and of truth).

5. Very static model of language—blind to the conflictual nature of utterance within a social context; unable to analyse power struggles (e.g., patriarchal discourse versus feminism); unable to demonstrate "the violence of representation" put on marginalized groups in society.
6. Merely assumes an abstract ideal reader—no account taken of the reading/viewing process; the co-production of the text by the reader is ignored. Reader-response theory is the Poststructuralist attempt to address that issue; so no stable meanings are pre-given by the text as Structuralists suggest.

7. Evades value judgements—seems complicit with the alienated theory of scientific practice which is so dominant in capitalist society; no critique of institutions developed from the practice of Structuralism. Some accuse Poststructuralism of the same value indifference due to its extreme sense of the relativity of knowledge.

8. Signifier/Signified are complementary, binary and stable—whereas Poststructuralism demotes the signified and sees the perpetual slippage of meaning in the infinite play of the signifier which has no determinable relation to extra-linguistic referents at all.

9. "Ironically, structuralism has had to sustain the opposing charges that it;
   a. lacks humanity because it subjects literature to scientific analysis and
   b. is over idealistic because it searches for universals and gives greater privilege to synchronic systems than to historical change"

10. "While structuralism sees the truth as being 'behind' or 'within' a text, post-structuralism stresses the interaction of reader and text as a productivity. In other words, reading has lost its status as a passive consumption of a product to become performance. Post-structuralism is highly critical of the unity of the stable sign (the Saussurian view). The new movement implies a shift from the signified to the signifier: and so there is a perpetual detour on the way to a truth that has lost any status or finality. Post-structuralists have produced critiques of the classical Cartesian conception of the unitary subject - the subject/author as originating consciousness, authority for
meaning and truth. It is argued that the human subject does not have a unified consciousness but is structured by language. Post-structuralism, in short, involves a critique of metaphysics, of the concepts of causality, of identity, of the subject, and of truth”.

**Post-structuralism** is a body of work that followed in the wake of structuralism, and sought to understand the Western world as a network of structures, as in structuralism, but in which such structures are ordered primarily by local, shifting differences (as in deconstruction) rather than grand binary oppositions and hierarchies (as in structuralism).

Post-structuralism is most clearly distinct from structuralism in its rejection of structuralism's tendency to seek simple, universal, and hierarchical structures. Post-structuralists challenge the structuralist claim to be a critical metalanguage by which all text can be translated, arguing that a neutral omniscient view outside the realm of text is impossible. Instead, they pursue an infinite play of signifiers and do not attempt to impose, or privilege, one reading of them over another. Appropriately, within the discipline of post-structuralism there are few theories in agreement, but all take as their starting point a critique of structuralism. Post-structuralist investigations tend to be politically oriented, as many of them believe the world we think we inhabit is merely a social construct with different ideologies pushing for hegemony.

Key post-structuralists are the historian Michel Foucault and the philosophers Jean-François Lyotard and Jacques Derrida. The works of Roland Barthes straddle the divide between structuralism and post-structuralism. Also important to the movement are Jean Baudrillard, Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari, and Frederic Jameson.

Post-structuralist thought is marked by diversity; indeed it intrinsically produces diversity as it opens the radical potential of the structuralist emphasis on difference. To summarise the aims of post-structuralism, to attempt to pull that
diversity into some systematic set of concepts, must, in a sense, run contrary to post-structuralism's very departure. Perhaps then, to maintain the post-structuralist insight, we should not so much conclude at this point, as merely set out certain fluid themes around; which the shift towards post-structuralist archaeology might be conceptualised; for the rest, this research work is insufficient so reading to get encountered with different meaning and under different conditions according to the various theories must be kept on.

**Collection of Facts and Criticism on Structuralism and Post structuralism:**

The reading of various books and critical material on my research topic gave me a way to come across various facts, criticism and comments about the said approaches which I collected for my personal understanding of the subjects. It also gave me an insight to understand the theories at greater level.

Here I serve all those facts and criticism with references for students and readers who are interested in further research regarding critical theories may seek a guidance from the following numerous facts and comments which may lead readers to conclude differently.

**Criticism on Structuralism:**

1. Structural analysis describes and explains a text as a system of narrative transformations. It presents a picture of possible narrative discourses, such that all existing narratives appear particular instances of a general - although variable - hypothetical model.

2. A structuralist narrative model is never either exhaustive or definitive. It cannot explain all the articulations of narrative discourse.

3. Structural analysis does not explain the meaning(s) of a text. To study the grammar of narrative is to attempt to specify the possibilities of meaning
and not to fulfil them. "What is in question in structural analysis is not the truth of a text, but its plurality" [Barthes].

4. Literary 'science' that is a product of structural analysis remains mostly at the level of description, unless and until it opens up onto a broader problematic that can account for the production of meaning. This is the precise juncture at which we begin to treat the 'work' as a 'text' (Harari, "Critical Factions/Critical Fictions", p. 26.

5. "Does there exist, in the end, a philosophy or a method that can be qualified as genuinely structuralist? Or are there only certain structural subjects common to the work of theorists that fit under the convenient unifying structuralist label? The reality of the situation is that various combinations of answers might all be valid, although we would be inclined to choose the second alternative. In our terms, the list of common denominators would then read:

6. the rejection of the concept of the 'full subject' to the benefit of that of structure;

7. the loss of pertinence of the traditional 'form/content' division insofar as for all structuralist theorists content derives its reality from its structure;

8. at the methodological level, a stress on codification and systematisation ...
   First, there is no unified view of structuralism, and second, structuralism as a movement is most clearly defined on the basis of the transformation it has wrought in the disciplines it has affected (Harari, "Critical Factions/Critical Fictions", pp. 26-7.

9. "It is hopeless to expect a structural analysis to change our way of perceiving concrete social relations. It will only explain them better ... But if a distinction is made between the level of observation and symbols to be substituted for it, I fail to see why an algebraic treatment of, let us say symbols for marriage rules, would not teach us, when aptly manipulated, something about the way a given marriage system actually works and bring

10. "The academic scene is fraught with mortality; the -isms of its trade have a way of dying a violent death ... naming a name is not equal to saying what the name names: if what we are witness to now is 'post-structuralism', it is valid to ask what that structuralism is which this post-structuralism is 'post' to" (Ruqaiya Hasan, "Directions from Structuralism", in Nigel Fabb *et al* (eds.), *The Linguistics of Writing: Arguments between Language and Literature*, pp. 103-22; p. 103.

11. "Structuralism insists on the difference between signifier and signified: indeed, the radical difference and then arbitrary association of signifier and signified is the basis of its account of the sign. Deconstruction, on the other hand, demonstrates that any signified is itself a signifier and that the signifier is already a signified, so that signs cannot be authoritatively identified and isolated. However, by approaching the problem in terms of form and content rather than signifier and signified, one can see these movements as part of the larger 'question of formalism' and one can explicate, in part, an apparently anomalous situation: structuralism and deconstruction seem in various ways opposed to one another; each of them is opposed to the New Criticism (whose faults are usually said to involve excessive formalism); nevertheless both can be identified with the impossibility of going beyond formalism" (Jonathan Culler, "Structuralism and Grammatology", in William V. Spanos, Paul A. Bové and Daniel O'Hara (eds.), *The Question of Textuality: Strategies of Reading in Contemporary American Criticism* (Indiana University Press: Bloomington, Indiana, 1982), pp. 75-85; p. 78.

12. "Structuralism was philosophically opposed to the subject and as part of this opposition reduced the roles of the author and reader to mere epiphenomena of writing and reading as activities, thus denying that they existed as independent forces ... Structuralism had relatively little influence
on criticism in the English-speaking world: in America in particular, few critics showed any interest in it. Its anti-humanism and the fact that it tended to concentrate on forms and genres rather than the close reading of texts made it difficult to accommodate" (Ken Newton, "Formalism, Dialogism, Structuralism", in Newton (ed.), Theory Into Practice: A Reader in Modern Literary Criticism, pp. 39-43; 42.

13."Literary criticism asks what texts mean. Semiotics and structuralism are among the theories that first ask how language and literature convey meaning ... Structuralism and semiotics recognise that communities that share a textual history reach a consensus about meaning because they share codes and conventions of expression" (Lori Hope Lefkowitz, "Creating the World: Structuralism and Semiotics", in Atkins and Morrow (eds.), Contemporary Literary Theory, pp. 60-80; 61).

14."Moving beyond the level of sentences to larger units of speech and writing, structuralism identifies the underlying structures shared by the individual surface manifestations of a system. It provides methods of analysis. Structural anthropology, particularly Claude Lévi-Strauss's work with myth, was an important application and extension of structuralism. Discovering the structural similarities among myths rewarded analysts with discoveries about the larger social functions of mythmaking. Working from Saussure's perception that meaning is relational, structural anthropology identifies the binary oppositions in a culture as they are manifested in story and ritual. Insofar as stories mediate between irreconcilable oppositions, mythmaking is a survival strategy" (Lefkowitz, "Creating the World: Structuralism and Semiotics", in Atkins and Morrow (eds.), Contemporary Literary Theory, pp. 60-80; 62-3.

15."Structuralism and semiotic studies have gone in several directions as critiques have developed into independent but related literary theories. Lacanian psychoanalytic criticism develops from the notion that the subject is constituted in language; the reader-response theories of Iser or Fish
develop from notions of communal consensus and the subjectivity of the message's receiver; feminist theory has been able to use the idea of coding to explain how the female body has been negatively inscribed in a culture that creates binary oppositions and hierarchies that have consistently worked to oppress women in work and in life; Derrida's deconstruction finds in texts not one but several competing signifying systems that are often in contradiction with each other, so that texts undercut their own meanings. The recognition that discourse is a matter of codes has revitalized genre criticism, exemplified in Tzvetan Todorov's work on the fantastic or Scholes's work on science fiction. The structural Marxism of Althusser and Jameson also departs from, but therefore acknowledges the contribution of, semiotic and structuralist principles" (Lefkowitz, p. 71).

16."The stress in linguistics, though at first not given this name, represents a shift from historical and comparative to analytic studies, made necessary especially by the problems of understanding languages which were outside the traditional groups in which earlier methods had been developed. Especially in the case of the American Indians, it was found necessary to discard presuppositions drawn from historical and comparative studies of Indo-European languages, and to study each language 'from the inside' or, as it was later put, structurally" (Williams, Keywords, p. 254).

17."What are the gains of structuralism? To begin with, it represents a remorseless demystification of literature. It is less easy after Greimas and Genette to hear the cut and thrust of the rapiers in line three, or feel that you know just what it feels like to be a scarecrow after reading The Hollow Men ... Moreover, the structuralist method implicitly questioned literature's claim to be a unique form of discourse: since deep structures could be dug out of Mickey Spillane as well as Sir Philip Sidney, and no doubt the same ones at that, it was no longer easy to assign literature an ontologically privileged status" (Eagleton, Literary Theory, pp. 106-7).
18. "The structuralist emphasis on the 'constructedness' of human meaning represented a major advance. Meaning was neither a private experience nor a divinely ordained occurrence: it was the product of certain shared systems of signification. The confident bourgeois belief that the isolated individual subject was the fount and origin of all meaning took a sharp knock: language pre-dated the individual, and was much less his or her product than he or she was the product of it" (Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, p. 107).

19. "Structuralism is a modern inheritor of [the] belief that reality, and our experience of it, are discontinuous with each other; as such, it threatens the ideological security of those who wish the world to be within their control, to carry its singular meaning on its face and yield it up to them in the unblemished mirror of their language." (Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, p.108-9)

20. "Structuralism, in a word, was hair-raisingly unhistorical: the laws of the mind it claimed to isolate - parallelisms, oppositions, inversions and the rest - moved at a level of generality quite remote from the concrete differences of human history" (Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, p. 109).

21. "The history of a system is itself a system ... diachrony can be studied synchronically" (Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, p. 111).

22. "The ideal reader or 'super-reader' posited by structuralism was in effect a transcendental subject absolved from all limiting social determinants. It owed much as a concept to the American linguist Noam Chomsky's notion of linguistic 'competence', by which was meant the innate capacities which allowed us to master the underlying rules of language. But not even Lévi-Strauss was able to read texts as would the Almighty himself. Indeed it has been plausibly suggested that Lévi-Strauss's initial engagements with structuralism had much to do with his political views about the reconstruction of post-war France about which there was nothing divinely assured" (Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, p. 121).
23. "Structuralism is a way of refurbishing the literary institution, providing it with a raison d'être more respectable and compelling than gush about sunsets" (Eagleton, * Literary Theory, p. 124).

24. "[In Cambridge] The controversy over 'structuralism' (used as the preferred shorthand for 'modern literary theory') was a rather aggressive expression of resistance, articulated - when it achieved articulateness - in terms of 'principles not theory' (dedication to principles in 'a grounded choice' as against literary theory defined by its abstraction, its systematisation, precisely its anti-literariness) and of true respect for the canon ('it is our job to teach and uphold the canon of English literature'). A much-favoured quotation at the time was from T. S. Eliot: 'to theorise demands vast ingenuity, and to avoid theorising demands vast honesty'' (Stephen Heath, "Modern Literary Theory", *Critical Quarterly* 31, 2 (1989), pp. 35-49; p.35.

**Criticism on Post-structuralism:**

1. "Poststructuralism as a general term for recent developments in literary theory and criticism, became common the 1970s. Is the relation to STRUCTURALISM one of succession or supercession? - that is, do we see poststructuralism as simply later than its predecessor, or is it in some sense an advance? Both usages can be found; and poststructuralism covers so many practices that it is impossible to define. But it can be approached as a working through, in various fields of inquiry, of some implications of DECONSTRUCTION. Derrida's influential lecture on 'Structure, sign and play in the discourse of the human sciences' (*Writing and Difference*, 1967, trans. 1978) proposed a disruption in the very concept of structure as a stable system, mischievously quoting Lévi-Strauss against himself. The effects of deconstruction, though, were not confined to a critique of structuralism. They rather emphasized a methodological shift, a move away from explanation by origin, order by opposition, fixed or closed signification, and the person as a unified subject. Recent PSYCHOANALYSIS, notably that of Jacques Lacan, encouraged the latter
move, and psychoanalytic criticism is one variety of poststructuralism. It
can also be traced in cultural and ideological analysis like that of Michel
Foucault or Gilles Deleuze, and in the feminism of Hélène Cixous or Luce
Irigaray. Divergent accounts of the READER, like Bloom's 'misreading',
can be cited; so, of course, can the literary studies listed under
DECONSTRUCTION. Roland Barthes's career shows the poststructural
shift with particular emphasis, as in the sardonic opening of S/Z (1970,
trans. 1974): 'There are said to be certain Buddhists whose ascetic practices
enable them to see a whole landscape in a bean.' Such tidy encapsulation
had been Barthes's own ambition in the mid-1960s, and it is precisely what
poststructuralism rejects" (Ellman Crasnow, "Poststructuralism", in Fowler

2. "'Post-structuralist' is a non- or even anti-name ... the name pins the writer
down, makes it possible to speak species, and offers a bootstrap by which
talk about the new theory can raise itself above talk about the old. But this
name also begs the question of another, previous name: ...'structuralism' ...
Structuralism offered criticism its last chance to make a science out of
theorizing literature. Fortunately enough, it resulted in a cross-fertilization
of disciplines this latest and spectacularly impotent offspring. Criticism
after structuralism is impotent in so far as it is unable to produce further and
greater structuralisms. There's not much science of the kind favoured by
structuralism to be found nowadays. It is as though the literary structuralists
represented the culmination and the grand finale of all previous attempts to
produce a scientific theory of literature; in this case, no 'new structuralism'
was possible. Perhaps 'fitz-structuralism more usefully describes what
happened next; it hints, among other things, at both the dangerously over-
productive parent and the contentiously illegitimate offspring. But even this
seems too closely to confine, or even to exclude its subject. In the event we
have the equally graphic 'post-structuralism', a term that seems not to name
what we do in the present at all, but rather to re-name structuralism itself, as
what we used to do in the past. It provides a post to which structuralism is	hen hitched, confining it by means of the shortest tether the language has to
offer” (Richard Machin and Christopher Norris (eds.), "Introduction", Post-
structuralist Readings of English Poetry (Cambridge University Press:

3. "... it is often when post-structuralism attempts to shift our attention away
from 'primary' literary texts, and toward the 'secondary' works of the critics
themselves, that it meets most resistance. Resistance, in this case, often
entails fear - fear that something important will be lost, or replaced by an
inferior product" (Machin and Norris, p. 5).

4. "Post-structuralism rejects the whole system of assumptions - the implied
metaphysics or ontology of form - that lay behind [New Criticism]. It
poetry up to a practice of intertextual reading that can take in philosophy,
history or psychoanalysis, not on the reckoning that these are 'meta-
languages' or ultimate sources of truth, but in order to see how texts relate
and produce new dimensions of sense" (Machin and Norris, p. 18).

5. "It is a normal monstrosity to say that everything the word
'poststructuralism' embraces is formalist, aesthetacist, apolitical, little
concerned with history or with socioeconomic reality. It is a normal
monstrosity to say of a thinking, which started out by putting logocentrism
into question that it confines itself to language and language games. It is a
normal monstrosity to think that to get back finally to reality, history,
society, politics; it suffices to leave behind these plays on words. It is a
normal monstrosity to go on setting the textual - as this notion has been re-
elaborated in the last twenty years - against the social, the political, and the
historical, as if the text were still the book on the bookshelf in the library"
(Jacques Derrida, 'Some Statements and Truisms", p. 79).

6. "The name 'post-structuralism' is useful in so far as it is an umbrella word,
significantly defining itself only in terms of a temporal, spatial relationship
to structuralism. This need not imply the organicist fiction of a development, for it involves, rather, a displacement. It is more a question of an interrogation of structuralism's methods and assumptions, of transforming structuralist concepts by turning one against another. But the name 'post-structuralism' is not useful if it recalls that other spatio-temporal metaphor, the Fall. For the notion of the Fall, and its complement (the concept of origin), is precisely what post-structuralism denies. Structuralism as an origin never existed in a pre-lapsarian purity or ontological fullness; post-structuralism traces the trace of structuralism's difference from itself" (Young, *Untying the Text*, p. 1).

7. "In brief, it may be said that post-structuralism fractures the serene unity of the stable sign and the unified subject. In this respect, the 'theoretical' reference points of post-structuralism can be best mapped via the work of Foucault, Lacan and Derrida, who in different ways have pushed structuralism to its limits and shown how its most radical premises open it up to its own deconstruction" (Young, *Untying the Text*, p. 8).

8. "Structuralism and post-structuralism also, are dead traditions of thought. Notwithstanding the promise they held in the fresh bloom of youth, they have ultimately failed to generate the revolution in philosophical understanding and social theory that was once their pledge ... Of course, many have doubted that there ever was a coherent enough body of thought to be designated by the name 'structuralism', let alone the even vaguer appellation 'post-structuralism' ... After all, most of the leading figures ordinarily lumped under these labels have rejected these terms as applying meaningfully to their own endeavours" (Anthony Giddens, "Structuralism, Post-structuralism and the Production of Culture", in Anthony Giddens and Jonathan H. Turner (eds.), *Social Theory Today* (Polity Press: Cambridge, 1987), pp. 195-223; p. 195).
9. "If structuralism divided the sign from the referent ... 'post-structuralism' -
goes a step further: it divides the signifier from the signified" (Eagleton,
"Post-structuralism", Literary Theory, pp. 127-50; p. 128).

10."We have moved ... from the era of structuralism to the reign of post-
structuralism, a style of thought which embraces the deconstructive
operations of Derrida, the work of the French historian Michel Foucault, the
writings of the French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan and of the feminist
philosopher and critic Julia Kristeva" (Eagleton, Literary Theory, p. 134).

11."There is no clear division for post-structuralism between 'criticism' and
'creation': both modes are subsumed into 'writing' as such" (Eagleton,
Literary Theory, p. 139).

12."With the advent of post-structuralism, what seemed reactionary about
structuralism was not this refusal of history, but nothing less than the very
concept of structure itself" (Eagleton, Literary Theory, p. 141).

13."Post-structuralism was a product of that blend of euphoria and
disillusionment, liberation and dissipation, carnival and catastrophe, which
was 1968" (Eagleton, Literary Theory, p. 142).

14."Within post-structuralism as a 'whole', real conflicts and differences exist
whose future history cannot be predicted. There are forms of post-
structuralism which represent a hedonistic withdrawal from history, a cult
of ambiguity or irresponsible anarchism; there are other forms, as with the
formidably rich researches of the French historian Michel Foucault, which
while not without their severe problems point in a more positive direction"
(Eagleton, Literary Theory, p. 150).

15."One could argue that many of the volumes under the heading of
structuralism touch already on post-structuralist issues. This is inevitably
ture to a certain extent. Since post-structuralism as a movement cannot be
clearly bracketed, it is just as hard to find anthologies or critical works that
deal solely with post-structuralist problematics" (Harari (ed.), *Textual Strategies*, pp. 445-46).

16. "[W]hat is post-structuralism? The question is less ambitious than it might appear; it does not seek a clear or unified answer, but only tentative answer that may perhaps be reduced, in the end, to nothing more than a panorama only slightly different from that offered by structuralism. For this reason, among others, post-structuralism - like structuralism - invites a plural spelling, even if such a spelling is not commonly used ... What, then, is post-structuralism? At the heart of the matter is a double problematic, both geographic and philosophical. First, *the problem of delimitation*: where does structuralism end and post-structuralism begin? What is the relationship of these two movements of thought? Which disciplines are grouped under the structuralist and which under the post-structuralist aegis? Second, *an epistemological problematic*, with all its related questions: what is the difference between structuralism and post-structuralism in the field of knowledge? Is there a simple transformation, a mutation, or a radical break?" (Harari, "Critical Factions/Critical Fictions", pp. 27-8).

17. "... even if the structuralist and post-structuralist enterprises are radically opposed to each other, they exhibit a certain complementarity. The denunciation of the concept of representation is *necessarily* based on the structuralist institution of the sign; it relies on structuralist premises in order, paradoxically, to show that structuralism has not fully pursued the implications of those premises. The post-structuralist attitude is therefore literally unthinkable without structuralism" (Harari, "Critical Factions/Critical Fictions", p. 30).

18. "A definition of post-structuralism and a full reply to the questions it poses will finally come - as has been the case for all previous movements of thought - only from the results afforded us by post-structuralist theoretical practices. These, then, will be answers, furnished not on the basis of an a priori definition of post-structuralism, but (1) by showing that post-
structuralism has wrought transformations in various disciplines, (2) by measuring the scope as well as the limits of these transformations, (3) by showing that in each instance these transformations reveal what one might call a post-structuralist thrust, and (4) by determining the changes - advances and retrenchments - which have occurred in our critical concepts and practices as a result of these transformations. On this basis, one will be able retrospectively to understand better and perhaps redefine the breadth and the import of post-structuralism" (Harari, "Critical Factions/Critical Fictions", p. 31).

19. "The self-sustaining objective structure of the text requires and must correspond to an equally self-sustaining subject. Structuralism becomes transformed into post-structuralism when the structures of the text are seen to be always structures in and for a subject (reader and critic). The text of structuralism is intransitive, that of post-structuralism transitive" (Antony Easthope, *British Post-Structuralism: Since 1968*, p. 33).

20. "The prefix 'post-' is serious not casual for post-structuralism gets its intellectual force by being both after structuralism and because of it, because of the limitations discovered in structuralism's project" (Easthope, *British Post-Structuralism*, p. 23).

21. "Derridean deconstruction emerged out of a critique of structuralism. Whereas Saussurean linguistics and the semiology derived from it emphasised the synchronic - the play of differences that define any system seen as existing at one point in time - at the expense of the diachronic or the changes that take place in any signifying system over time, Derrida questioned this synchronic model on the grounds that it assumes the existence of a centre which holds the structure together, a centre which is itself outside structurality" (Ken Newton, "Post-structuralism", in Newton (ed.), *Theory Into Practice*, pp. 122-26; 122).

22. "Structuralism was founded on the Saussurian principle that language as a system of signs must be considered synchronically, that is, within a single
temporal plane. The diachronic aspect of language, how it develops and changes over time, was seen as being of secondary importance. In post-structuralist thinking temporality again becomes central. The major influence on post-structuralist literary theory is the French philosopher Jacques Derrida, though the work of the psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan and the cultural theorist Michel Foucault is also important in the emergence of post-structuralism ... Roland Barthes' essay, 'The Death of the Author', first published in 1968, adopts a radically textual view of language and meaning and clearly shows his shift towards a post-structuralist position. It has close connections with his S/Z, first published in 1970, generally regarded as the first important work of post-structuralist literary criticism" (Newton, "Post-structuralism", in Newton (ed.), *Twentieth-Century Literary Theory*. "Where and how does this decentering, this notion of the structurality of structure, occur ... I would probably cite the Nietzschean critique of metaphysics ... the Freudian critique of self presence, that is, the critique of consciousness, of the subject, of self-identity and of self-proximity or self-possession; and, more radically, the Heideggerean destruction of metaphysics, of ontotheology, of the determination of being as presence" (Jacques Derrida, "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences", in Newton (ed.), *Twentieth-Century Literary Theory*, pp. 149-54; 151.

5. 5. Final Comments on the Structuralism and Poststructuralism:

The present study is an attempt at studying two modern literary theories i.e. Structuralism and Post structuralism. It reflects on the comparison of these two theories on the basis of its origin, pronouncements and limitations and outlines the merits and confines of these approaches to literature. Criticism is a science where interpretation, evaluations are conducted as a means to reach judgment which we have presumed to be the real end of criticism. The present study proposes to study the two literary theories i.e. Structuralism and Post structuralism in detail and to see how it gives different shades of meaning when applied to a particular work of art.
In fact, literary theory is a journey of exploration into the nature of literature in all its forms; it explores innumerable ways of understanding a work of arts. It also enables us to distinguish between qualities of literary books and helps to develop an insight to evaluate it as better or the best. All approaches aim at a real or an authentic meaning. But different approaches end up into giving different shades of meaning. Applications of literary theories have an object to recognize and understand the literary qualities of a work of art. They also open up the whole world of pleasure and imaginative experience by offering new lenses to read and retrieve meanings. After an application of theories, it is the hidden meaning that we arrive at. These hidden meanings create intellectual stimulus, which we may not be able to discover without the help of literary theories.

The purpose of the application of these theories is to quicken and refine our perceptiveness so that we can understand the exact meaning of a work of art. Normally, every reader reads and reaches a mere subjective reaction, which is not complete from the point of view of criticism. These literary theories offer the insights to read any literary work by modified and upgraded measures, which are impersonal or objective in nature. These objective standards offer readers an insight to read, to interpret, and to evaluate a work of art to achieve a more authentic and original meaning. It saves him from the several elusive meanings, which every common reader is obsessed by.

All literary pronouncements struggle to reach the meaning but the meaning that we move towards by applying a literary theory, differs from one another. Hence application of Structuralism and Post structuralism would help in exploring in the meaning, which biographical, sociological, formalistic approaches may fall short to convey. It makes us realize the larger sense and meaning of literature itself.

Concluding Remarks:

1. Reader of literature in almost all languages should note that criticism is not merely a library of secondary aids to the understanding and
appreciation of literary texts, it is rather a rapidly increasing body of knowledge.

2. There are numerous sources and notes to structuralism and poststructuralism now available in the market. This material is cheap and easy to collect. Sometimes it is useful, but it is not a substitute for the texts upon which it comments, though paradoxically it is often cheaper and easier to obtain.

3. In order to comprehend, structuralism, one should know what structuralism is or: perhaps one should ask, what was structuralism? Many qualified judges opine that structuralism is a thing of the past because it was already in deadly decline by 1960s.

4. We live in the age of post-structuralism - but to understand structuralism we must know what came before. Structuralism is a movement also known as 'the human sciences', by Continental Europeans. They aspired to explain and understand cultural happenings.

5. Structuralism has generated a much greater interest in literary critics. The aim of this literary theory is to understand an account of human consciousness and culture.

6. It is probably best to approach the term "structuralism" through an attempt to understand the concept of "structure" within this theoretical frame of reformer. Without an understanding of this fundamental concept, it is difficult to arrive at a comprehensive understanding of the intellectual movement known as structuralism.

7. One of the major problems with the term structure is its concreteness. The word refers to phenomena, e.g. buildings, which are most physical in their essence. But Structures in structuralism are neither concrete nor physical. Structures refer to mental models built after concrete reality.
8. Furthermore these structures demand an understanding of hidden or deep aspects, of the matter at hand. Following this approach, structuralism is an attempt to build models, which can help us understand works of art.

9. The most difficult aspect of structuralism is that these structures are not based on concrete or physical phenomena as they are in other sciences but based on cultural realities or tales. These cultural realities are mental. These structures and their structuralist models exist only in human minds and not in nature as for example a Marxist would claim.

10. Structuralism is an intellectual movement, which bases its analysis on the reduction of materials into models referred to as structures. It is necessary to understand that these structures do not show concrete reality instead they show cognitive models of reality.

11. Application of poststructuralist with respect to all the laws may cause a reader to lose a grip on his general understanding of the matter at hand for particular meaning.

12. While reading the poststructuralist theory, the reader should note that post structuralism is not anti structuralist theory. It is a theory most refined with respect to the changes in the due course of time. Hence it comprises of some of the part of, Structuralism. Post structuralism is structuralism considered as (Post) ‘after’ Structuralism.

**Suggestions:**

I would suggest that readers read and comprehend the work done by Foucault, Lacan and Derrida in order to arrive at the understanding of theoretical directions of structuralism and post structuralism.

1. Structuralism is a general approach in various academic disciplines that explores the relationships between fundamental elements of some kind, upon which some higher mental, linguistic, social, cultural etc "structures"
are built, through which then meaning is produced within a particular person, system, or culture.

2. Structuralism appeared in academic psychology for the first time in the 19th century and then reappeared in the second half of the 20th century, when it grew to become one of the most popular approaches in the academic fields that are concerned with analysing language, culture, and society.

3. In literary theory, structuralism is an approach to analysing the narrative material by examining the underlying invariant structure.

4. Structuralism, considered broadly, is any theory that follows Immanuel Kant's notion that the mind actively structures perceptions (Jean Piaget and Noam Chomsky are structuralists in this sense), or any theory that follows Durkheim's attention to social structure.

5. Post-Structuralism is a body of work that is a response to structuralism; it rejects structuralism yet for various reasons still defines itself in relation to it.

6. Structuralism is in many ways opposed to humanism, because it privileges structures and systems over the specific parts of these systems.

7. Post-structuralism is a method of textual and cultural analysis that emerged in France in the 1960s as a critique of structuralism.

8. The occasional designation of post-structuralism as a movement can be tied to the fact that mounting criticism of structuralism became evident at approximately the same time that structuralism became a topic of interest in universities in the United States.

9. Can--anyone with such a definitive judgment on a deconstruction clearly back that up with immense erudition and the fruits of long, deep reflection?
10. Poststructuralism leads to formalism in aesthetics—and the notion that a work of art is an organic unity; promotes art as a closed system of signification with no inherent connection to the real world. What happened to the concept of art and literature as social practice?

11. Brackets off the objective and in doing so it also brackets off the human subject (anti-Existentialist); anti-Humanist, anti-metaphysics. (This also defines most Post-structuralist thought which attacks notions of causality, of identity, of the subject, and of truth).

12. Very static model of language—blind to the conflictual nature of utterance within a social context; unable to analyse power struggles (e.g., patriarchal discourse versus feminism); unable to demonstrate "the violence of representation" put on marginalized groups in society.

13. Merely assumes an abstract ideal reader—no account taken of the reading/viewing process; the coproduction of the text by the reader is ignored. Reader-response theory is the Poststructuralist attempt to address that issue; so no stable meanings are pre-given by the text as Structuralists suggest.

14. Evades value judgments—seems complicit with the alienated theory of scientific practice which is so dominant in capitalist society; no critique of institutions developed from the practice of Structuralism. Some accuse Poststructuralism of the same value indifference due to its extreme sense of the relativity of knowledge.

15. Signifier/Signified are complementary, binary and stable, whereas Poststructuralism demotes the signified and sees the perpetual slippage of meaning in the infinite play of the signifier which has no determinable relation to extra-linguistic referents at all.

Literary theories aim at giving different meanings with different approaches, which may not be true at all. As you can't apply biographical
approach to the work of Sophocles or Dante or Chaucer or Shakespearean literature because, we know very little about their personal life. Yet each literary theory wants you to understand and enjoy the meaning, which may not even be meant by the composer himself. If this is so, does it mean that one enjoys a false meaning every time? Or keep applying all the literary theories one after another just because each theory gives you different shades of meaning? Should we conclude then, that the meaning is divided in the fragments and literary theories are to collect those fragments like a Mix-Pix game?

Does this imply that those who do not apply literary theories end up in enjoying misunderstandings? Post structuralist theory at the same time ends in saying there is no end to the meaning. It means that one would never reach at the original meaning. Hence further researchers should go for a theory to understand just the true meaning other than leading the reader in the elusive world of uncertain and dissatisfying meaning because Post structuralist theory believes that there is no end to the meaning.

-------------------
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