**Mr. Shahzad Farid\* Dr. Syed Amir Sohail\*\***

## Deconstructionof fictional writing: an analysis of Premchand's short story

**Abstract:** *The deconstruction, primarily, aims to analyze linguistic philosophy with the purpose to explore the existing pre-supposed truths in the text. We aimed to apply the method on fiction writings. In order to do so, we devised a method named "a restricted method to deconstruct a text (RMDT)" which confines the grammatological analysis to its imperative postulates. The methods was applied on a fictional story of Premchand i.e.*

یہی میرا وطن ہے *. We explored that the writing is exposed to logos' influence, phonocentrism and hierarchies of binary oppositions, which revealed that the text is theological. However, Premchand desired to disseminate patriotism, the nostalgic one, through the story.*

### Introduction

The paper, initially, introduced what is deconstruction and how it can be used as a method to deconstruct the *foundation* of a discipline or philosophy. It is also important to note that deconstruction is primarily interested in the writings of eminent philosophers, who laid a foundation of any discipline such as Plato and Pharmakon[1], Saussure and Structuralism, Husserl and Phenomenology, etc. because Derrida[2] attacked on the foundation of philosophy of linguistics these proponent figures established, so at the foundation of western philosophy in general.

However, such a gigantic analytical endeavor is not possible in a short space of an article. Therefore, we focused on fiction which has never been analysis under the perspective in Pakistan, as to our knowledge, –thus affirms the gap in the body of knowledge and chance to fill the gap, simultaneously.  The fiction, as a whole, can also be not enveloped in the paper, thus wereduced its approach to one piece of fiction because every word is a hypothesis in the Derridean perspective. This article selected a piece of fiction, written by Munshi Premchand, named یہی میرا وطن ہے. The sole reason for the selection of the fiction is that it is, comparatively, a short one.

### Deconstruction?

Written signifier has been treated as *derivative* ofa signified in the western history of philosophy[3] due to predetermined proximity of sound or voice with its producer[4], the being. Such predetermined, the established fact of the  proximity  of  voice  and  being,  is

\* **PhD Scholar (Sociology), International Islamic University, Islamabad**

\*\* **Professor Department of Urdu and Iqbaliat, Islamia University, Bahawalpur**

*logocentric*[5]–the metaphysics of writing (and presence) which values the superiority of one signifier over the other in a hierarchy of binary oppositions –which is phonocentrism: speech is superior to writing. The logocentrism, motivated by *transcendental signified* – an idea beyond signifier such as *ensprimumcognitum*[6] – showed that the western philosophy is captive of logos.

The logocentrism, the phonocentrism, the derivation of writing or superiority of speech or the proximity of speech and being, is due to the heritage of *logos*[7] in the western history of philosophy or history of philosophy of language in general. The epoch[8] in the history of philosophy (and history of philosophy of language) has been transmitting "the heritage" the epoch retained, to sustain, thereof, writing or written signifiers have been treated as derivatives or secondary (Derrida, 1976, p. 14). Thus, the project that the deconstruction as a method to unsettle the foundation of a discipline or philosophy or any other text, based upon logos, is the identification of its critical concepts and metaphors. As Derrida asserted,

> "…it is necessary to surround the *critical concepts* with a careful and thorough discourse –to mark the conditions, the medium, and the limits of their effectiveness and to *designate* rigorously their intimate relationship to the *machine whose deconstruction they permit*; and, in the same process, designate the crevice through which the yet unnameable glimmer beyond the closure can be glimpsed…The paradox to which attention must be paid is this: natural and universal writing, intelligible and nontemporal writing, is thus named by metaphor (Derrida, 1976, p.14-15, *authors' emphasis*).

Deconstruction does not attempt to resolve metaphysical or linguistic issues rather to signify a tendency or bias, conscious or unconscious, exists in the trajectory of philosophical terrain which exhibits a predetermined preference of *one term over other* (e.g., speech over writing, presence over absence) that is rooted in pre-Socrates, Platonic, Aristotelian and so forth, assertions of the conscious and unconscious world. Such tendency is logocentric. Table 1 comprised how speech has been preferred in western philosophy in Derrida's understanding. However, deconstruction is one of the procedures of greater discipline i.e. *Grammatology*, which aimed to establish the natural relationship between speech and writing (Derrida, 1976, p. 35).

Table 1: Preference of speech on writing in western philosophy[9]

| Speech | Writing |
|---|---|
| *Immediate* | *Delayed, distance* |
| *Presence* | *Absence* |
| *Derivative of signified* | *Derivative of speech* |
| *(direct) Signifier (of a signified)* | *Signifier of signifier* |
| *Primary* | *Secondary* |
| *Interior*[10] | *Exterior* |

He asserted in *of grammatology*(1976), "The metaphysics of phonetic writing (for example, of the alphabet) which was fundamentally… nothing but the most original and powerful ethnocentrism[11]… the history of (the only) metaphysics… *always assigned the origin of truth in general to the logos*: *the history of truth, of the truth of truth*…" (p.3, *authors' emphasis*). Such logocentrism, he named, 'metaphysics of presence'.

This is the general sui generis of Derrida's Grammatology, which encompasses deconstruction. However, both disciplines comprise some vital concepts and non-concepts e.g. *différance*, that must be conceptually clarified in order to comprehend the interconnectivity among these concepts, their relationship with deconstruction and their application on text or discourse. The description of his principle concepts, other than the previously explained, are as follows:

*Trace:* to understand trace, we need to believe that what is present has something absent as Derrida said in *Writing and difference* ([1978] 2005), "Present not as a total presence but as a *trace*" (p. 119). In other words, trace is *the absent part of something present*. In this way, what is in front of you, say a dog, a present object, has signs of its past which, in relation with the presence of dog, are absent and needed to be traced. Therefore, every sign we have, has its absent part such as "the good" has it absent part "the bad" because, Saussure said, a language[13] is composed of binary oppositions and we understand a word in relation with another word which is opposite to it. Therefore, trace reminds us to focus on the opposition, the trace of a sign. It is important to mention that language for Derrida is not just composed of signified and signifier rather an endless chain of signifiers. *It emphasizes on meticulous concentration on an opposition of a sign which defines it* –the binary oppositions define each other in their opposition, good/bad, day/night, presence/absence. Thus it shows the difference between two concepts and the "…difference cannot be thought without the *trace"* (Derrida, 1976, p. 57). Finally, Derrida asserted, "The trace is *nothing*, it is not an entity, it exceeds the question *What is*? and contingently makes it possible" (Derrida, 1976, p. 75). This question of "what", should be thought in terms of the absence of the presence because, it … is not more *natural…* than *cultural*, not more physical than psychic, biological than spiritual. It is that starting from which a becoming-unmotivated of the sign, and with it all the ulterior oppositions between *physis* and its other, is possible (Derrida, 1976, p. 47-48).

*Arche-writing and différance:* Arche-writing is an *original* form of writing which can not be derived from speech. He also called that *différance* isarche-writing[14] because the word différance makes it possible to show that both writing and speech could exist in one place as the word is pronounces exactly same as difference but constructed by two words: differ and defer. Derrida (1976) said that différance is *"an economic concept designating the production of differing/deferring"* (p. 23). Therefore, it showed in relation with presence and absence dichotomy associated with speech and writing that the writing and speech could exist simultaneously. Such arche-writing also revealed that, instead of western tradition which proclaimed that meanings exist in speech and writing distances the meaning, the meaning is only possible in writing in case of différance. Nevertheless, he is

not opposing the preference of speech over writing, neither attempting to alter the dichotomy i.e. placing of writing before speech, rather the possibility of existence of both in relation to each other and in relation to oneself/itself. Similarly, on the other hand, "The (pure) trace is differance" (Derrida, 1976, p. 62) because being independent to the sensibility of oppositions such as audible and visible or graphic and phonic, it is a condition for such sensibility[15].

For Derrida, the argument of Saussure that "the structure of language is purely differential" – that emphasizes on the *difference* among sounds in language in relation with signified and signifier, which forms a sign –reveals the superiority of *presence* over *absence* because a signifier e.g. Big, represents the *presence* of sound "B" while differentiating it from other similar sounds such as P, D, R, W, Z (Pig, dig, rig, wig, zig). Therefore, a listener understands the meaning of a signifier (i.e. Big) being conveyed by understanding the *absence* of P, D, R, W, Z (Pig, dig, rig, wig, zig). However, P, D, R, W, Z are not *actually absent*, they exist because without their presence, the presence of B has no meaning. Therefore, the differential sounds *present in absence* i.e. trace. It is also *undecidable*: *Pharmakon, the supplement, trace, etc.*

However, using the analogously pronounced words pertain different meanings while tracing the meanings across catalogue of prescribed meanings would lead to *Aporia*[16]. The word that ends the previous sentence is known as destination-less destination, a journey without definite passage, an inception as destination which *block* both inception and destination, an end without start and start without end, thus neither end nor start. I will take liberty of quoting a long passage of Derrida from*Aporias* (1993), for the concept, that reads,

> …this word [aporia] was the "not knowing where to go." It had to be a matter of *[ildevaity aller du]* the nonpassage, or rather from the experience of the nonpassage, the experience of what happens *[se passe]* and is fascinating [*passionne*]in this nonpassage, paralyzing us in this separation in a way that is not necessarily negative: before a door, a threshold, a border, a line, or simply the edge or the approach of the other as such. It should be a matter of [*devraity aller du*] what, in sum, appears to block our way orto separate us in the very place where *it would no longer be possible to constitute a problem,* a project, or a projection, that is, at the point where the very project or the problematic task becomes impossible and where we are exposed, absolutely without protection, without problem, and without prosthesis, without possible substitution, singularly exposed in our absolute and absolutely naked uniqueness, that is to say, disarmed, delivered to the other, incapable even of sheltering ourselves behind what could still protect the interiority of a secret. There, in sum, in this place ofaporia, *there is no longer any problem.* Not that, alas or fortunately, the solutions have been given, but because one could no longer even find a problem that would constitute itself and that one would

keep in front of oneself, as a presentable object or project, as a protective representative or a prosthetic substitute, as some kind ofborder still to cross or behind which to protect oneself (Derrida, 1993, p. 12, bracketsadded, *original emphasis*).

In this sense, the deconstruction is identical toAporia, as mentioned in the footnotes of the term, because the former concept, as a method, is an endless exercise of exploration in "*impossible*" which makes it possible through the possibility that what the impossibility allows in terms ofaporia. For example, a search in the wordsخدا، بھگوان، ایشورis an impermeable detection in two ways. First, the meanings of the words are already presupposed, predefined and pre-established, somewhat, alike meanings in their general sense. Second, the presupposed, predefined and pre-established meanings are dead-ends –there is "no more *trans*- (transport, transposition, transgression, translation, and even transcendence" (Derrida, , 1993, p. 21)– because they represent something present in absence and absence in presence, both the existence, in its non-entity or immaterial forms, and inexistence in its all pervaded form which allows its *trace* through, whenever, they are presupposed, pre-determined and pre-defined in a text. However, its trace in any text will be an aporetic exercise, the nonpassage of its search, the impasse of meaning, which allows its deconstruction through identification of it predetermined privileged meanings being *transcendental signified,* and *transcendental signifier in text*. Nevertheless, the deconstruction of any of the transcendental signifiers e.g.خدا، بھگوان، ایشور, does not meant to overthrow their all pervaded sense or alter its omnipresence with nothingness or vice versa but to zoom-in their presence, the privilege, or privilegedmeanings in the text exposing their latent tyranny in the text which they enjoy without manifesting themselves that made the project, the project of deconstruction, in itself, a playful research – a verbosity and circuitousness of and on,the silenced – a playboy mate of text which does not promise faithful marriage to reproduce textual dignity and dignity of text rather to expose the veiled body of text by exposing itself to the text;*analogously, a committed marriage vowed to embarrass, not the marriage but her partner by exposing him, hislatent cheatings, to himself, one by one, bit by bit: digging deep down.* On the other hand, these privileged words and their presupposed, self-identified meanings, could not be deconstructed or thought in Derridean perspective without trace because, "The "theological" is a determined moment in the total movement of the trace" (Derrida, 1976, p. 47) and "the logos as the sublimation of the trace is theological" (Derrida, 1976, p. 71). It demands what latent in the laps of the words because such words enjoy a metaphysical dogma of truth which, at the same time, signify the absence of something contrary: the contradiction is present, actually, in the presence of these words.

**Methods**

After the conceptualization of the key Derridean terms, the next imperative step is its application because deconstruction is not merely a theory, in itself, but a procedure: a method which can only be materialized in practice. Although, the extreme liberty that

deconstruction enjoys cannot be quantitatively bounded into order but considering the allowed scope of the paper we focused on vital methodological propositions of the discipline. Therefore,wedevised a *restricted methodto deconstruct a text* (RMDT), that is to say, to identify what the deconstruction offered to ascertain. The following steps are the guides of the application of RMDT.

1. Identification of *logocentric binary oppositions*
2. Identification of *phonocentrism* –preference of speech over writing
    a. Identification of *presence* over *absence,*speech demands presence and writing shows absence of writer.
3. Deconstruction of "the meanings" which come under the influence of *logos and truth* –the presupposed, pre-established, pre-determined and so forth (Derrida, 1976, p. 17).

Although, the ascertainment of a text on the above mentioned guidelines, postulates, indicators, etc. can be held critically accountable, for deconstruction is neither *linear* process nor *orderly* composed but sharp active opposite to such analytical traditions. However, practicing such a huge non-linear, non-traditional, non-established, etc. process requires an endless analysis which an article can never practically expose itself to. Therefore, the *restricted methods* was devised, for it provides an effective opportunity to scratch a text deconstructively within an academically defined space of an article; for it only deals with imperative coordinates of deconstruction in practice; for it rules-out some theoretical postulates e.g. purpose of grammatology, of grammatology which are wider in scope than deconstruction and cannot substantively participate in deconstructive research. Thus, RMDT is a potential tool for research on discourses with grammatologicalperspective.

**Analysis and Results**

A person has been living in the country which he possibly had the nationality of because he had spent almost his entire life, the youth and the aging, which is not possible otherwise to live there, yet he did not convince himself to be national of the country, America. Patriotism is logocentric in this fiction because it revealed the predetermined and predefined textual campaign of patriotism as established truth because the character had been in America for sixty years, became affluent, a Slumdog turned Richy-Rich, yet he saidمیں اس دیس کا نہیں ہوں(this evokes to view this fiction-story in Marxist perspective)but the paradox echoes when he used similar sentence for the country he was longing for to arrive where he said, ہائے! یہ میرا دیس نہیں ہے۔ یہ کوئی اور دیس ہے which showed the meanings of the text specifically such sentences are bound to the structure of the sentences but in the signified, handshaking with concept of the دیس which is synonym of patriotism in the text. The most interesting invincibility of metaphysics of presence reveals when the text emphasised on the *presence* of the main character which is actually present but explained his absence in relation with the feeling for the country he owed something, the presence.

It reveals physical absence in the presence. However, the presence in India became his absence when he encountered something which he did not expect where the use of the language is cultural laden such as the *inhospitality* he encountered which exposes the hidden cultural values of India the author desired to reveal.

Moreover, Premchand used the word دیس for America where he spent his entire mature life and the word وطن for India, he lived in, in his childhood when he may did not even understand the difference and meaning of both words. The tendency of Premchand for the words, although he also used the word دیس for India but the meaning of the word changed in relation with the internalized feeling for the country which can not replace America with India, are predetermined. Such privilege of the meaning of a word with two different meanings, form a hierarchy,latent in the fiction. It also reveals that although the love of and for the India he desired to show, exposes entirely in opposition such as although he was wrenching his heart to reside in the country yet he did not prefer to live in by the dint of the wealth as he said یہ میرے بلند ارادے اور بڑے بڑے منصوبے تھے جنہوں نے مجھے دیس سے جلا وطن کیا which expose destitution and deprivation of the country and affluent condition of America because that بلند ارادے اور بڑے بڑے منصوبے are, definitely, far more superior than the patriotism which Premchand thought to prefer; which are definitely nothing but urge for the wealth; which are definitely nothing but triumph of power; which are definitely nothing but internalized feelings that India is a home of impoverishmentalthough his father was سرچخ. Further, his wife, children and grandchildren preferred to live in America, they did not come back which also shows the preference of wealth over patriotism and over love for the country. In this way, what Premchand wanted to convey is completely opposite to the gist of the text.The second part of the sentence i.e. جنہوں نے مجھے دیس سے جلا وطن کیا ... showed a force separation,both, the*push factors*, at priority, a tyranny of the condition of India,and some *pull factors*, that is to say, that the author would be nothing but a bloody slave if he did not intentionally submit to the separation: the *posed grief of foreseen happiness* that turned into a *hoaxed wistfulness, a self-deceptive nostalgia.*

Thus, the trance of rendezvous which came true, is difference in the presence and absence which was juxtaposed with (India)یہ میرا دیس ہے۔ یہ کوئی اور دیس ہے and (America)میں اس دیس کا نہیں ہائے! but the juxtaposition is neither in the urge for presence nor in the absence, but in the logos, latterly appeared on the scene when the influence of foreign culture was discouraged. The old traditions, religious at priority, are taken as the spirit of the nation such as when the main.

Table 2: The preferred vocabulary to describe characteristics of characters

| Main character | Female (Wife) | Children |
|---|---|---|
| بلند ارادے | بے نظیر حسن | سعادت مند |
| بڑے بڑے منصوبے | خوبرو | کاروباری |
| خوب عیش و عشرت | وفاداری | سپوت |
| خوش رو | شیریں کلائیاں | مؤدب |
| قوی ہیکل | نازک ادائیں | |
| بے شمار دولت، جائیداد | | |
| بڑھاپہ | | |
| سگریٹ پینا | | |
| گھوڑے نہلانا، غوطے لگانا | | |
| حقہ پینا، قہقہے اڑانا | | |
| پتاجی = سرخ نج | | |

Other females in the story

مرکزی کردار سے عورتیں اور بچے گنے کارس لینے آتے

علی الصبح اشنان جانے والی عورتیں گیت گاتی ہیں (مرکزی کردار نے بھی یہ گیت گایا)

character looked at people who were heading towards their destinations: women towards open defecation[17] and men toward Ganga while singing religious songs, he shouted, یہی میرا وطن ہے، یہی میرا بھارت ہے. Here, the wistfulness, the nostalgia, the wish covered in patriotism showed its theological face. Interestingly, the stream of the fiction itself moved towards the theological conclusion because the patriotic wistfulness, which at a moment of inhospitality made the main character phlegmatic, turned into satisfaction – the delayed expectations the main character had appeared in theological practices – theologically. The last part of the fiction depicts such theological practices which reads,

"۔۔۔ میں انتہائی سُرور کے عالم میں تھا۔ میں نے اپنا پرانا کوٹ اور پتلوں اتار پھینکا اور جاکر گنگا ماتا کے گود میں گر پڑا۔ جیسے کوئی بے سمجھ بھولا بھالا بچہ دن بھر نامہرد دلوگوں میں رہنے کے بعد شام کو اپنی پیاری ماں کی گود میں دوڑ کر چلا آئے اور اس کی چھاتی سے چمٹ جائے۔ ہاں اب اپنے دیس میں ہوں۔ یہ میرا وطن ہے۔ یہ لوگ میرے بھائی ہیں۔ گنگا میری ماتا ہے!!!"

میں نے عین گنگا جی کے کنارے ایک چھوٹی سی جھونپڑی بنوالی ہے اور اب مجھے سوائے رام نام جپنے کے اور کوئی کام

نہیں۔ میں روز شام سویرے گنگااشنان کرتا ہوں اور یہ میری خواہش اور آرزو ہے کہ اس جگہ میرا دم نکلے اور میری

ہڈیاں گنگاماتا کے پاس لہروں کے نذر ہوں۔

میرے لڑکے اور میری بیوی مجھے بار بار بلاتے ہیں مگر اب میں یہ گنگا کا کنارہ! اور یہ پیارا دیس چھوڑ کر وہاں نہیں جا

سکتا۔ میں اپنی مٹی گنگا جی کو سونپوں گا۔ اب دنیا کی کوئی خواہش، کوئی آرزو مجھے یہاں سے نہیں ہٹاسکتی کیونکہ یہ میرا

پیارا دیس، میرا پیارا وطن ہے اور میری لالسا ہے کہ میں وطن میں مروں۔"

The vocabulary to describe the peace, the calm, the wish is not exposed in embracing the country but in the theological traditions such as the privileged words e.g. گنگا, گائیتری منتر, ہون, وید.

منتر , رام نام جپنا and گنگااشنان, Premchand selected not for the national rendezvous but *"the blissful theological rendezvous"*. The trace of the rendezvous is incapacity of the land, the country to internalize the feelings of the patriotism but theological tendentiousness which, further, exposes the influence of *logos* on his writing. The logocentrism of patriotism lies in the transcendental signifiers i.e. گنگا, گائیتری منتر ,ہون, وید منتر , رام نام جپنا. The long self-awaited revenant, rendezvoused not with the country but with religion –the patriotism dominated by theological. *The theological is national; the religion is nation: a pure logocentrism.*

Interestingly, the piece of writing of Premchand also indulged in the phonocentrism by the dint of the division in the vocabulary of the piece of fiction into presence and absence. The part which showed the absence of the main character from India is related with the nostalgia where *the presence of grief presupposed the absence of the joylessness* such as "دھن میرا تھا، بیوی میری تھی، لڑکے میرے تھے اور جائیدادیں میری تھیں مگر جانے کیوں مجھے رہ رہ کر ساتھیوں کی یاد ستا جایا کرتی تھی اور اکثر مسرتوں کی

گھاگہمی اور شادمانیوں کے ہجوم میں بھی یہ خیال دل میں چٹکی لیا کرتا کہ کاش اپنے دیس میں ہوتا!۔" the intensity of the absence of joylessness is associated with writing because the absence tuned into real grief to sorrow-baying and lament-shouting when he "*heard*" the inhospitable words –the speech is preferred –which were not signified (not Saussurean*signified*) in the whole text when the character was in America. More interestingly, the melancholy was not diminished until the religious songs were "*heard*" by him in the dawn which reads, پر بھو میرے اوگن-پر بھو میرے اوگن

چت نہ دھرو, right after the logos-laden-song which made him a kind of lunatic and intoxicated, as he wrote بول چال سنائی پڑی اور کچھ (bold emphasized). میں وجد کے عالم میں تھا کہ پھر مجھے بہت سے آدمیوں کی

which signifies the لوگ ہاتھوں میں پیتل کے کمنڈل لیے شیو-شیو۔ ہر- ہر- گنگے – گنگے-نارائن-نارائن کہتے ہوئے دکھائی دیے phonocentrism, the preference of speech in relation with the preference of presence in the story [18]. In other words, speech demands presence, and the above mentioned quotes are completely drowned in the postulate whereas the vocabulary and sentences in the part of the story where main character is fastened with its absence from India, which did not prefer that intensity of the presence of its absent grief that was present in the absence of

the character in America. Furthermore, as Derrida claimed that phonocentrism is logocentrism, similarly, the phonocentric sentences, as mentioned above, are under the influence of *logo* or could be said the logos themselves (شیو-شیو-ہر-ہر-گنگے-گنگے-نارائن-نارائن).

Thus, although it seems concurrently or in the first reading of the story that it provokes "patriotism" but it conveyed, entirely opposite message in the form of *logos* as *theological* is *patriotic*, wherein, the theological is transcendental signified which, in Derridean understanding of writing, is *signifier of signifier*, hence, logocentric. Such logocentrism can also be seen in the hierarchy of words which cannot be comprehended without trace because each word (see table 2) selected to describe male is in opposition to female such as wife is characterized by وفاداری and the main character (male) is attributed with عیش و عشرت. Similarly, the words attributed to children, which are male, also comes under the influence of *logos* such as سعادت مند،مؤدب،کاروباری etc. but such logocentric tendency cannot be seen as theological concurrently because مؤدب and سعادت مند are presumably cultural driven signifieds which provoke superiority problem between culture and religion, and the relation of writing with the former concepts.

To simplify the matter, it would be enough to state that Indian theology dominated culture –for even it was impossible to think without the aid of theology in the region. However, such claim would derailed the debate more than making it evincible. The point to focus is whether the words are logocentric? It can be analyzed on two strands: do their trace reveal presupposed truth? and do their trace expose the latent hierarchy? When the words will be held accountable on these grounds they would be exposed to logo's influence, for their trace presents the absence of بے ادب and بد خو, and they presuppose ideal attributes of male children –the ideality is the presupposed truth, the truth presumed for children, especially for male children only. Furthermore, it showed two dimensions of binary oppositions: first, Premchand preferred male children – میرے پانچ بیٹے ہوئے– as he did not incorporate daughter(s) in the story owing to the ideality of desired children and, secondly, the characteristics of the male children also presupposed the preference of respect, reverence and esteem – words have been perceived privileged with privileged meanings and always enjoy this status. Thus, the binary opposition will be appeared on the scene in the form of the words present and their absent parts (presence/absence) and in the form of male children as priority and female children as secondary (male/female) – for male attributed with opposite to the attributes which presupposed for female children which form the binary oppositions. Hence, where there is binary opposition, though presupposed or exposed, there is logocentrism, which makes the chain of signifiers, theological. The character of wife in the text can also be framed in the same equation, for she was described as جو حسن میں اپنی آپ ہی نظیر تھی. Interestingly, when it comes to marriage with a خوبرو wife, Premchand explicated her procurement a matter of *fate* – … خوبی قسمت سے بیوی بھی ایسی پائی

– which is the matter of deconstructive-focus because fate is nothing but an abstract action superior to individual's choice, such superior action is nothing but will of something supreme, an supreme will is theological which reveals something presupposed, assumed and predefined by Premchand. Such presupposition is nothing but logocentric.

Conclusively, the part of Premchand's fiction writing is not patriotic (or did not convey patriotism) but theological, thus logocentric –as the analysis[19] revealed. Interestingly, it is also phonocentric as well as entirely exposed to linguistic hierarchies.

**References:-**

1. *The pharmakon is a Greek word that includes among its meanings poison, medicine, magic potion. It is a word used to describe writing in Plato's Phaedrus.*
2. *He was inspired from Nietzsche because his writing is not "subordinate[d] to the logos and to truth" (Derrida, 1976, p. 17, brackets added).*
3. *From pre-Socrates to Aristotelian philosophy of language to the Hegelian and Post Hegelian i.e. Rousseau, history of metaphysics of language, even Saussure due to his concept of signifier which expose that a written signifier is derivative (or is a secondary) of signified (Derrida, 1976, p. 11-12).*
4. *Derrida (1976) argued, "The formal essence of the signified is presence, and the privilege of its proximity to the logos as phonè is the privilege of presence" (p. 18).*
5. *Logocentrism is phonocentrism, that is to say, speech is superior to language. It implies that written signifier are derived from speech. However, speech is also a signifier of a signified, say an idea. Therefore, writing is "signifier of signifier" (p. 7). Thus, writing is derivative of speech. The writing is also associated with absence because speech assumes the simultaneous presence of a speaker and a listener whereas writing does not imply the same. Because logocentrism preferred speech, writing has been treated as secondary in Western philosophy. It also implies the preference of logos in the history of western philosophy. Such ideas is the heritage of western philosophy and it is captive of logocentric signified or logocentric ideas and thoughts.*
6. *The argument of Thoman Aquinas that ""being" is the first intellect of human intelligence" (Kemple, 2017).*
7. *The logo, the metaphor, is comprehensible through the quotations Derrida gave in of Gramatology (1976)–in which Rabbi Eliezer said that the Torah "inexhaustible"; Galileo said The Book of Nature is written in mathematical language and so on – and said, "Writing in the common sense is the dead letter, it is the carrier of death. It exhausts life. On the other hand, on the other face of the same proposition, writing in the metaphoric sense, natural, divine, and living writing, is venerated; it is equal in dignity to the origin of value, to the voice of conscience as divine law, to the heart, to sentiment, and so forth" (Derrida, 1976, p. 17). It shows the preference of logos in writing. Precisely, the meanings which are "the presupposed, pre-established, pre-determined" (Derrida, 1976, p. 17).*
8. *"For a proper understanding of the gesture that we are sketching here, one must understand the expressions "epoch," "closure of an epoch," "historical genealogy" in a new way; and must first remove them from all relativism" (Derrida, 1976, p. 14).*
9. *This dichotomies that Derrida drew is for him is the tradition of western philosophy, especially of Plato, Rousseau and Saussure.*

10. It is labelled interior because speech has been treated closer to a signified than writing in the Western philosophy.

11. Derrida stated that the teleological interpretation of phonetic writing in comparison with system of spoken language – which described nonphonetic in writing as crisis – is "Western ethnocentrism" (Derrida, 1976, p. 40).

12. However, "Writing is one of the representatives of the trace in general, it is not the trace itself. The trace itself does not exist(Derrida, 1976, p. 167).

13. At one place he said that writing is the substitutive name of différance(Derrida, 1976, p. 268) but, in some special conditions, it is also Supplement (Derrida, 1976, p. 150).

14. Differance is therefore the formation of form (Derrida, 1976, p. 63).

15. The word used by Aristotle in his Physic IV(271b). Derrida also labelled it with different names such as "an interminable experience" (Derrida, 1993, p. 16), "impasse", "no limits" (p. 20), ... aporia, the impossible, the antinomy, or the contradiction, is a nonpassage because its elementary milieu does not allow for something that could be called passage, step, walk, gait, displacement, or replacement, a kinesis in general. There is no more path (odos, methodos, weg, or Holzweg). The impasse itself would be impossible. The coming or the future advent of the event would have no relation to the passage of what happens or comes to pass. In this case, there would be an aporia because there is not even any space for an aporia…" (p. 21). With respect to Aristotle's term, he also described apoira as, "I' stuck, I cannot get out, I'm helpless" (p. 13).

16. The open defecation is not a cultural practice but theological because in conservative Indian Hinduism, toilet to build in home is prohibited.

17. In Margins of Philosophy ([1972] 1982, p. 149), Derrida quoted two prominent philosophers of linguistics to show the preference of speech in the philosophy. Derrida quoted, Saussure: "Language and writing are two distinct systems of signs; the second exists for the sole purpose of representing the first." Rousseau: "Languages are made to be spoken, writing serves only as a supplement of speech. . . writing is only the representative of speech." Saussure: "Whoever says that a certain letter must be pronounced in a certain way is mistaking the written image of a sound for the sound itself. . . To attribute this oddity [bizarrerie] to an exceptional pronunciation is also misleading" (p. 30). Rousseau: "Writing is only the representation of speech; it is odd [bizarre] that more care is taken to determine the image than the object."

18. With respect to the analysis presented in the article, one may argued that RMDT is more like Saussurean structural analysis than deconstructive in its spirit because the meaning in the analysis were derived from the context of each sentence or paragraphs. It is a point of misconception because following what Derrida said, "No context can determine meaning to the point of exhaustiveness" (Derrida, 1993, p. 09) focused in the analysis wherein the vocabulary was not dissected in relation with the intrinsic meaning or the meaning in dictionary or the meaning confined in the context but the presuppositions of the text and the rivalries of the meanings the author attempted to convey with the meanings it was conveying such as the rivalry between the patriotic spirit which Premchand struggled to proposed and the theological inclination of the author which exposed itself in the selected vocabulary. The analysis was also not restricted to the apparent text, that is the text itself, rather the meanings

*were described also as the historical gestures were prescribed with them such as the meaning of the scene: women heading towards open defecation.*

**Bibliography**

*Derrida, J. (1993). Aporias. Stanford University Press.*
*Derrida, J. ([1967] 1976). Of grammatology. The John Hopkins University Press.*
*Derrida, J. ([1978] 2005). Writing and Difference. Routledge.*
*Derrida, J. ([1972] 1982). Margins of Philosophy. The University of Chicago.*
*Kemple, B. (2017). EnsPrimumCognitumin Thomas Aquinas and the Tradition: The Philosophy of Being as First Known. Brill.*

منشی پریم چند(2002)۔"مجموعہ منشی پریم چند: یہی میرا وطن ہے۔"سنگِ میل پبلی کیشنز لاہور 2002

☆☆☆☆☆