



DIALEKTIKA

Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya

ISSN: 2338-2635; e-ISSN: 2798-1371

Vol. 13 No. 1 (2026): Juni

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33541/dia.v13i1.8113>

FROM STRUCTURALISM TO DECONSTRUCTION: TRACING THE EVOLUTION OF LITERARY THEORIES AND THEIR RELEVANCE IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Sunara¹, Ida Maulida², Mimin Aminah³

English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher and Education, Universitas Subang,
Indonesia^{1,2,3}

sunara@unsub.ac.id¹, idamaulida@unsub.ac.id², miminaminah@unsub.ac.id³

Abstrak

Abstrak ini mengeksplorasi evolusi teori sastra dari Strukturalisme hingga Dekonstruksi dan signifikansinya. Pendahuluan menyoroti pergeseran paradigma selama abad terakhir, dimulai dengan Formalisme, yang menekankan esensi formal teks. Selanjutnya, Strukturalisme muncul dengan berfokus pada sistem bahasa, pola universal, dan oposisi biner yang mengatur makna lintas budaya. Perkembangan berlanjut dengan Dekonstruksi, yang menantang gagasan makna tetap dengan menekankan ketidakstabilan, ambiguitas, dan penundaan makna yang tak berujung yang melekat pada bahasa. Penelitian ini menggunakan analisis sastra komparatif untuk memeriksa perbedaan dan keterkaitan konsep inti teori-teori ini. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa meskipun pendekatannya kontras, kedua teori tersebut memperdalam pemahaman kita tentang bagaimana makna dibangun dan diinterpretasikan dalam teks. Analisis menekankan bahwa teori-teori ini tetap sangat relevan saat ini, terutama dalam menangani isu-isu sosial kompleks yang berkaitan dengan identitas gender, budaya digital, keterkaitan ekologis, dan globalisasi. Kesimpulan menekankan bahwa evolusi berkelanjutan dari Strukturalisme ke Dekonstruksi menawarkan wawasan penting bagi analisis sastra dan budaya kontemporer, mengembangkan metode interpretatif yang lebih bernuansa dan fleksibel yang mencerminkan kompleksitas masyarakat modern.

Kata kunci: *Evolusi Teori Sastra, Strukturalisme, Dekonstruksi, Strategi Interpretatif*

Abstract

This abstract explores the evolution of literary theories from Structuralism to Deconstruction and their significance. The introduction highlights the paradigm shifts over the past century, beginning with Formalism, which emphasizes formal essentials of texts. Subsequently, Structuralism emerged by focusing on language systems, universal patterns, and binary oppositions that organize meaning across cultures. The development continued with Deconstruction, which challenges the notion of fixed meaning by emphasizing language's inherent instability, ambiguity, and the endless deferment of meaning. The research employs comparative literature analysis to examine these theories' core concepts differences, and interconnections. Findings show that despite their contrasting approaches, both theories deepen our understanding of how meaning is constructed and interpreted in texts. The analysis emphasizes that these theories remain highly relevant today especially in addressing complex societal issues related to gender identity, digital culture, ecological interconnectedness, and globalization. The conclusion emphasizes that the ongoing evolution from Structuralism to

Deconstruction offers vital insights for contemporary literary and cultural analysis, developing more nuanced and flexible interpretative methods that reflect the complexities of modern society.

Keywords: Literary Theory Evolution, Structuralism, Deconstruction, Interpretative Strategy

1. Introduction

The landscape of literary theory has undergone profound transformation over the last century. Starting from the early 20th-century push to understand literature through scientific and formalist lenses, the field has evolved paradigmatically, responding to shifts in philosophical, cultural, and political thought (Caracciolo, 2019). Central to this evolution are major movements like Formalism, Structuralism, and Deconstruction, each reflecting different underlying assumptions about language, meaning, and interpretation. The autonomy of texts and the importance of linguistic structures, aligning with the principles of Formalism and Structuralism in literary studies (Barkhuizen, 1982)

Formalism is a literary theory that emphasizes the importance of a text's form, structure, and language over its historical context, author's biography, or social influences. It focuses on analyzing how elements like style, imagery, narrative devices, and literary techniques contribute to the meaning of a work (Phelan & Frow, 2022b).

Russian Formalism is characterized by a focus on form, emphasizing the arrangement of language, style, and literary devices. It posits the autonomy of the text, treating it as an independent entity with its own self-sufficient logic (Tchougounnikov, 2020a). Close reading is a fundamental technique, involving detailed analysis of language, syntax, imagery, and aesthetics (Snow & O'Connor, 2016b). Interpretation is derived from the internal elements of the text rather than external factors, allowing for a deeper understanding of the work itself. The primary purpose of this approach is to elucidate how the structure and style of a literary work produce aesthetic effects and meaning (Enuka & Ojukwu, 2016). By concentrating on the formal aspects, Russian Formalism aims to reveal the ways in which literary techniques enhance the reader's experience and understanding.

Structuralism is a theoretical approach that views language, culture, and literature as systems governed by underlying rules and binary oppositions. It seeks to identify universal structures that organize meaning across texts and cultures, emphasizing the relationships and differences between elements (Hauer, 2017). The theoretical framework draws on Saussure's linguistic theory, viewing language as a system of signs where words gain specific meaning within a network of relationships (Volek, 2006). It emphasizes binary oppositions, suggesting that meaning is generated through contrasts such as good/evil and life/death (Pitkanen, 2015). The focus is on analyzing the underlying structures, rules, and patterns that shape texts,

utilizing synchronic analysis to study these structures at a specific point in time rather than through historical development. The primary purpose is to uncover the deep, universal structures that underpin cultural products, including literature, myths, and social norms.

Deconstruction is a post-structuralist critical approach developed by Jacques Derrida (Dubey, 2014). It challenges the notion of fixed meanings and exposes the inherent contradictions, ambiguities, and multiple interpretations within texts. It emphasizes that language is unstable and that meaning is always deferred (Dubey, 2014).

Deconstruction revolves around the concept of *différance*, that meaning is always postponed and never fully present (Darabi & Sepehrmanesh, 2012). It emphasizes the inherent instability of texts, which contain contradictions that undermine any supposed stable meaning. Close reading is employed to reveal the underlying assumptions and binary oppositions within texts, leading to the idea of undecidability, where no definitive interpretation exists and meaning remains multiple and fluid (Shapiro, 2022). The primary purpose of this approach is to demonstrate that texts are open to endless interpretation.

Formalism emphasizes the analysis of formal elements within a text to uncover its aesthetic and intrinsic meaning (Phelan & Frow, 2022a), while Structuralism seeks to identify deep, universal patterns and systems that organize meaning across various texts and cultures. In contrast (Stawarska, 2015), Deconstruction questions the very possibility of definitive meaning, revealing the inherent instability and ambiguity within texts (Dubey, 2014). This triad of approaches offers distinct yet complementary perspectives on how we understand and interpret literature and cultural products.

The literary landscape has undergone transformations over the last century, and it manifested significant paradigm shifts from Formalism to Structuralism and to deconstruction subsequently. While previous scholarship has outlined the historical development of these movements, this study formulates research questions aimed at deepening understanding of the ongoing relevance scholarly, with the investigations are

1. What are the core conceptual differences and areas of intersection between Structuralism and Deconstruction as literary theory?
2. How have these theoretical frameworks evolved in response to shifting philosophical and sociocultural climates?
3. In what ways do Structuralism and Deconstruction provide useful insights for interpreting contemporary social issues such as gender identity, ecological interconnectedness, digital culture, and globalization?

The study of the research seeks go beyond a merely descriptive review by offering a critical analysis clarifying how theories are taking on increasingly dynamic roles in 21st-century literary and cultural study.

2. Literature Review

Concepts of Theory

Key concepts in Structuralism include the notion of language as a system of signs, as articulated by Saussure's distinction between the signifier and the signified (Muhammadi, 2016), which emphasizes how meaning is constructed through relationships within the linguistic system (Mondal, 2018). Another crucial idea is the use of binary oppositions, which serve as deep structures that organize cultural and literary texts, creating contrasts that help to shape meaning. Structuralism employs synchronic analysis, focusing on these structures at a specific point in time, in contrast to diachronic analysis, which examines historical development. Additionally, Structuralists seek to uncover universal patterns, pursuing the underlying rules that govern texts across different languages and cultures, thereby revealing the shared frameworks that inform human thought and experience (Anshori, 2019).

Several key figures significantly contributed to the development of Structuralism:

Ferdinand de Saussure is often regarded as the father of Structuralism , primarily due to his groundbreaking work in linguistics (Muhammadi, 2016). His concepts of the signifier and signified established the foundation for understanding how meaning is constructed through the relationships between signs within a language. Saussure's emphasis on the arbitrary nature of these signs highlighted that meaning is not intrinsic but rather shaped by social conventions and the systemic structures of language.

Claude Lévi-Strauss, a prominent anthropologist, applied Saussure's linguistic theories to the study of culture and mythology (Zou, 2023). He explored how human societies organize their beliefs and narratives through underlying structures, particularly through binary oppositions such as nature/culture and raw/cooked. Lévi-Strauss's work illuminated the shared patterns that exist across diverse cultures.

Roland Barthes further expanded Structuralist thought within literary studies by analyzing how texts operate through various codes (Khan & Malik, 2023). His seminal essay, "The Death of the Author," challenged traditional notions of authorship and interpretation, arguing that meaning arises from the interplay of textual codes and the reader's engagement with the text. Barthes' focus on the multiplicity of meanings within literature reflects the Structuralist commitment to uncovering deeper layers of understanding.

Algirdas Julien Greimas, a semiotician, contributed to Structuralism through his development of narrative structure and semiotic analysis (M., 2022). Greimas introduced the concept of the "actant," which categorizes roles within narratives—such as subject, object, and helper—thus providing a framework for analyzing the relationships and functions of characters in texts (Wang et al., 2005). His work further solidified the connection between language, meaning, and cultural narratives.

Together, these thinkers laid the groundwork for Structuralism, shaping the way we analyze language, culture, and literature, and influencing subsequent movements that built upon their ideas. Their contributions continue to resonate across various disciplines, demonstrating the enduring relevance of Structuralist thought in contemporary studies.

By the late 1960s, Structuralism faced critiques for its totalizing tendencies and perceived rigid determinism. Jacques Derrida's Deconstruction emerged as a radical response, emphasizing instability and endless deferral of meaning.

The shift in focus from Structuralism to Deconstruction marks a significant transformation in literary and cultural analysis. Initially, the emphasis was on discovering fixed structures that govern meaning, aiming to unveil the stable frameworks that underpin texts. However, this approach has evolved to prioritize the exposure of ambiguities and contradictions within texts, recognizing that meaning is often elusive and multifaceted.

3. Research Method

This research employs a qualitative comparative literary analysis methodology to examine the core concepts, assumptions, interpretative approaches of Structuralism and Deconstruction. The following components are the analytical framework of the study:

1. The primary materials analyzed are seminal theoretical texts foundational to each movement. For Structuralism, these include works by Ferdinand de Saussure, Claude Levi-Strauss, Roland Barthes, and Algirdas Julien Greimas. The analysis centres for Deconstruction on Jacques Derrida's major writings, especially those elaborating the concept of difference.
2. A Thematic coding approach, as an Analytical Framework, guides the comparative analysis, focusing on concepts such as the nature of language as a system of signs, binary oppositions, meaning construction, textual instability, and deferred meaning.
3. The study conducts close readings to explain these concepts in context. It compares systematically how each theory conceptualizes language and meaning, approaches textual interpretation, and addresses issues of ambiguity and stability.

4. Secondary scholarly analyses and critiques are also reviewed to contextualize findings and ensure a comprehensive, triangulated understanding of the theories' evolution and application.

This research uses comparative literary analysis to examine these theories' core concepts differences, and interconnections. This article explores *Structuralism* as a major literary theory, analyzing its origins, core concepts, and evolution through a comparative lens that includes its transition to Derrida's Deconstruction. (Thomas Hauer, 2017). By contrasting Russian Formalism and Derridean Deconstruction, we aim to elucidate the intellectual shifts that have shaped contemporary literary analysis and to reflect on the continued relevance of these theories in addressing current societal issues such as gender, ecology, digital culture, and globalization.

Structuralism emerged in the 1950s and 1960s as a significant intellectual movement (Abuzaifah, 2021), profoundly influenced by the linguistic theories of Ferdinand de Saussure (Thomas Hauer, 2017). Saussure's concepts, particularly his ideas about language as a system of signs, laid the groundwork for understanding how meaning is constructed within texts. He argued that words do not possess inherent meanings but derive significance from their relationships with other signs within a linguistic framework (Lyu, 2024). This perspective shifted the focus from individual words to the broader systems that govern language and communication. As a result, Structuralism sought to uncover the underlying structures that shape various cultural phenomena, including literature, myths, and social practices. Thinkers such as Claude Lévi-Strauss applied these ideas beyond linguistics, exploring how cultural narratives are organized through binary oppositions and recurring patterns, uncovering universal mental structures underlying cultural phenomena (Koyuncu, 2011). By analyzing the relationships between elements within a text or cultural artifact, Structuralists aimed to reveal the universal structures that inform human experience and understanding (Hauer, 2017). This approach not only transformed literary criticism but also influenced disciplines such as anthropology, psychology, and sociology, fostering a more systematic and scientific examination of culture and meaning. Ultimately, Structuralism's legacy lies in its emphasis on the interconnectedness of language, culture, and thought, paving the way for subsequent movements like Poststructuralism and Deconstruction.

4. Results and Discussion

This section presents a comparative analysis of Structuralism and Deconstruction, emphasizing the interconnections, transitions, and tensions between them. The analysis aims

to demonstrate how these two approaches understand language, meaning, and textual interpretation from distinct yet interconnected perspectives. These explanations are as follows:

1. Interconnection

Both Structuralism and Deconstruction engage deeply with the analysis of language as a central component of meaning, but they approach this concept from different angles. Structuralism, rooted in the theories of Ferdinand de Saussure, posits that language functions as a system of signs, where meaning is constructed through the relationships among these signs (Tchougounnikov, 2020b). This framework emphasizes the stability and structure inherent in language, allowing for the identification of universal patterns that govern communication across cultures. In contrast, Jacques Derrida's notion of *différance* retains the structuralist insight that languages are coded systems; however, it introduces a critical twist by highlighting the inherent instability and fluidity of meaning within these systems. Derrida argues that meaning is never fully present or fixed, as it is always postponed through the play of differences in language. This tension between the structured nature of language and its potential for ambiguity and contradiction illustrates a profound interconnection between both theories. While Structuralism seeks to uncover the stable structures that underpin meaning, Deconstruction reveals the complexities and instabilities that challenge the notion of fixed interpretations.

2. Transition

The move from Structuralism to Deconstruction represents a significant paradigm shift in literary and cultural theory, transitioning from a quest for fixed, universal meanings to an exploration of the fluid and undecidable nature of texts and signs (Volek, 2006). Structuralism, with its emphasis on uncovering the underlying structures that govern meaning, sought to identify stable patterns and codes that could be universally applied across various texts and cultural artifacts. This approach aimed to reveal the inherent logic of language and the shared frameworks that shape human understanding, portraying meaning as something that could be systematically analyzed and categorized. In contrast, Deconstruction challenges this notion of stability, arguing that meaning is inherently unstable and contingent upon context (Yegen & Abukan, 2014). Jacques Derrida's insights into *différance* emphasize that meanings are perpetually deferred and subject to the play of differences within language (Darabi & Sepehrmanesh, 2012). Rather than being fixed entities, texts are seen as open to multiple interpretations, marked by contradictions and ambiguities that resist definitive conclusions. This shift encourages a

more dynamic reading of texts, where the focus is on the interplay of meanings rather than the pursuit of a singular truth. As a result, Deconstruction not only critiques the assumptions of Structuralism but also expands the possibilities for interpretation, inviting readers to engage with the complexities of language and the richness of meaning that emerges from its inherent uncertainty. This evolution in thought reflects a broader cultural recognition of the complexities of communication, identity, and representation, emphasizing that understanding is a fluid process rather than a destination

3. Tensions

The relationship between Structuralism and Deconstruction is marked by inherent tensions that illuminate their differing approaches to meaning and interpretation (Dubey, 2014). Structuralism is characterized by its aim for clarity and systematic interpretation, seeking to uncover the stable structures that govern language and cultural texts. By focusing on the relationships between signs and the universal patterns that emerge from them, Structuralism endeavors to create a coherent framework within which meaning can be understood and analyzed consistently. This quest for clarity not only facilitates a structured approach to literary and cultural studies but also reinforces the belief in the possibility of objective interpretation, where texts can be dissected and understood through their formal elements.

In stark contrast, Deconstruction problematizes the very notion of stability that Structuralism upholds (Hauer, 2017). It emphasizes the presence of contradictions, echoes, and the multiplicity of interpretations inherent in any text. By revealing the ways in which meanings shift and transform based on context and reader engagement, Deconstruction challenges the idea that any single interpretation can be definitive or authoritative. This focus on ambiguity and fluidity invites a more nuanced understanding of texts, recognizing that they are not static entities but dynamic constructs subject to endless reinterpretation. The tension between these two approaches highlights the complexities of meaning-making, suggesting that while Structuralism seeks to impose order and clarity, Deconstruction embraces the chaos and richness that arise from the interplay of multiple interpretations. This dynamic interplay invites scholars and readers alike to engage more deeply with texts, acknowledging that the act of interpretation is as much about the questions posed as it is about the answers sought

Table 1 Theoretical Ideas Comparison

Aspect	Structuralism (Russian Formalism)	Derridean Deconstruction
--------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Aspect	Structuralism (Russian Formalism)	Derridean Deconstruction
View of language	Language as a closed, rule-governed system	Language as indeterminate, <i>différance</i>
Concept of meaning	Stable, systematic, linked to linguistic structures	Fluid, deferred, always resisting final interpretation
Approach to texts	Formal analysis, focusing on devices like plot, structure, codes	Close reading, exposing contradictions, undecidability
Influence	Semiotics, anthropology, literary codes	Philosophy, postmodern literary criticism

Structuralism perceives language as a closed, rule-governed system where meaning is derived from the relationships among signs within a structured network (Austin, 2021). Structuralism can develop a concept of linguistic form independent of rules and codes. This perspective, rooted in the theories of Ferdinand de Saussure, emphasizes the systematic nature of language, suggesting that linguistic elements function according to specific rules that create a coherent framework for understanding. In this view, language is seen as a stable medium through which meaning can be clearly conveyed and analyzed.

In contrast, Derridean Deconstruction presents a radically different perspective, viewing language as indeterminate and characterized by the concept of *différance* (Yegen & Abukan, 2014). This term encapsulates the idea that meaning is perpetually deferred, with words and signs never fully encapsulating their intended meanings. Instead of a closed system, language is portrayed as a dynamic interplay of differences, where meanings are constantly shifting and influenced by context.

a. Concept of Meaning

In Structuralism, meaning is regarded as stable and systematic, firmly linked to the underlying linguistic structures that govern language (Martinez del Castillo, 2015). This approach aims to reveal clear, objective meanings that can be consistently analyzed across different texts and contexts. The focus is on establishing connections between signs, leading to a coherent understanding of how meaning is constructed within a given framework.

Conversely, Derridean Deconstruction posits that meaning is fluid and deferred, always resisting final interpretation (Darabi & Sepehrmanesh, 2012). This perspective recognizes that texts are rife with contradictions and ambiguities, which complicate the process of deriving a singular meaning. Instead of seeking definitive conclusions, Deconstruction embraces the multiplicity of interpretations, highlighting that meaning is contingent upon various factors, including context, reader engagement, and the interplay of different textual elements.

b. Approach to Texts

Structuralism employs a formal analysis that focuses on the devices used within a text, such as plot, structure, and literary codes, structuralism analyzes intrinsic elements of a text (Rizkian, 2023). This method prioritizes a systematic examination of the formal elements, allowing scholars to uncover the underlying rules that shape a text's meaning. By concentrating on these devices, Structuralists aim to reveal the inherent logic of the text, thereby facilitating a clearer understanding of its construction and significance.

In contrast, Derridean Deconstruction advocates for close reading that exposes contradictions and the undecidability of texts (Snow & O'Connor, 2016a). This approach goes beyond formal analysis to interrogate the assumptions and binary oppositions that underpin a text. By revealing the tension between different meanings and the instability of language, Deconstruction encourages readers to engage with the complexities of interpretation, recognizing that texts often resist simplistic readings.

The influence of Structuralism extends into fields such as semiotics, anthropology, and literary codes. By establishing a systematic framework for analyzing language and culture, Structuralism has profoundly impacted various disciplines, promoting a scientific approach to understanding human behavior and thought. Its focus on universal patterns has paved the way for a more structured analysis of cultural artifacts and narratives.

On the other hand, Derridean Deconstruction has significantly influenced philosophy and postmodern literary criticism (Bist, 2020). By challenging traditional notions of meaning and interpretation, Deconstruction has reshaped the landscape of literary theory, encouraging a more critical and nuanced engagement with texts. Its emphasis on the fluidity of meaning and the complexities of language has prompted a re-evaluation of how we understand texts, culture, and identity, fostering an environment where ambiguity and multiplicity are not only acknowledged but celebrated.

The contrast between Structuralism and Derridean Deconstruction highlights two distinct approaches to understanding language and meaning (Zengguang, 2010). While Structuralism seeks stability and systematic interpretation within a closed linguistic framework, Deconstruction embraces the fluidity and complexity of language, revealing the inherent tensions and ambiguities that challenge fixed interpretations (Zengguang, 2010). Together, these approaches enrich our

comprehension of texts and cultural products, offering valuable insights into the nature of meaning and interpretation in literature and beyond (Stawarska, 2015).

Critical Reflection: Relevance to 21st-Century Issues

1. Gender and Identity

Deconstruction's emphasis on fluidity has profound implications for contemporary gender studies, where the instability of identity and meaning is a central concern (Stephens, 2014). Traditional notions of gender as fixed categories—male and female—are increasingly challenged by the understanding that gender is not a binary but a spectrum. This perspective aligns with Deconstruction's assertion that identity is not a stable construct but rather a dynamic interplay of social, cultural, and individual factors (Coney, 2015). By recognizing the fluid nature of identity, scholars can explore how gender is shaped by various contexts, experiences, and expressions, allowing for a more nuanced understanding of the complexities surrounding gender identity and the societal norms that influence it.

2. Ecological and Environmental Discourse

Structuralist ideas about systemic relationships offer valuable insights into ecological and environmental discourse, advocating for a comprehensive understanding of the interconnectedness between human and natural worlds (Li & Shen, 2023). By viewing ecosystems as systems governed by underlying structures and relationships, Structuralism provides a framework for analyzing how various elements within these systems interact and influence one another. This perspective encourages a holistic approach to environmental issues, emphasizing that human actions, cultural practices, and ecological health are interrelated ("Open Research Online," 2014). As global environmental challenges become increasingly pressing, applying Structuralist principles can foster a deeper appreciation of the intricate networks that sustain life and the importance of sustainable practices that respect these connections.

3. Digital Culture and Globalization

The fluid and undecidable nature of meaning in Deconstruction mirrors the constant flux characteristic of digital media and globalization (Capone et al., 2024). In today's interconnected world, the rapid dissemination of information through digital platforms creates an environment where meanings are continuously negotiated and redefined. Online texts and transnational dialogues exemplify this fluidity, as cultural

contexts and interpretations shift in real time. Deconstruction invites scholars to engage in contextual and multiplicity-based analyses.

Critique and Challenges

Despite their illuminating contributions, both Structuralism and Deconstruction face critiques, particularly concerning issues of relativism and the challenges of practical application (Ponzio & Salento, 1934). Critics argue that the emphasis on fluidity and instability can lead to a form of interpretive paralysis, where the absence of fixed meanings complicates efforts to address social issues or reach consensus. Applying these theoretical frameworks in concrete contexts can be difficult, as the complexity of social phenomena often requires more definitive conclusions. Nonetheless, the insights offered by these theories foster a nuanced understanding of the intricate dynamics at play in contemporary society. By acknowledging the complexities and contradictions within social issues, scholars and practitioners can develop more effective strategies for engagement and intervention.

5. Conclusion

This article investigates the evolution of literary theory, tracing the development from Formalism and Structuralism to Deconstruction. It explores the core concepts of these theories and their relevance in the 21st century. By contrasting Russian Formalism with Derridean Deconstruction, the essay reveals significant intellectual shifts in contemporary literary analysis and emphasizes the importance of these theories in addressing pressing societal issues, including gender, ecology, digital culture, and globalization.

Emerging in the 1950s and 1960s, Structuralism was influenced by Ferdinand de Saussure's linguistic theories, which positioned language as a system of signs. Key figures like Claude Lévi-Strauss and Roland Barthes expanded Structuralist thought, applying it to culture, mythology, and literary studies. However, critiques of Structuralism by the late 1960s led to the rise of Derrida's Deconstruction, which challenged the notion of stable meanings and highlighted the instability and endless deferral of meaning within texts.

The comparative analysis of Structuralism and Deconstruction reveals their interconnections, transitions, and tensions. While both approaches analyze language, Structuralism seeks stable structures and clear meanings, whereas Deconstruction emphasizes the fluidity and undecidability of texts. This shift represents a movement from the pursuit of fixed meanings to an exploration of the complexities and contradictions inherent in language and interpretation.

Finally, the essay reflects on the relevance of these theories in contemporary discourse. Deconstruction significantly influences gender studies by promoting the fluidity of identity and questioning rigid gender categories. In contrast, Structuralism offers insights into ecological discourse by framing ecosystems as interconnected systems. Additionally, Deconstruction resonates with digital culture, capturing the ambiguous and fluid nature of meaning in today's digital landscape.

References

- Abuzaifah, M. A. (2021). Paradigm Shift in the Schools of European Structuralism: From Pre-Structuralism to Post-Structuralism. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 11(4), 26. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v11n4p26>
- Anshori, I. (2019). Analisis Kritis Terhadap Anatomi Teori Strukturalisme Claude Levi-Strauss (Larangan Incest dalam Sistem Pernikahan dan Kekerabatan, serta Relevansinya dengan Pendidikan Islam). *Halaqa: Islamic Education Journal*, 3(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.21070/halaqa.v3i1.2127>
- Austin, P. (2021). Theory of language: A taxonomy. *SN Social Sciences*, 1(3), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-021-00085-x>
- Barkhuizen, J. H. (1982). Linguistiese grondslae van moderne teksinterpretasie. *HTS Theologiese Studies / Theological Studies*, 38(4), 28–34. <https://doi.org/10.4102/Hts.V38i4.4269>
- Bist, R. B. (2020). Postmodernism: An Anti-Foundational Philosophy of Western Intellectual Tradition. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 5(3), 627–632. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.53.8>
- Capone, L., Rocchi, M., & Bertolaso, M. (2024). Rethinking “digital”: A genealogical enquiry into the meaning of digital and its impact on individuals and society. *AI and Society*, 39(5), 2285–2295. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-023-01687-0>
- Caracciolo, M. (2019). *Form, science, and narrative in the Anthropocene*.
- Coney, N. (2015). *Performing Genders: A Study of Gender Fluidity*. 104.
- Darabi, B., & Sepehrmanesh, M. (2012). Meaning Perpetually Deferred: A Derridaean Study of Sam Shepard’s True West. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 2(3), 69–74. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v2n3p69>
- Dubey, L. (2014). W. B. Yeats’ Poem ‘When You Are Old and Gray ...’: A Deconstructionist Study. *II*(3), 3484–3494.
- Enuka, C., & Ojukwu, E. C. (2016). *Challenges of Nigeria’s Foreign Policy*.

- Hauer, T. (2017). *Structuralism and Postmodern Discourse*. *Philosophy Study*, 7(4), 191-196.
<https://doi.org/10.17265/2159-5313/2017.04.003>
- Khan, S., & Malik, A. (2023). Barthes Five Codes In The John Cheever's Short Story The Enormous Radio: A Structural Analysis. *Central European Management Journal*, 31, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.57030/23364890.cemj.31.2.53>
- Koyuncu, A. (2011). *Levi-Stratuss Yap ı salc ı l ı ğ ı Levi-Strauss ' s Structuralism*.
- Li, Y., & Shen, L. (2023). Analysis of Environmental News Reports From Ecological Discourse Theory. *Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Science*, 7(6), 1229–1234.
<https://doi.org/10.26855/jhass.2023.06.036>
- Lyu, L. (2024). The Dialectical Relationship of the Arbitrariness and Iconicity of Linguistic Semiotics. *Pacific International Journal*, 7(3), 154–157.
<https://doi.org/10.55014/pij.v7i3.642>
- M., R. (2022). the Modality of Proppian “False Hero”: Neither a Hero Nor a Villain in (Folk) Narratives and Real Life. *ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts*, 3(2), 89–96. <https://doi.org/10.29121/shodhkosh.v3.i2.2022.150>
- Martinez del Castillo, J. (2015). Meaning, What is It. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(6), 67. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.s.2015030601.19>
- Mondal, P. (2018). Lexicon, meaning relations, and semantic networks. *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, 2244, 40–52.
- Muhammadi, T. A. (2016). Saussurian Structuralism in Linguistics. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 20, 27–31.
- Open Research Online. (2014). *Choice Reviews Online*, 51(06), 51-2973-51–2973.
<https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.51-2973>
- Phelan, J., & Frow, J. (2022a). Reading Characters Rhetorically. *Narrative*, 30(2), 255–267.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/nar.2022.0015>
- Phelan, J., & Frow, J. (2022b). Reading Characters Rhetorically. *Narrative*, 30(2), 255–267.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/nar.2022.0015>
- Pitkanen, M. (2015). On Life , Death , Good and Evil Life and Death. 6(4), 222–239.
- Ponzio, L., & Salento, U. (1934). *Visões do estruturalismo*: 759–779.
- Rizkian, M. F. (2023). Strukturalisme Topeng Betawi Lakon Si Jantuk. *Deiksis*, 15(3), 254.
<https://doi.org/10.30998/deiksis.v15i3.21075>
- Shapiro, S. (2022). CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture. *CLCWeb - Comparative Literature and Culture*, 24(1). <https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.4283>

- Snow, C., & O'Connor, C. (2016a). Close Reading and Far-Reaching Classroom Discussion: Fostering a Vital Connection. *Journal of Education*, 196(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002205741619600102>
- Snow, C., & O'Connor, C. (2016b). Close Reading and Far-Reaching Classroom Discussion: Fostering a Vital Connection. *Journal of Education*, 196(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002205741619600102>.
- Stawarska, B. (2015). Strange life of a sentence: Saussurean doctrine and its discontents. *Philosophy Today*, 59(2), 305–316. <https://doi.org/10.5840/philtoday201522666>
- Stephens, E. (2014). Feminism and New Materialism: The Matter of Fluidity. *Interalia: A Journal of Queer Studies*, 186–202. <https://doi.org/10.51897/interalia/bosz9092>
- Tchougounnikov, S. (2020a). European Formalism and Empiriocriticism: Formalism within the International Empiriocritical Movement. *Linguistic Frontiers*, 3(1).
- Tchougounnikov, S. (2020b). European Formalism and Empiriocriticism: Formalism within the International Empiriocritical Movement. *Linguistic Frontiers*, 3(1), 39–47. <https://doi.org/10.2478/lf-2020-0004>
- Thomas Hauer. (2017). Structuralism and Postmodern Discourse. *Philosophy Study*, 7(4), 191–196. <https://doi.org/10.17265/2159-5313/2017.04.003>
- Volek, M. E. (2006). *Machinic Relations in the Production of Signs* (McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario). <https://prod-ms-be.lib.mcmaster.ca/server/api/core/bitstreams/6d5359b4-071b-4fce-a9cd-b1926f5dbefa/content>
- Wang, Y., Roberts, C. W., Wang, Y., & Roberts, C. W. (2005). *Montclair State University Digital Commons Actantial analysis Greimas ' s structural approach to the analysis of self-narratives Actantial analysis Greimas ' s structural approach to the analysis of self-narratives*.
- Yegen, C., & Abukan, M. (2014). Derrida and Language: Deconstruction. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 6(2), 37. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v6i2.5210>
- Zengguang, L. (2010). Structure and meaning. *Contemporary Chinese Thought*, 41(3), 88–95. <https://doi.org/10.2753/CSP1097-1467410307>
- Zou, X. (2023). Myth Theory and Structuralism—A Study of Lévi- Strauss's mythological Research from Myth and Meaning. *Social Science, Humanities and Sustainability Research*, 4(3), p106. <https://doi.org/10.22158/sshsr.v4n3p106>