fun stuff to hand out!

EVALUATIONS

Plan:
- I’ll talk a little bit about the introductory essay “Tympan”
- I’d like each of you to talk about Derrida
  - some point you get/like/might like/disagree about
  - your response to: “Is Derrida worth it?”

Q: What is the effect of this double writing?

   a din
   a confusion
   a lack of center

Why begin Margins of Philosophy this way?

resists concept of “margin”
- all of the above
   a din/a sounding over a comprehension
   a confusion/a derangement, unexpected
   a lack of center (texts not even centered w/other)

Essay/book really begins with THREE Hegelian epigraphs

summarize each:
1) Thesis and Antithesis → really a limit
   - with a beyond
   - moving beyond, moves limit
   therefore no limit
   but Aufhebung / transcendence

2) There is no philosophical ground for peculiarities (exceptions)

3) The need for philosophy presupposes philosophy
   (the answer is always already implied in the question)

see TN 1 – re: title tympaniser to criticize/ridicule publicly, but also part of the ear

Michel Leiris WHO

20th c ethnologist/philosopher/anthropologist
cofounded College de Sociologie with
Bataille, Blachot, Klossowski, and Roger Caillois
fascinating w/ethnography of Africa, Carib, Central Am
involved in emancipation of Algeria
obsessed with notion of presence (kindred spirit)
To tympanize – philosophy.

Being at the limit: these words do not yet form a proposition . . . (x)

to tympanize – also, perhaps, to make it resound / re-sound – like a tympany / drum

Being at the limit - not a proposition, not yet, avant le proposition – perhaps?
limit / margin

cf. Leiris text,
“the voice that sings in relation to the voice that speaks” (xxiii) is
“represented as a margin, a fringe surrounding an object” (xxiv)

at the limit of philosophy
philosophy has always aware of, “saying” its own limit BUT ALSO believing in its
own ability to master its limit / itself at the limit

“Philosophy has believed that it controls the margin of its volume and that it thinks its
other” (x).

Leiris

figure of an earwig perce-oreille / ear-piercer (p. xiii)
Why an earwig?
What does this say about Derrida?
about D. obliquely saying this about himself?

Philosophy claims always to “think its other”

What does this mean?
in Hegelian sense → relèver / Aufheben
a claim of mastery, and YET the threat of one more limit?

Hegel’s claim is to have surpassed even the last limit
transcending from the finite being to infinite spirit (the Platonic move)

Hegel is the predominant target in this book → because of this pretense of mastery

cf. the earwig
“I shall be examining the relevance of the limit. And therefore relaunching in every sense the
reading of the Hegelian Aufhebung, eventually beyond what Hegel, inscribing it, understood
himself to say or intended to mean, beyond that which is inscribed on the internal vestibule
of his ear” (xi).

and
“can one puncture the tympanum of a philosopher and still be heard and understood by
him?”
Philosophy’s relationship to its other
always already an act of appropriation
an effacement of the other as its own proper

Derrida’s project/challenge
to think “an other which is no longer its other” (xiv)
possessive

“Under what conditions, then, could one mark, for a philosopheme in general, a limit a margin that it could not infinitely reappropriate [possess], conceive [as a grasped concept] as its own, in advance engendering and interning the process of its expropriation (Hegel again, always), proceeding to its inversion by itself” (xv).

Margins of Philosophy not an answer of any kind
because Q&A is always already a metaphysical structure
(and cannot be the site of its resistance)

another Leiris image:
“mysterious is the voice that sings, in relation to the voice that speaks” (xxiii)
- only a singing voice can shatter glass hmm, very interesting, whaddayathink?

Key questions of this introduction (Derrida’s text):

“Can this text become the margin of a margin? Where has the body of the text gone when the margin is no longer a secondary virginity but an inexhaustible reserve, the stereographic activity of an entirely other ear?” (xxii)

(earlier, same page): “beyond the philosophical text there is not a blank, virgin, empty margin, but another text, a weave of differences of forces without any present center of reference”

THE QUESTION:
What is the specific resistance of philosophical discourse to deconstruction?