

德里达的记忆

Derrida's Memoirs

耿幼壮 中国人民大学

Geng Youzhuang

Renmin University of China

[英文提要]

Among Derrida's many books, *Memoirs of the Blind: The Self-portrait and Other Ruins* is a very unique one. As an exhibition catalogue, *Memoirs of the Blind* offers detailed readings of a collection of images selected by Derrida from Louvre, interweaving analysis of texts from Old and New Testament and writers like Diderot, Baudelaires, Merleau-Ponty, and Borges. Moreover, Derrida, in this catalogue essay, reports repeatedly his own memories related to vision and blindness.

Consisted of readings of pictures, texts, and personal experiences, Derrida's *Memoirs of the Blind* is itself an example of his theory of text, a structure of what he calls "difference", of endless substitutability of one "trace" with another "trace", or, an experience of what he calls "ruins", which challenges all forms of totality, unity, and identity. At the same time, *Memoirs of the Blind*, with all its visible markings on the page, demonstrates Derrida's own unique style of writing. Given his Jewish background,

this style of writing, as Geoffery Hartman has put it, is that of a “Hebrew rather than a Hellene: aniconic yet intensely graphic.”

By reading Derrida's *Memoirs of the Blind*, this paper hopes to show how much insight a text as such can provide, e. g. insights into writing and drawing, the spirit of the night, an aesthetics of the sense of touch, the fidelity of faith and the representation, the gaze veiled by tears, and the ruins of trace.

德里达受邀为卢浮宫策划一个展览，《盲目的记忆》，是德里达为展览撰写的长篇介绍。德里达挑选的绘画，德里达写出的文字，展示/论述了范围广泛的主题，诸如视觉、盲目、眼泪、素描、自画像、触觉、身体、书写、再现、痕迹和废墟。因此，《盲目的记忆》看上去是一本展览说明，读起来却像一部文学/哲学著作。

在《盲目的记忆》中，德里达示范性地展示了他所倡导的读解方法：一个文本必须拆散，置于不同的语境加以重新整理和安排，以使意义在文本间性中不断产生和消失。就如他早先在《绘画中的真理》中所提及的：“一件空间的，所谓造型的艺术品，并非必然限定了一种读解顺序。我可以面对着它上下左右观看，从上面或底下开始，有时可以围绕着它走动。”^①于是，在读解这些绘画文本时，德里达穿插了大量文字文本的分析，跨越和游走于形象与语言之间，同时不断回到自传性的个人记忆，提供了极为丰富和多层次的阐释。那么，面对德里达本人谈论绘画的文字，我们是否也可以无需遵循一定的读解顺序呢？当然可以。德里达曾明确表示：“如果那是一本在康德意义上的形而上学著作，

^① Jacques Derrida, *The Truth in Painting*, The University of Chicago Press, 1987, p.49.