

Nell'impossibilità di spiegare senza banalizzazioni perché un pensatore del calibro di Jacques Derrida – di cui Diego D'Angelo ricostruisce, nel contributo che segue questa piccola introduzione, alcune traiettorie – è stato decisivo nella prospettiva (interna ed esterna) delineata da *Philosophy Kitchen* negli ultimi 10 anni, lascio la parola a Judith Butler, che così ne ha splendidamente descritto la vita e l'opera all'indomani della morte, nel 2004:

Butler: «'How do you finally respond to your life and your name?' Derrida raised this question in his final interview with *Le Monde*, published on 18 August this year. If he could apprehend his life, he remarked, he would also be obliged to apprehend his death as singular and absolute, without resurrection and without redemption. At this revealing moment, it is interesting that Derrida the philosopher should find in Socrates his proper precursor: that he should turn to Socrates to understand that, at the age of 74, he still did not quite know how best to live. One cannot, he remarks, come to terms with one's life without trying to apprehend one's death, asking, in effect, how a human learns to live and to die [...]. It is surely uncontroversial to say that Jacques Derrida was one of the greatest philosophers of the 20th century; his international reputation far exceeds that of any other French intellectual of his generation. More than that, his work fundamentally changed the way in which we think about language, philosophy, aesthetics, painting, literature, communication, ethics and politics. His early work criticised the structuralist presumption that language could be described as a static set of rules, and he showed how those rules admitted of contingency and were dependent on a temporality that could undermine their efficacy. He wrote against philosophical positions that uncritically subscribed to 'totality' or 'systematicity' as values, without first considering the alternatives that were ruled out by that pre-emptive valorisation. He insisted that the act of reading

extends from literary texts to films, to works of art, to popular culture, to political scenarios, and to philosophy itself. This notion of ‘reading’ insists that our ability to understand relies on our capacity to interpret signs. It also presupposes that signs come to signify in ways that no particular author or speaker can constrain in advance through intention. This does not mean that language always confounds our intentions, but only that our intentions do not fully govern everything we end up meaning by what we say and write».

(tratto da: Judith Butler, *Jacques Derrida*, “London Review of Book”, 4 novembre 2004)

**Federica Buongiorno**