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Sei immer tot in Euridike—,
singender steige,/preisender
steige zurüè in den reinen
Bezug./Hier, unter Schwinden-
denden, sei, im Reiche der
Neige,/sei ein klingendes Glas,
das sich im Klang schon
zerschlug. RILKE

The object of the present work
[ouvrage], its style as well, is the
morceau (morceau: piece, shred,
bit, piece] (135b)

Memorials only, and Reviews,
write Prose Prior, 1721

Is the pleasure that is tasted pa-
tient of a long review? M. Ar-
nold, 1855

To read the already [déjà] as
siglum [initials: d.J.]. When I
sign, I am already dead. I have
hardly the time to sign that I
am already dead. I must ab-
breve writing, whence the
siglum, since the very structure
of the event of "signature" car-
rries within itself my death. So
that it is not an event, perhaps
signifying nothing, written
from/after [depuis] a past
which has never been present,
after a death which had never
been alive. To write for the
dead, from them, for ones who
have never been alive: such is
the desire which questions
itself . . . and resounds, here,
like glas, finally allowing the
unprecedented, unheard of, il-
legible of an already to be
heard/understood [entendu]
not amounting to anything pre-
sent, even were it as past. The
"I am therefore dead . . . I am
someone dead who looks at his
skeleton on the mirror . . . " of
the Miracle of the Rose is not
just one proposition among
others. Everywhere it is
repeated, minted, detailed/
retailed [détail], it gives
a stroke [coup] of writing
(or of already) to all the forces which cling to the present, to truth as presence. The past is no longer a past-present, nor the future a present-to-come. And all the values which depend on this axiom are jammed by this siglum, they no longer function, being in advance defunct, right here (26b)*

"What is the meaning of the glas of the proper name? Rather, does it mean anything at all?" (27b). The style that would write properly and with propriety, possessing itself through its signature, will have been judged at the stakes in Derrida's 1974 text GLAS [in German: glass; in French: knell(s)]. The proper noun, the name, would call the singular, unique individual, yet by a profound irony of language let him be classified into a system, be inscribed within a system of classification, mourned:

... mourning: is it a ... species of work? ... Is not rather all work mournful, of mourning, and at the same stroke, work of appropriation of a more or a less of a loss, a classical operation? A violent operation of class and classification? Such work of mourning is called/spelled [appelle] glas. It is always of the proper name. Glas is to begin with (class, chiasso, classum, classicum) the signal of a trumpet destined to call-forth (calare), to convoque, gather together as such a class of the Roman people. There is thus of glas in classical literature—but also in the struggle of the classes: class ... against class, glas of the classes right here and now (100-112b; the last three dots represent 12 pages).

To name is properly speaking to indicate or point-out an individual as uniquely determinable. But in fact, names, by the very process of calling, classify, order within an institutional hierarchy. A name posits an individual as a member of a class, as classifiable.

In the Phenomenology of Spirit Hegel had already convincingly shown that every intention directed to the unique is doomed to failure in the light of the rigorous work of the concept (Begriff). The individual is always already inscrib-

* All footnotes in parenthesis refer to Glas, Jacques Derrida, Editions Galilee, 1974. The "a" following the page number refers to its left column, the "b" to the right (following G. Hartman's convention).