

---

JACQUES  
DERRIDA

THE TRUTH  
IN PAINTING

Translated by  
Geoff Bennington  
and Ian McLeod

The University of Chicago Press  
Chicago and London

---

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 60637  
The University of Chicago Press, Ltd., London

© 1987 by The University of Chicago  
All rights reserved. Published 1987  
Printed in the United States of America

03 02 01 00 99 98 97 96 95 94 6 7 8 9 10

First published as *LA VÉRITÉ EN PEINTURE* in Paris, © 1978,  
Flammarion, Paris.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOGING-IN-PUBLICATION DATA

Derrida, Jacques.

The truth in painting.

Translation of: *La vérité en peinture*.

Includes index.

1. Aesthetics. I. Title.

BH39.D45 1987 701'.1'7 86-30914

ISBN 0-226-14324-4 (pbk.)

---

# Contents

	<b>List of Illustrations</b>	vii
	<b>Translators' Preface</b>	xiii
	<b>Passe-Partout</b>	1
<b>1.</b>	<b>Parergon</b>	15
	I. Lemmata	17
	II. The Parergon	37
	III. The <i>Sans</i> of the Pure Cut	83
	IV. The Colossal	119
<b>2.</b>	<b>+R (Into the Bargain)</b>	149
<b>3.</b>	<b>Cartouches</b>	183
<b>4.</b>	<b>Restitutions</b>	255
	<b>Index</b>	383



---

# List of Illustrations

## Parergon

- Johannes Kepler, *De Nive Sexangula*, printer's mark (photo, Flammarion) 25
- Lucas Cranach, *Lucretia*, 1533, Berlin, Staatliche Museen Preussische Kulturbesitz, Gemäldegalerie (photo, Walter Steinkopf) 58
- Antonio Fantuzzi, a cryptoportico, 1545 (photo, Flammarion) 60
- Master L. D., cryptoportico of the grotto in the pinegarden, at Fontainebleau (photo, Flammarion) 62
- Antonio Fantuzzi, ornamental panel with empty oval, 1542–43 (photo, Flammarion) 65
- Antonio Fantuzzi, empty rectangular cartouche, 1544–45 (photo, Flammarion) 66
- Doorframe, in the style of Louis XIV, anonymous engraving (photo, Roger Viollet) 72
- Nicolas Robert, The Tulip, in *Julia's Garland* (photo, Giraudon) 86
- Frontispiece to *New Drawings of Ornaments, Panels, Carriages, Etc.* (photo, Roger Viollet) 99

- The Colossus of Rhodes*, Gobelins Tapestry, Seventeenth Century 123
- Antoine Caron, *The Massacre of the Triumvirates*, The Louvre (photo, Flammarion) 124
- Francisco Goya, *The Colossus*, aquatint (photo, Rogert Viollet) 130
- Francisco Goya, *The Colossus or Panic*, oil; Prado museum (photo, Giraudon) 141

#### + R (Into the Bargain)

- Valerio Adami, *Study for a Drawing after Glas by Jacques Derrida*, 27 February 1975 153 and 167
- Valerio Adami, *Study for a Drawing after Glas by Jacques Derrida*, 27 February 1975, graphite pencil; private collection 154 and 168
- Valerio Adami, *Concerto a quattro mani*, 31 March 1975, graphite pencil 155 and 156
- Valerio Adami, *Study for a Drawing after Glas by Jacques Derrida*, 22 May 1975, graphite pencil; private collection 157
- Valerio Adami, *Autobiografia*, 6 April 1975, graphite pencil 164
- Valerio Adami, *Elegy for Young Lovers*, 1 April 1975, graphite pencil 165
- Valerio Adami, *La piscina*, 1966, oil on canvas; Schwartz Gallery, Milan (photo, Bacci) 170
- Valerio Adami, *La meccanica dell'avventura*, 25 March 1975, graphite pencil 173
- Valerio Adami, *Disegno per un ritratto di W. Benjamin*, 24 August 1973, graphite pencil; private collection 176 and 182
- Photograph of Walter Benjamin which served as the model for the *Disegno* 182
- (Photos, Maeght Gallery; except number 7: photo, Bacci)

#### Cartouches

- Gérard Titus-Carmel, photograph of the "real" model (*The Pocket Size Tlingit Coffin*, 1975) in the author's hand 187

- The Pocket Size Tlingit Coffin*, 1975; Georges Pompidou Center, Musée National d'Art Moderne, Paris (museum photos)
- 23 June 1975, pencil and watercolor on paper 199
- 11 July 1976, sanguine and collage on paper 199
- 29 August 1975, graphite pencil on paper 206
- 17 September 1975, lithographic pencil on paper 206
- 4 October 1975, graphite pencil on paper 207
- 9 February 1976, graphite pencil on paper 207
- 20 August 1975, ink, pencil and tracing on paper 212
- 21 August 1975, India ink on paper 212
- 24 June 1975, engraving plate and proof on paper 233
- 21 July 1975, soft varnish proof on paper 234
- 5 October 1975, pencil, tracing and collage on letter-paper 241
- 27 March 1976, sanguine pencil, pastel tracings on letter-paper fixed by its corners to supporting paper 241
- The author in front of *The Great Cultural Banana Plantation*; Aachen, January 1972 248
- The Four Season Sticks*—Summer Stick: Knotted at Both Ends, 1974, pencil on paper; private collection, Copenhagen 248
- 18 *Mausoleums for 6 New York Taxi Drivers*—Mausoleum Modesto Hernandez No. 3, 1970, pencil and fur on paper; private collection, Paris 249
- 20 *Variations on the Idea of Deterioration*—Drawing 12, 1971, pencil on paper, D.B.C. collection, Paris 250
- 17 *Examples of Alteration of a Sphere*—Ninth Alteration, 1971, pencil on paper, private collection, Liège 250
- The Use of the Necessary*—Lachesis 4, 1972, pencil on paper; F. and J. Choay collection, Paris 251
- The Use of the Necessary*—Léon, émir cornu d'un roc, rime. Noël, 1972, pencil on paper; Louisiana Museum, Humlebaeck, Denmark 251

- H.I.O.X.—O*, 1973, pencil and collage on paper, S. and Z. Mis collection, Brussels 252
- Dismantling*—*Dismantling 6*, 1972, pencil and collage on paper; private collection, Paris 252
- 15 *Latin Incisions*—*Lucretius (detail)*, 1973, pencil on paper; private collection, Liège 253

(Photos, André Morain, except where museum photos indicated)

### Restitutions

- Vincent Van Gogh, *Old Shoes with Laces*, 1886, National Vincent Van Gogh Museum, Amsterdam (museum photo) 258
- Vincent Van Gogh, *Still Life* (basket with oranges and lemons, branches, gloves), Arles, 1889; Mellon Collection, Upperville, Virginia (photo, MACULA) 270
- Vincent Van Gogh, *Peasant Woman of Brabant*, 1885; National Vincent Van Gogh Museum, Amsterdam (museum photo) 280
- Vincent Van Gogh, *The Shoes*, Paris, 1887; Baltimore Museum of Art (photo, MACULA) 289
- Vincent Van Gogh, *The Shoes*, Paris, 1886–87; Schumacher Collection, Brussels (photo, MACULA) 289
- Vincent Van Gogh, *Three Pairs of Shoes*, 1886–87; M. Wertheim Collection, Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts (museum photo) 310
- René Magritte, *The Red Model*, 1935; Georges Pompidou Center, Musée National d'Art Moderne, Paris (museum photo) 315
- René Magritte, *Philosophy in the Boudoir*, 1947; private collection, Washington, D.C. (photo, X.) 316
- René Magritte, *The Well of Truth*, 1963; Davlyn Galleries, New York (photo, X.) 317
- Vincent Van Gogh, *Still Life* (bottles, vases, clogs), Nuenen, 1884; Stichting Museum van Baaren, Utrecht (photo, MACULA) 330



- Vincent Van Gogh, *Still Life* (cabbages, clogs, etc.). The Hague, 1881, National Vincent Van Gogh Museum, Amsterdam (museum photo) 330
- René Magritte, *The Key of Dreams, The Moon* (detail), 1930; private collection (photo, X.) 333
- Richard Lindner, *The Shoe*, 1976–77 (photo, Maeght Gallery) 335
- Jan Van Eyck, *The Arnolfini Marriage*, 1434; National Gallery, London (museum photo) 350
- Vincent Van Gogh, *The Shoes, Arles, August 1888*; Kramarsky Trust Fund, New York (photo, MACULA) 375



---

# Translators' Preface

Classically speaking, any translator is placed in the uncomfortable position of absolute generosity with respect to his or her readers, giving them as a gift a meaning they would not otherwise be able to obtain. The translator's task, in this conception, is a noble and even saintly one, an act of pure charity independent of incidental financial reward. This position is uncomfortable because it is false: in fact the translator's attitude to the reader is profoundly ambivalent, and this ambivalence can only be increased when s/he has learned from the author to be translated that the task is strictly speaking an impossible one. The absolutely generous project of giving Derrida's meaning to be read would rapidly produce the absolutely ungenerous result of leaving the text in French, leaving ourselves a certain amount of self-congratulation on being able at least to begin to read it that way, and slyly affecting commiseration for those unable to do so. The classical ideal of self-effacing, respectful, and charitable translation is in fact the death of translation.

Yet Derrida's work undeniably calls for translation, but for translation as transformation: that transformation affects both languages at work—our English is transformed as is Derrida's French. As Derrida notes, however, such a transformation must be regulated (though not, we would add, by the principle of charity for the reader): yet no *single* rule is sufficient for that regulation, and least of all the rule that our aim should be to reproduce in the English or American reader the same "effect" that Derrida's French produces on the French. Any such rule would be a radical

refusal of the trace of translation, and is in fact the fantasy of logocentrism itself. Refusing any such rule implies the adoption of flexible strategies, including those of supplying some of the French text, adding some explanatory footnotes, sometimes being guided almost exclusively by the signifier, as in parts of "+ R" and in the subtitle of "Restitutions."

The problems facing the translator are at their greatest in the case of *idiom* (*The Truth in Painting* is also "about" the idiom [in painting]): pure idiom is the untranslatable itself. Here the best we can hope is that the reader might learn some French—it was a guiding fantasy of our work (a fantasy which remained just that) that by the end of the book the reader would have learned French and that our translation would thus have made itself unnecessary, although not self-effacing. No translation could be self-effacing before the *mise en boîte* of "Cartouches" or the *revenir* and *rendre* of "Restitutions." Not that these are *pure* idioms: but in Derrida's work of reliteralization and etymologization of such examples, the idiom becomes disseminated throughout the whole of French (and therefore several other languages too). This type of strategy completes the translators' discomfiture, in that it dispossesses of mastery even the claim to have read *La Vérité en peinture*.

It may seem paradoxical that in this situation we should claim the need for accuracy and rigor: but rigor here needs to be rethought in terms of flexibility and compromise, just as, in "Restitutions," stricture has also to be thought in terms of deconstruction. The "compromise English" in which this translation is written is inevitable and should stand in no need of excuse, if only because the supplement is never simply a substitute. "Compromise English" also recognizes that the supplement is never final or definitive: this version is therefore also a call for retranslation and modification.

Geoff Bennington  
Ian McLeod

---

# THE TRUTH IN PAINTING



---

## Passe-Partout

— I —

Someone, not me, comes and says the words: "I am interested in the idiom in painting."

You get the picture: the speaker is impassive, he remained motionless for the duration of his sentence, careful to refrain from any gesture. At the point where you were perhaps expecting it, near the head and around certain words, for example "in painting," he did not imitate the double horns of quotation marks, he did not depict a form of writing with his fingers in the air. He merely comes and announces to you: "I am interested in the idiom in painting."

As he comes and has just come [*vient de venir*], the frame is missing, the edges of any context open out wide. You are not completely in the dark, but what does he mean exactly?

Does he mean that he is interested in the idiom "in painting," in the idiom itself, for its own sake, "in painting" (an expression that is in itself strongly idiomatic; but what is an idiom?)?

That he is interested in the idiomatic expression itself, in the words "in painting"? Interested in words in painting or in the words "in painting"? Or in the words "'in painting' "?

That he is interested in the idiom in painting, i.e., in what pertains to the idiom, the idiomatic trait or style (that which is singular, proper, inimitable) in the domain of painting, or else—another possible translation—in the singularity or the irreducible

specificity of pictorial art, of that "language" which painting is supposed to be, etc.?

Which makes, if you count them well, at least four hypotheses; but each one divides again, is grafted and contaminated by all the others, and you would never be finished translating them.

Nor will I.

And if you were to bide your time awhile here in these pages, you would discover that I cannot dominate the situation, or translate it, or describe it. I cannot report what is going on in it, or narrate it or depict it, or pronounce it or mimic it, or offer it up to be read or formalized without remainder. I would always have to renew, reproduce, and reintroduce into the formalizing economy of my tale—overloaded each time with some supplement—the very indecision which I was trying to reduce. At the end of the line it would be just as if I had just said: "I am interested in the idiom in painting."

And should I now write it several times, loading the text with quotation marks, with quotation marks within quotation marks, with italics, with square brackets, with pictographed gestures, even if I were to multiply the refinements of punctuation in all the codes, I wager that at the end the initial residue would return. It would have set in train a divided Prime Mover.

And I leave you now with someone who comes and says the words, it is not I: "I am interested in the idiom in painting."

— 2 —

*The Truth in Painting* is signed Cézanne. It is a saying of Cézanne's.

Resounding in the title of a book, it sounds, then, like a due.

So, to render it to Cézanne; and first of all to Damisch, who cites it before me,<sup>1</sup> I shall acknowledge the debt. I must do that. In order that the trait should return to its rightful owner.

But the truth in painting was always something owed.

Cézanne had promised to pay up: "I OWE YOU THE TRUTH IN PAINTING AND I WILL TELL IT TO YOU" (to Emile Bernard, 23 October 1905).

1. *Huit thèses pour (ou contre!) une sémiologie de la peinture, Macula 2* (1977). From Damisch I even take the saying "saying" ("following the deliberately ambiguous saying or utterance of Cézanne") even if I were not to take what it says literally, for a reserve as to the limits of deliberation always remains here.



A strange utterance. The speaker is a painter. He is speaking, or rather writing, for this is a letter and this "bon mot" is more easily written than spoken. He is writing, in a language which shows nothing. He causes nothing to be seen, describes nothing, and represents even less. The sentence in no way operates in the mode of the statement/assertion [*constat*], exists outside the event which it constitutes but it commits the signatory with an utterance which the theorists of speech acts would here call "performative," more precisely with that sort of performative which they call "promise." For the moment I am borrowing from them only some convenient approximations, which are really only the names of problems, without knowing if there really are any such things as pure "constatives" and "performatives."

What does Cézanne do? He writes what he could say, but with a saying that does not assert anything. The "I owe you" itself, which could include a descriptive reference (I say, I know, I see that I owe you) is tied to an *acknowledgment* of debt which commits as much as it describes: it subscribes to.

Cézanne's promise, the promise made by the one whose signature is linked to a certain type of event in the history of painting and which binds more than one person after him, is a singular promise. Its performance does not promise, literally, to say in the constative sense, but again to "do." It promises another "performative," and the content of the promise is determined, like its form, by the possibility of that other. Performative supplementarity is thus open to infinity. With no descriptive or "constative" reference, the promise makes an event (it "does something" in uttering) provided that this possibility is assured by a certain conventional framing, in other words a context marked by performative fiction. Henceforth the promise does not make an event as does any "speech act": as a supplement to the act which it is or constitutes, it "produces" a singular event which depends on the performative structure of the utterance—a promise. But by way of another supplement, the object of this promise, that which is promised by the promise, is another performative, a "saying" which might well be—we do not yet know this—a "painting" which neither says nor describes anything, etc.

One of the conditions for the performance of such an event, for the unchaining of its chain, would, according to the classical theorists of speech acts, be that Cézanne should mean to say something and that one should be able to understand it. This

condition would be part of the fiction, in other words of the set of conventional protocols, at the moment when someone such as Emile Bernard sets about opening a letter.

Let us suppose that I wrote this book in order to find out whether that condition could ever be fulfilled, whether there was even any sense in defining it—which remains to be seen.

Does speech-act theory have its counterpart in painting? Does it know its way around painting?

Since it always, and necessarily, has recourse to the values of intention, truth, and sincerity, an absolute protocol must immediately stick at this first question: what must truth be in order to be *owed* [*due*], even be *rendered* [*rendue*]? In painting? And if it consisted, in painting, of *rendering*, what would one mean when one promised to render it itself as a due or a sum rendered [*un rendu*]?

What does it mean, to render?

What about restriction? And in painting?

Let us open the letter, after Emile Bernard. So “the truth in painting” would be a characteristic trait of Cézanne.

He supposedly signed it as one signs a shaft of wit. How can this be recognized?

First of all by this: that the event, the doubly uncertain double event contracts, and makes a contract with itself only at the instant when the singularity of the trait divides in order to link itself to the play, the chance, and the economy of a language. If there existed, in full purity, any (quantity of) idiom or dialect, one ought to be able to recognize them, at work, in this trait of Cézanne. They alone would be capable of providing so powerful an economic formalization in the elliptical savings of a natural language, and of saying so many things in so few words, as long as there still remain remainders (*leipsomena*), to exceed and overflow the ellipse in its reserve, to set the economy going by exposing it to its chance.

Let us suppose that I have ventured this book, in its four movements, for the interest—or the grace—of these remainders.

Remains—the untranslatable.

Not that the idiom “of the truth in painting” is simply untranslatable, I mean the idiom of the locution, for the quotation marks are not enough to assure us of it: it could be a matter of the idiom of truth in painting, of that to which this strange locution seems to be able to refer and which can already be understood in a multitude of ways. Untranslatable: this locution is not

absolutely so. In another language, given enough space, time, and endurance, it might be possible for long discourses to propose laborious approaches to it. But untranslatable it remains in its economic performance, in the ellipsis of its trait, the word by word, the word for word, or the trait for trait in which it contracts: as many words, signs, letters, the same quantity or the same expense for the same semantic content, with the same revenue of surplus value. That is what interests me, this "interest," when I say: "I am interested in the idiom of truth in painting."

You can always try to translate.

As for the meaning, for which of its pertinent features [*traits*] should one account in a translation which would no longer have an eye to pedagogical expense? There are at least four of them, supposing, *concesso non dato*, that the unity of each one remains unbroachable.

1. That which pertains to [*a trait à*] *the thing itself*. By reason of the power ascribed to painting (the power of direct reproduction or restitution, adequation or transparency, etc.), "the truth in painting," in the French language which is not a painting, could mean and be understood as: truth itself restored, in person, without mediation, makeup, mask, or veil. In other words the true truth or the truth of the truth, restituted in its power of restitution, truth looking sufficiently like itself to escape any misprision, any illusion; and even any representation—but sufficiently divided already to resemble, produce, or engender itself twice over, in accordance with the two genitives: truth of truth and truth of truth.

2. That which pertains, therefore, to adequate *representation*, in the order of fiction or in the *relief* of its effigy. In the French language, if such a one exists and is not a painting, "the truth in painting" could mean and be understood as: the truth faithfully represented, trait for trait, in its portrait. And this can go from reflection to allegory. The truth, then, is no longer itself in that which represents it in painting, it is merely its double, however good a likeness it is and precisely other by reason of the likeness. Truth of truth still, with the two genitives, but this time the value of adequation has *pushed aside* that of unveiling. The painting of the truth can be adequate to its model, in representing it, but it does not manifest it *itself*, in presenting it. But since the model here is truth, i.e., that value of presentation or representation, of unveiling or adequation, Cézanne's stroke [*trait*] opens up the abyss. (Heidegger in *The Origin of the Work of Art* names

the "stroke" [*Riss*] which not only opens above the gulf but also holds together the opposite edges of it.) If we are to understand Cézanne's sentence, the truth (presentation or representation, unveiling or adequation) must be rendered "in painting" either by presentation or by representation, according to the two models of truth. Truth, the painter's model, must be rendered in painting according to the two models of truth. Henceforth, the abyssal expression "truth of the truth," which will have made it be said that the truth is the nontruth, can be crossed with itself according to all sort of chiasmi, according as one determines the model as presentation or as representation. Presentation of the representation, presentation of the presentation, representation of the representation, representation of the presentation. Have I counted them correctly? That makes at least four possibilities.

3. That which pertains to the *picturality*, in the "proper" sense, of the presentation or of the representation. Truth could be presented or represented quite otherwise, according to other modes. Here it is done *in painting*: and not in discourse (as is commonly the case), in literature, poetry, theater; nor is it done in the time of music or in other spaces (architecture or sculpture). Thus we retain here that which is proper to an art, the art of the signatory, of Cézanne the painter. That which is proper to an art and an art understood in the proper sense this time, in the expression "in painting." We did not do this in the two previous cases: "painting" was there to figure the presentation or representation of a model, which happened to be the truth. But this troping figuration was valid for the logic of any other art of presentation or representation. In the French language, if there is one that is one and if it is not a painting, "the truth in painting" could mean and be understood as: the truth, as shown, presented or represented in the field of the pictural properly speaking, in the pictural, properly pictural mode, even if this mode is tropological with respect to truth itself. To understand the expression "truth in painting" in this way, no doubt one has to move away a little from the greater force of usage (assuming that there are any rigorous criteria for evaluating it), while nevertheless maintaining grammatical and syntactical and even semantic normality. But that's what an idiom is, if there is any such thing. It does not merely fix the economic propriety of a "focus," but regulates the possibility of play, of divergences, of the equivocal—a whole economy, precisely, of the trait. This economy parasitizes itself.

4. That which pertains to truth in the order of painting, then, and *on the subject of* painting, not only as regards the pictorial presentation or representation of truth. The parasitizing of the expression "in painting" by itself allows it to harbor a new sense: the truth as regards painting, that which is *true on* that art which is called pictural. If one now defines that art by its truth-value, in one sense or the other, one will understand here the true on the true. In the French language, if there is one that is one and which is not painting, and if nonetheless it can open its system up to its own parasitism, "the truth in painting" can mean and be understood as: truth in the domain of painting and on the subject of it, *in painting*, as in the saying "to be knowledgeable in painting." I owe you the truth on painting and I will tell it to you, and as painting ought to be the truth, I owe you the truth about the truth and I will tell it to you. In letting itself be parasitized, the system of language as a system of the idiom has perhaps parasitized the system of painting; more precisely, it will have shown up, by analogy, the essential parasitizing which opens every system to its outside and divides the unity of the line [*trait*] which purports to mark its edges. This partition of the edge is perhaps what is inscribed and occurs everywhere [*se passe partout*] in this book; and the protocol-frame is endlessly multiplied in it, from *lemmata* to *parerga*, from *exergues* to *cartouches*. Starting with the idiom of the *passe-partout*. One is always tempted by this faith in the idiom: it supposedly says only one thing, properly speaking, and says it only in linking form and meaning too strictly to lend itself to translation. But if the idiom were this, were it what it is thought it must be, it would not be that, but it would lose all strength and would not make a language. It would be deprived of that which in it plays with truth-effects. If the phrase "the truth in painting" has the force of "truth" and in its play opens onto the abyss, then perhaps what is at stake in painting is truth, and in truth what is at stake (that idiom) is the abyss.

Cézanne's *trait* is easily freed from an immediate context. Is it even necessary to know that it was signed by a painter? Its force even depends on this capacity to play with the determinations of the context without making itself indeterminate. No doubt the *trait* acts as a *passe-partout*. It circulates very quickly among its possibilities. With disconcerting agility it displaces its accents or its hidden punctuation, it potentializes and formalizes and economizes on enormous discourses, it multiplies the deal-

ings and transactions, the contraband and graft and parasitizing among them. But it only *acts as* a passe-partout, this is only an appearance: it does not mean everything and anything. And besides, like every passe-partout (in the strictest sense!), it must formally, i.e., by its forms, answer to a finite system of constraints.

What does a passe-partout do? What does it cause to be done or shown?

— 3 —

The painter does not promise to *paint* these four truths in painting, to render what he owes. Literally, at least, he commits himself to *saying* them: "I owe you the truth in painting and I will tell it to you." If we understand him literally, he swears an oath to *speak*; he does not only speak, he promises to do so, he commits himself to speak. He swears an oath to say, by speech, the truth in painting, and the four truths in painting. The act of speech—the promise—gives itself out as true, or in any case truthful and sincere, and it veritably does promise to say truly the truth. In painting, don't forget.

But must we take a painter literally, once he starts to speak? Coming from a Cézanne, "I will tell it to you" can be understood figuratively: he could have promised to tell the truth, in painting, to tell these four truths according to the pictorial metaphor of discourse or as a discourse silently working the space of painting. And since he promises to tell them "in painting," one does not even need to know of the signatory, for this hypothesis, that he is a painter.

This connection [*trait*] between the letter, discourse, painting is perhaps all that happens in or all that threads its way through *The Truth in Painting*.

The signatory promises, it seems, to "say" in painting, by painting, the truth and even, if you like, the truth in painting. "I owe you the truth in painting" can easily be understood as: "I must render the truth to you in painting," in the form of painting and by acting as a painter myself. We have not got to the end of this *speech act* promising perhaps a *painting act*. With this verbal promise, this performative which does not describe anything, Cézanne *does* something, as much as and more than he says. But in doing so, he promises that he will *say* the truth in painting. What he does is to commit himself to say something. But that saying could well be a doing, or a discursive doing, another performative

saying, producing a truth which was not already there, or a pictorial doing which, by reason of some occupancy of painting by speech, would have the value of saying. In the performance of this performative promising another performative saying nothing that will be *there*, the allegory of truth in painting is far from offering itself completely naked on a canvas.

Thus one dreams of a painting without truth, which, without debt and running the risk of no longer saying anything to anyone [of not interesting anyone: *ne plus rien dire à personne*—TRANS.], would still not give up painting. And this “without,” for example in the phrase “without debt” or “without truth,” forms one of the lightweight imports of this book.

What happens everywhere where these supplements of unchained performatives interlace their simulacra and the most serious quality of their literality? What happens in a game so perverse but also so necessary? One wonders what is left of it when the idiom-effect joins the party, the trait scarcely leaving the initiative to the so-called signatory of the promise. Did Cézanne *promise*, *truly* promise, promise to *say*, to say *the truth*, to say *in painting* the truth *in painting*?

And me?

— 4 —

I write four times here, *around* painting.

The first time I am occupied with folding the great philosophical question of the tradition (“What is art?” “the beautiful?” “representation?” “the origin of the work of art?” etc.) on to the insistent atopics of the *parergon*: neither work (*ergon*) nor outside the work [*hors d’oeuvre*], neither inside nor outside, neither above nor below, it disconcerts any opposition but does not remain indeterminate and it *gives rise* to the work. It is no longer merely around the work. That which it puts in place—the instances of the frame, the title, the signature, the legend, etc.—does not stop disturbing the *internal* order of discourse on painting, its works, its commerce, its evaluations, its surplus-values, its speculation, its law, and its hierarchies. On what conditions, if it’s even possible, can one exceed, dismantle, or displace the heritage of the great philosophies of art which still dominate this whole problematic, above all those of Kant, Hegel, and, in another respect, that of Heidegger? These prolegomena of *The Truth in Painting*, themselves the *parergon* of this book, are ringed together by a circle.

The second time, more attentive to the ring [*cerne*] itself, I attempt to decrypt or unseal a singular contract, the one that can link the phonic trait to the so-called *graphic* trait, even prior to the existence of the word (e.g., GL, or TR, or +R). Invisible and inaudible, this contract follows other paths, through different point-changes: it has to do with the letter and the proper name *in painting*, with narration, technical reproduction, ideology, the phoneme, the biographeme, and politics, among other things and still in painting. The opportunity will be given by *The Journey of the Drawing* by Valerio Adami.

The third time, putting in question again the trait as a signature, whether this signature passes via the proper name known as *patronymic* or via the idiom of the draftsman sometimes called *ductus*, I explore in its logical consistency the system of *duction* (production, reproduction, induction, reduction, etc.). This amounts to treating the trait, its unity and divisibility, otherwise, and it goes without saying that this has to do with the initial, as in "someone's initials," and with repetition and number, the model and paradigm, the series, the date, the event (the time, the chance, the throw, the turn), above all with genealogy and remainders, in the work of mourning: *in painting*. *Cartouches* gives its name—proper and common, masculine and feminine<sup>2</sup>—to the opportunity furnished by *The Pocket Size Tlingit Coffin*, by Gérard Titus-Carmel.

The fourth time, I interweave all these threads through a polylogue of  $n + 1$  voices, which happens to be that of a woman. What happens (and of what? and of whom?) wherever shoelaces are presented? Present themselves and disappear (*da/fort*), pass over and under, inside and outside, from left to right and vice versa? And what happens with (does without) shoelaces when they are more or less undone? What takes place when they are unlaced in painting? One looks for the revenue (return on investment) or the ghost [*revenant*], that which has just come back [*vient de revenir*], in these steps without steps, in these shoes of which nothing assures us that they make a pair. Thus the question of the *interlace* [*l'entrelacs*] and the *disparate* resounds. To whom and to what do the "shoes of Van Gogh" return in their truth of painting? What is a desire of *restitution* if it pertains to [*a trait à*] the truth in painting? The opportunity here was given by a sort of duel between Heidegger and Schapiro. A third party (more than a third party, nothing *less* than witnesses) feigned death while the

2. *Le cartouche* means a cartouche, *la cartouche* a cartridge.—



- [Source here](#)
- [read online \*\*Gone Feral: Tracking My Dad Through the Wild\*\* online](#)
- [download The Cinema of Werner Herzog: Aesthetic Ecstasy and Truth \(Directors' Cuts\)](#)
- [To Dream of the Dead \(Merrily Watkins Mysteries, Book 10\) book](#)
- [download online Wanderlust \(Sirantha Jax, Book 2\)](#)
- [read \*Temple of the Dragonslayer \(Dragonlance: The New Adventures, Book 1\)\* pdf](#)
  
- <http://academialanguagebar.com/?ebooks/X86-Assembly-Language-and-C-Fundamentals.pdf>
- <http://damianfoster.com/books/Magic-and-Mystery-in-Tibet.pdf>
- <http://ramazotti.ru/library/101-Ways-to-Workout-on-the-Ball--Sculpt-Your-Ideal-Body-with-Pilates--Yoga--and-More.pdf>
- <http://www.experienceolvera.co.uk/library/Returner-s-Wealth--Wymeweald--Book-1-.pdf>
- <http://berttrotman.com/library/Free-to-Fall.pdf>
- <http://anvilpr.com/library/Don-t-Move.pdf>