

Codillac's Question about the Origin and Derrida's Reading

AGARI Hiroki

After Locke's '*An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*' Condillac asks the origin of human knowledge in '*Essay on the Origin of Human Knowledge*' (*Essai sur l'origine des connaissances humaines*, 1746), and its question about the origin of progress of language had much influence on Rousseau's '*Essay on the Origin of Languages*'.

Derrida wrote the introduction to Condillac's '*Essay on the Origin of Human Knowledge*', titled '*Archeology of the Frivolous*' ('*L'Archéologie du frivole*'), and he tried to find the possibility of deconstruction in it.

In this paper we investigate 1. the background of many questions about the origin in 18th century, 2. the main difference between Locke's '*An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*' and Condillac's '*Essay on the Origin of Human Knowledge*', and 3. the productive function of analogy which inevitably makes the Frivolous.

Through these we will attain the conclusion that the most important difference between Locke and Condillac is that Condillac thinks the signs are the principle to germinate of ideas, and that Derrida find the possibility of deconstruction in the 'productive function of the language' and this function of language makes the Frivolous.