Araştırma Makalesi ● Research Article

Reading Derridean Deconstruction on the Repetitive Visuals of an Avant-garde Design

Avangard Bir Tasarımın Tekrarlanan Görselleri Üzerinden Derridacı Yapısökümü Okumak

Gizem KIZILTUNALI[a*]

[a] Dr. Öğretim Üyesi, Yaşar Üniversitesi, İletişim Fakültesi, Yeni Medya ve İletişim Bölümü, İzmir / TÜRKİYE
ORCID: 0000-0001-5681-9371

ÖZ

Bu makale, bir durum incelemesi çalışması olarak Hüseyin Çağlayan'ın *Memory Dress* tasarımına odaklanır ve Derridacı yapıbozumun eleştirel avangard yöntemi ile avangard moda tasarımı arasındaki benzerliklere işaret etmek için içerik analizi yapar. *Memory Dress*'in dört farklı versiyonu üzerinde yürütülen içerik analizini standart hale getirmek için bir kodlama şeması kullanılmıştır. Çalışma, *Memory Dress*'in dönüştürülebilir yüksek yaka, parlak düğme, dikey iğne dikişi, yatay çift dikişi ve yama göğüs cebi gibi tasarım detaylarına odaklanır ve Derridacı metinlerarasılık, iz ve *différance* kavramları altında her kategoriyi ayrı ayrı inceler. Kodlama şeması, giysinin görsel görüntüleri üzerinde yapılan nitel analiz yoluyla her Derridacı kavramının görsel karşılığını ortaya çıkarır. Bu şekilde makale, avangart bir giysinin yapısını dekonstrüktivist normlarla ilişkili olarak açıklamaktadır. Bu amaçla, makale, bir giysinin yapısal olarak nasıl somutlaştığını ve Derridacı metinlerarasılık, iz ve *différance* kavramlarını görsel olarak nasıl ilettiğini göstermektedir. Makale, tasarım detayları ve motifler üzerine soyut, felsefi terimleri somutlaştırarak, postmodern eleştirel düşünce ile avangard yaratıcılık arasındaki paralelliği vurgulamaktadır.

ABSTRACT

This article focuses on Hussein Chalayan's *Memory Dress* as a case study and applies content analysis on it so as to point out the similarities between the critical avant-garde method of Derridean deconstruction and avant-garde fashion design. A coding schema is utilized to standardize the content analysis conducted on the variety of styles of the *Memory Dress*. The study focuses on the design details of the *Memory Dress* such as the convertible high-stand collar, the shiny button, the vertical needle stitch, the horizontal double stitches and the chest patch pocket and studies each category separately under the Derridean concepts of intertextuality, trace and *différance*. The coding schema reveals the visual equivalence of each Derridean concept through the qualitative analysis conducted on the visual images of the garment. This way, the article explains an avant-garde garment's structure in relation to deconstructivist norms. With such intention, the article demonstrates how a garment structurally embodies and visually communicates the Derridean notions of intertextuality, trace and *différance*. By materializing abstract, philosophical terms on design details, and motifs, the article highlights the parallelism between postmodern critical thinking, and avant-garde creativity.

* *Sorumlu yazar/Corresponding author*.
e-posta: *Gizem.kiziltunali@yasar.edu.tr*

Introduction

This article focuses on the avant-garde Turkish fashion designer Hussein Chalayan's *Memory Dress*, which is repetitively presented in four different versions. The dress is from the designer's S/S 99-00 *Echoform* collection. The article conducts a content analysis on the garment and aims to show the similarities of an avant-garde fashion object with Derridean deconstruction. In doing so, the article focuses on the Derridean concepts of Intertextuality, Trace and *Différance*. Although Derrida did not directly write on fashion, according to Gill (2015, p. 256), Roland Barthes was invented methods to interpret fashion as an expressive language. She goes on to say that Derrida's technique of focusing on a text's assembly may be applied to garment structures as well. Building on Gill's words, this article utilizes particular concepts of deconstructivist criticism, and approaches an avant-garde fashion object as a text to show how it visually communicates the Derridean notions of Intertextuality, trace and *différance*. In this respect, the article brings an innovative perspective onto the analysis of fashion objects. Kwon and Keum's (2008) and Kwon's (2007) studies are the only ones conducted so far that apply deconstructivist characteristics to Alexander McQueen's collections. In this article I apply a similar approach to Chalayan's repetitive versions of the *Memory Dress* as so far only collection have but such a design with different versions has not been studied before.

Agnès Rocamora (2015, p. 255) stresses that fashion design, akin to Derrida's writing, may highlight an uncertainty in writing or clothing to communicate both creation and annihilation, creating and undoing. It would be plausible to state that the *Memory Dress* is a design that goes hand in hand with Rocamora's words in the way it deliberately emphasizes absence, presence, instability and uncertainty, like a text of deconstruction. Instead of a conventional garment structure, which is finalized, and presented in a single image, the *Memory Dress* is unfinished, open to interpretation and full of absence and presence that hinder a stability of look.

On different occasions, Derrida *described* what deconstruction is. Yet, he never *defined* it. The scholar never defined it because according to Derrida, defining something means its end, its finalization. Rather, deconstruction for Derrida is an on-going process, it is a strategy for reading texts (Rutli, 2019, p. 24). The fact that the *Memory Dress* is deliberately not finalized in the repetitive images it is presented, renders the garment an ideal case study for applying deconstructivist concepts on it. The article engages with content analysis. A coding schema is used to standardize the content analysis conducted on the *Memory Dress*. The schema includes five categories under the title of design details: The convertible high-stand collar, the shiny button, the vertical needle stitch, the horizontal double stitches, and the pocket. Each category is studied separately under the Derridean concepts of intertextuality, trace and *différance.*

Derridean Theoretical Framework

Jacques Derrida wrote his seminal book *Of Grammatology* in 1967 and introduced "Deconstruction" as a postmodern critical theory. The deconstructivist approach aims to unravel the irrational elements and inconsistencies that are to be found in Western philosophy (Best and Kellner, 1991; Sarup, 1993). Building on Saussure, Hegel and Rousseau, by the method of deconstruction, Derrida draws attention to the contradictory aspects of classical Western thinking's Meta narratives that have been present since Plato. According to the critical theory of deconstructivism, opposing concepts are merely constructions. In this respect, the deconstructivist technique aims to point out the ways binary oppositions are fabricated by Western metaphysics and imposed to us. It emphasizes that hierarchical binaries (established in the form of concepts) are not rightly or justly opposites only because one of them is considered to be of greater value over the other (Derrida, 1988, p. 236).

Binary oppositions provide a hierarchical system of ethics and values, with Western philosophy determining which thought is seen as superior to the others. This hierarchical dichotomy designates what *Truth* is. Conversely, Derridean deconstruction aims to challenge false pretences to truth established by dichotomies (Williams, 2005, p. 25) by focusing on these so-called assumptions (Williams, 2005, p. 29).

Method

This article focuses on the changing "details" of the four different versions of Chalayan's *Memory Dress*. The *Memory Dress* is chosen as a case study to be analysed. Case studies provide a possibility for a complete understanding of a process (Patton and Appelbaum, 2003, p.63). It plays an important role in generating ideas and developing theories. A case study is a research technique, not a method (Hartley, 2004, p. 323; Titscher et al., 2000, p. 43). Data gathering and analysis are done in a continuous process, which might be a merit because it allows for thinking based on empirical facts (Hartley, 2004, p. 329). Furthermore, a thorough explanation of the data and the creation of classifications into which to categorize actions or processes have shown to be critical phases in the data analysis process. The data can then be categorized around specific subjects, important themes, or essential issues, and then reviewed to see how well they fit or don't fit into the predicted classifications (Hartley, 2004, p. 329). A theory or theoretical framework emerges initially in case studies, not as a result of a logical approach, but as a result of the inductive method of analyzing an experiential example or object Content analysis is an inductive technique that uses a set of guideline procedures to analyze data sources in a systematic way. As a result, content analysis might be a good way to analyze and analyze case study data.

This study employs a guided method to content analysis, which begins with a theory or pertinent research findings as direction for first codes (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005). The hypothesis of the article is that avant-garde design carries qualities of Derridean deconstruction as and the key concepts related to it.

Content analysis provides for a qualitative or quantitative study of data in relation to a certain topic. According to Bryman (2004, p. 542) content analysis is An method of documents that stresses the investigator's role in the formation of textual meaning. Allowing categories to arise from data is emphasized, as is acknowledging the importance of knowing the setting in which an object being examined (and the categories formed from it) arose.

In content analysis, the emphasis is on constructivist methods where there is no clear-cut objectivity or reality, and qualitative procedures arise from phenomenological and interpretative paradigms (Cassell and Symon, 1994, p. 2).They add that, with its qualitative nature, content analysis is less likely to apply rigid a priori categories on the collecting of data and hence research is directed by emergent themes and idiographic descriptions rather than extremely explicit hypotheses and category frameworks (p. 4). Content analysis is used to show the amount of visual rhetoric related to the selected Derridean terms the *Memory Dress* manifests through its details. The essay analyses and creates qualitative relationships between the each Derridean notion and the *Memory Dress'* design features. The content analysis of the four various versions of the *Memory Dress* is standardized using a coding system: The convertible high-stand collar, the shiny button, the vertical needle stitch, the horizontal double stitches, and the pocket are all included in the design details schema. The Derridean ideas of intertextuality, trace, and *différance* are used to study each category independently. Each Derridean concept's visual equivalence is qualitatively observed and represented in the coding scheme.

Hussein Chalayan as an Avant-garde Designer

Hussein Chalayan, a Turkish/Cypriot designer working in London, was born in 1970. Chalayan was born in Nicosia, Cyprus, and attended Türk Maarif Koleji before fleeing to the

United Kingdom owing to political instability in 1974. Tangent Flows, the designer's graduation collection at Central Saint Martin's, was released in 1993. Browns, a London fashion retailer, later featured the collection. In 1994, he established his own label, "Cartesia Ltd," and named it after himself. Chalayan has become famous for his novel, unconventional fashion collections.

Having explained deconstructivist critical theory, deconstruction in fashion and Hussein Chalayan, the next section will focus on the Derridean concepts of intertextuality, trace and *différance* that will later be visually applied to Chalayan's *Memory Dress*.

Derridean Concepts of Intertextuality, Trace and *Différance*

Although the first traces of the concept of intertextuality can be found in T. S Eliot's 1919 essay ''Tradition and the Individual Talent'', Derrida's initial engagement with the notion starts when he 'question(s) Saussure's two-faced sign, the maintenance of the rigorous distinction between the signifier and the signified' (Hendricks, 2016, p. 3). According to the structuralist claims of Saussure (1857-1913), there exists an arbitrary relation between a signifier and a signified, which connects them to each other and ''specifies'' meaning (Jackson, 2014, p. 239). Derrida goes against Saussure's structuralist claim regarding the relation between the signifier and the signified. Derrida rejects Saussure's assertion, which he interprets to be a "simplistic, deterministic view of human signification" (Culler, 1982, p. 28). Instead, Derrida argues that there is no connection between a signifier and a signified that specifies meaning. This is because a signifier's meaning builds on other signifiers. In other words, an absolute meaning cannot exist between the signifier and the signified because meaning develops in regards to other signifiers within a platform based on continuous references. This platform is subject to incessant changes. Thus, these *changes* make the *specification* of meaning impossible. These inter-text connections and interactions amongst concepts and signs that affect one another for meaning production are defined as *Intertextuality* (Derrida, 1981, p. 26).

According to Derrida, if no specific meaning within a text is ever present, then only what he coins as Trace exists. In this respect, for Derrida, a signifier is merely a trace within an unlimited chain of referents consisting of other traces. As explained earlier and referred as intertextuality, in written or verbal discourse, no element can function as a signifier, without its connection to another element's trace. So, each element can exist only by referring to other elements' traces (Orman, 2015, p. 75). On this matter, Derrida (1981, p. 26) states as follows: "there are only, everywhere, differences and traces of traces". This means that each signifier is hindered from having a stable meaning. This is because each signifier exists in the form of a trace instead of being an entity endowed with a fixed meaning. Further to the matter, due to intertextuality, the structure and existence of a signifier is determined by the traces of the other signifiers (Orman, 2015, p. 75), which never end up being fixed or present. The concept of trace is not in a relationship with the future less than the relationship it has with the past and present (Can, 2016, p. 25). This means that, while each existing element carries the traces of the past elements, the traces of the future elements can also be observed in harmony with the past and present ones.

According to the deconstructivist method, the intertextual nature of texts causes signs and concepts to continuously change and interact with trace at their centre. For this reason, Derrida (1981, p. 136) puts deconstruction as "an incessant movement of recontextualization". As a result of this interaction and recontextualization, a constant reproduction of meaning takes place. This endless meaning generation obliterates the formation of grand narratives within texts. In other words, metanarratives within texts are eliminated by the constant reproduction of various meaning patterns. This situation makes deconstruction a creative approach.

For Derrida, 'texts need not refer to an external reality as metaphysically or ontotheologically present" (Hendricks, 2016, p. 9). In Derridean intertextuality, the authority of the author over a text is lost because there is no specific meaning to be conveyed and thus,

the so-called source of meaning (the author) becomes out of the question. Because there is no fixed meaning in any text, the existence of a *Transcendental Signifier* is impossible. In contrast to Derrida, Western metaphysics depends on transcendental signifiers that constitute fixed/stable meanings. These fixed meanings lead to hierarchical binaries that are believed to be true and they also generate grand narratives (Hendricks, 2016, p. 5). But for Derrida, as "nobody has the authority over the meaning of the text, and that there is no hidden, ultimate, stable meaning to be deciphered" (Haberer, 2007, p. 58), "the ontology of intertextuality claims that there is no transcendental signified, that the signifier points only to other signifiers, that texts refer only to other texts" (Irwin, 2004, p. 235). The fact that there is no transcendental signifier or an authority over a text means an objection against the presence of grand narratives and leads us from the concept of intertextuality to the concept of *Différance.*

The concept of *différance* first appeared in Derrida's paper entitled "Cogito and the History of Madness" (1978). The paper was written in response to Foucault's 1961 work *Folie et Deraison: Histoire de la Folie a l'age Classique* (the History of Madness). *Différance* has two meanings: 1. to be different by depending on the differences from others 2. the act of constantly postponing, deferring. *Différance* is a term that Derrida intentionally misspells but both words' (*différence & différance*) pronunciation is the same. By doing so, Derrida goes against what he criticizes in Saussure: *Logocentrism.* By Logocentrism, Saussure meant "the privileging of speech over writing" (Hendricks, 2016, p. 8). By the intentional misspelling of the word, Derrida aims to point out that because both words' pronunciations are the same during speech, and because speech fails to show the difference between the two words, the notion of speech proves to be inadequate. This situation defies the hierarchical binary of speech over writing that Western metaphysics and Saussure puts forward.

Différance and intertextuality are related. This is because in the case of intertextuality, as claimed by Saussure and rejected by Derrida, there is no one-to-one connection between a signifier and a signified. This means that meaning cannot be fully obtained because the meaning a signifier is supposed to be endowed with is always linked to other signifiers. Thus, for meaning to be produced, a signifier does not need to be connected with a signified because the meaning of a signifier always depends on other signifiers. This continues as an endless chain of difference from other signifiers, which leads us to the concept of *différance* states Rodolphe Gasché (cited in Sallis, 1987, p. 4).

So, the difference of a signifier from all other referents corresponds to the first meaning of *différance:* to diverge from others by depending on the differences from others. In this respect, it could be said that each element is subject to a process of 'infinite implication' that involves a reference of one signifier to another (Baugh, 1997, p. 129). Within this process, each concept 'always signifies again and differs' from others in an endless vicious circle (Baugh, 1997, p. 129).

The constant processes of referral and difference amongst signifiers results in the second meaning of *différance:* to postpone, to delay. Being dissimilar to others and becoming meaningful (never fully) in relation to others suggest a dependence on the other meanings and concepts of a text. This reliance creates a problem: the original meaning constantly gets deferred. In other words, it is not possible to capture the original, fixed meaning of a text because meaning is not independent from the signs, concepts and words used within a text, which are constantly in a process of change. In this regard, Derrida explains to John Caputo (1997, p. 31) that when you strive to solidify the sense of a object, try to set it in its place, the item itself fades away.

As meaning constantly circulates amongst signifiers, we can never be sure of it. This is because meaning is never specifically related to the connection between a signifier and a signified (Sarup, 1993, p. 40-41). In other words, it means the celebration of the free play of

language. As language is exempt from closed, stable or fixed meaning patterns, the presence of a grand narrative can never be captured (Kearney, 1996, p. 113). Rather, it is always postponed.

Similar to Barthes, through *différance*, Derrida objects to the concept of an author of a text and claims that there is only a circulation of signs that constantly change and this circulation of signs create an infinite phase of meaning, eliminating the chance of a final, fixed meaning (Calcagno, 2009, p. 36-38). Because of the ongoing process of meaning production and meaning's impossibility of being captured, meaning becomes something that is continuously postponed, which eliminates the important role an author plays within the production of a text.

The Memory Dress

Hussein Chalayan's *Memory Dress* is endowed with a design that visually demonstrates the Derridean notions of intertextuality, trace and *différance*. In his S/S 1999 collection entitled *Echoform* in which the *Memory Dress* was displayed, Chalayan engaged with memory and echo, created a wide range of almost similar denim outfits that he imagined as filled with the memories of other clothing (Evans, 2003, p. 57). Marcus Tomlinson took the pictures of the *Memory Dress* (figure 1), which were displayed in four distinct versions. Each image of the design features the garment and repeats it only with slight differences in the ensuing pictures. The fact that the *Memory Dress* is specifically chosen to be analysed in this paper is that similar to Derridean deconstruction that goes against the presence of grand narratives and meaning within texts, the *Memory Dress* rejects the presence of a finalized, completed look. Gill (2015, p. 256) states that Derrida's definition of textuality hints at a way of thinking about fashion products and pictures as densely linked intertexts full of meaning traces to be deciphered.

In this respect, approached as a text, the *Memory Dress* can be ''read'' and the concepts of intertextuality, trace and *différance* can be observed on it. The construction technique of the dress is endowed with a replication and deprivation of design elements. In other words, with each new capture, some detail, sign or motif of the *Memory Dress* is absent or illustrated again.

Before mentioning the changes that take place on the *Memory Dress*, I would like to draw attention to the shared qualities of the design for the purpose of making a general introduction to the garment's structure. The repetitive images of the *Memory Dress* display a rectangle body shape. There are no side seams observable that run along the side of the garment. Further, the highpoint shoulder is another shared quality in all four captures. The denim fabric and blue colour are other elements that are commonly presented in the garment and illustrated in each version of the garment.

Figure 1: Hussein Chalayan, The *Memory Dress*, Spring/Summer 99/00 *Echoform* Collection

Having made a general introduction to the dress and its common qualities that are illustrated in each image, what follows will conduct a content analysis on the *Memory Dress*.

Philosophy on Design: Observing Intertextuality, Trace and *Différance* on the Memory Dress

Intertextuality

As mentioned earlier, intertextuality can take place with regards to various elements. Chalayan (cited in Evans, 2003: 57) points out his emphasis on the intertextual dialogue of

timely elements he uses in his designs:

> Nothing is shiny and new; everything has a history ... A '60s dress gets cut away to reveal its past as a medieval dress.... The design is a wish or a curse that casts the garment and its wearer into a time warp through historical periods, like a sudden tumble through the sediment of an archaeological dig.

The *Memory Dress* illustrates such a position not in terms of conspicuous historical references in the form of details but in the absence, presence, appearance, disappearance and reappearance of references that are time wise intertextually constructed, brought together, deconstructed and reconstructed to be brought back again in every new version of the dress. Just as the words and concepts in texts change intertextually and generate new meanings, the details in each visual of the *Memory Dress* change intertextually and this way lead to a constant innovation of design and interpretation.

Table 1: Intertextuality

The Design Detail	Image 1	Image 2	Image 3	Image 4
The Convertible High-stand Collar	Both visible	One visible on the right	Both visible again	One visible on the right again
The Shiny Button	Second button	First button	Second button again	None visible
The Vertical Needle Stitch	Single stitch visible on the left	Double stitches visible on the right	Double stitches on the right	Double stitches at the centre
The Horizontal Double Stitches	Visible as a whole	Partly invisible on the left	Partly invisible on the left again	Mostly invisible on the right
The Chest Patch Pocket	Visible on the left	Visible on the right	Remains on the right	Moves back to the left side

The shifts that take place in the dress' design structure show that there is both a reference to the past and future as many times the past is brought back into the present with repetitive design details. To illustrate, the convertible high-stand collar that can be worn open or closed with buttons appears in the first picture as a whole. However, one of the pointed ends of the high-stand collar cannot be seen in the second photo. Instead, a half-scoop neckline appears on the left side. Yet, the high stand convertible collar comes back in the third image. In the final image, one of the pointed ends of the the high-stand collar reappears again. Furthermore, in all four pictures, the place of the shiny metal-looking button changes. In the first image, it appears as the second button right up to the vertical needle stitch, but in the second picture, it is on the top, this time next to the double needle stitch that runs vertically along the dress. In the third image, it is placed back down again up to the double needle stitch. In the final capture, no button is present. Similarly, the vertical needle stitch on the left changes into a double needle stitch on the right with partly missing areas in the second and third images and re-emerges at the centre in the final image. The double stitches that constitute the centre front that runs horizontally along the front appear as a whole in the first image. In the second image, some of the left parts of it are non-visible. In the third image, more left parts are invisible and in the final image most of the right parts have disappeared. The chest patch pocket is visible in the first picture on the left yet in the second image it moves to the right side and constitutes another design form. While

it stays the same in the third image, it switches back to the left side in the final picture and re-forms the first design structure.

Just like Derrida points out with regards to texts' structure, this play amongst the design details brings a past presence of a motif into the present and connotes an intertextual dialogue with regards to time. In this vein, the *Memory Dress* visually communicates how the elements of the past can be brought back again into the present and future and this way, generate new looks by intertextually mixing with other design details and motifs. Mainly, the absence and presence of the design details and motifs of the *Memory Dress* illustrate this intertextual cycle. The changing elements' visual dialogue with the other elements of the dress generates an on-going process of creation. Thus, when a change of design detail is brought together with an unchanged motif, or some other changed detail, a whole change of look appears and a new version of the *Memory Dress* gets created. This visual dynamic is akin to how Derrida claims the network of signs within a text and also amongst texts constantly create and recreate new meanings by the interaction amongst them and other textual elements. In other words, similar to how the past, present and future signs and elements intertextually mesh and weave new sentences and meanings within a text, the design details of the *Memory Dress* demonstrate the same relation amongst themselves and lead to a time wise intertextual creativity.

Approached as a text, the intertextual shift of details and motifs that take place on the *Memory Dress* leads to a cycle of ceaseless signification, interpretation and meaning elements. As a result of the intertextual play of signs in the form of motifs and details, a deconstructing and reconstructing process related to design occurs in each new capture. In this vein, the garment is repeatedly interpreted and reinterpreted because the signs and details continually change. Thus, the garment becomes endowed with many different interpretations of both design and meaning. Prudence Black (2009, p. 508), explains this process as follows, "in terms of semiotic systems, the detail is a vector as it points elsewhere from a given position. That elsewhere ... is another system... a linking device" which, as a consequence, leads to other significations and interpretations in terms of design and meaning. These structural and meaning wise interpretations are doomed be obliterated by some other detail, leading to a new reinterpretation form that continuously emerges within the design of the dress. This renders the *Memory Dress* as a *work in progress* and makes it a garment of *inventory yet*, which is endowed with a huge potential of different structure and meaning possibilities that operate in an endless cycle.

Trace

As argued by Derrida, trace can only be defined as a notion that refers to the missing details within a text. The *Memory Dress*, as a whole, can be interpreted as an embodiment of the notion of trace. This is because its design always has something missing. None of its details are ever visually finalized and they are always left in progress.

Table 2: Trace

The Design Detail	Image 1	Image 2	Image 3	Image 4
The Convertible High-stand Collar	Collars complete, left collar stitches partly missing	Left collar missing, right collar stitches partly missing	Collars complete, left collar stitches partly missing	Left collar missing
The Shiny Button	Missing on top	Missing on the lower part	Missing on top	Missing
The Vertical	Single stitch	Double stitches visible on the	Double stitches	At the centre with lower

Needle Stitch	visible on the left	right yet lower parts partly missing	visible on the right yet lower parts partly missing	parts missing
The Horizontal Double Stitches	Visible as a whole	Partly missing on the left	Partly missing on the left	Mostly missing on the right
The Chest Patch Pocket	Parts of the left pocket missing	Parts of the right pocket missing	Parts of the right pocket missing	Parts of the left pocket missing

As it is with the notion of trace, this quality endows the garment motifs with partial design details, structures and meanings but never with a full one that is enough to form a complete entity. To illustrate, the design motif of the convertible high-stand collar's stitches and the collar itself has something missing in each image. Further, the collar's left part even in the fourth image is missing. The shiny button, on the other hand, is missing on the top in the first image and it is missing on the lower part in the second image. In the third image it is missing again on the top but in the final image, it is completely missing. The needle stitch that runs vertically at the centre front appears as a single stitch on the left in the first image. Yet, it appears as a double stitch on the right in the second and third images with its lower areas partly missing. In the final image, it appears at the centre with lower parts missing. Additionally, the horizontal double stitches that constitute the centre front are mostly missing in all images except the first one. Further, in the first image we see a left chest patch pocket with missing parts. However, in the next image, we see an unfinished right pocket with missing parts, which is the same in the subsequent image. In the final image, we return where we were in the first image as, again, we see a left pocket with missing parts.

As it is clear, the design motifs and details of the *Memory Dress* serve as visual embodiments of the Derridean notion of trace with their largely missing structure that hinders the formation of a complete entity of themselves. Trace could be put as the basic trigger that creates the structural on-going process of change that takes place in the *Memory Dress*. It triggers the quest for completion yet fails to fulfil it. But this quest enables *change* to become an ever-ending process.

As it is with texts, trace observed in the structure of the *Memory Dress* is inseparable from the concept of *différance*.

Différance

According to Derridean deconstruction, capturing meaning is impossible as it constantly defers. Akin to the deferring of an original meaning within a text, due to the presence of traces, the four images of the *Memory Dress* display a constant postponement of design completion. Each new image of the *Memory Dress* directs us to the next image in search of seeing the design's final version. Yet, completion and finalization are constantly deferred and never reached. This situation highlights *différance*'s meaning of postponement. As a result of change that builds on incompletion, there exists no "final look" of the *Memory Dress*. To emphasize this, the fourth version of the dress (seemingly last) is presented as the one with the most missing parts; one side of the high stand collar is incomplete, no button is present, the vertical needle stitch's lower parts that run along the front are not visible. Equally, the horizontal seam allowances' right parts are not visible either. The fact that every new version of the dress and its details transform into another design of the dress without finalization is very similar to how meaning within texts gets constantly deferred and deprives its reader of reaching an original meaning, which the author aims to convey. A more detailed deployment of the missing details

can be seen in the following table.

Table 3: Différance

The Design Detail	Image 1	Image 2	Image 3	Image 4
The Convertible High-stand Collar	left collar stitches incomplete	Left collar missing, right collar stitches incomplete	left collar stitches partly incomplete	Left collar incomplete
The Shiny Button	Missing on top	Missing on the lower part	Missing on top	Missing
The Vertical Needle Stitch	Single stitch present on the left	Lower parts incomplete on the right	Lower parts incomplete on the right	At the centre with lower parts missing
The Horizontal Double Stitches	Visible as a whole	Incomplete on the left	Incomplete on the left	Incomplete on the right
The Chest Patch Pocket	Incomplete left pocket	Incomplete right pocket	Incomplete right pocket	Incomplete left pocket

Due to the differences and contrasts amongst the motifs and design details of the *Memory Dress*, a constant process of change in the garment's look takes place. The *Memory Dress* manifests a constant difference from the previous versions of the same dress. The generation of each new image takes place by forming something different than what has already been represented. Accordingly, the convertible high-stand left collar stitches are incomplete in the first image and such structure directs us to the next image. In the second image, the left collar is completely missing and the right collar stitches are incomplete. In the ensuing image, the collars are incomplete as the left collar is brought back with partly incomplete stitches. And in the final picture, the left collar is missing again. The shiny button is missing on top in the first image and directs us to the second, which, this time is missing on the lower part. While the shiny button is missing on the top in the third image, no button is visible in the final image. Further, the vertical needle stitch is present as a single stitch in the first image, yet, it can be seen as double stitches on the right with incomplete lower parts in the second and third images. This directs us to the final image where we see that it has moved to the centre with missing lower parts. While the horizontal double stitches are visible as a whole in the first image, they are incomplete on the left in the second and third images directing us to the final image where we face completion on the right side. The incomplete chest patch pocket attached to the horizontal seam allowances on the left in the first picture is positioned at the opposite side in the second and third pictures and positioned back to its initial left side in the final picture in its incomplete structure again.

Trace leads to *différance* and with *différance,* we are directed to the ensuing images right after the one we have seen. Each image carries difference from the previous one and completion is always deferred, postponed, which is why we are directed to the next image in search of completion.

Conclusion

By focusing on Hussein Chalayan's *Memory Dress*, which is repetitively presented in four different versions, this paper has demonstrated how the Derridean concepts of intertextuality, trace and *différance* can be visually observed on an avant-garde design. In doing so, the paper has shown how, akin to Derridean deconstruction, the avant-garde design

manifests the rejection of a grand narrative of look, which mainstream fashion commonly displays. Metaphorically *read* as a text, change and recreation that take place on the garment have been explained by the interaction amongst the design details and structural motifs, just as sentences and words in a text form meaning.

Although the critical technique of deconstruction has been applied to many different non-literary domains such as architecture, media, graphic design etc. the key notions that make up the concept of Derridean deconstruction (intertextuality, trace, *différance*) have not been applied to design objects on the basis of deconstruction's process-oriented operational mechanism. In doing so, the article has shown the applicability of these notions on areas other than literary texts. Such contnt analysis has underlined avant-garde creativity and its similarity with post-modern design thinking in Hussein Chalayan's fashion.

References

Baugh, B. (1997). Making the difference: Deleuze's difference and Derrida's différance. *Social Semiotics, 7*(2), 127-146.

Best, S. and Kellner, D. (1991). *Postmodern theory: Critical interrogations*. New York: Guilford Press.

Black, P. (2009). The detail: Setting fashion systems in motion. *Fashion Theory,13*(4), 499-510. doi: https://doi.org/10.2752/175174109X467503

Bryman, A. (2004). *Social research methods*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Calcagno, A. (2009). Foucault and Derrida: The question of empowering and disempowering the author. *Springer, 32*(1), 33-51.

Can, E. (2016). Anlam arayışında Derrida'nın yinelenebirlik ve différance söylemi. *Kaygı Uludağ Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Felsefe Dergisi, 27*(27), 15-28.

Caputo, J. (1997). *Deconstruction in a nutshell*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Cassell, C. and Symon, G. (1994). Qualitative research in work contexts. In C Cassell and G Symon (Ed), *Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research, a Practical Guide,* 1-13: London: Sage.

Culler, J. (1982). *On deconstruction: Theory and criticism after structuralism.* London: Routledge.

Derrida, J. (1988). *Limited Inc.* Evanston, IL: North-western University Press.

-- (1981). *Positions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

-- (1978). Cogito and the history of madness. In: A. Bass (Ed), *Writing and Difference,* 31-63: London & New York: Routledge.

-- (1967). *Of Grammatology*. Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Evans, C. (2003). *Fashion at the edge: Spectacle, modernity & deathliness*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Foucault, M. (1961). *Madness and civilization: A history of insanity in the age of reason*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Gasché, R. (1987). Infrastructures and systematicity. In: J. Sallis (Ed), *Deconstruction and Philosophy: The Texts of Jacques Derrida,* 3-20: Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

-- (2015). Jacques Derrida: Fashion under erasure. In: A. Rocamora and A. Smelik (Ed), *Thinking Through Fashion: A Guide to Key Theorists,* 251-268: London: I.B. Tauris.

Haberer, A. (2007). Intertextuality in theory and practice. *Literatura, 49*(5), 54-67.

Hartley, J. (2004). Case study research. In: C. Cassell and G. Symon (Ed), *Essential Guide to Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research*, 323-333: London: Sage.

Hendricks, P. (2016). Deconstruction the end of writing: Everything is a text, there is nothing outside context. *Verbum et Ecclesia, 32*(1), 2-9. doi: https://doi.org/10.4102/ve.v37i1.1509

Irwin, W. (2004). Against intertextuality. *Philosophy and Literature, 28*(2), 227-242.

Jackson, L. (2014). *The poverty of structuralism: Literature and structuralist theory.* New York: Routledge.

Kearney, R. (1996). *Modern movements in European philosophy*. Manchester and New york: Manchester University Press.

Kwon, H. S. (2007). Deconstructionism in Issey Miyake's Fashion Design. *Journal of Fashion Business, 11*(6), 87-100.

Kwon, H. S. and Keum, Y. J. (2008). Characteristics of avant-garde deconstruction-ism expressed in Alexander McQueen's design. *Journal of Fashion Business*, *12*(2), 100-116.

Orman, T. (2015). Language in Jacques Derrida's thought. *Cilicia Journal of Philosophy,* (1), 61-81.

Patton, E. and Appelbaum, S. (2003). The case for case studies in management research. *Management Research News*, *26*(5), 60-71.

Rocamora, A. (2015). *Thinking through fashion: A guide to key theorists*. London: I. B. Tauris.

Rutli, E. (2019). Yapısöküm ve hakikat. *Düşünbil*, 75.

Sarup, M. (1993). *Post-structuralism and postmodernism*. Essex: Pearson.

Williams, J. (2005). *Understanding post-structuralism*. Malta: Gutenberg Press.