

Outline of Gilles Deleuze, *Différence et Répétition* (Paris: PUF, 1968). English translation by Paul Patton, *Difference and Repetition* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994). (NB: page citations are to translation first, then original – as befits a work concerned with simulacra. And that will be the only joke here!)

Outline by: John Protevi
Department of French Studies
Louisiana State University
Date: 28 October 2006

Permission to reproduce granted for academic purposes with proper citation
(www.protevi.com/john/DG/DR.pdf).

This is a work in progress and I am happy to receive comments or suggestions at protevi@lsu.edu.

Preface

Introduction: Repetition and Difference

Chapter I: Difference in Itself

Chapter II: Repetition for Itself

Chapter III: The Image of Thought

Chapter IV: Ideas and the Synthesis of Difference

Chapter V: Asymmetrical Synthesis of the Sensible

Conclusion

By freeing the thought of difference from the demands of representation, Deleuze wants to articulate a "philosophy of difference." In one sense, he wants to articulate a Nietzschean ontology, a world of will to power and eternal return, the being of becoming, but with the help of insights from structuralism and Bergson that enable a reading of mathematics and biology. After an analysis of morally motivated philosophic barriers to thinking difference and repetition--representation and the negative--Deleuze articulates the heart of the matter in Chapters 4 and 5, where he thinks the transcendental--empirical relation as the actualizing of virtual Ideas. Ideas are structures of differential relations, elements, and singular points; there are as many Ideas as "regional ontologies": the linguistic Idea, the biological Idea, the social Idea, the mathematical Idea, and so on. Rather than a possible that resembles the real, the actual creates itself in differentiating itself from the differentiated virtual field in a process of individuation of intensities.

Preface

Introduction: Repetition and Difference (1-27 / 7-41)

I. Repetition is not generality (1-5 / 7-12)

A. 1st contrast: conduct (1 / 7)

1) Two orders of generality: of the particular

a) Qualitative order of resemblances

b) Quantitative order of equivalences

2) Repetition of the singular

a) Justified conduct only towards what cannot be replaced: the singular

b) Theft and gift rather than exchange

c) Repetition as conduct echoes more profound internal repetition w/in singular

- (1) E.g., festivals: do not add a 2nd or 3rd to the first
 - (2) But carry the first to the nth power
 - B. 2nd contrast: laws (2 / 8)
 - 1) Generality belongs to the order of laws
 - 2) Repetition is transgression: puts law into question in favor of more profound / artistic reality
 - a) But what about repetition of experiments in forming scientific laws?
 - b) We restrict open nature by defining phenomena in a few mathematical terms
 - (1) All we have done here is substitute one order of generality for another
 - (2) That is, qualitative resemblance is rewritten as quantitative equivalence
 - 3) Expecting repetition from law of nature is the "Stoic error": moralizing of repetition
 - a) We might think to escape boring reiteration in the moral law as criterion for repeating
 - b) But here we are simply stuck in the generality of habit as second nature
 - (1) Resemblance of elements of action with a model prior to habit formation
 - (2) Equivalence of elements of action in different situations after habit formation
 - 4) Repetition overturns moral law
 - a) Ironic ascent to principles
 - b) Humorous descent to consequences
- II. Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Péguy (5-11 / 12-20)
 - A. All three make repetition (5 / 12)
 - 1) A power peculiar to language and thought
 - 2) A superior pathos and pathology
 - 3) A fundamental category of a philosophy of the future
 - B. Four propositions (6 / 13)
 - 1) Make something new of repetition: connect it w/ test; make it supreme object of will / freedom
 - 2) Oppose repetition to the laws of nature
 - 3) Oppose repetition to moral law: suspension of ethics; beyond good and evil
 - 4) Oppose repetition to generalities of habit and particularities of memory
 - C. Kierkegaard and Nietzsche bring to philosophy new means of expression: movement (8 / 16)
 - 1) Objection to Hegel: false movement of abstract logical "mediation"
 - 2) Production of movement in the work: affecting mind outside of all representation
 - 3) Theater of future and new philosophy
 - a) Real movement: repetition
 - b) Hegel: abstract relation of particular and concept in general
 - c) Deleuze: true relation of singular and universal in Idea
 - D. Differences between Kierkegaard and Nietzsche (10 / 19)
 - 1) K = theater of faith: alliance between God and self as rediscovered
 - 2) N = theater of cruelty: ground ER in death of God and dissolution of self
- III. 3rd contrast: repetition opposed to generality re: concepts or representation (11-15 / 20-26)
 - A. Three principles of a "vulgarized Leibnizianism": difference as conceptual difference / representation as mediation (11 / 20)
 - 1) Principle of difference: every determination actually belongs to comprehension of a concept
 - 2) Principle of sufficient reason: always one concept per individual thing
 - 3) Reciprocal principle of identity of indiscernibles: one and only one thing per concept
 - B. Blockage of concepts: difference w/o concepts (12 / 21)
 - 1) Artificial or logical blockage
 - 2) Natural blockages: dialectic of existence: the discrete, the alienated, the repressed
 - a) Nominal concepts:
 - (1) discrete extension:
 - (2) paradox of twins
 - b) Concepts of nature: alienated in Nature
 - (1) indefinite comprehension (virtually infinite):
 - (2) paradox of symmetrical objects
 - c) Concepts of freedom
 - (1) Repression
 - (2) Paradox of buried objects
- IV. The Negative (15-19 / 26-31)

- A. Previous examples are negatively defined: inadequacy of concepts and representation (15 / 26)
 - B. Freud helps us see "masked" repetition: disguises as genetic elements of repetition (16 / 26)
 - 1) Death instinct in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* as positive and disguised
 - 2) But Freud also had model of brute repetition: death as tendency to return to inanimate matter
 - C. Simulacra: nothing but masks / no first term that is repeated (17 / 28)
 - 1) Freud moves away from real seduction
 - 2) Variations express differential mechanisms of essence of what is repeated
 - 3) Bare or mechanical repetition is cover of a "more profound repetition"
 - D. Inversion of the formula: I don't repeat bcs I repress, but I repress bcs I repeat (18 / 29)
 - 1) When Freud moves beyond repression of representations to primary repression of the lived
 - 2) He comes close to "positive internal principle of repetition" (which he sees as death instinct)
 - 3) Transference and the cure: authenticate the roles and select the masks
 - 4) The death instinct and repetition
 - a) Give repetition an original, positive principle
 - b) And an autonomous disguising power
 - c) Immanent meaning whereby terror mingles with selection and freedom
- V. Bare and clothed repetitions (19-26 / 31-39)
- A. [Natural concepts] Causality and signal-sign systems (19 / 31)
 - 1) Signal: system w/ orders of disparate size and dissymmetrical elements
 - 2) Sign: what happens in communication across these orders
 - a) Qua sign, it expresses the productive dissymmetry
 - b) But it tends to cancel that dissymmetry
 - B. Productive dissymmetry as internal difference: two repetitions (20 / 31)
 - 1) Static: referring to a single concept w/ external differences in its instances
 - 2) Dynamic: internal difference w/ distinctive points: Idea and a spatio-temporal dynamism
 - C. Nominal concepts: Roussel and Péguy (21 / 33)
 - D. Learning: relation of a sign and a response: the encounter with the Other (22 / 35)
 - 1) Three forms of heterogeneity in the sign
 - a) In the object which emits them (disparate orders between which the sign flashes)
 - b) In themselves: signs incarnate Ideas
 - c) In the response: does not resemble the sign
 - 2) Example of swimming:
 - a) A body combines its distinctive points with those of medium in question (wave)
 - b) Learning as constituting a space of an encounter w/ signs
 - 3) Signs are "true elements of theatre ... signify repetition as real movement"
 - E. The subject / Self / "soul" of repetition: the singularity w/in that which repeats (23 / 36)
 - 1) Again, the two repetitions
 - a) Bare, mechanical, material repetition:
 - (1) Difference external to a concept:
 - (2) Falls into indifference of space and time
 - b) Clothed, masked, dynamic repetition:
 - (1) Difference is internal to the Idea
 - (2) Unfolds as pure movement, as spatio-temporal dynamism
 - 2) But for all that, the two repetitions are not independent
 - a) The dynamic one does not pre-exist its disguises
 - b) In forming itself, it constitutes the bare repetition in which it becomes enveloped
 - F. Recap (25 / 38)
 - 1) Generality is not repetition
 - 2) Two forms of repetition
 - 3) Beneath the general operation of laws, the play of singularities
- VI. Forecast of chapters 1 and 2: concept of difference / essence of repetition (26-27 / 39-41)
- A. Hegel vs Leibniz: relation of difference and repetition to be settled by the facts
 - B. But, internal differences dramatize an Idea before representing an object:
 - C. We do not yet know the essence of repetition, nor do we have a concept of difference
 - 1) The mistake was in confusing concept of difference w/ a merely conceptual difference
 - 2) We thus have two questions

- a) What is the concept of difference?
- b) What is the essence of repetition?

CHART COMPARING THE TWO REPETITIONS

Bare repetition	Masked repetition
Difference external to same concept	Difference internal to the Idea
Falls into indifference of space and time	Creates a dynamic space and time
Repetition of the Same	Repetition of difference
Identity of the concept or representation	Alterity of the Idea
Negative: default in the concept	Affirmative: excess in the Idea
Conjectural	Categorical
Static	Dynamic
Repetition in the effect	Repetition in the cause
Extensive	Intensive
Ordinary	Distinctive / singular
Horizontal	Vertical
Developed and explicated	Enveloped and in need of interpretation
Revolving	Evolving
Equality, commensurability, and symmetry	Inequality, incommensurability, dissymmetry
Material	Spiritual
Inanimate	"Secret of our lives and deaths"
Bare repetition	Covered repetition: self-masking / self-disguising
Accuracy as criterion	Authenticity as criterion

Chapter 1: Difference in Itself (28-69 / 43-95)

I. Difference in itself (28-30 / 43-45)

- A. Introduction (28 / 43)
 - 1) Two aspects of indifference:
 - a) Black abyss of total dissolution
 - b) White surface of disparate unconnected determinations
 - 2) Difference: state in which we can talk of determination as such
 - a) Something distinguishes itself, yet that from which it distinguishes itself remains aloof
 - b) Cruelty / ground risen to surface; form reflected in ground = abstract line
 - 3) Project of a philosophy of difference: rescue difference from its monstrous / cursed state
- B. Representation (29 / 44)
 - 1) The four shackles of mediation
 - a) Identity in form of undetermined concept: thought
 - b) Analogy in relation of determinable concepts: judgment
 - c) Opposition in relation of determinations w/in concepts: predication
 - d) Resemblance in determined object of concept: perception
 - 2) Reconciling difference and concept
 - a) Greek propitious moment (Plato / Aristotle)
 - b) Realized in Large (Hegel) and Small (Leibniz)

II. Aristotle: organic representation (30-35 / 45-52)

- A. Difference not mere diversity or otherness; must be an underlying agreement (30 / 45)
 - 1) Types of opposition
 - a) Relation
 - b) Contradiction
 - c) Privation

- d) Contraries
 - 2) Contraries in the essence: specific difference: difference w/in a genus
 - B. Specific difference (31 / 46)
 - 1) Meets all requirements of organic representation
 - 2) Is only the "greatest difference" in being relative to identity in a concept
 - C. Aristotle's notion of difference thus (32 / 48)
 - 1) Never reaches the singular
 - 2) Disastrous confusion: concept of difference is confused with difference w/in concepts
 - D. Aristotelian difference and the elements of representation (32 / 48)
 - 1) All difference is *opposition* of predicates
 - 2) Specific difference: *identity* in the concept: univocity in a common genus
 - 3) Generic difference: *analogy* in the judgment: equivocality of being in its genera
 - a) Distribution: partition of concepts: common sense
 - b) Hierarchization: measuring of subjects: good sense
 - 4) Perception of *resemblances*
 - E. Difference as a reflexive concept: organic representation: broken only re: catastrophe (35 / 52)
- III. Univocal ontology (35-42 / 52-61)
- A. Being is said in single sense of all of which it is said, but it is said of difference itself
 - 1) Elements of proposition
 - a) Sense: what is expressed in the proposition
 - b) The designated: what expresses itself in the proposition
 - c) Expressors / designators: numerical modes or differential factors characterizing sense / designation
 - 2) Nomadic distribution and crowned anarchy
 - a) Types of distribution
 - (1) Territorial: divides that which is distributed in a closed [striated] space
 - (2) Nomad: a division of that which distributes itself in an open space
 - b) Types of hierarchy
 - (1) Measurement by limit, i.e., by distance from a principle
 - (2) "Measurement" by power [*puissance*]: going to limit of what a thing can do
 - B. Individuation precedes matter and form / species and parts
 - C. Three moments in history of philosophy of univocity of being
 - 1) Scotus: thinking univocal being by neutralizing being in an abstract concept
 - a) Formal distinction: real but not necessarily numerical distinction
 - b) Modal distinction: btw being (attributes) and intensive variations
 - 2) Spinoza: univocal being as object of pure affirmation
 - 3) Nietzsche: univocal being as realized in repetition in the ER
 - a) Practical selection: only the extreme, the excessive returns
 - b) Nobility: that which is capable of self-transformation
- IV. Hegel and Leibniz: infinite / orgiastic representation: the large and the small (42-50 / 61-71)
- A. Limit is no longer limit of form, but convergence to ground: differential calculus
 - B. Hegel: contradiction and the infinitely large
 - 1) Contradiction as maximum of difference, resolving it in relating it to a ground
 - 2) Hegelian infinite remains infinitely large of theology
 - C. Leibniz: vice-diction and the infinitely small
 - 1) Sketch of how L articulates the differential relation and distinctive points
 - 2) Theory of worlds:
 - a) Compossibility: series converging on a distinctive point continued in other series
 - b) Impossibility: divergent series: does not amount to contradiction
 - D. Infinite representation: inscribes difference in identity of concept
- V. Difference as condition for identity, but not foundation or limit (50-58 / 71-82)
- A. Limit and opposition are surface effects that imply difference in depth
 - B. Philosophy of difference must refuse formula that "all determination is negation"
 - 1) Nietzsche
 - a) Slave morality: negation is primary
 - b) Noble evaluation: affirmation of difference is primary: ER

- 2) Negation is a mere consequence, a distorted image of genetic difference
 - C. Representation fails to capture difference in its differing
 - D. Transcendental empiricism
 - 1) Aesthetics grasps being of sensible as difference behind qualitative diversity
 - 2) A strange "reason" of the multiple, chaos and difference
 - 3) Difference is behind everything, but behind difference there is nothing
 - E. Difference and repetition: cf Joyce's "chaosmos" and Nietzsche's ER
 - 1) Re-petition (univocity of different) is not re-presentation (difference bound to identity)
 - 2) Repetition is the formless being of all differences
 - F. Man and God
 - 1) Hegelian and Leibnizian infinite representation rely on Man-God couple
 - 2) Nietzsche saw that death of God works only with dissolution of the Self
 - 3) We need to focus on a "furtive and explosive moment" in Kant
 - a) Questioning of rational theology and fissure in the pure Self of the "I think"
 - b) "schizophrenia in principle"
 - (1) Characterizing highest power of thought
 - (2) Opens Being directly onto difference
- VI. The task of modern philosophy: reversing Platonism (59-64 / 82-89)
- A. With Plato, difference is not yet tamed as in Aristotelian organic representation
 - B. The method of division as distinguishing fine lines of descent / selection of claimants
 - 1) We must distinguish the Idea within an undifferentiated logical matter
 - 2) We must distinguish between things and their simulacra
 - 3) Role of myth in method of division (*Statesman* and *Phaedrus*): to provide a ground
 - C. Participation
 - 1) Justice: the ground
 - 2) The quality of justice: object of the claim
 - 3) The just: the claimants
 - D. "non-being" [= "(non)-being" or "?-being"] is not the negative, but is difference itself
- VII. Note on Heidegger's philosophy of difference (64-66 / 89-91)
- A. It's a misunderstanding to read Heidegger in terms of negativity
 - B. Rather, we must focus on relation of ontological difference and being of the question
- VIII. Plato: dialectic and simulacra (66-69 / 91-95)
- A. Overturning Platonism = denying primacy of original and glorifying reign of simulacra
 - 1) Klossowski's reading of the ER: circulation of copies w/o origin
 - 2) Simulacrum = sign that has interiorized conditions of its own repetition
 - 3) Universal ungrounding [*effondement*]: everything become simulacrum
 - B. Plato as the first to overturn Platonism:
 - 1) The sophist raises everything to level of simulacra
 - 2) The true figures of difference:
 - a) Selection
 - b) Repetition
 - c) Ungrounding
 - d) Question-problem complex
 - C. Recap: we must move from representation as conditions of possible experience to conditions of real experience in the theory of simulacra: lived reality of a sub-representative domain
-

Chapter 2: Repetition for Itself (70-128 / 96-168)

- I. First synthesis of time: habit and the living present (70-79 / 96-108)
 - A. Hume and repetition in imagination (70 / 96)
 - 1) Repetition changes nothing in object, only in contemplating mind
 - a) Retains impression of first object
 - b) Expects occurrence of next object
 - 2) The contracting imagination forms synthesis of time and the living present:
 - a) Past [retention] and future [anticipation] as dimensions of the present

- b) Present does not have to go outside itself in order to pass from past to future
 - c) But the living present itself is what travels from past to future
 - d) This is also the move from particular to general
- 3) Passive synthesis:
 - a) Occurs in mind which contemplates prior to memory & reflection
 - b) Essentially asymmetrical: orients the arrow of time
- 4) Active syntheses are supported by passive synthesis
 - a) Memory constitutes past of representation
 - b) Understanding constitutes future of prediction
- 5) Repetition implies three instances
 - a) In-itself: in which repetition disappears as it appears
 - b) For-itself: passive syntheses
 - c) "for us": active syntheses
- B. Elements and cases (72 / 98)
- C. Organic contemplation: levels of passive synthesis (72 / 99)
 - 1) Beneath the perceptual syntheses are organic syntheses:
 - a) A primary sensibility that we are
 - b) Organisms as sum of contractions, of retentions and expectations
 - c) Need as organic future; heredity as organic past
 - 2) Passive (organic & perceptual) syntheses redeployed in active syntheses of memory and intelligence or instinct and learning
 - 3) Signs: each contraction / passive synthesis = a sign interpreted in active syntheses
 - 4) Habit and contraction
 - a) Contraction as active element in tick-tock series (dilation as other element)
 - b) Contraction as passive synthesis of contemplative souls
- D. Difference and repetition (76 / 103)
 - 1) Lengthwise: from one order of repetition to another:
 - a) From instantaneous repetition which unravels itself
 - b) Through intermediary of passive synthesis
 - c) To active represented repetition
 - 2) In depth: passage within passive syntheses
 - 3) Difference lies between the two repetitions
- E. Limits of the present (76 / 105)
 - 1) Fatigue = point at which the soul can no longer contract what it contemplates
 - 2) Need
 - a) = lack from point of view of action and active syntheses
 - b) = fatigue from point of view of passive syntheses
 - c) = limits of the variable present
 - (1) Present extends between two eruptions of need
 - (2) And coincides with duration of a contemplation
 - d) Repetition of need / rhythms, etc. defined re: our contemplations
 - 3) Signs always belong to the present
 - a) Natural signs: founded on passive syntheses
 - b) Artificial signs: imply active syntheses:
 - (1) From spontaneous imagination to
 - (2) Active faculties of reflective representation, memory, intelligence
- F. First question-problem complex: the urgency of life appearing in living present (78 / 106)
 - 1) Selves as larval subjects: contracting machines drawing a difference from a repetition
 - 2) Beckett's novels: fatigue and passion in larval subjects
- II. Second synthesis of time: memory and the pure past (79-85 / 108-115)
 - A. Intro to the second synthesis of time (79 / 108)
 - 1) First synthesis (habit / foundation) occurs w/in second synthesis (memory / ground)
 - 2) Passive synthesis of memory is more profound than passive synthesis of habit
 - 3) Husserl's distinction of retention and reproduction
 - a) Retention / habit: past is particular and present is general
 - b) Reproduction / memory: past is general and present is particular

- (1) Former present is preserved in past and "re-presented" in present one
 - (2) Limits of representation: resemblance / contiguity as forms of association
- B. Active and passive synthesis of memory (80 / 109)
 - 1) Active synthesis: principle of representation
 - a) Reproduction of former present and reflection of present present
 - b) Embedding of presents
 - 2) Passive synthesis of memory constitutes pure past (presupposed by representation)
- C. Bergson and the constitutive paradoxes of memory and pure past (81 / 110)
 - 1) Contemporaneity of past w/ present that was
 - 2) Coexistence of all of past with new present
 - 3) Pre-existence of pure past relative to passing present
 - 4) The cone: destiny: sign of present as passage to the limit
- D. Material and spiritual repetition (84 / 114)
 - 1) Different relations to difference
 - 2) Neither is representable
- E. Proust and reminiscence: involuntary memory: past that was never present (84 / 114)
- F. Eros as transition to third synthesis of time (85 / 115)
- III. Third synthesis of time: caesura / pure & empty form of time and the future (85-96 / 116-128)
 - A. Kant and Descartes (85 / 116)
 - 1) Descartes's cogito: determination (I think) and undetermined existence (I am)
 - 2) Kant adds time as the form in which the undetermined is determinable
 - a) Discovery of transcendental difference
 - b) Internal difference yielding a priori relation btw thought and being
 - (1) Passive self: empirical / phenomenal subject in time
 - (2) Transcendental ego: active thinking subject outside time
 - c) The fractured I (*je fêlé*):
 - (1) Spontaneity of "I think" = affection of passive self
 - (2) I is fractured by the pure and empty form of time, split btw active / passive
 - (3) I can only represent spontaneity of my thought to myself as that of another
 - (4) [cf Ch 1: "schizophrenia in principle" of thought {58 / 82}]
 - d) Kant's failed breakthrough
 - (1) The fractured I also implies the speculative death of God
 - (2) But K turns back to give practical resurrection to God and the I
 - 3) Deleuze will not follow Kant
 - a) Kant restricts synthesis to active "I think" and passive self to mere receptivity
 - b) Deleuze investigates passive syntheses
 - B. Platonic reminiscence (87 / 118)
 - 1) Innateness = abstract image of knowledge
 - 2) Reminiscence = real movement of learning: pure past of the Ideas
 - 3) Equivocation / ambiguity of Memory
 - a) As ground, it surpassed and dominated world of representation
 - b) But remains relative to representation that it grounds
 - c) Circular movement of soul rather than introducing time into thought
 - C. Pure and empty form of time as order, totality, series (88 / 119)
 - 1) Order of time:
 - a) Purely formal distribution of the unequal in function of a caesura
 - b) The pure form of change
 - c) Constitutes the fracture in the I
 - 2) Totality of time:
 - a) Symbolic image: caesura as unique and tremendous event
 - b) Time is "thrown out of joint" but drawn together as totality of before / after event
 - 3) Temporal series
 - a) Lived in past: act is too big
 - b) Present of metamorphosis: becoming-equal to the act
 - c) Future: self smashed to piece by coherence of event and act
 - D. Repetition as historical condition of action: production of new / ER (90 / 121)

- E. Note on the three repetitions (91 / 123)
 - 1) Marx's theory of historical repetition
 - 2) Comic, tragic, and novel repetition
 - 3) Nietzsche's Zarathustra
 - 4) Three repetitions that cannot be reconciled
 - a) Intracyclic
 - b) Cyclic
 - c) Eternal return
- F. Recap on the three syntheses of time (93 / 125)
 - 1) The three syntheses
 - a) Habit / living present: passive foundation on which past and future depended
 - b) Memory / pure past: ground causes passing of present and arrival of another
 - c) Caesura / future: present is effaced and past is mere condition of action
 - 2) Repetition and the three syntheses
 - a) Present is the repeater: content and foundation of time
 - b) Past is repetition itself: ground of time
 - c) Future is that which is repeated: order of time, totality of series, final end of time
- G. Kierkegaard and Péguy (94 / 126)
- IV. Freud and the three syntheses (96-116 / 128-153)
 - A. Freud's problem: how does pleasure become a principle? (96 / 128)
 - 1) Biopsychical life as field of individuation
 - a) Differences in intensity distributed here and there = excitations
 - b) Local resolutions of these differences = pleasure
 - 2) Excitation (free difference) must be bound so pleasurable resolution is possible
 - B. First synthesis: Habitus / present / Id (96 / 128)
 - 1) Drives as bound excitations; at each level is formed a larval ego in the Id
 - 2) Habit precedes and renders possible the pleasure principle
 - 3) A more profound Transcendental Aesthetic
 - a) Kant divides receptivity as pure passivity from activity as synthesis
 - b) Deleuze: receptivity made possible by passive synthesis
 - 4) Two fold development on basis of passive syntheses
 - a) Active synthesis on foundation of passive synthesis: real object
 - (1) Relating bound excitation to object supposed to be real and goal of action
 - (2) Active self: attempt at global integration vs passive egos: local integrations
 - b) Passive syntheses have their own object constitution: virtual / partial object
 - 5) This duality of object constituting processes explains duality of drives
 - a) Self-preservative drives: real-whole objects / active synthesis / active global ego
 - b) Sexual drives: virtual-partial objects / passive syntheses / passive egos
 - 6) Relation of real and virtual objects
 - a) Virtual objects are deducted from series of real objects
 - b) Virtual objects are incorporated into series of real objects
 - C. Second synthesis: Eros – Mnemosyne / past / ego (101 / 134)
 - 1) Virtual objects belong essentially to the past; they are "shreds of pure past"
 - 2) Here we find the link of Eros and Mnemosyne
 - a) Eros tears virtual objects from pure past so they can be lived
 - b) Psychoanalysis and repetition
 - (1) Model of bare repetition
 - (a) Displacement / disguise is secondary
 - (b) Examples:
 - i. Fixation – regression and trauma – primal scene:
 - ii. Death instinct as return to inanimate matter
 - (c) Characteristics: realist, materialist, subjective
 - (d) Essence: representation / principle of identity
 - (2) Clothed repetition:
 - (a) Between two coexistent series formed in function of virtual object
 - (b) Displacement / disguises not secondary, but principle of repetition

- (c) We repress because we repeat, because we disguise
 - (d) No way to distinguish original and derived
 - (e) Lacan and Proust both testify to this clothed repetition
 - (f) Essence: symbolic, spiritual, intersubjective
- 3) Nature of the unconscious
 - a) Cannot be simple opposition of eros and thanatos drives
 - b) Rather must be differential (displacements and disguises)
 - c) The negative must be secondary to problems and questions
 - (1) Not speculative acts
 - (2) But the living acts of the unconscious
 - (a) (non)-being of the question vs non-being of the negative
 - (b) Expressed in form of difference and repetition
 - 4) Recap of the two syntheses so far
 - 5) Transition: ambiguity / confusion in synthesis of Eros and Mnemosyne
- D. Third synthesis: narcissistic ego – Thanatos / future / dissolved self (110 / 145)
- 1) Narcissistic ego: constitutive wound and disguises / displacements
 - 2) Passive / narcissistic ego related to fractured I: the I operating as another
 - 3) Form of time in I determines order, whole, and series confronting narcissistic ego
 - 4) Break with Eros – Mnemosyne link
 - 5) Pure and empty form of time = death instinct, a new synthesis
 - a) Reflux of libido onto ego allows desexualized energy forming death instinct
 - b) But Freud falters, proposing a death instinct prior to desexualized energy
 - (1) Dualist / conflictual theory of drives
 - (2) Model of material repetition: death as return to inanimate matter
 - 6) Blanchot: two aspects of death
 - 7) Deleuze:
 - a) No analytic difference btw eros and thanatos: neutral / displaceable energy
 - b) Thought as genital, not innate or acquired
- E. Recap and transition: (114 / 150)
- 1) Three syntheses and the unconscious
 - 2) The eternal return
 - 3) The divine game
- V. Differential systems [forecast of Chapters 4 and 5] (116-126 / 153-165)
- A. The differentiator of difference (116 / 153)
 - 1) Organization in series of differential intensities
 - 2) These series communicate in relating differences to differences: differentiator
 - a) Coupling
 - b) Resonance
 - c) Forced movement
 - 3) Many differential systems: physical, biological, social, aesthetic, philosophical
 - B. Pure spatio-temporal dynamisms (118 / 155)
 - 1) Experienced only at the borders of the livable: embryos
 - 2) Thought can only be sustained by a larval subject (not a Cartesian cogito)
 - C. The dark precursor: the "disparate" [= "different / disappearing"] (119 / 156)
 - 1) Must be purely differential: must avoid temptation to require resemblance of series
 - 2) Conceals itself and its functioning, conceals true nature of difference
 - a) This concealment gives rise to inevitable illusions of identity and resemblance
 - b) Thus precursor has no place other than that from which it is "missing"; object = x
 - c) Perpetual displacement / disguise
 - D. Examples of literary systems (121 / 158)
 - 1) Roussel
 - 2) Joyce
 - 3) Proust
 - E. The refrain (122 / 160)
 - F. Chaos and cosmos (123 / 161)
- VI. Plato and simulacra (126-128 / 165-168)

- A. Plato's philosophical / moral decision to subordinate difference (126 / 165)
 - 1) But Plato does not have Aristotle's categories of representation
 - 2) So difference still "rumbles" in his work
 - B. Simulacra: the anti-Platonism at the heart of Platonism (128 / 167)
 - 1) Challenges notion of copy: simulacra have no resemblances
 - 2) Challenges notion of model: model of other, of difference, of becoming, of the false
 - 3) Challenges notions of both copy and model: ending of the *Sophist*
 - a) Triumph of simulacra
 - b) Immanent identity of chaos and cosmos
 - c) Being in the ER: resemblance gives way to repetition
-

Chapter 3: The Image of Thought (129-167 / 169-217)

- I. The problem of presuppositions in philosophy (129-132 / 169-173)
 - A. Beginning as eliminating presuppositions
 - 1) Objective presuppositions:
 - a) concepts presupposed by another concept:
 - b) scientific axiomatics can eliminate this
 - 2) Subjective presuppositions:
 - a) contained in opinions: presumption of what "everyone knows":
 - b) examples: Descartes, Hegel, Heidegger
 - c) contrast: we need an individual of ill will who does not think naturally or conceptually: only this individual effectively begins and repeats
 - d) are the form of representation or recognition; the matter of this form is first postulate
 - B. First postulate: *cogitatio natura universalis*:
 - 1) "a natural capacity for thought endowed with a talent for truth"
 - 2) Double aspect:
 - a) Good will on the part of the thinker
 - b) Upright nature on the part of thought ("affinity w/ truth")
 - C. The target of critique is the dogmatic, orthodox, or moral image of thought
 - D. A philosophy w/o presuppositions
 - 1) Radical critique of the image of thought and its postulates
 - 2) Its difference or true beginning in rigorous struggle against the image
 - 3) Its authentic repetition in thought w/o image
 - a) Cost of greatest destructions and greatest demoralizations
 - b) No ally but paradox
- II. Second, third and fourth postulates (132-138 / 173-180)
 - A. Recap: taking the good nature of thought as a principle is the philosophical gesture
 - B. Second postulate: ideal / common sense:
 - 1) common sense: subjective *concordia facultatum*;
 - 2) good sense: distribution that determines contributions of faculties in empirical cases
 - C. Third postulate: model / recognition [verification via dead repetition of same object]
 - 1) The harmonious exercise of all the faculties upon a supposed same object
 - 2) Most harmful in practical realm: struggle for honors, wealth, power [*pouvoir*]
 - D. The three postulates follow upon each other and leave philosophy helpless before *doxa*
 - 1) "image of thought is only the figure in which *doxa* is universalized by being elevated to rational level"
 - 2) The "costly double danger to philosophy"
 - a) The "tracing method" of basing a principle on extrapolation from facts
 - b) The "disturbing complacency" of a thought which harms no one
 - 3) We need a thought of difference, of the new, which "calls forth forces in thought ... the powers of a completely other model" (cf. "cruelty")
 - 4) Kantian critique ultimately validates the 3 postulates; it is respectful; it lacks "the power [*puissance*] of a new politics which would overturn the image of thought"

E. Fourth postulate: element / representation

- 1) The four elements of representation conform to the three postulates
- 2) The cogito is most general principle of representation: source & unity of postulates
- 3) Difference is "crucified" on the four branches of the cogito
 - a) "difference becomes an object of representation always in relation to a conceived identity, a judged analogy, an imagined opposition, or a perceived similitude"
 - b) Thus "world of representation" cannot think difference in itself / repetition for itself

III. Differential theory of the faculties (138-148 / 180-192)

A. Plato posed the difference between objects of recognition and chance encounters w/ objects that force thought: the encounter moves each faculty to its transcendent exercise, communicating its violence from one to the other

- 1) The promise of Plato's text
 - a) The sign: that which can only be sensed (the *sentiendum*):
 - (a) "not a sensible being but the being of the sensible"
 - (b) "not the given, but that by which the given is given"
 - (2) It is thus "imperceptible" [*insensible*] from the point of view of recognition
 - (3) Sensibility finds itself before its limit, the sign, and is raised to its transcendent exercise
 - b) Problem: the sign moves the soul, forces it to pose a problem
 - (1) This is not mere empirical forgetting (just as the sign doesn't provoke mere doubt)
 - (2) Essential forgetting: transcendental memory: the being of the past
 - (a) grasps that which can only be recalled (the *memorandum*)
 - (b) forgetting exists w/in essential memory as its "Nth" power, as its limit
 - c) Finally, we arrive at that which can only be thought, the *cogitandum*
- 2) But Plato falls short of this promise
 - a) By posing the encounter as object of a contradictory perception he confuses being of the sensible w/ a simple sensible being
 - b) By posing the reminiscence as that of an already-recognized object he confuses the being of the past w/ a past being (time as physical cycle rather than pure form)
 - c) By defining essence as the form of real identity, Plato reinforces the good nature of thought and ultimately representation

B. Transcendent exercise of a faculty breaks with common sense and grasps that which concerns only itself

- 1) Must not be traced from its empirical use (the "tracing" method)
- 2) We must have a "superior" or "transcendental empiricism" to discover the limits of faculties
- 3) We must submit each faculty to a triple violence
 - a) The violence of that which forces it to be exercised
 - b) The violence of that which it (and it alone) is forced to grasp
 - c) The violence of that which is ungraspable from the point of view of its empirical exercise
- 4) This allows us to discover the difference and repetition of each faculty
 - a) Not just for sensibility, memory, and thought
 - b) Also imagination (sublime), language (silence), vitality (monstrosity), sociability (anarchy)
 - c) AND also for faculties yet to be discovered

C. Intensity is difference in itself, that which carries the faculties to their limits:

- 1) The faculties are linked in order as communicating violence (privilege of sensibility as origin)
 - a) Sensibility: pure difference in intensity is grasped immediately in the encounter
 - b) Imagination: the disparity in the phantasm is that which can only be imagined
 - c) Memory: the dissimilar in the pure form of time = the immemorial of transcendent memory
 - d) Thought: the fractured I is constrained to think the "aleatory point" or difference in itself
- 2) "free form of difference" moves each faculty and communicates its violence to the next
 - a) Thus the four elements of representation are only effects produced by difference
 - b) A "discordant harmony" (cf Kantian sublime) in this communicated violence

D. Ideas:

- 1) Traverse all faculties but are object of none: moving between faculties:
- 2) Ideas are problems
- 3) Ideas are obscure – distinct rather than clear – distinct

- E. Exchange of letters between Rivière (dogmatic image) and Artaud (destruction of that image)
- IV. Fifth postulate: the "negative" of error (148-153 / 192-198)
 - A. Error confirms the preceding postulates as much as it derives from them
 - B. But thought has other misadventures than error: madness [*folie*], stupidity, malevolence
 - 1) Dogmatic image treats these as mere facts, as external, as assimilated to errors they cause
 - 2) Same "tracing" method: error is empirical fact elevated to level of transcendental principle
 - 3) Philosophers have had a presentiment of this and have investigated superstition, etc
 - C. Stupidity [*bêtise*] is not animality: the animal is protected by its instincts from being *bête*
 - 1) Stupidity is a structure of thought as such
 - 2) It is made possible by the link between thought and individuation [cf Simondon]
 - 3) The I is tied to the species, but individuation involves fields of fluid intensive factors that do not take the form of an I or a Self (*moi*)
 - a) The field or pure ground is a-formal and rises to the surface along with the individual
 - b) Stupidity: relation in which individuation brings ground to surface w/o giving it form
 - c) We see here also malevolence, melancholy, madness
 - D. But the "pitiful faculty" of being able to see stupidity and not abide it can also spur philosophy
 - 1) Leads all the other faculties to their transcendent exercise
 - 2) Rendering possible a "violent reconciliation btw individual, ground, and thought"
- V. Sixth and seventh postulates: (153-164 / 198-213)
 - A. Sixth postulate: the privilege of designation
 - 1) Two elements of proposition: expression (sense) & designation (reference / "indication")
 - 2) Sense is condition of truth, but in dogmatic image, truth / falsity are confined to designation
 - a) In this way, sense is referred only to a psychological trait or logical formalism
 - b) For D, [sense as] condition must be condition of real experience, not possible experience
 - (1) An intrinsic genesis, not an extrinsic conditioning
 - (2) Truth is a matter of production, not of adequation
 - (a) Thus relation of proposition and referent must be established w/in sense
 - (b) Sense points beyond itself toward the object as limit of its genetic series
 - c) Only in cases of isolated propositions does the referent stand detached from sense
 - (1) "Tracing" method again if we erect a principle on basis of such empirical cases
 - (2) In "living thought" the proposition has the truth it deserves based on its sense
 - 3) Sense vs signification
 - a) Signification refers to concepts and their relation to objects in a field of representation
 - b) Sense is
 - (1) "like the Idea which is developed in the sub-representative determinations"
 - (2) Idea is both structure and genesis
 - (a) Structure: "constituted of structural elements which have no sense themselves"
 - (b) Genesis: "constitutes the sense of all that it produces"
 - 4) Sense as nonsense: limit of empirical exercise of faculties: "highest finality of sense"
 - a) First paradox of sense: proliferation: expressed of a name is designated by another name
 - b) Paradoxical repetition of doubling: immobilization of the proposition
 - (1) Complex theme of the proposition as ideal event: it insists or subsists
 - (2) But here sense is only a vapor that plays at the limit of words and things
 - (3) It is a "sterile incorporeal deprived of its generative power"
 - 5) Transition: expressing sense as a question shows how proposition is only one solution
 - a) Interrogation thus shows sense as a problem that is not dissolved by its solutions
 - b) Dogmatic image: "tracing" method: problems are traced from propositions
 - B. Seventh postulate: truth confined to solutions
 - 1) We are led to believe problems are ready-made and disappear in their solutions
 - a) There is an infantilizing element in culture corresponding to this postulate
 - b) This is "psychologically puerile and socially reactionary"
 - 2) Instead, problems must be constituted and invested in their proper symbolic fields
 - a) Transcendentally conceived, problems are "objectities"
 - b) Truth and falsity primarily affect problems
 - c) Problem / sense is both site of an originary truth and genesis of a derived truth
 - d) Stupidity is thus the faculty for false problems: inability to constitute problems as such

- 3) Natural illusion of tracing problems from propositions extended into philosophical illusion in which problems are true only insofar as they admit of solutions: problem is modeled on form of possibility of propositions
 - a) Aristotle and dialectic
 - b) Mathematical method: geometric and synthetic / algebraic and analytic
 - c) Empiricists
 - 4) Kant is bivalent here:
 - a) He discovered the problematic Idea,
 - b) But his critique remained subordinated to dogmatic image
 - 5) Problems are Ideas themselves
 - a) Particular vs. singular / general, vs. universal
 - (1) A proposition is particular: a determinate response
 - (2) A series of propositions can constitute a general solution
 - (3) But only the problematic Idea is universal
 - (4) The problematic Idea involves a distribution of singular points
 - b) Problematic Ideas are "multiplicities ... of relations and corresponding singularities"
 - (1) A problem does not exist apart from its solutions, but insists and persists in them
 - (2) The problem is at once both transcendent and immanent in relation to its solutions
 - c) Dialectical nature of problems: seen well by Albert Lautman; botched by Hegelianism
- VI. Eighth postulate: the result of knowledge [= possession of rule enabling solutions] (164-167 / 213-217)
- A. Learning = exploration of Ideas / elevation of faculties to their transcendent exercise
 - 1) Exploration of Ideas
 - a) Learning = entering into relations of Ideas and their corresponding singularities
 - b) For example, learning to swim
 - (1) Leibniz shows Idea of sea = systems of differential relations and singularities
 - (2) Learning to swim = "conjugating" distinctive points of our bodies w/ singularities of Idea of sea in order to form a problematic field
 - (a) This conjugation determines a threshold of consciousness
 - (b) Ideas are ultimate elements of nature and subliminal objects of little perceptions
 - (c) Learning is thus unconscious: "bond of profound complicity of nature and mind"
 - 2) Elevation of faculties
 - a) We never know in advance how one will learn: what encounters will work
 - b) There is no method, but only a "violent training" a culture which affects entire individual
 - c) Method is confined to knowledge; common sense; natural thought
 - d) Learning is misconstrued as the passage from ignorance to knowledge
 - e) Plato is double, once again
 - (1) He makes a break
 - (a) Learning is transcendental movement of soul
 - (b) Time is introduced into thought in reminiscence
 - (2) But ends up subordinating thought to resemblance and identity; to image of thought
 - B. Recap of the eight postulates forming the dogmatic image of thought

Chapter 4: Ideal Synthesis of Difference (168-221 / 218-285)

I. Introduction: Ideas as problematic (168-170 / 218-221)

- A. Kant's theory of Ideas
 - 1) Regulative use of Ideas renders them "problematic" [immanent and transcendent at once]
 - a) Immanent: Ideas provide a systematic unity of the understanding
 - b) Transcendent: our oriented research provides solutions that do not exhaust the Ideas
 - 2) Problems as the object of Ideas: as "objective and undetermined"
 - a) Three-fold structure
 - (1) Undetermined w/ regard to their object (problems)
 - (2) Determinable w/ regard to objects of experience
 - (3) Bearing Ideal of infinite determination w/ regard to concepts of understanding

- b) Thus representing three aspects of the Cogito
 - (1) "I am" as indeterminate existence
 - (2) Time as the form under which this existence is determinable
 - (3) "I think" as determination
 - 3) Ideas are the "differentials of thought" swarming in the fractured I
 - B. Criticism of Kant: he stayed at level of conditioning w/o attaining that of genesis
 - 1) 2nd and 3rd aspects remain extrinsic
 - 2) The 3 aspects are incarnated in distinct Ideas
 - a) The self as undetermined
 - b) The world as determinable
 - c) God as the ideal of determination
- II. Differentials (170-176 / 221-228)
- A. "Treasures" in "pre-scientific" (prior to set theory) differential philosophy
 - 1) Overview: dx as the Idea, with its threefold structure (sufficient reason):
 - a) undetermined: principle of determinability (dx, dy): "quantitability"
 - b) determinable: principle of reciprocal determination (dy/dx): "qualitability"
 - c) determined: principle of complete determination (values of dy/dx): "potentiality"
 - 2) discussion of each aspect:
 - a) dx as undetermined (Bordas-Demoulin)
 - (1) continuity and its cause forms element of "quantitability"
 - (2) fixed quantities of intuition (quantum)
 - (3) variable quantities in form of concepts of the understanding (quantitas)
 - b) dy/dx as reciprocally determined (Solomon Maimon)
 - (1) In qualitative form, as "pure element of qualitability"
 - (2) As genesis: Solomon Maimon's critique of Kant:
 - (a) Kant doesn't reach genesis, but stays w/ conditioning
 - (b) Need to think Ideas as overcoming duality of concept and intuition
 - (c) Reciprocal synthesis of diff. relations: source of production of real objects
 - (d) Triple genesis
 - i. Qualities: differences btw real objects of knowledge
 - ii. Space and time: form of conditions for knowledge of differences
 - iii. Concepts: form of conditions for the difference btw knowledges
 - c) Complete determination (values of dy/dx): pure potentiality (Wronski)
 - B. Ideas as concrete universals:
 - 1) Ideas as distinguished by their distribution of singularities
 - 2) Singularity itself (the Idea as singular, as unique) as the "pre-individual" [i.e., the field of individuation]
- III. Infinitesimals (176-182 / 228-235)
- A. Finitist (set theory) vs infinitist readings of the calculus: the "metaphysics of the calculus"
 - 1) Seeing the differentials as infinitesimals, as infinitely small, is representational
 - 2) Carnot and Leibniz lead us to think how problems resist being absorbed by solutions
 - a) For instance, look at difference btw integral curves and vector field
 - (1) Integral curves: specification of singularities
 - (2) Vector field: existence and distribution of singularities
 - b) Thus real vs fictive distinction doesn't hold for differentials, which are problematic
 - c) Neither does distinction of infinite vs finite representation
 - 3) Thus the differential element is "play of difference as such"
 - B. Rather than metaphysics, we should speak of a dialectics of the calculus
 - 1) "Dialectic" here refers to problems as distinct from mathematical solutions
 - 2) Lautman: three aspects of a problematic or dialectical Idea
 - a) Difference in kind from its solutions
 - b) Transcendence in relation to its solutions
 - c) Immanence in the solutions
 - C. Mathematics is only one field of solutions for Dialectical Idea
 - 1) Dialectical Idea has also physical, biological, psychical or sociological solutions
 - 2) Differential calculus is not the only mathematical expression of problems

- a) Method of exhaustion
 - b) Analytic geometry
 - c) Abel / Galois group theory: relates form of problem to field of possible solutions
- 3) "what matters to us is [how] ... dialectical problems, their mathematical expression, and the simultaneous origin of their fields of solvability are related"
- D. But, differential calculus can be a sort of *mathesis universalis* / "algebra of pure thought"
 - 1) Each engendered domain incarnating dialectical Ideas possesses its own calculus
 - 2) "Herein lies the adventure of Ideas"
- IV. Ideas as multiplicities (182-191 / 236-247)
 - A. Multiplicity as a substantive
 - 1) Genealogy: Riemann / Husserl / Bergson
 - 2) Avoids distorted oppositional dialectic of One-Many
 - 3) "Everything is a multiplicity in so far as it incarnates an Idea"
 - B. Definition of Idea: "an n-dimensional, continuous, defined multiplicity"
 - 1) Dimensions = variables or co-ordinates upon which a phenomenon depends
 - 2) Continuity = set of relations btw changes in these variables
 - 3) Definition = elements determined by these relations: no change w/o change in multiplicity
 - C. Three conditions for speaking of a multiplicity; these reconcile structure and genesis
 - 1) Elements must not posit identity; must be indeterminate, pure difference
 - 2) Elements must be only reciprocally determined by relations
 - a) Relations are non-localizable ideal connections
 - b) No reference to higher order space
 - 3) Multiplicities are actualizable (static genesis as correlate of passive synthesis)
 - a) Relations actualized as "diverse spatio-temporal relationships"
 - b) Elements actualized in a "variety of terms and forms"
 - D. Examples of Ideas as multiplicities
 - 1) Atomism as a physical Idea (Epicurus / Lucretius)
 - 2) The organism as a biological Idea (Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire)
 - 3) Society as an Idea (Marx)
 - E. Characteristics of Ideas
 - 1) Complexes of coexistence: relation of Ideas: "perplication"
 - a) Objectively made and unmade
 - b) Varieties which include in themselves sub-varieties
 - (1) Vertical: ordinal varieties according to nature of elements and diff. relations
 - (2) Horizontal: characteristic varieties:
 - (a) degrees of diff relations
 - (b) distribution of singularities
 - (3) Depth: axiomatic varieties:
 - 2) Problematic / inessential / eventual / affectional / accidental rather than essential
 - a) The question "what is X?"
 - (1) Plato and the aporetic dialogues
 - (2) Hegel
 - (3) God as locus of combinatory of abstract predicates is always the answer
 - b) D's preferred questions: "how much?" "how?" "in what cases?" "who?"
 - 3) Evental:
 - a) Conditions of a problem imply ideal events (sections, ablations, adjunctions)
 - b) Again, the "ontological difference" between
 - (1) Existence and distribution of singularities in Idea (differentiation)
 - (2) Specification of singularities in solution-curves (integration)
 - F. Procedure of vice-diction
 - 1) Task of thought = description of multiplicity / Idea
 - a) Evaluation of what is important and not
 - b) Discerning distribution of singular and regular points
 - (1) Stupidity = confusion of important and unimportant
 - (2) Different kinds of singularities
 - (a) Ordinary singularities: convergent series

- (b) Distinctive singularities: divergent series
 - 2) Two procedures of vice-diction: love and anger
 - a) Specification of adjunct fields: progressive determination of conditions
 - b) Condensation of singularities: make solution explode in revolution into actual
 - 3) NB: no metaphors, but categories of the dialectical Idea
 - 4) Schelling vs Hegel
- V. Ideas and the differential theory of the faculties: learning and the question (191-200 / 247-258)
- A. The real contrast is not that btw structure and genesis but btw Idea and representation
 - 1) Learning as meshing of singularities
 - 2) "To what are we dedicated if not to problems which demand of us the very transformation of our body and our language?" (cf. E 165)
 - 3) Again, the "tracing method": knowledge is pegged to propositions / solutions
 - B. Ideas are not limited to one faculty (cf. E 146)
 - 1) Ideas and the normal vs. transcendent object of faculties
 - a) Linguistic: speech vs. poetic usage
 - b) Society: sociability vs. revolution – freedom
 - c) Psyche: imagination vs. phantasy
 - d) Biology: vitality vs. monstrosity
 - e) Aesthetic: sensibility vs. sign
 - 2) Discordant harmony: transmission of violence (= "para-sense")
 - 3) Two definitions of learning (cf. E 164-165)
 - a) Penetrating an Idea = "para-sense"
 - b) Raising a faculty to its transcendent exercise = "paradox"
 - 4) Thought as a particular faculty
 - a) At extremity of fuse of violence in faculties: thought as ultimate origin of Ideas
 - b) Ideas as "differentials" of thought, as the "unconscious" of pure thought
 - c) Thought related to the fractured I of a dissolved Cogito
 - C. Renaissance of ontology in contemporary philosophy and the question-problem complex
 - 1) The intentionality of Being par excellence
 - 2) The ontology of the question
 - a) Silences all empirical responses which purport to repress it (Job and absurdity)
 - b) Puts into play (*mettre en jeu*) questioner and question (Oedipus and enigma)
 - c) Non-being as the being of the question (Odysseus and philosophical odyssey)
 - 3) Insufficiency of this ontology:
 - a) Questions must develop into problems in Ideas (Proust and art)
 - b) Teleology of thought
 - (1) Departure from hypothesis or proposition of cness affected by uncertainty
 - (2) Arrival at "eminently moral apodicticity or imperative"
 - D. Deleuze's alternative: thought moving from the problematical to the question
 - 1) Problem does not = hypothesis
 - 2) Questions express relation btw problems and imperatives (of "adventure") from which they proceed
 - a) Model of the divine game, the "dice throw": affirmation of chance
 - b) Ontology is the dice throw, the chaosmos from which the cosmos emerges
 - (1) In other words, the dice throw is two-fold process of difference
 - (a) differentiation w/in Ideas
 - (b) differentiation as actualization
 - (2) The dice throw is point at which thought thinks unconsciously
 - (a) Ideas enter and leave only by the fracture in the I
 - (b) Thus "another always thinks in me"
 - 3) This dissolution of subject / affirmation of chance = Nietzsche's will-to-power
- VI. Ideas and repetition: critique of the negative (200-208 / 258-269)
- A. The origin of the question in repetition
 - 1) Repetition of the dice throw can still affirm all of chance in each throw
 - 2) Clothed repetition and reprise / condensation / emission of singularities
 - 3) Heidegger / Nietzsche: "Being is itself repetition"

B. Status of the negative

- 1) The non-being of the problematic is not negative
- 2) The negative is an illusion clinging to propositions
- 3) Effective critiques of negative
 - a) Must denounce equation of opposition and limitation
 - b) Must be conducted on basis of Idea

C. Multiplicity is the key

- 1) For example, the linguistic Idea
 - a) Differential elements = phonemes
 - b) Differential relations determining these elements
 - c) Singular points assumed by these determined elements
 - d) Problematic nature: language as multiplicity, as set of problems
 - e) Unconscious / virtual character of elements and relations
 - f) Actualization as differentiation
- 2) But linguists constantly speak in terms of negation and opposition
 - a) Saussure and Trubetzkoy
 - b) Versus Gustave Guillaume: principle of differential position

D. Genesis of the negative as objective or transcendental illusion

- 1) Negative results from focus on propositions
 - a) Isolated from their genetic conditions
 - b) Ignoring structure / genesis of Ideas as differentiation / differentiation
- 2) First determination of the negative: the shadow of the problem
 - a) The falsification that is the negative doubles the actualization
 - b) Problems are always reflected in false problems
- 3) Second determination of the negative: objective field of the false problem
 - a) Natural object of social consciousness re: value = fetishized commodity
 - b) Transcendent object of faculty of sociability = revolution
- 4) Practical struggle: never by negation, but by difference / affirmation

VII. Ideas and virtuality (208-214 / 269-276)

A. Reality of the virtual

- 1) Must be defined as "strictly a part of the real object – as though the object had one part of itself in the virtual into which it plunged as though into an objective dimension"
- 2) The reality of the virtual is structure: differential elements, relations, singularities
- 3) Double process: reciprocal / complete determination = completely determined virtual
 - a) Complete determination of virtual is only ideal part of object
 - b) Virtual participates with other parts of objects in Idea, but does not form whole

B. The "second part of difference": differentiation = actualization, constitution of solutions

- 1) Complex notion of differentiation:
 - a) Duality of object (virtual / actual)
 - b) Non-resemblance: "two unequal odd halves"
- 2) Differentiation has two aspects: varieties of relations and singular points
- 3) Differentiation also has two aspects:
 - a) Qualities and species actualize the varieties of relations
 - b) Parts and organs actualize the singular points
- 4) Virtual space and virtual time
 - a) *Diaphora*: virtual space defined by singularities subtends differences in quality
 - b) Progressive determination: virtual time: determines rhythms of actualization

C. Danger of confusing the virtual and the possible

- 1) Existence:
 - a) Produced by virtual time and space of real Idea
 - b) Not a brute leap from possible
- 2) Virtual refers to pure multiplicity of Idea, not to identity in the concept
- 3) Virtual does not resemble actual as possible resembles real (Bergson)
 - a) Thus, actualization or differentiation is "always a genuine creation"
 - b) Actualization creates divergent lines corresponding to virtual multiplicity
 - c) Diff and rep in virtual ground actualization, differentiation as creation

- 4) Leibniz oscillates re: respecting difference btw virtual and possible
 - a) Leibniz speaks of Ideas as virtual multiplicities
 - (1) Made of differential relations and singular points
 - (2) Apprehended by thought in a stupor, swoon, etc.
 - b) However, the world in which Ideas are actualized is a possible world
 - 5) Leibniz's remarks about the distinct-obscure are crucial
 - a) Descartes's "clear and distinct" is representational
 - b) Leibniz's remarks about the murmuring of the sea [virtual theory of perception]
 - (1) Clear – confused [Apollo]: apperception of sea noise:
 - (a) [Consciousness of whole object] is clear
 - (b) But also confused, as the little component perceptions are obscure
 - (2) Distinct – obscure [Dionysus]: little perceptions [of individual waves]
 - (a) Distinct because they grasp differential relations and singularities
 - (b) Obscure because these are not yet differentiated
 - i. Singularities condense to determine threshold of cness re: bodies
 - ii. This actualizes the little perceptions
 - iii. But in an apperception that is clear and confused
 - 6) Remarks on style
 - a) Distinctness – obscurity is intoxication / philosophical stupor / Dionysian Idea
 - b) Clear – confused thinker (Apollo) needed to think Dionysian Ideas?
 - c) Two languages aiming at divergent exercise of faculties: disparity of style
- VIII. Transition to Ch 5: Differentiation as actualization (214-221 / 276-285)
- A. Spatio-temporal dynamisms: actualizing / differentiating agencies
 - 1) Hidden by the constituted qualities and extensities
 - 2) Example of embryology:
 - a) Dynamic of egg's morphogenesis implies virtual Idea
 - b) Analysis of Baër shows:
 - (1) There are things only an embryo can do / withstand [affects]
 - (2) There is no movement from general to specific, but a difference in kind
 - (a) Pure spatio-temporal dynamisms [embryo as "larval subject"]
 - (b) Beneath constituted parts and qualities
 - (3) This is a progressive determination going from virtual to actual
 - B. Possibility of evolution: Cuvier vs Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire
 - C. "The entire world is an egg": dramas of actualization
 - 1) Space corresponding to differential relations and singularities
 - a) Egg as theatre [of "cruelty"]:
 - (1) Roles dominate actors
 - (2) Spaces dominate roles
 - (3) Ideas dominate spaces
 - b) Multiple levels: genetics and ecology
 - 2) Time: incarnate the time of progressive determination: differential rhythms
 - 3) Thus dramatization is differentiation of differentiation
 - a) Qualitative: temporal response to a question: species
 - b) Quantitative: spatial solution to a problem: parts
 - D. Spatio-temporal dynamisms and Kantian schemata
 - 1) Schema is indeed a rule of determination for time and construction for space
 - 2) But unlike dynamisms, a schema does not account for the power w/ which it acts
 - E. Artaud and the theatre of cruelty
 - 1) Becoming-embryo [= "death of subject"] not regression, but repetition
 - 2) "Larvae bear Ideas in their flesh, while we do not go beyond representations of concepts"
 - F. Actualization takes place in three series: space, time, and consciousness
 - 1) An "elementary cness" accompanies s-t dynamisms: threshold of condensed singularities of body
 - 2) Repetition as power of difference and differentiation
 - G. The Idea:
 - 1) Mathematics and biology are only "technical models"

- a) Allow "exposition" of virtual and process of actualization
 - b) Two halves of difference: dialectical (virtual) half and aesthetic (actual) half
 - 2) Chapter 5: grounding 3rd element of sufficient reason: potentiality and dramatization
-

Chapter 5: Asymmetrical Synthesis of the Sensible (222-261 / 286-335)

- I. Difference is the giving of diversity, the noumenon closest to the phenomenon (222-223 / 286-87)
 - A. What appears is correlated w/ orders of difference of intensity:
 - 1) "every phenomenon flashes in a signal / sign system"
 - a) Signal: when system has 2 heterogeneous series able to communicate
 - b) Sign: what flashes across, bringing series into communication
 - 2) intensity is the form of difference / every intensity is differential
 - B. Disparity (=difference of intensity) is condition of that which appears
- II. Intensity appears only in extensity (223-28 / 287-293)
 - A. Intensity tends to self-cancel in extensity and under quality [it is "suicidal"]
 - 1) Thermodynamics allows for alliance of science, good sense, philosophy
 - 2) Good sense: distribution that banishes difference
 - a) Presupposes mad / nomadic distribution: "crowned anarchy" / difference
 - b) Arrange in time and extensity so things negate selves
 - (1) Bourgeois ideology (invisible hand as law of market)
 - (2) Prediction, entropic
 - c) Based on 1st synthesis of time = habit / living present: arrow of time (Boltzmann)
 - (1) Past as improbable
 - (2) Future as more probable
 - B. Good sense and common sense
 - 1) Refer to each other
 - 2) Common sense: recognition / good sense: prediction
 - C. But difference gives diversity, so that
 - 1) We are forced to sense or think difference
 - 2) Paradox is "the pathos or passion of philosophy"
- III. Implication and Explication: (228-232 / 294-299)
 - A. The being of difference is implication: explication of difference is its cancellation
 - 1) Intensity is explicated in extending [*extensio*] resulting in extended span [*extensum*]
 - 2) Appearing outside itself of intensity / place where it is hidden beneath appearing quality
 - 3) Double aspect of quality as sign
 - a) Refers to implicated order of constitutive differences
 - b) Cancels out those differences in extended order of explication
 - 4) Paradox or transcendental illusion of entropy
 - B. Depth: not an extension, but a pure implex, serving as the matrix of all extensity
 - 1) Critique of gestalt: figure / ground relation relies on the unground of differential depth
 - 2) Pure spatial syntheses repeat temporal syntheses
 - a) Explication of extensity: 1st synthesis of habit / present
 - b) Implication of depth: 2nd synthesis of memory / past
 - c) Third synthesis is felt in depth: ungrounding
 - C. Original depth = space as intensive quantity: pure spatium
 - 1) "Depth is the intensity of being or vice versa"
 - 2) Kant's mistake: reserve intensive quantity to matter filling an extensity
 - a) Instead, for Deleuze, space as pure intuition or spatium is an intensive quantity
 - b) Source of a quadruple genesis
 - 3) Hemann Cohen was thus right to focus on intensive quantities
- IV. Intensity and difference (232-244 / 299-314)
 - A. Three characteristics of intensity:
 - 1) Includes the unequal in itself
 - a) Quality [of difference] that belongs to quantity

- b) Extensive quantity: quantitative destination
 - (1) History of number: essential inequality
 - (a) Intensive and vectorial
 - (b) Extensive and scalar
 - (2) E.g., natural numbers
 - (a) At first ordinal: intensive
 - i. Ordinal construction: distance / ordered difference of an intensive spatium
 - ii. Not repetition of same unit
 - (b) Cardinal numbers: explication of the ordinal
 - c) "intensity is the uncancellable in the difference of quantity"
 - (1) Extension as process is distribution and equalization in resultant extensity
 - (2) Cf. *Timaeus*
 - (a) Divisible: bears inequality in itself
 - (b) Indivisible: one: imposition of equality/docility
 - (c) "Underneath ... the unequal still rumbles in intensity"
- 2) Intensity affirms difference [Nietzschean nobility]
- a) "Important enterprise of a mathematics w/o negation"
 - (1) Rests axiomatically on
 - (a) An affirmative definition of inequality for 2 natural numbers
 - (b) Positive definition of distance: three terms in infinite series of affirmative relations
 - i. Distance here must be referred to its intensive origin / series of differences
 - ii. Intensity affirms even the lowest series: "asymmetrical synthesis"
 - b) Negation is inverted image of difference: seen from below (slave morality)
 - (1) Representation: subordination to identity
 - (2) Shadow of "problems": illusion of negative
 - (3) Extensity and quality from explication of intensity
 - c) Being of the sensible:
 - (1) Plato: paradoxical existence of something that simultaneously cannot be sensed (empirically) and can only be sensed (transcendent exercise)
 - (a) Plato assigns this to that which gives rise to contrary sensations
 - (b) This seems to lead to a "mad" or unlimited becoming
 - (c) But Plato recognized intensive quantities only in development
 - (2) Deleuze: Plato misses the being of the sensible as difference in intensity
 - (a) Transcendent exercise of sensibility: awakening memory and forcing thought
 - (b) Pedagogy of the senses aims at this transcendent exercise
 - 3) intensity: implicated or "embryonized" quantity
 - a) Intensity: implicated in itself: implicat-ing and implicat-ed
 - (1) Implicating and enveloping: difference
 - (2) Implicated and enveloped: distance
 - b) Contrast of extensive and intensive quantities
 - (1) Extensive quantities
 - (a) Have a fixed metric or indivisible unit
 - (b) No change in nature when divided
 - (2) Intensive quantities
 - (a) Do not have a fixed metric but imply series of heterogeneous terms
 - (b) Hence cannot be divided w/o change in nature
 - c) "Distance": indivisible asymmetrical relation
 - (1) Ordinal and intensive in character
 - (2) Between series of heterogeneous terms
 - d) Leads to distinguishing of two types of multiplicity
- B. Difference in kind; difference in degree
- 1) Difference becomes qualitative only in being extended
 - a) Qualities have more stability than usually thought
 - b) They are orders of resemblance
 - 2) Bergsonian critique of intensity is unconvincing
 - a) Assumes quality and extensivity already made

- b) Assigns difference of kind to quality; difference of degree to extensity
 - c) Bergson gives to quality what belongs to intensive quantity
 - d) But memory rediscovers in duration implicated intensity
- C. Transcendental inquiry to dispel illusion of difference of intensity cancelled in extension
 - 1) Two orders of implication or degradation
 - a) Secondary: envelopment of intensity in explicative qualities and extensity (cancelling)
 - b) Primary: difference as intensity implicated in itself (affirmation)
 - 2) Illusion = confusing these two orders
 - 3) Transcendental principle = difference of intensity
 - a) "The beautiful and profound tautology of the different"
 - b) Energy in general/intensive quantity = spatium
 - c) = "theater of all metamorphosis"
- D. Eternal return as intensive repetition: the identical said of the different
 - 1) Opposition of modern linear and ancient cyclical time is a weak idea
 - a) We end up with simple and general resemblance: the same
 - b) Instead we should have qualitative metamorphosis and quantitative inequality
 - 2) Nietzsche: ER is not a law of nature but involves groundlessness, natural chaos
 - a) Will to power: world of differences
 - b) ER: being of this world of differences
 - (1) Difference in WP is the 1st affirmation; ER the 2nd
 - (2) What does not return is that which denies ER
 - 3) "Ethics of intensive quantities":
 - a) Affirm even the lowest
 - b) Do not explicate too much: keep in reserve
- V. Intensive quantities and differential relations (244-254 / 314-327)
 - A. Differential relations in Idea and relations of intensity in asymmetrical synthesis of sensible
 - 1) Ideas: "perplexed" virtual multiplicities / intensities: implicated multiplicities
 - 2) "Aesthetic of intensities develops its moments in correspondence w/ dialectic of Ideas"
 - a) Power of intensity (depth) grounded in potentiality of Idea
 - b) Cancellation of intensity in extensity / disappearance of problematic Ideas in solutions
 - c) Humor of aesthetic / irony of dialectic
 - 3) But this general correspondence is not precise; for that we need symbol of different/ciation:
 - a) Differential relations in Ideas: virtual multiplicity
 - b) Qualitative and extensive series actualize relations by differentiating them
 - 4) But this still leaves condition of actualization indeterminate; we must turn to intensity
 - B. Intensity is determinant in actualization: it dramatizes: expressed in spatio-temporal dynamisms
 - 1) Individuation: essential process of intensive quantities: individuals are signal/sign systems
 - 2) Simondon: individuation presupposes metastable state
 - a) = 2 orders of magnitude btw which are potentials (signal)
 - b) These potentials = objective problematic field
 - c) Individuation is act of solving problem
 - (1) = Actualization of a potential
 - (2) Establishing communication btw disparates (sign)
 - d) Individual coupled to pre-individual virtual field of differential relations and singularities
 - e) Individuation: answer to question "who"?
 - 3) The "total notion" is "indi-different/ciation (indi-drama-different/ciation)
 - 4) Irony: dialectical Idea / pre-individual singularities – humor: play of individuals
 - 5) Individual is neither a quality nor an extension:
 - a) Differentiation presupposes prior intense field of individuation
 - b) Confusing individuation – differentiation analogous to confusing virtual – possible
 - C. Classification and difference: "Copernican Revolution of Darwinism"
 - 1) Cuvier / Geoffroy: general difference though borne by individual
 - 2) Darwin: thought of individual difference:
 - a) Natural selection as differentiation of difference / survival of most divergent
 - b) Taxonomic units (genera, families, etc.)
 - (1) No longer subordinate difference in representation (resemblance, etc)

- (2) But are now understood relative to natural selection as process of differentiation
 - 3) Weissmann: sexed reproduction as natural cause of individual difference
- D. Embryo: organic de-differentiation
 - 1) Von Baër: embryonic life: from more to less general
 - a) This generality is not abstraction, but is lived
 - b) It points to:
 - (1) Differential relations or virtuality prior to act. Of species
 - (2) Condition of actualization: individuation in field of the egg
 - c) Generality points beyond species to pre-individual singularities
 - d) Species is illusion of play of individuation:
 - (1) Points to primacy of individuation over differentiation
 - (2) Embryo is individual as such caught up in field of its individuation
 - 2) Intensities in the egg as primary (critique of genetic reductionism)
 - a) World is an egg: model for order of reasons
 - (1) Nucleus / genes: differential relations/pre-individual field to be actualized
 - (2) Cytoplasm: gradients and field of individuation determining the actualization
 - 3) Non-resemblance of species/parts to differential relations / singularities / intensities
- E. The "principal difficulty": we have posed field of individuation formally and generally
 - 1) It thus seems to depend upon the species
 - 2) We must conceive individuating difference as individual difference: no 2 eggs are identical
 - a) Enveloping intensity:
 - (1) Clear = expressing certain relations / degrees of variation
 - (2) Depth = field of individuation / individuating differences
 - b) Enveloped intensity:
 - (1) Confused = expressing all relations / degrees of variation
 - (2) Distance = individual differences

VI. Evolution of physical, biological, psychic systems (254-261 / 327-335)

- A. Physical vs. biological systems
 - 1) Distinguished by
 - a) Order of Ideas
 - b) Processes of individuation
 - (1) Physical: happens all at once, affecting only the boundaries
 - (2) Biological: successive waves of singularities are actualized, involving whole internal milieu
 - c) Figures of differentiation
 - (1) Physical: qualification and distribution
 - (2) Biological: organization and determination of species
 - 2) Similar in both involving cancellation of productive difference: equilibrium / death
 - 3) "Evolutionary" formula: more complex systems = more values peculiar to implication
 - a) Values of implication = centers of envelopment [DNA as genetic code]
 - (1) Noumenon finds its phenomenon in them
 - (2) Expressive: they reveal sense
 - (3) Interiorize the individuating factors
 - b) Both difference and repetition tend to become interiorized at once in signal-sign systems
- B. Psychic systems
 - 1) I and Self are figures of differentiation rather than individuation: Cogito
 - a) I = quality of human being as species = form
 - b) Self = properly psychic organism = matter
 - 2) Individuating factors or implicated factors do not have form of I or matter of Self
 - a) The individual never ceases to divide and change its nature: it is intensive
 - b) Nietzsche: I and Self are abstract universals to be replaced by individuating factors
- C. Doubled death: both internal "instinct" and external accident
 - 1) Internal freeing of individuating elements from form of I / matter of Self
 - 2) Cancellation of large differences in extension and liberation of small differences in intensity
- D. Centers of envelopment in psychic systems: the Other: expressive value
 - 1) The Other as expression of a possible world

- 2) Versus I and Self as explication or development of world expressed by the Other
 - 3) Return to "ethics of intensive quantities"
 - a) Do not explicate oneself too much with the other
 - b) But maintain one's implicit values and multiply own world with expressed expressions
 - 4) It's not that the other is another I, but that "I is an other," a "fractured I"
 - 5) Love: begins w/ revelation of a possible world
 - 6) Words of the other convey reality on the possible worlds they express
 - 7) Other and language = manifestation of noumenon / tendency to interiorization of difference
-

Conclusion: Difference and Repetition (262-304 / 337-389)

I. Thought of difference in itself vs. representation (262-272 / 337-349)

- A. four iron collars of representation: four roots of sufficient reason
 - 1) identity in the concept: *ratio cognoscendi*
 - 2) opposition of predicate in *ratio fiendi*
 - 3) analogy of judgment in *ratio essendi*
 - 4) resemblance of perception in *ratio agenda*
- B. orgiastic representation still does not affirm difference
 - 1) Hegel: infinitely large difference: contradiction
 - a) synthetic finite identity
 - b) "only in relation to the identical ... contradiction is the greatest difference"
 - 2) Leibniz: infinitely small difference: vice-diction
 - a) infinite analytic identity
 - b) perhaps Leibniz went further than Hegel
- C. Platonism as moral motivation of subordination of difference to representation as in Aristotle
 - 1) Model/copy/simulacrum can only be distinguished by same, similar, analogous, opposed
 - 2) Plato as site of decision
- D. Representation as site of transcendental illusion: four interrelated forms: thought [identity of concept], sensibility [resemblance in perception], idea [negative, opposition in the predicate], being [analogy of judgment]
 - 1) thought: image made up of postulates
 - a) identical thinking subject as principle of identity for concepts in general
 - b) subjective concomitants brought to concept: memory, recognition, self-ness
 - c) moral vision in subjective identity [common sense]
 - d) this destroys fractured I: thought of its own death in pure and empty form of time
 - 2) resemblance: of the diverse sensible to itself
 - a) difference is cancelled in quality and extension
 - b) illusion of "good sense" complementary to "common sense"
 - c) rather, difference in intensive in the spatium
 - d) intensity is the being of sensible:
 - 3) Idea: illusion of the negative:
 - a) difference as limitation / opposition = surface effects vs. depth of positive difference
 - b) Ideas are genuine objectivities
 - (1) differential elements and relations
 - (2) mode of the problematic
 - (3) positive multiplicities
 - (4) complete and reciprocal determination
 - (5) positivity of Ideas--affirmations which solve them
 - (6) multiple affirmation of difference: negative shadow
 - c) Ideas are unconscious:
 - (1) do not resemble propositions which represent the affirmations
 - (2) illusion occurs when we begin with propositions
 - d) distortion of dialectic culminates in Hegel
 - (1) substitutes labor of negative for play of difference

- (2) practical implications: we are led away from "most important task"
 - (a) determining problems and realizing in them our power of creation and decision
 - (b) history progresses by deciding problems and affirming differences
 - (3) Nietzschean affirmation vs. bourgeois negation
 - e) being is full positivity and pure affirmation, and there is the (non)-being of the problematic
 - (1) that virtuality in capturing which by creation, we make our history
 - (2) for Frankfurt School, revolutionary power of negating present circumstances--but D rejects this characterization of revolution
 - 4) Being [analogy of judgment]
 - a) indeterminate concept needs determinable primary concepts
 - b) these ordinary predicates are the categories / opposed to them are empirical concepts
 - E. the four illusions distort repetition as well as difference
 - 1) assimilated to generality and resemblance
 - 2) difference w/o a concept
 - a) but w/ identical concept presupposed
 - b) mere numerical difference, in space and time
 - 3) merely negative explanation: blockages of the concept
 - a) nominal concepts
 - b) concepts of nature
 - c) concepts of freedom
 - 4) must represent identical concept
 - a) repetition of the same
 - b) suppresses thickness of repetition
- II. Ground and determination (272-277 / 349-355)
- A. Three senses of grounding
 - 1) ground is the same or the identical
 - a) operation of logos
 - b) Platonic selection of claimants
 - c) distinguishes copies from simulacra
 - 2) in representation, identical is now a claim to be grounded
 - a) operation of sufficient reason
 - b) to ground is to render representation infinite
 - 3) these two senses united in third: to organize order of time
 - a) represent the present
 - b) ground is thus an immemorial Memory or pure past
 - B. ambiguity of ground
 - 1) to ground is to ground representation to which it is attracted
 - 2) grounding suffers a fall into the grounded
 - 3) but grounding is also attracted to a beyond, a groundlessness
 - a) third synthesis of time: form of empty time
 - b) world of ground undermined by excluded simulacra
 - c) multiple reason that articulates Ideas
 - C. complexity of grounding
 - 1) to ground is to determine the indeterminate
 - a) ground rises to the surface as "depth"
 - b) forms decomposes as "abstract line"
 - 2) matter-form cannot describe determination
 - 3) thought as pure determination must confront indeterminate
 - a) this is the stupidity of thought: weakness and resource
 - b) play of sense and non-sense
 - 4) empty form of time
 - a) introduces and constitutes difference in thought
 - b) distributes throughout itself fractured I + passive self
 - c) we need theory of thought w/o image
 - D. representation (esp. infinite representation) has presentiment of groundlessness
 - 1) but it represents this as undifferentiated abyss

- a) since it represents
 - (1) all individuality as personal (I)
 - (2) and all singularity as individual (Self)
 - b) and since all groundlessness lacks individuation and singularity
 - 2) but the world of "one" or "they" is one of
 - a) impersonal individuation (individuating difference)
 - b) pre-individual singularity (differential determination)
 - 3) thus groundlessness "swarms with differences"
- III. systems of simulacra: sites for actualization of Ideas (277-285 / 355-365)
- A. notions needed to describe these systems
 - 1) depth or spatium of intensities
 - 2) disparate series and fields of individuation
 - 3) "dark precursor" causing communication of series and fields
 - 4) linkages, internal resonances, forced movements
 - 5) passive selves/larval subjects; pure spatio-temporal dynamisms
 - 6) qualities-extension, species-parts which cover over 1-5
 - 7) centers of envelopment testifying to 1-5 in developed world
 - B. these systems affirm divergence and de-centering
 - 1) only unity is an informal chaos including them all
 - a) each is constituted by differences
 - b) they communicate amongst each other by diff of diff
 - 2) crowned anarchies and nomadic distributions
 - C. Ideas
 - 1) multiplicity of differential elements – differential relations – singularities
 - 2) multiple reason: ideal temporal dimension of progressive determination
 - a) elements: determinability or principle of quantifiability
 - b) relations: reciprocal determination: principle of qualifiability
 - c) singularities: complete determination: principle of potentiality
 - 3) empiricism of the Idea
 - a) we must investigate whether, e.g., genes are elements
 - b) Ideas affirm divergence: resonance btw divergent series
 - c) sense: distinction and distribution of points in Idea
 - 4) pure virtuality of Ideas: non-resemblance to actualizations
 - a) incarnated in fields of individuation
 - b) actualized in species and parts which cover these fields
 - 5) t/c as symbol of difference
 - a) Ideas are differentiated in themselves
 - b) but are actualized by differentiation
 - c) "totality of system" as "(indi)-different/ciation"
 - 6) two halves of everything:
 - a) ideal half: differential relations / corresponding singularities
 - b) actual half: qualities actualizing those relations / parts actualizing those singularities
 - c) individuation ensures the embedding of the two halves
 - 7) Ideas by themselves are "distinct-obscure"
 - D. Problems
 - 1) the problematic is a state of the world, reality of virtual
 - 2) four fold "pli"
 - a) perplication: state of Problem-Ideas
 - b) complication: state of chaos: actual intensive series corresponding to ideal series
 - c) implication: communication/resonance of intensive series
 - d) explication: state of qualities and extensities
 - 3) the case of the Other in psychic systems
 - E. Origin of Ideas: plunge of reason into the beyond
 - 1) origin assimilated to solitary and divine game
 - a) bad, false, moral, human way to play [Pascal]
 - (1) presupposes pre-existing categorical rules

- (2) rules determine probabilities
 - (3) never affirm the whole of chance
 - (4) sedentary distributions
 - b) divine game: [Heraclitus, Mallarmé, Nietzsche]
 - (1) no pre-existent rule: game includes own rule
 - (2) every time, whole of chance is affirmed
 - (3) nothing is exempt from the game
 - (4) different throws distinguished formally
 - (5) different outcomes in nomadic distribution
 - 2) game of problematic and imperative, of diff and repetition
 - F. descriptive notions proposed here are not categories
 - 1) apply to real experience, not possible experience
 - 2) nomadic distributions, not sedentary
 - 3) complexes of space and time;
 - a) essential encounter, not recognition
 - b) like Kantian schemata, but not subordinated to categories
- IV. Two [or three] repetitions (285-293 / 365-376)
- A. repetition as represented
 - B. understood in terms of identity, explain negatively
 - 1) matter:
 - a) allows concept to be spread over cases
 - b) prevents further specification of concept
 - c) matter is therefore alienated concept
 - 2) bare, material repetition is model for representation
 - a) but such repetition is unthinkable: one case appears only when other has disappeared
 - b) so contemplative souls must be installed in matter: sub-representative and contracting
 - C. whence the difference that is contracted
 - 1) Bergson's hypothesis: present as contraction of past
 - 2) present diff is now depth itself; rep is of totalities
 - 3) difference is now between levels of repetition
 - D. two consequences from difference between repetitions
 - 1) difference represented w/in identity; repetition. = difference w/o concept
 - a) Ideas make same problem of difference and repetition
 - 2) not enough to oppose two repetitions; 2nd must be reason of 1st
 - a) three cases of freedom, nature, nominal concepts
 - E. distinction between two repetitions is not enough; need 3rd repetition
 - 1) repetition that makes the difference
 - 2) repetition of ungrounding; an ontological repetition
 - a) distribute difference to the two repetitions
 - b) produce illusion by which they are affected
 - 3) ultimate repetition = ultimate theater
 - a) encompasses everything
 - b) destroys everything
 - c) selects among everything
 - F. Art
 - 1) highest object of art: bring into play all these repetitions
 - 2) art reverses copies into simulacra
 - 3) aesthetic problem: insertion of art into everyday life
 - a) make resonate the two extremes
 - (1) habitual series of consumption
 - (2) instinctual series of destruction and death
 - b) three examples
 - (1) modern music (Berg)
 - (2) Pop Art (Warhol)
 - (3) novel (Robbe-Grillet)
- V. The form of time (294-304 / 376-389)

- A. as straight line, time seems to establish a frontier btw first time and repetition
- B. but in the pure form of time, each determination is already repetition in itself
 - 1) power of selection depends on distribution of repetitions in form, order, totality, series of time
 - 2) third repetition; repetition w/in eternal return
 - a) ensures that only it returns
 - b) drives away negative, similar, analogous
- C. Excursus: Nietzsche's texts on the ER
- D. Eternal Return
 - 1) peculiar power of difference:
 - a) "displacement and disguise of that which repeats only reproduces the divergence and de-centering of the different in a single movement of *diaphora* or transport"
 - (1) ER affirms difference, dissemblance, chance, multiplicity
 - (2) ER eliminates strangulation of diff in representation
 - 2) unity of the play of difference
 - a) same is the returning of what returns: the different
 - b) similar is returning of what returns: the dissimilar
 - 3) practical reversal of world of representation
 - a) real dispute is not, w/ Heidegger, btw same and identical
 - b) but between same/identical as primary or secondary
 - 4) self-delighting illusion of ER: doubled affirmation of difference
 - a) produces image of identity as though the end of the difference
 - b) produces image of resemblance as effect of disparate
 - c) produces image of negative as consequence of affirmation
 - d) ER denies what denies multiple and different affirmation; doubles what it affirms
 - 5) genesis of "priority" of negative
 - a) process: simulated identity of simulacra retrojected onto difference
 - (1) simulated external resemblance becomes interiorized
 - (2) negative becomes principal and agent
 - b) results:
 - (1) difference valid only w/in pre-existing Same which sees it as conceptual difference
 - (2) repetition valid only under Identical positing it as difference w/o concept
- E. Analogy and representation; univocity and repetition [302-304]
 - 1) In representation, everything takes place between generic and specific difference this misses
 - a) Univocity as collective sense of being
 - b) Singularity and play of individuating difference
 - 2) Univocity:
 - a) Two theses
 - (1) Forms of being imply no division w/in being
 - (2) That of which being is said is repartitioned by essentially mobile individuating differences: plurality of modal significations
 - b) In Spinoza:
 - (1) Attributes are not genera, but are ontologically one although formally distinct
 - (2) Modes are not species, but individuating differences = degrees of power in intensity
 - c) The true throws of the dice:
 - (1) Throws are formally distinct, but re: an ontologically unique throw
 - (2) Outcomes are distributed in open space of the univocal
 - d) Spinozism needed to make substance turn around the modes to make univocity the object of pure affirmation; that is, to recognize univocity in the form of repetition in er
 - e) Opening is an essential feature of univocity: nomadic distributions and crowned anarchies