from the solution-instance; it is in the movement by which the solutions necessarily come to conceal the problem; it is in the sense that the conditions of the problem are the object of a synthesis in the Idea which cannot be expressed in the analysis of the propositional concepts constituting cases of solution. As a result, the first alternative – real or fictive? – collapses. Neither real nor fictive, differentials express the nature of a problematic as such, its objective consistency along with its subjective autonomy.

Perhaps the other alternative collapses as well, that between infinite and finite representation. As we have seen, infinite and finite are indeed characteristics of a representation in so far as the concept that it implicates develops all its possible comprehension or, on the contrary, blocks it. In any case, the representation of difference refers to the identity of the concept as its principle. We can therefore treat representations like propositions of consciousness, designating cases of solution in relation to the concept in general. However, the problematic element, with its extra-propositional character, does not fall within representation. Neither particular nor general, neither finite nor infinite, it is the object of the Idea as a universal. This differential element is the play of difference as such, which can neither be mediated by representation nor subordinated to the identity of the concept. The antinomy of the finite and the infinite emerges precisely when Kant feels himself obliged, by virtue of the special nature of cosmology, to pour into representation the content corresponding to the Idea of the world. The antinomy is resolved, according to him, when on the one hand he discovers within representation an element irreducible to either infinity or finitude (regress); and when on the other he adds to this element the pure thought of another element which differs in kind from representation (noumena). However, to the extent that this pure thought remains undetermined – or is not determined as differential – representation, for its part, is not really overcome, any more than the propositions of consciousness which constitute the substance and the details of the antinomies. In a different manner, modern mathematics also leaves us in a state of antinomy, since the strict finite interpretation that it gives of the calculus nevertheless presupposes an axiom of infinity in the set theoretical foundation, even though this axiom finds no illustration in calculus. What is still missing is the extra-propositional or sub-representative element expressed in the Idea by the differential, precisely in the form of a problem.

We should speak of a dialectics of the calculus rather than a metaphysics. By 'dialectic' we do not mean any kind of circulation of opposing representations which would make them coincide in the identity of a concept, but the problem element in so far as this may be distinguished from the properly mathematical element of solutions. Following Lautman's general theses, a problem has three aspects: its difference in kind from

solutions; its transcendence in relation to the solutions that it engenders on the basis of its own determinant conditions; and its immanence in the solutions which cover it, the problem *being* the better resolved the more *it is* determined. Thus the ideal connections constitutive of the problematic (dialectical) Idea are incarnated in the real relations which are constituted by mathematical theories and carried over into problems in the form of solutions. We have seen how all three of these aspects were present in the differential calculus: the solutions are like the discontinuities compatible with differential equations, engendered on the basis of an ideal continuity in accordance with the conditions of the problem. However, an important point must be specified. Differential calculus obviously belongs to mathematics, it is an entirely mathematical instrument. It would therefore seem difficult to see in it the Platonic evidence of a dialectic superior to mathematics. At least, it would be difficult if the immanent aspect of problems did not offer an adequate explanation. *Problems are always dialectical*: the dialectic has no other sense, nor do problems have any other sense. What is mathematical (or physical, biological, psychical or sociological) are the solutions. It is true, however, that on the one hand the nature of the solutions refers to different *orders* of problem within the dialectic itself; and on the other hand that problems – by virtue of their immanence, which is no less essential than their transcendence – express themselves technically in the domain of solutions to which they give rise by virtue of their dialectical order. Just as the right angle and the circle are duplicated by ruler and compass, so each dialectical problem is duplicated by a symbolic field in which it is expressed. That is why it must be said that there are mathematical, physical, biological, psychical and sociological problems, even though every problem is dialectical by nature and there are no non-dialectical problems. Mathematics, therefore, does not include only solutions to problems; it also includes the expression of problems relative to the field of solvability which they define, and define by virtue of their very dialectical order. That is why the differential calculus belongs entirely to mathematics, even at the very moment when it finds its sense in the revelation of a dialectic which points beyond mathematics.

We cannot even suppose that, from a technical point of view, differential calculus is the only mathematical expression of problems as such. The methods of exhaustion played this role in very diverse domains, as did analytic geometry. More recently, other procedures have fulfilled this role better. Recall the circle in which the theory of problems was caught: a problem is solvable only to the extent that it is 'true', but we always tend to define the truth of a problem in terms of its solvability. Instead of basing the extrinsic criterion of solvability upon the internal character of the problem (Idea), we make the internal character depend upon the simple external criterion. Now, the mathematician Abel was perhaps the first to break this circle: he elaborated a whole method according to which

solvability must follow from the form of the problem. Instead of seeking to find out by trial and error whether a given equation is solvable in general, we must determine the conditions of the problem which progressively specify the fields of solvability in such a way that 'the statement contains the seeds of the solution'. This is a radical reversal in the problem–solution relation, a more considerable revolution than the Copernican. It has been said that Abel thereby inaugurated a new *Critique of Pure Reason*, in particular going beyond Kantian '*extrinsicism*'. This same judgement is confirmed in relation to the work of Galois: starting from a basic 'field' (R), successive adjunctions to this field (R', R", R'"...) allow a progressively more precise distinction of the roots of an equation, by the progressive limitation of possible substitutions. There is thus a succession of 'partial resolvents' or an embedding of 'groups' which make the solution follow from the very conditions of the problem: the fact that an equation cannot be solved algebraically, for example, is no longer discovered as a result of empirical research or by trial and error, but as a result of the characteristics of the groups and partial resolvents which constitute the synthesis of the problem and its conditions (an equation is solvable only by algebraic means – in other words, by radicals, when the partial resolvents are binomial equations and the indices of the groups are prime numbers). The theory of problems is completely transformed and at last grounded, since we are no longer in the classic master–pupil situation where the pupil understands and follows a problem only to the extent that the master already knows the solution and provides the necessary adjunctions. For, as Georges Verriest remarks, the group of an equation does not characterise at a given moment what we know about its roots, but the objectivity of what we do not know about them.[10] Conversely, this non-knowledge is no longer a negative or an insufficiency but a rule or something *to be learnt* which corresponds to a fundamental dimension of the object. The whole pedagogical relation is transformed – a new Meno – but many other things along with it, including knowledge and sufficient reason. Galois's 'progressive discernibility' unites in the same continuous movement the processes of reciprocal determination and complete determination (pairs of roots and the distinction between roots within a pair). It constitutes the total figure of sufficient reason, into which it introduces *time*. With Abel and Galois, the mathematical theory of problems is able to fulfil all its properly dialectical requirements, and to break the circle in which it was caught.

Modern mathematics is therefore regarded as based upon the theory of groups or set theory rather than upon differential calculus. Nevertheless, it is no accident that Abel's method concerned above all the integration of differential formulae. What matters to us is less the determination of this or that break [*coupure*] in the history of mathematics (analytic geometry, differential calculus, group theory ...) than the manner in which, at each

moment of that history, dialectical problems, their mathematical expression and the simultaneous origin of their fields of solvability are interrelated. From this point of view, there is a continuity and a teleology in the development of mathematics which makes the differences in kind between differential calculus and other instruments merely secondary. Calculus recognises differentials of different orders. However, the notions of differential and order accord with the dialectic in a quite different manner. The problematic or dialectical Idea is a system of connections between differential elements, a system of differential relations between genetic elements. There are different orders of Ideas presupposed by one another according to the ideal nature of these relations and the elements considered (Ideas of Ideas, etc.). There is as yet nothing mathematical in these definitions. Mathematics appears with the fields of solution in which dialectical Ideas of the last order are incarnated, and with the expression of problems relative to these fields. Other orders of Ideas are incarnated in other fields and in other modes of expression corresponding to different sciences. In this manner, a genesis of diverse scientific domains takes place on the basis of dialectical problems and their orders. Differential calculus in the most precise sense is only a mathematical instrument which, even in its own domain, does not necessarily represent the most complete form of the expression of problems and the constitution of their solutions in relation to the order of dialectical Ideas which it incarnates. It nevertheless has a wider universal sense in which it designates the composite whole that includes Problems or dialectical Ideas, the Scientific expression of problems, and the Establishment of fields of solution. More generally, we must conclude that there is no difficulty with any supposed application of mathematics to other domains, in particular with regard to differential calculus or group theory. It is rather that each engendered domain, in which dialectical Ideas of this or that order are incarnated, possesses its own calculus. Ideas always have an element of quantitability, qualitability and potentiality; there are always processes of determinability, of reciprocal determination and complete determination; always distributions of distinctive and ordinary points; always adjunct fields which form the synthetic progression of a sufficient reason. There is no metaphor here, except the metaphor consubstantial with the notion of Ideas, that of the dialectical transport or '*diaphora*'. Herein lies the adventure of Ideas. It is not mathematics which is applied to other domains but the dialectic which establishes for its problems, by virtue of their order and their conditions, the direct differential calculus corresponding or appropriate to the domain under consideration. In this sense there is a *mathesis universalis* corresponding to the universality of the dialectic. If Ideas are the differentials of thought, there is a differential calculus corresponding to each Idea, an alphabet of what it means to think. Differential calculus is not the unimaginative calculus of the utilitarian, the crude arithmetic

calculus which subordinates thought to other things or to other ends, but the algebra of pure thought, the superior irony of problems themselves – the only calculus 'beyond good and evil'. This entire adventurous character of Ideas remains to be described.

Ideas are multiplicities: every idea is a multiplicity or a variety. In this Reimannian usage of the word 'multiplicity' (taken up by Husserl, and again by Bergson) the utmost importance must be attached to the substantive form: multiplicity must not designate a combination of the many and the one, but rather an organisation belonging to the many as such, which has no need whatsoever of unity in order to form a system. The one and the many are concepts of the understanding which make up the overly loose mesh of a distorted dialectic which proceeds by opposition. The biggest fish pass through. Can we believe that the concrete is attained when the inadequacy of an abstraction is compensated for by the inadequacy of its opposite? We can say 'the one is multiple, the multiple one' for ever: we speak like Plato's young men who did not even spare the farmyard. Contraries may be combined, contradictions established, but at no point has the essential been raised: 'how many', 'how', 'in which cases'. The essence is nothing, an empty generality, when separated from this measure, this manner and this study of cases. Predicates may be combined, but the Idea is missed: the outcome is an empty discourse which lacks a substantive. 'Multiplicity', which replaces the one no less than the multiple, is the true substantive, substance itself. The variable multiplicity is the how many, the how and each of the cases. Everything is a multiplicity in so far as it incarnates an Idea. Even the many is a multiplicity; even the one is a multiplicity. That the one is *a* multiplicity (as Bergson and Husserl showed) is enough to reject back-to-back adjectival propositions of the one–many and many–one type. Everywhere the differences between multiplicities and the differences within multiplicities replace schematic and crude oppositions. Instead of the enormous opposition between the one and the many, there is only the variety of multiplicity – in other words, difference. It is, perhaps, ironic to say that everything is multiplicity, even the one, even the many. However, irony itself is a multiplicity – or rather, the art of multiplicities: the art of grasping the Ideas and the problems they incarnate in things, and of grasping things as incarnations, as cases of solution for the problems of Ideas.

An Idea is an *n*-dimensional, continuous, defined multiplicity. Colour – or rather, the Idea of colour – is a three-dimensional multiplicity. By dimensions, we mean the variables or co-ordinates upon which a phenomenon depends; by continuity, we mean the set of relations between changes in these variables – for example, a quadratic form of the differentials of the co-ordinates; by definition, we mean the elements

reciprocally determined by these relations, elements which cannot change unless the multiplicity changes its order and its metric. When and under what conditions should we speak of a multiplicity? There are three conditions which together allow us to define the moment at which an Idea emerges: (1) the elements of the multiplicity must have neither sensible form nor conceptual signification, nor, therefore, any assignable function. They are not even actually existent, but inseparable from a potential or a virtuality. In this sense they imply no prior identity, no positing of a something that could be called one or the same. On the contrary, their indetermination renders possible the manifestation of difference freed from all subordination. (2) These elements must in effect be determined, but reciprocally, by reciprocal relations which allow no independence whatsoever to subsist. Such relations are precisely non-localisable ideal connections, whether they characterise the multiplicity globally or proceed by the juxtaposition of neighbouring regions. In all cases the multiplicity is intrinsically defined, without external reference or recourse to a uniform space in which it would be submerged. Spatio–temporal relations no doubt retain multiplicity, but lose interiority; concepts of the understanding retain interiority, but lose multiplicity, which they replace by the identity of an 'I think' or something thought. Internal multiplicity, by contrast, is characteristic of the Idea alone. (3) A multiple ideal connection, a differential *relation*, must be actualised in diverse spatio–temporal *relationships*, at the same time as its *elements* are actually incarnated in a variety of *terms* and forms. The Idea is thus defined as a structure. A structure or an Idea is a 'complex theme', an internal multiplicity – in other words, a system of multiple, non-localisable connections between differential elements which is incarnated in real relations and actual terms. In this sense, we see no difficulty in reconciling genesis and structure. Following Lautman and Vuillemin's work on mathematics, 'structuralism' seems to us the only means by which a genetic method can achieve its ambitions. It is sufficient to understand that the genesis takes place in time not between one actual term, however small, and another actual term, but between the virtual and its actualisation – in other words, it goes from the structure to its incarnation, from the conditions of a problem to the cases of solution, from the differential elements and their ideal connections to actual terms and diverse real relations which constitute at each moment the actuality of time. This is a genesis without dynamism, evolving necessarily in the element of a supra-historicity, a *static genesis* which may be understood as the correlate of the notion of *passive synthesis*, and which in turn illuminates that notion. Was not the mistake of the modern interpretation of calculus to condemn its genetic ambitions under the pretext of having discovered a 'structure' which dissociated calculus from any phoronomic or dynamic considerations? There are Ideas which correspond to mathematical relations and realities, others which

correspond to physical laws and facts. There are others which, according to their order, correspond to organisms, psychic structures, languages and societies: these correspondences without resemblance are of a structural–genetic nature. Just as structure is independent of any principle of identity, so genesis is independent of a rule of resemblance. However, an Idea with all its adventures emerges in so far as it already satisfies certain structural and genetic conditions, and not others. The application of these criteria must therefore be sought in very different domains, by means of examples chosen almost at random.

First example: atomism as a physical Idea. Ancient atomism not only multiplied Parmenidean being, it also conceived of Ideas as multiplicities of atoms, atoms being the objective elements of thought. Thereafter it is indeed essential that atoms be related to other atoms at the heart of structures which are actualised in sensible composites. In this regard, the *clinamen* is by no means a change of direction in the movement of an atom, much less an indetermination testifying to the existence of a physical freedom. It is the original determination of the direction of movement, the synthesis of movement and its direction which relates one atom to another. '*Incerto tempore*' does not mean undetermined but non-assignable or non-localisable. If it is true that atoms, the elements of thought, move 'as rapidly as thought itself', as Epicurus says in his letter to Herodotus, then the *clinamen* is the reciprocal determination which is produced 'in a time smaller than the minimum continuous time thinkable'. It is not surprising that Epicurus makes use here of the vocabulary of exhaustion: there is something analogous in the *clinamen* to a relation between the differentials of atoms in movement. There is a declination here which also forms the language of thought; there is something here in thought which testifies to a limit of thought, but on the basis of which it thinks: faster than thought, 'in a time smaller...'. Nevertheless, the Epicurean atom still retains too much independence, a shape and an actuality. Reciprocal determination here still has too much of the aspect of a spatio–temporal relation. The question whether modern atomism, by contrast, fulfils all the conditions of a structure must be posed in relation to the differential equations which determine the laws of nature, in relation to the types of 'multiple and non-localisable connections' established between particles, and in relation to the character of the 'potentiality' expressly attributed to these particles.

Second example: the organism as biological Idea. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire seems to be the first to have defended the consideration of elements that he called abstract, taken independently of their forms and their functions. This is why he criticised not only his predecessors but also his contemporaries (Cuvier) for not going beyond an empirical distribution of differences and resemblances. These purely anatomical and atomic elements, such as

small bones, are linked by ideal relations of reciprocal determination: they thereby constitute an 'essence' which is the Animal in itself. It is these differential relations between pure anatomical elements which are incarnated in diverse animal configurations, with their diverse organs and functions. Such is the threefold character of anatomy: atomic, comparative and transcendent. In his *Notions synthétiques et historiques de philosophie naturelle* (1837), Geoffroy spells out his dream which, he says, was also that of the young Napoleon: to be the Newton of the infinitely small, to discover 'the world of details' or 'very short distance' ideal connections beneath the cruder play of sensible and conceptual differences and resemblances. An organism is a set of real terms and relations (dimension, position, number) which actualises on its own account, to this or that degree, relations between differential elements: for example, the hyoid of a cat has nine small bones, whereas in man it has only five; the other four are found towards the skull, outside the organ reduced in this way by the upright position. The genesis of development in organisms must therefore be understood as the actualisation of an essence, in accordance with reasons and at speeds determined by the environment, with accelerations and interruptions, but independently of any transformist passage from one actual term to another.

Such is the genius of Geoffroy. Here too, however, the question of a structuralism in biology (in accordance with the word 'structure', which Geoffroy often employed) depends upon the ultimate determination of the differential elements and of the type of relations between them. Are anatomical elements, principally bones, capable of fulfilling this role, as though the necessity for muscles did not set limits to their relations; and as though these elements did not themselves still enjoy an actual, or too actual, existence? It may be, then, that structure reappears on a quite different level, with a completely new determination of differential elements and ideal connections. This occurs with genetics. There are perhaps as many differences between genetics and Geoffroy as there are between modern atomism and Epicurus. Nevertheless, chromosomes appear as *loci*; in other words, not simply as places in space but as complexes of relations of proximity; genes express differential elements which also characterise an organism in a global manner, and play the role of distinctive points in a double process of reciprocal and complete determination; the double aspect of genes involves commanding several characteristics at once, and acting only in relation to other genes; the whole constitutes a virtuality, a potentiality; and this structure is incarnated in actual organisms, as much from the point of view of the determination of their species as from that of the differenciation of their parts, according to rhythms that are precisely called 'differential', according to comparative speeds or slownesses which measure the movement of actualisation.

Third example: are there social Ideas, in a Marxist sense? In what Marx calls 'abstract labour', abstraction is made from the particular qualities of the products of labour and the qualities of the labourers, but not from the conditions of productivity, the labour-power and the means of labour in a society. The social Idea is the element of quantitability, qualitability and potentiality of societies. It expresses a system of multiple ideal connections, or differential relations between differential elements: these include relations of production and property relations which are established not between concrete individuals but between atomic bearers of labour-power or representatives of property. The economic instance is constituted by such a social multiplicity – in other words, by the varieties of these differential relations. Such a variety of relations, with its corresponding distinctive points, is then incarnated in the concrete differenciated labours which characterise a determinate society, in the real relations of that society (juridical, political, ideological) and in the actual terms of those relations (for example, capitalist–wage-labourer). Althusser and his collaborators are, therefore, profoundly correct in showing the presence of a genuine structure in *Capital*, and in rejecting historicist interpretations of Marxism, since this structure never acts transitively, following the order of succession in time; rather, it acts by incarnating its varieties in diverse societies and by accounting for the simultaneity of all the relations and terms which, each time and in each case, constitute the present: that is why 'the economic' is never given properly speaking, but rather designates a differential virtuality to be interpreted, always covered over by its forms of actualisation; a theme or 'problematic' always covered over by its cases of solution.[11] In short, the economic is the social dialectic itself – in other words, the totality of the problems posed to a given society, or the synthetic and problematising field of that society. In all rigour, there are only economic social problems, even though the solutions may be juridical, political or ideological, and the problems may be expressed in these fields of resolvability. The famous phrase of the *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, 'mankind always sets itself only such tasks as it can solve', does not mean that the problems are only apparent or that they are already solved, but, on the contrary, that the economic conditions of a problem determine or give rise to the manner in which it finds a solution within the framework of the real relations of the society. Not that the observer can draw the least optimism from this, for these 'solutions' may involve stupidity or cruelty, the horror of war or 'the solution of the Jewish problem'. More precisely, the solution is always that which a society deserves or gives rise to as a consequence of the manner in which, given its real relations, it is able to pose the problems set within it and to it by the differential relations it incarnates.

Ideas are complexes of coexistence. In a certain sense all Ideas coexist, but

they do so at points, on the edges, and under glimmerings which never have the uniformity of a natural light. On each occasion, obscurities and zones of shadow correspond to their distinction. Ideas are distinguished from one another, but not at all in the same manner as forms and the terms in which these are incarnated. They are objectively made and unmade according to the conditions which determine their fluent synthesis. This is because they combine the greatest power of being differentiated with an inability to be differenciated. Ideas are varieties which include in themselves sub-varieties. We can distinguish three dimensions of variety. In the first, vertical dimension we can distinguish *ordinal varieties* according to the nature of the elements and the differential relations: for example, mathematical, mathematico-physical, chemical, biological, physical, sociological and linguistic Ideas. ... Each level implies differentials of a different dialectical 'order', but the elements of one order can pass over into those of another under new relations, either by being dissolved in the larger superior order or by being reflected in the inferior order. In the second, horizontal dimension we can distinguish characteristic varieties corresponding to the degrees of a differential relation within a given order, and to the distribution of singular points for each degree (such as the equation for conic sections which gives according to the case an ellipse, a hyperbola, a parabola or a straight line; or the varieties of animal ordered from the point of view of unity of composition; or the varieties of language ordered from the point of view of their phonological system). Finally, in depth we can distinguish axiomatic varieties which determine a common axiom for differential relations of a different order, on condition that this axiom itself coincides with a third-order differential relation (for example, the addition of real numbers and the composition of displacements; or, in an altogether different domain, the weaving-speech practised by the Griaule Dogons). Ideas and the distinctions between Ideas are inseparable from their types of varieties, and from the manner in which each type enters into the others. We propose the term 'perplication' to designate this distinctive and coexistent state of Ideas. Not that the corresponding connotation of 'perplexity' signifies a coefficient of doubt, hesitation or astonishment, or anything whatsoever incomplete about Ideas themselves. On the contrary, it is a question of the identity of Ideas and problems, of the exhaustively problematic character of Ideas – in other words, of the manner in which problems are objectively determined by their conditions to participate in one another according to the circumstantial requirements of the synthesis of Ideas.

Ideas are by no means essences. In so far as they are the objects of Ideas, problems belong on the side of events, affections, or accidents rather than on that of theorematic essences. Ideas are developed in the auxiliaries and the adjunct fields by which their synthetic power is measured. Consequently, the domain of Ideas is that of the inessential. They proclaim their affinity with the inessential in a manner as deliberate and as fiercely

obstinate as that in which rationalism proclaimed its possession and comprehension of essences. Rationalism wanted to tie the fate of Ideas to abstract and dead essences; and to the extent that the problematic form of Ideas was recognised, it even wanted that form tied to the question of essences – in other words, to the 'What is X?'. How many misunderstandings are contained in this will! It is true that Plato employs *this* question in order to refute those who content themselves with offering empirical responses, and to oppose essence and appearance. His aim, however, is to silence the empirical responses in order to open up the indeterminate horizon of a transcendental problem which is the object of an Idea. Once it is a question of determining the problem or the Idea as such, once it is a question of setting the dialectic in motion, the question 'What is X?' gives way to other questions, otherwise powerful and efficacious, otherwise imperative: 'How much, how and in what cases?' The question 'What is X?' animates only the so-called aporetic dialogues – in other words, those in which the very form of the question gives rise to contradiction and leads to nihilism, no doubt because they have only propaedeutic aims – the aim of opening up the region of the problem in general, leaving to other procedures the task of determining it as a problem or as an Idea. When Socratic irony was taken seriously and the dialectic as a whole was confused with its propaedeutic, extremely troublesome consequences followed: for the dialectic ceased to be the science of problems and ultimately became confused with the simple movement of the negative, and of contradiction. Philosophers began to talk like young men from the farmyard. From this point of view, Hegel is the culmination of a long tradition which took the question 'What is X?' seriously and used it to determine Ideas as essences, but in so doing substituted the negative for the nature of the problematic. This was the outcome of a distortion of the dialectic. Moreover, how many theological prejudices were involved in that tradition, since the answer to 'What is X?' is always God as the locus of the combinatory of abstract predicates. It should be noticed how few philosophers have placed their trust in the question 'What is X?' in order to have Ideas. Certainly not Aristotle. ... Once the dialectic brews up its matter instead of being applied in a vacuum for propaedeutic ends, the questions 'How much?', 'How?', 'In what cases?' and 'Who?' abound – questions the function and sense of which we shall see below.[12] These questions are those of the accident, the event, the multiplicity – of difference – as opposed to that of the essence, or that of the One, or those of the contrary and the contradictory. Hippias triumphs everywhere, even already in Plato: Hippias who refused essences, but nevertheless did not content himself with examples.

Problems are of the order of events – not only because cases of solution emerge like real events, but because the conditions of a problem themselves imply events such as sections, ablations, adjunctions. In this sense, it is

correct to represent a double series of events which develop on two planes, echoing without resembling each other: real events on the level of the engendered solutions, and ideal events embedded in the conditions of the problem, like the acts – or, rather, the dreams – of the gods who double our history. The ideal series enjoys the double property of transcendence and immanence in relation to the real. In effect, we have seen how the existence and distribution of singular points belongs entirely to the Idea, even though their specification was immanent in the solution-curves of their neighbouring regions – or, in other words, in the real relations in which the Idea is incarnated. In his wonderful description of the event, Péguy deployed two lines, one horizontal and another vertical, which repeated in depth the distinctive points corresponding to the first, and even anticipated and eternally engendered these distinctive points and their incarnation in the first. At the intersection of these lines – where a powder fuse forms the link between the Idea and the actual – the 'temporally eternal' is formed, and our greatest mastery or greatest power is decided, that which concerns problems themselves:

> Suddenly, we felt that we were no longer the same convicts. Nothing had happened. Yet a problem in which a whole world collided, a problem without issue, in which no end could be seen, suddenly ceased to exist and we asked ourselves what we had been talking about. Instead of an ordinary solution, a found solution, this problem, this difficulty, this impossibility had just passed what seemed like a physical point of resolution. A crisis point. At the same time, the whole world had passed what seemed like a physical crisis point. There are critical points of the event just as there are critical points of temperature: points of fusion, freezing and boiling points; points of coagulation and crystallization. There are even in the case of events states of superfusion which are precipitated, crystallized or determined only by the introduction of a fragment of some future event.[13]

For this reason, the procedure capable of following and describing multiplicities and themes, the procedure of *vice-diction*, is more important than that of contradiction, which purports to determine essences and preserve their simplicity. It will be said that the essence is by nature the most 'important' thing. This, however, is precisely what is at issue: whether the notions of importance and non-importance are not precisely notions which concern events or accidents, and are much more 'important' within accidents than the crude opposition between essence and accident itself. The problem of thought is tied not to essences but to the evaluation of what is important and what is not, to the distribution of singular and regular, distinctive and ordinary points, which takes place entirely within the inessential or within the description of a multiplicity, in relation to the ideal events which constitute the conditions of a 'problem'. To have an Idea means no

more than this, and erroneousness or stupidity is defined above all by its perpetual confusion with regard to the important and the unimportant, the ordinary and the singular. It is vice-diction which engenders cases, on the basis of auxiliaries and adjunctions. It presides over the distribution of distinctive points within the Idea; it decides the manner in which a series must be continued, from one singular point among regular points up to which other; it determines whether the series obtained within the Idea are convergent or divergent (there are therefore singularities which are themselves ordinary because of the convergence of the series, and singularities which are distinctive because of their divergence). Vice-diction has two procedures which intervene both in the determination of the conditions of the problem and in the correlative genesis of cases of solution: these are, in the first case, the *specification of adjunct fields* and, in the second, the *condensation of singularities*. On the one hand, in the progressive determination of the conditions, we must in effect discover the adjunctions which complete the initial field of the problem as such – in other words, the varieties of the multiplicity in all its dimensions, the fragments of ideal future or past events which, by the same token, render the problem solvable; and we must establish the modality in which these enclose or are connected with the initial field. On the other hand, we must condense all the singularities, precipitate all the circumstances, points of fusion, congelation or condensation in a sublime occasion, *Kairos*, which makes the solution explode like something abrupt, brutal and revolutionary. Having an Idea is this as well. It is as though every Idea has two faces, which are like love and anger: love in the search for fragments, the progressive determination and linking of the ideal adjoint fields; anger in the condensation of singularities which, by dint of ideal events, defines the concentration of a 'revolutionary situation' and causes the Idea to explode into the actual. It is in this sense that Lenin had Ideas. (There is an objectivity on the part of adjunction and condensation, and an objectivity of conditions, which implies that Ideas no more than Problems do not exist only in our heads but occur here and there in the production of an actual historical world.) Furthermore we must not see mathematical metaphors in all these expressions such as 'singular and distinctive points', 'adjunct fields', and 'condensation of singularities', nor physical metaphors in 'points of fusion or congelation ...', nor lyrical or mystical metaphors in 'love and anger'. These are categories of the dialectical Idea, the extensions of the differential calculus (*mathesis universalis* but also universal physics, universal psychology and universal sociology) corresponding to the Idea in all its domains of multiplicity. They are what is amorous or revolutionary in every Idea, that by virtue of which Ideas are always unequal glimmers of love and wrath which have nothing in common with any natural light.

(The most important aspect of Schelling's philosophy is his consideration of powers. How unjust, in this respect, is Hegel's critical remark about the

black cows! Of these two philosophers, it is Schelling who brings difference out of the night of the Identical, and with finer, more varied and more terrifying flashes of lightning than those of contradiction: with *progressivity*. Anger and love are powers of the Idea which develop on the basis of a *mē on* – in other words, not from a negative or a non-being [*ouk on*] but from a problematic being or non-existent, a being implicit in those existences beyond the ground. The God of love and the God of anger are required in order to have an Idea. A, A^2, A^3 form the play of pure depotentialisation and potentiality, testifying to the presence in Schelling's philosophy of a differential calculus adequate to the dialectic. Schelling was Leibnizian, but also Neo-Platonic. The great Neo-Platonic fantasy which offered a response to the problem of the *Phaedrus*, stacking or embedding types of Zeus by a method of exhaustion and evolution of powers: Zeus, $Zeus^2$, $Zeus^3$. ... It is here that division finds its scope, which is not in breadth in the differenciation of species within the same genus, but in depth in derivation and potentialisation, already a kind of differentiation. Thus, in a serial dialectic, the powers of a Difference which draws together and assembles [*ho synochikos*] are awakened and become Titanic with anger, demiurgic with love, and even Apolloniac, Aretic and Athenaic.[14])

There is no more opposition between event and structure or sense and structure than there is between structure and genesis. Structures include as many ideal events as they do varieties of relations and singular points, which intersect with the real events they determine. Those systems of differential elements and relations which we call structures are also *senses* from a genetic point of view, with regard to the actual terms and relations in which they are incarnated. The true opposition lies elsewhere: between Idea (structure–event–sense) and representation. With representation, concepts are like possibilities, but the subject of representation still determines the object as really conforming to the concept, as an essence. That is why representation as a whole is the element of knowledge which is realised by the recollection of the thought object and its recognition by a thinking subject. The Idea makes a virtue of quite different characteristics. The virtuality of the Idea has nothing to do with possibility. Multiplicity tolerates no dependence on the identical in the subject or in the object. The events and singularities of the Idea do not allow any positing of an essence as 'what the thing is'. No doubt, if one insists, the word 'essence' might be preserved, but only on condition of saying that the essence is precisely the accident, the event, the sense; not simply the contrary of what is ordinarily called the essence but the contrary of the contrary: multiplicity is no more appearance than essence, no more multiple than one. The procedures of vice-diction cannot, therefore, be expressed in terms of representation, even infinite: as we saw with Leibniz, they thereby lose their principal power,

that of affirming divergence or decentring. In fact, the Idea is not the element of knowledge but that of an infinite 'learning', which is of a different nature to knowledge. For learning evolves entirely in the comprehension of problems as such, in the apprehension and condensation of singularities and in the composition of ideal events and bodies. Learning to swim or learning a foreign language means composing the singular points of one's own body or one's own language with those of another shape or element, which tears us apart but also propels us into a hitherto unknown and unheard-of world of problems. To what are we dedicated if not to those problems which demand the very transformation of our body and our language? In short, representation and knowledge are modelled entirely upon propositions of consciousness which designate cases of solution, but those propositions by themselves give a completely inaccurate notion of the instance which engenders them as cases, and which they resolve or conclude. By contrast, the Idea and 'learning' express that extra-propositional or sub-representative problematic instance: the presentation of the unconscious, not the representation of consciousness. It is not surprising that, among many of the authors who promote it, *structuralism* is so often accompanied by calls for a new theatre or a new (non-Aristotelian) interpretation of the theatre: a theatre of multiplicities opposed in every respect to the theatre of representation, which leaves intact neither the identity of the thing represented, nor author, nor spectator, nor character, nor representation which, through the vicissitudes of the play, can become the object of a production of knowledge or final recognition. Instead, a theatre of problems and always open questions which draws spectator, setting and characters into the real movement of an apprenticeship of the entire unconscious, the final elements of which remain the problems themselves.

How should the necessarily unconscious nature of Ideas be understood? Must it be supposed that Ideas are the objects of a particular exclusive faculty, and that to the extent that they cannot be grasped by its empirical exercise they expose the transcendent or limit element of that faculty? This hypothesis would already have the advantage of eliminating Reason or even the understanding as the faculty of Ideas, and more generally of eliminating every faculty constitutive of a common sense under which is subsumed the empirical exercise of the other faculties with regard to a supposed same object. It is incomprehensible only from the point of view of a common sense or that of an exercise traced from the empirical that, for example, thought should find within itself something which it *cannot* think, something which is both unthinkable and that which must be thought. According to an objection often made against Maïmon, Ideas, understood as the differentials of thought, themselves introduce a minimum of 'given' which cannot be thought; they restore the duality of infinite and finite understanding, which function respectively as the conditions of existence and the conditions of knowledge, and which the

entire Kantian Critique nevertheless proposed to eliminate. This objection, however, applies only to the extent that the faculty of Ideas according to Maïmon is the understanding, just as it was reason according to Kant; that is, in either case, a faculty which constitutes a common sense and cannot tolerate the presence within itself of a kernel on which the empirical exercise of the conjoint faculties would break. It is only under these conditions that the unthought in thought, the unconscious of a pure thought, must be realised in an infinite understanding which serves as the ideal of *knowledge*, and that the differentials are condemned to the status of mere *fictions* unless they acquire the status of a fully *actual* reality in that infinite understanding. Once again, however, the alternative is false. We might as well say that the specificity of the problematic and the presence of the unconscious in finite thought remain misunderstood. This is no longer so when Ideas are related to the transcendent exercise of a particular faculty liberated from any common sense.

However, we do not believe this first response to be sufficient, nor that Ideas and structures refer to a particular faculty. Ideas occur throughout the faculties and concern them all. According to the place and the existence of a faculty determined as such, they render possible both the differential object and the transcendent exercise of that faculty. Take, for example, the linguistic multiplicity, regarded as a virtual system of reciprocal connections between 'phonemes' which is incarnated in the actual terms and relations of diverse languages: such a multiplicity renders possible speech as a faculty as well as the transcendent object of that speech, that 'metalanguage' which cannot be spoken in the empirical usage of a given language, but must be spoken and can be spoken only in the poetic usage of speech coextensive with virtuality. Take the social multiplicity: it determines sociability as a faculty, but also the transcendent object of sociability which cannot be lived within actual societies in which the multiplicity is incarnated, but must be and can be lived only in the element of social upheaval (in other words, freedom, which is always hidden among the remains of an old order and the first fruits of a new). The same could be said for other Ideas or multiplicities: the psychic multiplicities of imagination and phantasy, the biological multiplicities of vitality and 'monstrosity', the physical multiplicities of sensibility and sign. ... In this manner, Ideas correspond in turn to each of the faculties and are not the exclusive object of any one in particular, not even of thought. The essential point is that in this way we do not reintroduce any form of common sense – quite the contrary. We saw how the discord between the faculties, which followed from the exclusive character of the transcendent object apprehended by each, nevertheless implied a harmony such that each transmits its violence to the other by powder fuse, but precisely a 'discordant harmony' which excludes the forms of identity, convergence and collaboration which define a common sense. This harmonious Discord

seemed to us to correspond to that Difference which by itself articulates or draws together. There is thus a point at which thinking, speaking, imagining, feeling, etc., are one and the same thing, but that *thing* affirms only the divergence of the faculties in their transcendent exercise. It is a question, therefore, not of a common sense but, on the contrary, of a 'para-sense' (in the sense that paradox is also the contrary of good sense). The elements of this para-sense are Ideas, precisely because Ideas are pure multiplicities which do not presuppose any form of identity in a common sense but, on the contrary, animate and describe the disjoint exercise of the faculties from a transcendental point of view. Ideas are thus multiplicities with differential glimmers, like will-o'-the-wisps, 'virtual trails of fire', from one faculty to another, without ever having the homogeneity of that natural light which characterises common sense. That is why learning may be defined in two complementary ways, both of which are opposed to representation in knowledge: learning is either a matter of penetrating the Idea, its varieties and distinctive points, or a matter of raising a faculty to its disjoint transcendent exercise, raising it to that encounter and that violence which are communicated to the others. That is also why the unconscious has two complementary determinations which necessarily exclude it from representation but render it worthy and capable of a pure presentation: the unconscious may be defined either by the extra-propositional and non-actual character of Ideas in the *para-sense*, or by the non-empirical character of the *paradoxical* exercise of the faculties.

It is nevertheless true that Ideas have a very special relationship to pure thought. Thought here must undoubtedly be regarded not as the form of identity of all the faculties but as a particular faculty defined in the same manner as the others by its differential object and its separate exercise. The para-sense or violence which is communicated from one faculty to another according to an order then assigns a particular place to thought: thought is determined in such a manner that it grasps its own *cogitandum* only at the extremity of the fuse of violence which, from one Idea to another, first sets in motion sensibility and its *sentiendum*, and so on. This extremity might just as well be regarded as the ultimate origin of Ideas. In what sense, however, should we understand 'ultimate origin'? In this same sense, while the opposition between thought and all forms of common sense remains stronger than ever, Ideas must be called 'differentials' of thought, or the 'Unconscious' of pure thought. Ideas, therefore, are related not to a Cogito which functions as ground or as a proposition of consciousness, but to the fractured I of a dissolved Cogito; in other words, to the universal *ungrounding* which characterises thought as a faculty in its transcendental exercise. Ideas are not the object of a particular faculty, but nevertheless particularly concern a special faculty to the point that one can say: they come from it (in order to consititute the para-sense of all the faculties). Once again, what does 'come from' or 'find its origin' mean here? Where

do Ideas come from, where do problems, their elements and ideal relations come from?

The time has come to determine the difference between the two instances of the problem and the question that we have until now left vague. It must be remembered to what extent modern thought and the renaissance of ontology is based upon the question–problem complex. This complex has ceased to be considered the expression of a provisional and subjective state in the representation of knowledge in order to become the intentionality of Being *par excellence*, the only instance to which, properly speaking, Being answers without the question thereby becoming lost or overtaken. On the contrary, it alone has an opening coextensive with that which must respond to it and can respond to it only by retaining, repeating and continually going over it. This conception of the ontological scope of the question animates works of art as much as philosophical thought. Works are developed around or on the basis of a fracture that they never succeed in filling. The fact that the novel, particularly since Joyce, has found a new language in the mode of an 'Enquiry' or 'Questionnaire' and presents essentially problematic events and characters obviously does not mean that nothing is certain; it is obviously not the application of a generalised method of doubt nor the sign of a modern scepticism but, on the contrary, the discovery of the question and the problematic as a transcendental horizon, as the transcendental element which belongs 'essentially' to beings, things and events. It is the novelistic or theatrical or musical or philosophical, etc., discovery of the Idea, and at the same time the discovery of a transcendent exercise of sensibility, of image-memory, language and thought, by means of which each of these faculties communicates in full discordance with the others and opens on to the difference of Being by taking its own difference as object – in other words, by posing the question of its own difference. Hence that form of writing which is nothing but the question 'what is writing?', or that sensibility which is nothing but the question 'what is it to sense?', or that thought which asks 'what does it mean to think?'. These give rise to the greatest monotonies and the greatest weaknesses of a new-found common sense in the absence of the genius of the Idea, but also to the most powerful 'repetitions', the most prodigious inventions in the para-sense when the Idea emerges in all its violence. Let us recall the mere principles of this ontology of the question: (1) far from being an empirical state of knowledge destined to disappear in the response once a response is given, the question silences all empirical responses which purport to suppress it, in order to force the one response which always continues and maintains it: like Job, in his insistence upon a first-hand response which becomes confused with the question itself (first power of the absurd); (2) whence the power of the question to put in play the questioner as much as that which is questioned, and to put itself in question: Oedipus and his manner of

never being finished with the Sphinx (second power of the enigma); (3) whence the revelation of Being as corresponding to the question, reducible neither to the questioned nor to the questioner but that which unites both in the articulation of its own Difference: a *mē on* which is neither non-being [*non-être*] nor the being of the negative, but non-being [*non-étant*] or the being of the question: Ulysses and the response 'No one' (third power, which is that of the philosophical Odyssey).

This modern ontology nevertheless remains inadequate. It sometimes plays upon the indeterminate as an objective power of the question, only to introduce a subjective emptiness which is then attributed to Being, thereby substituting for the force of repetition the impoverishment of the already said or the stereotypes of a new common sense. Sometimes it even manages to dissociate the complex, thereby entrusting questions to the religiosity of a beautiful soul while relegating problems to the status of external obstacles. However, what would a question be if it were not developed under the auspices of those problematising fields alone capable of determining it within a characteristic 'science'? The beautiful soul never ceases to pose its own question, that of betrothal, but how many fiancées were abandoned or disappeared once the question found its right problem which then reacts upon it, corrects it and displaces it with all the difference of a thought (thus Proust's hero asking 'Will I marry Albertine?', but developing the question in the *problem of the work of art to be undertaken*, where the very question undergoes a radical metamorphosis). We must investigate the manner in which questions develop into problems within Ideas, how problems are enveloped by questions within thought. Here too, the classical image of thought must be confronted with another image, this one suggested by the contemporary renaissance of ontology.

From Plato to the post-Kantians, philosophy has defined the movement of thought as a certain type of passage from the hypothetical to the apodictic. Even the Cartesian movement from doubt to certainty is a variant of the passage. Another is the passage from hypothetical necessity to metaphysical necessity in the *On the Ultimate Origination of Things*. Already with Plato the dialectic was defined in this manner: depart from hypotheses, use hypotheses as springboards or 'problems' in order to attain the an-hypothetical principle which determines the solution to the problems as well as the truth of the hypotheses. The whole structure of the *Parmenides* follows from this, under conditions such that it is no longer possible to see therein a propaedeutics, a gymnastics, a game or a formal exercise, as has nevertheless been done ever so delicately. Kant himself is more Platonic than he thinks when he passes from the *Critique of Pure Reason*, entirely subordinated to the hypothetical form of possible experience, to the *Critique of Practical Reason* in which, with the aid of problems, he discovers the pure necessity of a categorical principle. Even more so the post-Kantians when they wish to transform hypothetical

judgement into thetic judgement immediately, without changing 'critiques'.[15] It is not illegitimate, therefore, to summarise in this way the movement of philosophy from Plato to Fichte or Hegel by way of Descartes, whatever the diversity of the initial hypotheses or the final apodicticities. There is at least something in common: namely, the point of departure found in a 'hypothesis' or proposition of consciousness affected by a coefficient of uncertainty (as with Cartesian doubt) and the point of arrival found in an eminently moral apodicticity or imperative (Plato's One-Good, the non-deceiving God of the Cartesian Cogito, Leibniz's principle of the best of all possible worlds, Kant's categorical imperative, Fichte's Self, Hegel's 'Science'). However, while this procedure maximally approximates the real movement of thought, it also maximally betrays and distorts this movement: this conjoint hypotheticism and moralism, this scientistic hypotheticism and this rationalist moralism, render unrecognisable what they approximate.

Suppose we say instead that the movement goes not from the hypothetical to the apodictic but from the problematical to the question: at first the difference seems very slight – all the slighter to the extent that while the apodictic is inseparable from a moral imperative, the question, for its part, is also inseparable from an imperative, albeit of another kind. A chasm nevertheless separates these two formulae. The assimilation of the problem and the hypothesis is already a betrayal of the problem or Idea, involving the illegitimate reduction of the latter to propositions of consciousness and to representations of knowledge: the problematical is different in kind from the hypothetical; the *thematic* is not to be confused with the *thetic*. At issue in this difference is the whole distribution, the whole determination, destination and exercise of the faculties within a general doctrine. Moreover, to speak of the apodictic instance and the question-instance is to speak of very different things, since these involve two kinds of imperative, incomparable in every respect. Questions are imperatives – or rather, *questions express the relation between problems and the imperatives from which they proceed.* Is it necessary to take the example of the police in order to demonstrate the imperative character of questions? 'I'm asking the questions.' In fact, however, it is already the dissolved self of the one being questioned which speaks through his torturer. Problems or Ideas emanate from imperatives of adventure or from events which appear in the form of questions. This is why problems are inseparable from a power of decision, a *fiat* which, when we are infused by it, makes us semi-divine beings. Did not mathematicians declare themselves to be descended from the gods? This power of decision is exercised to the highest degree in the two fundamental procedures of adjunction and condensation. It is grounded in the nature of the problems to be resolved, since it is always in relation to an ideal field added by the mathematician that an equation turns out to be reducible or not. The infinite power to add

an arbitrary quantity: it is no longer a question of a game after the manner of Leibniz, where the moral imperative of predetermined rules combines with the condition of a given space which must be filled *ex hypothesi*. It is rather a question of a throw of the dice, of the whole sky as open space and of throwing as the only rule. The singular points are on the die; the questions are the dice themselves; the imperative is to throw. Ideas are the problematic combinations which result from throws. The throw of the dice is in no way suggested as an abolition of chance (the sky-chance). To abolish chance is to fragment it according to the laws of probability over several throws, in such a way that the problem is already dismembered into hypotheses of win and loss, while the imperative is moralised into the principle of choosing the best hypothesis which determines a win. By contrast, the throw of the dice affirms chance every time; each throw of the dice affirms the whole of chance each time. The repetition of throws is not subject to the persistence of the same hypothesis, nor to the identity of a constant rule. The most difficult thing is to make chance an object of *affirmation*, but it is the sense of the imperative and the questions that it launches. Ideas emanate from it just as singularities emanate from that aleatory point which every time condenses the whole of chance into one time. It will be said that by assigning the imperative origin of Ideas to this point we invoke only the arbitrary, the simple arbitrariness of a child's game, the child-god. This, however, would be to misunderstand what it means to 'affirm'. Chance is arbitrary only in so far as it is not affirmed or not sufficiently affirmed, in so far as it is distributed within a space, a number and under rules destined to avert it. When chance is sufficiently affirmed the player can no longer lose, since every combination and every throw which produces it is by nature adequate to the place and the mobile command of the aleatory point. What does it mean, therefore, to affirm the whole of chance, every time, in a single time? This affirmation takes place to the degree that the disparates which emanate from a throw begin to resonate, thereby forming a problem. The whole of chance is then indeed in each throw, even though this be partial, and it is there in a single time even though the combination produced is the object of a progressive determination. The throw of the dice carries out the calculation of problems, the determination of differential elements or the distribution of singular points which constitute a structure. The circular relation between imperatives and the problems which follow from them is formed in this manner. Resonance constitutes the truth of a problem as such, in which the imperative is tested, even though the problem itself is born of the imperative. Once chance is affirmed, all arbitrariness is abolished every time. Once chance is affirmed, divergence itself is the object of affirmation within a problem. The ideal fields of adjunction which determine a problem remain in the grip of the arbitrary so long as the basic field does not resonate by incorporating all the values expressible by the adjunct. In

general a work is always in itself an ideal field, an ideal field of adjunction. The work is a problem born of the imperative; it is all the more perfect and total in a single throw as the problem is all the more progessively determined as a problem. The author of the work is therefore justly called the operator of the Idea. When Raymond Roussel poses his 'equations of facts' as problems to be solved, as ideal facts or events which begin to resonate as an effect of an imperative of language, or as facts which are themselves *fiats*; when many modern novelists install themselves in this aleatory point, this imperative and questioning 'blind spot' from which the work develops like a problem by making divergent series resonate – they are not doing applied mathematics, or employing a mathematical or physical metaphor. Rather, by establishing that 'science' or universal *mathesis* immediately in each domain, they make the work a process of learning or experimentation, but also something total every time, where the whole of chance is affirmed in each case, renewable every time, perhaps without any subsistent arbitrariness.[16]

This power of decision at the heart of problems, this creation or throw which makes us descendant from the gods, is nevertheless not our own. The gods themselves are subject to the *Anankē* or sky-chance. The imperatives and questions with which we are infused do not emanate from the I: it is not even there to hear them. The imperatives are those of being, while every question is ontological and distributes 'that which is' among problems. Ontology is the dice throw, the chaosmos from which the cosmos emerges. If the imperatives of Being have a relation with the I, it is with the fractured I in which, every time, they displace and reconstitute the fracture according to the order of time. Imperatives do indeed form the *cogitanda* of pure thought, the differentials of thought, at once that which cannot be thought and that which must be thought and can be thought only from the point of view of the transcendent exercise. Questions are these pure thoughts of the *cogitanda*. Imperatives in the form of questions thus signify our greatest powerlessness, but also that point of which Maurice Blanchot speaks endlessly: that blind, acephalic, aphasic and aleatory original point which designates 'the impossibility of thinking that is thought', that point at which 'powerlesness' is transmuted into power, that point which develops in the work in the form of a problem. Far from referring back to the Cogito as a proposition of consciousness, imperatives are addressed to the fractured I as though to the unconscious of thought. For the I has the rights of an unconscious without which it would not think, and in particular would not think the pure *cogitanda*. Contrary to what is stated by the banal propositions of consciousness, thought thinks only on the basis of an unconscious, and thinks that unconscious in the transcendent exercise. Consequently, far from being the properties or attributes of a thinking substance, the Ideas which derive from imperatives enter and leave only by that fracture in the I, which means that another

always thinks in me, another who must also be thought. Theft is primary in thought. Of course powerlessness can remain powerlessness, but it alone can also be raised to the highest power. This is precisely what Nietzsche meant by will to power: that imperative transmutation which takes powerlessness itself as an object (be cowardly, lazy or obedient if you wish! on condition that ...) – that dice throw capable of affirming the whole of chance, those questions with which we are infused during torrid or glacial hours, those imperatives which dedicate us to the problems they launch. For 'There is something irreducible in the depths of the spirit: a monolithic bloc of Fatum, of decision already taken on all problems in their measure and their relation to us; and also a right that we have to accede to certain problems, like a hot-iron brand imprinted on our names.'[17]

How disappointing this answer seems to be! We asked what was the origin of Ideas and where problems come from: in reply we invoke throws of the dice, imperatives and questions of chance instead of an apodictic principle; an aleatory point at which everything becomes *ungrounded* instead of a solid ground. We contrast this chance with arbitrariness to the extent that it is affirmed, imperatively affirmed, affirmed in the particular manner of the question; but we measure this affirmation itself by the resonance established between the problematic elements which result from a throw of the dice. In what circle do we turn such that we cannot speak of the origin in any other way? We distinguished four instances: imperative or ontological questions; dialectical problems or the themes which emerge from them; symbolic fields of solvability in which these problems are 'scientifically' expressed in accordance with their conditions; the solutions given in these fields when the problems are incarnated in the actuality of cases. From the outset, however, what are these fiery imperatives, these questions which are the beginning of the world? The fact is that every thing has its beginning in a question, but one cannot say that the question itself begins. Might the question, along with the imperative which it expresses, have no other origin than *repetition*? Great authors of our time (Heidegger, Blanchot) have exploited this most profound relation between the question and repetition. Not that it is sufficient, however, to repeat a single question which would remain intact at the end, even if this question is 'What is being?' [*Qu'en est-il de l'être?*]. It is the bad throws of the dice which are inscribed in the same hypotheses (representing propositions of consciousness or the opinions of a common sense) and approach what is more or less the same apodictic principle (representing the determination of the winning throw). It is the bad players who repeat only by fragmenting chance and dividing it among several throws. By contrast, the good throw of the dice affirms all of chance in one throw, and it is here that we find the essence of what is called a question. There are nevertheless several throws of the dice: the throw of the dice is repeated. Each, however, takes the chance all at once, and instead of having the different, or different

combinations, result from the Same, has the same, or the repetition, result from the Different. In this sense, the repetition which is consubstantial with the question is at the source of the 'perplication' of Ideas. The differential of the Idea is itself inseparable from the process of repetition which defined the throw of the dice. There is an iteration in calculus just as there is a repetition in problems which reproduces that of the questions or the imperatives from which it proceeds. Here again, however, it is not an ordinary repetition. Ordinary repetition is prolongation, continuation or that length of time which is stretched into duration: bare repetition (it can be discontinued, but remains fundamentally the repetition of the same). However, *who* is prolonged in this manner? A singularity, as far as the vicinity of another singularity? On the contrary, what defines the extraordinary power of that clothed repetition more profound than bare repetition is the reprise of singularities by one another, the condensation of singularities one into another, as much in the same problem or Idea as between one problem and another or from one Idea to another. Repetition is this emission of singularities, always with an echo or resonance which makes each the double of the other, or each constellation the redistribution of another. Moreover, it amounts to the same thing to say that clothed repetition is more profound at the level of problems, and that repetition results from the different at the level of the questions from which these proceed.

Heidegger shows clearly how the repetition of the question itself develops in the relation between the problem and repetition:

> By a repetition of a fundamental problem we understand the disclosure of the primordial possibilities concealed in it. The development of these possibilities has the effect of transforming the problem and thus preserving it in its import as a problem. To preserve a problem means to free and to safeguard its *intrinsic powers, which are the source of its essence and which make it possible as a problem.* The repetition of the possibilities of a problem, therefore, is not a simple taking up of that which is 'in vogue' with regard to this problem. ... The possible, thus understood, in fact hinders all genuine repetition and thereby all relation to history. ... [A good interpretation must, on the contrary, decide] how far the understanding of the possible which governs all repetition extends and whether it is equal to that which is repeatable.[18]

What is this possible at the heart of a problem which stands opposed to the possibilities or propositions of consciousness, to the currently accepted opinions which make up hypotheses? Nothing but the potentiality of an Idea, its determinable virtuality. On this point, Heidegger is Nietzschean. Of what is repetition said in the eternal return if not the will to power, the world of the will to power with its imperatives, its throws of the dice and its problems resulting from such throws? Repetition in the eternal return

never means continuation, perpetuation or prolongation, nor even the discontinuous return of something which would at least be able to be prolonged in a partial cycle (an identity, an I, a Self) but, on the contrary, the reprise of pre-individual singularities which, in order that it can be grasped as repetition, presupposes the dissolution of all prior identities. Every origin is a singularity and every singularity a commencement on the horizontal line, the line of ordinary points on which it is prolonged like so many reproductions or copies which form the moments of a bare repetition. It is also, however, a recommencement on the vertical line which condenses singularities and on which is woven the other repetition, the line of the affirmation of chance. If 'being' is above all difference and commencement, Being is itself repetition, the recommencement of being. Repetition is the 'provided' of the condition which authenticates the imperatives of Being. This is the constant ambiguity of the notion of origin and the reason for our earlier deception: origins are assigned only in a world which challenges the original as much as the copy, and an origin assigns a ground only in a world already precipitated into universal *ungrounding*.

One final consequence remains, concerning the status of negation. There is a non-being, yet there is neither negative nor negation. There is a non-being which is by no means the being of the negative, but rather the being of the problematic. The symbol for this (non)-being or ?-being is 0/0. The zero here refers only to difference and its repetition. This (non)-being which corresponds to the form of a problematic field, even though the modalities of proposition tend to assimilate it to negative non-being, reappears with the so-called expletive 'Ne' which grammarians have so much difficulty in interpreting: like the witness of an extra-propositional grammatical instance, an expletive 'Ne' always appears in propositions where there is a question developed into a problem. The negative is an illusion, no more than a shadow of problems. We have seen how problems were necessarily hidden by possible propositions corresponding to cases of solution: instead of being grasped as problems, they can then appear as no more than hypotheses or series of hypotheses. As a proposition of consciousness, each of these hypotheses is flanked by a double negative: whether the One is, whether the One is not ... whether it is fine, whether it is not fine. ... The negative is an illusion because the form of negation appears with propositions which express the problem on which they depend only by distorting it and obscuring its real structure. Once the problem is translated into hypotheses, each hypothetical affirmation is doubled by a negation, which amounts to the state of a problem betrayed by its shadow. There is no Idea of the negative any more than there are hypotheses in nature, even though nature does proceed by means of problems. That is why it matters little whether the negative is understood as logical limitation or real opposition. Consider the great negative notions such as the many in relation to the One, disorder in relation to order,

nothingness in relation to being: it makes no difference whether they are interpreted as the limit of a process of degeneration or as the antithesis of a thesis. At best, the process will be grounded, either in the analytic substance of God or in the synthetic form of the Self. God or the self, it is the same thing. In both cases we remain in the hypothetical element of a simple concept, under which are subsumed either all the infinite degrees of an identical representation or the infinite opposition of two contrary representations. Critiques of the negative are never decisive as long as they invoke the rights of a first concept (the One, order, being); they are no more so as long as they are content to translate opposition into limitation. The critique of the negative is effective only when it denounces the interchangeability of opposition and limitation, thereby denouncing the hypothetical conceptual element which necessarily sustains one or the other, or even one by means of the other. In short, the critique of the negative must be conducted on the basis of the ideal, differential and problematic element, on the basis of the Idea. It is the notion of multiplicity which denounces simultaneously the One and the many, the limitation of the One by the many and the opposition of the many to the One. It is variety which denounces simultaneously order and disorder, and (non)-being or ?-being which denounces simultaneously both being and non-being. The complicity of the negative and the hypothetical must everywhere be dissolved in favour of a more profound link between difference and the problematic. In effect, the Idea is made up of reciprocal relations between differential elements, completely determined by those relations which never include any negative term or relation of negativity. The oppositions, conflicts and contradictions in the concept appear such crude and rough measures by contrast with the fine and differential mechanisms which characterise the Idea – weight in contrast to lightness. We should reserve the name 'positivity' for this state of the multiple Idea or this consistency of the problematic. Moreover, we must guard every time against the manner in which this perfectly positive (non)-being leans towards a negative non-being and tends to collapse into its own shadow, finding there its most profound distortion, to the further advantage of the illusion of consciousness.

Take the example of the linguistic Idea, so frequently invoked today. As defined by phonology, the linguistic Idea certainly has all the characteristics of a structure: the presence of differential elements, called phonemes, extracted from the continuous sonorous flux; the existence of differential relations (distinctive features) which reciprocally and completely determine these elements; the value of singular points assumed by the phonemes in that determination (pertinent particularities); the manner in which the system of language so constituted assumes the character of a multiplicity, the problematic nature of which objectively represents the set of problems which the language poses for itself, and

solves in the constitution of significations; the unconscious, non-actual and virtual character of the elements and relations, along with their double status of transcendence and immanence with regard to the sounds actually articulated; the double actualisation of the differential elements, the double incarnation of the differential relations at once both in different languages and in the different significant parts of the same language (differenciation), each language incarnating certain varieties of relation and certain singular points; the complementarity of sense and structure, genesis and structure, where this takes the form of a passive genesis which is revealed in this actualisation. Now, despite all these aspects which define a fully positive multiplicity, linguists constantly speak in negative terms and assimilate the differential relations between phonemes to relations of opposition. Perhaps it might be said that this is only a matter of conventional terminology, and that 'opposition' here means simply correlation. It is true that the notion of opposition employed by linguists seems particularly pluralised and relativised, since each phoneme enters into several distinct oppositions with other phonemes from different points of view. For example, in Trubetzkoy's classification, opposition is so dismembered and distributed among the coexisting varieties of relation that it no longer exists as opposition but rather as a complex or perplexed differential mechanism. A Hegelian would not be at home there, in the absence of the uniformity of a large contradiction. Nevertheless, we touch here upon an essential point: here as elsewhere, in phonology as well as in other domains and with regard to other Ideas, it is a question of knowing whether it is enough to pluralise opposition or to overdetermine contradiction and to distribute them among different figures which, despite everything, still preserve the form of the negative. It seems to us that pluralism is a more enticing and dangerous thought: fragmentation implies overturning. The discovery in any domain of a plurality of coexisting oppositions is inseparable from a more profound discovery, that of difference, which denounces the negative and opposition itself as no more than appearances in relation to the problematic field of a positive multiplicity.[19] One cannot pluralise opposition without leaving its domain and entering the caves of difference which resonate with a pure positivity and reject opposition as no more than a shadow cavern seen from without.

To return to the linguistic Idea: why does Saussure, at the very moment when he discovers that 'in language there are only differences', add that these differences are 'without positive terms' and 'eternally negative'? Why does Trubetzkoy maintain as sacred the principle that 'the idea of difference' which is constitutive of language 'presupposes the idea of opposition'? Everything points to the contrary. Is this not a way of introducing the point of view of consciousness and actual representations into what should be the transcendent exploration of the Idea of the linguistic unconscious – in other words, the highest exercise of speech in

relation to the point zero of language? When we interpret differences under the category of opposition and as negatives, are we not already on the side of the listener, even that of the bad listener who hesitates between several possible versions of what was actually said and tries to find himself by establishing oppositions? In other words, are we not on the lesser side of language rather than the side of the one who speaks and assigns meaning? Have we not already betrayed the nature of the play of language – in other words, the sense of that combinatory, of those imperatives or linguistic throws of the dice which, like Artaud's cries, can be understood only by the one who speaks in the transcendent exercise of language? In short, the translation of difference into opposition seems to us to concern not a simple question of terminology or convention, but rather the essence of language and the linguistic Idea. When difference is read as opposition, it is deprived of the peculiar thickness in which its positivity is affirmed. Modern phonology lacks a dimension which would prevent it from playing with shadows on a single plane. In a sense, this is Gustave Guillaume's message throughout his work, the importance of which is today beginning to be understood. For opposition teaches us nothing about the nature of that which is thought to be opposed. The selection of phonemes possessing pertinent value in this or that language is inseparable from that of morphemes as elements of grammatical constructions. Moreover, the morphemes, which on their own account bring into play the virtual whole of the language, are the object of a progressive determination which proceeds by 'differential thresholds' and implies a purely logical time capable of measuring the genesis or actualisation. The formal reciprocal determination of the phonemes refers to that progressive determination which expresses the action of the virtual system on the phonic matter; and it is only when the phonemes are considered abstractly – in other words, when the virtual is reduced to a simple possible – that their relations take the negative form of an empty opposition, rather than that of filling differential positions around a threshold. The fundamental lesson of Guillaume's work is the substitution of a principle of *differential position* for that of distinctive opposition.[20] This substitution takes place to the extent that morphology is no longer simply a continuation of phonology, but rather introduces properly problematic values which determine the significant selection of phonemes. For us, it is from this linguistic point of view that non-being finds the confirmation of its necessary dissociation: on the one hand, in a NE that we have called 'discordant', *disparate* or differential rather than negative, a problematic NE which should be written as (non)-being or ?-being; on the other hand, in a so-called 'foreclusive' PAS which should be written as *non*-being, but which indicates in the engendered proposition only the result of the preceding process. In fact, it is not the expletive NE which presents a little-understood special case of negation: rather, the expletive NE is the

original sense from which emerges the negation PAS, both as a necessary consequence and as an inevitable illusion. 'Ne ... pas' divides into a problematic NE and a negative PAS which are like two instances differing in kind, the second of which attracts the first only in order to betray it.

The genesis of the negative is as follows: the affirmations of being are genetic elements in the form of imperative questions; these develop in the positivity of problems; the propositions of consciousness are engendered affirmations which designate cases of solution. Each proposition, however, has a double negative which expresses the shadow of the problem in the domain of solutions – in other words, it expresses the manner in which the problem subsists in the distorted image of it given in representation. The formula 'That is not the case' means that a hypothesis passes over into the negative in so far as it does not represent the currently fulfilled conditions of a problem, to which, on the contrary, another proposition corresponds. The negative is indeed, therefore, the turning shadow of the problematic upon the set of propositions that it subsumes as cases. As a general rule, the critique of the negative remains ineffective so long as it assumes as given the form of affirmation ready made in the proposition. The critique of the negative is radical and well grounded only when it carries out a genesis of affirmation and, *simultaneously*, the genesis of the appearance of negation. For the question is to know how affirmation itself can be multiple, or how difference as such can be the object of pure affirmation. This is possible only to the extent that affirmation as a mode of the proposition is produced from extra-propositional genetic elements (the imperative questions or original ontological affirmations), then 'carried through' or determined by way of problems (multiplicities or problematic Ideas, ideal positivities). Under these conditions, it must be said in effect that the negative in the proposition sits alongside affirmation, but only as the shadow of the problem to which the proposition is thought to respond – in other words, like the shadow of the genetic instance which produces the affirmation itself.

Ideas contain all the varieties of differential relations and all the distributions of singular points coexisting in diverse orders 'perplicated' in one another. When the virtual content of an Idea is actualised, the varieties of relation are incarnated in distinct species while the singular points which correspond to the values of one variety are incarnated in the distinct parts characteristic of this or that species. The Idea of colour, for example, is like white light which perplicates in itself the genetic elements and relations of all the colours, but is actualised in the diverse colours with their respective spaces; or the Idea of sound, which is also like white noise. There is even a white society and a white language, the latter being that which contains in its virtuality all the phonemes and relations destined to be actualised in diverse languages and in the distinctive parts of a given language. Thus, with actualisation, a new type of specific and partitive distinction takes the

place of the fluent ideal distinctions. We call the determination of the virtual content of an Idea differentiation; we call the actualisation of that virtuality into species and distinguished parts differenciation. It is always in relation to a differentiated problem or to the differentiated conditions of a problem that a differenciation of species and parts is carried out, as though it corresponded to the cases of solution of the problem. It is always a problematic field which conditions a differenciation within the milieu in which it is incarnated. Consequently – and this is all we wish to say – the negative appears neither in the process of differentiation nor in the process of differenciation. The Idea knows nothing of negation. The first process is identical with the description of a pure positivity, in the form of a problem to which are assigned relations and points, places and functions, positions and differential thresholds which exclude all negative determination and find their source in the genetic or productive elements of affirmation. The other process is identical with the production of finite engendered affirmations which bear upon the actual terms which occupy these places and positions, and upon the real relations which incarnate these relations and these functions. Forms of the negative do indeed appear in actual terms and real relations, but only in so far as these are cut off from the virtuality which they actualise, and from the movement of their actualisation. Then, and only then, do the finite affirmations appear limited in themselves, opposed to one another, and suffering from lack or privation. In short, the negative is always derived and represented, never original or present: the process of difference and of differenciation is primary in relation to that of the negative and opposition. Those commentators on Marx who insist upon the fundamental difference between Marx and Hegel rightly point out that in *Capital* the category of differenciation (the differenciation at the heart of a social multiplicity: the division of labour) is substituted for the Hegelian concepts of opposition, contradiction and alienation, the latter forming only an apparent movement and standing only for abstract effects separated from the principle and from the real movement of their production.[21] Clearly, at this point the philosophy of difference must be wary of turning into the discourse of beautiful souls: differences, nothing but differences, in a peaceful coexistence in the Idea of social places and functions ... but the name of Marx is sufficient to save it from this danger.

The problems of a society, as they are determined in the infrastructure in the form of so-called 'abstract' labour, receive their solution from the process of actualisation or differenciation (the concrete division of labour). However, as long as the problem throws its shadow over the ensemble of differenciated cases forming the solution, these will present a falsified image of the problem itself. It cannot even be said that the falsification comes afterwards: it accompanies or doubles the actualisation. A problem is always reflected in *false problems* while it is being solved, so that the

solution is generally perverted by an inseparable falsity. For example, according to Marx, fetishism is indeed an absurdity, an illusion of social consciousness, so long as we understand by this not a subjective illusion born of individual consciousness but an objective or transcendental illusion born out of the conditions of social consciousness in the course of its actualisation. There are those for whom the whole of differenciated social existence is tied to the false problems which enable them to live, and others for whom social existence is entirely contained in the false problems of which they occupy the fraudulent positions, and from which they suffer. All the figures of non-sense appear in the objective field of the false problem: that is, all the counterfeit forms of affirmation, distortions of elements and relations, and confusions of the distinctive with the ordinary. This is why history is no less the locus of non-sense and stupidity than it is the process of sense or meaning. While it is the nature of consciousness to be false, problems by their nature escape consciousness. The natural object of social consciousness or common sense with regard to the recognition of value is the fetish. Social problems can be grasped only by means of a 'rectification' which occurs when the faculty of sociability is raised to its transcendent exercise and breaks the unity of fetishistic common sense. The transcendent object of the faculty of sociability is revolution. In this sense, revolution is the social power of difference, the paradox of society, the particular wrath of the social Idea. Revolution never proceeds by way of the negative. We could not have established the first determination of the negative, as *shadow of the problem as such*, without already being embarked upon a second determination: the negative is *the objective field of the false problem*, the fetish in person. The negative is both shadow of the problem and false problem *par excellence*. Practical struggle never proceeds by way of the negative but by way of difference and its power of affirmation, and the war of the righteous is for the conquest of the highest power, that of deciding problems by restoring them to their truth, by evaluating that truth beyond the representations of consciousness and the forms of the negative, and by acceding at last to the imperatives on which they depend.

We have ceaselessly invoked the virtual. In so doing, have we not fallen into the vagueness of a notion closer to the undetermined than to the determinations of difference? It is precisely this, however, that we wished to avoid in speaking of the virtual. We opposed the virtual and the real: although it could not have been more precise before now, this terminology must be corrected. The virtual is opposed not to the real but to the actual. *The virtual is fully real in so far as it is virtual.* Exactly what Proust said of states of resonance must be said of the virtual: 'Real without being actual, ideal without being abstract'; and symbolic without being fictional. Indeed,

the virtual 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. Accounts of the differential calculus often liken the differential to a 'portion of the difference'. Or, following Lagrange's method, the question is asked which part of the mathematical object presents the relations in question and must be considered derived. The reality of the virtual consists of the differential elements and relations along with the singular points which correspond to them. The reality of the virtual is structure. We must avoid giving the elements and relations which form a structure an actuality which they do not have, and withdrawing from them a reality which they have. We have seen that a double process of reciprocal determination and complete determination defined that reality: far from being undetermined, the virtual is completely determined. When it is claimed that works of art are immersed in a virtuality, what is being invoked is not some confused determination but the completely determined structure formed by its genetic differential elements, its 'virtual' or 'embryonic' elements. The elements, varieties of relations and singular points coexist in the work or the object, in the virtual part of the work or object, without it being possible to designate a point of view privileged over others, a centre which would unify the other centres. How, then, can we speak simultaneously of both complete determination and only a part of the object? The determination must be a complete determination of the object, yet form only a part of it. Following suggestions made by Descartes in his *Replies to Arnaud*, we must carefully distinguish the object in so far as it is complete and the object in so far as it is whole. What is complete is only the ideal part of the object, which participates with other parts of objects in the Idea (other relations, other singular points), but never constitutes an integral whole as such. What the complete determination lacks is the whole set of relations belonging to actual existence. An object may be *ens*, or rather *(non)-ens omni modo determinatum*, without being entirely determined or actually existing.

There is thus another part of the object which is determined by actualisation. Mathematicians ask: What is this other part represented by the so-called primitive function? In this sense, integration is by no means the inverse of differentiation but, rather, forms an original process of differenciation. Whereas differentiation determines the virtual content of the Idea as problem, differenciation expresses the actualisation of this virtual and the constitution of solutions (by local integrations). Differenciation is like the second part of difference, and in order to designate the integrity or the integrality of the object we require the complex notion of differen*t*/*c*iation. The *t* and the *c* here are the distinctive feature or the phonological relation of difference in person. Every object is double without it being the case that the two halves resemble one another, one being a virtual image and the other an actual image. They are unequal

odd halves. Differentiation itself already has two aspects of its own, corresponding to the varieties of relations and to the singular points dependent upon the values of each variety. However, differenciation in turn has two aspects, one concerning the qualities or diverse species which actualise the varieties, the other concerning number or the distinct parts actualising the singular points. For example, genes as a system of differential relations are incarnated at once both in a species and in the organic parts of which it is composed. There is in general no quality which does not refer to a space defined by the singularities corresponding to the differential relations incarnated in that quality. The work of Lavelle and of Nogué, for example, has shown the existence of spaces belonging to qualities and the manner in which these spaces are constructed alongside singularities, so that a difference in quality is always subtended by a spatial difference (*diaphora*). Furthermore, the reflections of painters teach us everything about the space of each colour and the alignment of such spaces within a work. Species are differenciated only in so far as each has parts which are themselves differenciated. Differenciation is always simultaneously differenciation of species and parts, of qualities and extensities: determination of qualities or determination of species, but also partition or organisation. How, then, do these two aspects of differenciation connect with the two preceding aspects of differentiation? How do the two dissimilar halves of an object fit together? Qualities and species incarnate the varieties of actual relation; organic parts incarnate the corresponding singularities. However, the precision with which they fit together is better seen from two complementary points of view.

On the one hand, complete determination carries out the differentiation of singularities, but it bears only upon their existence and their distribution. The nature of these singular points is specified only by the form of the neighbouring integral curves – in other words, by virtue of the actual or differenciated species and spaces. On the other hand, the essential aspects of sufficient reason – determinability, reciprocal determination, complete determination – find their systematic unity in progressive determination. In effect, the reciprocity of determination does not signify a regression, nor a marking time, but a veritable progression in which the reciprocal terms must be secured step by step, and the relations themselves established between them. The completeness of the determination also implies the progressivity of adjunct fields. In going from A to B and then B to A, we do not arrive back at the point of departure as in a bare repetition; rather, the repetition between A and B and B and A is the progressive tour or description of the whole of a problematic field. It is like Vitrac's poem, where the different steps which each form a poem (Writing, Dreaming, Forgetting, Looking for the opposite, Humourising and finally *Rediscovering by analysing*) progressively determine the whole poem as a problem or a multiplicity. In this sense, by virtue of this progressivity, every

structure has a purely logical, ideal or dialectical time. However, this virtual time itself determines a time of differenciation, or rather rhythms or different times of actualisation which correspond to the relations and singularities of the structure and, for their part, measure the passage from virtual to actual. In this regard, four terms are synonymous: actualise, differenciate, integrate and solve. For the nature of the virtual is such that, for it, to be actualised is to be differenciated. Each differenciation is a local integration or a local solution which then connects with others in the overall solution or the global integration. This is how, in the case of the organic, the process of actualisation appears simultaneously as the local differenciation of parts, the global formation of an internal milieu, and the solution of a problem posed within the field of constitution of an organism.[22] An organism is nothing if not the solution to a problem, as are each of its differenciated organs, such as the eye which solves a light 'problem'; but nothing within the organism, no organ, would be differenciated without the internal milieu endowed with a general effectivity or integrating power of regulation. (Here again, in the case of living matter, the negative forms of opposition and contradiction, obstacle and need, are secondary and derivative in relation to the imperatives of an organism to be constructed or a problem to be solved.)

The only danger in all this is that the virtual could be confused with the possible. The possible is opposed to the real; the process undergone by the possible is therefore a 'realisation'. By contrast, the virtual is not opposed to the real; it possesses a full reality by itself. The process it undergoes is that of actualisation. It would be wrong to see only a verbal dispute here: it is a question of existence itself. Every time we pose the question in terms of possible and real, we are forced to conceive of existence as a brute eruption, a pure act or leap which always occurs behind our backs and is subject to a law of all or nothing. What difference can there be between the existent and the non-existent if the non-existent is already possible, already included in the concept and having all the characteristics that the concept confers upon it as a possibility? Existence is *the same* as but outside the concept. Existence is therefore supposed to occur in space and time, but these are understood as indifferent milieux instead of the production of existence occurring in a characteristic space and time. Difference can no longer be anything but the negative determined by the concept: either the limitation imposed by possibles upon each other in order to be realised, or the opposition of the possible to the reality of the real. The virtual, by contrast, is the characteristic state of Ideas: it is on the basis of its reality that existence is produced, in accordance with a time and a space immanent in the Idea.

Secondly, the possible and the virtual are further distinguished by the fact that one refers to the form of identity in the concept, whereas the other designates a pure multiplicity in the Idea which radically excludes the

identical as a prior condition. Finally, to the extent that the possible is open to 'realisation', it is understood as an image of the real, while the real is supposed to resemble the possible. That is why it is difficult to understand what existence adds to the concept when all it does is double like with like. Such is the defect of the possible: a defect which serves to condemn it as produced after the fact, as retroactively fabricated in the image of what resembles it. The actualisation of the virtual, on the contrary, always takes place by difference, divergence or differenciation. Actualisation breaks with resemblance as a process no less than it does with identity as a principle. Actual terms never resemble the singularities they incarnate. In this sense, actualisation or differenciation is always a genuine creation. It does not result from any limitation of a pre-existing possibility. It is contradictory to speak of 'potential', as certain biologists do, and to define differenciation by the simple limitation of a global power, as though this potential were indistinguishable from a logical possibility. For a potential or virtual object, to be actualised is to create divergent lines which correspond to – without resembling – a virtual multiplicity. The virtual possesses the reality of a task to be performed or a problem to be solved: it is the problem which orientates, conditions and engenders solutions, but these do not resemble the conditions of the problem. Bergson was right, therefore, to say that from the point of view of differenciation, even the resemblances which appear along divergent lines of evolution (for example, the eye as an 'analogous' organ) must be related first of all to the heterogeneity in the production mechanism. Moreover, the subordination of difference to identity and that of difference to similitude must be overturned in the same movement. What is this correspondence, however, without resemblance or creative differenciation? The Bergsonian schema which unites *Creative Evolution* and *Matter and Memory* begins with the account of a gigantic memory, a multiplicity formed by the virtual coexistence of all the sections of the 'cone', each section being the repetition of all the others and being distinguished from them only by the order of the relations and the distribution of singular points. Then, the actualisation of this mnemonic virtual appears to take the form of the creation of divergent lines, each of which corresponds to a virtual section and represents a manner of solving a problem, but also the incarnation of the order of relations and distribution of singularities peculiar to the given section in differenciated species and parts.[23] Difference and repetition in the virtual ground the movement of actualisation, of differenciation as creation. They are thereby substituted for the identity and the resemblance of the possible, which inspires only a pseudo-movement, the false movement of realisation understood as abstract limitation.

Any hesitation between the virtual and the possible, the order of the Idea and the order of the concept, is disastrous, since it abolishes the reality of the virtual. There are traces of such an oscillation in the philosophy of

Leibniz. Every time Leibniz speaks of Ideas, he presents them as virtual multiplicities made of differential relations and singular points, which thought apprehends in a state close to sleep, stupor, swooning, death, amnesia, murmuring or intoxication. ...[24] However, that in which Ideas are actualised is rather conceived as a possible, a realised possible. This hesitation between the possible and the virtual explains why no one has gone further than Leibniz in the exploration of sufficient reason, and why, nevertheless, no one has better maintained the illusion of a subordination of that sufficient reason to the identical. No one has come closer to a movement of vice-diction in the Idea, but no one has better maintained the supposed right of representation, albeit at the price of rendering it infinite. No one has been better able to immerse thought in the element of difference and provide it with a differential unconscious, surround it with little glimmerings and singularities, all in order to save and reconstitute the homogeneity of a natural light *à la* Descartes. It is in effect with Descartes that the principle of representation as good sense or common sense appears in its highest form. We can call this the principle of the 'clear *and* distinct', or the principle of the proportionality of the clear and the distinct: an idea is all the more distinct the clearer it is, and clarity-distinctness constitutes the light which renders thought possible in the common exercise of all the faculties. Given this principle, we cannot overemphasize the importance of a remark that Leibniz constantly makes in his logic of ideas: a clear idea is in itself confused; it is confused *in so far as it is clear*. Without doubt, this remark may be accommodated within the Cartesian logic, and taken to mean simply that a clear idea is confused because it is not yet clear enough in all its parts. Moreover, is this not how Leibniz himself finally tends to interpret it? However, is it not also susceptible to another more radical interpretation, according to which there would be a difference between the clear and the distinct, not just of degree but in kind, such that the clear would be in itelf confused and the distinct in itself obscure? What is this distinct–obscure which corresponds to the clear–confused? Consider Leibniz's famous passages on the murmuring of the sea. Here too, two interpretations are possible. Either we say that the apperception of the whole noise is clear but confused (not distinct) because the component little perceptions are themselves not clear but obscure; or we say that the little perceptions are themselves distinct and obscure (not clear): distinct because they grasp differential relations and singularities; obscure because they are not yet 'distinguished', not yet differenciated. These singularities then condense to determine a threshold of consciousness in relation to our bodies, a threshold of differenciation on the basis of which the little perceptions are actualised, but actualised in an apperception which in turn is only clear and confused; clear because it is distinguished or differenciated, and confused because it is clear. The problem is then no longer posed in terms of whole–parts (from the point of view of logical

possibility) but in terms of virtual–actual (actualisation of differential relations, incarnation of singular points). At this point, the value of representation in the common sense divides into two irreducible values in the para-sense: a distinctness which can only be obscure, the more obscure the more it is distinct; and a confusion–clarity which can only be confused. The nature of the Idea is to be distinct and obscure. In other words, the Idea is precisely *real without being actual, differentiated without being differenciated, and complete without being entire.* Distinctness–obscurity is intoxication, the properly philosophical stupor or the Dionysian Idea. Leibniz very nearly encountered Dionysus at the sea shore or near the water mill. Perhaps Apollo, the clear–confused thinker, is needed in order to think the Ideas of Dionysus. However, the two never unite in order to reconstitute a natural light. Rather, they compose two languages which are encoded in the language of philosophy and directed at the divergent exercise of the faculties: the disparity of style.

How does actualisation occur in things themselves? Why is differenciation at once both composition and determination of qualities, organisation and determination of species? Why is differenciation differenciated along these two complementary paths? Beneath the actual qualities and extensities, species and parts, there are spatio–temporal dynamisms. These are the actualising, differenciating agencies. They must be surveyed in every domain, even though they are ordinarily hidden by the constituted qualities and extensities. Embryology shows that the division of an egg into parts is secondary in relation to more significant morphogenetic movements: the augmentation of free surfaces, stretching of cellular layers, invagination by folding, regional displacement of groups. A whole kinematics of the egg appears, which implies a dynamic. Moreover, this dynamic expresses something ideal. Transport is Dionysian, divine and delirious, before it is local transfer. Types of egg are therefore distinguished by the orientations, the axes of development, the differential speeds and rhythms which are the primary factors in the actualisation of a structure and create a space and a time peculiar to that which is actualised. Baër concluded, on the one hand, that differenciation went from the more general to the less general because the dynamic structural characteristics of the major types or branches appeared before the merely formal characteristics of the species, the genus or even the class; and, on the other hand, that the irreducibility of these dynamisms, the fault lines between these types, imposed actual distinctions between Ideas and singular limitations upon the possibilities of evolution. However, these two points raise many problems. In the first place, the highest generalities put forward by Baër are generalities only for an adult observer who contemplates them from without. In themselves, they are lived by the individual-embryo in its field of individuation. Furthermore –

as Vialleton, a disciple of Baër, points out – they can only be lived, and lived only by the individual-embryo: there are 'things' that only an embryo can do, movements that it alone can undertake or even withstand (for example, the anterior member of the tortoise undergoes a relative displacement of 180 degrees, while the neck involves the forward slippage of a variable number of proto-vertebrae).[25] The destiny and achievement of the embryo is to live the unlivable, to sustain forced movements of a scope which would break any skeleton or tear ligaments. It is indeed true that differenciation is progressive and serial: the characteristics of the major types appear before those of genus and species in the order of the determination of species; and in the order of organisation, this shoot is the beginning of a paw before it becomes a right or left paw. Rather than a difference in generality, however, this movement implies a difference in kind: rather than discovering the more general beneath the less general, we discover pure spatio–temporal dynamisms (the lived experience of the embryo) with regard to the constituted parts and qualities, beneath the morphological, histological, anatomical, physiological and other characteristics. Rather than going from more to less general, determination progresses from virtual to actual in accordance with the primary factors of actualisation. The notion of 'generality' here suffers the disadvantage of suggesting a confusion between the virtual, in so far as it is actualised by a process of creation, and the possible, in so far as it is realised by limitation. Before the embryo as general support of qualities and parts there is the embryo as individual and patient subject of spatio–temporal dynamisms, the larval subject.

As for the other aspect, that of the possibility of evolution, we must approach it in terms of pre-evolutionist polemics. The great controversy between Cuvier and Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire concerns the unity of composition: is there an Animal in itself or an Idea of the universal animal – or do the sub-kingdoms introduce impassable gulfs between the types of animal? The discussion finds its poetic method and test in *folding*: is it possible to pass by folding from Vertebrate to Cephalopod? Can a Vertebrate be folded in such a manner that the two ends of the spine approach one another, the head moving towards the feet, the pelvis towards the neck, and the viscera arranged in the manner of Cephalopods? Cuvier denies that folding can produce such an arrangement. What animal could pass the test, even reduced to its dry skeleton? Geoffroy, it is true, does not claim that the passage is carried out by folding; his argument is more profound: that there are developmental times which stop a given animal at a particular degree of composition ('organ A would be in an unusual relation to organ C if B were not produced, or if development had stopped too soon and prevented its production').[26] The introduction of the temporal factor is essential, even though Geoffroy conceives of it only in the form of stoppages – in other words, progressive stages ordered

according to the realisation of a *possible* common to all animals. It is enough to endow time with its true meaning of creative actualisation for evolution to find a principle which conditions it. For if, from the point of view of actualisation, the dynamism of spatial directions determines a differenciation of types, then the more or less rapid times immanent to these dynamisms ground the passage from one to the other, from one differenciated type to another, either by deceleration or by acceleration. With contracted or extended times and according to the reasons for acceleration or delay, other spaces are created. Even the stoppage assumes the aspect of a creative actualisation in the case of neoteny. In principle, the temporal factor allows the transformation of dynamisms, even though these may be asymmetrical, spatially irreducible and completely differenciated – or rather, differenciating. In this sense, Perrier saw phenomena of 'accelerated repetition' (tachygenesis) at the origin of the branchings of the animal kingdom, and found in the precocity of the appearance of types a superior proof of evolution itself.[27]

The entire world is an egg. The double differenciation of species and parts always presupposes spatio–temporal dynamisms. Take a division into 24 cellular elements endowed with similar characteristics: nothing yet tells us the dynamic process by which it was obtained – 2 x 12, (2 x 2) + (2 x 10), or (2 x 4) + (2 x 8) ...? Even Platonic division would lack a rule with which to distinguish the two sides, if movements and orientations or spatial lines did not provide one. Thus, in the case of fishing: entrap the prey or strike it, strike it from top to bottom or from bottom to top. It is the dynamic processes which determine the actualisation of Ideas. But what is their relation to this actualisation? They are precisely *dramas*, they dramatise the Idea. On the one hand, they create or trace a space corresponding to the differential relations and to the singularities to be actualised. When a cellular migration takes place, as Raymond Ruyer shows, it is the requirements of a 'role' in so far as this follows from a structural 'theme' to be actualised which determines the situation, not the other way round.[28] The world is an egg, but the egg itself is a theatre: a staged theatre in which the roles dominate the actors, the spaces dominate the roles and the Ideas dominate the spaces. Furthermore, by virtue of the complexity of Ideas and their relations with other Ideas, the spatial dramatisation is played out on several levels: in the constitution of an internal space, but also in the manner in which that space extends into the external extensity, occupying a region of it. For example, the internal space of a colour is not to be confused with the manner in which it occupies an extensity where it enters into relations with other colours, whatever the affinity between these two processes. A living being is not only defined genetically, by the dynamisms which determine its internal milieu, but also ecologically, by the external movements which preside over its distribution within an extensity. A kinetics of population adjoins, without resembling,

the kinetics of the egg; a geographic process of isolation may be no less formative of species than internal genetic variations, and sometimes precedes the latter.[29] Everything is even more complicated when we consider that the internal space is itself made up of multiple spaces which must be locally integrated and connected, and that this connection, which may be achieved in many ways, pushes the object or living being to its own limits, all in contact with the exterior; and that this relation with the exterior, and with other things and living beings, implies in turn connections and global integrations which differ in kind from the preceding. Everywhere a staging at several levels.

On the other hand, the dynamisms are no less temporal than spatial. They constitute a time of actualisation or differenciation no less than they outline spaces of actualisation. Not only do these spaces begin to incarnate differential relations between elements of the reciprocally and completely determined structure, but the times of differenciation incarnate the time of the structure, the time of progressive determination. Such times may be called differential rhythms in view of their role in the actualisation of the Idea. Finally, beneath species and parts, we find only these times, these rates of growth, these paces of development, these decelerations or accelerations, these durations of gestation. It is not wrong to say that time alone provides the response to a question, and space alone provides the solution to a problem. Consider the following example, concerning sterility and fecundity (in the case of the female sea-urchin and the male annelid): *problem* – will certain paternal chromosomes be incorporated into new nuclei, or will they be dispersed into the protoplasm? *question* – will they arrive soon enough? However, the distinction is obviously relative, for it is clear that the dynamism is simultaneously temporal and spatial – in other words, spatio–temporal (in this case, the formation of cones of division, the splitting of chromosomes and the movement which takes them to the poles of the cones). The duality does not exist in the process of actualisation itself, but only in its outcome, in the actual terms, species and parts. Nor is it a question of a real distinction but rather a strict complementarity, since the species designates the quality of the parts just as the parts designate the number of the species. More precisely, the species gathers the time of the dynamism into a quality (lion-ness, frog-ness) while the parts outline its space. A quality always flashes within a space and endures the whole time of that space. In short, dramatisation is the differenciation of differenciation, at once both qualitative and quantitative. However, in saying 'at once' we mean that differenciation differenciates itself into these two correlative paths, species and parts, determination of species and determination of parts. Just as there is a difference of difference which gathers up the different, so there is a differenciation of differenciation which integrates and welds together the differenciated. This is a necessary outcome to the extent that dramatisation inseparably incarnates the two

traits of the Idea, differential relations and corresponding singular points, the latter being actualised in the parts while the former are actualised in the species.

Are not these spatio–temporal determinations what Kant called schemata? There is, nevertheless, an important difference. A schema is indeed a rule of determination for time and of construction for space, but it is conceived and put to work in relation to concepts understood in terms of logical possibility: this is so much part of its nature that it does no more than convert logical possibility into transcendental possibility. It brings spatio–temporal relations into correspondence with the logical relations of the concept. However, since it remains external to the concept, it is not clear how it can ensure the harmony of the understanding and sensibility, since it does not even have the means to ensure its own harmony with the understanding without appeal to a miracle. Schematism possesses an immense power: it can divide a concept and specify it according to a typology. A concept alone is completely incapable of specifying or dividing itself; the agents of differenciation are the spatio–temporal dynamisms which act within or beneath it, like a hidden art. Without these, we would still confront the questions which Aristotle raised with regard to Platonic division: where do the halves come from? However, the schema does not account for the power *with which* it acts. Everything changes when the dynamisms are posited no longer as schemata of concepts but as dramas of Ideas. For if the dynamism is external to concepts – and, as such, a schema – it is internal to Ideas – and, as such, a drama or dream. Species are divided into lineages, Linnaeons into Jordanons, concepts into types, but these divisions do not have the same criteria as the divided, they are not homogeneous with the divided, and they are established in a domain external to that of concepts but internal to that of the Ideas which preside over division itself. Dynamism thus comprises its own power of determining space and time, since it immediately incarnates the differential relations, the singularities and the progressivities immanent in the Idea.[30] *The shortest* is not simply the schema of the concept of straight, but the dream, the drama or the dramatisation of the Idea of a line in so far as it expresses the differenciation of the straight from the curved. We distinguish Ideas, concepts and dramas: the role of dramas is to specify concepts by incarnating the differential relations and singularities of an Idea.

Dramatisation takes place under the critical eye of the savant as much as it does in the head of the dreamer. It acts below the sphere of concepts and the representations subsumed by them. There is nothing which does not lose its identity as this is constituted by concepts, and its similarity as this is constituted in representation, when the dynamic space and time of its actual constitution is discovered. The 'type hill' is no more than a stream along parallel lines, the 'type slope' an outcrop of hard layers along which the rocks are buried in a direction perpendicular to that of the hills; but on

the scale of millions of years which constitutes the time of their actualisation, the hardest rocks in turn are fluid matters which flow under the weak constraints exercised on their singularities. Every typology is dramatic, every dynamism a catastrophe. There is necessarily something cruel in this birth of a world which is a chaosmos, in these worlds of movements without subjects, roles without actors. When Artaud spoke of the theatre of cruelty, he defined it only in terms of an extreme 'determinism', that of spatio–temporal determination in so far as it incarnates an Idea of mind or nature, like a 'restless space' or movement of turning and wounding gravitation capable of directly affecting the organism, a pure staging without author, without actors and without subjects. Spaces are hollowed out, time is accelerated or decelerated, only at the cost of strains and displacements which mobilise and compromise the whole body. Shining points pierce us, singularities turn us back upon ourselves: everywhere the tortoise's neck with its vertiginous sliding of proto-vertebrae. Even the sky suffers from its cardinal points and its constellations which, like 'actor-suns', inscribe Ideas in its flesh. There are indeed actors and subjects, but these are larvae, since they alone are capable of sustaining the lines, the slippages and the rotations. Afterwards it is too late. It is true that every Idea turns us into larvae, having put aside the identity of the I along with the resemblance of the self. This is badly described as a matter of regression, fixation or arrestation of development, for we are never fixed at a moment or in a given state but always fixed by an Idea as though in the glimmer of a look, always fixed in a movement that is under way. What would Ideas be if not the fixed and cruel Ideas of which Villiers de l'Isle-Adam speaks? We are always patients where Ideas are concerned. This, however, is not an ordinary fixation or patience. What is fixed is not ready-made or already complete. When we remain or again become embryos, it is rather because of this pure movement of repetition which is fundamentally distinguished from all regression. The larvae bear Ideas in their flesh, while we do not go beyond the representations of the concepts. They know nothing of the domain of the possible, being close to the virtual, the first actualisations of which they bear as though they had chosen them. Such is the intimacy of the Leech and the Higher Man: they are at once dream and science, object of dreams and object of science, bite and knowledge, mouth and brain (Perrier spoke of the conflict between mouth and brain played out between the Vertebrates and the annulate Worms).

Ideas are dramatised at several levels, but so too dramatisations of different orders echo one another across these levels. Take the Idea of an Island: geographical dramatisation differenciates it or divides the concept into two types, the original oceanic type which signals an eruption or raising above the sea, and the continental drift type which results from a disarticulation or fracture. The Island dreamer, however, rediscovers this

double dynamism because he dreams of becoming infinitely cut off, at the end of a long drift, but also of an absolute beginning by means of a radical foundation. It has often been remarked that the global sexual behaviour of men and women tends to reproduce the movement of their organs, and that the latter in turn tend to reproduce the dynamism of the cellular elements: psychic, organic and chemical – three dramatisations of different orders echo one another. While it is thought which must explore the virtual down to the ground of its repetitions, it is imagination which must grasp the process of actualisation from the point of view of these echoes or reprises. It is imagination which crosses domains, orders and levels, knocking down the partitions coextensive with the world, guiding our bodies and inspiring our souls, grasping the unity of mind and nature; a larval consciousness which moves endlessly from science to dream and back again.

Actualisation takes place in three series: space, time and also consciousness. Every spatio–temporal dynamism is accompanied by the emergence of an elementary consciousness which itself traces directions, doubles movements and migrations, and is born on the threshold of the condensed singularities of the body or object whose consciousness it is. It is not enough to say that consciousness is consciousness of something: it is the double of this something, and everything is consciousness because it possesses a double, even if it is far off and very foreign. Repetition is everywhere, as much in what is actualised as in its actualisation. It is in the Idea to begin with, and it runs through the varieties of relations and the distribution of singular points. It also determines the reproductions of space and time, as it does the reprises of consciousness. In every case, repetition is the power of difference and differenciation: because it condenses the singularities, or because it accelerates or decelerates time, or because it alters spaces. Repetition is never explained by the form of identity in the concept, nor by the similar in representation. No doubt conceptual blockage gives rise to a bare repetition that we can effectively represent as the repetition of the same. However, *who* blocks the concept, if not the Idea? Moreover, as we have seen, the blockage takes place along the three lines of space, time and consciousness. It is the excess in the Idea which explains the lack in the concept. Similarly, it is the clothed, singular or extraordinary repetition, dependent upon the Idea, which explains that ordinary, bare repetition which is dependent upon the concept and plays only the role of the outer garment. In the Idea and its actualisation, we find at once both the natural reason for conceptual blockage and the supernatural reason for a repetition superior to that subsumed within the blocked concept. What remains outside the concept refers more profoundly to what is inside the Idea. The entire Idea is caught up in the mathematico–biological system of different/ciation. However, mathematics and biology appear here only in the guise of technical models which allow

the exposition of the virtual and the process of actualisation, along with the exploration of the two halves of difference, the dialectical half and the aesthetic half. The dialectical Idea is doubly determined by the variety of differential relations and the distribution of correlative singularities (differentiation). Aesthetic actualisation is doubly determined by the determination of species and by composition (differenciation). The determination of species incarnates the relations, just as composition does the singularities. The actual qualities and parts, species and numbers, correspond to the element of qualitability and the element of quantitability in the Idea. However, what carries out the third aspect of sufficient reason – namely, the element of potentiality in the Idea? No doubt the pre-quantitative and pre-qualitative dramatisation. It is this, in effect, which determines or unleashes, which differenciates the differenciation of the actual in its correspondence with the differentiation of the Idea. Where, however, does this power of dramatisation come from? Is it not, beneath the species and parts, the qualities and numbers, the most intense or most individual act? We have not yet shown what grounds dramatisation, both for the actual and the Idea, as the development of the third element of sufficient reason.

Chapter V

Asymmetrical Synthesis of the Sensible

Difference is not diversity. Diversity is given, but difference is that by which the given is given, that by which the given is given as diverse. Difference is not phenomenon but the noumenon closest to the phenomenon. It is therefore true that God makes the world by calculating, but his calculations never work out exactly [*juste*], and this inexactitude or injustice in the result, this irreducible inequality, forms the condition of the world. The world 'happens' while God calculates; if the calculation were exact, there would be no world. The world can be regarded as a 'remainder', and the real in the world understood in terms of fractional or even incommensurable numbers. Every phenomenon refers to an inequality by which it is conditioned. Every diversity and every change refers to a difference which is its sufficient reason. Everything which happens and everything which appears is correlated with orders of differences: differences of level, temperature, pressure, tension, potential, *difference of intensity*. Carnot's principle says this in one fashion, Curie's principle in another.[1] There are locks everywhere. Every phenomenon flashes in a signal–sign system. In so far as a system is constituted or bounded by at least two heterogeneous series, two disparate orders capable of entering into communication, we call it a signal. The phenomenon that flashes across this system, bringing about the communication between disparate series, is a sign. 'The emerald hides in its facets a bright-eyed water-sprite ...': every phenomenon is of the 'bright-eyed water-sprite' type, made possible by an emerald. Every phenomenon is composite because not only are the two series which bound it heterogeneous but each is itself composed of heterogeneous terms, subtended by heterogeneous series which form so many sub-phenomena. The expression 'difference of intensity' is a tautology. Intensity is the form of difference in so far as this is the reason of the sensible. Every intensity is differential, by itself a difference. Every intensity is E – E', where E itself refers to an $e - e'$, and e to $\varepsilon - \varepsilon'$ etc. : each intensity is already a coupling (in which each element of the couple refers in turn to couples of elements of another order), thereby revealing the properly qualitative content of quantity.[2] We call this state of infinitely doubled difference which resonates to infinity *disparity*. Disparity – in other words, difference or intensity (difference of intensity) – is the sufficient reason of all phenomena, the condition of that which appears. Novalis, with his tourmaline, is closer to the conditions of the sensible than Kant, with space and time. The reason of the sensible, the condition of that which appears, is not space and time but the Unequal in

itself, *disparateness* as it is determined and comprised in difference of intensity, in intensity as difference.

Nevertheless, we encounter severe difficulties when we attempt to consider Carnot's or Curie's principles as local manifestations of a transcendental principle. We know only forms of energy which are already localised and distributed in extensity, or extensities already qualified by forms of energy. Energetics defined a particular energy by the combination of two factors, one *intensive* and one *extensive* (for example, force and distance for linear energy, surface tension and surface area for surface energy, pressure and volume for volume energy, height and weight for gravitational energy, temperature and entropy for thermal energy ...). It turns out that, in experience, *intensio* (intension) is inseparable from an *extensio* (extension) which relates it to the *extensum* (extensity).[3] In these conditions, intensity itself is subordinated to the qualities which fill extensity (primary physical qualities or *qualitas*, and secondary perceptible qualities or *quale*). In short, we know intensity only as already developed within an extensity, and as covered over by qualities. Whence our tendency to consider intensive quantity as a badly grounded empirical concept, an impure mixture of a sensible quality and extensity, or even of a physical quality and an extensive quantity.

It is true that this tendency would lead nowhere if intensity, for its own part, did not present a corresponding tendency within the extensity in which it develops and under the quality which covers it. Intensity is difference, but this difference tends to deny or to cancel itself out in extensity and underneath quality. It is true that qualities are signs which flash across the interval of a difference. In so doing, however, they measure the time of an equalisation – in other words, the time taken by the difference to cancel itself out in the extensity in which it is distributed. This is the most general content of the principles of Carnot, Curie, Le Chatelier, *et al.* : difference is the sufficient reason of change only to the extent that the change tends to negate difference. It is indeed in this manner that the principle of causality finds in the signalling process its categorical physical determination: intensity defines an objective sense for a series of irreversible states which pass, like an 'arrow of time', from more to less differenciated, from a productive to a reduced difference, and ultimately to a cancelled difference. We know how these themes of a reduction of difference, a uniformisation of diversity, and an equalisation of inequality stitched together for the last time a strange alliance at the end of the nineteenth century between science, good sense and philosophy. Thermodynamics was the powerful furnace of that alloy. A system of basic definitions was established which satisfied everybody, including a certain Kantianism: the given as diverse; reason as a process of identification and

equalisation tending towards identity; the absurd or irrational as the resistance of the diverse to that identificatory reason. The words 'the real is rational' found there a new sense, for diversity tended to be reduced in Nature no less than in reason. As a result, difference was neither a law of nature nor a category of the mind but only the origin = *x* of the diverse: a given, but not a 'value' (except a regulative or compensatory value).[4] In truth, our epistemological tendency to be suspicious of the notion of intensive quantity would prove nothing were it not linked to this other tendency on the part of differences of intensity to cancel themselves out in qualified extended systems. Intensity is suspect only because it seems to rush headlong into suicide.

Science and philosophy here gave a final satisfaction to good sense. For it is not science that is in question – it remains indifferent to the extension of Carnot's principle – nor philosophy, which also, after a fashion, remains indifferent to Carnot's principle. Every time science, philosophy and good sense come together it is inevitable that good sense should take itself for a science and a philosophy (that is why such encounters must be avoided at all costs). It is therefore a question of the essence of good sense. This essence is clearly and concisely outlined by Hegel in *The Difference between the Systems of Fichte and Schelling*: good sense is partial truth in so far as this is joined to the feeling of the absolute. The truth in the form of reason is present in a partial state, and the absolute is there in the form of a feeling. But how is the feeling of the absolute attached to the partial truth? Good sense essentially distributes or repartitions: 'on the one hand' and 'on the other hand' are the characteristic formulae of its false profundity or platitude. It distributes things. It is obvious, however, that not every distribution flows from good sense: there are distributions inspired by madness, mad repartitions. Perhaps good sense even presupposes madness in order to come after and correct what madness there is in any prior distribution. A distribution is in conformity with good sense when it tends to banish difference from the distributed. Only when the inequality of the portions is supposed to disappear from the milieu over time does the repartition effectively conform to good sense, or follow a sense which is called good. Good sense is by nature eschatological, the prophet of a final compensation and homogenization. If it comes second, this is because it presupposes mad distribution – instantaneous, nomadic distribution, crowned anarchy or difference. However, this sedentary, patient figure which has time on its side corrects difference, introduces it into a milieu which leads to the cancellation of differences or the compensation of portions. It is itself this 'milieu'. Thinking itself to be in between the extremes, it holds them off and fills in the interval. It does not negate differences – on the contrary: it arranges things in the order of time and under the conditions of extensity such that they negate themselves. It multiplies the intermediates and, like Plato's demiurge, ceaselessly and

patiently transforms the unequal into the divisible. Good sense is the ideology of the middle classes who recognise themselves in equality as an abstract product. It dreams less of acting than of constituting a natural milieu, the element of an action which passes from more to less differenciated: for example, the good sense of eighteenth-century political economy which saw in the commercial classes the natural compensation for the extremes, and in the prosperity of commerce the mechanical process of the equalisation of portions. It therefore dreams less of acting than of foreseeing, and of allowing free rein to action which goes from the unpredictable to the predictable (from the production of differences to their reduction). Neither contemplative nor active, it is prescient. In short, it goes from the side of things to the side of fire: from differences produced to differences reduced. It is thermodynamic. In this sense it attaches the feeling of the absolute to the partial truth. It is neither optimistic nor pessimistic, but assumes a pessimistic or optimistic tint depending upon whether the side of fire, which consumes everything and renders all portions uniform, bears the sign of an inevitable death and nothingness (we are all equal before death) or, on the contrary, bears the happy plenitude of existence (we all have an equal chance in life). Good sense does not negate difference: on the contrary, it recognises difference just enough to affirm that it negates itself, given sufficient extensity and time. Between mad difference and difference cancelled, between the unequal in the divisible and the divisible equalised, between the distribution of the unequal and equality distributed, good sense necessarily lives itself as a universal rule of distribution, and therefore as universally distributed.

Good sense is based upon a synthesis of time, in particular the one which we have determined as the first synthesis, that of habit. Good sense is good only because it is wedded to the sense of time associated with that synthesis. Testifying to a living present (and to the fatigue of that present), it goes from past to future as though from particular to general. However, it defines this past as the improbable or the less probable. In effect, since every partial system has its origin in a difference which individualises its domain, how would an observer situated within the system grasp this difference except as past and highly 'improbable', given that it is behind him? On the other hand, at the heart of the same system, the future, the probable and the cancellation of difference are identified in the direction indicated by the arrow of time – in other words, the right direction. This condition grounds prediction itself (it has often been noticed that if initially indistinguishable temperatures are allowed to differenciate, it cannot be predicted which will increase or decrease; and if viscosity is accelerated, it will tear moving bodies from their state of rest, but in an unpredictable direction). Well-known pages by Boltzmann comment upon this scientific and thermodynamic guarantee of good sense: they show how within a partial system difference, the improbable and the past are identified on the

one hand, while uniformity, the probable and the future are identified on the other.[5] In the dream of a truly universal good sense, one which attaches the feeling of the absolute to partial truths, along with the moon to the earth, this equalisation and homogenisation do not occur only in each partial system, but continue from one system to another. However, as Boltzmann shows, this attachment is not legitimate, any more than this synthesis of time is sufficient.

We are at least in a position to clarify the relation between good sense and common sense. Common sense was defined subjectively by the supposed identity of a Self which provided the unity and ground of all the faculties, and objectively by the identity of whatever object served as a focus for all the faculties. This double identity, however, remains static. We no more find ourselves before a universal indeterminate object than we are a universal Self. Objects are divided up in and by fields of individuation, as are Selves. Common sense must therefore point beyond itself towards another, dynamic instance, capable of determining the indeterminate object as this or that, and of individualising the self situated in this ensemble of objects. This other instance is good sense, which takes its point of departure from a difference at the origin of individuation. However, precisely because it ensures the distribution of that difference in such a manner that it tends to be cancelled in the object, and because it provides a rule according to which the different objects tend to equalise themselves and the different Selves tend to become uniform, good sense in turn points towards the instance of a common sense which provides it with both the form of a universal Self and that of an indeterminate object. Good sense, therefore, has two definitions, one objective and one subjective, which correspond to those of common sense: a rule of universal distribution and a rule universally distributed. Good sense and common sense each refer to the other, each reflect the other and constitute one half of the orthodoxy. In view of this reciprocity and double reflection, we can define common sense by the process of recognition and good sense by the process of prediction. The one involves the qualitative synthesis of diversity, the static synthesis of qualitative diversity related to an object supposed the same for all the faculties of a single subject; the other involves the quantitative synthesis of difference, the dynamic synthesis of difference in quantity related to a system in which it is objectively and subjectively cancelled.

Nevertheless, difference remains not the given itself but that by which the given is given. How could thought avoid going that far, how could it avoid thinking that which is most opposed to thought? With the identical, we think with all our force, but without producing the least thought: with the different, by contrast, do we not have the highest thought, but also that which cannot be thought? This protestation of the Different is full of sense. Even if difference tends to be distributed thoughout diversity in such a manner as to disappear, and to render uniform the diversity it creates, it

must first be sensed as that which gives diversity to be sensed. Moreover, it must be thought as that which creates diversity. (Not because we would then return to the common exercise of the faculties, but precisely because the dissociated faculties enter into the violent relation in which each transmits its constraint to the other.) Delirium lies at the base of good sense, which is why good sense is always secondary. Thought must think difference, that absolutely different from thought which nevertheless gives it thought, gives to be thought. In some fine pages, Lalande says that reality is difference, whereas the law of reality, or principle of thought, is identification: 'Reality is therefore in opposition to the law of reality, the present state with what it will become. How could such a state of affairs come to be? How could it be that the physical world is constituted by a fundamental property which its own laws endlessly attenuate?'[6] In other words, reality is not the result of the laws which govern it, and a saturnine God devours at one end what he has made at the other, legislating against his creation because he has created against his legislation. Thus we are forced to sense and to think difference. We sense something which is contrary to the laws of nature; we think something which is contrary to the principles of thought. Moreover, even if the production of difference is by definition 'inexplicable', how can we avoid *implicating* the inexplicable at the heart of thought itself? How can the unthinkable not lie at the heart of thought? Or delirium at the heart of good sense? How can we be content to relegate the improbable to the beginning of a partial evolution, without also grasping it as the highest power of the past, or as the immemorial in memory? (In this sense the partial synthesis of the present already led us into another synthesis of time, that of the immemorial memory, at the risk of leading us further still ...)

Philosophy is revealed not by good sense but by paradox. Paradox is the pathos or the passion of philosophy. There are several kinds of paradox, all of which are opposed to the complementary forms of orthodoxy – namely, good sense and common sense. Subjectively, paradox breaks up the common exercise of the faculties and places each before its own limit, before its incomparable: thought before the unthinkable which it alone is nevertheless capable of thinking; memory before the forgotten which is also its immemorial; sensibility before the imperceptible which is indistinguishable from its intensive. ... At the same time, however, paradox communicates to the broken faculties that relation which is far from good sense, aligning them along a volcanic line which allows one to ignite the other, leaping from one limit to the next. Objectively, paradox displays the element which cannot be totalised within a common element, along with the difference which cannot be equalised or cancelled at the direction of a good sense. It is correct to say that the only refutation of paradoxes lies in good sense and common sense themselves, but on condition that they are

already allowed everything: the role of judge as well as that of party to the case, the absolute along with the partial truth.

It is not surprising that, strictly speaking, difference should be 'inexplicable'. Difference is explicated, but in systems in which it tends to be cancelled; this means only that difference is essentially implicated, that its being is implication. For difference, to be explicated is to be cancelled or to dispel the inequality which constitutes it. The formula according to which 'to explicate is to identify' is a tautology. We cannot conclude from this that difference is cancelled out, or at least that it is cancelled in itself. It is cancelled in so far as it is drawn outside itself, *in* extensity and *in* the quality which fills that extensity. However, difference creates both this extensity and this quality. Intensity is developed and explicated by means of an extension [*extensio*] which relates it to the extensity [*extensum*] in which it appears outside itself and hidden beneath quality. Difference of intensity is cancelled or tends to be cancelled in this system, but it creates this system by explicating itself. Whence the double aspect of the quality as a sign: it refers to an implicated order of constitutive differences, and tends to cancel out those differences in the extended order in which they are explicated. This is also why causality finds in signalling at once both an origin and an orientation or destination, where the destination in a sense denies the origin. The peculiarity of 'effects', in the causal sense, is to have a perceptual 'effect' and to be able to be called by a proper name (Seebeck effect, Kelvin effect ...), because they emerge in a properly differential field of individuation which the name symbolises. The vanishing of difference is precisely inseparable from an 'effect' of which we are victims. Difference in the form of intensity remains implicated in itself, while it is cancelled by being explicated in extensity. It is therefore unnecessary, in order to save the universe from heat death or to safeguard the chances of eternal return, to imagine highly 'improbable' extensive mechanisms supposedly capable of restoring difference. For difference has never ceased to be in itself, to be implicated in itself even while it is explicated outside itself. Therefore, not only are there sensory illusions but there is also a transcendental physical illusion. In this regard, we believe that Léon Selme made a profound discovery.[7] In opposing Carnot and Clausius, he wanted to show that the increase of entropy was illusory. Moreover, he pointed out certain empirical or contingent factors of this illusion: the relative smallness of the differences in temperature produced in thermal machines, the enormity of the dampening which seems to preclude the construction of a 'thermal ram'. Above all, however, he discovered a transcendental form of illusion: of all extensions, entropy is the only one which is not measurable either directly or indirectly by any procedure independent of energetics. If it were the same for volume or for quantity of electricity, we would necessarily have

the impression that these increase through irreversible transformations. The paradox of entropy is the following: entropy is an extensive factor but, unlike all other extensive factors, it is an extension or 'explication' which is implicated as such in intensity, which does not exist outside the implication or except as implicated, and this is because it has the function of *making possible* the general movement by which that which is implicated explicates itself or is extended. There is thus a transcendental illusion essentially tied to the *qualitas*, Heat, and to the extension, Entropy.

It is notable that extensity does not account for the individuations which occur within it. No doubt the high and the low, the right and the left, the figure and the ground are individuating factors which trace rises and falls, currents and descents in extensity. However, since they take place within an already developed extensity, their value is only relative. They therefore flow from a 'deeper' instance – depth itself, which is not an extension but a pure *implex*. No doubt every depth is also a possible length and size, but this possibility is realised only in so far as an observer changes place and gathers into an abstract concept that which is length for itself and that which is length for others: in fact, it is always on the basis of a new depth that the old one becomes length or is explicated in length. It obviously amounts to the same thing whether we consider a simple plane, or an extensity in three dimensions where the third is homogeneous with the other two. Once depth is grasped as an extensive quantity, it belongs to engendered extensity and ceases to include in itself its own heterogeneity in relation to the other two. We see then that it is the ultimate dimension of extensity, but we see this only as a fact without understanding the reason, since we no longer know that it is original. We also then note the presence in extensity of individuating factors, but without understanding where their power comes from, since we no longer know that they express the original depth. It is depth which explicates itself as right and left in the first dimension, as high and low in the second, and as figure and ground in the homogenised third. Extensity does not develop or appear without presenting a left and a right, a high and a low, an above and a below, which are like the dissymmetrical marks of its own origin. The relativity of these determinations, moreover, is further testimony to the absolute from which they come. Extensity as a whole comes from the depths. Depth as the (ultimate and original) heterogeneous dimension is the matrix of all extensity, including its third dimension considered to be homogeneous with the other two.

The ground [*fond*] as it appears in a homogeneous extensity is notably a projection of something 'deeper' [*profond*]: only the latter may be called *Ungrund* or groundless. The law of figure and ground would never hold for objects distinguished from a neutral background or a background of other objects unless the object itself entertained a relation to its own depth. The relation between figure and ground is only an extrinsic plane relation

which presupposes an internal, voluminous relation between surfaces and the depth which they envelop. This synthesis of depth which endows the object with its shadow, but makes it emerge from that shadow, bears witness to the furthest past and to the coexistence of the past with the present. We should not be surprised that the pure spatial syntheses here repeat the temporal syntheses previously specified: the explication of extensity rests upon the first synthesis, that of habit or the present; but the implication of depth rests upon the second synthesis, that of Memory and the past. Furthermore, in depth the proximity and simmering of the third synthesis make themselves felt, announcing the universal 'ungrounding'. Depth is like the famous geological line from NE to SW, the line which comes diagonally from the heart of things and distributes volcanoes: it unites a bubbling sensibility and a thought which 'rumbles in its crater'. Schelling said that depth is not added from without to length and breadth, but remains buried, like the sublime principle of the *differend* which creates them.

Extensity can emerge from the depths only if depth is definable independently of extensity. The extensity whose genesis we are attempting to establish is extensive magnitude, the *extensum* or term of reference of all the *extensio*. The original depth, by contrast, is indeed space as a whole, but space as an intensive quantity: the pure *spatium*. We know that sensation or perception has an ontological aspect: precisely in the syntheses which are peculiar to it, confronted by that which can only be sensed or that which can only be perceived. Now, it appears that depth is essentially *implicated* in the perception of extensity: neither depth nor distances are judged by the apparent magnitude of objects, but, on the contrary, depth envelops in itself distances which develop in extensity and explicate in turn the apparent magnitudes. It also appears that depth and distances, in this state of implication, are fundamentally linked to the intensity of the sensation: it is the power of diminution of the intensity experienced that provides a perception of depth (or rather, provides depth to perception). The perceived quality presupposes intensity, because it expresses only a resemblance to a 'band of isolatable intensities', within the limits of which a permanent object is constituted – the qualified object which affirms its identity across variable distances.[8] Intensity, which envelops distances, is explicated in extensity, while extensity develops, exteriorises and homogenises these very distances. At the same time, a quality occupies this extensity, either in the form of a *qualitas* which defines the milieu of a direction, or in the form of a *quale* which characterises a given object in relation to that direction. Intensity is simultaneously the imperceptible and that which can only be sensed. How could it be sensed for itself, independently of the qualities which cover it and the extensity in which it is distributed? But how could it be other than 'sensed', since it is what gives to be sensed, and defines the proper limits of sensibility? Depth is

simultaneously the imperceptible and that which can only be perceived (in this sense, Paliard called it simultaneously both conditioning and conditioned, and showed the existence of an inverse complementary relation between distance as ideal existence and distance as visual existence). The strangest alliance is formed between intensity and depth, which carries each faculty to its own limit and allows it to communicate only at the peak of its particular solitude: an alliance between Being and itself in difference. Depth and intensity are the same at the level of being, but the same in so far as this is said of difference. Depth is the intensity of being, or vice versa. Out of this intensive depth emerge at once the *extensio* and the *extensum*, the *qualitas* and the *quale*. The vectors or vectorial magnitudes which occur throughout extensity, but also the scalar magnitudes or particular cases of vector-potentials, are the eternal witness to the intensive origin: for example, altitudes. The fact that they cannot be added in any order whatsoever, or that they have an essential relation to an order of succession, refers us back to the synthesis of time which acts in depth.

Kant defined all intuitions as extensive quantities – in other words, quantities such that the representation of the parts necessarily preceded and made possible the representation of the whole. However, space and time are not presented as they are represented. On the contrary, the presentation of the whole grounds the possibility of the parts, the latter being only virtual and actualised only by the determinate values of empirical intuition. It is empirical intuition which is extensive. While he refuses a logical extension to space and time, Kant's mistake is to maintain a geometrical extension for it, and to reserve intensive quantity for the matter which fills a given extensity to some degree or other. In the case of enantiomorphic bodies, Kant recognised precisely an *internal difference*. However, since it was not a conceptual difference, on his view it could refer only to an *external relation* with extensity as a whole in the form of extensive magnitude. In fact, the paradox of symmetrical objects, like everything concerning right and left, high and low, figure and ground, has an intensive source. Space as pure intuition or *spatium* is an intensive quantity, and intensity as a transcendental principle is not merely the anticipation of perception but the source of a quadruple genesis: that of the *extensio* in the form of schema, that of extensity in the form of extensive magnitude, that of *qualitas* in the form of matter occupying extensity, and that of the *quale* in the form of designation of an object. Hermann Cohen was right, therefore, to attach full value to the principle of intensive quantities in his reinterpretation of Kantianism.[9] While space may be irreducible to concepts, its affinity with Ideas cannot nevertheless be denied – in other words, its capacity (as intensive *spatium*) to determine in extensity the actualisation of ideal connections (as differential relations contained in the Idea). Finally, while the conditions of possible experience

may be related to extension, there are also subjacent conditions of real experience which are indistinguishable from intensity as such.

Intensity has three characteristics. According to the first, intensive quantity includes the unequal in itself. It represents difference in quantity, that which cannot be cancelled in difference in quantity or that which is unequalisable in quantity itself: it is therefore the quality which belongs to quantity. It appears less as a species of the genus quantity than as the figure of a fundamental or original moment present in every quantity. On the other hand, this means that extensive quantity is the figure of another moment which indicates, rather, quantitative destination or finality (in a partial numerical system). In the history of number, we see that every systematic type is constructed on the basis of an essential inequality, and retains that inequality in relation to the next-lowest type: thus, fractions involve the impossibility of reducing the relation between two quantities to a whole number; irrational numbers in turn express the impossibility of determining a common aliquot part for two quantities, and thus the impossibility of reducing their relation to even a fractional number, and so on.

It is true that a given type of number does not retain an inequality in its essence without banishing or cancelling it within the new order that it installs. Thus, fractional numbers compensate for their characteristic inequality by the equality of an aliquot part; irrational numbers subordinate their inequality to an equality of purely geometric relations – or, better still, arithmetically speaking, to a limit-equality indicated by a convergent series of rational numbers. Here, however, we rediscover only the duality between explication and the implicit, between extensity and the intensive: for if a type of number cancels its difference, it does so only by explicating it within the extension that it installs. Nevertheless, it maintains this difference in itself in the implicated order by which it is grounded. Every number is originally intensive and vectorial in so far as it implies a difference of quantity which cannot properly be cancelled, but extensive and scalar in so far as it cancels this difference on another plane that it creates and on which it is explicated. Even the simplest type of number confirms this duality: natural numbers are first ordinal – in other words, originally intensive. Cardinal numbers result from these and are presented as the explication of the ordinal. It is often objected that ordination cannot lie at the origin of number because it already implies cardinal operations of colligation. This, however, is because the formula 'the cardinal results from the ordinal' has been poorly understood. Ordination in no way presupposes the repetition of the same unit which must be 'cardinalised' every time the following ordinal number is reached. Ordinal construction does not imply a supposed same unit but only, as we shall see, an irreducible notion of distance – the distances implicated in the depth of an

intensive *spatium* (ordered differences). Identical unity is not presupposed by ordination; on the contrary, this belongs to cardinal number and presupposes an extensive equality among cardinal numbers, a relative equivalence of exteriorised terms. We should not, therefore, believe that cardinal number results analytically from ordinal, or from the final terms of finite ordinal series (the preceding objection would then be justified). In fact, ordinal number becomes cardinal only by extension, to the extent that the distances enveloped in the *spatium* are explicated, or developed and equalised in an extensity established by natural number. We should therefore say that, from the outset, the concept of number is synthetic.

Intensity is the uncancellable in difference of quantity, but this difference of quantity is cancelled by extension, extension being precisely the process by which intensive difference is turned inside out and distributed in such a way as to be dispelled, compensated, equalised and suppressed in the extensity which it creates. Nevertheless, how many necessary operations must intervene in this process! Admirable pages in the *Timaeus* bring together the divisible and the indivisible.[10] The important point is that the divisible is defined as that which bears in itself the unequal, whereas the indivisible (the Same or the One) seeks to impose an equality upon it, and thereby render it docile. God begins by making a mixture of the two elements. However, precisely because the divisible, B, escapes the mixture and shows its inequality and oddness, God obtains only $A + B/2 = C$. As a result, he must make a second mixture: $A + B/2 + C$ – in other words, $A + B/2 + (A + B/2)$. This mixture, however, also rebels, and he must avert the rebellion: he distributes it into parts according to two arithmetic progressions, one whose principle is 2, which refers to the element A (1, 2, 4, 8); and the other whose principle is 3, which refers to C and recognises the oddness of B (1, 3, 9, 27). Now God is faced with intervals, with *distances* to fill: he does this with two intermediates, one of which is arithmetic (corresponding to A), while the other is harmonic (corresponding to C). From this may be derived the relations, and the relations between these relations, which pursue the task of tracking the unequal in the divisible throughout the entire mixture. Furthermore, God must cut the whole in two, cross over the two halves and then bend them into two circles, such that the outer circle contains the equal in the form of the movement of the Same, while the other, inner circle, orientated along a diagonal, retains what subsists of inequality in the divisible by distributing it among secondary circles. Finally, God has not defeated the unequal in itself but only separated it from the divisible and enclosed it within an outer circle, *kuklos exothen*. He has equalised the divisible in this extension which is the extension of the Soul of the world, but underneath, at the deepest layer of the divisible, the unequal still rumbles in intensity. This is of little consequence to God, for he fills the entire expanse of the soul with the extensity of bodies and their qualities. He covers everything.

Nevertheless, he dances upon a volcano. Never have so many, so diverse and such demented operations been multiplied in order to draw from the depths of an intensive *spatium* a serene and docile extensity, and to dispel a Difference which subsists in itself even when it is cancelled outside itself. The labour of God is always threatened by the third hypothesis of the *Parmenides*, that of the differential or intensive instant.

A second characteristic flows from the first: since it is already difference in itself and comprises inequality as such, intensity *affirms* difference. It makes difference an object of affirmation. Curie commented that it was useful but misleading to speak of dissymmetry in negative terms, as though it were the absence of symmetry, without inventing positive terms capable of designating the infinite number of operations with unmatched outcomes. The same goes for inequality: it is through inequalities that we discover the affirmative formula for irrational numbers (for p and q whole, each number $(p-q\sqrt{2})^2$ will always exceed a certain value). It is also through inequalities that we can positively establish the convergence of a series (rounding up to the highest integer). The important enterprise of a mathematics without negation is obviously not based upon identity, which, on the contrary, determines the negative by the excluded middle and non-contradiction. It rests axiomatically upon an affirmative definition of inequality ($\neq$) for two natural numbers, and in other cases, upon a positive definition of *distance* ($\neq \neq$) which brings into play three terms in an infinite series of affirmative relations. In order to appreciate the logical power of an affirmation of distances in the pure element of positive difference, we need only consider the formal difference between the following two propositions: 'if $a \neq b$ is *impossible*, then $a = b$'; 'if a is *distant* from every number c which is distant from b, then $a = b$'.[11] We shall see, however, that the distance referred to here is by no means an extensive magnitude, but must be related to its intensive origin. Since intensity is already difference, it refers to a series of other differences that it affirms by affirming itself. It is said that in general there are no reports of null frequencies, no effectively null potentials, no absolutely null pressure, as though on a line with logarithmic graduations where zero lies at the end of an infinite series of smaller and smaller fractions. We must advance further, at the risk of falling into an 'ethics' of intensive quantities. Constructed on at least two series, one superior and one inferior, with each series referring in turn to other implicated series, intensity affirms even the *lowest*; it makes the lowest an object of affirmation. The power of a Waterfall or a very deep descent is required to go that far and make an affirmation even of descent. Everything is like the flight of an eagle: overflight, suspension and descent. Everything goes from high to low, and by that movement affirms the lowest: asymmetrical synthesis. High and low, moreover, are only a manner of speaking. It is a question of depth, and of the lower depth which essentially belongs to it. There is no depth which is not a

'seeker' of a lower depth: it is there that distance develops, but distance understood as the affirmation of that which it distances, or difference as the sublimation of the lower.

When does the negative emerge? Negation is the inverted image of difference – in other words, the image of intensity seen from below. In effect, everything is overturned. What, from on high, is affirmation of difference becomes from below the negation of that which differs. Here again, therefore, the negative appears only with extensity and quality. We have seen that the first dimension of extensity was a power of limitation, while the second was a power of opposition. These two figures of the negative are grounded upon the 'conservative' character of extensions (an extension within a system cannot be increased without decreasing the extension of the same kind in a related system). Quality in turn seems inseparable from opposition: the opposition of contradiction, as Plato showed, to the extent that each quality presupposes the identity of 'more' and 'less' in the intensities it isolates; the opposition of contrariety in the paired distribution of qualities themselves. Moreover, when contrariety fails, as in the case of odours, this is in order to make room for a play of limitations in a series of increasing or decreasing resemblances. There is no doubt that resemblance is the law of quality, just as equality is that of extensity (or invariance that of extension): as a result, extensity and quality are the two forms of generality. However, precisely this is sufficient to make them the elements of representation, without which representation itself would not be able to fulfil its dearest task, which is to relate difference to the identical. We can therefore add a third reason to the two which we we have already given in order to explain the illusion of the negative.

Difference is not negation. On the contrary, the negative is difference inverted, seen from below. Always the candle in the bovine eye. Difference is inverted, first, by the requirements of representation which subordinate it to identity. Then, by the shadow of 'problems' which give rise to the illusion of the negative. Finally, by extensity and quality which cover or explicate intensity. *It is underneath quality and within extensity that Intensity appears upside down*, and that its characteristic difference takes the form of the negative (either of limitation or of opposition). The fate of difference is tied to the negative only within extensity and quality, which precisely tend to cancel difference. Every time we find ourselves confronted with qualified oppositions and in an extensity in which these are distributed, we must not count upon an extensive synthesis which would overcome and resolve them. On the contrary, the constituent disparities or enveloped distances inhabit intensive depth. These are the source of the illusion of the negative, but also the principle of the denunciation of this illusion. Only depth resolves, because only difference gives rise to problems. It is not the synthesis of the different which leads to

reconciliation in extensity (pseudo-affirmation) but, on the contrary, the *differenciation* of their difference which affirms them in intensity. Oppositions are always planar; they express on a given plane only the distorted effect of an original depth. This has often been commented upon for stereoscopic images. More generally, every field of forces refers back to a potential energy, every opposition refers to a deeper 'disparateness', and oppositions are resolved in time and extensity only to the extent that the disparates have first invented their order of communication in depth and rediscovered that dimension in which they envelop one another, tracing hardly recognisable intensive paths through the ulterior world of qualified extensity.[12]

What is the being *of* the sensible? Given the conditions of this question, the answer must designate the paradoxical existence of a 'something' which simultaneously cannot be sensed (from the point of view of the empirical exercise) and can only be sensed (from the point of view of the transcendent exercise). In a passage from Book VII of the *Republic*, Plato showed how such a being transmits a shock to the other faculties, shaking them from their torpor, stirring the memory and constraining thought. However, Plato characterises this being as the contrary–sensible, that which gives rise to contrary sensations at the same time. As the *Philebus* expressly shows, Plato means that sensible qualities or relations are not in themselves separable from a contrariety, or even a contradiction, in the subject to which they are attributed. Since every quality is a becoming, one does not become 'harder' (or taller) than one was without at the same time becoming 'softer' (or smaller) than one is in the process of becoming. We cannot avoid this by distinguishing times, since the distinction between times is subsequent to the becoming which interposes the one in the other and, at the same time, posits both the movement by which the new present is constituted and the movement by which the former present is constituted as past. It seems impossible to escape a mad-becoming or an unlimited becoming which implies the identity of opposites in the form of the coexistence of *more* and *less* with a given quality. However, this Platonic response will not do: in fact, it rests upon intensive quantities, but recognises these only in qualities in the course of development – and for this reason, it assigns both the being of the sensible and contrariety to qualities. However, while the contrary–sensible or contrariety in the quality may constitute sensible being *par excellence*, they by no means constitute the being *of* the sensible. It is difference in intensity, not contrariety in quality, which constitutes the being 'of' the sensible. Qualitative contrariety is only the reflection of the intense, a reflection which betrays it by explicating it in extensity. It is intensity or difference in intensity which constitutes the peculiar limit of sensibility. As such, it has the paradoxical character of that limit: it is the imperceptible, that which cannot be sensed because it is always covered by a quality which alienates

or contradicts it, always distributed within an extensity which inverts and cancels it. In another sense, it is that which can only be sensed or that which defines the transcendent exercise of sensibility, because it gives to be sensed, thereby awakening memory and forcing thought. The point of sensory distortion is often to grasp intensity independently of extensity or prior to the qualities in which it is developed. A pedagogy of the senses, which forms an integral part of 'transcendentalism', is directed towards this aim. Pharmacodynamic experiences or physical experiences such as vertigo approach the same result: they reveal to us that difference in itself, that depth in itself or that intensity in itself at the original moment at which it is neither qualified nor extended. At this point, the harrowing character of intensity, however weak, restores its true meaning: not the anticipation of perception but the proper limit of sensibility from the point of view of a transcendent exercise.

In terms of a third characteristic which includes the other two, intensity is an implicated, enveloped or 'embryonised' quantity. Not implicated in quality, for it is only secondarily so. Intensity is primarily implicated in itself: implicating and implicated. We must conceive of implication as a perfectly determined form of being. Within intensity, we call that which is really implicated and enveloping *difference*; and we call that which is really implicated or enveloped *distance*. For this reason, intensity is neither divisible, like extensive quantity, nor indivisible, like quality. The divisibility of extensive quantities is defined in the following manner: by the relative determination of a unit (this unit itself never being indivisible but only marking the level at which division ceases); by the equivalence of the parts determined by the unit; by the consubstantiality of the parts with the whole which is divided. Division can therefore take place and be continued without any change in the nature of what is being divided. By contrast, when it is pointed out that a temperature is not composed of other temperatures, or a speed of other speeds, what is meant is that each temperature is already a difference, and that differences are not composed of differences of the same order but imply series of heterogeneous terms. As Rosny showed, the fiction of a homogeneous quantity vanishes with intensity. An intensive quantity may be divided, but not without changing its nature. In a sense, it is therefore indivisible, but only because no part exists prior to the division and no part retains the same nature after division. We should nevertheless speak of 'smaller' and 'greater', according to whether the nature of a given part presupposes a given change of nature or is presupposed by it. Thus, the acceleration or deceleration of a movement defines within it intensive parts that must be called greater or smaller, even while these undergo a change of nature and following the order of these changes (ordered differences). In this sense, difference in depth is composed of distances, 'distance' being not an extensive quantity but an indivisible asymmetrical relation, ordinal and intensive in character,

which is established between series of heterogeneous terms and expresses at each moment the nature of that which does not divide without changing its nature.[13] By contrast with extensive quantities, intensive quantities are therefore defined by the enveloping difference, the enveloped distances, and the unequal in itself which testifies to the existence of a natural 'remainder' which provides the material for a change of nature. We must henceforth distinguish between two types of multiplicities, such as those represented by distances and lengths respectively: implicit as opposed to explicit multiplicities; those whose metric varies with division and those which carry the invariable principle of their metric. Difference, distance and inequality are the positive characteristics of depth as intensive *spatium*. Furthermore, the movement of explication is the movement by which difference tends to be cancelled, but also by which distances tend to be extended and developed into lengths, and the divisible tends to be equalised. (Once again, Plato's greatness lies in having seen that the divisible formed a nature in itself only by including the unequal.)

We could be criticized for having included all differences in kind within intensity, thereby inflating it with everything that normally belongs to quality. Equally, we could be criticized for having included within distances what normally belongs to extensive quantities. To us, these criticisms do not appear well founded. It is true that in being developed in extension, difference becomes simple difference of degree and no longer has its reason in itself. It is true that quality benefits from that alienated reason and takes over differences in kind. However, the distinction between the two, like that between mechanism and 'qualitativism', rests upon a sleight of hand: the one profits from what has disappeared in the other, but the true difference belongs to neither. Difference becomes qualitative only in the process by which it is cancelled in extension. In its own nature, difference is no more qualitative than extensive. We should note, first, that qualities have much more stability, immobility and generality than is often admitted. They are orders of resemblance. Certainly they differ, and differ in kind, but always within a supposed order of resemblance. Moreover, their variations in resemblance refer to variations of a quite different sort. Certainly, a qualitative difference does not reproduce or express a difference of intensity. However, in the passage from one quality to another, even where there is a maximum of resemblance or continuity, there are phenomena of delay and plateau, shocks of difference, distances, a whole play of conjunctions and disjunctions, a whole depth which forms a graduated scale rather than a properly qualitative duration. Finally, if intensity were not there to attend to, support and relay quality, what would the duration attributed to quality be but a race to the grave, what time would it have other than the time necessary for the annihilation of difference in the corresponding extensity, or the time necessary for the uniformisation of qualities

themselves? In short, there would no more be qualitative differences or differences in kind than there would be quantitative differences or differences of degree, if intensity were not capable of constituting the former in qualities and the latter in extensity, even at the risk of appearing to extinguish itself in both.

This is why the Bergsonian critique of intensity seems unconvincing. It assumes qualities ready-made and extensities already constituted. It distributes difference into differences in kind in the case of qualities and differences in degree in the case of extensity. From this point of view, intensity necessarily appears as no more than an impure mixture, no longer sensible or perceptible. However, Bergson has thereby already attributed to quality everything that belongs to intensive quantities. He wanted to free quality from the superficial movement which ties it to contrariety or contradiction (that is why he opposed duration to becoming); but he could do so only by attributing to quality a depth which is precisely that of intensive quantity. One cannot be against both the negative and intensity at once. It is striking that Bergson should define qualitative duration not as indivisible but as that which changes its nature in dividing, that which does not cease to divide and change its nature: virtual multiplicity, he says, in opposition to the actual multiplicities of number and extensity which retain only differences of degree. There comes a moment, however, in this philosophy of Difference which the whole of Bergsonism represents, when Bergson raises the question of the double genesis of quality and extensity. This fundamental differenciation (quality–extensity) can find its reason only in the great synthesis of Memory which allows all the degrees of difference to coexist as degrees of relaxation and contraction, and rediscovers at the heart of duration the implicated order of that intensity which had been denounced only provisionally and from without.[14] For the differences of degree and the extensity which represents them mechanically do not carry their reason within themselves; but neither do the differences in kind and the duration which represents them qualitatively. The soul of mechanism says that everything is difference of degree. The soul of quality replies that there are differences in kind everywhere. However, these are false souls, minor and auxiliary souls. Let us take seriously the famous question: is there a difference in kind, or of degree, between differences of degree and differences in kind? Neither. Difference is a matter of degree only within the extensity in which it is explicated; it is a matter of kind only with regard to the quality which covers it within that extensity. Between the two are all the degrees of difference – beneath the two lies the entire nature of difference – in other words, the intensive. Differences of degree are only the lowest degree of difference, and differences in kind are the highest form of difference. What differences in kind or of degree separate or differenciate, the degrees or nature of difference make the Same, but the same which is said of the different. Bergson, as we have seen,

went as far as this extreme conclusion: perhaps this 'same', the identity of nature and degrees of difference, is Repetition (ontological repetition) ...

There is an illusion tied to intensive quantities. This illusion, however, is not intensity itself, but rather the movement by which difference in intensity is cancelled. Nor is it only apparently cancelled. It is really cancelled, but outside itself, in extensity and underneath quality. We must therefore distinguish two orders of implication or degradation: a secondary implication which designates the state in which intensities are enveloped by the qualities and extensity which explicate them; and a primary implication designating the state in which intensity is implicated in itself, at once both enveloping and enveloped. In other words, a secondary degradation in which difference in intensity is cancelled, the highest rejoining the lowest; and a primary power of degradation in which the highest affirms the lowest. The illusion is precisely the confusion of these two instances or extrinsic and intrinsic states. How could it be avoided from the point of view of the empirical exercise of sensibility, since the latter can grasp intensity only in the order of quality and extensity? Only transcendental enquiry can discover that intensity remains implicated in itself and continues to envelop difference at the very moment when it is reflected in the extensity and the quality that it creates, which implicate it only secondarily, just enough to 'explicate it'. Extensity, quality, limitation, opposition indeed designate realities, but the form which difference assumes here is illusory. Difference pursues its subterranean life while its image reflected by the surface is scattered. Moreover, it is in the nature of that image, but only that image, to be scattered, just as it is in the nature of the surface to cancel difference, but only on the surface.

We asked how a transcendental principle might be extracted from the empirical principles of Carnot or Curie. When we seek to define *energy* in general, either we take account of the extensive and qualified factors of extensity – in which case we are reduced to saying 'there is something which remains constant', thereby formulating the great but flat tautology of the Identical – or, on the contrary, we consider pure intensity in so far as it is implicated in that deep region where no quality is developed, or any extensity deployed. In this case, we define energy in terms of the difference buried in this pure intensity and it is the formula 'difference of intensity' which bears the tautology, but this time the beautiful and profound tautology of the Different. Energy in general will not then be confused with a uniform energy at rest, which would render any transformation impossible. Only a particular form of empirical energy, qualified in extensity, can be at rest; one in which the difference in intensity is already cancelled because it is drawn outside itself and distributed among the elements of the system. However, energy in general or intensive quantity is the *spatium*, the theatre of all metamorphosis or difference in itself which envelops all its degrees in the production of each. In this sense, energy or

intensive quantity is a transcendental principle, not a scientific concept. In terms of the distinction between empirical and transcendental principles, an empirical principle is the instance which governs a particular domain. Every domain is a qualified and extended partial system, governed in such a manner that the difference of intensity which creates it tends to be cancelled within it (*law of nature*). But the domains are distributive and cannot be added: there is no more an extensity in general than there is an energy in general within extensity. On the other hand, there is an intensive space with no other qualification, and within this space a pure energy. The transcendental principle does not govern any domain but gives the domain to be governed to a given empirical principle; it accounts for the subjection of a domain to a principle. The domain is created by difference of intensity, and given by this difference to an empirical principle according to which and in which the difference itself is cancelled. It is the transcendental principle which maintains itself in itself, beyond the reach of the empirical principle. Moreover, while the laws of nature govern the surface of the world, the eternal return ceaselessly rumbles in this other dimension of the transcendental or the volcanic *spatium*.

When we say that the eternal return is not the return of the Same, or of the Similar or the Equal, we mean that it does not presuppose any identity. On the contrary, it is said of a world *without identity*, without resemblance or equality. It is said of a world the very ground of which is difference, in which everything rests upon disparities, upon differences of differences which reverberate to infinity (the world of intensity). The eternal return is itself the Identical, the similar and the equal, but it presupposes nothing of itself in that of which it is said. It is said of that which has no identity, no resemblance and no equality. It is the identical which is said of the different, the resemblance which is said of the pure *disparate*, the equal which is said only of the unequal and the proximity which is said of all distances. Things must be dispersed within difference, and their identity must be dissolved before they become subject to eternal return and to identity in the eternal return. We can therefore measure the chasm which separates eternal return as a 'modern' belief, or even a belief of the future, from eternal return as an ancient or supposedly ancient belief. In fact, it is a meagre achievement on the part of our philosophy of history to oppose what is taken to be our historical time with the cyclical time supposed to be that of the Ancients. It is supposed that for the Ancients *things revolve*, whereas for we Moderns they progress in a straight line. However, this opposition between cyclical and linear time is a weak idea. Every time such a schema is tested it fails for several reasons. In the first place, the eternal return that is attributed to the Ancients presupposes the identity in general of that which it is supposed to make return. This return of the identical, however, is subject to certain conditions which contradict it in fact. For it is grounded either upon the cyclical transformation of qualitative elements

into one another (physical eternal return) or upon the circular movement of incorruptible celestial bodies (astronomical eternal return). In both cases, return is presented as a 'law of nature'. In the one case, it is interpreted in terms of quality, in the other case, in terms of extensity. However, whether astronomical or physical, extensive or qualitative, this interpretation of eternal return has already reduced the identity that it presupposes to a simple and very general resemblance: for the 'same' qualitative process, or the 'same' respective position of the stars determine only very crude resemblances among the phenomena they govern. Moreover, eternal return is here so badly understood that it is opposed to what is intimately connected with it: on the one hand, with the ideal of an exit from the 'wheel of births', it finds a first qualitative limit in the form of metamorphoses and transmigrations; on the other hand, with the irreducible inequality of the celestial periods, it finds a second quantitative limit in the form of irrational numbers. Thus the two themes most profoundly linked to eternal return, that of qualitative metamorphosis and that of quantitative inequality, are turned back against it, having lost all intelligible relation to it. We are not saying that eternal return 'as it was believed by the Ancients' is erroneous or unfounded. We are saying that the Ancients only approximately and partially believed in it. It was not so much an eternal return as a system of partial cycles and cycles of resemblance. It was a generality – in short, a law of nature. (Even the great year of Heraclitus was only the time necessary for that part of fire which constituted a living being to transform itself into earth and back into fire.)[15] Alternatively, if there is, in Greece or elsewhere, a genuine knowledge of eternal return, it is a cruel and esoteric knowledge which must be sought in another dimension, more mysterious and more uncommon than that of astronomical or qualitative cycles and their generalities.

Why did Nietzsche, who knew the Greeks, know that the eternal return was *his* own invention, an untimely belief or belief of the future? Because 'his' eternal return is in no way the return of a same, a similar or an equal. Nietzsche says clearly that if there were identity, if there were an undifferentiated qualitative state of the world or a position of equilibrium for the stars, then this would be a reason never to leave it, not a reason for entering into a cycle. Nietzsche thereby links eternal return to what appeared to oppose it or limit it from without – namely, complete metamorphosis, the irreducibly unequal. Depth, distance, caves, the lower depths, the tortuous, and the unequal in itself form the only landscape of the eternal return. Zarathustra reminds the buffoon as well as the eagle and the serpent that it is not an astronomical 'refrain', nor a physical circle. ... It is not a law of nature. The eternal return is elaborated within a ground, or within a groundlessness in which original Nature resides in its chaos, beyond the jurisdictions and laws which constitute only second

nature. Nietzsche opposes 'his' hypothesis to the cyclical hypothesis, 'his' depth to the absence of depth in the sphere of the immutable. The eternal return is neither qualitative nor extensive but intensive, purely intensive. In other words, it is said of difference. This is the fundamental connection between the eternal return and the will to power. The one does not hold without the other. The will to power is the flashing world of metamorphoses, of communicating intensities, differences of differences, of *breaths*, insinuations and exhalations: a world of intensive intentionalities, a world of simulacra or 'mysteries'.[16] Eternal return is the being of this world, the only Same which is said of this world and excludes any prior identity therein. It is true that Nietzsche was interested in the energetics of his time, but this was not the scientific nostalgia of a philosopher. We must discover what it was that he sought to find in the science of intensive quantities – namely, the means to realise what he called Pascal's prophecy: to make chaos an object of affirmation. Difference in the will to power is the highest object of sensibility, the *hohe Stimmung*, sensed against the laws of nature (remember that the will to power was first presented as a feeling, a feeling of distance). A thought contrary to the laws of nature, repetition in the eternal return is the highest thought, the *gross Gedanke*. Difference is the first affirmation; eternal return is the second, the 'eternal affirmation of being' or the 'nth' power which is said of the first. It is always on the basis of a signal – or, in other words, a primary intensity – that thought occurs. Along the broken chain or the tortuous ring we are violently led from the limit of sense to the limit of thought, from what can only be sensed to what can only be thought.

It is because nothing is equal, because everything bathes in its difference, its dissimilarity and its inequality, even with itself, that everything returns – or rather, everything does not return. What does not return is that which denies eternal return, that which does not pass the test. It is quality and extensity which do not return, in so far as within them difference, the condition of eternal return, is cancelled. So too the negative, in so far as difference is thereby inverted and cancelled. So too the identical, the similar and the equal, in so far as these constitute the forms of indifference. So too God, along with the self as the form and guarantee of identity: everything which appears only under the law of 'once and for all', including repetition when it is subject to the condition of the identity of a same quality, a same extended body, a same self (as in the 'resurrection'). ... Does this truly mean that neither quality nor extensity returns? Or were we not, rather, led to distinguish two states of quality along with two states of extension? One in which quality flashes like a sign in the distance or interval created by a difference of intensity; the other in which, as an effect, it reacts upon its cause and tends to cancel difference. One in which extension remains implicated in the enveloping order of differences; the other in which extensity explicates difference and cancels it within a qualified system. This

distinction, which cannot be drawn within experience, becomes possible from the point of view of the thought of eternal return. The hard law of explication is that what is explicated is *explicated once and for all*. The ethics of intensive quantities has only two principles: affirm even the lowest, do not explicate oneself (too much). We must be like the father who criticised the child for having uttered all the dirty words he knew – not only because it was wrong but because he had said everything at once, because he kept nothing in reserve, no remainder for the subtle, implicated matter of the eternal return. Moreover, if the eternal return reduces qualities to the status of pure signs, and retains of extensities only what combines with the original depth, even at the cost of our coherence and in favour of a superior coherence, then the most beautiful qualities will appear, the most brilliant colours, the most precious stones and the most vibrant extensions. For once reduced to their seminal reasons, and having broken all relation with the negative, these will remain for ever affixed in the intensive space of positive differences. Then, in turn, the final prediction of the *Phaedo* will be realised, in which Plato promised to the sensibility disconnected from its empirical exercise temples, stars and gods such as had never before been seen, unheard-of affirmations. The prediction is realised, it is true, only by the very overturning of Platonism.

The affinity between intensive quantities and differentials has often been denied. Such criticism, however, bears only upon a misconception of this affinity. This should be grounded not upon the consideration of a series, the terms of a series and the differences between consecutive terms, but upon the confrontation between two types of relation: differential relations in the reciprocal synthesis of the Idea and relations of intensity in the asymmetrical synthesis of the sensible. The reciprocal synthesis dy/dx is continued in the asymmetrical synthesis which connects y to x. The intensive factor is a partial derivative or the differential of a composite function. A whole flow of exchange occurs between intensity and Ideas, as though between two corresponding figures of difference. Ideas are problematic or 'perplexed' virtual multiplicities, made up of relations between differential elements. Intensities are implicated multiplicities, 'implexes', made up of relations between asymmetrical elements which direct the course of the actualisation of Ideas and determine the cases of solution for problems. The aesthetic of intensities thus develops each of its moments in correspondence with the dialectic of Ideas: the power of intensity (depth) is grounded in the potentiality of the Idea. Already the illusion we encountered on the level of the aesthetic repeats that of the dialectic, and the form of the negative is the shadow projected by problems and their elements before it is the inverted image of intensive differences. Just as intensive quantities seem to be cancelled, so problematic Ideas seem to disappear. The unconscious of

little perceptions or intensive quantities refers to the unconscious of Ideas, and the art of the aesthetic echoes that of the dialectic. The latter is irony, understood as the art of problems and questions which is expressed in the handling of differential relations and in the distribution of the ordinary and the singular. By contrast, the art of the aesthetic is humour, a physical art of signals and signs determining the partial solutions or cases of solution – in short, an implicated art of intensive quantities.

These very general correspondences do not, nevertheless, indicate precisely how the affinity works, nor how the connection between intensive quantities and differentials operates. Let us reconsider the movement of Ideas, which is inseparable from a process of actualisation. For example, an Idea or multiplicity such as that of colour is constituted by the virtual coexistence of relations between genetic or differential elements of a particular order. These relations are actualised in qualitatively distinct colours, while their distinctive points are incarnated in distinct extensities which correspond to these qualities. The qualities are therefore differenciated, along with the extensities, in so far as these represent divergent lines along which the differential relations which coexist only in the Idea are actualised. We have seen that every process of actualisation was in this sense a double differenciation, qualitative and extensive. The categories of differenciation no doubt change according to the order of the differentials constitutive of the Idea: qualification and partition are the two aspects of physical actualisation, just as organisation and the determination of species are of biological actualisation. However, the qualities differenciated by virtue of the relations they actualise impose their own requirements, as do the extensities differenciated by virtue of the distinctive points they incarnate. That is why we proposed the concept of differen*t*/ciation to indicate at once both the state of differential relations in the Idea or virtual multiplicity, and the state of the qualitative and extensive series in which these are actualised by being differenciated. Thereby, however, the condition of such actualisation remains completely indeterminate. How is the Idea determined to incarnate itself in differenciated qualities and differenciated extensities? What determines the relations coexisting within the Idea to differenciate themselves in qualities and extensities? The answer lies precisely in the intensive quantities. Intensity is the determinant in the process of actualisation. It is intensity which *dramatises*. It is intensity which is immediately expressed in the basic spatio–temporal dynamisms and determines an 'indistinct' differential relation in the Idea to incarnate itself in a distinct quality and a distinguished extensity. In this way, after a fashion (but, as we shall see, only after a fashion), the movement and the categories of differenciation reproduce those of explication. We speak of differenciation in relation to the Idea which is actualised. We speak of explication in relation to the intensity which 'develops' and which, precisely, determines the movement

of actualisation. However, it remains literally true that intensity creates the qualities and extensities in which it explicates itself, because these qualities and extensities do not in any way resemble the ideal relations which are actualised within them: differenciation implies the creation of the lines along which it operates.

How does intensity fulfil this determinant role? In itself, it must be no less independent of the differenciation than of the explication which proceeds from it. It is independent of the explication by virtue of the order of implication which defines it. It is independent of the differenciation by virtue of its own essential process. The essential process of intensive quantities is individuation. Intensity is individuating, and intensive quantities are individuating factors. Individuals are signal–sign systems. All individuality is intensive, and therefore serial, stepped and communicating, comprising and affirming in itself the difference in intensities by which it is constituted. Gilbert Simondon has shown recently that individuation presupposes a prior metastable state – in other words, the existence of a 'disparateness' such as at least two orders of magnitude or two scales of heterogeneous reality between which potentials are distributed. Such a pre-individual state nevertheless does not lack singularities: the distinctive or singular points are defined by the existence and distribution of potentials. An 'objective' problematic field thus appears, determined by the distance between two heterogeneous orders. Individuation emerges like the act of solving such a problem, or – what amounts to the same thing – like the actualisation of a potential and the establishing of communication between disparates. The act of individuation consists not in suppressing the problem, but in integrating the elements of the disparateness into a state of coupling which ensures its internal resonance. The individual thus finds itself attached to a pre-individual half which is not the impersonal within it so much as the reservoir of its singularities.[17] In all these respects, we believe that individuation is essentially intensive, and that the pre-individual field is a virtual–ideal field, made up of differential relations. Individuation is what responds to the question 'Who?', just as the Idea responds to the questions 'How much?' and 'How?'. 'Who?' is always an intensity. ... Individuation is the act by which intensity determines differential relations to become actualised, along the lines of differenciation and within the qualities and extensities it creates. The total notion is therefore that of: indi-differen*t/c*iation (indi-drama-differen*t/c*iation). Irony, as the art of differential Ideas, is by no means unaware of singularity: on the contrary, it plays upon the entire distribution of ordinary and distinctive points. However, it is always a question of pre-individual singularities distributed within the Idea. It is unaware of the individual. Humour, the art of intensive quantities, plays upon the individual and individuating factors. Humour bears witness to the play of individuals as cases of solution, in relation to the differenciations it determines, whereas

irony, for its part, proceeds to the differentiations necessary within the calculation of problems or the determination of their conditions.

The individual is neither a quality nor an extension. The individual is neither a qualification nor a partition, neither an organisation nor a determination of species. The individual is no more an *infima species* than it is composed of parts. Qualitative or extensive interpretations of individuation remain incapable of providing reasons why a quality ceases to be general, or why a synthesis of extensity begins here and finishes there. The determination of qualities and species presupposes individuals to be qualified, while extensive parts are relative to an individual rather than the reverse. It is not sufficient, however, to mark a difference in kind between individuation and differenciation in general. This difference in kind remains unintelligible so long as we do not accept the necessary consequence: that individuation precedes differenciation in principle, that every differenciation presupposes a prior intense field of individuation. It is because of the action of the field of individuation that such and such differential relations and such and such distinctive points (pre-individual fields) are actualised – in other words, organised within intuition along lines differenciated in relation to other lines. As a result, they then form the quality, number, species and parts of an individual in short, its generality. Because there are individuals of different species and individuals of the same species, there is a tendency to believe that individuation is a continuation of the determination of species, albeit of a different kind and proceeding by different means. In fact any confusion between the two processes, any reduction of individuation to a limit or complication of differenciation, compromises the whole of the philosophy of difference. This would be to commit an error, this time in the actual, analogous to that made in confusing the virtual with the possible. Individuation does not presuppose any differenciation; it gives rise to it. Qualities and extensities, forms and matters, species and parts are not primary; they are imprisoned in individuals as though in a crystal. Moreover, the entire world may be read, as though in a crystal ball, in the moving depth of individuating differences or differences in intensity.

All differences are borne by individuals, but they are not all individual differences. Under what conditions does a difference become regarded as individual? The problem of classification was clearly always a problem of ordering differences. However, plant and animal classifications show that we can order differences only so long as we are provided with a multiple network of continuity of resemblance. The idea of a continuity among living beings was never distinct from that of classification, much less opposed to it. It was not even an idea supposed to limit or nuance the demands of classification. On the contrary, it is the prerequisite of any possible classification. For example, one asks which among several differences is the one which truly forms a 'characteristic' – in other words,

the one which allows to be grouped under a reflected identity those beings which resemble one another on a maximum number of points. It is in this sense that a genus may be simultaneously both a concept of reflection and also a natural concept (to the extent that the identity it 'carves out' is related to that of neighbouring species). If we consider three plants, A, B and C, of which A and B are ligneous while C is non-ligneous, B and C are blue while A is red, then 'ligneous' will be the characteristic, since it ensures the greatest subordination of differences to the order of increasing and decreasing resemblances. No doubt the order of resemblances may be denounced as belonging to crude perception. This, however is so only on condition that one substitutes for units of reflection the great constitutive units (either Cuvier's great functional units or Geoffroy's great units of composition), in relation to which difference is still understood in terms of judgements of analogy or in terms of variation within a universal concept. In any case, so long as it is subordinated to the criteria of resemblance within perception, identity within reflection, analogy within judgement and opposition within the concept, difference is not regarded as individual difference. It remains only general difference, even though it is borne by the individual.

Darwin's great novelty, perhaps, was that of inaugurating the thought of individual difference. The leitmotiv of *The Origin of Species* is: we do not know what individual difference is capable of! We do not know how far it can go, assuming that we add to it natural selection. Darwin's problem is posed in terms rather similar to those employed by Freud on another occasion: it is a question of knowing under what conditions small, unconnected or free-floating differences become appreciable, connected and fixed differences. Natural selection indeed plays the role of a principle of reality, even of success, and shows how differences become connected to one another and accumulate in a given direction, but also how they tend to diverge further and further in different or even opposed directions. Natural selection plays an essential role: the differenciation of difference (survival of the most divergent). Where selection does not occur or no longer occurs, differences remain or once more become free-floating; where it occurs, it does so to fix the differences and make them diverge. The great taxonomic units – genera, families, orders and classes – no longer provide a means of understanding difference by relating it to such apparent conditions as resemblances, identities, analogies and determined oppositions. *On the contrary*, these taxonomic units are understood on the basis of such fundamental mechanisms of natural selection as difference and the differenciation of difference. For Darwin, no doubt, individual difference does not yet have a clear status, to the extent that it is considered for itself and as primary matter of selection or differenciation: understood as free-floating or unconnected difference, it is not distinguished from an indeterminate variability. That is why Weissmann makes an essential

contribution to Darwinism when he shows how individual difference finds a natural cause in sexed reproduction: sexed reproduction as the principle of the 'incessant production of varied individual differences'. To the extent that sexual differenciation itself results from sexed reproduction, we see that the three great biological differenciations – that of species, that of organic parts and that of the sexes – turn around individual difference, not vice versa. These are the three figures of the Copernican Revolution of Darwinism. The first concerns the differenciation of individual differences in the form of the divergence of characteristics and the determination of groups. The second concerns the connection of differences in the form of the co-ordination of characteristics within the same group. The third concerns the production of differences as the continuous matter of differenciation and connection.

In appearance – well-founded appearance, certainly – sexed reproduction is subordinated to the criteria of the species and the demands of the organic parts. It is true that the egg must reproduce all the parts of the organism to which it belongs. It is also more or less true that sexed reproduction operates within the limits of the species. However, it has often been noticed that all modes of reproduction imply phenomena of organic 'de-differenciation'. The egg reconstitutes the parts only on condition that it develops within a field which does not depend upon them. It develops within the limits of the species only on condition that it also presents phenomena of specific de-differenciation. Only beings of the same species can effectively overcome the limits of the species and produce beings which function as sketches, provisionally reduced to supra-specific characteristics. This is what von Baër discovered when he showed that an embryo does not reproduce ancestral adult forms belonging to other species, but rather experiences or undergoes states and undertakes movements which are not viable for the species but go beyond the limits of the species, genus, order or class, and can be sustained only by the embryo itself, under the conditions of embryonic life. Baër concludes that epigenesis proceeds from more to less general – in other words, from the most general types to generic and specific determinations. However, this high level of generality has nothing to do with an abstract taxonomic concept since it is, as such, *lived* by the embryo. It refers, on the one hand, to the differential relations which constitute the virtuality which exists prior to the actualisation of the species; on the other hand, it refers to the first movements of that actualisation, and particularly to its condition – namely, individuation as it finds its field of constitution in the egg. The highest generalities of life, therefore, point beyond species and genus, but point beyond them in the direction of the individual and pre-individual singularities rather than towards an impersonal abstraction. If we notice, with Baër, that not only the type but also the specific form of the embryo appears very early, we should not necessarily take this to indicate the

irreducibility of types and branchings, but rather the speed and relative acceleration of the influence exercised by individuation upon actualisation or the determination of species.[18] It is not the individual which is an illusion in relation to the genius of the species, but the species which is an illusion – inevitable and well founded, it is true – in relation to the play of the individual and individuation. The question is not whether in fact the individual can be separated from its species and its parts. It cannot. However, does not this very 'inseparability', along with the speed of appearance of the species and its parts, testify to the primacy in principle of individuation over differenciation? It is the individual which is above the species, and precedes the species in principle. Moreover, the embryo is the individual as such directly caught up in the field of its individuation. Sexed reproduction defines this very field: if it is accompanied in the product by an all the more precocious apparition of the specific form, this is because the very notion of the species depends first upon sexed reproduction, which accelerates the movement of the unfolding of actualisation by individuation (the egg itself is already the site of the first developments). The embryo is a sort of phantasm of its parents; every embryo is a chimera, capable of functioning as a sketch and of living that which is unlivable for the adult of every species. It undertakes forced movements, constitutes internal resonances and dramatises the primordial relations of life. The problem of comparison between animal and human sexuality consists of finding out how sexuality ceases to be a function and breaks its attachments to reproduction, for human sexuality interiorises the conditions of the production of phantasms. Dreams are our eggs, our larvae and our properly psychic individuals. The vital egg is nevertheless already a field of individuation, and the embryo is a pure individual, and the one in the other testifies to the primacy of individuation over actualisation – in other words, over both organisation and the determination of species.

Individuating difference must be understood first within its field of individuation – not as belated, but as in some sense in the egg. Since the work of Child and Weiss, we recognise the axes or planes of symmetry within an egg. Here too, however, the positive element lies less in the elements of the given symmetry than in those which are missing. An intensity forming a wave of variation throughout the protoplasm distributes its difference along the axes and from one pole to another. The region of maximal activity is the first to come into play, exercising a dominant influence on the development of the corresponding parts at a lower rate: the individual in the egg is a genuine descent, going from the highest to the lowest and affirming the differences which comprise it and in which it falls. In a young amphibian *gastrula* the intensity seems to be maximal in a mid '*sub-blastoporal*' region and to decrease in all directions, but less rapidly towards the animal pole. In the middle layer of a young vertebrate *neurula* the intensity decreases, for each transverse section, from

the mid-dorsal to the mid-ventral line. In order to plumb the intensive depths or the *spatium* of an egg, the directions and distances, the dynamisms and dramas, the potentials and potentialities must be multiplied. The world is an egg. Moreover, the egg, in effect, provides us with a model for the order of reasons: (organic and species related) differentiation–individuation–dramatisation–differenciation. We think that difference of intensity, as this is implicated in the egg, expresses first the differential relations or virtual matter to be organised. This intensive field of individuation determines the relations that it expresses to be incarnated in spatio–temporal dynamisms (dramatisation), in species which correspond to these relations (specific differenciation), and in organic parts which correspond to the distinctive points in these relations (organic differenciation). Individuation always governs actualisation: the organic parts are induced only on the basis of the gradients of their intensive environment; the types determined in their species only by virtue of the individuating intensity. Throughout, intensity is primary in relation to organic extensions and to species qualities. Notions such as 'morphogenetic potential', 'field–gradient–threshold' put forward by Dalcq, which essentially concern the relations of intensity as such, account for this complex ensemble. This is why the question of the comparative role of the nucleus and the cytoplasm, in the egg as in the world, is not easily solved. The nucleus and the genes designate only the differentiated matter – in other words, the differential relations which constitute the pre-individual field to be actualised; but their actualisation is determined only by the cytoplasm, with its gradients and its fields of individuation.

Species do not resemble the differential relations which are actualised in them; organic parts do not resemble the distinctive points which correspond to these relations. Species and parts do not resemble the intensities which determine them. As Dalcq says, when a caudal appendix is induced by its intensive environment, that appendix corresponds to a certain level of morphogenetic potential and depends upon a system in which 'nothing is *a priori* caudal'.[19] The egg destroys the model of similitude. To the extent that the requirements of resemblance disappear, two quarrels seem to lose much of their meaning. On the one hand, pre-formism and epigenesis cease to be opposed once we admit that the enveloped pre-formations are intensive while the developed formations are qualitative and extensive, and that they do not resemble one another. On the other hand, fixism and evolutionism tend to be reconciled to the extent that movement does not go from one actual term to another, nor from general to particular, but – by the intermediary of a determinant individuation – from the virtual to its actualisation.

Nevertheless, we have not advanced with regard to the principal difficulty. We invoke a field of individuation or individuating difference as the condition of the organisation and determination of species. However,

this field of individuation is posited only formally and in general: it seems to be 'the same' for a given species, and to vary in intensity from one species to another. It seems, therefore, to depend upon the species and the determination of species, and to refer us once more to differences borne by the individual, not to individual differences. In order for this difficulty to disappear, the individuating difference must not only be conceived within a field of individuation in general, but must itself be conceived as an individual difference. The form of the field must be necessarily and in itself filled with individual differences. This plenitude must be immediate, thoroughly precocious and not delayed in the egg, to such a degree that the principle of indiscernibles would indeed have the formula given it by Lucretius: no two eggs or grains of wheat are identical. These conditions, we believe, are fully satisfied in the order of implication of intensities. Intensities presuppose and express only differential relations; individuals presuppose only Ideas. Furthermore, the differential relations within Ideas are not more species (or genera, or families, etc.) than their distinctive points form parts. They by no means constitute either qualities or extensions. On the contrary, all the Ideas, all the relations with their variations and points, coexist, even though there are changes of order according to the elements considered: they are fully determined and differentiated even though they are completely undifferenciated. Such a mode of 'distinction' seemed to us to correspond to the *perplication* of Ideas – in other words, to their problematic character and to the reality of the virtual which they represent. This is why Ideas have the logical character of being simultaneously both distinct and obscure. They are obscure (undifferenciated and coexisting with other Ideas, 'perplicated' with them) in so far as they are distinct [*omni modo determinata*]. The question then is what happens when Ideas are expressed by intensities or individuals in this new dimension of implication.

Intensity or difference in itself thus expresses differential relations and their corresponding distinctive points. It introduces a new type of distinction into these relations and between Ideas a new type of distinction. Henceforward, the Ideas, relations, variations in those relations and distinctive points are in a sense separated: instead of coexisting, they enter states of simultaneity or succession. Nevertheless, all the intensities are implicated in one another, each in turn both enveloped and enveloping, such that each continues to express the changing totality of Ideas, the variable ensemble of differential relations. However, each intensity *clearly* expresses only certain relations or certain degrees of variation. Those that it expresses clearly are precisely those on which it is focused when it has the *enveloping* role. In its role as the *enveloped*, it still expresses all relations and all degrees, but *confusedly*. As the two roles are reciprocal, and as intensity is in the first instance enveloped by itself, it must be said that the clear and the confused, as logical characteristics in the intensity

which expresses the Idea – in other words, in the individual which thinks it – are no more separable than the distinct and the obscure are separable in the Idea itself. The clear–confused as individuating intensive unit corresponds to the distinct–obscure as ideal unit. Clear–confused does not qualify the Idea, but the thinker who thinks or expresses it. The thinker is the individual. The distinct was precisely the obscure: it was the obscure in so far as it was distinct. In the present case, however, the clear is precisely the confused; it is confused in so far as it is clear. We saw that the weakness of the theory of representation, from the point of view of the logic of knowledge, was to have established a direct proportion between the clear and the distinct, at the expense of the inverse proportion which relates these two logical values: the entire image of thought was compromised as a result. Only Leibniz approached the conditions of a logic of thought, inspired by his theory of individuation and expression. For despite the complexity and ambiguity of the texts, it does indeed seem at times that the expressed (the continuum of differential relations or the unconscious virtual Idea) should be in itself distinct and obscure: for example, all the drops of water in the sea like so many genetic elements with the differential relations, the variations in these relations and the distinctive points they comprise. In addition, it seems that the expressor (the perceiving, imagining or thinking individual) should be by nature clear and confused: for example, our perception of the noise of the sea, which confusedly includes the whole and clearly expresses only certain relations or certain points by virtue of our bodies and a threshold of consciousness which they determine.

The order of implication includes the enveloping no less than the enveloped, depth as well as distance. When an enveloping intensity clearly expresses certain differential relations and certain distinctive points, it still expresses confusedly all the other relations, all their variations and points. It expresses these in the intensities it envelops. These latter enveloped intensities are then within the former. The enveloping intensities (depth) constitute the field of individuation, the individuating differences. The enveloped intensities (distances) constitute the individual differences. The latter necessarily fill the former. Why is the enveloping intensity already a field of individuation? Because the differential relation on which it is focused is not yet a species, nor are its distinctive points yet parts. They will become so, but only in being actualised by the action of this field which it constitutes. Must we say at least that all the individuals of a given species have the same field of individuation, since they point originally to the same relation? Certainly not, for while two individuating intensities may be abstractly the same by virtue of their clear expression, they are never the same by virtue of the order of intensities which they envelop or the relations which they confusedly express. There is a variable order according to which the ensemble of relations is diversely implicated in

these secondary intensities. We should nevertheless avoid saying that an individual has individual difference only by virtue of its confused sphere. This would be again to neglect the indissolubility of the clear and the confused. It would be to forget that the clear is confused by itself, in so far as it is clear. In effect, the secondary intensities represent the fundamental property of the primary intensities – namely, the power to divide in changing their nature. Two intensities are never identical except abstractly. Rather, they differ in kind, if only by the manner in which they divide within the intensities they include. Finally, we should not say that the individuals of a given species are distinguished by their participation in other species: as if, for example, there was ass or lion, wolf or sheep, in every human being. There is indeed all that, and metempsychosis retains all its symbolic truth. However, the ass and the wolf can be considered species only in relation to the fields of individuation which clearly express them. In the confused and in the enveloped, they play only the role of variables, of individual differences or composing souls. That is why Leibniz was right to substitute the notion of 'metaschematism' for that of metempsychosis, meaning by this that a soul never changed bodies, but its body could be re-enveloped or reimplicated in order to enter, if need be, other fields of individuation, thereby returning to a 'more subtle theatre'.[20] Every body, every thing, thinks and is a thought to the extent that, reduced to its intensive reasons, it expresses an Idea the actualisation of which it determines. However, the thinker himself makes his individual differences from all manner of things: it is in this sense that he is laden with stones and diamonds, plants 'and even animals'. The thinker, undoubtedly the thinker of eternal return, is the individual, the universal individual. It is he who makes use of all the power of the clear and the confused, of the clear–confused, in order to think Ideas in all their power as the distinct–obscure. The multiple, mobile and communicating character of individuality, its implicated character, must therefore be constantly recalled. The indivisibility of the individual pertains solely to the property of intensive quantities not to divide without changing nature. We are made of all these depths and distances, of these intensive souls which develop and are re-enveloped. We call individuating factors the ensemble of these enveloping and enveloped intensities, of these individuating and individual differences which ceaselessly interpenetrate one another throughout the fields of individuation. Individuality is not a characteristic of the Self but, on the contrary, forms and sustains the system of the dissolved Self.

We must give a more precise account of the relations between explication and differenciation. Intensity creates the extensities and the qualities in which it is explicated; these extensities and qualities are differenciated. Extensities are formally distinct from one another, and comprise within them-

selves the distinctions between parts corresponding to the distinctive points. Qualities are materially distinct, and comprise the distinctions corresponding to the variations of relations. Creation is always the production of lines and figures of differenciation. It is nevertheless true that intensity is explicated only in being cancelled in this differenciated system that it creates. Equally, we notice that the differenciation of a system occurs by linkage with a more general system which is 'de-differenciated'. In this sense, even living beings do not contradict the empirical principle of degradation, and the local differenciations are compensated by an overall tendency towards uniformity, in exactly the same way as a final cancellation compensates the originary creations. We nevertheless see that very important variations occur from one domain to the next. Physical and biological systems are distinguished first by the order of the Ideas they incarnate or actualise: differentials of this or that order. Secondly, they are distinguished by the process of individualisation which determines that actualisation: in a physical system, this happens all at once, and affects only the boundaries, whereas a biological system receives successive waves of singularities and involves its whole internal milieu in the operations which take place at the outer limits. Finally, they are distinguished by the figures of differenciation which represent actualisation itself: organisation and the determination of biological species as opposed to simple physical qualification and distribution. Nevertheless, whatever the domain under consideration, the law of explication remains the cancellation of productive difference and the erasure of the differenciation produced which is manifest in physical equilibrium as well as in biological death. Once again, the principle of degradation is never negated or contradicted. Yet if it 'explicates' everything, it accounts for nothing. As has been said: if everything goes into this principle, nothing comes out. If nothing contradicts it, if there is no counter-order or exception, then there are, on the contrary, many things of another order. While local increases in entropy may be compensated by a more general degradation, they are in no way comprised in or produced by the latter. Empirical principles tend to leave out the elements of their own foundation. The principle of degradation obviously does not account either for the creation of the most simple system or for the evolution of systems (the threefold difference between biological systems and physical ones). The living therefore testifies to the existence of another order, a heterogeneous order of another dimension – as though the individuating factors or the atoms taken individually with their power of mutual communication and fluent instability there enjoyed a higher degree of expression.[21]

What is the formula for this 'evolution'? The more complex a system, the more the *values peculiar to implication* appear within it. The presence of these values is what allows a judgement of the complexity or the complication of a system, and determines the preceding characteristics of biological systems. The values of implication are centres of envelopment.

These centres are not the intensive individuating factors themselves, but they are their representatives within a complex whole in the process of explication. It is these which constitute the little islands and the local increases of entropy at the heart of systems which nevertheless conform overall to the principle of degradation: atoms taken individually, for example, even though they none the less confirm the law of increasing entropy when considered *en masse* in the order of explication of the system in which they are implicated. In so far as it testifies to individual actions between directed molecules, an organism such as a mammal may be assimilated to a microscopic being. The function of these centres may be defined in several ways. First, to the extent that the individuating factors form a kind of noumenon of the phenomenon, we claim that the noumenon tends to appear as such in complex systems, that it finds its own phenomenon in the centres of envelopment. Second, to the extent that sense is tied to the Ideas which are incarnated and to the individuations which determine that incarnation, we claim that these centres are expressive, or that they reveal sense. Finally, to the extent that every phenomenon finds its reason in a difference of intensity which frames it, as though this constituted the boundaries between which it flashes, we claim that complex systems increasingly tend to interiorise their constitutive differences: the centres of envelopment carry out this interiorisation of the individuating factors. The more the difference on which the system depends is interiorised in the phenomenon, the more repetition finds itself interior, the less it depends upon external conditions which are supposed to ensure the reproduction of the 'same' differences.

As the movement of life shows, difference and repetition tend to become interiorised in signal–sign systems both at once. Biologists are right when, in posing the problem of heredity, they avoid allocating distinct functions, such as variation and reproduction, to these systems, but rather seek to show the underlying unity or reciprocal conditioning of these functions. At this point, the theories of heredity necessarily open on to a philosophy of nature. It is as if repetition were never the repetition of the 'same' but always of the Different as such, and the object of difference in itself were repetition. At the moment when they are explicated in a system (once and for all) the differential, intensive or individuating factors testify to their persistence in implication, and to eternal return as the truth of that implication. Mute witnesses to degradation and death, the centres of envelopment are also the dark precursors of the eternal return. Here again, it is the mute witnesses or dark precusors which do everything – or, at least, it is in these that everything happens.

Speaking of evolution necessarily leads us to psychic systems. For each type of system, we must ask what pertains to Ideas and what pertains to implication–individuation and explication–differenciation respectively. With psychic systems the problem assumes a particular urgency, since it is

by no means certain that either the I or the Self falls within the domain of individuation. They are, rather, figures of differenciation. The I forms the properly psychic determination of species, while the Self forms the psychic organisation. The I is the quality of human being as a species. The determination of psychic species is not of the same type as the determination of biological species, since here the determination must equal, or be of the same power as, the determinable. That is why Descartes refused any definition of human being which would proceed by genus and difference as in the case of animal species: for example, 'rational animal'. On the contrary, he presents the *I think* as another procedure of *definition*, one capable of demonstrating the specificity of humanity or the quality of its substance. In correlation with the I, the Self must understand itself in extension: the Self designates the properly psychic organism, with its distinctive points represented by the diverse faculties which enter into the comprehension of the I. As a result, the fundamental psychic correlation is expressed in the formula '*I* think *Myself*', just as the biological correlation is expressed in the complementarity of species and their parts, of quality and extension. That is why both the I and the Self each begin with differences, but these differences are distributed in such a way as to be cancelled, in accordance with the requirements of good sense and common sense. The I therefore appears at the end as the universal form of psychic life, just as the Self is the universal matter of that form. The I and the Self explicate one another, and do so endlessly throughout the entire history of the Cogito.

The individuating factors or the implicated factors of individuation therefore have neither the form of the I nor the matter of the Self. This is because the I is inseparable from a form of identity, while the Self is indistinguishable from a matter constituted by a continuity of resemblances. The differences included within the I and the Self are, without doubt, borne by individuals: nevertheless, they are not individual or individuating to the extent that they are understood in relation to this identity in the I and this resemblance in the Self. By contrast, every individuating factor is already difference and difference of difference. It is constructed upon a fundamental disparity, and functions on the edges of that disparity as such. That is why these factors endlessly communicate with one another across fields of individuation, becoming enveloped in one another in a demesne which disrupts the matter of the Self as well as the form of the I. Individuation is mobile, strangely supple, fortuitous and endowed with fringes and margins; all because the intensities which contribute to it communicate with each other, envelop other intensities and are in turn enveloped. The individual is far from indivisible, never ceasing to divide and change its nature. It is not a Self with regard to what it expresses, for it expresses Ideas in the form of internal multiplicities, made up of differential relations and distinctive points or pre-individual

singularities. Nor is it an I with regard to its expressive character, for here again it forms a multiplicity of actualisation, as though it were a condensation of distinctive points or an open collection of intensities. The fringe of indetermination which surrounds individuals and the relative, floating and fluid character of individuality itself has often been commented upon (for example, the case of two physical particles whose individuality can no longer be observed when their fields of individuation or domains of presence encroach upon one another; or the case of the biological distinction between an organ and an organism which depends on the situation of the corresponding intensities according to whether or not these are enveloped within a larger field of individuation). The error, however, is to believe that this indetermination or this relativity indicates something incomplete in individuality or something interrupted in individuation. On the contrary, they express the full, positive power of the individual as such, and the manner in which it is distinguished in nature from both an I and a self. The individual is distinguished from the I and the self just as the intense order of implications is distinguished from the extensive and qualitative order of explication. Indeterminate, floating, fluid, communicative and enveloping–enveloped are so many positive characteristics affirmed by the individual. It is therefore insufficient to multiply selves or to 'attenuate' the I in order to discover the true status of individuation. We have seen to what extent selves must be presupposed as a condition of passive organic syntheses, already playing the role of mute witnesses. However, the synthesis of time which is carried out in them refers precisely to other syntheses as though to other witnesses, thereby leading us into the domain of another nature in which there is no longer either self or I, and in which, by contrast, we encounter the chaotic realm of individuation. For each self still retains some resemblance in its matter, while each I retains an identity, however attenuated. However, that which has its ground in dissemblance, or its lack of ground in a difference of difference, does not fit the categories of the I and the Self.

The great discovery of Nietzsche's philosophy, which marks his break with Schopenhauer and goes under the name of the will to power or the Dionysian world, is the following: no doubt the I and the Self must be replaced by an undifferenciated abyss, but this abyss is neither an impersonal nor an abstract Universal beyond individuation. On the contrary, it is the I and the self which are the abstract universals. They must be replaced, but in and by individuation, in the direction of the individuating factors which consume them and which constitute the fluid world of Dionysus. What cannot be replaced is individuation itself. Beyond the self and the I we find not the impersonal but the individual and its factors, individuation and its fields, individuality and its pre-individual singularities. For the pre-individual is still singular, just as the ante-self and the ante-I are still individual – or, rather than simply 'still', we should say

'finally'. That is why the individual in intensity finds its psychic image neither in the organisation of the self nor in the determination of species of the I, but rather in the fractured I and the dissolved self, and in the correlation of the fractured I with the dissolved self. This correlation seems clear, like that of the thinker and the thought, or that of the clear–confused thinker with distinct–obscure Ideas (the Dionysian thinker). It is Ideas which lead us from the fractured I to the dissolved Self. As we have seen, what swarms around the edges of the fracture are Ideas in the form of problems – in other words, in the form of multiplicities made up of differential relations and variations of relations, distinctive points and transformations of points. These Ideas, however, are expressed in individuating factors, in the implicated world of intensive quantities which constitute the universal concrete individuality of the thinker or the system of the dissolved Self.

Death is inscribed in the I and the self, like the cancellation of difference in a system of explication, or the degradation which compensates for the processes of differenciation. From this point of view, death may well be inevitable, but every death is none the less accidental and violent, and always comes from without. Simultaneously, however, death has quite another face hidden among the individuating factors which dissolve the self: here it is like a 'death instinct', an internal power which frees the individuating elements from the form of the I or the matter of the self in which they are imprisoned. It would be wrong to confuse the two faces of death, as though the death instinct were reduced to a tendency towards increasing entropy or a return to inanimate matter. Every death is double, and represents the cancellation of large differences in extension as well as the liberation and swarming of little differences in intensity. Freud suggested the following hypothesis: the organism wants to die, but to die in its own way, so that real death always presents itself as a foreshortening, as possessing an accidental, violent and external character which is anathema to the internal will-to-die. There is a necessary non-correspondence between death as an empirical event and death as an 'instinct' or transcendental instance. Freud and Spinoza are both right: one with regard to the instinct, the other with regard to the event. Desired from within, death always comes from without in a passive and accidental form. Suicide is an attempt to make the two incommensurable faces coincide or correspond. However, the two sides do not meet, and every death remains double. On the one hand, it is a 'de-differenciation' which compensates for the differenciations of the I and the Self in an overall system which renders these uniform; on the other hand, it is a matter of individuation, a protest by the individual which has never recognised itself within the limits of the Self and the I, even where these are universal.

There must none the less be values of implication in psychic systems in the process of being explicated; in other words, there must be centres of

envelopment which testify to the presence of individuating factors. These centres are clearly constituted neither by the I nor by the Self, but by a completely different structure belonging to the I–Self system. This structure should be designated by the name 'other'. It refers only to the self for the other I and the other I for the self. Theories tend to oscillate mistakenly and ceaselessly from a pole at which the other is reduced to the status of object to a pole at which it assumes the status of subject. Even Sartre was content to inscribe this oscillation in the other as such, in showing that the other became object when I became subject, and did not become subject unless I in turn became object. As a result, the structure of the other, as well as its role in psychic systems, remained misunderstood. The other who is nobody, but who is self for the other and the other for the self in two systems, the *a priori Other* is defined in each system by its expressive value – in other words, its implicit and enveloping value. Consider a terrified face (under conditions such that I do not see and do not experience the causes of this terror). This face expresses a possible world: the terrifying world. By 'expression' we mean, as always, that relation which involves a torsion between an expressor and an expressed such that the expressed does not exist apart from the expressor, even though the expressor relates to it as though to something completely different. By 'possible', therefore, we do not mean any resemblance but that state of the implicated or enveloped in its very heterogeneity with what envelops it: the terrified face does not resemble what terrifies it, it envelops a state of the terrifying world. In every psychic system there is a swarm of possibilities around reality, but our possibles are always Others. The Other cannot be separated from the expressivity which constitutes it. Even when we consider the body of another as an object, its ears and eyes as anatomical pieces, we do not remove all expressivity from them even though we simplify in the extreme the world they express: the eye is an implicated light or the expression of a possible light, while the ear is that of a possible sound.[22] Concretely, however, it is the so-called tertiary qualities whose mode of existence is in the first instance enveloped by the other. The I and the Self, by contrast, are immediately characterised by functions of development or explication: not only do they experience qualities in general as already developed in the extensity of their system, but they tend to explicate or develop the world expressed by the other, either in order to participate in it or to deny it (I unravel the frightened face of the other, I either develop it into a frightening world the reality of which seizes me, or I denounce its unreality). However, these relations of development, which form our commonalities as well as our disagreements with the other, also dissolve its structure and reduce it either to the status of an object or to the status of a subject. That is why, in order to grasp the other as such, we were right to insist upon special conditions of experience, however artificial – namely,

the moment at which the expressed has (for us) no existence apart from that which expresses it: the Other as *the expression of a possible world.*

In the psychic system of the I–Self, the Other thus functions as a centre of enwinding, envelopment or implication. It is the representative of the individuating factors. Moreover, if an organism may be regarded as a microscopic being, how much more is this true of the Other in psychic systems. It gives rise there to local increases in entropy, whereas the explication of the other by the self represents a degradation in accordance with law. The rule invoked earlier – not to be explicated too much – meant, above all, not to explicate oneself too much with the other, not to explicate the other too much, but to maintain one's implicit values and multiply one's own world by populating it with all those expresseds that do not exist apart from their expressions. For it is not the other which is another I, but the I which is an other, a fractured I. There is no love which does not begin with the revelation of a possible world as such, enwound in the other which expresses it. Albertine's face expressed the blending of beach and waves: 'From what unknown world does she distinguish me?' The entire history of that exemplary love is the long explication of the possible worlds expressed by Albertine, which transform her now into a fascinating subject, now into a deceptive object. It is true that the other disposes of a means to endow the possibles that it expresses with reality, independently of the development we cause them to undergo. This means is language. Words offered by the other confer reality on the possible as such; whence the foundation of the lie inscribed within language itself. It is this role of language as a result of the values of implication or the centres of envelopment which endows it with its powers within internal resonance systems. The structure of the other and the corresponding function of language effectively represent the manifestation of the noumenon, the appearance of expressive values – in short, the tendency towards the interiorisation of difference.

Conclusion

Difference is not and cannot be thought in itself, so long as it is subject to the requirements of representation. The question whether it was 'always' subject to these requirements, and for what reasons, must be closely examined. But it appears that pure *disparates* formed either the celestial beyond of a divine understanding inaccessible to our representative thought, or the infernal and unfathomable for us below of an Ocean of dissemblance. In any case, difference in itself appears to exclude any relation between different and different which would allow it to be thought. It seems that it can become thinkable only when tamed – in other words, when subject to the four iron collars of representation: identity in the concept, opposition in the predicate, analogy in judgement and resemblance in perception. As Foucault has shown, the classical world of representation is defined by these four dimensions which co-ordinate and measure it. These are the four roots of the principle of reason: the identity of the concept which is reflected in a *ratio cognoscendi*; the opposition of the predicate which is developed in a *ratio fiendi*; the analogy of judgement which is distributed in a *ratio essendi*; and the resemblance of perception which determines a *ratio agendi*. Every other difference, every difference which is not rooted in this way, is an unbounded, uncoordinated and inorganic difference: too large or too small, not only to be thought but to exist. Ceasing to be thought, difference is dissipated in non-being. From this, it is concluded that difference in itself remains condemned and must atone or be redeemed under the auspices of a reason which renders it livable and thinkable, and makes it the object of an organic representation.

The greatest effort of philosophy was perhaps directed at rendering representation infinite (orgiastic). It is a question of extending representation as far as the too large and the too small of difference; of adding a hitherto unsuspected perspective to representation – in other words, inventing theological, scientific and aesthetic techniques which allow it to integrate the depth of difference in itself; of allowing representation to conquer the obscure; of allowing it to include the vanishing of difference which is too small and the dismemberment of difference which is too large; of allowing it to capture the power of giddiness, intoxication and cruelty, and even of death. In short, it is a question of causing a little of Dionysus's blood to flow in the organic veins of Apollo. This effort has always permeated the world of representation. The ultimate wish of the organic is to become orgiastic and to conquer the in-itself, but this effort found two culminating moments in Leibniz and Hegel. With the former, representation conquers the infinite because a

technique for dealing with the infinitely small captures the smallest difference and its disappearance. With the latter, representation conquers the infinite because a technique for dealing with the infinitely large captures the largest difference and its dismembering. The two are in agreement, since the Hegelian problem is *also* that of disappearance, while the Leibnizian problem is also that of dismembering. Hegel's technique lies in the movement of contradiction (difference must attain that point, it must be extended that far). It consists of inscribing the inessential in the essence, and in conquering the infinite with the weapons of a synthetic finite identity. Leibniz's technique lies in the movement we call vice-diction: it consists in constructing the essence from the inessential, and conquering the finite by means of an infinite analytic identity (difference must be developed to that point). But what is the point of making representation infinite? It retains all its requirements. All that is discovered is a *ground* which relates the excess and default of difference to the identical, the similar, the analogous and the opposed: reason, – that is, sufficient reason – has become the ground which no longer allows anything to escape. Nothing, however, has changed: difference remains subject to malediction, and all that has happened is the discovery of more subtle and more sublime means to make it atone, or to redeem it and subject it to the categories of representation.

Thus, Hegelian contradiction appears to push difference to the limit, but this path is a dead end which brings it back to identity, making identity the sufficient condition for difference to exist and be thought. It is only in relation to the identical, as a function of the identical, that contradiction is the *greatest* difference. The intoxications and giddinesses are feigned, the obscure is already clarified from the outset. Nothing shows this more clearly than the insipid monocentricity of the circles in the Hegelian dialectic. Moreover, in another manner perhaps the same should be said of the condition of convergence in the Leibnizian world. Take a notion such as that of Leibnizian incompossibility. Everyone recognises that incompossibility is not reducible to contradiction, and compossibility is not reducible to the identical. It is indeed in this sense that the compossible and the incompossible testify to a specific sufficient reason and to a presence of the infinite – not only in the totality of possible worlds, but in each chosen world. It is more difficult to say in what these new notions consist. It seems to us that compossibility consists uniquely in the following: the condition of a maximum of continuity for a maximum of difference – in other words, a condition of convergence of established series around the singularities of the continuum. Conversely, the incompossibility of worlds is decided in the vicinity of those singularities which give rise to divergent series between themselves. In short, representation may well become infinite; *it nevertheless does not acquire the power to affirm either divergence or decentring.* It requires a convergent and monocentric world: a world in

which one is only apparently intoxicated, in which reason acts the drunkard and sings a Dionysian tune while none the less remaining 'pure' reason. The ground or sufficient reason is nothing but a means of allowing the identical to rule over infinity itself, and allowing the continuity of resemblance, the relation of analogy and the opposition of predicates to invade infinity. This is the originality of sufficient reason: better to ensure the subjection of difference to the quadripartite yoke. The damage is done not only by the requirement of finite representation, which consists of fixing a propitious moment for difference, neither too large nor too small, in between excess and default; but also by the apparently contrary requirement of infinite representation, which purports to integrate the infinitely large and the infinitely small of difference, excess and default themselves. *The entire alternative between finite and infinite applies very badly to difference*, because it constitutes only an antinomy of representation. We saw this, moreover, in the case of calculus: modern finitist interpretations betray the nature of the differential no less than the former infinitist interpretations, because both fail to capture the extra-propositional or sub-representative source – in other words, the 'problem' from which the calculus draws its power. In addition, the alternative of the Small and the Large, whether in finite representation which excludes both, or in infinite representation which wants to include both, and each within the other, does not, in general, fit difference. The reason is that this alternative expresses only the oscillations of representation with regard to an always dominant identity, or rather the oscillations of the Identical with regard to an always rebellious matter, the excess and default of which it sometimes rejects and sometimes tries to integrate. Finally, returning to Leibniz and Hegel and their common attempt to extend representation to infinity: we are not sure that Leibniz does not go 'farthest' (nor that, of the two, he is not the least theological). His conception of the Idea as an ensemble of differential relations and singular points, the manner in which he begins with the inessential and constructs essences in the form of centres of envelopment around singularities, his presentiment of divergences, his procedure of vice-diction, his approximation to an inverse ratio between the distinct and the clear, all show why the ground rumbles with greater power in the case of Leibniz, why the intoxication and giddiness are less feigned in his case, why obscurity is better understood and the Dionysian shores are closer.

What motivated the subordination of difference to the requirements of finite or infinite representation? It is correct to define metaphysics by reference to Platonism, but insufficient to define Platonism by reference to the distinction between essence and appearance. The primary distinction which Plato rigorously establishes is the one between the model and the copy. The copy, however, is far from a simple appearance, since it stands in an internal, spiritual, noological and ontological relation with the Idea

or model. The second and more profound distinction is the one between the copy itself and the phantasm. It is clear that Plato distinguishes, and even opposes, models and copies only in order to obtain a selective criterion with which to separate copies and simulacra, the former founded upon their relation to the model while the latter are disqualified because they fail both the test of the copy and the requirements of the model. While there is indeed appearance, it is rather a matter of distinguishing the splendid and well-grounded Apollonian appearances from the other, insinuative, malign and maleficent appearances which respect the ground no more than the grounded. This Platonic wish to exorcize simulacra is what entails the subjection of difference. For the model can be defined only by a positing of identity as the essence of the Same [*auto kath' hauto*], and the copy by an affection of internal resemblance, the quality of the Similar. Moreover, because the resemblance is internal, the copy must itself have an internal relation to being and the true which is analogous to that of the model. Finally, the copy must be constructed by means of a method which, given two opposed predicates, attributes to it the one which agrees with the model. In all these ways, copies are distinguished from simulacra only by subordinating difference to instances of the Same, the Similar, the Analogous and the Opposed. No doubt with Plato these instances are not yet distributed as they will be in the deployed world of representation (from Aristotle onwards). Plato inaugurates and initiates because he evolves within a theory of Ideas which *will* allow the deployment of representation. In his case, however, a moral motivation in all its purity is avowed: the will to eliminate simulacra or phantasms has no motivation apart from the moral. What is condemned in the figure of simulacra is the state of free, oceanic differences, of nomadic distributions and crowned anarchy, along with all that malice which challenges both the notion of the model and that of the copy. Later, the world of representation will more or less forget its moral origin and presuppositions. These will nevertheless continue to act in the distinction between the originary and the derived, the original and the sequel, the ground and the grounded, which animates the hierarchies of a representative theology by extending the complementarity between model and copy.

Representation is a site of transcendental illusion. This illusion comes in several forms, four interrelated forms which correspond particularly to thought, sensibility, the Idea and being. In effect, thought is covered over by an 'image' made up of postulates which distort both its operation and its genesis. These postulates culminate in the position of an identical thinking subject, which functions as a principle of identity for concepts in general. A slippage occurs in the transition from the Platonic world to the world of representation (which again is why we can present Plato as the origin or at the crossroads of a decision). The 'sameness' of the Platonic Idea which serves as model and is guaranteed by the Good gives way to the

identity of an originary concept grounded in a thinking subject. The thinking subject brings to the concept its subjective concomitants: memory, recognition and self-consciousness. Nevertheless, it is the moral vision of the world which is thereby extended and represented in this subjective identity affirmed as a *common sense* [*Cogitatio natura universalis*]. When difference is subordinated by the thinking subject to the identity of the concept (even where this identity is synthetic), difference in thought disappears. In other words, what disappears is that difference that thinking makes in thought, that *genitality* of thinking, that profound fracture of the I which leads it to think only in thinking its own passion, and even its own death, in the pure and empty form of time. To restore difference in thought is to untie this first knot which consists of representing difference through the identity of the concept and the thinking subject.

The second illusion concerns the subordination of difference to resemblance. Given the manner in which it is distributed in representation, resemblance need no longer be just that between copy and model. It can be determined as the resemblance of the (diverse) sensible to itself, in such a way that the identity of the concept should be applicable to it, and receive from it in turn the possibility of specification. The illusion takes the following form: difference necessarily tends to be cancelled in the quality which covers it, while at the same time inequality tends to be equalised within the extension in which it is distributed. The theme of quantitative equality or equalisation doubles that of qualitative resemblance and assimilation. As we saw, this was the illusion of 'good sense', complementary to the preceding illusion and its 'common sense'. It is a transcendental illusion because it is entirely true that difference is cancelled qualitatively and in extension. It is nevertheless an illusion, since the nature of difference lies neither in the quality by which it is covered nor in the extensity by which it is explicated. Difference is intensive, indistinguishable from depth in the form of an non-extensive and non-qualified *spatium*, the matrix of the unequal and the different. Intensity is not the sensible but the being *of* the sensible, where different relates to different. To restore difference within intensity as the being of the sensible is to untie the second knot, one which subordinates difference to the similar within perception, allowing it to be experienced only on condition that there is an assimilation of diversity taken as raw material for the identical concept.

The third illusion concerns the negative and the manner in which it subordinates difference to itself, in the form of both limitation and opposition. The second illusion already prepared us for this discovery of a mystification on the part of the negative: it is in quality and extensity that intensity is inverted and appears upside down, and its power of affirming difference is betrayed by the figures of quantitative and qualitative limitation, qualitative and quantitative opposition. Limitation and opposition are first- and second-dimension surface effects, whereas the

living depths, the diagonal, is populated by differences without negation. Beneath the platitude of the negative lies the world of 'disparateness'. The origin of the illusion which subjects difference to the false power of the negative must therefore be sought, not in the sensible world itself, but in that which acts in depth and is incarnated in the sensible world. We have seen that Ideas are genuine objectivities, made up of differential elements and relations and provided with a specific mode – namely, the 'problematic'. Problems thus defined do not designate any ignorance on the part of a thinking subject, any more than they express a conflict, but rather objectively characterise the nature of Ideas as such. There is indeed, therefore, a *mē on*, which must not be confused with the *ouk on*, and which means the being of the problematic and not the being of the negative: an expletive NE rather than a negative 'not'. This *mē on* is so called because it precedes all affirmation, but is none the less completely positive. Problems–Ideas are positive multiplicities, full and differentiated positivities described by the process of complete and reciprocal determination which relates problems to their conditions. The positivity of problems is constituted by the fact of being 'posited' (thereby being related to their conditions and fully determined). It is true that, from this point of view, problems give rise to propositions which give effect to them in the form of answers or cases of solution. These propositions in turn represent affirmations, the objects of which are those differences which correspond to the relations and the singularities of the differential field. In this sense, we can establish a distinction between the positive and the affirmative – in other words, between the positivity of Ideas understood as differential positings and the affirmations to which they give rise, which incarnate and solve them. With regard to the latter, we should say not only that they are different affirmations but that they are *affirmations of differences*, as a consequence of the multiplicity which belongs to each Idea. Affirmation, understood as the affirmation of difference, is produced by the positivity of problems understood as differential positings; multiple affirmation is produced by problematic multiplicity. It is of the essence of affirmation to be in itself multiple and to affirm difference. As for the negative, this is only the shadow cast upon the affirmations produced by a problem: negation appears alongside affirmation like a powerless double, albeit one which testifies to the existence of another power, that of the effective and persistent problem.

Everything, however, is reversed if we begin with the propositions which represent these affirmations in consciousness. For Problems–Ideas are by nature unconscious: they are extra-propositional and sub-representative, and do not resemble the propositions which represent the affirmations to which they give rise. If we attempt to reconstitute problems in the image of or as resembling conscious propositions, then the illusion takes shape, the shadow awakens and appears to acquire a life of its own: it is as though

each affirmation referred to its negative, or has 'sense' only by virtue of its negation, while at the same time a generalised negation, an *ouk on*, takes the place of the problem and its *mē on*. Thus begins the long history of the distortion of the dialectic, which culminates with Hegel and consists in substituting the labour of the negative for the play of difference and the differential. Instead of being defined by a (non)-being which is the being of problems and questions, the dialectical instance is now defined by a *non*-being which is the being of the negative. The false genesis of affirmation, which takes the form of the negation of the negation and is produced by the negative, is substituted for the complementarity of the positive and the affirmative, of differential positing and the affirmation of difference. Furthermore, if the truth be told, none of this would amount to much were it not for the moral presuppositions and practical implications of such a distortion. We have seen all that this valorisation of the negative signified, including the conservative spirit of such an enterprise, the platitude of the affirmations supposed to be engendered thereby, and the manner in which we are led away from the most important task, that of determining problems and realising in them our power of creation and decision. That is why conflicts, oppositions and contradictions seemed to us to be surface effects and conscious epiphenomena, while the unconscious lived on problems and differences. History progresses not by negation and the negation of negation, but by deciding problems and affirming differences. It is no less bloody and cruel as a result. Only the shadows of history live by negation: the good enter into it with all the power of a posited differential or a difference affirmed; they repel shadows into the shadows and deny only as the consequence of a primary positivity and affirmation. For them, as Nietzsche says, affirmation is primary; it affirms difference, while the negative is only a consequence or a reflection in which affirmation is doubled.[1] That is why real revolutions have the atmosphere of fêtes. Contradiction is not the weapon of the proletariat but, rather, the manner in which the bourgeoisie defends and preserves itself, the shadow behind which it maintains its claim to decide what the problems are. Contradictions are not 'resolved', they are dissipated by capturing the problem of which they reflect only the shadow. The negative is always a conscious reaction, a distortion of the true agent or actor. As a result, as long as it remains within the limits of representation, philosophy is prey to the theoretical antinomies of consciousness. The choice whether difference must be understood as quantitative limitation or qualitative opposition is no less devoid of sense than that between the Small and the Large. For whether it is limitation or opposition, difference is unjustly assimilated to a negative non-being. Whence another illusory choice: either being is full positivity, pure affirmation, but undifferenciated being, without difference; or being includes differences, it is Difference and there is non-being, a being of the negative. All these antinomies are connected,

and depend upon the same illusion. We must say both that being is full positivity and pure affirmation, and that there is (non)-being which is the being of the problematic, the being of problems and questions, not the being of the negative. In truth, the origin of the antinomies is as follows: once the nature of the problematic and the multiplicity which defines the Idea is misrecognised, once the Idea is reduced to the Same or even to the identity of a concept, the negative takes wing. Instead of the positive process of determination in the Idea, what emerges is a process of opposition of contrary predicates or limitation of primary predicates. To restore the differential in the Idea, and difference to the affirmation which flows from it, is to break this unholy bond which subordinates difference to the negative.

Finally, the fourth illusion concerns the subordination of difference to the analogy of judgement. In effect, the identity of the concept does not yet give us a concrete rule of determination, since it appears only as the identity of an indeterminate concept; Being or I am (that 'I am' which Kant said was the perception or the feeling of an existence independently of any determination). The ultimate concepts or primary and originary predicates must therefore be posited as determinable. They are recognised by the fact that each maintains an internal relation to being. In this sense, these concepts are analogues, or Being is analogous in relation to them and acquires simultaneously the identity of a distributive common sense and that of an ordinal good sense (we have seen how analogy took two forms, which rested not upon equality but upon the interiority of the relation of judgement). It is not sufficient, therefore, that representation be grounded upon the identity of an indeterminate concept. Identity must itself be represented every time in a certain number of determinable concepts. These originary concepts, in relation to which Being is distributive and ordinal, are called categories or genera of being. On the basis of such categories, specific derived concepts can in turn be determined by a method of division – in other words, by the play of contrary predicates within each genus. In this manner, difference is assigned two limits, in the form of two irreducible but complementary figures which indicate precisely its belonging to representation (the Large and the Small): the categories as *a priori* concepts and the empirical concepts; the originary determinable concepts and the derived determined concepts; the analogous and the opposed; *the large genera and the species*. This distribution of difference in a manner entirely dependent upon the requirements of representation essentially belongs within the analogical vision of the world. However, this form of distribution commanded by the categories seemed to us to betray the nature of Being (as a cardinal and collective concept) and the nature of the distributions themselves (as nomadic rather than sedentary and fixed distributions), as well as the nature of difference (as individuating difference). In terms of this distribution, the individual is only, and only

understood as, that which bears differences in general, while Being distributes itself among the fixed forms of these differences and is said analogically of that which is.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that the four illusions of representation distort repetition no less than they distort difference, and for reasons which are in certain respects comparable. In the first place, representation provides no direct and positive criteria for distinguishing between repetition and the order of generality, resemblance or equivalence. That is why repetition is represented as a perfect resemblance or an extreme equality. Second, representation in effect invokes the identity of the concept in order to explain repetition no less than to understand difference. Difference is represented *in* the identical concept, and thereby reduced to a merely conceptual difference. Repetition, by contrast, is represented *outside* the concept, as though it were a difference without concept, *but always with the presupposition of an identical concept*. Thus, repetition occurs when things are distinguished *in numero*, in space and time, while their concept remains the same. In the same movement, therefore, the identity of the concept in representation includes difference and is extended to repetition. A third aspect follows from this: it is apparent that repetition can no longer receive anything but a negative explanation. In effect, it is a matter of explaining the possibility of differences without concept. Or one invokes a logical limitation of the concept at each of its moments – in other words, a relative 'blockage' such that, however far the comprehension of the concept is pushed, there is always an infinite number of things which can correspond to it, since in fact one can never encompass the infinity of that comprehension which would make every difference a conceptual difference. Repetition is then explained only in terms of a relative limitation in our representation of the concept and, from precisely this point of view, we deprive ourselves of any means of distinguishing repetition from simple resemblance. Alternatively, a real opposition is invoked, one that is capable of imposing an absolute natural blockage on the concept: by assigning to it a comprehension that is in principle necessarily finite, by defining an order external to the comprehension of even an indefinite concept, or by bringing in forces opposed to the subjective concomitants of the infinite concept (memory, recognition, self-consciousness). We have seen how these three cases seemed to be illustrated respectively by nominal concepts, concepts of nature and concepts of freedom: words, Nature and the unconscious. In all these cases, thanks to the distinction between absolute natural blockage and artificial or logical blockage, there is no doubt that we have the means to distinguish between repetition and simple resemblance, since things are said to repeat when they differ even though their concept is *absolutely* the same. However, not only this distinction but repetition itself is explained here in an entirely negative fashion. *It* (language) repeats because *it* (the words) is

not real, because there is no definition other than nominal. *It* (nature) repeats because *it* (matter) has no interiority, because it is *partes extra partes*. *It* (the unconscious) repeats because *it* (the Ego) represses, because *it* (the Id) has no memory, no recognition and no consciousness of itself – ultimately because it has no instinct, instinct being the subjective concomitant of the species as concept. In short, things repeat always by virtue of what they are not and do not have. We repeat because we do not hear. As Kierkegaard said, it is the repetition of the deaf, or rather for the deaf: deafness of words, deafness of nature, deafness of the unconscious. Within representation, the forces which ensure repetition – in other words, a multiplicity of things for a concept absolutely the same – can only be negatively determined.

Fourth, repetition is not only defined in relation to the absolute identity of the concept; it must, in a certain manner, itself represent this identical concept. A phenomenon corresponding to the analogy of judgement emerges here. Repetition is not content with multiplying instances of the same concept; it puts the concept outside itself and causes it to exist in so many instances *hic et nunc*. It fragments identity itself, just as Democritus fragmented the One-Being of Parmenides and multiplied it into atoms. Or rather, the multiplication of things under an absolutely identical concept has as its consequence the division of the concept into absolutely identical things. Matter realises this state of the concept outside itself or the infinitely repeated element. That is why the model of repetition is indistinguishable from pure matter understood as the fragmentation of the identical or the repetition of a minimum. Repetition, therefore, has a *primary sense* from the point of view of representation – namely, that of a material and bare repetition, a repetition *of* the same (and not only *under* the same concept). All the other senses will be derived from this extrinsic model. In other words, every time we encounter a variant, a difference, a disguise or a displacement, we will say that it is a matter of repetition, but only in a derivative and 'analogical' manner. (Even in the case of Freud, the prodigious conception of repetition in psychic life is dominated not only by a schema of opposition in the case of the theory of repression, but by a material model in that of the death instinct.) This extrinsic material model, however, takes repetition as already accomplished and presents it to a spectator who contemplates it from without. It suppresses the thickness in which repetition occurs and unfolds, even in the case of matter and death. Whence the attempt, by contrast, to represent disguise and displacement as the constituent elements of repetition, but on condition that repetition is confounded with analogy itself. Identity is no longer that of an element but, in accordance with the traditional signification, that of a relation between distinct elements or a relation between relations. Earlier, physical matter provided repetition with its *primary sense*, and the other senses (biological, psychic, metaphysical...) were said by analogy. Now, analogy

by itself is the logical matter of repetition, providing it with a *distributive sense*.[2] However, it is still a sense understood in relation to a thought identity or to a represented equality, with the result that repetition remains a concept of reflection which ensures the distribution and the displacement of terms, the transportation of the element, but only within representation and for a spectator who remains extrinsic.

To ground is to determine. But what is determination, and upon what is it exercised? Grounding is the operation of the logos, or of sufficient reason. As such, it has three senses. In its first sense, the ground is the Same or the Identical. It enjoys supreme identity, that which is supposed to belong to Ideas or to the *auto kath' hauto*. What it is, and what it possesses, it is and it possesses primarily, in the utmost. What, apart from Courage, would be courageous, or virtuous apart from Virtue? What the ground has to ground, therefore, is only the claim of those who come after, all those who at best possess secondarily. It is always a claim or an 'image' that requires a ground or appeals to a ground: for example, the claim of men to be courageous, to be virtuous – in short, to have part or to participate in (*metexein* means to have after). As such, we may distinguish between the ground or ideal Essence, the grounded in the form of Claimant or claim, and that upon which the claim bears – in other words, the Quality that the ground possesses primarily and the claimant will possess secondarily, assuming that its claim is well grounded. This quality, the object of the claim, is difference – the fiancée, Ariadne. The essence or ground is the identical in so far as it originarily includes the difference of its object. The operation of grounding renders the claimant *similar* to the ground, endowing it with resemblance from within and thereby allowing it to participate in the quality or the object which it claims. As similar to the same, the claimant is said to *resemble* – this, however, is not an external resemblance to the object but an internal resemblance to the ground itself. In order to have the daughter, one must resemble the father. Difference is thought here in terms of the principle of Sameness and the condition of resemblance. Moreover, there will be claimants in third place, fourth place and fifth place, as many as there are images grounded in the hierarchy of this internal resemblance. That is why the ground selects and establishes the difference between the claimants themselves. Each well-grounded image or claim is called a representation [*icône*], since the first in the order of claims is still second in itself in relation to the foundation. It is in this sense that Ideas inaugurate or ground the world of representation. As for the rebellious images which lack resemblance [*simulacra*], these are eliminated, rejected and denounced as ungrounded, false claimants.

In a second sense, once the world of representation is established, the ground is no longer defined by the identical. The identical has become the

internal character of representation itself, while resemblance has become its external relation with the thing. The identical now expresses a claim which must in turn be grounded. For the object of the claim is no longer difference understood as the quality, but that which is too large or too small in the difference, the excess and the default – in other words, the infinite. What must be grounded is the claim of representation to conquer the infinite, in order that it be indebted to no one for the daughter and capture the heart of difference. It is no longer the image which seeks to conquer difference as this seemed to be originarily included in the identical, but, on the contrary, identity which seeks to conquer that which it does not include of difference. *To ground no longer means to inaugurate and render possible representation, but to render representation infinite.* The ground must now operate in the heart of representation, in order to extend its limits to both the infinitely small and the infinitely large. This operation is carried out by a method which ensures a monocentricity of all the possible centres of finite representation, a convergence of all the finite points of view of representation. This operation expresses sufficient reason. The latter is not identity but, rather, the means of subordinating to the identical and the other requirements of representation that part of difference which escaped them in the first sense.

The two senses of the ground are nevertheless united in a third. In effect, to ground is always to bend, to curve and recurve – to organise the order of the seasons, the days and years. The object of the claim (the quality, difference) finds itself placed in a circle; the arcs of the circle are distinguished to the extent that the ground establishes moments of stasis within qualitative becoming, stoppages in between the two extremes of more and less. The claimants are distributed around the mobile circle, each receiving the lot which corresponds to the worth of its life: a life is here assimilated to a strict *present* which stakes its claim upon a portion of the circle, which 'contracts' that portion and draws from it a loss or a gain in the order of more and less according to its own progression or regression in the hierarchy of images (another present or another life contracts another portion). In Platonism we see clearly how the rotation of the circle and the distribution of lots, cycle and metempsychosis, form a grounding test or lottery. With Hegel again, however, all the possible *beginnings* and all the presents are distributed within the unique incessant principle of a grounding circle, which includes these in its centre while it distributes them along its circumference. With Leibniz, too, compossibility itself is a circle of convergence on which are distributed all the *points of view*, all the presents of which the world is composed. To ground, in this third sense, is to represent the present – in other words, to make the present arrive and pass within representation (finite or infinite). The ground then appears as an immemorial Memory or pure past, a past which itself was never present

but which causes the present to pass, and in relation to which all the presents coexist in a circle.

To ground is always to ground representation. How, then, are we to explain the ambiguity that is essential to the ground? It is as though it were attracted by the representation that it grounds (in these three senses), while at the same time it is drawn towards a beyond; as though it vacillated between a fall into the grounded and an engulfment in a groundlessness [*sans fond*]. We saw this in the case of the Memory-ground: it tended to represent itself as a former present and to enter into the circle which it organised in principle. Is this not the most general characteristic of the ground – namely, that the circle which it organises is also the vicious circle of philosophical 'proof', in which representation must prove what proves it, just as for Kant the possibility of experience serves as the proof of its own proof? On the other hand, when transcendental memory overcomes its vertigo and maintains the irreducibility of the pure past to any present which passes in representation, it is only to see this pure past dissolve in another manner, and to see unravelled the circle on which it too simply distributes difference and repetition. In this manner, the second synthesis of time which united Eros and Mnemosyne (Eros as the seeker after memories, Mnemosyne as the treasure of the pure past) is overcome or overturned in a third synthesis, one which brings together a desexualised death instinct and an essentially amnesiac narcissistic ego *within the form of empty time*. Moreover, how can the ground in its other senses be protected from challenge at the hands of the simulacra and all the forces of divergence and decentring which overturn the false distributions and the false repartitions as they do the false circle and the false lottery? The world of the ground is undermined by what it tries to exclude, by the simulacrum which draws it in only to fragment it. When the ground in the first sense appeals to the Idea, it is on condition that the latter be attributed an identity that it does not have by itself, but which it derives solely from the requirements of that which it claims to prove. The Idea no more implies an identity than its process of actualisation is explicated by resemblance. An entire multiplicity rumbles underneath the 'sameness' of the Idea. There is no doubt that describing Ideas as substantive multiplicities, irreducible to any same or One, showed us how sufficient reason was capable of engendering itself independently of the requirements of representation, along the pathways of the multiple as such, by determining the elements, relations and singularities corresponding to a given Idea in terms of the threefold principle of determinability, reciprocal determination and complete determination. Upon precisely what ground, however, is this multiple reason engendered and played out; in what unreason is it submerged, and from what new type of game or lottery does it draw its singularities and its distributions which remain irreducible to all that we have just seen? In short, *sufficient reason or the ground is strangely bent*:

on the one hand, it leans towards what it grounds, towards the forms of representation; on the other hand, it turns and plunges into a groundlessness beyond the ground which resists all forms and cannot be represented. If difference is the fiancée, Ariadne, then it passes from Theseus to Dionysus, from the grounding principle to the universal 'ungrounding'.

The fact is that to ground is to determine the indeterminate, but this is not a simple operation. When determination as such occurs, it does not simply provide a form or impart form to a given matter on the basis of the categories. Something of the ground rises to the surface, without assuming any form but, rather, insinuating itself between the forms; a formless base, an autonomous and faceless existence. This ground which is now on the surface is called depth or groundlessness. Conversely, when they are reflected in it, forms decompose, every model breaks down and all faces perish, leaving only the abstract line as the determination absolutely adequate to the indeterminate, just as the flash of lightning is equal to the night, acid equal to the base, and distinction adequate to obscurity as a whole: monstrosity. (A determination which is not opposed to the indeterminate and does not limit it.) That is why the matter–form couple is not sufficient to describe the mechanism of determination: matter is already informed, form is not separable from the model of the *species* or that of the *morphē*, and the whole is under the protection of the categories. In fact, this couple is completely internal to representation, serving to define its first state as this was established by Aristotle. It is already progress to invoke the complementarity of force and the ground as the sufficient reason of form, matter and their union. More profound and threatening still is the couple formed by the abstract line and the groundlessness which dissolves matters and breaks down models. Thought understood as pure determination or abstract line must confront this indeterminate, this groundlessness. This indeterminate or groundlessness is also the animality peculiar to thought, the genitality of thought: not this or that animal form, but stupidity [*bêtise*]. For if thought thinks only when constrained or forced to do so, if it remains stupid so long as nothing forces it to think, is it not also the existence of stupidity which forces it to think, precisely the fact that it does not think so long as nothing forces it to do so? Recall Heidegger's statement: 'What gives us most cause for thought is the fact that we do not yet think.' Thought is the highest determination, confronting stupidity as though face to face with the indeterminate which is adequate to it. Stupidity (not error) constitutes the greatest weakness of thought, but also the source of its highest power in that which forces it to think. Such is the prodigious adventure of Bouvard and Pécuchet or the play of sense and non-sense.[3] As a result, determination and the indeterminate remain equal and do not progress, the one always adequate to the other – a strange repetition which ties them to the wheel, or rather

to the same double pulpit. Shestov saw in Dostoyevsky the outcome of the *Critique of Pure Reason* in the sense of both culmination and exit. Let us for a moment be allowed to see Bouvard and Pécuchet as the outcome of the *Discourse on Method*. Is the Cogito a stupidity? It is necessarily a non-sense to the extent that this proposition purports to state both itself and its sense. However, it is also a confusion (as Kant showed) to the extent that the determination 'I think' purports to bear immediately on the indeterminate existence 'I am', without specifying the form under which the indeterminate is determinable. The subject of the Cartesian Cogito does not think: it only has the possibility of thinking, and remains stupid at the heart of that possibility. It lacks the form of the determinable: not a specificity, not a specific form informing a matter, not a memory informing a present, but the pure and empty form of time. It is the empty form of time which introduces and constitutes Difference in thought, on the basis of which it thinks, in the form of the difference between the indeterminate and the determination. It is this form of time which distributes throughout itself an I fractured by the abstract line, a passive self produced by a groundlessness that it contemplates. It is this which engenders thought within thought, for thought thinks only by means of difference, around this point of ungrounding. It is difference or the form of the determinable which causes thought to function – in other words, the entire machine of determination and the indeterminate. The theory of thought is like painting: it needs that revolution which took art from representation to abstraction. This is the aim of a theory of thought without image.

Representation, especially when it becomes infinite, is imbued with a presentiment of groundlessness. Because it has become infinite in order to include difference within itself, however, it represents groundlessness as a completely undifferenciated abyss, a universal lack of difference, an indifferent black nothingness. For representation began by connecting individuation to the form of the I and the matter of the self. In effect, for representation the I is not only the superior form of individuation but the principle of recognition and identification for all judgements of individuality bearing upon things: 'It is the same wax ...'. *For representation, every individuality must be personal* (I) *and every singularity individual* (Self). Where one no longer says I, individuation also ceases, and where individuation ceases, so too does all possible singularity. Since groundlessness lacks both individuality and singularity, it is therefore necessarily represented as devoid of any difference. We see this with Schelling, with Schopenhauer, and even with the first Dionysus, that of the *Birth of Tragedy*: their groundlessness cannot sustain difference. However, the self in the form of passive self is only an event which takes place in pre-existing fields of individuation: it contemplates and contracts the individuating factors of such fields, and constitutes itself at the points of resonance of their series. Similarly, the I in the form of a fractured I allows

to pass all the Ideas defined by their singularities, themselves prior to fields of individuation.

Just as singularity as differential determination is pre-individual, so is individuation as individuating difference an ante-I or ante-self. The world of 'one' or 'they' is a world of *impersonal individuations* and *pre-individual singularities*; a world which cannot be assimilated to everyday banality but one in which, on the contrary, we encounter the final face of Dionysus, and in which resonates the true nature of that profound and that groundlessness which surrounds representation, and from which simulacra emerge. (Hegel criticized Schelling for having surrounded himself with an indifferent night in which all cows are black. What a presentiment of the differences swarming behind us, however, when in the weariness and despair of our thought without image we murmur 'the cows', 'they exaggerate', etc.; how differenciated and differenciating is this blackness, even though these differences remain unidentified and barely or non-individuated; how many differences and singularities are distributed like so many aggressions, how many simulacra emerge in this night which has become white in order to compose the world of 'one' and 'they'.)[4] The ultimate, external illusion of representation is this illusion that results from all its internal illusions – namely, that groundlessness should lack differences, when in fact it swarms with them. What, after all, are Ideas, with their constitutive multiplicity, if not these ants which enter and leave through the fracture in the I?

Systems in which different relates to different through difference itself are systems of simulacra. Such systems are intensive; they rest ultimately upon the nature of intensive quantities, which precisely communicate through their differences. The fact that conditions are necessary for such communication to take place (small difference, proximity, etc.) should lead us to believe not in a condition of prior resemblance, but only in the particular properties of intensive quantities which may divide, but do so only in changing their nature according to their own particular order. As for resemblance, it seems to us to result from the functioning of the system, like an 'effect' which it would be wrong to take for a cause or condition. In short, systems of simulacra must be described with the help of notions which, from the outset, appear very different from the categories of representation:

(1) the depth or *spatium* in which intensities are organised;
(2) the disparate series these form, and the fields of individuation that they outline (individuating factors);
(3) the 'dark precursor' which causes them to communicate;
(4) the linkages, internal resonances and forced movements which result;