

## PREPARING TO LEARN FROM *DIFFERENCE AND REPETITION*

Draft of version that appeared in *Journal of Philosophy: A Cross-Disciplinary Inquiry* (Nepal) Winter 2010, Vol. 5, No. 11: 35-45.

John Protevi  
Department of French Studies  
Louisiana State University

In this essay I'd like to help readers prepare to learn from Gilles Deleuze's *Difference and Repetition*.<sup>1</sup> Such an essay is needed, as truer words were never spoken than when Deleuze said of it in his "Letter to a Harsh Critic": "it's still full of academic elements, it's heavy going"<sup>2</sup> Now part of the "academic" aspect of the work comes from Deleuze having submitted *Difference and Repetition* to his jury as the primary thesis for the *doctorat d'Etat* in 1968.<sup>3</sup> But that doesn't lessen the need for help when first approaching the book.

The context of Deleuze's remarks in his "Letter" should be noted: he has just been noting that "the history of philosophy plays a patently repressive role in philosophy, it's philosophy's own version of the Oedipus complex."<sup>4</sup> Deleuze continues that he tried to subvert this repressive function by various means. First, by writing on authors such as Lucretius, Hume, Spinoza and Nietzsche who contested the rationalist tradition by the "critique of negativity, the cultivation of joy, the hatred of interiority, the externality of forces and relations, the denunciation of power [*pouvoir*]." Second, and quite notoriously, by "a sort of buggery [*enculage*] or (it comes to the same thing) immaculate conception." That is, by making the author say something in their own words that would be "monstrous."<sup>5</sup>

These are famous lines, and the last is certainly amusing in an *épater les bourgeois* sort of way. But what's really important in my view comes next, when Deleuze explains what it means to finally write "in your own name," as he claims he first did in *Difference and Repetition*:

Individuals find a real name for themselves ... only through the harshest exercises in depersonalization, by opening themselves up to the multiplicities everywhere in them, to the intensities running through them. [This is] a depersonalization through love rather than through subjection.<sup>6</sup>

So that's our challenge in reading *Difference and Repetition*: can we avoid subjecting ourselves to it as a monument in the history of philosophy? That is, can we avoid an Oedipal relation to the history of philosophy, in which you give yourself up to be a mere *répétiteur* (an old occupational title in the French academic system)? Rather, can we turn our reading of it into a "harsh exercise in depersonalization," that is, by opening ourselves up to the "multiplicities" and "intensities" in us?

This is all a bit mysterious. Deleuze continues that this opening up can be seen as the index of a second form of reading a book. Instead of looking at a book as a container with meanings or signifiers inside it, we see it as "a little cog in much more complicated external machinery."<sup>7</sup> And we then insert ourselves into that machinery: "it's like plugging into an electric circuit."<sup>8</sup> So we see with these images of machines and exteriority what our preparation aims at: not an intellectual search for meaning, but an

affective encounter, a turning on. And that turning on doesn't give us back to ourselves with greater stock of knowledge, but changes us, "depersonalizes" us. Can we learn from our encounter with *Difference and Repetition*, can we be depersonalized through love, rather than becoming a subject of knowledge in relation to it? That's what this essay seeks to do: prepare us to learn from *Difference and Repetition*.

### LEARNING AND THE IMAGE OF THOUGHT

We are fortunate in that *Difference and Repetition* contains a discussion of learning. It's not just a matter of quasi-Romantic sloganeering about leaving your old self behind. Rather, *Difference and Repetition* conceptually works out a challenge to thinking of philosophy solely in terms of concepts as sets of signifiers. Rather, concepts are markers of problematic fields, and our encounter with those fields will affectively change us.

The discussion of learning occurs at a key point in *Difference and Repetition*, at the turning point of the book, the end of the middle chapter, "The Image of Thought." To appreciate the importance of this placement, let's look at the architecture of the book, which after the Preface, has a pleasing and significant asymmetry:

Introduction: Repetition and Difference

1: Difference in Itself

2: Repetition for Itself

3: The Image of Thought

4: Ideal Synthesis of Difference

5: Asymmetrical Synthesis of Sensibility

Conclusion: Difference and Repetition

At first glance we see that the title / subject of the book, difference and repetition, structures the book. The conclusion repeats, with a difference, the Introduction, while chapter 4 repeats chapter 1 and chapter 5 repeats chapter 2. Chapter 3 is the center of the book, the pivot on which it turns. In a useful article, Timothy S Murphy will claim it is the "caesura," the pure and empty form of time, which breaks naked repetition and opens the way to a novel future, repetition with a difference.<sup>9</sup>

We should note that in an interview from 1988 Deleuze says that "noology" or the study of the image of thought is the "prolegomena to philosophy."<sup>10</sup> So, roughly speaking, we can say that the first part of the book (the Introduction and Chapters 1 and 2) is Deleuze's voyage of depersonalization through the history of philosophy (repeating it with a difference, his *enculage* of the philosophers he writes on). Chapter 3, the study of the image of thought, is the prolegomena to philosophy, while the second part of the book (Chapters 4, 5, and Conclusion) is Deleuze "doing philosophy" in his "own name," after his "harsh exercise" of depersonalization. It doubles the repetition of the history of philosophy we find in the first half of the book by doing philosophy in a novel way. *Difference and Repetition* is itself a living repetition, differing from the bare repetition that would have been a standard reading of Plato, Aristotle, Leibniz, Kant, Hegel, et al.

So let's look first at the image of thought chapter: It lays out 8 postulates of the "dogmatic image of thought." Murphy shows how the treatment of the first 4 postulates is resentful, ending the image of difference "crucified" by representation. Then, in the middle of the chapter, we find the disjunctive theory of the faculties. The discussion of each of the first 3 of the last 4 postulates introduces a theme to be developed in Chapter 4: Idea, sense, and problem. The last postulate is that of "learning."

So it seems the disjunctive theory of the faculties will be crucial, in all the senses of that word: it's important, and it's the crossroads of the book (and it comes just after the crucifixion of difference by representation.) To set the stage for the discussion of the doctrine of faculties, recall that difference is crucified by the fourfold structure of representation: 1) identity in the concept; 2) opposition in the predicate; 3) analogy in judgment; and 4) resemblance in perception. These are what is to be avoided in discussing the differential theory of the faculties.

Deleuze's exposition of the differential theory of the faculties begins with Plato's notion of a sensory object that cannot be made sense of. In developing his theory of the faculties, Deleuze picks up elements of Kant's notion of the sublime: a violence done to the soul in a sensation that provokes a discord of imagination and understanding. In colloquial language: you have to have your mind blown. You have to be forced to think.<sup>11</sup> This blowing your mind or communication of "violence" among the faculties happens, for Deleuze, in "exploring Ideas": "the exploration of Ideas and the elevation of each faculty to its transcendent exercise amounts to the same thing."<sup>12</sup> Ideas are the "differentials of thought"; they "swarm in the fracture of the I."<sup>13</sup> Ideas are sets of differential relations with their attendant singularities; a singularity is a critical point, a turning point, a point at which a system changes qualitatively. The differential transcendental field of Deleuze is populated by Ideas and singularities, that is, by problematic fields and thresholds. A problematic field relates processes to each other in terms of tensions such that any one "solution," any one particular relation of processes, changes the field and hence changes the conditions for future solutions. Solutions can never thus fully resolve the tensions which constitute the problematic fields from which they emerge. Thresholds are significant points in the relations of processes such that crossing them provokes a qualitative shift in the processes (the boiling point for water is a classic example).

Now learning happens when we "conjugate the distinctive points of our bodies with the singular points of the objective Idea in order to form a problematic field."<sup>14</sup> This conjugation is demanding: "To what are we dedicated if not to problems which demand of us the very transformation of our body and our language?"<sup>15</sup> We learn when our bodies and our language are transformed in becoming sensitive to turning points in the systems we come into contact with (when we can "interpret signs" as Deleuze would say – signs indicating precisely transformations of systems, when two differential series are placed in communication, resulting in "resonances" [coupling of systems: e.g., "entrainment" or "falling in love"] and "forced movements" [amplifications of small differences in positive feedback loops]).

But we can never predict how learning will take place. Our systems are too complex; we can only experiment with encounters, what Deleuze calls "culture," and which he opposes to "method."<sup>16</sup> So here we are faced with the encounter with *Difference and Repetition*. That encounter, if it is to be learning, should be a "clothed" repetition rather than the "repetition" undergone by a subjection to knowledge. It's in the second part of the Introduction that Deleuze introduces the notion of clothed repetition, as well as that of "signal / sign" systems, on which we have just commented. Let us examine this section more closely.

In the discussion of clothed repetition, we see a movement typical of *Difference and Repetition*: a historical figure (Freud in this case, but this will also be how Deleuze reads Plato, Leibniz, and Kant) does not grasp, or backs away from, the radical implications of what he has written in a "furtive and explosive moment."<sup>17</sup> In this case, in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, we see the death instinct as bare or naked or brute repetition, a mechanical or material model, as the tendency of life to return to inanimate matter. But there is another reading of the death instinct in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (as Deleuze argues at length in Chapter 2), a reading that sees it as "positive and disguised," rather than as bare repetition. That is, the differential reading sees disguises that do not simply disguise a brute fact that is first there, fully present, and then is repeated again and again. Rather, disguises are themselves what is first there: they are the "internal genetic elements of repetition itself, its integral and constituent parts."<sup>18</sup> In other words, which certainly resonate with Derrida's conceptual frame, difference is primary: "there is no first term which is repeated."<sup>19</sup>

Here Deleuze introduces a term, "simulacra," which we will find again and again in *Difference and Repetition* (especially the end of Chapter 1 and of Chapter 2), and in one of the appendices to *Logic of Sense*, "The Simulacrum and Ancient Philosophy." When we follow up the references, we see that in two passages of the *Sophist*, Plato has the Eleatic Stranger distinguish icons from phantasms (236a-b and 264c). Icons do not have the same proportions as beautiful things, but do have precisely those different proportions that produce a beautiful appearance like that – resembling that – of the original beautiful thing. On the other hand, phantasms produce an appearance like that of the beautiful, but only because they are seen from an unfortunate angle; if we had a view to the original, we would see that they do not resemble that which they claim to be like.

It's at this point that the Stranger heads off into a "very difficult investigation" (236e), the famous investigation of the being of falsehood as the being of non-being (*to mē on einai*), which as we know, will involve risking the charge of parricide in confronting Parmenides. In the latter passage, the Stranger recalls, but then quickly dismisses, the possibility of a doctrine which asserts that "neither likeness (*eikon*) nor image (*eidolon*) nor phantasm exists, because falsehood never exists" (264c). Now if falsehood doesn't exist, that is because the true as original doesn't exist, from which the false as copy is distinguished. The banishing of this option is what Deleuze calls Plato's decision in favor of a "moral view of the world."<sup>20</sup> If Plato is ultimately more interesting to Deleuze than Aristotle, it is because Plato, out Aristotle's categories which will lock difference into representation, still allows us to hear the "rumbling" of difference. It's into this rumbling world of difference, an amoral world of "cruelty" and dissolution of identities, of disguises, theft, and ill will, that Deleuze will lead us.

### A Case Study: Deleuze and Kant

To take the largest overview in our preparation to learn from *Difference and Repetition*, you could replace its title with *Structure and Genesis*: structures are differential, and genesis produces repetition, that is, different incarnations of the same structure. The key is to identify the conditions for living repetition, that which introduces difference into what tends toward dead repetition, repeated elements that are different only in a horizon

of identity: different cases of the same concept, and so on, the four shackles of representation.

So there is something to the clichéd label of Deleuze as "post-structuralist." James Williams has a very nice reading of the "How does one recognize structuralism?" essay as a draft of *Difference and Repetition*.<sup>21</sup> Structures (what Deleuze will call Ideas) are conditions of genesis, conditions for the creative transformation of things. So in a twist typical of Deleuze, a twist in which the form of his thought maps its content, we're not trying to "recognize" structuralism, that is, produce a finite set of necessary and sufficient conditions so that we can judge something as falling in the category of "structuralism," but we are trying to establish the conditions for the creative transformation of structuralism. That is, we're trying to find the sensitive points of structuralism so that if we nudge it a little, it and we will be transformed. We're trying to "conjugate our singularities" with that of structuralism to produce something new: what Deleuze and Guattari will call in *A Thousand Plateaus*, a "becoming," or "mutual de/re-territorialization."<sup>22</sup> We're trying to form a "war machine," in which we re-territorialize on our powers of de-territorialization: we're trying to form a habit of creative transformation of habits, we're trying to feel at home while we're on the move – even when that being on the move entails no change of spatial location.

But *Difference and Repetition* is just as much a rewriting of Kant as it is a work of "post-structuralism." In fact, it includes engagements with Plato, Aristotle, Scotus, Spinoza, Leibniz, Hume, Hegel, Nietzsche, Freud, and Bergson, as well as with Kant. With Aristotle and Hegel, the engagements are uniformly critical, and with Spinoza, Nietzsche, and Bergson they are largely positive. Plato, Kant, Leibniz and Freud are the interesting cases. Deleuze treats them as what the early Derrida would call "marginal," inscribing openings or gestures toward differential thought in their writing, but not following up on them. With Plato we get the simulacrum, and with Leibniz, the notion of "vice-diction" and the glimpse into the world of divergent series (followed up on by Borges in the notion of the garden of bifurcating paths). With Freud we find the rethinking of death. There's also the very important though largely unmarked influence of Simondon, from whom the notion of individuation is taken.

But let's focus on Kant here. The following are the important engagements: (1) The "fractured I." (2) The differential theory of the faculties. (3) The problematic Idea. Let us take each in turn.

(1) The fractured "I" or *je fêlé*. In Chapter 4 Deleuze poses three aspects of "sufficient reason," the undetermined, the determinable, and the determined. Here in Chapter 2's discussion of the third synthesis of time, we find that Descartes has two aspects: determination (I think) and undetermined existence (I am). In the Critique of Pure Reason, Kant adds time as the form in which the undetermined is determinable. Time is the form of inner sense. It is a "pure and empty" form. everything is presented "in" time: this gives us the "empirical reality" of time as "the real form of inner intuition." But nothing is presented "as" time. This reality is not that of an "object," but is "the mode of representation of myself as object."<sup>23</sup> Thus although time has empirical reality, we must also acknowledge the "transcendental ideality" of time, for "if we abstract from the subjective conditions of sensible intuition, time is nothing ..."<sup>24</sup>

Deleuze doesn't enter this level of detail, but if we follow Heidegger's lead in *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics* (who also accuses Kant of backing away from the

radicality of the A Deduction)<sup>25</sup> we see Heidegger interpreting the syntheses of apprehension, reproduction, and recognition in the A Deduction, proposed by Kant as "the pure transcendental synthesis of imagination as conditioning the very possibility of all experience,"<sup>26</sup> as linked with the schematism, in which the form of time is that which bridges the manifold of intuition and the categories of the understanding.

For Deleuze, then, Kant's locating of the pure and empty form of time in the transcendental synthesis of imagination is the discovery of transcendental difference, an internal difference yielding an a priori relation between thought and being. We find the passive self (*moi*): an empirical / phenomenal subject in which events of thought and sensation occur in time and the transcendental ego (*je*): an active thinking subject which synthesizes time but whose activity cannot be represented as occurring in time. Thus correlated with the passive self is the fractured I (*je fêlé*): the pure and empty form of time cracks the I, so that the spontaneity of "I think" is the affection of the passive self. I can only represent the spontaneity of my thought to myself as that of another.<sup>27</sup>

The transcendental difference between the fractured I and passive self, which founds the Copernican Revolution and forbids speculative knowledge or "metaphysics" thus implies the speculative death of God, but Kant turns back to give practical resurrection to God and the I, whereas Deleuze will reject the Kantian restriction of synthesis to the active "I think" and the relegation of the passive self to receptivity, instead investigating passive synthesis.<sup>28</sup>

(2) We've already talked about the differential theory of the faculties, the communication of violence from one faculty to another blowing apart "common sense," which Deleuze sketches in *Kant's Critical Philosophy*<sup>29</sup> in the analysis of the sublime in the *Critique of Judgment*, and which, in Murphy's reading, forms the caesura of Chapter 3 and hence all of *Difference and Repetition*.

(3) Let's now talk about the problematic Idea, which is at the heart of *Difference and Repetition*. Kantian transcendental Ideas or pure concepts of reason are produced by applying the form of the syllogism to the synthetic unity of intuitions under the direction of the categories.<sup>30</sup> Kant explains that this means we are after the "unconditioned" as the ground of synthesis of any given or conditioned object, as the ground for positing the "totality of conditions for any given conditioned."<sup>31</sup> The Ideas (soul, world, and God) provide a focus for the understanding; they orient its use toward convergence in a unity of natural or moral laws. This is what Deleuze means when he says that Ideas pose a problem.<sup>32</sup>

The transcendent use of Ideas, that is, when we apply the categories to them in order to produce them as objects of knowledge, is only productive of paralogisms (soul) and antinomies (world and God); the only proper application of categories, or course, is in relation to the manifold of sensation. With transcendent use ruled out, the only proper use of the Ideas is a "regulative" use. The regulative use of Ideas renders them "problematic," that is, immanent and transcendent at once. They are immanent in that Ideas provide a systematic unity to the use of the understanding, while they are transcendent in that our oriented research provides solutions that do not exhaust the Ideas. As Kant puts it, "no object adequate to the transcendental idea can ever be found in experience ... it remains a problem to which there is no solution."<sup>33</sup>

We see in Ideas the same three-fold structure we saw in the subject. Ideas are: (1) Undetermined with regard to their object: no adequate object can be produced: problems

remain transcendent to their solutions. (2) Determinable with regard to objects of experience: their regulative use guides the understanding in producing objective knowledge. (3) Bearing Ideal of infinite determination with regard to concepts of understanding: the focal point of synthetic unity of the manifold of uses of the understanding. They thus represent three aspects of the Cogito: (1) "I am" as indeterminate existence. (2) Time as the form under which this existence is determinable. (3) "I think" as determination. Because of this correlation, Deleuze will say that Ideas are the differentials of thought swarming in the fractured I. Deleuze's criticism of Kant is that he stayed at level of conditioning out attaining that of genesis. The 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> aspects of Ideas remain extrinsic: Ideas are not determinable in themselves, but only in relation to objects of experience; likewise, they do not have the Ideal of determination in themselves, but only in relation to concepts of the understanding. Furthermore, the three aspects are incarnated in distinct Ideas: the self as undetermined; the world as determinable; and God as the ideal of determination.

So we have the criteria for Deleuze's Ideas: they must be undetermined, determinable and bearing an Ideal of determination. They are transcendental, but they do not provide the conditions of possibility of objects of experience, but the conditions of the genesis of real objects. An Idea is a set of differential elements, differential relations, and singularities, what Deleuze calls a "multiplicity." Ideas structure the intensive processes that give rise to the behavior patterns of systems, and they mark the thresholds at which systems change behavior patterns. In a word, the virtual Idea is the transformation matrix for material systems or bodies. Bodies are determined "solutions" to the "problem" that lays out the manifold options for incarnating bodies of that nature.

As we have seen, singularities are turning points of systems; they are remarkable points as opposed to ordinary ones. This mathematical sense of singularity should be distinguished from the logical sense of singularity in which the unique is distinguished from the generic. We can combine them by saying that a mathematical singularity indicates a threshold whereby a logically unique or singular system changes behavior patterns.

Let me give you an example from the world of sports. Deleuze talks about the physical Idea (atoms in Lucretius), the linguistic Idea (phonemes as differential) and the social Idea (Marx). Let's take the Idea of football games. Or better, let's start a given, American football. What is the Idea that conditioned the genesis of American football? Well, it would be a multiplicity of differential elements, differential relations, and singularities. The differential elements would be the players, the field, and the ball. They are differential elements because they are defined only in relation to each other. A prolate spheroid of pigskin leather is only a football in relation to the players, who are only players when they entertain a certain relation to each other and to the ball, and of course, to the field, which in turn. The differential relations are what the players are able to do to the ball and each other. They are differential in that they are relations of change in the elements: how they are able to move, to advance and retreat. And these relations are strewn singularities, or sensitive points: when the ball moves between players across a certain threshold of the field, a touchdown or field goal is scored.

But American football is only one actualization of this Idea. Changes in the elements, relations and singularities will change the game. Forbid the forward pass and blocking and you have rugby (which itself has two species, rugby league and rugby

union). Make it a completely savage festival and you have either Gaelic or Australian rules football. Restrict the handling of the ball to the goalkeeper, change the shape of the goal and the field, install a penalty area around the goal and you have association football or soccer. Now Ideas shade off into other Ideas. They are "perpllicated." They are "objectively made and unmade according to the conditions which determine their fluent synthesis."<sup>34</sup> Move soccer inside to a wooden court and require the players to dribble (but only three times) and you have team handball. Elevate the goal, make it circular, and allow as much dribbling as you want (but only from on top of the ball and only with one hand) and you have basketball. And so on.

What have we done? It's important to see first of all that we have NOT established a finite set of necessary and sufficient conditions for membership in a class: what are the criteria for identifying football games? Deleuze insists that "Ideas are by no means essences"<sup>35</sup>. Instead, we have gone from an actualization to its conditions of genesis in a multiplicity ("vice-diction"), and then experimented with the singularities of the Idea: if we fiddle around with them, do we get a different football game (differentiation), or even a different kind of ball game (differentiation)? In this way, Deleuze can say "the problem of thought is not tied 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."<sup>36</sup> If this is the problem of thought, then it is clear why stupidity is "defined above all by its perpetual confusion with regard to the important and the unimportant, the ordinary and the singular."<sup>37</sup>

In this treatment, we have concentrated on only some aspects of Deleuze's relation to Kant. But I hope these remarks may help others prepare to learn in an encounter with *Difference and Repetition*.

## APPENDIX

### HELPFUL WORKS FOR A FIRST READING OF *DIFFERENCE AND REPETITION*

#### Overall commentaries

James Williams, *Gilles Deleuze's Difference and Repetition: A Critical Introduction and Guide*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003.

Joe Hughes, *Deleuze's Difference and Repetition: A Reader's Guide*. London: Continuum, 2009.

Philippe Mengue, *Gilles Deleuze ou Le Système du multiple*. Paris : Kimé, 1994, 139-174.

Daniel Smith and John Protevi, "Gilles Deleuze." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <http://plato.stanford.edu/contents.html>

#### Chapter 1: Difference in Itself

On the simulacrum: "Plato and the Simulacrum," in *Logic of Sense*, pp. 253-266.

Overview of the issues: Patrick Hayden, *Multiplicity and Becoming: The Pluralist Empiricism of Gilles Deleuze* (Peter Lang, 1998): 5-17.

On univocity: Daniel W. Smith, "The Doctrine of Univocity: Deleuze's Ontology of Immanence," in Mary Bryden, ed., *Deleuze and Religion* (Routledge, 1999).

On univocity: Miguel de Beistegui, *Truth and Genesis: Philosophy as Differential Ontology* (Indiana, 2004): 225-241.

#### Chapter 2: Repetition for Itself

On habit: *Empiricism and Subjectivity*, 66-72; 92-98

On memory: *Proust and Signs*, 45-46; 57-59; 62-63; *Bergsonism*, 54-62; see also Leonard Lawlor, "Bergson Revisited," *Symposium* 10.1 (Spring 2006): 35-52.

On the Eternal Return: *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, 68-72; 195-198; "Conclusions on the Will to Power and the Eternal Return," in *Desert Islands*.

On repetition: *Bergsonism*, 60-61.

Overview of the issues: Hayden, *Multiplicity and Becoming*, 17-26.

On the syntheses of time: Tamsin Lorraine, "Living a Time out of Joint," in Paul Patton and John Protevi, eds., *Between Deleuze and Derrida* (Continuum, 2003): 30-45.

#### Chapter 3: The Image of Thought

On the history of philosophy: "Letter to a Harsh Critic," in *Negotiations*, 5-7; see also *Dialogues*, 12-16.

On the study of the image of thought as "prolegomena to philosophy": "On Philosophy," in *Negotiations*, 148-149.

On the image of thought: *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, 103-110; *Proust and Signs*, 94-101; *A Thousand Plateaus*, 15-17 (rhizome vs. tree); 375-80 (State thought); *What is Philosophy?*, 35-60, esp. 37.

- On the disjunctive doctrine of the faculties: *Kant's Critical Philosophy*: throughout, but esp. 50-52.
- On signs: *Proust and Signs*, 15-25.
- On the structure of the "Image of Thought" chapter and the concept of caesura (3<sup>rd</sup> synthesis of time): Timothy S. Murphy, "The Philosophy (of the Theatre) of Cruelty in Gilles Deleuze's *Difference and Repetition*," in Joan Broadhurst, ed., *Deleuze and The Transcendental Unconscious – Pli: Warwick Journal of Philosophy* (1992).
- On signs as provocations of thought and the disjunctive theory of the faculties: Daniel W. Smith, "Deleuze's Theory of Sensation: Overcoming the Kantian Duality," in Paul Patton, ed., *Deleuze: A Critical Reader* (Blackwell, 1996).
- On the status of problems: James Williams, *The Transversal Thought of Gilles Deleuze: Encounters & Influences* (Clinamen, 2006), chapter 7: "Deleuze and Harman: distinguishing problems from questions."
- On transcendental empiricism: Beistegui, *Truth and Genesis*, 241-247; Bruce Baugh, "Deleuze and Empiricism," *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology*, 24.1 (January 1993): 15-31 and "Transcendental Empiricism: Deleuze's Response to Hegel," *Man and World*, 25.2 (1992): 133-148; Hayden, *Multiplicity and Becoming*, 26-35; John Marks, *Gilles Deleuze: Vitalism and Multiplicity* (Pluto, 1998): 78-90.
- On learning: Beistegui, *Truth and Genesis*, 280-289.

#### Chapter 4: The Ideal Synthesis of Difference

- On the virtual: *Proust and Signs*, 61; *Bergsonism*, 94-103
- On multiplicity: *Bergsonism*, 38-47.
- We can consider Deleuze's essay "How Do We Recognize Structuralism?" (reprinted in *Desert Islands*) to be a draft version of this chapter. On the "How do we recognize" essay, see James Williams, "Poststructuralism as Philosophy of Difference: Gilles Deleuze's *Difference and Repetition*," Chapter 3 in *Understanding Poststructuralism* (Acumen, 2005).
- On the "mathematics of the virtual": Manuel DeLanda, *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy* (London: Continuum, 2002): chapter 1; see also Beistegui, *Truth and Genesis*, 248-280.
- On axiomatics (Badiou) versus problematics (Deleuze): Daniel W. Smith, "Mathematics and the Theory of Multiplicities: Badiou and Deleuze Revisited," *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* 41:3 (2003). See also, Smith, "Axiomatics and problematics as two modes of formalization: Deleuze's epistemology of mathematics," in Simon Duffy, ed., *Virtual Mathematics: The Logic of Difference* (Clinamen, 2006): 145-168, which is similar to the above, but out the reference to Badiou.
- On Lautman and the theory of differential Ideas. Jean-Michel Salankis, "Idea and Destination," in Patton 1996.
- On Deleuze and calculus: Aden Evens, "Math Anxiety: Deleuze and the Differential," *Angelaki* 5.3 (December 2000): 105-115; Simon Duffy, "The Mathematics of Deleuze's differential logic and metaphysics," in Duffy 2006: 118-144.

On multiplicity and virtuality: Constantin Boundas, "Bergson-Deleuze: An Ontology of the Virtual," in Patton 1996.

On structure and genesis: Tim Clark, "Deleuze and Structuralism: Toward Geometry of Sufficient Reason," in Keith Ansell Pearson, ed., *Deleuze and Philosophy: The Difference Engineer* (Routledge, 1997).

#### Chapter 5: The Asymmetrical Synthesis of the Sensible

We can consider "The Method of Dramatization" (reprinted in *Desert Islands*) to be a draft version of this chapter.

On individuation: "On Gilbert Simondon" in *Desert Islands*. On Simondon, see Alberto Toscano, *The Theatre of Production* (Palgrave-Macmillan, 2006): 136-156.

English translation of a key Simondon piece: "The Genesis of the Individual," in Jonathan Cary and Sanford Kwinter, eds., *Incorporations: Zone 6* (Zone Books, 1992): 292-319. (Introduction to *L'Individu et sa genèse physico-biologique* [PUF, 1964]; reprinted: Grenoble: Jérôme Millon, 1995.)

DeLanda, *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy*, chapters 2 and 3. For a mildly critical look at DeLanda's reading of "intensity," see James Williams, "Science and Dialectics in the Philosophies of Deleuze, Bachelard and DeLanda," in *Paragraph 29.2* (July 2006): 98-114. For an advanced view, including criticism of DeLanda, see also Toscano, *Theatre of Production*, 157-198.

Beistegui, *Truth and Genesis*, 290-334.

## NOTES

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*. Translated by Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- <sup>2</sup> Gilles Deleuze, *Negotiations. 1972-1990*. Translated by Martin Joughin. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995, p. 7.
- <sup>3</sup> Alan Schrift, *Twentieth-century French Philosophy: Key Themes and Thinkers*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006, p. 118.
- <sup>4</sup> Deleuze, *Negotiations*, 5.
- <sup>5</sup> Deleuze, *Negotiations*, 6.
- <sup>6</sup> Deleuze, *Negotiations*, 6.
- <sup>7</sup> Deleuze, *Negotiations*, 8.
- <sup>8</sup> Deleuze, *Negotiations*, 8.
- <sup>9</sup> Timothy S. Murphy, "The Philosophy (of the Theatre) of Cruelty in Gilles Deleuze's *Difference and Repetition*," in Joan Broadhurst, ed., *Deleuze and The Transcendental Unconscious – Pli: Warwick Journal of Philosophy* (1992).
- <sup>10</sup> Deleuze, *Negotiations*, 149.
- <sup>11</sup> In a more formal language, we can refer to the notion of "unlearning" in Walter J. Freeman, *How Brains Make Up Their Minds*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- <sup>12</sup> Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 164.
- <sup>13</sup> Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 169.
- <sup>14</sup> Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 165.
- <sup>15</sup> Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 192.
- <sup>16</sup> Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 165.
- <sup>17</sup> Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 58. The reference is to Kant.
- <sup>18</sup> Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 17.
- <sup>19</sup> Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 17.
- <sup>20</sup> Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 129.
- <sup>21</sup> James Williams, "Poststructuralism as Philosophy of Difference: Gilles Deleuze's *Difference and Repetition*," Chapter 3 in *Understanding Poststructuralism* (Acumen, 2005).
- <sup>22</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.
- <sup>23</sup> Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Norman Kemp Smith. New York: St Martin's, 1965, A 37/ B 54.

- 
- <sup>24</sup> Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, A36 / B 52.
- <sup>25</sup> Martin Heidegger, *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*. Translated by Richard Taft. Fourth edition, enlarged. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- <sup>26</sup> Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, A 102.
- <sup>27</sup> Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 85-86. Compare *Difference and Repetition*, 58, and the notion of the "schizophrenia in principle" of thought.
- <sup>28</sup> Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 73.
- <sup>29</sup> Deleuze, *Kant's Critical Philosophy*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985.
- <sup>30</sup> Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, A 321 / B 378.
- <sup>31</sup> Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, A 322 / B 379.
- <sup>32</sup> Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 168.
- <sup>33</sup> Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, " A 327-328 / B 384.
- <sup>34</sup> Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 187.
- <sup>35</sup> Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 187.
- <sup>36</sup> Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 189.
- <sup>37</sup> Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 190.