

BUT IN THE END, WHY IS DELEUZE “ANTI-HEGELIAN”? AT THE ROOT OF THE HEGEL–DELEUZE AFFAIR

Giacomo Pezzano

Università degli Studi di Torino
Dipartimento di Filosofia e Scienze dell’Educazione
Sant’Ottavio Str. 20, 10124 Torino, Italy
Email: giacomo.pezzano@unito.it

Deleuze said that he detested Hegelianism and dialectics: this paper claims that Deleuze is contra Hegel because he has and proposes a different philosophical system. Thus, I suggest that if we want to understand the reason of such a “disgust,” we need to focus the philosophical question that moves the entire Deleuzian system (§ 1). Then, I explain that if the ground-question of Hegel’s philosophy is “how is it possible that things are surpassed, that they go on?,” the Deleuzian one is “how is it that there is always something new, that things come out?” (§ 2). Finally, I discuss how desire can be considered as a key-example for seeing how the perspectives of the two thinkers diverge (§ 3).

Keywords: dialectic, recollection, creativity, transformation, philosophy of difference, desire.

I have always felt that I am an empiricist, that is, a pluralist. [...] The aim is not to rediscover the eternal or the universal, but to find the condition under which something new is produced (*creativity*) (*D*: vii).¹

Indeterminacy [...] does not invite us to abandon reason but to reconnect with the true reason of the thing in the process of being made, the philosophical reason that is not determination but difference (*DI*: 31).

1. Thumbs Down for the Dialectic

One thing is pretty well known, at least among Deleuzian scholars: Gilles Deleuze stated that what he “most detested” in his

education in the history of philosophy “was Hegelianism and dialectics” (*N*: 6). It is also quite known that Deleuze had in mind the French reading of Georg Hegel, according to which the human consciousness would proceed toward an ultimate state of perfection through a process of negation, that is, in a more ontological sense, the Absolute would finally return “forward back” to itself via negation. But, in brief, what does Deleuze *conceptually* say about Hegel?

Already in 1954, Deleuze affirmed that “contradiction is less and not more than difference,” that is, contradiction is the phenomenal and anthropological aspect of difference (*DI*: 15–18), while – as he will express later in his major work dedicated to the problem of difference – actually difference “is the noumenon closest to phenomenon” (*DR*: 222), so that difference is more profound than contradiction, and “it is not difference which presupposes op-

¹ Deleuzian works explicitly quoted will have following abbreviations: *EP* – Deleuze 1990; *B* – Deleuze 1991; *DR* – 1994; *N* – Deleuze 1995; *DI* – Deleuze 2004; *NP* – Deleuze 2006; *RF* – Deleuze 2007; *D* – Deleuze-Parnet 1987.

position, but opposition which presupposes difference” (*DR*: 51).

Two years later and through Henri Bergson, Deleuze underlines that meant as *internal* – that is, as *duration* – the difference could be no more confused with negativity (difference of a thing from everything it is not), neither with diversity (external difference of one thing from another), nor with identity (difference of things sharing a common element or ground): difference is pure *heterogeneity* that differs from itself, in itself and by itself, or – better said – it is the *continuous process* of “heterogenization,” alteration and not alterity, immediate difference and not mediate difference, and so on (*DI*: 24–51; see also *B*: 37–49).

More specifically, Deleuze thinks that Hegel subordinates difference not just to negation or to identity, but to *the identity* of identity and difference, so that difference would be already placed on a path laid out by identity (*DR*: 44–50): in Hegel’s system, difference is destined to the development of opposition into contradiction and the resolution of contradiction (*NP*: 157). If we have negation, we don’t have difference; if we have homogeneity, we don’t have difference: Hegel would have summed these mistakes, linking negation and identity, so that his dialectical would not be able to grasp difference as such.

At first instance, according to Deleuze difference is a matter of *tendency* and not of distinction between static entities: for sure, we can distinguish one *actual* thing from another *actual* one, and we can also say that they are in a relationship of contradiction or opposition (that they negate each other); but this is possible because of their process of actualization, of their differing duration – in the verbal sense (cf. also *DR*: i.e.

207, 235–236). Furthermore, the process of actualization could not be thought as a *determinatio via negatio*, neither as a realization through the limitation of possibilities: it should be rather conceived as an *expression of virtuality*, or as a position and a development of problems.

So, here we have the core of the issue: in Deleuzian perspective, if things limit and oppose each other, it is because, first of all, they affirm themselves, and not because they need to determine themselves through negation, neither because as such they are only referring to a general common identity. In other words, if, from the point of view of the “reactive forces,” the negativity comes first, then from the point of view of “active forces,” it is affirmativity that comes first; in talking about forces, it means that rather than being logical operations, affirmation and negation are first of all qualities of becoming (*NP*: 54) – namely, a matter of intensity and energy.

If it is true that Hegel may appear as a philosopher of the becoming, for him – from the Deleuzian point of view – becoming actually consists of the unity of a quality with its negation, that is, “in the ‘always already’ of being having passed over into nothing and nothing having passed over into being”: Hegel treats becoming in terms of coming-to-be and ceasing-to-be, so that he always selects just one of the qualities in the qualitative unity of becoming, and “uses this to define movement” (Bryant 2008: 141–142). In Hegel’s becoming, what is important is the identity of the becoming, an identity reached through a mediation “of negation of negation of negation, and so on,” which is always already at work.

In sum, the main features of Deleuzian “Anti-Hegelianism” are two. They are, as

the saying goes, two sides of the same coin: in Hegelianism, it happens that (a) identity "overlaps" difference, and (b) contradiction "exhausts" difference. a) Every particular difference is what it is only if it is referred to the general identity of the concept, or to the specific identity of another difference (which, in turn, is different from that identity, and so on). b) Every particular difference is negated from the general identity of the concept, or from the specific identity of another difference (which, in turn, is everything it is not, and so on). This implies that, according to Deleuze, difference is not difference *from*, neither simply *of*, but it is difference *for*, *with*, *between*, or – better, as it will become clearer – difference *in-between*: it is this kind of difference that is "the sufficient reason for change" (*DR*: 223).

Up until now, I have just resumed the general sense of Deleuze's aversion toward Hegel's philosophy. That said, I will try to explain why Deleuze *cannot be* anything else than an "Anti-Hegelian" thinker, that is, that there are structural philosophical reasons for this strong hatred. In order to do this, the field should be primarily delimited, declaring (i) what I *will not* claim and (ii) what instead I *will* claim.

i) I will not claim that there could not be a relationship between some (even important) aspects of their philosophies or that they could not share a same common ground. I will not claim that Hegel is not important in the development of Deleuze's thought. I will not claim that Deleuze could not be read as a dialectician – although in a peculiar way. I will not claim that the Deleuzian reading of Hegel is true (or false). I will not claim that one of them is right. After all, on all these topics, the debate is currently gro-

wing, several positions are being assumed, and even very technical analysis are more and more available, stressing that Hegel and Deleuze could be put *together again for the first time* (cf., i.e. Baugh 2009; Duffy 2006; Hardt 1993; Houle-Vernon 2013; Simont 1997; Somers-Hall 2012).

ii) I will claim that if we want to understand the reason why Deleuze is *contra* Hegel, we need to focus on the core of the Deleuzian problem, that is, the philosophical question that moves the entire Deleuzian system, outlining a comparison with the core of the Hegelian one (§ 2). Then, I will claim that desire can be considered as a key example for seeing how the perspectives of the two thinkers could be widely divergent (§ 3).

Thereby, I claim that one should not believe that Deleuze is *contra* Hegel because Hegel is an emblem of philosophy as a system, that is, because Deleuze is against system and systematicity as such; rather, Deleuze is *contra* Hegel for he has and proposes a *different* system. By system, we should intend not something governed by specific argumentative or rationalistic norms, neither by an end point of truth and knowledge, but instead something governed by the immanent lines of the articulation of the problem which itself is posing; that is, not something "whose coordinates are the Identical, the Similar, and the Analogous," but instead something "in perpetual heterogeneity," or – even better – "a *heterogenesis*" itself (*RF*: 361). Briefly, a system is something that insists and persists in posing and developing some fundamental questions (in actualizing a virtual), without answering to any general and external criterion (transcendence), but

inventing its own conditions (immanence). In this sense, it's true that Deleuze's philosophy has "global systematic ambitions," and is "a philosophy of everything," constructing "a system that maximizes its conceptual reach across fields and across different kinds of cases" (Williams 2016: 142).

Said otherwise, here I just want to outline a synoptical vision of the Hegelian and Deleuzian systems of thought, which clearly opens up to – if not necessitates of – a more analytical enquiry on the details of these systems and their relationships. But – as Hegel himself would have said – we should not miss the forest for the trees, and above all here I will start from one simple – almost ingenuous – question and I will attempt to answer it: *but in the end, why does Deleuze show all that animosity against Hegel?* Furthermore, this attitude is – to be honest – quite strange for a philosopher who has done of the stigmatization of the reactivity his own emblem. In conclusion, this paper tries to clarify if this strangeness could be better understood stating the key-questions that Hegel and Deleuze pose through their philosophies to themselves and to us: to offer a preliminary formulation, I suggest that if Hegel asks something as *and after that, what happens?* Deleuze instead asks something as *and during that, what happens?* In the next pages, I want to explain the meaning of such a statement.

2. Different Solutions for Different Problems. Unveiling the Trick

2.1. Separated at Birth

Jean-Luc Nancy, pointing out that Deleuze's thought is a philosophy of *transformation*, states that the "parallel difference" between

the philosophies of Derrida and Deleuze could be traced back in their different philosophical heritage: a German one for Derrida and a French one for Deleuze. In the first, the problem of the form is equal to the problem of its *origin* and *end*, namely of its *birth* and *death*; in the second, the problem of the form is equal to the problem of its *transition*, namely of its *becoming* (Nancy 2008: 15–25). Here, Nancy refers mostly to – respectively – Martin Heidegger and Henri Bergson, but we could easily say that the German *fil rouge* involves also the Hegelian system, at least in a double sense.

The first takes in Nancy himself, who elsewhere has presented Hegel as the thinker of the "restlessness of the negative," where this negativity is to be understood not as a denial that fulfills and satisfies itself in totality, discovering its own end in identity, but rather as the incessant work of transfiguration of the self through the negative, without a final return to itself (cf. Nancy 2002). In other words, even if in Hegel the end would not be the same of the origin, we have nevertheless a restless movement of taking and losing form, driven by the labor of the negative: forms are born, forms die; they are born thanks to the negativity, they die owing to the negativity.

The second instead takes in Catherine Malabou, who has gone deeper in this issue, stating that plasticity should be considered as the main ontological category of Hegelian thought (cf. mostly Malabou 2005). This means – first of all – that Hegelian synthesis is not a thinking of the closure of the totalization, but of the openness. Thus – secondly – futurity would play the main role within Hegel's system due to the fact

that in order to be transformable (plastic), the self should be opened to the alterity of the future, which is by definition wholly inscrutable and unexpected, together able to give and receive form. It is quite hard to be sure that this “futuristic” Hegel is actually the real Hegel, that is – as it is to be explained – that the original and noteworthy reading of Malabou gives account of the true problem posed by Hegel. However, even in such a perspective, it persists to be true that Hegel would care about the question of the assumption and dissolution of form, of the emergence and explosion of form. In this sense, it could be true that the movement does not go toward identity, and also that it is not an endless process of unresolvable negativity; but this happens owing to the fact that the triumph of the identity and the definitiveness of the disruption are nothing but the two moments of a dialectical process of contradiction, that cannot be – in the Hegelian sense – abstracted. Here, transformation is conceived as the passage from birth to death and vice versa, as their contradictory alternance; but – we will see – Deleuze states that transformation is rather something different, or – more properly – the difference in itself.

So, it seems that, on the one hand, Hegel and Deleuze walk the same path (the attempt to understand the form), but also, on the other hand, that they can never really meet each other, at least for two reasons. The first is that one is moved by the negativity, the other by the affirmativity; the second is that one seems to seek for form-configuration, the other for form-traversal.²

² I have discussed this problem of the “form-traversal” also in Pezzano 2016b and Pezzano 2017.

That said, it would be too simple just to say that Hegel is a (or the) philosopher of the negation and Deleuze a (or the) philosopher of affirmation, thus Deleuze would be against dialectics, and that’s the end of the story. This is *obviously* true: to say the least, we can remember Hegel’s expressions, such as “tarrying with the negative,” “Calvary of absolute spirit,” “negativity relating itself to itself,” “this Night, this empty nothing which contains everything in its simplicity,” and so on. Again, it is true that while Hegel seems to point out a teleological becoming, Deleuze looks for a sort of “adestinal” becoming, so that he cannot but refuse to recognize lack – the absence of the end – as the driving force behind becoming – and this is true even if one could say that Deleuze underestimates Hegel (cf. Malabou 1996). Lastly, it is true that for both Hegel and Deleuze the core of reality is movement, productivity and effectiveness, but while for the first the substance is the subject that goes out from itself and comes back to itself passing through negation, for the second nature is the process that endures in affirming and disclosing relations. But once we have made these opportune statements, have we really understood what is at stake?

In order to explain these aspects, I think that we need to go deeper in the sense of Hegelian insistence on negation, and – consequently – in its Deleuzian rejection: my claim is that we should ask ourselves what kind of problem is Hegel posing and facing, and if this is the same that Deleuze faces and poses – and I will answer *no*. I should declare myself: this kind of approach is already Deleuzian, because it considers that what is more relevant and remarkable

in a philosophical theory are not the solutions but the problems. Said otherwise: in order to understand a philosopher and how he thinks (even before “what he thinks”), you need first of all to clarify what kind of questions he is posing, to himself and to us. Rather than looking for the (un)truthfulness of the specific statements of a philosopher, first of all you have to look for what kind of problem a philosopher makes you see, perceive, or – more precisely – conceive.

In sum, you need to identify the ground impetus or the driving force behind a philosophy as a whole: to find a *problematic* way through a philosophy in its entirety. In this way, you can also, to all effects, understand why a philosopher could be even radically divergent – implicitly or explicitly – from another one, as in the Hegel-Deleuze affair.

Now I will expose briefly, on the one hand, which is the Hegelian problem and which is the Deleuzian one, and – on the other hand – which are the main models underlying the formulation of these problems. In a few initial words, my idea is that Hegel and Deleuze do not just offer diverse or opposite or incommensurable solutions, but they pose different problems and give conceptual form to different experiences, *thus* their solutions could be even very distant.

2.2. *Once It Happens, You Have to Deal With It. Hegel's Recollection*

Starting with Hegel, I suggest that the ground-issue of his philosophy is the attempt to answer to the question *why are things overcome?* That is, “how is it possible that things are surpassed, that they go on?”

Historically, as it has been suggested, this question could be considered a sort of “symbolical doubling” of some social problems that troubled Hegel and his times: is it possible to leave behind both the theocratic and aristocratic *Ancien Régime* and the bourgeois and capitalistic Enlightenment without simply erasing them? Is it possible to legitimate the idea of an association of free and equal individuals, able at the same time to conserve, if not enrich, the previous traditions of civilization, mutual help and reciprocal benevolence? Is it possible to integrate the emancipatory effects of the Enlightenment with the exigence of not being overwhelmed by its radical individualism and its abstract universalism? Or also, is it possible to save the classic harmony together with the modern fracture? That is, finally, is it possible to deal with the contradictions that permeate the society? And if all this is possible, then how is it possible? (cf. above all Lukács 1948, but also see De Giovanni 1970, Michéa 2006 and Pezzano 2014).

Beyond this, such a question about the “overcoming” is not the same as, for example, “why things are”, neither as “why things become” and so on, because here the problem is not just that things are, so to speak, both always different and always the same. Rather, here the problem is that in their passing away, things do not simply persist, but they do “evolve” in a problematic way, we can say. It is well known that the Hegelian *answer* will be that this can happen because things are lifted up or sublated, namely because of the *Aufhebung*, but here it is important to note that this kind of answer could have sense only in respect of that problem. Briefly, the role of

Aufhebung is to put together preservation and suppression, or – as said before – formation and deformation, the fact that a form resists to deformation and the fact that deformation however occurs.

From another point of view, it is as if Hegel would like to understand how history works: in fact, in history, things do nothing but go ahead, but they are also "stored" or "saved," and it is precisely in this way that they can become part of the history. Said otherwise, Hegel thinks that if things can be overcome, it is thanks to a peculiar process of negation that can both "erase" and "preserve."

If we move from this, it is clear how identity and negation could play a key role in Hegel's system: there is something (identity), but this is to be overcome (negation), in turn producing something else (identity); this "something else" is nothing but the reflected "something of the beginning" (identity and negation are all in one). Here we can see the general structure of Hegelian reasoning and conception of time: the "in itself" could be not separated from *its own* "for itself" in order to finally develop "in and for itself"; the origin could be not separated from *its own* extrinsecation in order to come back to its own "originary future." Thus, there could be different stages, modes or forms during the process, just because they are inserted in a progressive becoming, whose end is to put in light its own origin and fully develop its necessity.

As it has been insightfully claimed, Hegel's logic is a *narrative* one, one that wants to explain the *historical* identity posing a *narrative connection* between potency and act, and according to which every single mode is a moment of the identity of the

Notion that should be finally "recollected." In other words, Hegel's logic is a logic of the *Erinnerung*, namely "one of recollection, of memory, its necessity is the internal consistency of what is remembered" (Bencivenga 2000: 55): under this regard, in Hegel's world there is no real space for novelty and future, but this does not simply mean that for Hegel, once a story has been told, there won't be any new event. Rather, in his perspective, what matters is that "all *chronology* has been *redeemed*: everything that is, and was, the case has been proved necessary" and so "everyone is at the end of (her own) history when she takes the retrospective, rationalizing position with respect to it": for her, "everything has already happened because, trivially, the range of that "everything" is precisely what has already happened," and for Hegel "there are no other demands: no reference to other, possible, future data even makes sense" (Bencivenga 2000: 69–70).

Undoubtedly, telling a story requires events, and new ones above all, so Malabou could be right under this regard. But the problem is not simply if Hegel's system states that a future does not exist (this is, I would say, quite impossible); rather, it is if this system incorporates the question of the future as a decisive one within itself. Said otherwise, it is clear that identity demands for differences as material for its own digestion, but, finally, this would mean nothing but the differences are to be assimilated. I would say that if any future counts for Hegel, it is the one of the future form, that is, a future to be ultimately recollected, to be in the end put into form. The future must be digested into the past, so to speak. In this respect, we are not so far from the

Aristotelian definition of *ousia* as the “what it was to be” (*to ti en einai*) of a thing.

So, the key point is that Hegel does not want to explain how something new and different could ever come, but how is it possible to encompass, reflect, comprehend, realize, incorporate, and so on, what has already come. In this sense, “Hegel is located at the threshold of the future” (Bencivenga 2000: 71), but he is not really engaged with the future: he is more interested in how we can judge what has happened than in how we can avoid to prejudice what will happen (as Deleuze instead does). For Hegel, it is just a question of re-reading, acknowledgement and recognition (of *Anerkennung*, or of the transition from *kennen* to *erkennen*) – or, as it has been noted – of brooding and digestion (cf. Bodei 2014: 129–136), although it may involve not a process of defecation, consumption and reappropriation, but one of swallowing, constipation and defecation (cf. Žižek 2006: 348–353). In this respect, the final act of the process would be the “excremental” maneuver of dropping, releasing and letting go, instead of the “incremental” one of recontraction, recovering and reassimilation. But this means exactly that what comes in the end is not something new; rather, it is the recomprehension of something that has already happened, which in this way could be finally set free in itself.

To be clear, I’m not claiming that Hegel is wrong, or that his problem is irrelevant or uninteresting; I’m simply saying that *this is his problem* and the propeller of his reasoning: one could easily say that grasping what has already happened is as important as – or even more important than – opening the way to what will or could happen.

Furthermore, it seems to me that the main experience that shapes and influences the position and development of the Hegelian problem is the way in which self-consciousness works. In fact, it is in consciousness that – at least in Hegel’s view – things are continuously “digested,” “removed” and “conserved” at the same time, and it is this movement that constitutes the Self as such; it is in consciousness that – at least in Hegel’s view – everything passes in everything without going out from this same process, but, on the contrary, enlightening the sense of the process itself; it is in consciousness that – at least in Hegel’s view – there is no immediacy apart from a movement of mediacy, that is, apart from a reflection. The Logic is the Effective for Hegel, for sure – that is, what is logical is what is real (“the Real is the Rational and the Rational is the Real”) because it represents the structure of the reality in itself; but the rhythm of this Logic is traced from the proceeding of self-consciousness. What mind does is to ruminate. In Hegel’s view, finally, the fundamental activity of the Mind, Consciousness, or Spirit, namely, of the Subject, is the reflection, which – as re-flection – is led by negativity.

Moreover, we can observe – but this is nothing more than a first sketch of the matter that the main ontological concepts of Hegel’s philosophy are *linguistic* (just as the Aristotelian ones, as well): notion, concept, idea, noun, substance, subject, logic, being, nothing etc. One could say that they are nominal concepts rather than verbal, adverbial or prepositional; this may be true (as I will discuss again in next paragraphs), but – apart from this and following the theses of Agamben (2006) and

Virno (2013) – the point is that if language is the place of negativity, then a linguistic ontology cannot but be a negative ontology.

Lastly, this also implies that there is a strict connection – if not even a coincidence – between language and thought, between language and mind, between language and consciousness, as it is for Hegel: if Mind, let me say, continuously digests, it is because it has interiorized the digestive process of language; if Self, let me say, continuously changes form, it is because it has interiorized the process of nomination of language.

In a few words, it is as if the Hegelian perspective highlights that – as the saying goes – life is like photography, because we all need the negatives to develop. Under this regard, the Deleuzian perspective could probably underline that if life is like photography, it's because we all need the research and the “capture” to make a creation possible.

2.3. How Can It Happen?

Deleuze's Creation

In fact, Deleuze said that if “why is there something rather than nothing” is a false problem, a true one is “why this rather than something else,” or – better – “why a thing is itself rather than something else,” namely, “why this tension of duration,” “why this speed rather than another” (*B*: 13–35; *DI*: 24–26, 50–51): the problem that Deleuze formulates and poses concerns how it is possible that things are different, or – better – that things become different. Immediately, one could object that things are not different, but they are similar, they do share something, and this needs to be explained. This is, it goes without saying, one of the most classical philosophical

problems, but it must be clear: *this is not* the Deleuzian problem. Deleuze observes that things are first of all different, rather than similar, and tries to explain why and how this can happen.

In other words, Deleuze asks how is the creation of the new possible; Deleuzian questions are such as: how is it that there is always something new? How are novelty and change possible? How can we account for a future that is different from, and not merely predetermined by, the past? *How do things come out?* His answer is firstly that if things are empirically different one from each other, it is because they are internally moved by a process in which the impelling force is not simply similar to what expresses and that they take in charge of its élan, and vice versa. Said otherwise, it is the internal, transcendental or noumenical difference that can explain the external, empirical or phenomenal difference. The point is not that things or individuals have or assume different forms, that is, that they become *something* (and can cease to be that thing); it is rather that things or individuals can transform, that is, that they always are transformable: what counts is the innovative, and endlessly alive, core of things and individuals.

That the Deleuzian philosophy is a philosophy of the creation of the new is widely stated, also in several different ways (i.e., see Hallward 2006; Lambert 2008; Lundy 2012; Shaviro 2009), even if not all totally appropriate, and developing all the systematic implications of this fact with completeness is a work still to be done. We can say that Deleuze is one of the first philosophers who attempted to build something like an “ontology of what is not

there,” whose importance is now beginning to be stressed (cf., i.e. Poli 2006). However, here I can solely outline those elements that could be more relevant for the comparison with Hegel’s thought. They can be summarized as follows:

- i) Time is future-oriented;
- ii) An Idea is a principle of innovation;
- iii) Everything is a problem;
- iv) In a relation, there is much more than mere opposition.

Again, these elements are all reciprocally intertwined, but the clarification of such connections would take too much space, and it cannot be done here; hence, I will explain them separately and shortly.³

First. One of the hardest and most debated parts of the entire Deleuzian corpus is definitely the deduction of the three syntheses of time in the second chapter of *DR* (70–128). Thus, its articulation cannot be fully discussed here, but it is however important to note its structure: the present (Habit) is founded on the past (Memory), but the past is in its turn founded on the future (Eros/Thanatos). Deleuze states that *ne fait revenir que l’à-venir*: the present is the repeater (the moment of the return), the past is the repetition itself (the returning), but the future is that which is repeated (the “object” of the return). If there is a present, it is because there is a condensation of the past, but if the past can have effectiveness, it is because it is open by and to the future. The present is linked with the coexistence of states (contraction), but this relies upon the past as succession of states (collection),

which finally is grounded on the future as bifurcation of states (openness). What is relevant to stress here is that in Deleuze’s argument, the third synthesis is necessary to render the past searchable, explorable, problematizable and developable, and to avoid that the past would become a simple celebration of the mythical origin that would contain everything in advance. For these aims, it needs a force of searching and innovation, an action of invention and creation, that is, a dimension of time which is properly “rushing,” “leaping,” and “bouncing”: *the future*, the pure form of continuity and determinability. In this way, the future – and time in general – becomes a pure principle of novelty. The third synthesis points out not just that time as future is pure variability; rather, it puts in evidence the force of the moment in which it emerges the new, that is, the propelling and even cracking dynamism that opens up to the creation of the new. It is proper in this sense that the third synthesis can be both named *Eros* and *Thanatos*, for the “erotic” tension of the effort of transformation is all in one with the “mortal” shattering of the trigger of differentiation – as if in the beginning was the “original delay.” In other words, for Deleuze, time is duration in the sense of the persistence of the creative endeavor and of the force of transformation (that stores in order to prolong and vice versa: *memory*), not in that of the permanence of a given state, but neither in that of the continuous flow that simply devours and destroys everything, or simply passes away (*panta rei*). Said briefly, in Deleuze’s view, time is the open process of the genesis of the new.

Second. For Deleuze, an idea is *not* an objective model (Platonism) *neither* a

³ I have gone a little bit further in this issue in Pezzano 2016a, where more detailed references to Deleuzian works can also be found.

subjective representation (Modernism), because in both cases ideas are thought through the principle of identity and under the scheme of similarity and likeness. This part of the story is the core of the Deleuzian *vulgate*, but here it comes as another part, which is less-stated but is really important in order to understand some apparently weird Deleuzian pages (such as *DR*: 168–261): Deleuze conceives the idea as *an invention*. Deleuze, I suggest, is the first philosopher who has tried to give a true philosophical status to the meaning of the word “idea” which can be found in expressions such as “I have an idea,” “that’s really a good idea,” “what an idea!”, and so on. Deleuze, in fact, considers ideas as potentials that are already engaged in one mode of expression or another and that are inseparable from the mode of expression: a creator only does what is needed and he needs to do, and this necessity is a very complex thing in the literal sense, for it requires to be explicated or unfolded. In this sense, an idea is *the in-between* in respect of the object and the subject, and – more in general – it points at what has a potential that needs and requires to be developed in an original and creative way. An idea is not a static and atemporal principle, but a genetic and temporal one, it comes out everywhere where a transformation occurs or can occur: it is necessary, but just in the sense in which a need to be taken in charge in a creative and unforeseeable way emerges (it is necessary to do something, *but what, and how?*). More than in the question of the essence of the noun *idea*, Deleuze, let me say, is interested in the question of the modes of the verb *ideare*, which in Italian means exactly “to have an idea,” “to create,”

“to conceive” and so on. We could even say of the “unground principle” of the metaphysics of the difference, that Deleuze opposes to the “ground principle” of the metaphysics of the identity, corresponds to the shocking “breakthrough” of an idea, that is, to the future as an empty form of time, which has removed any ground for putting in advance events and things in one order rather than another. Said briefly, in Deleuze’s view, an idea is a demand for creation.

Third. As Deleuze himself has underlined, everything has its own reason, but this is its idea, and ideas are problems, or – if you prefer – ideas are problematic. A problem, for Deleuze, has a specific ontological status (the cryptic “?-being” or “quasi-cause”), according to which it is *distinct* and *obscure* at the same time; therefore, it is objective without being already done: that’s why it could be described as a *question*. In fact, a question is nothing but an exigence, an impelling force, that is, something which moves and animates a process of development that: a) On the one hand, refers to the demand, while, on the other hand, it cannot be similar to this demand; b) On the one hand, tells about the exigence, while, on the other hand, it cannot tell this exigence; c) On the one hand, actualizes the inducing dynamism of the question, while, on the other hand, it cannot exhaust this dynamism. As Deleuze puts it, problems do not disappear with their solutions, since they are the condition without which no solution would ever exist; at the same time, without solutions, no problem would ever take shape. A problem is an active power that compels for taking charge of it and discovering its solvability.

In this sense, the problem and the virtual are all in one: the virtual is what needs an actualization, without predetermining which and how this could or will be; the actual is nothing without referring to the virtual, but the way of this referral is still to be created. When we ask a question, we are posing a sort of constraining instance of dissimilarity: how could *it* be answered? But, firstly, how should *it* be properly posed? What could *it* mean? Finally, it is an imperative not in the commanding form of “do this!”, but in the provoking one of “can you do something with and of this?” A question circulates in all the answers that itself has opened, without coinciding with none of them; that is, it makes them circulating and communicating: a question is the “object=x” that circulates within a structure and enables it to function as such (it distributes differences), and which, in its turn, is also produced by this structure (it is expressed through the variation of the differential relations). So, the affirmation that Deleuze cares about is not the subordination, overwhelming, overtaking, overpowering etc. of something or someone else: this would be to all effects *an affirmation through negation*. Rather, he conceives the pure force of the affirmation under the paradoxical form of the *position of a question*, that is, under a problematical form. Said briefly, in Deleuze’s view, a problem is what asks for the construction of a field of possible solutions.

Fourth. Deleuze has stressed the importance of the concept of relation since his first book on David Hume, and has again and again remarked it throughout all his work, particularly in his last interviews, seminars and interventions. What is really

at stake in understanding the relations for Deleuze is the possibility to grasp nothing less than the difference-in-itself: a relation is external to its terms, but it also in some sense constitutes its terms (it can constitute its terms *because of its externality*). Hence, a relation is not “a thing,” but nothing else than a “thunderbolt” (the “dark precursor”): the principle of differentiation, of pure alteration, which has not identity in itself and cannot be thought as similar to a given something, for it is the occurrence of an encounter, that can produce or not something, that can give birth or not to a “disjunctive synthesis”, that can be or not actualized. So, the “creative AND” (“in-between,” “in the middle,” “inter-being,” “*intermezzo*,” “transversal,” “fold,” “interstitial,” “extra-being” etc.) is the pure power of the affirmation of the difference as such that constitutes the *real genesis* of the reality, because the relations cannot change without the terms changing. We can say that the pure relation is experienced in the so-called “aha moments,” in which we have an idea, just while it is *it* that comes to us: in similar cases, we become a sort of passive recipient of a message from a mysterious outside force; that is, we *are activated*, for we have the insight of a sudden and unexpected possible relation, which still needs to be articulated and developed (cf. Irvine 2015). Therefore, the most important thing to underline is that the tensor-relation, that is, the relation as transitive and transitory, is the pure agent of becoming, the absolute vector of heterogenization, the virtual of the actual – for pure relation is at the same time completely undetermined (obscured) and fully determinable (distinct). Or, also, it becomes the name of the pure event, of

the pure temporality, of the pure duration: of the becoming in all its own consistency. This means that, for Deleuze, the difference is the most generic name that can be given to the relation, that this, any possible relation is first of all a relation of difference, a pure alteration, only then it can be a *relation of* opposition, contrariety, contradiction and so on. It is, in this sense, that difference comes first and all other kinds of relation, particularly the Hegelian negative ones, come after: difference here becomes constitutive of identity, rather than the contrary; that is, it becomes productive and genetic. Relations such as identity, analogy, opposition and resemblance, are all secondary effects or results of prior relations of difference. Relations of negation, finally, are all secondary in respect of the preliminary relations of affirmation – in the problematic sense. Said briefly, in Deleuze’s view, the difference is the *Ur-relation* by excellence.

At the opposite, we can synthetically say that, from a Deleuzian perspective, in Hegel’s view:

- i) Time is the process of the origin’s recovering;
- ii) An idea is a movement of the reappropriation of its own sameness;
- iii) A problem is oriented toward its own end-solution;
- iv) Contradiction is the *Ur-relation*.

If, as seen, Hegel’s logic is a logic of recollection, Deleuze’s “logic of the AND” or “logic of the multiplicity” wants to be a logic of *pure differentiation* and of *mere alteration* – that is, a logic of affirmative creation, free from opposition and privation: a paradoxical *energetic logic*, as is to be explained. It is this same logic that Deleuze had already spotted in Spinoza’s world: “*non*

opposita sed diversa is the formula of a new logic” (EP: 60).

In Deleuze’s view, finally, the fundamental activity of the “subject” is the position of problems, which – as questioning – is led by affirmativity, a spontaneous and unconscious affirmativity. In fact, to be more precise, in Deleuze’s view, there is no main-place for the subject, the conscious or the person in the strict sense, just because his insistence on the impersonal, pre-individual, or un-/pre-conscious wants to emphasize that the main experience of our being in the world is not the conscious or linguistic one (the problematic is the unconscious and vice versa). Rather, it is the “energetic” one, connected with the order of the affects and, above all, with the affirmative plane of reality. As a matter of fact, it’s easy to see that the main Deleuzian ontological concepts are traced from this kind of “intensive” and “active” experience or condition: power, duration, desire, *comatus*, sense, sensation, intensity, future, energy, force, movement, virtual, tendency and so on.

As it has been noted – even if with a negative accent – one could even say that Deleuze ignores language; that is, he embraces an energetic model made of intensities, connections, virtuality, immediacy, strengths, overabundance etc., in which there is no space for separation and contraposition, just because this model rejects the “linguistic turn” of the 20th century as the analysis of linguistic mechanisms. Therefore, Deleuze would not be able to give account of the medial, negative, splitting or divisive phenomena: when he talks about “logic” (*The Logic of Sense*, *The Logic of Sensation* and so forth), to all effects he would always be talking about

“physics” (cf. Bottiroli 2013: 77–89). Even when Deleuze talks about concept, he talks about *conception*, namely, about the creative process of conceiving: he always points not at The Concept, but at *a concept*, at *a process of conceptualization*, at *a process of creation of a concept*.

My conviction is that in this respect Deleuze is less anthropocentric than Hegel: the first efforts to conceptualize the essence of the reality itself, conceived in a naturalistic sense, namely, made of forces, energies, relations, durations and so forth; the second disqualifies nature and attributes to the reality in itself the main features of the mind, conceived in a self-conscious meaning. However, I admit that at least two valid objections could be posed; the second could be considered as a development and a radicalization of the first.

The first is that Deleuze is actually just privileging *some other linguistic aspects*, that is, verbs, adverbs, or even prepositions, and so on, rather than proper names, adjectives, copula, predication and so on. This objection hits the target if we think that Deleuze often emphasizes linguistic traits, such as infinitive verbs, modes of verbal attribution, performative speech, pragmatics, indefinite articles etc., or prepositions, such as “between,” “infra,” “inter” etc., or conjunctions, such as “and,” “or” and so on. Nevertheless, if we look at the entire Deleuzian *corpus*, we can see that to Deleuze, all these more “active” and “dynamical” linguistic elements are the secondary effect, or the redoubling, of the main dynamism of *natura naturans* as such rather than vice versa.

The second is that Deleuze is “symbolizing” in concepts just *another kind of human experience* (desiring, sensing, being affected

etc.), not finally grasping though concepts something like the nature in itself, and – maybe – he is not even conceptualizing the most relevant kind of human experience. As it could be seen, this objection raises, then, a wider and deeper problem, perhaps the most crucial for all philosophy: is it possible for our thought to relate, no matter how, to reality in itself? Hence, here I must leave this point⁴ *sub judice*, not only because what now matters is to stress that – according to the former paragraphs – Deleuze intends to think that pure effectiveness as such, that is, *as affirmation/alteration/differentiation*, is free from any form of negative mediacy, but also because in doing this he shapes his concepts referring to all those “energetic” events that occur in nature.

If Hegel continues the classic tradition of ontolinguistic metaphysics, based on

⁴ For instance, one could also say that Deleuze is actually giving conceptual consistence to *another dimension* of the same “interiority.” In fact, rather than on *consciousness*, Deleuze always insisted on *thinking*: the first is linked with a *conscious* process of mediation (logical, argumentative, rational etc.), conscious properly insofar as mediated; the second, instead, is paradoxically much closer to the unconsciousness, as it represents an effort of concentration, that refolding for which one is in the process of grasping or catching something, that concentration for which one *doesn't realize* that a suspension of the ordinary use of faculties was happening. The first is on the level of good and common sense, of recognition (I am me), while the second on the level strictly creative, as – so to say – problematic and not mechanical concentration (“to be taken with” what one is doing). Actually, the moments in which we say to be thinking are moments of deep “unconsciousness”: moments in which we doubt, waver, hesitate etc. in an almost “ecstatic” way – atopic and alienated.

concepts, such as substance, predication, judgement etc. (cf. also Chiurazzi 1996), Deleuze continues instead that sort of tradition of cosmological metaphysics, based on such concepts as energy, force, field and so forth. Here, in general, eternity is not the permanence of a form (of a given substance), but the persistence of an effort of transformation (of a process): it's not a problem of continuity of a state, but of “continuity” of a lasting. It is not the case that Deleuze often uses a language full of images taken by the natural sciences, or that his work could have shown so many connections with some contemporary issues of the natural sciences.⁵

It is in this kind of energetic and, so to speak, prelinguistic world that, in example, all truth-criteria could be not a question of adequacy, neither of recollection, nor of reconciliation, but always of interest, relevance and importance, namely, of the expanding-power or of the capacity to extend (“what can...?”). What counts here is, I would say, the “differential coefficient,” remembering that this does not entail a simple, uncontrolled proliferation of virtual forces, but the *actual* consistence

of the richest differences. In a few words, Deleuze does not say or wish that everything would expand into infinity, nor that it is only through negation that there could be expansion (which would rather imply limitation); on the contrary, he says exactly that everything expands as far and as long as it can. Again, it is in this sense – as it should be clear now – that Deleuze thinks that one of the main errors of the Hegelian dialectic was to focus on the confrontation between opposing, contrary or contradictory solutions, rather than stressing the importance of the affirmative and objective power of the problems, which is instead the real core of the Absolute – putting it in Hegelian words.

3. To Be Hungry. Trauma and Desire

It may seem that, so far, I have just drawn two more or less accurate drafts of the Hegelian and Deleuzian philosophies, in a too speculative, foggy and even partisan way to really be able to clarify why Deleuze is not and *could not* be Hegelian. For this reason, now I want to make an example, which could be a paradigm not simply of the irreducible, essential divergence between Hegel and Deleuze, but instead of what, given a certain condition or experience, Hegel and Deleuze can differently sharpen. I am talking of the desire, which – as known – plays a key role in the Deleuzian production (mostly in the works with Guattari) and is also a key moment in the development of the *Gestalten* of the Hegelian Mind.

Before this, let me highlight another more general situation that can help us in this understanding. Think of psychological traumas: what do they reveal to and represent for a subject?

⁵ About this, cf. mainly DeLanda 2002; Gaffney 2010. But I can also add that some of the most relevant contemporary scientific ideas are, let me say, deeply Deleuzian. I.e.: the idea of a structural physical realism in which there is nothing but vibrations, that is, tensile relations (cf. French 2014); the idea of a world made not of the *endure* of substances, but of the *perdurer* of processes (cf. Esfeld 2012: 74); the idea of something as an ideal virtual empty element as engine of the entire universe (cf. Deacon 2011), or – lastly – the idea of an info-world inhabited by info-org, made of *diaphora*, that is, of pure difference (cf. Floridi 2010; 2011).

In the Hegelian world, they act as a sort of formative medium, as if Hegel would renew the saying “learning by suffering” (already stated in Aeschylus’s *Agamemnon*, but cf. also Gadamer 2004: 350–351), or they even represent – as Malabou has particularly insisted – a *transformative* opportunity. In other words, they denote that the encounter with the negative – when “removed” and “digested” – is even necessary in that journey within oneself, where several forms of the Self contrast with each other and which constitutes the Self as such. I would say that the protagonist of the Hegelian transformation is always *a subject*, even when he projects himself toward and exposes himself to the unexpected and the unforeseeable, it is in order to become *a new subject*. As said before, every deformation, every reformation and every transformation is, first of all, a matter of *formation*, that is, a problem of the presence or the absence of a form. Undoubtedly, forms do change, but this means that one form is negated and this negation is negated in order to constitute a new form and so on: what counts, finally, is that a form is to be determined thanks to the negativity. Loss of form, restoration of form, becoming as passage from one form to another form: this is Hegel’s transformation.

In the Deleuzian world, instead, a trauma is a sort of a sign, almost in the literal sense of the problem, as a complex of hurling and hindering, that is, something which points not at an external limit (that negates the subject), but, firstly, at internal research (the movement of affirmation of the subject). In other words, while for Hegel a trauma testifies, first of all, the irruption of something that negates the

subject and thus can be the source of his reshaping-delimitation, for Deleuze, it reveals above all that there was a demand still unanswered within (rather than “of”) the subject and thus it – and the subject with it – could be now better developed and shaped. Also, from the external point of view, a trauma represents an obstacle in the problematic sense for Deleuze: an event to be counter-effectuated, a case the prolongation of which is to be tested, an occasion of de- and then re-individuation. Involution and virtualization of form, diagonalization of form, the becoming as in-between forms: this is Deleuze’s transformation.

Said briefly, in the Hegelian world, a trauma exposes an external negation, that the Self should himself negate in order to reappropriate his own identity, insofar as this could have another form; in the Deleuzian world, a trauma shows an internal-external differentiation, the reemergence of a virtual, pre- and trans-individual question that should be tested, prolonged and developed in order to make a subject take shape, or – better – in order to see if and what a subject can do. If a Hegelian says to himself, “now I have to overcome it and leave it behind!” – a Deleuzian instead asks “how can this instance be reintegrated – if it can – in the path of one life?” In the one case, negation is the engine of consciousness’ development; in the other, problematization is the source of the construction of an experimental field. There, we are always looking for the result of the process, even if this would be only momentary; here, we are always in the middle of a process, in *the enduring of it*.

This contrast of Hegel-Deleuze may appear too dualistic – and it probably is – but I think that nevertheless it is useful to

better circumscribe the core of the issue here discussed, and to understand the presentation of the key example that follows in a clearer way.

Coming to the desire, here I don't want to reconstruct all the aspects of its presence in the work of the two philosophers; after all, these are quite widely known, and there are also relevant specific texts about the comparison between Hegelian and Deleuzian ways of conceiving the desire (cf., above all, Adkins 2007). Hence, I just want to put in evidence some general traits, in relation with the previous pages.

If we look at the way in which Hegel describes the desire and its process, we can easily see the following:

- i) The desire is linked (since the form of the animal need) with the feeling of a defect and the perception of a lack;
- ii) The experience of desiring is thus experiencing pain and sufferance;
- iii) In order to respond to this and overcome the lack – that is, in order to negate this negativity, it needs to be negated with both the interior stimulus and something exterior to oneself, which, in its turn, opposes itself to oneself;
- iv) When desires *stricto sensu* meet, their encounter is always a question of a struggle to get recognition, that is, an attempt to reciprocally negate the other and the negation operated by the other and so on.

Deleuzian desire has been often misunderstood or – more properly – it has been discussed mostly in the political, social and psychoanalytical senses, but not so much in the *philosophical* one. The consequence of this general attitude is that desire has been painted now as a free, revolutionary

kind of energy, now as a free enjoyment, that is, now as a free flow to be celebrated, now as a free flow to be demonized. By looking *philosophically* at the desire and its immanence, instead, it allows us, for instance, to see that:

- i) The desire is linked with the force of a questioning and the affirmation of an instance to be expressed;
- ii) The experience of desiring is thus experiencing intensity and energy;
- iii) In order to respond to this and extend this quest – that is, in order to affirm this affirmativity, it needs to be developed by both the interior endeavor and the possibilities of encounter and composition with something exterior to oneself;
- iv) Every interlacement of different desires gives birth to a process of differentiation – that is, to an entanglement of problems and solutions that could be good as bad, expressive as repressive and so on – but which is always *transformative*.

Thinking of the image of the nutrition, for Hegel, it entails a process of annihilation, assimilation and digestion, that is, the attempt to overcome the lack of the appetite through the negation of the immediacy of the object and the negation of oneself immediacy (I negate the immediate form of the object by its transformation, I negate my own immediate appetite through work, I finally negate the object and my appetite through digestion). Instead, for Deleuze – it is quite clear already since his reflection on the tension between instincts and institutions in the 1950s – it entails a process of expression, folding and satisfaction – that is, the attempt to prolong and extend the demand of the appetite through its flection,

the invention of a way to satisfy it and the composition of a good encounter, able to avoid poisoning (the appetite is affirmed, but also the object, because it is put in a relation that differentiates and expands itself, and the satisfaction produces both the I enjoying and a new configuration of the object). There, we go from the immediate to the mediate and vice versa by opposing negations; here, we go from the virtual to the actual and vice versa by repeated differentiations. Or, so to say, what matters to Hegel is to come in the end to digestion and defecation, while what counts for Deleuze is to live in the middle of the process of satisfying and tasting.

Furthermore, if we take the master-slave dialectic, which is precisely one of or the main *locus* of Hegelian desire, we can focus on in which sense for Deleuze contradiction is – at best – nothing but a case of the more generic relation of difference. First of all, the relation of a master-slave cannot be considered a sort of monadic intrinsic property of the two subjects or individuals: in fact, it qualifies the *relata* not in the same way (one is the master, the other is the slave), that is, it characterizes them differently. Hence, it must be extrinsic to them, which is another way of saying that before and apart from the master-slave relationship, *there aren't such things as a master and a slave*.

But this is not enough, and Hegel could even agree with this insight. Indeed, secondly, for Deleuze, what counts is that the relation of a master-slave makes them above all *different with respect to each other*, not that they can then be reciprocally opposite or against each other. Besides for Deleuze, we have two movements of affirmation (the ones of the “master” and the “slave”),

which go toward a transformation when they undergo an encounter (the relation of difference), which, is in its turn, an affirmative agent (the agent of becoming): all we have – in short – is the constitution of an open, problematic field. We do not have two subjects trying to negate each other, thus put in a contrastive relationship.

Simply said, it's just like Deleuze wants to stress that we cannot take *one kind* of a relation (master-slave as a struggle to the death) and say, “that's relation as such!” Rather, we should understand – let me say – what different kinds of relation are shared (mother-son, friendship, hammer-worker and so forth), that is, the fact of being relations, of posing a transformative difference between the *relata*. *All relations share the fact of being differences, of affirming differences, nothing more and nothing less.*⁶

Going to the conclusion, let me add just another thing. Desire could also be a good example to understand the general frame of the Deleuzian “Transcendental Deduction” of time, sketched above. In fact, the process of sensing and responding to a desire could be described in three stages.

First. We are all enchanted in what we are doing at the moment – that is, we are all contracted with our present, we are – as Deleuze puts it – contemplating: we are simply all the same with our present activity, whatever it is; we don't feel any need.

Second. The enchantment breaks up and fatigue emerges, revealing that we were not generating needs, that we were

⁶ For a more general presentation of relations as a ground philosophical problem, see Marmodoro-Yates 2016, where also some important affinities with the Deleuzian perspective appear.

totally absorbed by the previous activity, which solely now appears as such. The past comes over, telling us not just what we were doing, but above all that there was a "hidden" request inhabiting us ("so was I hungry?"). If we could be enchanted, it was because a kind of energy reserve was stored, but now it is awakening itself and us.

Third. It's the time of the future, the real origin of all the matter. The energy reserve becomes problematic, it compels and animates us: the past undergoes forking paths. Now we can try to face this request, articulating its indetermination and developing its determinability, in order to find how they could be formulated, expressed and finally satisfied ("how can I satisfy the appetite? Should I?" etc.). Only then we could fall again under the spell of the present, of another unpredictable present, without knowing when, why and how that is, in a passive and unconscious way. And now, the eternal return can go on and on.

For Hegel, instead, it seems as if this process consists in returning to the (supposed) condition of the beginning, that is, to the absence (negation) of lack (negation), where time is finally annulled, or – at least – where the recollection of all the stages of the negation has been completed, and the origin – that is, a form – has been regained. It matters less to satisfy the desire and more to apprehend retrospectively it, its meaning and its sense, so to speak; or – better – what most counts is that in the end the subject has found a new form through his labor and pain – namely, that he has digested and defecated, that has freed himself and let free.

We can say that in Deleuze's philosophy, desire is nothing but the same of the virtual,

or of the problem, or of the question, or of the pure empty form of time and so on. On the Hegelian side, we have desire seen as the loss of the best star and the subsequent painful need to recollect it, counting on the power of the negative; on the Deleuzian side, we have desire seen as openness of the sky full of stars, and the subsequent demand for the construction of the better circumstantiated constellation of stars, relying upon the dynamism of the affirmative. *Aufhebung contra agencement*, or *recollection contra expression*, to put it in a slogan.

Let me be clear: again, I'm not saying that Hegel is wrong, while Deleuze is right, or vice versa. One could say that even if desiring is active and problematic questioning, satisfying it requires *de facto* the negation, as it happens when – in example – you have to kill an animal, or to eat a killed animal, in order to silence your hunger; and here you are not taking in a generic, differential and affirmative process of composition of forces. Hence, I'm not saying that things cannot be seen as such, *rather* I'm exactly saying that things *can be seen that way*, or – better – that you can see them in these different ways depending on the conceptual framework you rely on.

So, it is in this sense that I'm claiming that Hegel and Deleuze do nothing but build *different* conceptual architectures, and that it is exactly this fact (*the faktum of the difference*) that – according to Deleuze – Hegel is not able to focus; before that they reciprocally negate in order to determine themselves, things just difference themselves and have to develop that internal difference that constitutes them. But this is also why, paradoxically, Deleuze ends up being *radically against* Hegel – as

if he himself could not resist to that movement of becoming where there could not be a Deleuze-becoming of Hegel without a Hegel-becoming of Deleuze.

In the end, this ambiguity may indicate that, on the one side, Hegel and Deleuze do, at all effects, pose different problems, but, on the other side, they also share a field of coordinates within which these problems are posed and developed. In other words,

Hegel asks how a process starts and ends, while Deleuze asks what happens in the middle of a process; but both of them are nonetheless asking if and how it is possible to *think the process*. Is this the reason why Deleuze, the philosopher of the “indifference” toward opposition, could not be indifferent to Hegelian system? Maybe, but this problem could be the start of another new philosophical system, which is yet to come.⁷

References

- Adkins, B. 2007. *Death and Desire in Hegel, Heidegger and Deleuze*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Agamben, G. 2006. *Language and Death: The Place of Negativity* (1982). Transl. by M. Hardt. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Baugh, B. 2009. G. W. F. Hegel, in G. Jones, J. Roffe (Eds.). *Deleuze's Philosophical Lineage*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press:130–146.
- Bencivenga, E. 2000. *Hegel's Dialectical Logic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bodei, R. 2014. *La civetta e la talpa. Sistema ed epoca in Hegel*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Bottioli, G. 2013. *La ragione flessibile. Modi d'essere e stili di pensiero*. Torino: Bollati Boringhieri.
- Bryant, L. R. 2008. *Difference and Givenness. Deleuze's Transcendental Empiricism and the Ontology of Immanence*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Chiurazzi, G. 1996. *Hegel, Heidegger e la grammatica dell'essere*. Roma–Bari: Laterza.
- Deacon, T. W. 2011. *Incomplete Nature. How Mind Emerged from Matter*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- De Giovanni, B. 1970. *Hegel e il tempo storico della società borghese*. Bari: De Donato.
- DeLanda, M. 2002. *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy*. London–New York: Bloomsbury.
- Deleuze, G. 1990. *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza* (1968). Transl. by M. Joughin. New York: Zone Books.
- Deleuze, G. 1991. *Bergsonism* (1966). Transl. by H. Tomlinson. New York: Zone Books.
- Deleuze, G. 1994. *Difference and Repetition* (1968). Transl. by P. Patton. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. 1995. *Negotiations. 1972–1990* (1990). Transl. by M. Joughin. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. 2004. *Desert Islands and Other Texts. 1953–1974* (2002). Transl. by M. Taormina. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Deleuze, G. 2006. *Nietzsche and Philosophy* (1962). Transl. by Hugh Tomlinson. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. 2007. *Two Regimes of Madness. Texts and Interview, 1975–1995* (2003). Transl. by A. Hodges, M. Taormina. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Deleuze G.; Parnet, C. 1987. *Dialogues* (1977). Transl. by H. Tomlinson, G. Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press.

⁷ Such a work of construction will also force us to discuss systems of thought that are different from the Western ones, as – for instance – the work of sinologist François Jullien shows remarkably (cf. i.e. the synthesis offered in Jullien 2015).

- Duffy, 2006. *The Logic of Expression: Quality, Quantity, and Intensity in Spinoza, Hegel and Deleuze*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Esfeld, M. 2012. *Physique et métaphysique: une introduction à la philosophie de la nature*. Lausanne : Presses Polytechniques et Universitaires Romandes.
- Floridi, L. 2010. *Information: A Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Floridi, L. 2011. *The Philosophy of Information*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- French, S. 2014. *The Structure of the World: Metaphysics and Representation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gadamer, H.-G. 2004. *Truth and Method* (1960). Transl. by J. Weinsheimer, D. G. Marshall. London–New York: Continuum.
- Gaffney, P. (Ed.). 2010. *The Force of the Virtual. Deleuze, Science, and Philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hallward, P. 2006. *Out of This World: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Creation*. London–New York: Verso.
- Hardt, M. 1993. *Gilles Deleuze: An Apprenticeship in Philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Houle, K.; Vernon, J. 2013. *Hegel and Deleuze. Together Again for the First Time*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Irvine, W. B. 2015. *Aha! The Moments of Insight that Shape Our World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jullien, F. 2015. *De l'être au vivre. Lexique euro-chinois de la pensée*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Lambert, G. 2008. *Who's Afraid of Deleuze and Guattari?* London–New York: Continuum.
- Lukács, G. 1948. *Der junge Hegel. Über die Beziehungen von Dialektik und Ökonomie*. Zürich–Wien: Europa.
- Lundy, C. 2012. *History and Becoming: Deleuze's Philosophy of Creativity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Malabou, C. 1996. Who is Afraid of Hegelian Wolves? in P. Patton (Ed.). *Deleuze: A Critical Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell: 114–138.
- Malabou, C. 2005. *The Future of Hegel: Plasticity, Temporality, and Dialectic* (1996). Transl. by L. During. London: Routledge.
- Marmodoro, A.; Yates, D. (Eds.). 2016. *The Metaphysics of Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Michéa, J.-C. 2006. *Impasse Adam Smith: Brèves remarques sur l'impossibilité de dépasser le capitalisme sur sa gauche*. Paris : Champs-Flammarion.
- Nancy, J.-L. 2002. *Hegel. The Restlessness of the Negative* (1997). Transl. by J. Smith, S. Miller. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Nancy, J.-L. 2008. *Le differenze parallele. Deleuze e Derrida*. Ed. by T. Ariemma, L. Cremonesi. Verona: Ombre Corte.
- Pezzano, G. 2014. Essere e pensiero: farsi un'altra idea della filosofia, in A. Monchietto, G. Pezzano (Eds.). *Invito allo straniamento. I. Costanzo Preve filosofo*. Pistoia: Petite Plaisance: 115–148.
- Pezzano, G. 2016a. *Ideare. Gilles Deleuze e la ricostruzione del platonismo*. Verona: QuiEdit.
- Pezzano, G. 2016b. Tra normalità e anormalità. Deleuze e la norma come problema filosofico, *Trópos. Rivista di ermeneutica e critica filosofica*, IX (1): 145–165.
- Pezzano, G. 2017. L'ora del possibile. Deleuze e la possibilità intra-fattuale, in G. Chiu-razzi, G. Pezzano (Eds.). *Attualità del possibile*. Milano–Udine: Mimesis: 49–63.
- Poli, R. 2006. The Ontology of What is Not There, in J. Malinowski, A. Pietruszek (Eds.). *Essays in Logic and Ontology. Dedicated to Jerzy Perzanowski*. Amsterdam: Rodopi: 73–80.
- Shaviro, S. 2009. *Without Criteria: Kant, Whitehead, Deleuze, and Aesthetics*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Simont, J. 1997. *Essai sur la quantité, la qualité, la relation chez Kant, Hegel, Deleuze. Les "fleurs noires" de la logique philosophique*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Somers-Hall, H., 2012. *Hegel, Deleuze, and the Critique of Representation: Dialectics of Negation and Difference*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Virno, P. 2013. *Saggio sulla negazione. Per un'antropologia linguistica*. Turin: Bollati Boringhieri.

Williams, J. 2016. *A Process Philosophy of Signs*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
 Žižek, S. 2006. *Interrogating the Real*. London–New York: Continuum.

TAČIAU, GALIAUSIAI, KODĖL DELEUZE'AS YRA „ANTIHĖGELININKAS“? HEGELIO–DELEUZE'O SUSIDŪRIMO PRIEŽASTIS

Giacomo Pezzano

Santrauka

Deleuze'as yra pasakęs, kad *nekenčia* hėgelizmo ir dialektikos. Šiame straipsnyje tvirtinama, jog Deleuze'as yra *prieš* Hegelį, nes turi ir siūlo *kitokią filosofinę sistemą*. Taigi straipsnio autorius teigia, kad, norėdami suprasti tokio „bjaurėjimosi“ priežastį, turime susitelkti į filosofinį klausimą, išjudinantį visą delioziškąją sistemą (§ 1). Autorius paaiškina, kad pamatinis Hegelio filosofijos klausimas – kaip yra įmanoma dalykų įveika, vystymasis?, o delioziškasis klausimas – kaip įmanomas naujumas, dalykų pasirodymas (§ 2). Galiausiai autorius aptaria, kaip geismas gali būti laikomas pagrindiniu pavyzdžiu, parodančiu abiejų autorių perspektyvų išsiskyrimą (§ 3).

Pagrindiniai žodžiai: dialektika, prisiminimas, kūrybiškumas, transformacija, skirties filosofija, geismas.