

THE ETERNAL RETURN AND THE PHANTOM OF DIFFERENCE¹

Catherine Malabou

Translated by Arne De Boever²

Under the title “The Eternal Return and the Phantom of Difference,” I want to cast light on what I will present as the interpretative coup that, from Deleuze to Derrida, and via Klossowski and Blanchot, has oriented and governed understandings of Nietzsche’s philosophy during the second half of the twentieth century. This coup consists in turning Nietzsche into a thinker--the first and foremost thinker, even--of “difference.”

This is not a particularly “French” move. It was actually Heidegger who started it: he set out to read Nietzsche using ontological difference as his guiding thread. And indeed, the authors that I just evoked have all been profoundly influenced, each in his particular way, by this reading. The “French” component, if I can call it that, of their interpretative decision is that whereas Heidegger sees in Nietzsche’s thought at the same time an unveiling and a covering over of difference, they on the other hand find in this same thought the birth of a straightforward difference, without ambivalence, unequivocal.

Nietzschean difference would be an originary, foundational difference, a principle of sufficient reason, as Deleuze says, an irreducible, undeconstructible difference. It would appear as an instrument of the deconstruction of ontological difference itself, which is still considered too heavy, too encompassing, too attached to the sense of being. Nietzschean difference would thus be more radical than ontological difference.

The purest, most probing expression of this radicality is, in the eyes of the French thinkers, the doctrine of the eternal return. This is the particularly “French” orientation of the reading of Nietzsche during the second half of the twentieth century: *putting forward the doctrine of the eternal return to announce a thought of difference*. “Return,” Deleuze declares in *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, is the “being of difference as such or the eternal return.”³

THE ETERNAL RETURN AND THE PHANTOM OF DIFFERENCE

But why speak of a “coup” to refer to such an interpretation, given that this term implies violence, or even deceit? First of all, because one cannot but notice that difference, “Unterschied” or “Differenz,” is not a Nietzschean concept. It does not at all take up a privileged place in the philosopher’s lexicon and it does not receive any special discussion. Secondly, because considering the eternal return of the same as a radical thought of difference is paradoxical for more than one reason. Indeed, such an interpretation presupposes that the eternal return, contrary to what its name indicates, is a principle of selection that, one could say, automatically sorts between that which returns—or deserves to return—and that which does not. A principle that *differentiates* [*fait la différence*] between the ontological candidates for return. A principle that announces, therefore, contrary to what its name indicates, neither the return of the identical, nor the return of all things.

Identity, Deleuze declares, must precisely be understood starting from difference. For Nietzsche, identity does not preexist the return, it is produced by it. Identity is therefore the result of difference. Is one still dealing with an “identity,” in this sense? Deleuze replies: “Eternal return cannot mean the return of the Identical because it presupposes a world [...] in which all previous identities have been abolished and dissolved. [...] Returning is thus the only identity, but identity as a secondary power; the identity of difference, the identical which belongs to the different, or turns around the different.”⁴ As for the return of “all things,” it is a repetition that selects and makes the division between that which can and that which cannot bear the test of the return. “If eternal return is a wheel, then it must be endowed with a violent centrifugal movement which expels [...] everything which cannot pass the test.”⁵

In another way, but with a different conclusion, Derrida insists in his short little text titled “Otobiographies” on the link between that which unites the circle of the eternal return and the movement of difference. It is as *différance*—affirmation and selection—that the eternal return must be understood.

Rereading all the instances of the doctrine of the eternal return in Nietzsche’s texts, in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, *The Gay Science*, and notably in the posthumous texts, one cannot find anything that justifies such an understanding of the doctrine, however dominant and widespread it might be. The “Different” does not exist. Whence, then, such insistence?

I would like to develop a partial answer to this question here. Seen from the standpoint of difference, the eternal return is understood by the authors that I have just referred to as a process of the discussion of duality, of the dyad, of ontological couples, that opposes itself on all counts to the Hegelian dialectic. *Anti-Hegelianism thus constitutes another dominant feature of the French understanding of Nietzsche*, and one that is inseparable from the first. It is in the name of anti-Hegelianism that difference is promoted to the rank of a guiding concept. Indeed, difference is not opposition; as such, it is not looking for its resolution. This remark enables me to cast light on the meaning of the word “phantom” in my title: “The eternal return and the phantom of difference.” According to the authors that I have evoked, Nietzsche replaces the dialectical process of the resolution of opposites, which reduces difference and subordinates it to the work of the negative, with a principle of *spectralizing* selection. The wheel of the return would make the difference between life—vitality of affirmation, of all that deserves to return—and death—infirmary, nihilism, weakness that cannot bear the test of the return. Difference would thus produce phantoms, it would be the principle of the distinction between living beings and their specters. The principle of automatic selection between creative vitality and reactive phantoms. Without contradiction, without negation. Everything that returns would thus return simultaneously accompanied by its phantom and liberated from it. The production of the spectral double would be the Nietzschean reply—a non-dialectical one—to the dialectical resolution.

We will see that in both Deleuze and Derrida, the most phantomatic of phantoms—the one that does not deserve to return in any other form than that of a shadow—is Hegel. Deleuze affirms: “the Negative does not return. The Identical does not return [...] Only affirmation returns – in other words, the Different, the Dissimilar.”⁶ The doctrine of the eternal return of the same would thus mean: only difference returns. Or also: “two negations” only ever make a “phantom of affirmation.”⁷ The Hegelian point of view is “the point of view

of the slave who draws from the ‘No’ a phantom of an affirmation.”⁸

Now, in the same way that Nietzsche is perhaps no thinker of difference, he might not be obsessed with the phantom of Hegel. This will be my question today: isn’t it difference itself that has become phantomatic? Isn’t it difference itself that is no more than a specter, and that, as such, is no longer operative, just like the critique of dialectics that it seeks to orient?

One will object, of course, and I must confront this from the get-go, that the concept of difference appeared, if not as the best solution for, then at least as the least faulty way of discussing the problem posed by the doctrine of eternal return. This problem has to do with the fact that there is indeed precisely always a “two,” a dyad, in the formulation of the eternal return. The return always announces itself in Nietzsche as a *between-two*, whether this takes the form of a gateway where two paths cross in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, or whether one is dealing with an “or (*oder*)” that structures the announcement of the “heaviest weight” in *The Gay Science*. In “On the Vision and the Riddle” (*Vom Gesicht und Räthsel*), in the third part of *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Nietzsche declares: “See this gateway, dwarf! ... It has two faces (*zwei Gesichter*). Two paths (*zwei Wege*) come together here; no one has yet walked them to the end. This long lane back: it lasts an eternity (*eine Ewigkeit*). And that long lane outward: that is another eternity (*eine andre Ewigkeit*). They contradict each other, these paths; they blatantly offend each other (*sie widersprechen sich, diese Wege, sie stossen sich gerade vor den Kopf*)—and here at this gateway is where they come together. The name of the gateway is inscribed at the top: ‘Moment (*Augenblick*)’.”⁹

In paragraph 341 from *The Gay Science*, titled “The Heaviest Weight,” one reads: “What if some day or night a demon were to steal into your loneliest loneliness and say to you: ‘This life as you now live it and have lived it you will have to live once again and innumerable times again; and there will be nothing new in it, but every pain and every joy and every thought and every sigh and everything unspeakably small or great in your life must return to you, all in the same succession and sequence—even this spider and this moonlight between the trees, and even this moment and I myself. The eternal hourglass of existence is turned over again and again, and you with it, speck of dust! Would you not throw yourself down and gnash your teeth and curse the demon who spoke thus? Or have you once experienced a tremendous moment when you would have answered him: ‘You are a god, and never have I heard anything more divine.’”¹⁰

There is this “two” of eternity, of ways, of paths; there is this “or.” What else can they express, other than a *difference*? Doesn’t the return, in its very movement, operate a *selection*, a hierarchization, without dialectical solution, between two significations of itself? A first signification, called “nihilist,” according to which everything returns to the same, and a second, resolutely “creative,” which draws from repetition the possibility of a transvaluation and an overcoming of nihilism? Aren’t there from now on two returns in the return, indeed a difference of the return to itself, which marks the separation between the dwarf and the overman, the “yes” of the donkey and the “yes” of the creator, the affirmation and its phantom?

Deleuze thematizes this difficulty: how to explain, he asks, that “Zarathustra [becomes] angry and suffers such a terrible nightmare when the dwarf says: ‘All truth is crooked, time itself is a circle’? As he explains later in interpreting his nightmare: he fears that eternal return means the return of Everything, of the Same and the Similar, including the dwarf and including the smallest of men.”¹¹ However, he quickly puts this hesitation to an end and responds firmly: in reality, there is neither an “at the same time” nor an “oscillation.” Difference works here to create a hierarchy between the perspectives that appeared to be the same. There is a *difference of intensity in being* that separates the consistency of active instances from the phantoms of passivity.

Confronted with this difficulty of the “or” (*oder*), how to understand the eternal return in any other way than as the blade of a difference that separates and prevents it from being a simple song that we have heard millions of times before? What would be its meaning without this difference? Without *its* difference? Would it not be, in fact, pure absurdity, pure repetition, nihilism all over again? The return does not return without difference. That’s how things have been understood.

THE ETERNAL RETURN AND THE PHANTOM OF DIFFERENCE

Heidegger was the first to insist on the value of the moment in “On the Vision and the Riddle.” The moment, which corresponds to the bite that severs the head of the black snake, is the decisive moment that interrupts the uniform course of the return and thus allows those who have the vision to overcome nihilism.

Now, the “French” insistence on difference as the motor of eternal return is at the same time a radicalization and a displacement of the Heideggerian insistence. Radicalisation, because the moment is understood as the decisive moment in which specters are produced. Displacement, because the weight of the analysis clearly bears on the critique of dialectics. I will show first that in Deleuze, the moment is understood as this differentiant [*différenciant*] of the difference that operates an *energetic* but not a *logical* division between that which returns and that which fails to return. A principle of selection that separates the affirmation from what it is not and distinguishes it from what Deleuze calls precisely its phantom.

After that I will focus on the understanding of the moment developed by Derrida. This understanding is subordinated to the logic of the *autobiography*. The eternal return is a doctrine that can only be taught by an individual that carries a name, that of Zarathustra, or that of Nietzsche. No eternal return without a proper name. The doctrine only escapes the cliché because of the singularity of the name of whoever announces it. Seen in this way, the eternal return is not only the hourglass turned over and over again of all things in their neutrality, their banality, or their anonymity, but *a* life that sees itself return. In the indifference of the stream, there is the *I* that ties itself to itself in the irreducible unity of its life and experiences the *difference between life and death*. This difference, which also produces the phantom of the writer, enables one to introduce some depth and hierarchy into the eternal return.

After having examined the essential traits of these two positions which, even though they cannot be reduced to each other, incontestably have points of commonality, I will formulate my question in the following terms: *and what if difference were not the right word to do justice to the two paths of the gateway or of the “or” itself? And what if overcoming nihilism did not amount to “making difference”?*



There is nothing outrageous about saying that Deleuze’s two works *Nietzsche and Philosophy* and *Difference and Repetition* present the doctrine of eternal return as a strategy for breaking down the Hegelian dialectic. The concept of “difference” expresses for Deleuze before anything else an irreducibility to opposition, to contradiction, in a word: to *negation*. Against the process of *Aufhebung* that regulates in advance the cuts, the ruptures, in the service of a predetermined identity, Nietzsche defines an energetics, a force field at the heart of which no force exists before its being put in relation with the force or the forces from which it differs. There is therefore no identity that precedes the relation, all presence results from an originary “*diapherein*.” Accordingly, no specific instance governs the reconciliation of forces: difference is a mode of the being of the multiple that is neither self-contradictory nor self-overcoming. Its constancy is assured through repetition, which is not a reduction to the identical. The eternal return, Deleuze declares in *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, is the “principle of the reproduction of diversity as such, of the repetition of difference; the opposite of ‘*adiaphoria*’.”¹²

The difference of forces is at the same time quantitative and qualitative. According to their difference in quantity, Deleuze declares, forces are said to be dominant or dominated. According to their difference in quality, they are said to be active or reactive.¹³ The forces are therefore originally divided, without process, according to this double differentiation. The return is precisely what enables this differentiation to be constantly operative.

Indeed, if everything must return, what serves as the selective principle and prevents reactive or dominated forces from returning, in the same way that active and dominant forces do? Here we find the threat of nihilism. Indeed, Deleuze reminds us that “Zarathustra not only presents the thought of the eternal return as mysterious and secret but as nauseating and difficult to bear.” Something seems to “contaminate [the eternal return] so gravely that it becomes an object of anguish, repulsion and disgust.”¹⁴ This threat of contamination is nothing other than the circle of dialectics, which makes being turn in circles and guarantees the triumph of

reactive forces: “Hegel’s circle is not the eternal return, only the infinite circulation of the identical by means of negativity [...] difference remains subordinated to identity, reduced to the negative, incarcerated within similitude and analogy.”¹⁵

The eternal return, through its force of selection, is precisely what breaks the circle. That which returns, returns differently, “repetition is the differentiant of difference.” The will to power is the test of this differentiation, which brings about the inversion of the meaning of reaction or reactivity through the dynamic of affirmation alone: “whatever you will, will it in such a way that you also will its eternal return.”¹⁶ Deleuze adds: “Laziness, stupidity [*bêtise*], baseness, cowardice or spitefulness that would will its own eternal return would no longer be the same laziness, stupidity, etc. How does the eternal return perform the selection here? It is the *thought* of the eternal return that selects. It makes willing something whole. The thought of the eternal return eliminates from willing everything which falls outside the eternal return, it makes willing a creation, it brings about the equation ‘willing=creating’.”¹⁷

And it is at this point that selection creates phantoms. The forces that are cast aside by the wheel become indeed phantoms of force; what falls outside of the return is spectralized. And the most phantomatic of phantoms, as we have said, is the dialectical process. “Those who bear the negative know not what they do: they take the shadow for reality, they encourage phantoms [...].”¹⁸ This is why “the negative, the similar and the analogous are repetitions, but they do not return, forever driven away by the wheel of the eternal return.”¹⁹ Becoming thus appears like a process of hierarchization of being—whose constancy is assured by repetition—over the phantom, simulacrum or *ersatz* of presence.

I could cite even more passages concerning the critique of dialectics, the assimilation of dialectics to nihilism, the bringing to light of negation as the ontological phantom of affirmation. But most of all I want to confess my embarrassment here in the face of these analyses. Indeed, and first of all, where can one find in Nietzsche the idea that the negative, dialectics, Hegelian thought itself do not return? This question leads to a second: where can one find, in Nietzsche, the idea that the eternal return is an automatic principle of selection? Deleuze presents the eternal return as a wheel, which appears in its turn as a machine to make difference, an automatic differentiation. Now where can this motif be found in the texts? Finally, and thirdly, and this is the most serious question, isn’t the Deleuzian understanding of the eternal return, which starts from difference, extremely violent in its anti-Hegelianism? Isn’t the eternal return transformed by the prejudice of such a reading into an *elimination machine*? “Selection occurs between two repetitions: those who repeat negatively and those who repeat identically will be eliminated.”²⁰

The verb “to eliminate” returns over and over again in Deleuze’s writing. An elimination that corresponds to a destruction, even an auto-destruction: “By and in the eternal return nihilism no longer expresses itself as the conservation and victory of the weak but as their destruction, their *self-destruction*.”²¹ Where can one read, in Nietzsche, that the weak auto-destruct? And a machine to destroy weakness, to make a difference between two repetitions--is such a machine ultimately not more totalitarian, more threatening, more reactive than dialectics?

The idea that the eternal return chases away the specters is a seductive but dangerous vision. On top of that, it appears that Nietzsche is absent from such a vision. Difference is something that is *imposed* upon him.

In the two books *Nietzsche and Philosophy* and *Difference and Repetition*, one does not find a single citation of Nietzsche that literally mobilizes the concept of difference. It is not that Nietzsche never uses the word, or that Deleuze’s reading is rendered invalid by the absence of the fundamental textual occurrence of the concept. One can simply ask oneself whether such a reading, in spite of its grandeur and its importance, does not settle too quickly the fundamental question of the complicity of nihilism and creative affirmation, by invoking this phantom of the dialectic, transformed into a bad subject—whether such a reading does not already by itself eliminate in a machine-like, systematic way the alliance of the “two paths,” the fact that all things are “firmly knotted together.”²²

THE ETERNAL RETURN AND THE PHANTOM OF DIFFERENCE



At first sight, the reading that Derrida proposes of Nietzsche appears to insist more on this link, this knot that ties all things together, on the difficulty of separating, of selecting at the heart of this complication. However, we will discover very quickly that the motifs of difference and of spectrality govern, even here still, the interpretation. One should of course take time to indicate everything that separates Deleuze's difference from Derrida's difference, everything that also separates their concepts of spectrality, but let us focus here on our problem.

In "Otobiographies," a work that contains many essential elements of deconstructive thought, Derrida shows that the originality of the thought of the eternal return depends on the signature that it leaves in itself of the one who thinks it. The eternal return is a thought that is not separable from the proper name of the one who thinks it. There is therefore an alliance between the circle of the eternal return and of the singular life of the one who has a revelation about it. Two rings within the ring.

The thematic of difference is precisely introduced in the analysis of the duality of the circles, the first of which can be called *ontological*, the second *autobiographical*. There is at the same time similitude and difference between the ring of the return of all things and the ring that unites this ring to the life of the thinker. The point of encounter between the two rings is the *anniversary*, a motif that is so important for Nietzsche—whether we are talking about high noon or the anniversary of the middle of life evoked in *Ecce Homo*.

The anniversary marks at the same time the infinite return and the finite return of life on itself. It is by articulating this double logic of the anniversary that Derrida reads the declaration of Nietzsche in *Ecce Homo*: "I looked backwards, I looked out, I have never seen so many things that were so good, all at the same time."²³ Derrida declares: "The anniversary is the moment when the year turns back on itself, forms a ring or annulus with itself, annuls itself and begins anew."²⁴ The two returns included in the eternal return are marked by the coincidence of the anonymous return of time and date, the signature that is proper to such an anniversary: "To date," Derrida writes, "is to sign."²⁵ The signature of the moment is a date: today is my anniversary.

Between the ring of the eternal return and the dated moment of the anniversary, one finds the structural statute of autobiography. Nietzsche's own contribution to this is the revelation of the necessarily autobiographical dimension of philosophy. In the co-incident of the ring and the instant, life opens up a credit to itself, it sees itself pass, it recites itself, narrates itself. The philosopher from then on no longer speaks of life in general, but always of his life, in its name: "The name of Nietzsche is perhaps today, for us in the West, the name of someone who [...] was alone in treating both philosophy and life, the science and the philosophy of life *with his name and in his name*. He has perhaps been alone in putting his name—his names—and his biographies on the line."²⁶

Now it is there that Nietzsche is separated from Hegel forever, because the latter never spoke in his name, because he on the other hand always thought the effacement of the proper name in the logic of absolute knowledge. Moreover, the duality of the rings in the eternal return—eternal ring and finite ring—never contradicts itself in Nietzsche. There also, it does not give birth to a single dialectical process. "The shadow of all negativity has disappeared."²⁷ High noon is "delivered from the negative and from dialectic."²⁸

The production of the specter takes place here precisely at the point of encounter between the two rings: at the point, the moment, the date of the anniversary. At the moment when Nietzsche signs *in his name* the story of his life, he is no longer living, but surviving, he has become his own name, a living-dead. A phantom. There is thus always "a difference of autobiography."²⁹ The name, Derrida writes, "is always and *a priori* a dead man's name, a name of death. What returns to the name never returns to the living. Nothing ever comes back to the living."³⁰ Derrida puts his analyses in relation to two passages from *Ecce Homo* in which Nietzsche says "I am [...] already dead as my father (*als mein Vater bereits gestorben*), while as my mother, I am still living and becoming old (*als meine Mutter lebe ich noch und werde alt*)"³¹ and "In order to understand anything at all of my *Zarathustra*, one must perhaps be similarly conditioned as I am—with one foot *beyond* life."³² This beyond is therefore no longer a

dialectical solution either, it is “beyond the opposition of life and death,” it marks their between-two, *the difference between the two*. As in Hegel, the subject is not absolutely present to itself.

The fact that the subject of autobiography never coincides with itself, is always different from itself—one part of it living, the other dead—shows that the eternal return is even in this case still a principle of selection. To affirm that *nothing returns to the living* is to affirm once more that not everything returns in the eternal return. No longer in the sense that, as Deleuze uncovered, certain things return and others do not: affirmation and not negation, for example. But in the sense of the dative: not that which returns but the one to whom this returns, the addressee of that which returns, as if there were a selection, with her or him, between the living and the dead. Between the addressee’s name, the name of death, the name of the father, which conserves, safeguards the genealogies, and the living, the mother, creation, affirmation. Autobiographical difference refers to eternity the fracture of the haunting of finitude, of life and death.

As we have seen, in Deleuze the phantom corresponds to this pitiful and weak being, evicted by the wheel of the eternal return. In Derrida, on the other hand, the phantom is not in the being of things, or of forces, but in the subjectivity of the thinker, of the “I” of the one who thinks the eternal return. This “I” finds itself divided between life and death, cast out by the wheel in this case as well, between infinity and finitude.

The two positions are therefore very different, sometimes even opposed to each other; nevertheless, I have allowed myself here to bring them together at the site of an identical conclusion. The two encounter each other at the site of a common affirmation: in Nietzsche, only difference returns. In the same way that one doesn’t find with this thinker the problematic of the auto-destruction of the weak or of the centrifugal wheel, one does not find with him any evidence of a mortification of life in the name of a logic of autobiography either. Could Nietzsche have signed the following sentence: “nothing living returns to the living”? With what right does one read the doctrine of eternal return as a thanatography?

Once again, it seems to me that these readings perhaps do not entirely respect the eternal return to the extent that they see in it a principle of cutting, a critical instance that is doubtlessly not there.

In the first volume of his *Nietzsche*, Heidegger declares: “The thought of eternal return of the same *is* only *as* this conquering thought. The overcoming must grant us passage across a gap that seems to be quite narrow. The gap opens between two things that in one way are alike, so that they appear to be the same. On the one side stands the following: ‘Everything is nought, indifferent, so that nothing is worthwhile—it *is all alike* (*alles ist gleich*).’ And on the other side: ‘Everything recurs, it depends on each moment, everything matters—it *is all alike* (*alles ist gleich*).”³³

“The smallest gap, the rainbow bridge of the phrase *it is all alike*, conceals two things that are quite distinct (*verbirgt das schlechthin Verschiedene*): ‘everything is indifferent’ (*alles ist gleichgültig*) and ‘nothing is indifferent’ (*nichts ist gleichgültig*).”³⁴

Undoubtedly, there is a “simple difference” that is hiding between the two versions of the thought of the eternal return; however, it is not certain that this “simple difference” is an origin and not rather a result. It may be that difference is not pertinent, in spite of appearances, to think duality, specifically the duplicity of the doctrine’s significations. As we have already seen: if difference is constituted as the master term of Nietzsche’s thought, if the eternal return becomes an automatic machine of selection, a process that guarantees its difference, then nothing remains of the essential ambivalence of the word “gleich”—*alles ist gleich* no longer means anything.

“The ring of being remains loyal to itself eternally.”³⁵ When we read this sentence, is it the urgency of difference that catches the eye? Isn’t it rather the necessity of *co-implication*? Who says that to overcome means to differentiate rather than to carry together, to hold the one *and* the other, to think complicity from two sides, between the two *together*?

THE ETERNAL RETURN AND THE PHANTOM OF DIFFERENCE

“Everything breaks, everything is joined anew; the same house of being builds itself eternally. Everything parts, everything greets itself again.”³⁶ Don’t Nietzsche’s texts make us think *putting in relation* and inevitable reduplication rather than dissociation? After all, isn’t there also a nihilist side to the thought of difference? Doesn’t it also return as *ressentiment*, anti-Hegelian reaction, weakness? Doesn’t it become its own phantom? An empty cask that has had its time?

But then what would a reading of Nietzsche give that would refuse to turn difference into its guiding thread? It is with this question that I will end this text, leaving open the possibility of a new understanding of the eternal return, that is to say also of life, that would substitute synthesis for difference, and the equally unsettling figure of the *clone* for that of the phantom. I thus state very simply, in the form of an announcement, the possibility of reading the doctrine of *the eternal return as a thought of ontological cloning*. And what if, in the end, everything were to redouble, if all the ontological knots were to reduplicate, without being different but without returning to the same either? What if the philosophical challenge of our epoch, prefigured by Nietzsche, was precisely to come to think without identity and without difference?

CATHERINE MALABOU teaches philosophy at the University of Paris X-Nanterre and is Visiting Professor of Comparative Literature at the State University of New York, Buffalo. Her work articulates the notion of plasticity at the crossroads of philosophy and neuroscience. Her publications in English include *The Future of Hegel*, *Counterpath* (with Jacques Derrida), *What Should We Do With Our Brain?*, and *Plasticity at the Dusk of Writing*.

NOTES

1. This essay was originally published as “L'éternel retour et le fantôme de la différence” in Pornschlegel, Clemens and Martin Stingelin, eds. *Nietzsche und Frankreich*. New York/Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009, 391-404. *Parrhesia* would like to thank Catherine Malabou for granting us permission to publish the essay's English translation.
2. [T.N.: I would like to thank Jon Roffe and Ashley Woodward for their last-minute assistance with the translation.]
3. Gilles Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson. London: Athlone Press, 1983, 189.
4. Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, trans. Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994, 41.
5. *Ibid.*, 55.
6. *Ibid.*, 299.
7. *Ibid.*, 53.
8. *Ibid.*, 54.
9. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, trans. Adrian del Caro. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, 125.
10. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, trans. Josefine Nauckhoff and Adrian del Caro. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001, 194.
11. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 298.
12. Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, 46.
13. Cf. *Ibid.*, 42.
14. *Ibid.*, 65.
15. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 50.
16. Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, 68.
17. *Ibid.*, 69.
18. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 55.
19. *Ibid.*, 297. Cf. also: “Selection occurs between two repetitions: those who repeat negatively and those who repeat identically will be eliminated” (Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 298).
20. *Ibid.*, 298.
21. Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, 70.
22. Nietzsche, *Zarathustra*, 126.
23. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Anti-Christ, Ecce Homo, Twilight of the Idols, and Other Writings*, trans. Judith Norman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005, 74.
24. Jacques Derrida, *The Ear of the Other: Otobiography, Transference, Translation*, trans. Peggy Kamuf. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1988, 11.
25. *Ibid.*, 11.
26. *Ibid.*, 6.
27. *Ibid.*, 12.
28. *Ibid.*, 17.
29. *Ibid.*, 19.
30. *Ibid.*, 7.
31. Nietzsche, cited at *ibid.*, 15.
32. Nietzsche, cited at *ibid.*, 19.
33. Martin Heidegger, *Nietzsche: The Will to Power as Art and The Eternal Recurrence of the Same* (Vols. I and II), trans. David Farrell Krell. London: Harper, 1991, 182.
34. *Ibid.*
35. Nietzsche, *Zarathustra*, 175.
36. *Ibid.*