The verb "to differ" [différer] seems to differ from itself. On the one hand, it indicates difference as distinction, inequality, or discernibility; on the other, it expresses the interposition of delay, the interval of a spacing and temporalizing that puts off until "later" what is presently denied, the possible that is presently impossible. Sometimes the different and sometimes the deferred correspond [in French] to the verb "to differ." This correlation, however, is not simply one between act and object, cause and effect, or primordial and derived.

In the one case "to differ" signifies nonidentity; in the other case it signifies the order of the same. Yet there must be a common, although entirely different [différent], root within the sphere that relates the two movements of differing to one another. We provisionally give the name difference to this sameness which is not identical: by the silent writing of its a, it has the desired advantage of referring to differing, both as spacing/temporalizing and as the movement that structures every dissociation.
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As distinct from difference, differance thus points out the irreducibility of temporalizing (which is also temporalization—in transcendental language which is no longer adequate here, this would be called the constitution of primordial temporality—just as the term “spacing” also includes the constitution of primordial spatiality). Differance is not simply active (any more than it is a subjective accomplishment); it rather indicates the middle voice, it precedes and sets up the opposition between passivity and activity. With its 2, differance more properly refers to what in classical language would be called the origin or production of differences and the differences between differences, the *play* [jeu] of differences. Its locus and operation will therefore be seen wherever speech appeals to difference.

*Differance* is neither a *word* nor a *concept*. In it, however, we shall see the juncture—rather than the summation—of what has been most decisively inscribed in the thought of what is conveniently called our “epoch”: the difference of forces in Nietzsche, Saussure’s principle of semiotic difference, differing as the possibility of [neurone] facilitation,2 impression and delayed effect in Freud, difference as the irreducibility of the trace of the other in Levinas, and the ontic-ontological difference in Heidegger.

Reflection on this last determination of difference will lead us to consider difference as the *strategic* note or connection—relatively or provisionally privileged—which indicates the closure of presence, together with the closure of the conceptual order and denomination, a closure that is effected in the functioning of traces.

I shall speak, then, of a letter—the first one, if we are to believe the alphabet and most of the speculations that have concerned themselves with it.

I shall speak then of the letter a, this first letter which it seemed necessary to introduce now and then in writing the word “difference.” This seemed necessary in the course of writing about writing, and of writing within a writing whose different strokes all pass, in certain respects, through a gross spelling mistake, through a violation of the rules governing writing, violating the law that governs writing and regulates its conventions of propriety. In fact or theory we can always erase or lessen this spelling mistake, and, in each case, while these are analytically different from one another but for practical purposes the same, find it grave, unseemly, or, indeed, supposing the greatest ingenuousness, amusing. Whether or not we care to quietly overlook this infraction, the attention we give it beforehand will allow us to recognize, as though prescribed by some mute irony, the inaudible but displaced character of this literal permutation. We can always act as though this makes no difference. I must say from the start that my account serves less to justify this silent spelling mistake, or still less to excuse it, than to aggravate its obtrusive character.

On the other hand, I must be excused if I refer, at least implicitly, to one or another of the texts that I have ventured to publish. Precisely what I would like to attempt to some extent (although this is in principle and in its highest degree
impossible, due to essential de jure reasons) is to bring together an assemblage of the different ways I have been able to utilize—or, rather, have allowed to be imposed on me—what I will provisionally call the word or concept of difference in its new spelling. It is literally neither a word nor a concept, as we shall see. I insist on the word “assemblage” here for two reasons: on the one hand, it is not a matter of describing a history, of recounting the steps, text by text, context by context, each time showing which scheme has been able to impose this graphic disorder, although this could have been done as well; rather, we are concerned with the general system of all these schemata. On the other hand, the word “assemblage” seems more apt for suggesting that the kind of bringing-together proposed here has the structure of an interlacing, a weaving, or a web, which would allow the different threads and different lines of sense or force to separate again, as well as being ready to bind others together.

In a quite preliminary way, we now recall that this particular graphic intervention was conceived in the writing-up of a question about writing; it was not made simply to shock the reader or grammarians. Now, in point of fact, it happens that this graphic difference (the a instead of the e), this marked difference between two apparently vocalic notations, between vowels, remains purely graphic: it is written or read, but it is not heard. It cannot be heard, and we shall see in what respects it is also beyond the order of understanding. It is put forward by a silent mark, by a tacit monument, or, one might even say, by a pyramid—keeping in mind not only the capital form of the printed letter but also that passage from Hegel’s Encyclopaedia where he compares the body of the sign to an Egyptian pyramid. The a of difference, therefore, is not heard; it remains silent, secret, and discreet, like a tomb.3

It is a tomb that (provided one knows how to decipher its legend) is not far from signaling the death of the king.

It is a tomb that cannot even be made to resonate. For I cannot even let you know, by my talk, now being spoken before the Société Française de Philosophie, which difference I am talking about at the very moment I speak of it. I can only talk about this graphic difference by keeping to a very indirect speech about writing, and on the condition that I specify each time that I am referring to difference with an e or difference with an a. All of which is not going to simplify matters today, and will give us all a great deal of trouble when we want to understand one another. In any event, when I do specify which difference I mean—when I say “with an e” or “with an a”—this will refer irreducibly to a written text, a text governing my talk, a text that I keep in front of me, that I will read, and toward which I shall have to try to lead your hands and eyes. We cannot refrain here from going by way of a written text, from ordering ourselves by the disorder that is produced therein—and this is what matters to me first of all.

Doubtless this pyramidal silence of the graphic difference between the e and the a can function only within the system of phonetic writing and within a lan-
guage or grammar historically tied to phonetic writing and to the whole culture which is inseparable from it. But I will say that it is just this—this silence that functions only within what is called phonetic writing—that points out or reminds us in a very opportune way that, contrary to an enormous prejudice, there is no phonetic writing. There is only purely and strictly phonetic writing. What is called phonetic writing can only function—in principle and de jure, and not due to some factual and technical inadequacy—by incorporating nonphonetic “signs” (punctuation, spacing, etc.); but when we examine their structure and necessity, we will quickly see that they are ill described by the concept of signs. Saussure had only to remind us that the play of difference was the functional condition, the condition of possibility, for every sign; and it is itself silent. The difference between two phonemes, which enables them to exist and to operate, is inaudible. The inaudible opens the two present phonemes to hearing, as they present themselves. If, then, there is no purely phonetic writing, it is because there is no purely phonetic phone. The difference that brings out phonemes and lets them be heard and understood [entendre] itself remains inaudible.

It will perhaps be objected that, for the same reasons, the graphic difference itself sinks into darkness, that it never constitutes the fullness of a sensible term, but draws out an invisible connection, the mark of an inapparent relation between two spectacles. That is no doubt true. Indeed, since from this point of view the difference between the e and the a marked in “differance” eludes vision and hearing, this happily suggests that we must here let ourselves be referred to an order that no longer refers to sensibility. But we are not referred to intelligibility either, to an ideality not fortuitously associated with the objectivity of theorein or understanding. We must be referred to an order, then, that resists philosophy’s founding opposition between the sensible and the intelligible. The order that resists this opposition, that resists it because it sustains it, is designated in a movement of differance (with an a) between two differences or between two letters. This differance belongs neither to the voice nor to writing in the ordinary sense, and it takes place, like the strange space that will assemble us here for the course of an hour, between speech and writing and beyond the tranquil familiarity that binds us to one and to the other, reassuring us sometimes in the illusion that they are two separate things.

Now, how am I to speak of the a of differance? It is clear that it cannot be exposed. We can expose only what, at a certain moment, can become present, manifest; what can be shown, presented as a present, a being-present in its truth, the truth of a present or the presence of a present. However, if differance is (I also cross out the “is”) what makes the presentation of being-present possible, it never presents itself as such. It is never given in the present or to anyone. Holding back and not exposing itself, it goes beyond the order of truth on this specific point and in this determined way, yet is not itself concealed, as if it were
something, a mysterious being, in the occult zone of the nonknowing. Any exposition would expose it to disappearing as a disappearance. It would risk appearing, thus disappearing.

Thus, the detours, phrases, and syntax that I shall often have to resort to will resemble—will sometimes be practically indiscernible from—those of negative theology. Already we had to note that difference is not, does not exist, and is not any sort of being-present (on). And we will have to point out everything that it is not, and, consequently, that it has neither existence nor essence. It belongs to no category of being, present or absent. And yet what is thus denoted as difference is not theological, not even in the most negative order of negative theology. The latter, as we know, is always occupied with letting a supraessential reality go beyond the finite categories of essence and existence, that is, of presence, and always hastens to remind us that, if we deny the predicate of existence to God, it is in order to recognize him as a superior, inconceivable, and ineffable mode of being. Here there is no question of such a move, as will be confirmed as we go along. Not only is difference irreducible to every ontological or theological—onto-theological—reappropriation, but it opens up the very space in which onto-theology—philosophy—produces its system and its history. It thus encompasses and irrevocably surpasses onto-theology or philosophy.

For the same reason, I do not know where to begin to mark out this assemblage, this graph, of difference. Precisely what is in question here is the requirement that there be a de jure commencement, an absolute point of departure, a responsibility arising from a principle. The problem of writing opens by questioning the arché. Thus what I put forth here will not be developed simply as a philosophical discourse that operates on the basis of a principle, of postulates, axioms, and definitions and that moves according to the discursive line of a rational order. In marking out difference, everything is a matter of strategy and risk. It is a question of strategy because no transcendent truth present outside the sphere of writing can theologically command the totality of this field. It is hazardous because this strategy is not simply one in the sense that we say that strategy orients the tactics according to a final aim, a telos or the theme of a domination, a mastery or an ultimate reappropriation of movement and field. In the end, it is a strategy without finality. We might call it blind tactics or empirical errance, if the value of empiricism did not itself derive all its meaning from its opposition to philosophical responsibility. If there is a certain errance in the tracing-out of difference, it no longer follows the line of logico-philosophical speech or that of its integral and symmetrical opposite, logico-empirical speech. The concept of play [jeu] remains beyond this opposition; on the eve and aftermath of philosophy, it designates the unity of chance and necessity in an endless calculus.

By decision and, as it were, by the rules of the game, then, turning this thought around, let us introduce ourselves to the thought of difference by way of the theme of strategy or stratagem. By this merely strategic justification, I want to emphasize that the efficacy of this thematics of difference very well
may, and even one day must, be sublated, i.e., lend itself, if not to its own replacement, at least to its involvement in a series of events which in fact it never commanded. This also means that it is not a theological thematics.

I will say, first of all, that differance, which is neither a word nor a concept, seemed to me to be strategically the theme most proper to think out, if not master (thought being here, perhaps, held in a certain necessary relation with the strucational limits of mastery), in what is most characteristic of our “epoch.” I start off, then, strategically, from the place and time in which “we” are, even though my opening is not justifiable in the final account, and though it is always on the basis of differance and its “history” that we can claim to know who and where “we” are and what the limits of an “epoch” can be.

Although “differance” is neither a word nor a concept, let us nonetheless attempt a simple and approximative semantic analysis which will bring us in view of what is at stake [en vue de l’enjeu].

We do know that the verb “to differ” [différer] (the Latin verb differre) has two seemingly quite distinct meanings; in the Littre dictionary, for example, they are the subject of two separate articles. In this sense, the Latin differre is not the simple translation of the Greek diapherein; this fact will not be without consequence for us in tying our discussion to a particular language, one that passes for being less philosophical, less primordially philosophical, than the other. For the distribution of sense in the Greek diapherein does not carry one of the two themes of the Latin differre, namely, the action of postponing until later, or taking into account, the taking-account of time and forces in an operation that implies an economic reckoning, a detour, a respite, a delay, a reserve, a representation—all the concepts that I will sum up here in a word I have never used but which could be added to this series: temporalizing. “To differ” in this sense is to temporalize, to resort, consciously or unconsciously, to the temporal and temporalizing mediation of a detour that suspends the accomplishment or fulfillment of “desire” or “will,” or carries desire or will out in a way that annuls or tempers their effect. We shall see, later, in what respects this temporalizing is also a temporalization and spacing, is space’s becoming-temporal and time’s becoming-spatial, is “primordial constitution” of space and time, as metaphysics or transcendental phenomenology would call it in the language that is here criticized and displaced.

The other sense of “to differ” [différer] is the most common and most identifiable, the sense of not being identical, of being other, of being discernible, etc. And in “differents,” whether referring to the alterity of dissimilarity or the alterity of allergy or of polemics, it is necessary that interval, distance, spacing occur among the different elements and occur actively, dynamically, and with a certain perseverance in repetition.

But the word “difference” (with an e) could never refer to differing as temporalizing or to difference as polemos. It is this loss of sense that the word differance (with an a) will have to schematically compensate for. Differance can refer to the whole complex of its meanings at once, for it is immediately and ir-
reducibly multivalent, something which will be important for the discourse I am trying to develop. It refers to this whole complex of meanings not only when it is supported by a language or interpretive context (like any signification), but it already does so somehow of itself. Or at least it does so more easily by itself than does any other word: here the a comes more immediately from the present particle [différent] and brings us closer to the action of “differing” that is in progress, even before it has produced the effect that is constituted as different or resulted in difference (with an e). Within a conceptual system and in terms of classical requirements, differance could be said to designate the productive and primordial constituting causality, the process of scission and division whose differings and differences would be the constituted products or effects. But while bringing us closer to the infinitive and active core of differing, “differance” with an a neutralizes what the infinitive denotes as simply active, in the same way that “parlance” does not signify the simple fact of speaking, of speaking to or being spoken to. Nor is resonance the act of resonating. Here in the usage of our language we must consider that the ending -ance is undecided between active and passive. And we shall see why what is designated by “differance” is neither simply active nor simply passive, that it announces or rather recalls something like the middle voice, that it speaks of an operation which is not an operation, which cannot be thought of either as a passion or as an action of a subject upon an object, as starting from an agent or from a patient, or on the basis of, or in view of, any of these terms. But philosophy has perhaps commenced by distributing the middle voice, expressing a certain intransitiveness, into the active and the passive voice, and has itself been constituted in this repression.

How are differance as temporalizing and differance as spacing conjoined?

Let us begin with the problem of signs and writing—since we are already in the midst of it. We ordinarily say that a sign is put in place of the thing itself, the present thing—“thing” holding here for the sense as well as the referent. Signs represent the present in its absence; they take the place of the present. When we cannot take hold of or show the thing, let us say the present, the being-present, when the present does not present itself, then we signify, we go through the detour of signs. We take up or give signs; we make signs. The sign would thus be a deferred presence. Whether it is a question of verbal or written signs, monetary signs, electoral delegates, or political representatives, the movement of signs defers the moment of encountering the thing itself, the moment at which we could lay hold of it, consume or expend it, touch it, see it, have a present intuition of it. What I am describing here is the structure of signs as classically determined, in order to define—a commonplace characterization of its traits—signification as the difference of temporalizing. Now this classical determination presupposes that the sign (which defers presence) is conceivable only on the basis of the presence that it defers and in view of the deferred presence one intends to reappropriate. Following this classical semiology, the substitution of the sign
for the thing itself is both secondary and provisional: it is second in order after an original and lost presence, a presence from which the sign would be derived. It is provisional with respect to this final and missing presence, in view of which the sign would serve as a movement of mediation.

In attempting to examine these secondary and provisional aspects of the substitute, we shall no doubt catch sight of something like a primordial difference. Yet we could no longer even call it primordial or final, inasmuch as the characteristics of origin, beginning, telos, eschaton, etc., have always denoted presence—ousia, parousia, etc. To question the secondary and provisional character of the sign, to oppose it to a “primordial” difference, would thus have the following consequences:

1. Differance can no longer be understood according to the concept of “sign,” which has always been taken to mean the representation of a presence and has been constituted in a system (of thought or language) determined on the basis of and in view of presence.

2. In this way we question the authority of presence or its simple symmetrical contrary, absence or lack. We thus interrogate the limit that has always constrained us, that always constrains us—we who inhabit a language and a system of thought—to form the sense of being in general as presence or absence, in the categories of being or beingness (ousia). It already appears that the kind of questioning we are thus led back to is, let us say, the Heideggerian kind, and that differance seems to lead us back to the ontic-ontological difference. But permit me to postpone this reference. I shall only note that between differance as temporalizing-temporalization (which we can no longer conceive within the horizon of the present) and what Heidegger says about temporalization in Sein und Zeit (namely, that as the transcendental horizon of the question of being it must be freed from the traditional and metaphysical domination by the present or the now)—between these two there is a close, if not exhaustive and irreducibly necessary, interconnection.

But first of all, let us remain with the semiological aspects of the problem to see how differance as temporalizing is conjointed with differance as spacing. Most of the semiological or linguistic research currently dominating the field of thought (whether due to the results of its own investigations or due to its role as a generally recognized regulative model) traces its genealogy, rightly or wrongly, to Saussure as its common founder. It was Saussure who first of all set forth the arbitrariness of signs and the differential character of signs as principles of general semiology and particularly of linguistics. And, as we know, these two themes—the arbitrary and the differential—are in his view inseparable. Arbitrariness can occur only because the system of signs is constituted by the differences between the terms, and not by their fullness. The elements of signification function not by virtue of the compact force of their cores but by the network of oppositions that distinguish them and relate them to one another. “Arbitrary and differential” says Saussure “are two correlative qualities.”
As the condition for signification, this principle of difference affects the whole sign, that is, both the signified and the signifying aspects. The signified aspect is the concept, the ideal sense. The signifying aspect is what Saussure calls the material or physical (e.g., acoustical) "image." We do not here have to enter into all the problems these definitions pose. Let us only cite Saussure where it interests us:

The conceptual side of value is made up solely of relations and differences with respect to the other terms of language, and the same can be said of its material side. . . . Everything that has been said up to this point boils down to this: in language there are only differences. Even more important: a difference generally implies positive terms between which the difference is set up; but in language there are only differences without positive terms. Whether we take the signified or the signifier, language has neither ideas nor sounds that existed before the linguistic system, but only conceptual and phonic differences that have issued from the system. The idea of phonic substance that a sign contains is of less importance than the other signs that surround it.

The first consequence to be drawn from this is that the signified concept is never present in itself, in an adequate presence that would refer only to itself. Every concept is necessarily and essentially inscribed in a chain or a system, within which it refers to another and to other concepts, by the systematic play of differences. Such a play, then—difference—is no longer simply a concept, but the possibility of conceptuality, of the conceptual system and process in general. For the same reason, difference, which is not a concept, is not a mere word; that is, it is not what we represent to ourselves as the calm and present self-referential unity of a concept and sound [phonie]. We shall later discuss the consequences of this for the notion of a word.

The difference that Saussure speaks about, therefore, is neither itself a concept nor one word among others. We can say this a fortiori for differance. Thus we are brought to make the relation between the one and the other explicit.

Within a language, within the system of language, there are only differences. A taxonomic operation can accordingly undertake its systematic, statistical, and classificatory inventory. But, on the one hand, these differences play a role in language, in speech as well, and in the exchange between language and speech. On the other hand, these differences are themselves effects. They have not fallen from the sky ready made; they are no more inscribed in a topos noetos than they are prescribed in the wax of the brain. If the word "history" did not carry with it the theme of a final repression of differance, we could say that differences alone could be "historical" through and through and from the start.

What we note as differance will thus be the movement of play that "produces" (and not by something that is simply an activity) these differences, these
effects of difference. This does not mean that the differance which produces differences is before them in a simple and in itself unmodified and indifferent present. Differance is the nonfull, nonsimple “origin”; it is the structured and differing origin of differences.

Since language (which Saussure says is a classification) has not fallen from the sky, it is clear that the differences have been produced; they are the effects produced, but effects that do not have as their cause a subject or substance, a thing in general, or a being that is somewhere present and itself escapes the play of difference. If such a presence were implied (quite classically) in the general concept of cause, we would therefore have to talk about an effect without a cause, something that would very quickly lead to no longer talking about effects. I have tried to indicate a way out of the closure imposed by this system, namely, by means of the “trace.” No more an effect than a cause, the “trace” cannot of itself, taken outside its context, suffice to bring about the required transgression.

As there is no presence before the semiological difference or outside it, we can extend what Saussure writes about language in signs in general: “Language is necessary in order for speech to be intelligible and to produce all of its effects; but the latter is necessary in order for language to be established; historically, the fact of speech always comes first.”

Retaining at least the schema, if not the content, of the demand formulated by Saussure, we shall designate by the term differance the movement by which language, or any code, any system of reference in general, becomes “historically” constituted as a fabric of differences. Here, the terms “constituted,” “produced,” “created,” “movement,” “historically,” etc., with all they imply, are not to be understood only in terms of the language of metaphysics, from which they are taken. It would have to be shown why the concepts of production, like those of constitution and history, remain accessories in this respect to what is here being questioned; this, however, would draw us too far away today, toward the theory of the representation of the “circle” in which we seem to be enclosed. I only use these terms here, like many other concepts, out of strategic convenience and in order to prepare the deconstruction of the system they form at the point which is now most decisive. In any event, we will have understood, by virtue of the very circle we appear to be caught up in, that differance, as it is written here, is no more static than genetic, no more structural than historical. Nor is it any less so. And it is completely to miss the point of this orthographical impropriety to want to object to it on the basis of the oldest of metaphysical oppositions—for example, by opposing some generative point of view to a structuralist-taxonomic point of view, or conversely. These oppositions do not pertain in the least to differance; and this, no doubt, is what makes thinking about it difficult and uncomfortable.

If we now consider the chain to which “differance” gets subjected, according to the context, to a certain number of nonsynonymic substitutions, one will
ask why we resorted to such concepts as “reserve,” “protowriting,” “proto-
trace,” “spacing,” indeed to “supplement” or “pharmakon,” and, before long,
to “hymen,” etc. 6

Let us begin again. Difference is what makes the movement of signification
possible only if each element that is said to be “present,” appearing on the stage
of presence, is related to something other than itself but retains the mark of a
past element and already lets itself be hollowed out by the mark of its relation
to a future element. This trace relates no less to what is called the future than to
what is called the past, and it constitutes what is called the present by this very
relation to what it is not, to what it absolutely is not; that is, not even to a past
or future considered as a modified present. In order for it to be, an interval must
separate it from what it is not; but the interval that constitutes it in the present
must also, and by the same token, divide the present in itself, thus dividing,
along with the present, everything that can be conceived on its basis, that is,
every being—in particular, for our metaphysical language, the substance or sub-
ject. Constituting itself, dynamically dividing itself, this interval is what could
be called spacing; time’s becoming-spatial or space’s becoming-temporal (temp-
oralizing). And it is this constitution of the present as a “primordial” and irre-
ducibly nonsimple, and, therefore, in the strict sense nonprimordial, synthesis
of traces, retentions, and protentions (to reproduce here, analogically and pro-
visionally, a phenomenological and transcendental language that will presently
be revealed as inadequate) that I propose to call protowriting, prototrace, or
difference. The letter (is) (both) spacing (and) temporalizing. 7

Given this (active) movement of the (production of) difference without ori-
gin, could we not, quite simply and without any neologism, call it differen-
tiation? Among other confusions, such a word would suggest some organic unity,
some primordial and homogeneous unity, that would eventually come to be di-
vided up and take on difference as an event. Above all, formed on the verb “to
differentiate,” this word would annul the economic signification of detour, tem-
oralizing delay, “deferring.” I owe a remark in passing to a recent reading of
one of Koyré’s texts entitled “Hegel at Jena.” 8 In that text, Koyré cites long pas-
gages from the Jena Logic in German and gives his own translation. On two oc-
casions in Hegel’s text he encounters the expression “differente Beziehung.”
This word (different), whose root is Latin, is extremely rare in German and
also, I believe, in Hegel, who instead uses verschieden or ungleich, calling differ-
ence Unterschied and qualitative variety Verschiedenheit. In the Jena Logic, he
uses the word different precisely at the point where he deals with time and the
present. Before coming to Koyré’s valuable remark, here are some passages
from Hegel, as rendered by Koyré:

The infinite, in this simplicity is—as a moment opposed to the self-identical—
the negative. In its moments, while the infinite presents the totality to (itself)
and in itself, (it is) excluding in general, the point or limit; but in this, its own
(action of) negating, it relates itself immediately to the other and negates itself. The limit or moment of the present (der Gegenwart), the absolute "this" of time or the now, is an absolutely negative simplicity, absolutely excluding all multiplicity from itself, and by this very fact is absolutely determined; it is not an extended whole or quantum within itself (and) which would in itself also have an undetermined aspect or qualitative variety, which of itself would be related, indifferently (gleichgültig) or externally to another, but on the contrary, this is an absolutely different relation of the simple.\(^9\)

And Koyré specifies in a striking note: "Different relation: differente Beziehung. We could say: differentiating relation." And on the following page, from another text of Hegel, we can read: "Diese Beziehung ist Gegenwart, als eine differente Beziehung" (This relation is [the] present, as a different relation). There is another note by Koyré: "The term 'different' is taken here in an active sense."

Writing "differing" or "differance" (with an a) would have had the utility of making it possible to translate Hegel on precisely this point with no further qualifications—and it is a quite decisive point in his text. The translation would be, as it always should be, the transformation of one language by another. Naturally, I maintain that the word "differance" can be used in other ways, too; first of all, because it denotes not only the activity of primordial difference but also the temporalizing detour of deferring. It has, however, an even more important usage. Despite the very profound affinities that differance thus written has with Hegelian speech (as it should be read), it can, at a certain point, not exactly break with it, but rather work a sort of displacement with regard to it. A definite rupture with Hegelian language would make no sense, nor would it be at all likely; but this displacement is both infinitesimal and radical. I have tried to indicate the extent of this displacement elsewhere; it would be difficult to talk about it with any brevity at this point.

Differences are thus "produced"—differed—by differance. But what differs, or who differs? In other words, what is differance? With this question we attain another stage and another source of the problem.

What differs? Who differs? What is differance?

If we answered these questions even before examining them as questions, even before going back over them and questioning their form (even what seems to be most natural and necessary about them), we would fall below the level we have now reached. For if we accepted the form of the question in its own sense and syntax ("What?", "What is?", "Who is?"), we would have to admit that differance is derived, supervenient, controlled, and ordered from the starting point of a being-present, one capable of being something, a force, a state, or power in the world, to which we could give all kinds of names: a what, or being-present as a subject, a who. In the latter case, notably, we would implicitly admit that the being-present (for example, as a self-present being or consciousness) would eventually result in differing: in delaying or in diverting the fulfill-
ment of a "need" or "desire," or in differing from itself. But in none of these cases would such a being-present be "constituted" by this differance.

Now if we once again refer to the semiological difference, what was it that Saussure in particular reminded us of? That "language [which consists only of differences] is not a function of the speaking subject." This implies that the subject (self-identical or even conscious of self-identity, self-conscious) is inscribed in the language, that he is a "function" of the language. He becomes a speaking subject only by conforming his speech—even in the aforesaid "creation," even in the aforesaid "transgression"—to the system of linguistic prescriptions taken as the system of differences, or at least to the general law of differance, by conforming to that law of language which Saussure calls "language without speech." "Language is necessary for the spoken word to be intelligible and so that it can produce all of its effects."\(^{10}\)

If, by hypothesis, we maintain the strict opposition between speech and language, then differance will be not only the play of differences within the language but the relation of speech to language, the detour by which I must also pass in order to speak, the silent token I must give, which holds just as well for linguistics in the strict sense as it does for general semiology; it dictates all the relations between usage and the formal schema, between the message and the particular code, etc. Elsewhere I have tried to suggest that this differance within language, and in the relation between speech and language, forbids the essential dissociation between speech and writing that Saussure, in keeping with tradition, wanted to draw at another level of his presentation. The use of language or the employment of any code which implies a play of forms—with no determined or invariable substratum—also presupposes a retention and protention of differences, a spacing and temporalizing, a play of traces. This play must be a sort of inscription prior to writing, a protowriting without a present origin, without an arché. From this comes the systematic crossing-out of the arché and the transformation of general semiology into a grammatology, the latter performing a critical work upon everything within semiology—right down to its matricial concept of signs—that retains any metaphysical presuppositions incompatible with the theme of differance.

We might be tempted by an objection: to be sure, the subject becomes a speaking subject only by dealing with the system of linguistic differences; or again, he becomes a signifying subject (generally by speech or other signs) only by entering into the system of differences. In this sense, certainly, the speaking or signifying subject would not be self-present, insofar as he speaks or signifies, except for the play of linguistic or semiological differance. But can we not conceive of a presence and self-presence of the subject before speech or its signs, a subject's self-presence in a silent and intuitive consciousness?

Such a question therefore supposes that prior to signs and outside them, and excluding every trace and differance, something such as consciousness is possible. It supposes, moreover, that, even before the distribution of its signs in
space and in the world, consciousness can gather itself up in its own presence. What then is consciousness? What does “consciousness” mean? Most often in the very form of “meaning” ["vouloir-dire"], consciousness in all its modifications is conceivable only as self-presence, a self-perception of presence. And what holds for consciousness also holds here for what is called subjective existence in general. Just as the category of subject is not and never has been conceivable without reference to presence as hypokeimenon or ousia, etc., so the subject as consciousness has never been able to be evinced otherwise than as self-presence. The privilege accorded to consciousness thus means a privilege accorded to the present; and even if the transcendental temporality of consciousness is described in depth, as Husserl described it, the power of synthesis and of the incessant gathering-up of traces is always accorded to the “living present.”

This privilege is the ether of metaphysics, the very element of our thought insofar as it is caught up in the language of metaphysics. We can only de-limit such a closure today by evoking this import of presence, which Heidegger has shown to be the onto-theological determination of being. Therefore, in evoking this import of presence, by an examination which would have to be of a quite peculiar nature, we question the absolute privilege of this form or epoch of presence in general, that is, consciousness as meaning [vouloir-dire] in self-presence.

We thus come to posit presence—and, in particular, consciousness, the being-next-to-itself of consciousness—no longer as the absolutely matrical form of being but as a “determination” and an “effect.” Presence is a determination and effect within a system which is no longer that of presence but that of difference; it no more allows the opposition between activity and passivity than that between cause and effect or in-determination and determination, etc. This system is of such a kind that even to designate consciousness as an effect or determination—for strategic reasons, reasons that can be more or less clearly considered and systematically ascertained—is to continue to operate according to the vocabulary of that very thing to be de-limited.

Before being so radically and expressly Heideggerian, this was also Nietzsche’s and Freud’s move, both of whom, as we know, and often in a very similar way, questioned the self-assured certitude of consciousness. And is it not remarkable that both of them did this by starting out with the theme of differance?

This theme appears almost literally in their work, at the most crucial places. I shall not expand on this here; I shall only recall that for Nietzsche “the important main activity is unconscious” and that consciousness is the effect of forces whose essence, ways, and modalities are not peculiar to it. Now force itself is never present; it is only a play of differences and quantities. There would be no force in general without the difference between forces; and here the difference in quantity counts more than the content of quantity, more than the absolute magnitude itself.
Quantity itself therefore is not separable from the difference in quantity. The
difference in quantity is the essence of force, the relation of force with force. To
fancy two equal forces, even if we grant them opposing directions, is an ap-
proximate and crude illusion, a statistical dream in which life is immersed, but
which chemistry dispels.11

Is not the whole thought of Nietzsche a critique of philosophy as active indifference
to difference, as a system of reduction or adiaphoristic repression? Following
the same logic—logic itself—this does not exclude the fact that philosophy
lives in and from difference, that it thereby blinds itself to the same, which is
not the identical. The same is precisely difference (with an a), as the diverted
and equivocal passage from one difference to another, from one term of the op-
position to the other. We could thus take up all the coupled oppositions on
which philosophy is constructed, and from which our language lives, not in or-
der to see opposition vanish but to see the emergence of a necessity such that
one of the terms appears as the difference of the other, the other as “differed”
within the systematic ordering of the same (e.g., the intelligible as differing from
the sensible, as sensible differed; the concept as differed-differing intuition, life
as differing-differed matter; mind as differed-differing life; culture as differed-
differing nature; and all the terms designating what is other than physis—
techné, nomos, society, freedom, history, spirit, etc.—as physis differed or
physis differing: physis in difference). It is out of the unfolding of this “same”
as difference that the sameness of difference and of repetition is presented in the
eternal return.

In Nietzsche, these are so many themes that can be related with the kind of
symptomatology that always serves to diagnose the evasions and ruses of any-
thing disguised in its difference. Or again, these terms can be related with the
entire thematics of active interpretation, which substitutes an incessant deciphering for the disclosure of truth as a presentation of the thing itself in its pres-
ence, etc. What results is a cipher without truth, or at least a system of ciphers
that is not dominated by truth value, which only then becomes a function that is
understood, inscribed, and circumscribed.

We shall therefore call difference this “active” (in movement) discord of the
different forces and of the differences between forces which Nietzsche opposes
to the entire system of metaphysical grammar, wherever that system controls
culture, philosophy, and science.

It is historically significant that this diaphoristics, understood as an energet-
ics or an economy of forces, set up to question the primacy of presence qua con-
sciousness, is also the major theme of Freud’s thought; in his work we find
another diaphoristics, both in the form of a theory of ciphers or traces and an
energetics. The questioning of the authority of consciousness is first and always
differential.

The two apparently different meanings of difference are tied together in
Freudian theory: differing [le différer] as discernibility, distinction, deviation,
diastem, spacing; and deferring [le différer] as detour, delay, relay, reserve, temporizing. I shall recall only that:

1. The concept of trace (Spur), of facilitation (Bahnung), of forces of facilitation are, as early as the composition of the Entwurf, inseparable from the concept of difference. The origin of memory and of the psyche as a memory in general (conscious or unconscious) can only be described by taking into account the difference between the facilitation thresholds, as Freud says explicitly. There is no facilitation [Bahnung] without difference and no difference without a trace.

2. All the differences involved in the production of unconscious traces and in the process of inscription (Niederschrift) can also be interpreted as moments of difference, in the sense of “placing on reserve.” Following a schema that continually guides Freud’s thinking, the movement of the trace is described as an effort of life to protect itself by deferring the dangerous investment, by constituting a reserve (Vorrat). And all the conceptual oppositions that furrow Freudian thought relate each concept to the other like movements of a detour, within the economy of differance. The one is only the other deferred, the one differing from the other. The one is the other in difference, the one is the difference from the other. Every apparently rigorous and irreducible opposition (for example, that between the secondary and primary) is thus said to be, at one time or another, a “theoretical fiction.” In this way again, for example (but such an example covers everything or communicates with everything), the difference between the pleasure principle and the reality principle is only difference as detour (Aufschieben, Aufschub). In Beyond the Pleasure Principle, Freud writes:

Under the influence of the ego’s instincts of self-preservation, the pleasure principle is replaced by the reality principle. This latter principle does not abandon the intention of ultimately obtaining pleasure, but it nevertheless demands and carries into effect the postponement of satisfaction, the abandonment of a number of possibilities of gaining satisfaction and the temporary toleration of unpleasure as a step on the long indirect road (Aufschub) to pleasure.12

Here we touch on the point of greatest obscurity, on the very enigma of differance, on how the concept we have of it is divided by a strange separation. We must not hasten to make a decision too quickly. How can we conceive of differance as a systematic detour which, within the element of the same, always aims at either finding again the pleasure or the presence that had been deferred by (conscious or unconscious) calculation, and, at the same time, how can we, on the other hand, conceive of differance as the relation to an impossible presence, as an expenditure without reserve, as an irreparable loss of presence, an irreversible wearing-down of energy, or indeed as a death instinct and a relation to the absolutely other that apparently breaks up any economy? It is evident—it is evidence itself—that system and nonsystem, the same and the absolutely other, etc., cannot be conceived together.
If difference is this inconceivable factor, must we not perhaps hasten to make it evident, to bring it into the philosophical element of evidence, and thus quickly dissipate its mirage character and illogicality, dissipate it with the infallibility of the calculus we know well—since we have recognized its place, necessity, and function within the structure of difference? What would be accounted for philosophically here has already been taken into account in the system of difference as it is here being calculated. I have tried elsewhere, in a reading of Bataille, to indicate what might be the establishment of a rigorous, and in a new sense “scientific,” relating of a “restricted economy”—one having nothing to do with an unreserved expenditure, with death, with being exposed to nonsense, etc.—to a “general economy” or system that, so to speak, takes account of what is unreserved. It is a relation between a difference that is accounted for and a difference that fails to be accounted for, where the establishment of a pure presence, without loss, is one with the occurrence of absolute loss, with death. By establishing this relation between a restricted and a general system, we shift and recompose the very project of philosophy under the privileged heading of Hegelianism.

The economic character of difference in no way implies that the deferred presence can always be recovered, that it simply amounts to an investment that only temporarily and without loss delays the presentation of presence, that is, the perception of gain or the gain of perception. Contrary to the metaphysical, dialectical, and “Hegelian” interpretation of the economic movement of difference, we must admit a game where whoever loses wins and where one wins and loses each time. If the diverted presentation continues to be somehow definitively and irreducibly withheld, this is not because a particular present remains hidden or absent, but because difference holds us in a relation with what exceeds (though we necessarily fail to recognize this) the alternative of presence or absence. A certain alterity—Freud gives it a metaphysical name, the unconscious—is definitively taken away from every process of presentation in which we would demand for it to be shown forth in person. In this context and under this heading, the unconscious is not, as we know, a hidden, virtual, and potential self-presence. It is differed—which no doubt means that it is woven out of differences, but also that it sends out, that it delegates, representatives or proxies; but there is no chance that the mandating subject “exists” somewhere, that it is present or is “itself,” and still less chance that it will become conscious. In this sense, contrary to the terms of an old debate, strongly symptomatic of the metaphysical investments it has always assumed, the “unconscious” can no more be classed as a “thing” than as anything else; it is no more of a thing than an implicit or masked consciousness. This radical alterity, removed from every possible mode of presence, is characterized by irreducible aftereffects, by delayed effects. In order to describe them, in order to read the traces of the “unconscious” traces (there are no “conscious” traces), the language of presence or absence, the metaphysical speech of phenomenology, is in principle inadequate.

The structure of delay (retardement: Nachträglichkeit) that Freud talks about indeed prohibits our taking temporalization (temporalizing) to be a sim-
ple dialectical complication of the present; rather, this is the style of transcendental phenomenology. It describes the living present as a primordial and incessant synthesis that is constantly led back upon itself, back upon its assembled and assembling self, by retentional traces and protentional openings. With the alterity of the “unconscious” we have to deal not with the horizons of modified presents—past or future—but with a “past” that has never been nor will ever be present, whose “future” will never be produced or reproduced in the form of presence. The concept of trace is therefore incommensurate with that of retention, that of the becoming-past of what had been present. The trace cannot be conceived—nor, therefore, can difference—on the basis of either the present or the presence of the present.

A past that has never been present: with this formula Emmanuel Levinas designates (in ways that are, to be sure, not those of psychoanalysis) the trace and the enigma of absolute alterity, that is, the Other [autrui]. At least within these limits, and from this point of view, the thought of difference implies the whole critique of classical ontology undertaken by Levinas. And the concept of trace, like that of difference, forms—across these different traces and through these differences between traces, as understood by Nietzsche, Freud, and Levinas (these “authors’ names” serve only as indications)—the network that sums up and permeates our “epoch” as the de-limitation of ontology (of presence).

The ontology of presence is the ontology of beings and beingness. Everywhere, the dominance of beings is solicited by difference—in the sense that sollicitare means, in old Latin, to shake all over, to make the whole tremble. What is questioned by the thought of difference, therefore, is the determination of being in presence, or in beingness. Such a question could not arise and be understood without the difference between Being and beings opening up somewhere. The first consequence of this is that difference is not. It is not a being-present, however excellent, unique, principal, or transcendent one makes it. It commands nothing, rules over nothing, and nowhere does it exercise any authority. It is not marked by a capital letter. Not only is there no realm of difference, but difference is even the subversion of every realm. This is obviously what makes it threatening and necessarily dreaded by everything in us that desires a realm, the past or future presence of a realm. And it is always in the name of a realm that, believing one sees it ascend to the capital letter, one can reproach it for wanting to rule.

Does this mean, then, that difference finds its place within the spread of the ontic-ontological difference, as it is conceived, as the “epoch” conceives itself within it, and particularly “across” the Heideggerian meditation, which cannot be gotten around?

There is no simple answer to such a question.

In one particular respect, difference is, to be sure, but the historical and epochal deployment of Being or of the ontological difference. The a of difference marks the movement of this deployment.

And yet, is not the thought that conceives the sense or truth of Being, the determination of difference, as ontic-ontological difference—difference con-
ceived within the horizon of the question of Being—still an intrametaphysical effect of difference? Perhaps the deployment of difference is not only the truth or the epochality of Being. Perhaps we must try to think this unheard-of thought, this silent tracing, namely, that the history of Being (the thought of which is committed to the Greco-Western logos), as it is itself produced across the ontological difference, is only one epoch of the diapherein. Then we could no longer even call it an "epoch," for the concept of epochality belongs within history understood as the history of Being. Being has always made "sense," has always been conceived or spoken of as such, only by dissimulating itself in beings; thus, in a particular and very strange way, difference (is) "older" than the ontological difference or the truth of Being. In this age it can be called the play of traces. It is a trace that no longer belongs to the horizon of Being but one whose sense of Being is borne and bound by this play; it is a play of traces or difference that has no sense and is not, a play that does not belong. There is no support to be found and no depth to be had for this bottomless chessboard where being is set in play.

It is perhaps in this way that the Heraclitean play of the ben diapheron beautoi, of the one differing from itself, of what is in difference with itself, already becomes lost as a trace in determining the diapherein as ontological difference.

To think through the ontological difference doubtless remains a difficult task, a task whose statement has remained nearly inaudible. And to prepare ourselves for venturing beyond our own logos, that is, for a difference so violent that it refuses to be stopped and examined as the epochality of Being and ontological difference, is neither to give up this passage through the truth of Being, nor is it in any way to "criticize," "contest," or fail to recognize the incessant necessity for it. On the contrary, we must stay within the difficulty of this passage; we must repeat this passage in a rigorous reading of metaphysics, wherever metaphysics serves as the norm of Western speech, and not only in the texts of "the history of philosophy." Here we must allow the trace of whatever goes beyond the truth of Being to appear/disappear in its fully rigorous way. It is a trace of something that can never present itself; it is itself a trace that can never be presented, that is, can never appear and manifest itself as such in its phenomenon. It is a trace that lies beyond what profoundly ties fundamental ontology to phenomenology. Like difference, the trace is never presented as such. In presenting itself it becomes effaced; in being sounded it dies away, like the writing of the a, inscribing its pyramid in difference.

We can always reveal the preclusive and secretive traces of this movement in metaphysical speech, especially in the contemporary talk about the closure of ontology, i.e., through the various attempts we have looked at (Nietzsche, Freud, Levinas)—and particularly in Heidegger's work.

The latter provokes us to question the essence of the present, the presence of the present.

What is the present? What is it to conceive the present in its presence?
Let us consider, for example, the 1946 text entitled "Der Spruch des Anaximander." Heidegger there recalls that the forgetting of Being forgets about the difference between Being and beings:

But the point of Being (die Sache des Seins) is to be the Being of beings. The linguistic form of this enigmatic and multivalent genitive designates a genesis (Genesis), a provenance (Herkunft) of the present from presence (des Anwesenden aus dem Anwesen). But with the unfolding of these two, the essence (Wesen) of this provenance remains hidden (verborgen). Not only is the essence of this provenance not thought out, but neither is the simple relation between presence and present (Anwesen und Anwesenden). Since the dawn, it seems that presence and being-present are each separately something. Imperceptibly, presence becomes itself a present. . . . The essence of presence (Das Wesen des Anwesens), and thus the difference between presence and present, is forgotten. The forgetting of Being is the forgetting of the difference between Being and beings.\textsuperscript{14}

In recalling the difference between Being and beings (the ontological difference) as the difference between presence and present, Heidegger puts forward a proposition, indeed, a group of propositions; it is not our intention here to idly or hastily "criticize" them but rather to convey them with all their provocative force.

Let us then proceed slowly. What Heidegger wants to point out is that the difference between Being and beings, forgotten by metaphysics, has disappeared without leaving a trace. The very trace of difference has sunk from sight. If we admit that difference (is) (itself) something other than presence and absence, if it traces, then we are dealing with the forgetting of the difference (between Being and beings), and we now have to talk about a disappearance of the trace’s trace. This is certainly what this passage from "Der Spruch des Anaximander" seems to imply:

The forgetting of Being is a part of the very essence of Being, and is concealed by it. The forgetting belongs so essentially to the destination of Being that the dawn of this destination begins precisely as an unconcealment of the present in its presence. This means: the history of Being begins by the forgetting of Being, in that Being retains its essence, its difference from beings. Difference is wanting; it remains forgotten. Only what is differentiated—the present and presence (das Anwesende und das Anwesen)—becomes uncovered, but not insofar as it is differentiated. On the contrary, the matinal trace (die frühe Spur) of difference effaces itself from the moment that presence appears as a being-present (das Anwesen wie ein Anwesendes erscheint) and finds its provenance in a supreme (being)-present (in einem höchsten Anwesen-den).\textsuperscript{15}

The trace is not a presence but is rather the simulacrum of a presence that dislocates, displaces, and refers beyond itself. The trace has, properly speaking,
no place, for effacement belongs to the very structure of the trace. Effacement must always be able to overtake the trace; otherwise it would not be a trace but an indestructible and monumental substance. In addition, and from the start, effacement constitutes it as a trace—effacement establishes the trace in a change of place and makes it disappear in its appearing, makes it issue forth from itself in its very position. The effacing of this early trace (die frühe Spur) of difference is therefore "the same" as its tracing within the text of metaphysics. This metaphysical text must have retained a mark of what it lost or put in reserve, set aside. In the language of metaphysics the paradox of such a structure is the inversion of the metaphysical concept which produces the following effect: the present becomes the sign of signs, the trace of traces. It is no longer what every reference refers to in the last instance; it becomes a function in a generalized referential structure. It is a trace, and a trace of the effacement of a trace.

In this way the metaphysical text is understood; it is still readable, and remains to be read. It proposes both the monument and the mirage of the trace, the trace as simultaneously traced and effaced, simultaneously alive and dead, alive as always to simulate even life in its preserved inscription; it is a pyramid.

Thus we think through, without contradiction, or at least without granting any pertinence to such contradiction, what is perceptible and imperceptible about the trace. The "matinal trace" of difference is lost in an irretrievable invisibility, and yet even its loss is covered, preserved, regarded, and retarded. This happens in a text, in the form of presence.

Having spoken about the effacement of the matinal trace, Heidegger can thus, in this contradiction without contradiction, consign or countersign the sealing of the trace. We read on a little further:

The difference between Being and beings, however, can in turn be experienced as something forgotten only if it is already discovered with the presence of the present (mit dem Anwesen des Anwesenden) and if it is thus sealed in a trace (so eine Spur geprägt hat) that remains preserved (gewahrt bleibt) in the language which Being appropriates.\textsuperscript{16}

Further on still, while meditating upon Anaximander's τὸ χρεών, translated as Brauch (sustaining use), Heidegger writes the following:

Dispensing accord and deference (Fug und Ruch verfügend), our sustaining use frees the present (das Anwesende) in its sojourn and sets it free every time for its sojourn. But by the same token the present is equally seen to be exposed to the constant danger of hardening in the insistence (in das bloße Beharren verbürtet) out of its sojourning duration. In this way sustaining use (Brauch) remains itself and at the same time an abandonment (Aushändigung; handing-over) of presence (des Anwesens) in den Un-fug, to discord (disjointedness). Sustaining use joins together the dis- (Der Brauch fügt das Un-).\textsuperscript{17}
And it is at the point where Heidegger determines sustaining use as trace that the question must be asked: can we, and how far can we, think of this trace and the dis- of difference as Wesen des Seins? Doesn’t the dis of difference refer us beyond the history of Being, beyond our language as well, and beyond everything that can be named by it? Doesn’t it call for—in the language of being—the necessarily violent transformation of this language by an entirely different language?

Let us be more precise here. In order to dislodge the “trace” from its cover (and whoever believes that one tracks down some thing?—one tracks down tracks), let us continue reading this passage:

The translation of τὸ χρεών by “sustaining use” (Brauch) does not derive from cogitations of an etymologico-lexical nature. The choice of the word “sustaining use” derives from an antecedent translation (Übersetzen) of the thought that attempts to conceive difference in the deployment of Being (im Wesen des Seins) toward the historical beginning of the forgetting of Being. The word “sustaining use” is dictated to thought in the apprehension (Erfahrung) of the forgetting of Being. Τὸ χρεών properly names a trace (Spur) of what remains to be conceived in the word “sustaining use,” a trace that quickly disappears (als-halbd verschwindet) into the history of Being, in its world-historical unfolding as Western metaphysics.18

How do we conceive of the outside of a text? How, for example, do we conceive of what stands opposed to the text of Western metaphysics? To be sure, the “trace that quickly disappears into the history of Being, . . . as Western metaphysics,” escapes all the determinations, all the names it might receive in the metaphysical text. The trace is sheltered and thus dissimulated in these names; it does not appear in the text as the trace “itself.” But this is because the trace itself could never itself appear as such. Heidegger also says that difference can never appear as such: “Lichtung des Unterschiedes kann deshalb auch nicht bedeuten, dass der Unterschied als der Unterschied erscheint.” There is no essence of difference; not only can it not allow itself to be taken up into the as such of its name or its appearing, but it threatens the authority of the as such in general, the thing’s presence in its essence. That there is no essence of difference at this point also implies that there is neither Being nor truth to the play of writing, insofar as it involves difference.

For us, difference remains a metaphysical name; and all the names that it receives from our language are still, so far as they are names, metaphysical. This is particularly so when they speak of determining difference as the difference between presence and present. (Amwesen/Amwesend), but already and especially so when, in the most general way, they speak of determining difference as the difference between Being and beings.

“Older” than Being itself, our language has no name for such a difference. But we “already know” that if it is unnamable, this is not simply provisional; it is not because our language has still not found or received this name, or because
we would have to look for it in another language, outside the finite system of our language. It is because there is no name for this, not even essence or Being—not even the name "difference," which is not a name, which is not a pure nominal unity, and continually breaks up in a chain of different substitutions.

"There is no name for this": we read this as a truism. What is unnamable here is not some ineffable being that cannot be approached by a name; like God, for example. What is unnamable is the play that brings about the nominal effects, the relatively unitary or atomic structures we call names, or chains of substitutions for names. In these, for example, the nominal effect of "difference" is itself involved, carried off, and reinscribed, just as the false beginning or end of a game is still part of the game, a function of the system.

What we do know, what we could know if it were simply a question of knowing, is that there never has been and never will be a unique word, a master name. This is why thinking about the letter α of difference is not the primary prescription, nor is it the prophetic announcement of some imminent and still unheard-of designation. There is nothing kerygmatic about this "word" so long as we can perceive its reduction to a lower-case letter.

There will be no unique name, not even the name of Being. It must be conceived without nostalgia; that is, it must be conceived outside the myth of the purely maternal or paternal language belonging to the lost fatherland of thought. On the contrary, we must affirm it—in the sense that Nietzsche brings affirmation into play—with a certain laughter and with a certain dance.

After this laughter and dance, after this affirmation that is foreign to any dialectic, the question arises as to the other side of nostalgia, which I call Heideggerian hope. I am not unaware that this term may be somewhat shocking. I venture it all the same, without excluding any of its implications, and shall relate it to what seems to me to be retained of metaphysics in "Der Spruch des Anaximander," namely, the quest for the proper word and the unique name. In talking about the "first word of Being" (das frühe Wort des Seins: τὸ χρεών), Heidegger writes,

The relation to the present, unfolding its order in the very essence of presence, is unique (ist eine einzige). It is pre-eminently incomparable to any other relation; it belongs to the uniqueness of Being itself (Sie gehört zur Einzigkeit des Seins selbst). Thus, in order to name what is deployed in Being (das Wesende des Seins), language will have to find a single word, the unique word (ein einziges, das einzige Wort). There we see how hazardous is every word of thought (every thoughtful word: denkende Wort) that addresses itself to Being (das dem Sein zugesprochen wird). What is hazarded here, however, is not something impossible, because Being speaks through every language; everywhere and always.¹⁹

Such is the question: the marriage between speech and Being in the unique word, in the finally proper name. Such is the question that enters into the affir-
mation put into play by differance. The question bears (upon) each of the words in this sentence: “Being / speaks / through every language; / everywhere and always /.”

NOTES

1. [The reader should bear in mind that “differance,” or difference with an a, incorporates two significations: “to differ” and “to defer.”—Translator.]
2. [For the term “facilitation” (frayage) in Freud, cf. “Project for a Scientific Psychology I” in The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, 24 vols. (New York and London: Macmillan, 1964), I, 300, note 4 by the translator, James Strachey: “The word ‘facilitation’ as a rendering of the German ‘Bahnung’ seems to have been introduced by Sherrington a few years after the Project was written. The German word, however, was already in use.” The sense that Derrida draws upon here is stronger in the French or German; that is, the opening-up or clearing-out of a pathway. In the context of the “Project for a Scientific Psychology I,” facilitation denotes the conduction capability that results from a difference in resistance levels in the memory and perception circuits of the nervous system. Thus, lowering the resistance threshold of a contact barrier serves to “open up” a nerve pathway and “facilitates” the excitatory process for the circuit. Cf. also J. Derrida, L’Écriture et la différence, Chap. VII, “Freud et la scène de l’écriture” (Paris: Seuil, 1967), esp. pp. 297–305.—Translator.]
7. [Derrida often brackets or “crosses out” certain key terms taken from metaphysics and logic, and in doing this, he follows Heidegger’s usage in Zur Seinsfrage. The terms in question no longer have their full meaning, they no longer have the status of a purely signified content of expression—no longer, that is, after the deconstruction of metaphysics. Generated out of the play of differance, they still retain a vestigial trace of sense, however, a trace that cannot simply be gotten around (incontournable). An extensive discussion of all this is to be found in De la grammaïologie, pp. 31–40.—Translator.]