

Gilles Deleuze

Seminar on Cinema: Classification of Signs and Time, 1982-1983

Lecture 16, 12 April 1983 (Cinema Course 37)

Transcription: [La voix de Deleuze](#) (Paris 8), Fabienne Kabou (Part 1) and [transcriber not indicated] (Part 2); new transcription prepared by Marc Haas; additional revisions to the transcription and time stamp, Charles J. Stivale

Translation: Charles J. Stivale

Part 1

[A student is speaking to Deleuze]

Deleuze: What?

The student: [*Inaudible comments*]

Deleuze: Ah, why yes! Ah, yes! No, no, I remember, it was to know whether you, you yourself remember, [*Laughter*] a question like that, really, because I'd like to start class lightly. I'd like for us to have a very light session, very light, not harsh, [*Laughter*] in that way, a session for musing [*rêverie*]. [*Pause*] I'd like to try to be very clear about this story of the sublime in Kant because it's really beautiful what he says. Anyway, you see, there's no, there's no question about the point we've reached, which would let me gain some time? [*Pause*] No questions? Well, then, we have to start, let's get going. So, there we are, we need... The ideal would therefore be for you to have maintained a recollection of our long classification of movement-images and signs. [*Pause*]

There is one thing I've never said, because in my mind, I didn't think to say it, and then I told myself that it goes without saying. When we relate the movement-image to cinema -- I feel the need to say it now, you will understand why, because from now on, I will need it, I will need it more -- when we relate the movement-image to cinema, that means, of course, that in the cinematographic image, there are things or people who move. But it's not through this that it's the movement-image. Strictly speaking, I would say it's an image in movement; it's already enough to distinguish it from photography. So, the image which presents us with people or moving objects will be called, in contrast to the photographic image, a cinematographic image, that is, an image in movement. I place myself in the static shot situation with moving people, a train, a gentleman. But why -- it's still my terminological concern, so you don't believe that, after all, if you make up a word, or if you write it in a particular way, it will be there to look pretty -- when I say "movement-image" with a hyphen, either it doesn't make sense and it shouldn't have been used, or else it implies something more, compared to the image in movement. [*Pause*]

And what more does that imply in relation to the image in movement? Immediately I think of the basic Bergsonian statement, for all of Bergsonism. Bergson keeps telling us: well, after all, to

understand movement in its most concrete character, one must manage, by an act of the mind which he calls an intuition, to detach" or "extract" it from its moving body or vehicle. Our natural perception -- and it's here, it seems to me, that he is very strong -- he says: our natural perception only grasps movement when attached to something that serves as a moving body or vehicle for it, either object or subject. But more important than the idea of object or subject is the idea of mobile body or vehicle. Well, he says, philosophy will only be a philosophy of movement if it succeeds in extracting movement from what serves as its moving body or vehicle.

Well, that's interesting, but anyway, who does that? This is the cinematic image. Bergson doesn't want it, and he doesn't want it because he doesn't know it, and he doesn't know it because he can't know it. This is why he criticizes cinema for simply giving us an abstract image of movement. But movement as separated from its moving body or its vehicle is not at all an abstract image of movement; it is movement in its essence, in its concrete essence, or it is movement as substance, as a real substance.

I'm saying, that's what the cinematographic image does. Under what conditions and when? Since we've seen a first case of the cinematographic image, it is the image in movement, a fixed shot with something moving in the shot. It's an image in movement, good, but you notice that the movement is not detached from a moving body or a vehicle. It's the movement of the train, it is the movement of the character. Here, my current musing is: what is it, what is the movement-image that is not in the image in movement, and how does it arise in cinema? The easiest answer: well, it arises with the camera's movement. The camera, the camera, well okay, but the camera is definitely a moving body; it's a vehicle. For example, it is on a rail, or it is carried on someone's back, or shoulder, etc. Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yes, materially. But the camera's movement is like -- we saw it another year, last year -- it could almost be called, and not at all in the sense of an abstraction, but of a concrete reality, the general equivalent of any possible movement, even if, in fact, there are movements that it cannot make; as long as it is on rails, these movements are relatively limited, so then there's the crane, then there's the hand camera, on a man's back, there's everything you want, on a man's shoulder, good, a mobile camera, a liberated camera, the liberated camera of [F.W.] Murnau, etc. Good.

So, I'm saying, understand, although the camera ... although the camera movement may on its own be related to a mobile body or to a vehicle, on the other hand -- which is the camera itself, in movement -- on the other hand, it's in its relationship with movement that it traces -- and the relationship of this movement with the other movements -- the movements of the image in movement, there is something like a release. I mean, a movement emerges that is grasped independently [*Pause*] of its own mobile body or vehicle. [*Pause*] It's a step towards this capture of pure movement, the camera's mobility. [*Pause*] Why? Because it causes movement's transformation. The famous example of the liberated camera in Murnau, it gets off a bicycle; Murnau puts it on a bicycle. He puts everything in an elevator -- it's "The Last Laugh" [1924] -- he puts everything on an elevator; the elevator descends, the camera films the hotel's lobby through the elevator's windows, and, continuously, it emerges on a bicycle, a guy being on the bicycle, and obviously, it crosses the lobby. The camera's movement, in a way, connects two movements with different mobile bodies: the elevator, the bicycle. It could show one of them and hide the other; it will show the elevator's movement, it will hide the bicycle's movement, it hardly matters. It tends, I'm saying, the camera's movement tends to extract a pure movement

from its varied mobile bodies and vehicles.¹

Hence what struck me in a recent cinema project, hence what struck me greatly in [Wim] Wenders's films, namely this sort of equivalence that runs through Wenders's first films, the camera movement as equaling a plane, plus a train, plus a boat, plus walking, plus an automobile, etc. Notice in this equivalence, for example, in "Kings of the Road" [1976] or, even more in "Alice in the Cities" [1974], in which the changes of means of transportation are as if collected by the camera which is supposed to extract from all these means of transportation the pure movement detached from the vehicle. So that's a means, it's a tendency, to be discerned.² So, you will tell me, but nevertheless, there are still some people, that goes without saying, that goes without saying, there are still some people on the screen, there remains..., etc. But what's important is that all these movements related to their mobile body and their vehicle are as if taken up again, they are not canceled out, but are taken up again in a deeper movement which, itself, detaches them or tends to detach them from the mobile body and from the vehicle. In this way, the image in movement becomes a movement-image. Good. [Pause]

But isn't there another way to pass from the image in movement to the movement-image? Of course, there is another way. Because, for a long time, and even now, if you look in a film at the number of fixed shots and the number of mobile shots -- calling mobile shots the shots that have camera movement -- well, you see first of all that in all so-called classic cinema, right, there is a very great superiority of fixed shots. [Pause] When the camera became mobile, it invaded very few images. It is notorious, for example, that in [D.W.] Griffith's films, the camera movements are all the more striking, and they are all the more splendid for being rare. They are reserved for certain privileged moments. [Pause] In "Faust" [1926] by Murnau, the camera movements are rare, [Pause] [13:00] and yet, as Noël Burch says very well, these are films that give us the impression of a fundamental mobility. Yet they operate mostly by fixed shots. They hold back their camera movements. Needless to say, what I'm saying also applies to many things in modern cinema.³

But then, in that case, when it is not the camera movement that assures or realizes, that produces this tendency to detach movement from the vehicle or from the mobile body, [Pause] what will satisfy this function [Pause] in the case of fixed shots, where that movement remains irreducibly attached to these mobile bodies and vehicles? So, it's very simple. What will guarantee this is, what will guarantee and carry out this same tendency is the succession of shots, it's the montage. [Pause] There are two ways for cinema to tend to surpass – I say, “tend to surpass”, not at all meaning that this is a failure – but, because if this tendency were completely realized, we would fall into abstraction. If movement were completely detached from all mobile bodies and vehicles, we would have a cinema that we could call, we would have images that we could call “abstract”. That's been done.

But here, at the level where I'm situating myself, it is not even a question of that; it is a question of doubling the level on which movement relates to mobile bodies and vehicles, of doubling it at the same time by the outline, the drawing of a movement, if needs be the same, insofar as it no longer relates to its mobile body and its vehicle. And I'm saying that to produce this tendency to extract pure movement, you have two means: the camera movement or the montage of fixed shots. You can combine the two means with montage [Pause] at the level of movements, camera

movements.

You understand, it's in this sense that I can say: the cinematographic image is not only an image in movement, but it is really movement-image. [Pause]⁴ This highlights the difference between the cinematographic image and the photographic image. Why? Because, if I thus define the cinematographic image as a tendency to extract -- I insist on tendency --, a tendency to extract pure movement from its mobile bodies and its vehicles, [Pause] I would say that almost here, the photo and cinema oppose each other quite fully. At which level? I have the feeling that even from the most technical, technological point of view, one can -- and this is not at all a criticism -- liken the photo to a kind of molding [*moulage*].

There is a text by [André] Bazin which seems very interesting to me -- I don't have it, but... -- in which Bazin says something like: the photo is a luminous mold, it's a luminous imprint [*empreinte*], [Pause] provided you understand what a mold is.⁵ A mold, I mean -- otherwise it would be too easy a criticism, a criticism of the photograph, but precisely I have no critical intention when I say the photograph is a molding -- a mold, I mean, is not simply a form which imposes itself on a material from the outside. What happens when a child goes to the beach? See, in the old days -- these aren't the kinds of games anymore -- these are old games that, then, used molds. So, children, for example, made a mold in the shape of a shell, then we put sand in it, some sand, and then that created the shell, right? There is a mold.

I'm saying, it is not simply the imposition of a form on a material. That would be a purely extrinsic operation. The walls of the mold, that is, the external shape, in fact, lead to what? A whole reorganization of the states of forces which one could call "the states of intermolecular forces of matter". And it leads all of these intermolecular forces of matter, in the specific case, sand, leads them to a state of equilibrium. Once this state of equilibrium -- it takes time -- once this state of equilibrium is reached, you can unmold. This idea is very simple. I'm saying, in this sense, well, photography is a luminous mold, it's a mold of light. It is a molding of light. [Pause]

Whereas what is the cinematographic image? There is indeed a difference in nature between the photo-image and the cinema-image. [Pause] This is a technical operation that has been very well analyzed by some people, [Pause] and it's something we encountered on a specific topic several years ago, particularly about music when we were talking about music. It's modulation. What really sets molding apart is modulation, I mean, what stands out in the sense of, at the same time, being concerned with. And there is an author who has analyzed very well, technologically, the difference between molding and modulation as two ends of the technological chain. It's Gilbert Simondon.⁶

And⁷ he says, well you see, a modulation, a modulator, how is it different from a mold, to mold or to modulate, especially since there are all sorts of transitions between molding and modulating? Well, a modulation is, if you will, a variable and continuous mold. It's a variable and continuous molding. That is, in the case of a mold, the conditions of equilibrium are reached after a certain time. That needs to settle. So, there you have it, the first characteristic of the mold: the conditions of equilibrium are reached after a certain time. By conditions of equilibrium, I mean the state of the intermolecular forces of the material, in the molded material, what's being molded. A second characteristic: once they are reached, we can demold; that does not change

anymore. It is the role of the instant, it's done.

In modulation, it's just the opposite. In -- see, sense that once again, I'm considering pure modulation -- I would say, in pure modulation, the conditions of equilibrium are reached in an instant, [Pause] but at every instant also, they change. [Pause] You could just as well say that demolding never happens, or that demolding is constant and permanent. [Pause] In other words, Simondon says quite well: a modulation is variable and continuous, and temporal molding. Modulation is a variable, temporal and continuous mold which itself modifies, the conditions of equilibrium. That's what a modulator is.

So here, I would say exactly, literally, if you've followed me, the cinematographic image is a movement-image, or, what amounts to the same thing, a modulation of light, [Pause] while the photographic image is a molding of light. [Pause] And in fact, a modulation of light, or [Pause] the tendency to extract movement from its mobile bodies and its vehicles, is exactly the same thing; it is the reverse and the front side of the same operation. [Pause] I could almost say, at the extreme, to modulate light is [Pause] not to cease, so it's to tend toward and not to cease extracting the movement of its mobile body or its vehicle, and vice versa.

And this would be very valuable for us because it would make us come back to the double aspect of the cinematographic image. [Pause] From the beginning, from the beginning of this year, we've said, yes, [the image] is indissolubly movement-image and light-image. It's the light-image as a modulation of light; [Pause] it is the movement-image as an extraction of the movement from its mobile bodies and its vehicles. [Pause] Well, but then, we return to the point we've reached in our analysis. -- Are you okay, are you okay? Is this okay, nothing to...? -- [Pause] I'm saying, this restarts everything because, on this, we have at our disposal, we again have at our disposal, I'm not going back over it, our whole series of types of movement-image. Types of image-movement, there are all kinds, each with its signs; we've covered all that.

And so, we reached the following problem: well, precisely in the case of these movement-images, or of these light-images, [Pause] we are going to reach a new type of image that we'll have to call: "image of time". And here, the questions rush in for us. [Pause] Why call them "image of time" and not "time-image"? It's always out of a need for terminological rigor. We said, well yes, starting from, if we obtain an image of time, or images of time from movement-images, they are necessarily images of time. Why? Because they are obtained indirectly. They are obtained indirectly; they are obtained by the composition of movement-images.

Hence a question returned immediately, and that we'll hold back for later since this will be the basis for the year-end, I assume: well, aren't there other conditions through which we might reach indirect time-image? I could call a direct image of time a "time-image". But as much as I apprehend time starting from and as a function of movement-images, I can only say: this is an indirect image of time. This is an image of time that I obtain through the composition of movement-images. And after all, that seemed to us to be a definition, one of the definitions of montage in cinema among many others, or one aspect of montage, the composition of movement-images such that an indirect image of time emerges. [Pause]

And here we have exactly, this is so that you have the whole problem in mind. *[Pause]* So we were in the process of adding to our classification of images and signs a new major category of image. We had created the whole classification of movement-images and the corresponding signs. We had obtained all sorts, all sorts of signs, I don't know, but anyway, it could multiply, so 30, 40, 50. We named them; all that was a lot of fun. *[Laughter]* And then, now, we're telling ourselves, well, we must add the indirect images of time, *[Pause]* the indirect images of time that derive from the composition, that is, from the montage of movement-images. And then we'll have to add, perhaps, direct images of time. *[Pause]* So, from here onward, whether these are indirect images of time, or direct time-images, if they exist -- we don't even know yet if they exist and if they can exist, direct time-images -- but assuming they exist, in any case, they will be grouped under the general title of "chronosigns". They will be chronosigns. *[Pause]*

And what we began before the vacation *[session 15, March 22, 1983]* was a first sort of indirect image of time. Because after all, we didn't say it because we had too many things to say; it seems to me, well now the moment has come -- as we have a sort of pause, the before vacation and the afterward -- well, it's obvious that, in any case, we had to expect two indirect images of time. We had to expect two indirect images of time. Why was that? Because we have seen the front and reverse sides of the movement-image; it's the movement-image and it's the light-image. *[Pause]*

On one hand, it is *[Pause]* -- let's also take a term here that we sometimes encounter in Bergson - - on one hand, it is "mobility". I'm saying "Bergsonian term" because he defines it in a very special way. For him, mobility is movement in its essence, that is, extracted from its mobile body or vehicle, pure mobility. And the movement-image, on the one hand, is pure mobility, and therefore, it refers to its movement-image aspect, and on the other hand, it is pure modulation. *[Pause]* And, under this other aspect, inseparable from the first one, it refers to the reverse side of the movement-image, or to the front side, it doesn't matter, the reverse side of the movement-image or the front side of the movement-image, it is the light-image. It's mobility of movement. Once again, mobility of movement means for us something precise -- it is not literature, here, it's not a way of speaking -- mobility of the movement means movement insofar as it is no longer related, or that it is not only related, to its mobile body or vehicle. So, on one hand, I have mobility of movement, and on the other hand, modulation of light.

In some ways, it's the same; in other ways, it's not. Why is that? Here again, I come back to it, because we'd need, we'd have to take another year, when, *[Pause]* in the dream of a course that I could do one day on "what is philosophy?" anyway, *[Laughter]* what would impress me the most is what I've already told you a lot, that is, whatever it is..., I'm trying to say it the most concretely possible, hence as flatly as possible, namely that philosophy obviously has no privilege in relation to the true and the false, and has nothing to say about the true and the false, but that it has something fundamental to say about constructing concepts. And so, what philosophy does is to build concepts; it is, like that, like architects, they build houses, musicians, they build sounds, etc. Well, the production of concepts is what philosophy is all about.

But, if that's what philosophy is, what interests me is these kinds of interests or tastes, *[Pause]* which once again, means that, as well at the level, and so among philosophers, in philosophy, there are, there are as in all the other arts, there are producers, or creators, there are spectators,

and there are all the intermediaries between the two. The spectator in philosophy is the one who says, "Oh, what a beautiful concept that is". [*Laughter*] A beautiful concept, yes. But what does it mean, the one who says, "That's a beautiful concept"? Because there, the problem is the same for the spectator and the creator. The spectator who tells himself about certain concepts, "what a beautiful concept", that amounts to saying -- I am a Cartesian, for example, if they are concepts from Descartes, [*Pause*] well -- he will be marked by Descartes. If you grant me, what goes without saying is that philosophy has more urgent, higher and more important tasks than searching for truth, and since precisely its highest and most important task is to create concepts, with all the questions, obviously, that must arise: what is the point of this, why, why do this? Why do this rather than something else? But the creation of concepts is as important as the creation of colors and lines, as the creation of sound complexes, it's as important, as beautiful, as good.

And I always come back to this, there is a matter of taste. There's a matter of taste. What do you want, when, when you say ...? I'm not going to tell someone, I assume, or no one's going to tell me: you're wrong in what you're saying. That's why I can't stand objections, anyway; [*Laughter*] this isn't, it's not possible, I'm not wrong in what I'm saying. At the same, while it's not possible, what is possible is something much more awful, that I don't pose the right problems. Really, that's awful. But once again, a problem, you have to risk a problem. You have to build these problems. There is no, there is nothing... The answers, I understand that the answers can be true or false, but the problems... [*Pause*] If someone tells me the year in which Descartes was born, yes, I say, that's true or false. And there is only one way to re-establish, in my opinion, there is only one way to re-establish verification of knowledge in philosophy -- it wouldn't be difficult -- the day we join the continuous verification of knowledge, it is in the form of questions and answers concerning philosophical concepts. Because here, this is frightening: at the level of the philosophers themselves, right? It's the parade, really; it would consist... verifying knowledge in philosophy would consist in saying: what is the a priori in Kant? What is, what does Kant call transcendental, etc.? Solely creating definitions of concepts, but anyway.

When you feel, when you have a relationship with a philosopher that is favorable, or a relationship with a philosopher that is unfavorable, and you happen to express it in the form of "he's wrong", you feel that you are saying something shameful, after all. It is as if you were to tell a mathematician: ah, you are wrong! You wouldn't dare say that to a mathematician because he would smack you. [*Laughter*] On the other hand, what might happen? I saw, at one point, I happened to read a mathematical journal. I remember some reviews of university theses by [Henri] Poincaré. And Poincaré said about a mathematician's thesis -- so it's at a high level; a mathematics thesis is at a very high level -- well, Poincaré said, in his judgement, speaking summarily: without any interest. Without any interest. That's interesting, this judgment: without any interest. Understand why this is interesting. Because a mathematician is not going to reproach another mathematician for having made a mistake in his calculation or his proof. The mathematician didn't make a mistake, or if he made a mistake, even that doesn't matter, right? If he wrote $7 + 4 = 15$, it doesn't matter, it really doesn't matter.

On the other hand, what happens is that people invent theorems that are without interest. It's not that it's false. It's not that it's false, it's worse [*Pause*]: it doesn't make mathematical sense. It's

true, it might be true, or it can be, why not, there's no necessity, it doesn't advance anything, it doesn't advance anything, it doesn't advance anything. This is a much more obscure, much more difficult field of thought. And it is true of all works of art; it is not true of sciences only. You will have films, well yes, zero. What does "zero" mean? It has no interest, none, no interest. It's grabs things from right and left, they're gimmicks... yes, it makes a whole; this whole: zero, no interest.

What does that mean, "it's without interest"? It's a funny thing. Or what does it mean, someone, and what is this "me" who can say: ah this, that interests me. Not "me" in my personality; that interests me. I mean, what is it that makes each of us have our preferred authors? So, it's this taste that I would like to talk about one day. It is this taste that is one with the activity of creation; it is this viewer's taste that is one with the activity of creation, and that constitutes the deepest affinity of the spectator and the creator, that consists in the character, for lack of a better word, I say, the interesting or important character, either of a concept, or of a painting, or of an image. What does it mean: this is interesting, and this is important, whereas it does not mean: is it true? The category of importance... [*Interruption of the recording*]

... I can say, understand that philosophers, well, when we say that they've contradicted each other, this is absolutely false. A philosopher has never contradicted another philosopher, any more than a mathematician has contradicted another mathematician. It's much worse, [*Pause*] it's much worse: [*Pause*] they haven't stopped transforming their problems. They haven't stopped transforming their problems. It's obvious that if you want to understand something, for example, about the relationship between Bergson and Plato, well, it doesn't happen by saying: one tells us this and the other tells us the opposite. It's by asking ourselves, for example: in what way does one and then the other pose the problem of movement? And it becomes evident precisely that the way in which Bergson poses the problem of movement has no equivalent in Plato, or has only very marginal equivalents, but that, on the other hand, certain problems in Plato's works have no equivalent in Bergson. What is this tension of problems, this tension of problematics?

So, well, that's a bit of what I want to talk about with my image story. I'm saying, movement-image and light-image, these are the front and reverse sides, they're inseparable. And you won't have movement without light and transformation of lights, and you won't have light without movement. [*Pause*] And practically, that doesn't prevent that -- and this will make big differences in images -- practically, you have people who are interested -- I'm coming back to my topic of importance and interest -- what they are interested in is above all light. They are children of light, or children of the night. That's what interests them. What do you want to tell them at that level? Do you want to tell them: "You're wrong"? "You should be interested in something else"? You can always tell someone: "You should be interested in something else", but I don't see what right you have. It's already quite wonderful that he's interested in something. [*Laughter*]

I'm saying, there are certain authors about whom it's said: their main concern is light. It's true in painting, it's true in cinema, it's true in philosophy. There are others for whom the problem of light, well no, it doesn't mean anything to them. They say what, well... there are some people in the cinema, there are some people for whom the real problem for them is movement. What does that mean, concretely? This is a way to qualify my idea. I'm indeed saying: by right. If you consider the image itself, any movement-image is light-image, any light-image is movement-

image. I tried to show this in, at the very beginning of this year.⁸ I've just specified this; it means pure mobility, and it means pure modulation. And mobility is a modulation, modulation is a mobility. All right, fine, all that goes without saying. But that doesn't prevent there being authors who are only interested in movement, finally, because it redistributes lights. For them, movement is at a second power; what interests them is that movement makes light move. They will be called Luminists; that will be their primary problem.

And then you have other authors for whom light is fundamentally subordinate to movement. Light allows decompositions and compositions of movement. Light is one of the means by which one can extract pure mobility from movement, that is, the movement of one's mobile body or of one's vehicle. *[Pause]* Light is at the service of movement. *[Pause]* They can make great discoveries in the domain of light, but it is precisely because, for them, light will only be at a second power, that they will make discoveries of this type. I would say of this race of authors that they are Mobilists. At the same time, we shouldn't harden the categories too much. Of course, of course, the Luminists are interested in movement; of course, the Mobilists are interested in light, and yet it's a system completely... it's a very, very different system. And furthermore, they will be able to converge towards common achievements by which we viewers are dazzled, both by the light which emerges from it and carried away by the movement. And that doesn't prevent these achievements from being analyzable, and perhaps analyzable in two simultaneous ways, one in which it's movement that drives the light, the other in which it's light that commands movement. And it will not be created in the same way depending on one case or the other.

Hence, I'm saying, we had to expect two figures, two indirect images of time. *[Pause]* On the one hand, it's necessary to draw from movement-images an indirect image of time, *[Pause]* and on the other hand, it's necessary to draw from the light-image, from light-images, an indirect image of time. And this won't be the same, this won't be the same. So, I will already have two chronosigns, *[Pause]* a chronosign of the movement-image, a chronosign of the light-image. *[Pause]* And why are they separable, even though they are very, very intertwined? Well, for one simple reason. It is that movement-image, as its name suggests -- with its problem of mobility and the extraction of movement from the mobile body or the vehicle -- must be understood as extensive movement, movement in extension. *[Pause]* Time as an indirect image that emerges from it, well, as we have seen, it's a time under a double aspect. This is what we saw the last time, just before the holidays, it's time as the "interval" of movement; it corresponds to the part, and it is time as the Whole of movement. *[Pause]*

So, my first image -- you see that this gets complicated -- my first image of time -- time such as it is extracted from movement and such as it is related to extensive movement -- has itself two signs: the interval, the interval of extensive movement, the interval of movement, and the Whole of movement, the Whole of movement. I will not return to this point. The Whole of movement was, for example, what Descartes called the constancy of the quantity of movement in the universe. *[Pause]* Long before him, and in quite a different way, this is what the Greeks called the number, the great number of time... sorry, the great number of movement.

Okay, so I have a first indirect figure of time; let's call it -- so, it is time obtained by composition of movement-images -- we can call it, literally, "cinechrony", cinechrony. *[Pause]* Cinechrony is

the figure of time as composed from and as a function of movement-images of extension, movement-images of extension. I'm saying that this figure of time, as we have seen, has two aspects: once again, time as interval which refers to the part of time... [*Deleuze corrects himself*] which refers to the part of movement, time as the whole that refers to the Whole of movement. Concretely, we have seen this, and I'm returning to the image at the point we reached, this time-image, rather this image of time, this first image of time; it is the image of the bird, it is that of the most beautiful of birds which is the bird of prey; it is the great circles of the soaring bird of prey. That is time as Whole, and it is the wing beats of the fleeing bird. And the wing beat is the interval of movement, just as the great circle which reveals the horizon of the world is the Whole of time.

What is time as an interval? It's the present. The present is the in-between-beats. The present is the interval. And I can never say "the present" without adding the "variable present". My present is eminently variable. No present is the same as another present. No beat happens the same way. So, there are, there are, there are, there are statistical balances: I can say, my present is the interval between an exhale and an inhale. It's the interval between a contraction and a dilation. I will have defined my present by the pulmonary interval in one case; I will have defined my present by the cardiac interval in other cases. But already, it's as much to say that I am straddling multiple variable presents. And it is according to my occupations that I refer to a particular present as a way to define my present, but I am a component of a multiplicity of virtual presents.

It's very nice to know that. It's very nice, and then obviously, first off, when they come apart, what is it that... when they come apart, when they burst, when the heart goes one way, the lungs another, and the feet still elsewhere, this is what is called a panic situation, when there is no longer a common measure between the different variable presents that compose me. There has to be some kind of common measure, otherwise then, otherwise my heart goes one way when my feet go the other, right? Good. I'm saying, time as an interval is the variable present. There we have the first figure of time, or rather, there we have the first sign of time.

The second is the Whole, time as the Whole of movement, and time as the Whole of movement, what is it? This time, it is no longer the variable present, it is the immensity of the past and the future insofar as they are supposed to constitute a circle or a constant. Example: Descartes's invariant, MV. A completely different example: the Great Year in certain forms of ancient thought, which represents the Whole of time, that is, the moment when all the planets find the same respective position. Are you following me?

So, I have two signs of time: the variable present and the immensity of the future and the past. Notice that it gets complicated because the vastness of the past and the future, ultimately, has no need of the present. Variable presents have no need for past and future. These are notions that are completely heterogeneous, which come from: the presents measure intervals of movement. [*Pause*] The line of the future and the past does something completely different; it measures the Whole of a movement or, in short, the Whole of movement in general. Good.

So, I'm saying, the first indirect image of time, the image I called cinechrony, that is, the image of time extracted from movement-images, it presents two signs to me: "the interval" and "the immense". I'm no longer using "immense", I'm using it for convenience, but I'm giving it a very

concrete meaning, since what I'm calling "the immense" is the immensity of the future and the past. So, the interval and the immense are the two signs of time insofar as it relates to the movement-image. [*Pause*]

But, as we have just seen, we must expect another, another image, another indirect image of time, this time in relation to the other aspect of the movement-image. I could start another graph again. Here, we've restarted, we've restarted a graph that will be very, very, no, not complicated, very simple. I could create it, but it's not worth it; you create it in your head. That if the reverse side is the light-image, we have seen that, in this sense, it was something other than this reverse side, it was not the same thing as..., that there was an order of importance, which you could sometimes, well yes, you can turn over, it's an image that you can turn over. If it's light that interests you, well, you turn it over, you place movement upside down. If it's movement that interests you, you turn it over, the light is underneath.

And now then, I'm saying, suppose it's light that we're interested in. We therefore grasp our movement-image no longer as movement-image, but as modulation-image, light-image. [*Pause*] Well, light-images will also come out through montage, that is, through composition, an indirect image of time. [*Pause*] They won't be the same, it won't have the same signs, and for a very simple reason. What I could say: light is a movement. Okay, but this is not a case of movement. Why? I said, it's like the front and reverse sides. It is like the front and reverse sides, one of them being extensive movement, light being intensive moment, [*Pause*] it's intensity par excellence. Would it be possible to demonstrate or show that all intensities arise from light? [*Pause*] Without a doubt. Demonstrate, in what sense? Could we demonstrate it physically? Maybe, right, that, I don't know, maybe, but why not? There are many things that would go in that direction. Can we show it in another way? I would say that all of Romanticism was the attempt, but the entirely successful attempt, to show from what point of view all intensities flowed from light. Good.

The movement-image was understood from movement in extension, extensive movement, that is, from a movement that is defined by displacement in space. The light-image can equally be defined as movement, but as intensive movement. It is to be expected that intensive movement has a completely different nature than the extensive movement: in what sense? Well, we already see it right away, the intensive movement, it has degrees, while extensive movement has parts. Good. A degree is not a part. [*Pause*] So, I can say: the second figure of time, the second indirect image of time, is the one that I draw or that I can draw through composition – but obviously it won't be the same composition – that I can draw through composition of light-images, that is, modulation-images, that is, intensive movement-images.

And there, it would be obviously, solely by symmetry -- it's not required, not required -- that we also find two signs of this second image of time. This second image of time, well, fine, it is time as I conclude it from compositions of light. A time such as I conclude it from compositions of light, what is that? What is that... I could tell what the parts were, the parts of movement, from the point of view of extension. I said it earlier: the parts of movement from the point of view of extension are time as interval. This is the interval. This is the interval of movement. See, there's something clever here, it's not funny, but there's something clever all the same. I am wary since obviously I cannot define a part of movement as part of a space traversed. Above all, I must avoid it, because there, you could make an objection to me, and you would be right. You would

say to me, what you're saying is stupid, it's stupid. [Pause] Ten meters, for example, is not a part of movement, it is a part of space traversed by a mobile body. Also, I'm saying, there are parts of movement, but I am careful not to identify parts of movement with parts of space traversed. This is why I said: the parts of movement are time as interval, [Pause] namely the part of the movement of a bird, of a particular bird, it's the interval between two wing beats. [Pause]

So here... Well, for the intensive movement, that is, for light, I will have to find it as well. And I was saying, there is no part there, there are degrees, [Pause] yes, and the intensive movement will go through degrees. Oh, it's going to go through degrees, but then... let's just let it go here. We must try to move forward; to try to move forward, you have to muse, you have to... It's going to go through degrees, but going through degrees, what is that? It has a name, it is descending and ascending, descending and ascending. I'm not saying that intensity is linked, or is reduced to that, but that's it above all: intensity is something that rises and falls. Hey, but you will tell me, it occurs in extension, rising and falling. It's possible, but it's not, it's not so with the extension... never would falling and rising have been isolated, isolable. It comes from intensity, falling and rising. Maybe; that's what I think anyway. Fine.

On the other hand, what belongs to the extension as such is making circles [Pause] and arranging intervals. Amazing, that's pure extension. Descending and ascending, passing through degrees; to descend and to ascend is to pass through degrees. That's it, the origin of descending and ascending. It really is something entirely different. And feel that it's a whole different time that we're going to enter. And the degrees of light... and in fact, I'm coming back to..., light, it falls, and once again, what does it mean, to fall? That doesn't mean it's falling apart; it remains in itself. But that means that the ray of light comes out of it in a certain way: it falls. And light rises back up, right, all that's fine... [Interruption of the recording]⁹

... What are these degrees of light? We can call them -- here, it's just a hypothesis, because that would, that would bring us back to things that we saw last year or two years ago, I no longer know; for those who were here, it would make it possible to make links with last year, I believe - degrees of light, we can call them, even if it means justifying it only later, degrees of light, we can call them call them "colors".¹⁰ Colors would be degrees of light, that is, colors would be intensities of light. Can that be said? Well, in what sense? If it's true, in any case, that would give me a name, a word, one more word to designate this new image of time. I would say that the image of time which corresponds to intensive movement or to light, this time is no longer a cinechrony, as earlier, but this image of time is a "chromochrony", a chromochrony. I'm happy because this is the title of a great work by [Olivier] Messiaen.¹¹ So, fine. [Pause] And chromochrony, that is, the figure of time in relation to intensive movement, in relation to the light-image, well, it would itself have signs; what would these signs be? Let's try to move forward a bit, ok? These are not the same ones, obviously, as earlier. Earlier it was the interval and the Whole.

Let us take any intensive quantity whatever. In any case, it falls. What do I mean by "it falls"? Do I mean it disappears? No. To fall is its appearing [*apparaître*]. So, let's try to say, more and more, as one can, it doesn't need to fall in order to fall. I mean, it falls onto you, it's not the one falling. It can fall, it's both, it's both. An intensity can always fall. You'll tell me, a movement in the extensive can always stop. Well, yes, okay, but it's not the same thing at all. In fact, when I

say, “an extensive movement can always stop”, that means, it can always lead into an interval, and there’d be no resumption afterwards. That's its way of stopping. [*Pause*] But when I say: an extensive movement falls, and can always fall, well there, I have no notion of interval for the moment.

Furthermore, I have the impression that I will never have one. The interval belongs completely to the extensive movement. If I maintain my terminological rigor firmly, something else will be needed. Between two degrees, I couldn't speak of an interval. When can I speak interval between two degrees? The answer is well-known: when I've substituted extensive quantities for intensive quantities that allow them to be measured. Namely, when I've substituted for heat the rise of the column of mercury; with the rise of the column of mercury which is an extensive movement, there I can say: there is an interval between two degrees. But insofar as being an intensive quantity, the notion of interval is completely unjustifiable. So, what can I do, what does that mean? I'm saying: the intensive quantity can always fall by itself, "fall" meaning “reach zero”. So, it has a relation toward zero. We already have something very important: it has a relation toward zero which is consubstantial with it.

Any intensive quantity is a function of zero. The extensive movement, as we have seen, was related, had a reference. I mean, you'll be doing philosophy if you don't stop twitching; you have to, you have to wade through these kinds of evidence, of, of platitudes, right? I'm saying, the extensive movement is not in an essential relation with a zero. If you think of extensive movement, you tell yourself: it must have a unit. The extensive relation is in relation with the unit, [*Pause*] or, what comes to the same thing, with something able to be used as a unit. And this is very different. The intensive movement, in its essence, in its intimacy, is in a relation with zero. Well, it's its possibility of falling toward zero. And in fact, any intensity can drop to zero. But it doesn't need to fall to zero to be an intensity, that is, to drop on top of us.

I would even say, falling toward zero is the vulgarity of intensity. It's the vulgarity of intensity, that is, it's the easiest way, for it – I'm imagining intensity as living -- I would say, it's the easiest way for it to make us feel something of its essence. [*Pause*] It's falling toward zero because there, when it falls toward zero, it becomes glaring that as an intensity it was concerned with zero. But in its nobler essence, that is, in its intimate essence, it does not need to fall toward zero in order to be concerned with zero; it falls on us. It doesn't need to fall itself. The light falls down on us, it does not stop, it does not reach zero for that; it keeps falling on us. And that's the intensity; it won't stop falling on us. And it is you who will plead for mercy, that is, it's each one of us who will plead for mercy.

Perhaps extensive movement will not stop composing units. And in fact, the parts of movement, what are the parts of extensive movement? You have movements -- well, I'll take the simplest one -- you have so-called linear movements, so-called circular movements, and it doesn't stop, it doesn't stop being composed. Looking at a spinning wheel, a spinning wheel, it's a composition of movement, okay. The movement does not cease being composed, and the intensities do not stop falling, falling down on you. So, fine. But it's already in this that they have a relation with zero. Why? Because what is it that defines an intensity? In what way is it a quantity? Well, it's a quantity because, like any quantity, it's the unit of a multiplicity, the unit of a plurality. [*Pause*] In the case of extension, it's very simple; in the case of extensive movement, a unit of plurality,

it's very simple: plurality is the successive parts, the parts, and the unit is gathering into one. [Pause]

But in intensive movement? [Pause] That's very odd. Kant tells us quite well: it is a unit [Pause] whose plurality is apprehended in the instant. Perhaps you notice, this is the introduction for the first time, well, of this word "instant". I'm saying: you notice, because we feel that it will be extremely useful to us, "instant" is something concerning time. It is not at all the same as the present. We can say that we vaguely defined the present earlier, but we had nothing to say about the instant. The instant will perhaps fundamentally belong to our second figure of time.

So, we'll certainly hold on to that. So, it's a unit whose plurality is apprehended in the instant. How? In the form of its distance to zero, distance to zero. Why distance? The distance to zero fundamentally belongs to intensity. In what sense? In the sense that intensive distance is opposed to, or is distinguished from, extensive magnitude. [Pause] How is that distinguished? All distances are indivisible. "All distances are indivisible", what does that mean? That means, "thirty degrees of heat" is defined by its distance from zero. [Pause] "Fifteen degrees of heat" is defined by its distance from zero. But thirty degrees of heat was never fifteen plus fifteen. Intensive quantities are not the product of an addition of parts. [Pause] As the other said, you won't create heat by adding snowballs.¹²

Distances are indivisible. I mean, the distance, therefore the intensities. And I am in the process of defining intensity through two aspects: its degree, that is, its unit apprehended in the instant, [Pause] its plurality is defined as an indivisible distance from zero. Well, all intensities are indivisible distances according to their degree, are indivisible distances to zero, with respect to zero. But that doesn't prevent thirty degrees from being more than fifteen degrees. Thirty degrees is not fifteen degrees plus fifteen degrees, but thirty degrees is more than fifteen degrees. Well, fine. So, I can introduce pluses and minuses. Yes, I can introduce pluses and minuses provided that I justify it, provided that it exists in another way than in extensive quantity. And in fact, I can say that one distance is greater than another, [Pause] but I cannot say by how much. You will tell me, but yes you can, thirty degrees is two times fifteen. You're answering yourself in advance: but no, that's not what it is. What is double is the rise of the column of mercury which itself is extension.

But then, if you cannot, if you cannot add intensities, distances, if you cannot add distances which are indivisible, what can you do? You can order them. Ordering is not the same as measuring; these are two different concepts. You order differences or distances, whereas for extensive movement, you juxtapose parts. Juxtaposing parts and ordering differences or distances are not the same. I would say that intensity is the set of ordered differences or ordered distances, calling distance, or difference, the relation of any intensive degree whatever with zero. [Pause]

Don't I have two aspects of time? All that, that's it, we're acting a bit as... [Interruption of the recording]

... I have just found something like the two signs of this second image of time, this time which responds to intensive movement, or this time which responds to light, this time which responds to light. You remember that for extensive movement, we had time as a Whole, and time as an

interval. Time as Whole was the immense, that is, the immensity of the future and the past, and time as interval was the present. And now, I have time as "order" or as "power" [*puissance*]. I don't know, I see advantages in both words. So, that's annoying, anyhow, but finally, for the moment, I see that, time as order or as power.

What would I call the order or the power of time? That's quite different from time as Whole, right? The order and power of time is the set of distances and differences as ordinates. Time is what orders distances. My heart is stirred because I only say this on the condition that you see no objection to be made to it. I see some of you who are on the brink of a kind of sleep, but invincible. If you feel exhausted, you tell me, right, and then we'll stop for a bit, ok? [*Pause*] So. I'm concluding this point.

Time as order; so there we find there's to be an order of time which is not at all the same as the Whole of time. We will imagine battles between all these aspects of time. After all, this must animate mythology. When intervals of time, which are small gods, very small gods, tiny gods, intervals of time, the interval-god, it's..., the Greeks were very familiar with this, they called it "a demon". The interval was a demon. This was good, it was a great idea. Why? See, because the interval is demonic, because for the Greeks, the gods had kingdoms, they had kingdoms, it was... They were always gods of the limit. [*Pause*] It was the limit that was divine, and the demon is what always crosses the limit. It's what jumps. The demon, by definition, is the jump. In Oedipus, there is a sentence which is, which is often very badly translated, because it's translated literally – dead languages can only be translated literally – it is Oedipus who says, invoking fate: "Which demon, which demon, which demon jumped the longest jump?" "Which demon jumped the longest jump?" Everything gets justified because what jumps is always the demon. And there, Oedipus finds that the leap was a bit strong. The jump that caused him to cross the limits was a bit strong. Which demon jumped the longest jump? So, if you don't think about this relationship between the demon, the interval, the leap, obviously the sentence is obscure, it's even unintelligible. Good, but anyway.

So, I was saying, we can... the interval can very well rebel; it's demons who come to offend the gods. They will rebel against the Whole, the Whole of time. There is going to be the struggle of the Whole of time and the intervals of time. The variable presents go to war. Why are they going to war? Because they refuse to be parts of the Whole of time. Okay, so all of that, fine. What does it matter, when the variable presents rebel? So suddenly, even if it means showing a vast culture, we jump from Sophocles to Shakespeare. What does Hamlet mean when he says: "time is out of joint", "time is out of joint"? Perhaps when the variable presents rebel against the Whole of time, then time gets out of joint, that is, the immensity of the future and past no longer makes a loop, no longer makes a circle, good, but anyway.¹³

So, here we are, then, with... Well, yes, so I am going to withdraw the word "power", and yet I need it, because all of this should be said to be powers of time: the first power of time, as we have seen, would be the interval; the second power of time would be the Whole of time; what is the third power of time? Well, that's the one we're talking about right now, in relation to intensive time. Well, I'm saying, it is the order of time, that is, the order of all distances, the order of all intensive differences, time as order, it orders distances. It would be like a kind of... it was not endowed before, a kind of depth of time, a depth of time in which all distances are ordered

toward zero. And what is this zero? That would really be the abyss of time, this zero. In fact, the image of depth would have to be imposed on us since time would have to plunge into an abyss which is precisely [zero], and which has zero as its sign. Good, but then the order of time would then be something very different from the Whole of time. [Pause] And the second sign of the intensive image of time, as we have seen, is that in its distance toward zero, all intensity is apprehended in "the instant", [Pause] and the instant would be precisely that aspect of time under which an intensity is intensity.

As a result, my two aspects of intensive time would be: the order of time, which would therefore be like the third power, and the instant which would be the fourth power. I will have four signs of the time, for the moment, for two figures. What is this instant then? [Pause] This instant would be the capture of intensive quantity, of any intensive quantity as a unit, whereas distance would be the capture of indecomposable plurality, that is, of its relation to zero. Good, but you see that they are two completely different figures, and yet they are both sublime, yet they are both sublime, and both, I would say, concern as closely as possible, that is, what affects us most deeply, otherwise they would not affect us, they concern our soul. Yet at first glance, that does not concern our soul since extensive movement concerns the world, concerns space. Intensity, if it is true that it has its source in light, well yes, but we know well that our soul has a very close relationship with the world and that [intensity] has a very close relationship with light. It would still be necessary to show how that concerns our soul.

So, fine. And I'm saying, in both cases, there is something sublime, and finally, Kant can be our intermediary [*relai*]. Because, when I spoke of the sublime in Kant, I only spoke about half of it, and is it by chance that Kant distinguishes two forms of the sublime, and that he says, there is a sublime – he says, in his language, in his very rigorous terminology – he tells us: there is a mathematical sublime and there is a dynamic sublime? [Pause] And he adds: the simplest figure, the figure of the mathematical sublime, is the immense -- all that suits us greatly [Pause] -- and the simplest figure of the dynamic sublime is the deformed or formless. That suits us greatly. [Pause] Why?¹⁴

There is a very common expression in physics in the 17th and the 16th century, and it is deformedly deformed speed. Deformedly deformed speed refers to and is opposed to uniformly accelerated movement, which is a very simple case. On the other hand, speed is the intensive quantity of the extensive movement. Speed is, [*Deleuze coughs*] it's literally a distance, in the sense that I have just given to distance, it's a difference. It is an intensive notion, therefore, the deformed. The dynamic sublime is the deformed or the formless.

And he tells us, an example of the mathematical sublime: "the starry vault of the sky" – and again, not just any conditions; he will state the conditions, since he says everything – "the starry vault of heaven".¹⁵ You are the night, you raise... "and trembling, I raised the palm of my body..." -- it's a verse, it's a verse that suddenly I remember -- "and trembling, I raised trembling the palm of my body", but I don't know the rest, otherwise I would have recited it all to you. [*Laughter*] It's a very beautiful verse, well, I find it very beautiful.¹⁶ Well, you raise the palm of your body trembling, there, under "the starry vault of the sky". Either you are denatured or else you are invaded by the feeling of the sublime, but it's a mathematical sublime. Either you are facing the sea, facing the calm sea which is limited only by the horizon, and you experience the feeling of

the mathematical sublime. Right? Good.

But, but... -- [*Deleuze looks in his text*] because here, I don't want to, I can't substitute for the text which is so convincing -- but, any other case, and there you really feel that it isn't the same case. [*Pause*] "You find yourself facing formless mountainous masses, piled on top of each other in savage disorder", [*Pause*] or else you find yourself facing -- we will see why -- facing, "a dark raging sea, or else in the storm."¹⁷ It is no longer the starry celestial vault; it is the darkness from which a terrifying flash emerges. There you are, the sea in fury, the mountain in avalanche, the lightning in the dark sky. There you also experience the sublime, but you are not confused; there you are not mistaken, and you tell yourself: ah, that is a sublime dynamic. Earlier, you were saying: I'm fully within the mathematical sublime, good. What differences are there? Here, I'm making a long parenthesis which is uniquely on Kant. We are going to rest because this will provide us with a lot.

Well, the dynamic sublime, here we have the story of the dynamic sublime. Nature is unleashed, [*Pause*] yeah, it's catastrophe, nature as catastrophe, flood, fire, ocean raging, all that, catastrophe. Nature is unleashed, and what do you feel? That you are nothing, Kant says, that you are nothing. I, man, I am nothing. In other words, it's too strong for me. It's too strong for me. I mean, it's very simple. -- Personally, I find these pages from Kant prodigious because they have such simplicity, and it swells, you understand, it's really... in this respect, only music gives these, gives the same joys, the simplicity of a theme, for example, the simplicity of a musical theme, a very small theme, here, the simplicity of a motif and the way in which this motif will swell, will swell, will swell, and will offer something extraordinarily complex, an extraordinarily complex construction. In philosophy, you have exactly that. –

So, I find myself in this situation, the mountain, the avalanche, all that, the storm on a glacier, right, the storm on a glacier, and you feel that you are nothing. There are forces, there are unleashed forces, and yours are nothing compared to them. In other words, that falls upon you; it is not, it is not force, it is not intensity that you see that falls toward zero. It falls upon you, it reduces you to zero. It doesn't need to reach zero, since you are what it's reducing to zero. It's too strong for me. So, you are nothing. [*Pause*] Hence a kind of terror. Who are you? You, a human, insofar as you are captured in all your sensible faculties. Also, you fear for your life, you tremble for your days. Good.

But, but, but, but, at the same time, Kant says – his outline is very simple, and how beautiful it is -- Kant says, at the same time – we'll see under what conditions, not under just any conditions – at the same time that you feel your own strength reduced to zero by the enormity of the force in whose presence you are, you feel being born in you, or awakening, or taking action, a spiritual faculty which itself dominates nature, a spiritual faculty which dominates nature and which tells you – it is not you who says it – and which says within you: "that does my human life matter?" I mean, the sublime, it's made of all that, and if you tear off a piece, what does my human life matter? What does my human life matter? That is, I am nothing, I am nothing vis-à-vis nature, from the point of view of my sensible faculties, but nature in fury, I dominate you through my spiritual faculties. You can kill me; what does my death matter? And the raging ocean and the storm must awaken in you that spiritual faculty, from which, at the moment when you are reduced to zero by the forces of nature, you rise above nature in the form: my life has no

importance.

You don't seem convinced. [*Laughter*] Otherwise, I mean, there's no problem, otherwise you don't have the feeling of the sublime. See what Kant means: the feeling of "dynamic sublime" is made up of these two things: the way in which, facing an unleashed nature, you discover yourself as being zero from the point of view of your physical faculties, but where, at the same time, a faculty of the spirit awakens in you which makes you think about nature. And insofar as you think of nature, you think of it based on a spiritual faculty, therefore suprasensible, which makes you superior to this nature and which makes you say: "what does my life matter?", which makes you say, "It's God's will." Or, because Kant is very complicated, which perhaps makes you speak blasphemies, because in a strange text, Kant says: despair is also sublime when it is a rebellious despair; despair is also sublime when it's a rebellious despair, which means, literally, if I understand correctly, when it's not a despair out of fear, "ooh there, I'm going to die", but when it is a despair of revolt, that is, "God, I spit on you", etc. In any case, this is a faculty of the mind through which you think of nature and through which you present yourself as superior to the unleashed forces, in relation to which at the same time you are nothing from the point of view of your sensible faculties.

So obviously, Kant has, we could... Me, I think he does it on purpose because he has a lot of humor. We wouldn't notice it, in his texts, we wouldn't notice it, but when you look closely... No, there is a moment when obviously he's laughing. He says [*Deleuze laughs*], for my story to be sublime... it amounts to saying: for my story of the dynamic sublime to work, what is needed? Well, you have to be sheltered, [*Laughter*] and so, he finds it quite funny, and he will show, so he will make a theory of the need to be sheltered. And so, we can see it very clearly, like that, he shouldn't have gone out when there was a storm. [*Laughter*] And it's so beautiful, [*Pause*] and why? We must first understand why it is necessary. If I'm on the raging ocean, on my little boat, well, I can't follow this course of the dynamic sublime because I'm so scared -- Kant says it's normal -- I'm so scared, that only one thing counts, namely the feeling that I can do nothing such that the whole process, the whole process of the dynamic sublime is cut off. I find myself facing forces of nature, and the feeling that as a creature endowed with sensible faculties, I can do nothing. And if there were only that, there would be no sublime. So, if I am not sheltered, I cannot experience the sublime.

In fact, let's think about it. Let's be even more Kantian than Kant because, in my opinion, here he's being deliberately provocative. I can, even when I am in danger, I can achieve the dynamic sublime. I mean, not me, but there are people who have not ceased, in full danger, to reach for the dynamic sublime. [*Pause*] Yeah, that, I guess there are people, in catastrophes, who pretty much take this Kantian journey, and they're caught up in the catastrophe, the feeling that they're nothing, that their sensible forces are reduced to nothingness, are reduced to zero, since if intensity does not get reduced to zero, it reduces you to zero. Fortunately, it does not cease, you do not cease being reborn. And that's the instant, that's what the fundamental relationship with the instant is. And that's going to result in it providing a very particular time, intensity. You no longer know where you are within an intensity, that is, you are reduced to zero, always. But anyway, good, so you are reduced to zero in your sensible faculties, but at the same time, you feel a suprasensible faculty awakening within you, a spiritual faculty through which you are superior to nature.

So, you see, at the same time, nature is superior to you in its unleashing and reduces you to zero as being endowed with sensible faculties, but awakens in you a spiritual faculty, a suprasensible faculty through which you think of nature, and you say: “what does it matter, I’m standing up to you, because I am spirit”. Good, well, how many commanders have died at sea [*Laughter*] asserting that they have spiritual power? Not only in Victor Hugo,¹⁸ but in... there are some admirable ones, Melville’s commanders, there are strange commanders in Melville. Captain Ahab, Captain Ahab, is he sublime? Obviously, Captain Ahab is sublime, including, including in his revolted despair, since he is fundamentally revolted, since he competes with God. Alright, so every... [*Deleuze does not complete the sentence*]

And that doesn't prevent it obviously from being easier to follow... I would say that it's not impossible, when you're in danger, to follow the path of the dynamic sublime. We introduce this miniscule correction, which does not authorize us to say: Kant was mistaken. We are saying, Kant is enjoying himself here. For what pleases me greatly is his phrase... See, when we discover ourselves as a spiritual faculty, superior to nature itself, [*Pause*] he can say that we hold ourselves in esteem -- that's his way of speaking – we hold ourselves in esteem, not at all an egotistical esteem, but esteem insofar as being spiritual. We discover in ourselves the spiritual faculty, we hold ourselves in esteem. And here is the text: “This self-estimation loses nothing from the fact that we must find ourselves safe in order to feel this exciting liking” – he just explained that one had to remain on the shore to admire the ocean’s fury, and that at that moment, we feel ourselves born as a spiritual being, superior to nature – “This self-estimation loses nothing from the fact that we must find ourselves safe in order to feel this exciting liking, since the danger is not genuine” – in fact, when I am on the shore and I am certain there’s no boat, otherwise I feel pity, compassion, if I am certain there’s no one in danger, the fact that the danger is not taken as genuine, I’m not taking the danger as genuine, there’s no one, and I am well sheltered there, under my rock, everything is fine – “since the danger is not genuine does not imply, whatever it might seem, does not imply that what there is of the sublime in our spiritual faculty is not genuine.”¹⁹ That’s beautiful. Of course, I don't take danger seriously; I am safely sheltered. That does not prevent the fact that, through the intermediary of unleashed nature and the spectacle of unleashed nature, a spiritual faculty has awakened in me which makes me think of nature and which I take seriously.

Which allows Kant to say: but, you know, what is sublime is never nature, and that’s his great conclusion. What is sublime is necessarily the soul because nature is only the occasional object, it is only the occasion [*Pause*] under which the feeling of the sublime awakens in us. But the true object of the feeling of the sublime is the spiritual faculty which awakens in us. Therefore, nature has only the appearance of the sublime, but the essence of the sublime is the spiritual faculty which awakens in us on the occasion of the natural appearance. [*Pause*]

So, about this, you see, I’m insisting, I would say that the sublime dynamic is made up of the common feeling of three powers. Three powers intervene: the power of nature in the formless or the deformed; [*Pause*] the impotence of my being as a physical being, that is, I am reduced to zero; the power of my spiritual being which rises above nature as formless. [*Pause*] There we are, these are the three powers-impotencies, and compared to my power as a spiritual being, the power of nature was nothing, is nothing anymore. What does it matter if I die? The power of nature is now nothing. But compared to nature, my power as a physical being is now nothing.

You still have the theme of distance toward zero and of an order of time, of a power of time which marks, on the one hand, the infinite distance that there is between the force of nature and your physical being, and which marks, on the other hand, the infinite distance that there is between your faculty as a spiritual being and nature itself. In other words, this is a struggle between nature and spirit. Well, why draw such a boring conclusion? Obviously because we will need it later, the idea of a fundamental struggle as it is expressed in the dynamic sublime.

And, if you agree to go back a little bit to the mathematical sublime as we saw it the last time, well, you may remember, we can clearly see that, in a completely different form, there was something similar. How did Kant define the mathematical sublime? I remind you, that is, the one that corresponds to the immense, to the starry vault of the sky when the weather is fine, to the calm sea. He defined it by telling us exactly this: your imagination is overcome, that was the first characteristic of the mathematical sublime. Your imagination collides with a limit it cannot cross. Nature exceeds the limits of your imagination. Anything you want, see that? Place it immediately in parallel with, on the side of the sublime dynamic, nature reduces you to zero as a physical being. There, nature reduces your imagination to impotence. And why does it reduce your imagination to impotence? Because the spectacle it presents to you forces you to perpetually change units of measurement [*Pause*] and not be able to maintain the previous units when you get to the next ones. I won't go back over that because I think I commented on it in great detail. Your imagination cannot comprehend, as Kant says; its ability to comprehend is completely overwhelmed since it can't recall the previous units when you reach the next ones. In other words, something exceeds the power of your imagination: it's the immense.

Whereas in the purely mathematical evaluation of magnitudes, you can always convert one unit into another, and you can comprehend infinitely in the conceptual form of a number. But here, in the sublime, you are outside concepts. It is no longer about concepts, it is no longer about the concept of the sky/heaven; I mean, it is not about the sky as a science, such as astronomy, would analyze it. It concerns the analysis of the feeling of the sublime, that is, it concerns, as Kant says all the time, it concerns aesthetics and not science. For if you do the conceptual analysis of the sky, nothing else equals, obviously, the two structures of the sublime which belong to a completely different domain, namely, which belong to the domain of lived experience. So, your imagination encounters its limit, and this nature is pushed, this starry vault of the sky, it pushes your imagination to its limit, that is, it makes you experience the impotence of your imagination.

But at the same time -- see, there is coexistence of the two movements, the two analyses are very symmetrical -- but at the same time, this same nature, which reduces your imagination to impotence, requires your reason, [*Pause*] and convinces your reason, that is, your spiritual faculty, that there is a Whole of nature. [*Pause*] It is a Whole which is always an excess in relation to your strengths. It is a Whole that exceeds your strengths. It is a Whole which is a "too much" in relation to you as a sensible being; that is, the imagination cannot satisfy, your imagination as a sensible faculty cannot satisfy the requirement of your mind as a supersensible faculty. Your mind, facing the starry sky, demands that it be presented with a Whole of nature, and your imagination, which alone could provide the image of this Whole to the mind, cannot do so.

This is why Kant will always define the sublime as a disagreement, a discordance of our

faculties. Our faculties, instead... In everyday life, in the finite world, in the everyday world, our faculties never cease to be exercised harmoniously, without the deplorables, right... what we feel, we can touch, all that. What we imagine, we can remember, we can perceive, that's, that's... The sublime tears us away from ourselves. Why? Because it induces in our faculties a state of discordance. But you see that the two discordances, the mathematical discordance and the dynamic discordance, echo each other wonderfully, but they are not the same. In one case, you have a discrepancy... I would almost say that, in the case of the mathematical sublime, there is a sharp discordance between the two aspects of time, the interval and the Whole. *[Pause]* Your imagination reaches its limit which is not adequate to the Whole; it cannot cross [the limit], it is reduced to zero or, if you prefer, the interval gets shorter and shorter. But your mind continues to demand a presentation of the Whole of nature, the Whole being too much.

That's what I was trying to explain about... So, suddenly, coming back to cinema, the French school of cinema, when *[Abel]* Gance says things... Here, Gance's texts would be very beautiful because for Gance, this would be cinema of the mathematical sublime. You will tell me right away: objection, I suppose, objection. Precisely the storm, the storm, the railway accident in "La Roue" [1923], the storm in "Napoleon" [1927], okay. All right, things are always more complicated than people say. That doesn't prevent it from being a mathematical conception of the sublime. For a very simple reason, it's because what counts above all is movement, the Whole of movement. And I tried to explain the last times how the Whole of movement, he was trying to obtain it as much by polyvision, as by simultaneity, and by superimpositions. And in fact, superimposition, Gance's famous superimpositions -- when he tells us: I'm throwing 24 superimpositions at you, I know fully that you will not see them, but they will act on your soul -- this is exactly, this is exactly the Kantian theme. He goes so far as to say -- he attributes this to Nietzsche; I don't know which text by Nietzsche; it may be in Nietzsche -- he says: as Nietzsche says, it is the souls that envelop the bodies and not the reverse. It's the souls that envelop the bodies and not the reverse. This is because, in fact, although he's taking movement in space, what interests him is the relationship of movement in space with the soul. And I would say this is a conception, despite everything, of the mathematical sublime, namely, it is this "too much", or this excess in relation to our imagination that exists in time as Whole, or in the idea of a Whole of movement. With our imagination reduced to impotence, going beyond imagination and realizing oneself as a spiritual being, all that, Gance's texts, which are completely lyrical, completely, go entirely in this direction.

In the dynamic sublime, it's something else, you see; at the same time, it's quite comparable. Once again, I am reduced to zero as a physical being, and at the same time, a spiritual faculty awakens in me which reduces to zero that which reduces me to zero, which reduces this sensible nature to zero. Fine. I would say, then, in our own language, let's return to this: the mathematical sublime is the extensive sublime, and it's the relationship, I would say, it's exactly the relationship of the image-movement to the two aspects of time, the interval and the Whole. The dynamic sublime, I would say suddenly, is the relationship between intensive movement and time with a double aspect of time: the order of time, that is, time which plunges into the abyss, *[Pause]* and the instant. And this translates the soul and light, this time, just as earlier it was the soul and movement. For the dynamic sublime, in fact, in both cases, Kant will say that nature is only apparently sublime. The true sublime is the mind which affirms itself as a faculty through the sublime, through the sublime of nature, on the occasion of the sublime of nature, and in one

case, it is the soul which affirms itself as the soul of movement, and in the other case, it is the soul which affirms itself as the soul of light... [*Interruption of the recording*]

... its side, its side, its too rational side would have to be suppressed. It would have to be taken almost much more in the direction of the imperative since, in this time, in fact, we cross the moment, we reach moment zero, we are reduced to nothing, even if it means then becoming the distance infinite. And there, we obviously circulate following an order of time. But what is this order? This is very different from our previous aspects of time.²⁰ It's as if, it's not... On the one hand, it's no longer the variable present, it's the instant. But what is the instant? -- Here, I'm really stating things in the simplest way. -- The instant, or the lived instant, is the presentiment that something which is posited as future, in a reflective way, is in fact already here. This is the instant.

You live an instant moment when, at the same time, I would say, you posit something as to come, that is, eventual or probable or certain, and you discover, in another way, you discover that it is already here. In other words, the instant is before [*en deçà*] the future. It's what precedes the future, in what sense? I could just as well say: it is the imminence of the future. Well, no, well, no, it's not at all far off, that's it, it's already here. At that moment, you are living an instant. Ah no, it's not tomorrow; oh, I thought it was tomorrow. No, it's here, it's now. Good. Imminence, the substitution of imminence for the future, that's what the instant is. Good. Does that happen to us all the time, for example, a feeling of death? I'm not choosing the happiest [example], but earlier that was very... or else, the feeling that it's already there.

So, in old age, we have that; in old age, then, this time, it's the reverse. Through a rational faculty, we think of death in the future, but somewhere, we know very well that it was already here. It is already [here], well yes, not for you, but for me, it is already here. Ah yes, well, I think it's... but that's not true, fine. Understand? It's really the future's substitution with a before [*en deçà*] of the future, of an "on this side" of the future, an imminence. We very rarely have it; it's exactly as if someone, I have the feeling that there is something, someone behind my back, and I say, oh well, he's already here. But it's already here, right, all that, it's already over. In a way, it's already over.

But what comes along with that? There is a compensation. It's that, at the same time as the future gives way to imminence, which is something completely different from the future, it's something completely different from the future, it's really on this side of the future. Do you think it's for tomorrow? In fact, it's already here. It's the "already here" of the future, right, imminence, and, in the same movement, an infinite retreat of the past. That's also the instant, it's the two phases of the instant: it substitutes the imminent for the future, that is, a before of the future, and it constitutes itself as a beyond the past, it tears open the past. That is, what happened yesterday seems centuries ago to you, centuries ago. You see someone, or you remember, what happened two years ago, you remember, and it's the same feeling of aging. Aging has both of them. You see someone you saw eight days ago, you tell yourself: no, no, it's not possible; it's as if it's been centuries, all that is over, all that is over. It's not, it's not sad, right, it's not sad at all.

It is a beyond of the past, a before of the future, the contamination of both. It's as if time there had entered a corner in time that knocked it off its hinges. The infinitely distant past, the future,

which is as if reversed, right? So, we will no longer speak, at the level of this time, of intensity; we will no longer speak of the immensity of the future and the past. We will speak, on the contrary, of this kind of disjunction between an immemorial and an imminent, an immemorial, that is, a beyond of the past, an imminent, a before of the future. And it would be this, this kind of order of time, this order of time with, as a correlate, the instant. Fine, it's possible.

But it remains for us to see, then, what would this order of time be, always in relation to light. We have just discovered that light, just like movement, movement has a fundamental concern with the soul, and light has a fundamental concern with the soul, in one case in the form of intensive movement, in the other case, in the form of the extensive movement. What we need is really, really to manage to create for intensive movement what we've done, that is, to imagine. Let us try to imagine the story of the relations between light and the soul, it being said that these relations are going to be very precisely the content of our image of time, namely of this intensive time which emerges from light, or of the intensive composition that emerges from intensive movement. I mean, the whole journey of relations of soul and light is going to constitute the time of intensity. So, if that's what it is, what would happen? We would have to reach something as complete as what we tried to do for extensive movement.

And fortunately, I was saying, it seems to me that we find elements that will jump across history. At the beginning of the 17th century, [there's] this bizarre author I was telling you about, Jakob Böhme, Jakob Böhme, who tells us a very, very, very important story about the soul and light, since it will animate all of German Romanticism, and in particular, a philosopher called [Friedrich] Schelling, and just before, Goethe who, knowing Jakob Böhme very well, and who is concerned with the same problems of the soul and of light, since that's what "Faust" is, [Pause] the Romantic problem of the spirit of evil, that's it. [Pause] That's part of it all, right, "Faust". Goethe had written his *Treatise on Colors*, and his treatise on color is one of the greatest texts on colors as degrees of light, and the book ends on the relationship between color and soul.

And finally, if we try to connect cinema, just as we had for Gance, obviously, [there's] German Expressionism, which never ceased to take up the same story, namely: the light-image. For they're the ones interested in light over movement, and they're the ones for whom movement, however strong they push it, and God, how they push it in all directions, and for them, movement is subordinate to light; movement is only there to produce effects of light. This is precisely the opposite of the French school which, it seems to me, establishes the subordination of light to movement. [Deleuze coughs]

And they will come back to the problems, not of color, why? For a very simple reason. They will do it their way. I mean, it turns out that the whites and blacks of Impressionism [Deleuze means *Expressionism*] make up all the colors, make up all the colors, in what way? Does it make up all the colors? It composes at least one color, and that of Expressionism, sorry, and that's where Expressionism has always recognized itself in its favorite color, namely red. And why do they obtain red effects? And why did one of the greatest Expressionists [Deleuze coughs] himself consider that his problem with light, or one of his problems with light, was producing red? Producing invisible red, producing red, that's Murnau.

To make light sparkle, and to make it sparkle in such a way that the characters are captured as if

in a kind of reddish brilliance, reddish brilliance, which will be that, well, which will be that of the spirit of evil par excellence, namely: Nosferatu on luminous background, Nosferatu on a background of light, a silhouette, like a kind of flattened silhouette on a background of light. Why is this, why is this brilliance of the image in Murnau? I think it's the..., of all film authors, he's the one who has achieved the most, or who made the most of light, really a brilliance, a phosphorescence, you know. And all the more so, in his "Faust" [1926], where precisely the reddishness of the light, the red light, there, takes on a meaning... good. But, do we... I mean, we have to start all over again because at that point, you have to enter into the problem of the light-spirits relationships – the words don't matter when I say -- soul, spirit.

And I'm saying that Böhme – we'll stop soon, you should be able to take a bit more, right? -- and I'm saying that Böhme was beginning, he was beginning a very, very curious story in which he told us more or less: well, here it is, God is light -- I'm outlining greatly, right, as much as I was attached to Kant's specifics, here, Böhme, I'm trying to extract themes that you also find in Schelling – God is light, only there you are, light – hey, that should tell us something – that's what we don't see. Light is what we do not see. It is the most hidden, it is the most buried. Light is God, but the God is the hidden.

I would say, if I was trying to establish my propositions, here is the initial proposition. You will tell me, but what does that mean, are they mystics? Not at all; as we have seen, that means an extremely simple thing: light by itself and in its state of diffusion -- this is considered in a certain way by Bergson --, light in its state of pure diffusion, it's by nature invisible. It is all the more invisible because there is no eye to see it. There is nothing. It diffuses, but it is not only because there is no eye. As long as light diffuses, it is invisible. What makes it visible? Remember -- and here in my opinion, it's obvious that Bergson was only making more rational, expressing more rationally this vision of German Romanticism – well, what makes light visible is when it collides with an opaque body which reflects it and refracts it. Otherwise, purely diffuse light is invisible. In other words, light becomes visible when it hits a black screen, Bergson tells us.

So, let's accept this as a very old theme, which you can interpret theologically, which you can interpret metaphysically, which you can interpret poetically, which you can interpret scientifically. No matter, at this level of science, it is not very complicated in fact. It makes sense on its own. Light becomes visible when it collides with an opaque body which reflects it. It's not complicated. There we are.

So, this is what he tells us, this is what Böhme tells us: God is light, [*Pause*] but by that very fact, [God] does not manifest itself. It [God] is not because it is light that it manifests itself; it is because it is light that it does not manifest itself, it is because it is light that it is the invisible. But insofar as it is light, it is possessed by something which is not to be confused with it, but which is deepest in it, which is not itself, but which is what Böhme already calls the "depthless within it" [*sans-fond en lui*], and the depthless within it, it's the will to manifest itself. In all of this, Hegel is not far off. The depthlessness of God is the will to manifest itself. God is the unmanifest light, but the depthlessness of God is the will to manifestation. Alright, well, that's the first moment. How beautiful the world was in that era! God only had to do... [*Deleuze does not finish the sentence*]

A second moment, it's the wrath of God, what Böhme calls the wrath of God. I am angry, namely, God is going to oppose pure opacity, that is, dark shadows [*ténèbres*], to move on to its own manifestation. [Pause] And the wrath of God is the act by which God or light sets up darkness as a condition of its manifestation. At that moment, and in relation to this darkness which opposes light, it seems that the light becomes white. The wrath of God is the confrontation of white and black. The light has become white in relation to dark shadows. This is the first manifestation.

You will tell me, there, it's still not very scientific. Yes and no. In fact, it takes on a very mystical appearance, this thing which opposes itself a limit to manifest itself, this light which is..., etc., but you can translate it very easily: it is in fact the passage from light to the opposition pair: white and black. Black will be darkness, darkness in its pure state; white will be light in relation to this darkness. That's it, but for the moment, nothing is manifesting; these are the conditions of the manifestation. [Pause]

I'm just saying, a third moment – quickly, so you can catch up if necessary, and we'll leave it at that -- for something to manifest -- everything is ready, for manifestation -- but for something to manifest, what does it take? It takes a little more than the conditions of the manifestation. The darkness needs to lighten a little bit under the light, [Pause] and the white, the opposite of darkness, needs white to darken a little bit under the darkness.²¹ When white darkens a little under the darkness, you have yellow which is an obscuring, a darkening of the white. When the black of the shadows fades a little bit, you have blue, which is a fading of black. [Pause] Yellow and blue are the form of the manifestation of things; things manifest as yellow or as blue. Yellow and blue race the outline of things. This third stage is the stage of what Schelling will splendidly call "the outline" [*le contour*], or "egoism". [Pause] Selfishness is things that are like "I"'s, that have outlines. One more effort, which will show us everything, and then you'll think about it.

You've faded the black, fourth step. It turns out that you cannot stop, because it always turns out, ever since light wanted to manifest, it was the movement of intensity, the intensive movement as such. [Pause] So white and black, yellow and blue, were degrees caught in this movement, but you can't stop. This movement is inseparable from an intensification of terms. What will the intensification be? The intensification of blue, that's well known, it's... Rather what happens when a color is intensified, when you apply several layers, when you bring it to completion? There, for once, the physical experiences, everyone agrees, the experiences... more and more there emerges, emerges a glimmer, a reflection, a brilliance, which can be called "reddish" [*rougeâtre*]. And in the intensification of blue, you have the formation of a brilliance which will be called "blue-red", and in the intensification of yellow, you have a brilliance which will be called "yellow-red".

And at the outcome of the intensification of the two, you have what? You have a red which is neither yellow nor blue, which we will call purple, to give it a special name, which we will call purple, which does not exist in the rainbow, since the blue-red and the yellow-red do not intersect, but which exists in chemistry and in dyeing, in which the dyer and the chemist hold a secret, which is what? Which is not that of nature, which is the secret of the spirit. Red, red is the secret of the spirit since it is the intensification of the two optical colors, and the formation of the two, I would say, physical colors, blue and yellow, and the formation of a third color, which is

the spiritual color, red. [Pause] But you see that this is tragic because what's red going to be? It's going to be the blaze of colors, and it's going to be the blaze of the world, and it's going to be fire in a pure state, or it's going to be the spirit of evil, signed Mephisto, or signed Nosferatu. And it is through the spirit of evil that the spirit penetrates the world.

Oh, well then... So, there we are, this is just so you might think about this, [Laughter] right? Fine, we'll come back to this next time. [End of the recording] [2:43:03]

Notes

¹ See the discussion of Murnau and Wim Wenders in *The Movement-Image*, pp. 22-24.

² On Wenders, see session 10 of the Cinema seminar 1, February 23, 1982.

³ On Burch's analysis, see *The Movement-Image*, pp. 46-47; Deleuze talks about this mobility effect in the previous session, March 22, 1983.

⁴ Here begins the omission of 3 paragraphs on the Paris 8 and WebDeleuze sites.

⁵ See *The Movement-Image*, p. 24, where Deleuze quotes Bazin, *Qu'est-ce que le cinéma?* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1958).

⁶ On Gilbert Simondon and modulation, see the session in the A Thousand Plateaus IV seminar, February 27, 1979; see also session 5 in the seminar on Painting, May 12, 1981, where Deleuze refers to Simondon's text *L'individu et sa genèse physico-biologique* (Paris: PUF, 1964); Deleuze addresses the molding-modulation distinction in *The Movement-Image*, pp. 23-24, and note 21.

⁷ Here the transcription on the Paris 8 and WebDeleuze sites resumes.

⁸ Notably, see session 2, November 23, 1982.

⁹ Here begins, on the one hand, part 2 of the transcription on the Paris 8 site and, on the other hand, in part 1, 30 minutes of omitted text, although contained (yet misplaced) in part 2.

¹⁰ This may be a reference Session 10 of the Cinema seminar 1, February 23, 1982.

¹¹ Although Deleuze pronounces this term as presented here, Messiaen's composition is written "Chronochromie" (1958).

¹² On this vague reference, see session 12 of the seminar on Spinoza, March 10, 1981, where Deleuze attributes this quotation, without exact source, to Diderot.

¹³ Deleuze develops this reference to "Hamlet" in several texts and seminars, notably in sessions 5 and 12 of Cinema seminar 3, December 13, 1983 and February 28, 1984; see also the seminar on Kant, session 5; in *Essays Critical and Clinical*, trans. Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco (1993; Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), "On Four Poetic Formulas That Might Summarize The Kantian Philosophy", pp. 27-35; finally, see *The Time-Image*, pp. 40-41, 112, 270-271.

¹⁴ On the sublime and the formless, see *The Movement-Image*, pp. 53-54.

¹⁵ Kant, *Critique of Judgment*, Book B, para. 29.

¹⁶ See the poem by Paul Fort, "Le bercement du monde" [*The lulling of the world*] in which this verse appears, at the poem's end: "Je me tenais debout entre les genêts d'or, dans le soir où Dieu jette un grand cri de lumière... et je levais tremblant la palme de mon corps vers cette grande Voix qui rythme l'Univers" [I was standing between the golden broom trees, in the evening where God threw a great cry of light... and trembling I raised the palm of my body toward the great Voice that rhythms the Universe].

¹⁷ Critique of Judgment, Book B, para. 26 [in fact, para. 29, in "General Comment on the Exposition of Aesthetic Reflective Judgment"].

¹⁸ No doubt, in Hugo's *Les Travailleurs de la mer* (1864) and *Quatre-Vingt-Treize* (1874).

¹⁹ Kant, *The Critique of Judgment*, Book II, Part B, para. 28. While I begin this quote with the translation by Werner S. Pluhar, *Critique of Judgment* (Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Co., 1987), p. 121, I follow Deleuze's enunciation of the paragraph which seems to depart from the sense of Pluhar's translation: "This self-estimation

loses nothing from the fact that we must find ourselves safe in order to feel this exciting liking so that (as it might seem), since the danger is not genuine, the sublimity of our intellectual ability might also not be genuine.”

²⁰ On the order of time, see *The Time-Image*, pp. 273-276.

²¹ Here ends both part 1 and part 2 of the transcription on Paris 8 and WebDeleuze.