



GILLES DELEUZE

Foucault

SEMINAR AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS,
VINCENNES-ST. DENIS, 1985-1986

LECTURE 25
27 MAY 1986

TRANSCRIBED BY ANNABELLE DUFOURCQ
TRANSLATED BY BILLY DEAN GOEHRING

I

And I'm just coming back to my answer... the answer I gave to... to somebody... obviously, what I'm offering you is an interpretation of Foucault's thought. But what do I mean by interpretation? For me, to interpret... I think it's beautiful how Heidegger puts it, that all interpretation is an act of violence. For me, to interpret means, strictly speaking, two things. It means uncovering an author's original concepts, and as I've often said, concepts are particular to philosophy no less than colors are to painting, or lines. You wouldn't confuse one of Mondrian's lines with one of... of Kandinsky's. Likewise, you do not confuse the concepts surrounding one philosopher with the concepts of another. Even if you can draw a connection between both of their concepts—just as you can between a painter's lines and those of some other painter—I mean that major concepts are signed, and I see philosophy as a creative task. It's a question of creating new concepts as they're needed. Not according to social requirements but ones that are arguably deeper.

Thus, to talk about a philosopher is necessarily to interpret them, to the extent that it involves drawing out the new concepts they were able to invent. These concepts are sometimes designated by well-known common nouns, despite having radically new meanings. Sometimes they're designated by less familiar common nouns. By that I mean common nouns which take on new senses. Sometimes it's necessary—but why is it suddenly necessary? We have to look in each case—sometimes it's necessary to coin a word, a new name. So, throughout my lecture, I reckon this year we've covered a few concepts that I picked out as concepts original to Foucault. The second way I understand “interpretation” is as mapping out the lines, following a certain order—this order can be very complex, but you have to choose one, at any rate—to map out the lines that tie these concepts together and to other concepts from other philosophers who are especially relevant to the philosopher under consideration. You see, for me... I say “for me” not because I feel I'm right but because I want to be clear—I'm not saying that everyone understands interpretation this way. For me, interpretation is absolutely not the search for what something means.

I understand interpretation to mean uncovering conceptual nodes, or conceptual creations,¹ and mapping out how concepts are connected to each other. So, maybe today and next time, for those who want to come... I think the only reason to come in would be if you

¹ “Conceptual design” is a common translation for this phrase, but given Deleuze's frequent description of philosophy as a creative endeavor, “creation” might be more appropriate.



had something to say about your work [?]. There are two sorts of things you can bring me, plus whatever else you come up with. The first thing you can say is “Personally, I see things differently.” That is, you’ll say, “Foucault has some very original concepts that you’ve overlooked,” or “There are some links between concepts that you missed.” It might be on particular aspects or on the whole. Then I’d say you’d be offering a different interpretation. And I believe that not all interpretations are worthwhile; an interpretation’s criterion, what makes it better than another, is its richness—it isn’t its inherent truth [but] its richness, its weight; it’s its weight. Just as one talks about the weight of a color, concepts have weight. You’d have to define a concept’s coordinates... I mean, if we’re talking about color, one talks about... about light, saturation, and weight. In music, you have other criteria. In philosophy, you’d have to define the coordinates of a concept. Are we talking about the concept’s weight like we talk about the weight of a color? Do we mean that a concept is saturated? Uh... so on, and so forth... But really, that’d be a different analysis.

So, of course what I want from you is to say, in general or in particular, not that “there’s something wrong” [with my account], since that’d hurt my feelings, but that there’s something important that I failed to see. That’s all. Well... but I’ll back up even further, while I have a few of you who—legitimately—understand interpretation totally differently and who’d say that my take on interpretation, as I’ve just tried to describe it, is insufficient and shouldn’t abandon the question “What does it mean?” For my part, you see, if I’m leaving the question, “What does it mean?” aside, it’s because “what it means” strictly depends on the novelty of the invented concepts and chains of concepts, and it will always mean [what it means] according to the concepts invented. That’s why I say that the true reversal, for me... in my opinion it holds for all philosophy, again, that concepts are signed. You can’t say “I think” without referring to Descartes and without drawing from Descartes’s world. And if you transform it as much as Kant did, then you create a new concept, but this new concept traces a line you have to account for: in what sense it derives from Descartes and in what way Kant transforms it. That means something very simple: proper nouns never designate people; proper nouns name operations, either of nature or of the mind. There is a lot to console us in that, since we are [?] of proper nouns, but we are not people.

II

How do you recognize it? You recognize it by the need... Then, how do you recognize that it’s a new concept? It... How do you recognize concepts... it comes back to working with coordinates. Thus, that’s what I want from you—maybe a little today and then next time. If you have nothing to say, then hey—I won’t have anything to say, either. So, we’ll meditate in silence. And then today... it’s just... yes, because there are some small things I had to skip, because I got too caught up in my schema last time... uh... I do have some things... so, a line, I said there was a line from Foucault between Foucault and Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, around this business of the fold and the unfold. I’d like to take this opportunity, perhaps, to say very briefly and even very vaguely since [?] my subject... you see that I already... I have nothing else to say, so uh... I’ll force myself a bit and try to discuss the relationship between this business of the fold and the unfold... well, it doesn’t seem to me very [?]. And... and well, in the same vein, I asked one of you who, by the way, suggested that we take a look at... Anyway, it’s someone contemporary with Foucault, Pierre Boulez, uh... and who Foucault knew very well and Boulez knew Foucault very well uh... There’s a piece or rather a set of pieces of Boulez which are titled *Fold by Fold*. And I thought, hey now! If there was someone competent among us—and I have to say that this year we’ve had so many great talents... I’ve



always been very pleased with Paris VIII audiences, but rarely do we have... I can now say at the year's end that I've been teaching people of whom I feel most know Foucault's writing as well as I do. That's been very, very special to me and a sort of force...

But I was saying, we have this work, *Fold by Fold*, and Boulez borrows the expression, "fold by fold" from a poem by Mallarmé; and he calls it *Fold by Fold* and the pieces, this complex piece by Boulez, is built around three great Mallarmé poems, two to a lesser extent, right—yes?

Speaker: [?]

Deleuze: That's it, yes, the title...

Speaker: [?]

Deleuze: Okay, yes—

Speaker: [?]

Deleuze: The three "Improvisations"...

Speaker: [?]

Deleuze: Ah, I forgot "The Tomb" [?] ! Uh... then, it's not music based on a few Mallarmé poems, it's... Few musicians, I think, have reflected as much as Boulez has on the musical text/poetic text relationship. So, when he borrows—we'll see under what conditions—when he borrows from Mallarmé for the main title of this work, *Fold by Fold*, it must be noted that he takes it out of its context—the Mallarméan context being very interesting, we'll see, but also very precise—no doubt, he removes it from its context... perhaps, perhaps it's that he wants to highlight the fold of poetry and that of music; perhaps he wants to highlight something about the poem-music relationship. It's not about adding something to Mallarmé's poems, which weren't lacking anything—Boulez is the first to realize it and to say it... Ah yes! It may be an operation, then, that would consist in a little folding—why? To what end? Maybe if we get a handle on that, we'll have no problem jumping ahead, we'll be able to jump ahead and recall some things Heidegger told us about the nature of the fold, since Heidegger's the one who made the fold a philosophical concept. Which would let us come back to Foucault who, when he gets his hands on the notion of the fold, maybe handles it in another way that, by the way, wasn't missed on either Boulez or Heidegger. So then I don't at all know how it's going to go, if it's going to work, if we're going to listen uh... You've chosen certain clips... What do you have in mind? Listen for a bit? And then you try to explain your selection...?

Speaker: ? short presentation...

Deleuze: Okay, yes, yes.

Speaker: *Fold by Fold* is the title...

Deleuze: You speak loudly... I feel, so we'll need for you and me to switch places... is that okay?

Speaker: [?] I move there like that, I could....

Deleuze: Okay, yes. But if we can't see you, we can't hear you turned around; you can't really hear someone from behind. You can do the opposite: have us listen first and then talk after. Maybe the shock of listening to it is good, too.

Speaker: ?

Deleuze: There, that's good. [Chair sounds]. [Commotion]

Deleuze: One has the right... it's private, eh? It's not public. Anyway, surely [?] everywhere [?] laugh. [Commotion]

Deleuze: And you have every right, if you find the music too beautiful, we'll stop there, and we won't talk anymore... [?] [Commotion]

Speaker: We will begin with the first piece of [?]

Deleuze: "The Gift", that is!



Speaker: The first piece [?] Mallarmé's poem.

Deleuze: Right. For those who know Mallarmé, I'll remind you, it's [?] [First movement: *Le Don*]

Speaker: ? [inaudible] ... It's the only time where Boulez allowed for us to hear the text perfectly... The singer has the choice between talking in a low voice [?]... first part which shows his interest in leaving some room for chance, for the aleatory. [?] And the much more eventful upper group with more agitated interventions. [?]... Boulez didn't want a fixed organization... [?] And this part ends on a fermata... [?] the soprano's return in the movement. [?] There a good deal is left up to the soloist's prerogative [?] and in the obligatory [?] she sometimes can choose between several solutions and it's normally up to the instrumentalist to decide, up to the prerogative of [?]. The references are, in order, first, to the sonnet corresponding to "Improvisation III", second, to the sonnet corresponding to "Improvisation II", and third, to the sonnet corresponding to "Improvisation I" [?]. And "The Gift" ends with a third and final part which, there again, appeals to choice [?]. The orchestra is divided in two levels: the upper lever and the lower level [?]. ... in five parts: A B C D E. So that gives us: in the upper part A B C D E [?] and in the interior of [?] the conductor chooses the trajectory that he wants to take. Then, basically, there are some rules that intervene, i.e. the whole of the [?] and the succession of letters in a line should be respected, that is to say, well, you can play A B; then, if you want to leave this line and go to A, you're required to eventually work back up to C, but you can't get to D or E. Thus [?] you're forced to fall back down to B, you can eventually play BC and climb up to D, and the two E parts are required to be played together. So, Boulez determined six possible trajectories by leaving it up to the conductor to choose which trajectory to carry out.²

Deleuze: I would just like... a side note... if you'll let me? You find it... and you'll find this everywhere in contemporary music—the blending of two sorts of rules. I'm trying to connect back up with our discussion. You constantly find in contemporary music the blending of actually binding rules with optional rules. On several points he's already laid out certain rules for the singer: she can speak the lyric, she can sing it... There you have a very good example where you have a blend of rules in which some are binding and some are optional. And that, in current music—I'm also thinking of Bériot, for example—you find... uh... Recall how, in a completely different context, of course, in Foucault, there is this game of binding rules and optional rules even at the level of statements.³ Yet [?] musical statements that present this complex of rules very different from each other. And that's all I wanted to add...

Speaker: [?] He employs [?] pure chance [?]

Deleuze: Yes, never! Never.

Speaker: ... in any event, to preserve the conductor's or the soloist's ability to choose [?] But the choice should be determined by a person; it's not the intervention of pure chance.

Deleuze: And it's forced, eh? The difference—you're absolutely right—the difference [?] Boulez in this regard, it's forced; there can't be pure chance...

² I've tried to translate this as transcribed, but Deleuze and the presenter, in particular, refer to sheet music and/or other diagrams/notation of Boulez's composition. I don't know how much of it comes out in what we're given here, but Emily Adamowicz's dissertation offers an excellent account of the "rotational array" described above—her work is replete with helpful diagrams and musical notation. Cf. Emily J. Adamowicz, "A Study of Form and Structure in Pierre Boulez's *Pli selon Pli*," *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository* 3133 (2015).

³ I'm flagging this—since I'm sure there will be an editorial decision made on "énoncé."



III

Deleuze: What's funny is that, at the same time, he moves back closer to Cage; this represents Boulez's step towards... reunion with Cage.

Speaker: ?

Deleuze: Yes, yes, yes, yes!

Speaker: ?

Student Question: ?

Speaker: [?] the soprano comes back here, and the previous page, Boulez marked [?], in other words, the whole orchestra is then led by the conductor. In that case, things respect the hierarchical organization. And then, when it comes to the soprano's intervention, she takes syllables from verses [?]. And there, she has a choice to make between three columns: either AAA, BBB, or CCC. But she has to distribute them uh... over time in two [?]. She has an optional insert [?]

Question: [?]

Speaker: so, when she sings, she of course has her own line with notes [?]

Question: Her line is independent?

Speaker: Her line is independent. There, the orchestra is no longer divided in blocs but is reunited [?] a resonance that supports the soprano's voice, at least makes the words more intelligible—not a lot, but more so than with the whole orchestra scattered [?] would mask the soprano's voice.

Question: [?]

Speaker: To a certain extent, yes—ultimately, I'd say yes. In the end, one would have to ask Boulez [?]

Question: [?]

Speaker: I don't know, that might be less clear, since the structures aren't the same; there, it is the lyrics that intervene and... [?] of the soprano, whereas previously, the music is written out entirely, there isn't [?] movement between the three blocs... [?]

Deleuze: I'd like to... we don't have unlimited time, I mean, unfortunately; I'd almost like for you to choose another piece, if it were possible, another passage... Myself, I'm struck by the questions [?] on the singer's role that I think you only partially answered, since there are actually several instances in what you played for us... where the words... the point is that she casts words, and there are [types of] word-casting with very different functions uh... already it seems to me, in what you said and what you played for us, there is a lot... there is a lot to reflect on. So I'd almost like, if you wouldn't mind, for you to do the same thing, only with another piece. For you to forget those who are already interested or familiar, or what you can gather from reading Mallarmé's poems, and so on. We'll say what we have to for the books, the book that will help you, and so on... not difficult. So, we'll act a little as though it said something differently to everyone. So you take either "The Tomb,"⁴ if you like, or something of... an improvisation...

Speaker: I think we would have to listen to an improvisation, regardless, because it's delicate... one can [?]

Deleuze: Okay, which improvisation?

Speaker: [?]

Deleuze: Okay, is it "This virginal long-living lovely day"? That's right, yes.

Speaker: Well, I think it might be best to listen (...)



Deleuze (interrupting the recording): Uh... could you... could you stop and rewind... is that possible?

Speaker: [?]

Deleuze: No, no, no, no! The tempo that I read the poem because it really changes if you've... I'll read it plainly, alright, so that you'll hear the sonorities, otherwise it's... [Deleuze reads:]

“This virginal long-living lovely day
will it tear from us with a wing's wild blow
the lost hard lake haunted beneath the snow
by clear ice-flights that never flew away!

A swan of old remembers it is he
superb but strives to break free woebegone
for having left unsung the territory
to live when sterile winter's tedium shone.

His neck will shake off this white throe that space
has forced the bird denying it to face,
but not the horror of earth that traps his wings.

Phantom imposed this place by his sheer gleam,
he lies immobile in scorn's frigid dream
worn by the Swan dismissed to futile things.”⁵

That's it... now you might have a better idea... Let's...

Speaker: [?]

Deleuze: You already grasp—because the poem, “This virginal long-living lovely day,” is an extraordinary demonstration of voice (...)

Speaker: Then, in this first improvisation [?] see to what extent the form of Mallarmé's sonnet influenced the improvisation's musical form. [?] The division's aren't mine; it's indicated on the score—it's Boulez. The first quatrain, then, he puts at zero. At A, an instrumental interlude. At B, the second quatrain. At C [?]. At D, the tercet. At E, the third interlude. [?] At F, the second tercet. And at G, one can't call it an interlude, but a coda, an instrumental coda. So the divisions are very clean since, in the interludes, the voice doesn't intervene at all, at any time. These are purely instrumental passages. So, if we follow the alternation, we can eventually divide the piece in two groups—one which would go from zero to C, the other which would go from D to G—which would each alternate between instrument-and-voice, instruments-only, instrument-and-voice, instruments-only. [?] That's one form of the piece's organization. It's one possible reading, but there are others. [?] One can see the different parts as organized by tempo [?]. At B, moderate. At C, very slow. At D, again, not too slow. [?] Not too slow at F and at G, very slow. Then, with one exception, one could have another mode of organization, which would be the following: [?]. If someone is working on the instrumentation of the different parts [?] in his work on Boulez [?] four possible instrumentations: he called the first *alpha*, [?] instrumental composed of [?]. Instrumentation *beta* has vibraphone and harp on A, and vibraphone, harp, and gong on E. And

⁵ Stéphane Mallarmé, *Collected Poems and Other Verse*, trans. E.H. and A.M. Blackmore, introduction by Elizabeth McCombie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 66-69.



instrumentation *gamma* is [?]. So if we drew up a third schema... can I erase one? [?] would reveal the arch shape, rather traditional in [?]. By taking middle part, C, as the peak of the arch, as the form's culminating point. [?] Let's still consider Part C, then, as a coda. [?] So, these different forms aren't uh... coexist. All are possible readings. [?] the plurality of discourse that emerges.

Question from the audience: [?]

Speaker: [?]

Question: That—it's called improvisation?"?

Speaker: It's called improvisation.

Question: [?]

Speaker: No, no, no, [?] no room for randomness. Well, what it is, is that there are effectively two versions. A first version [?]. The grand version [?] by Boulez so that it pairs with "Improvisation III" when the work is played in its [?]. In that case, there's a correspondence. [?] "Improvisation I" goes with "Improvisation III," and "Improvisation II" would be the center of the form [i.e. the arch]. But there isn't any room for randomness...

Question: [?]

Speaker: [?]

Deleuze: I think that seems like enough, right? You've given us a very rich subject. A lot to think about.

Speaker: [?]

Deleuze: Yeah, thankfully, because, if you had, it's not what I wanted, in any case; what I wanted was for... nobody wanted that.

Speaker: [?] something to think about...

Deleuze: Yeah, that's exactly what I had in mind and I think you did it very, very well, that is, we are all... thanks to you, we have material where we can... I wouldn't dare say "analyze in a different way"—neither is it a question of analyzing it philosophically—but [we can] think about the subject with which I began: *Fold by Fold*. I'd almost say that we have a good case here, thanks to you. But where are the folds? And what does it mean to "fold"? And what does it mean to "unfold"? What does "fold by fold" mean? What do "fold and unfold" mean as artistic or philosophical gestures? Personally, you know, it occurred to me, while I was listening, that somebody might be able to—it's not my thing, I mean—but really, I wondered whether a Heideggerian could comment along these lines on Heidegger's main take on the fold and the unfold; in other words, he could render it as a musical presentation. It should exist, after all, because some Heideggerian musicians uh... He is very close... I mean, a comparison between a great musician, [?] force [sic] example, with Heidegger would be as valuable as a comparison between Boulez and Mallarmé. Now, in my opinion, one would be surprised to see that, once again, the fold and the unfold are presented as creative acts... or something else, other operations, eh, other operations.... that's what... So, at least you had something to add... thanks to you, we can dwell a little on this point.

Speaker: [?]

Deleuze: Yes, there, we don't need to hear any more... I mean, with regard to the text you're reading, we don't need to listen to anymore. I mean it's the text, *Points de repère*⁶... Right, yes, it's the same text. Yes. Yes, yes, yes because he did it deliberately. The text is so far from the music that...

Speaker: [?]

Deleuze: Right, right.

Speaker: [?]

⁶ I assume that this refers to Pierre Boulez, *Points de repère* (Paris: Christian Bourgois, 1981).



Deleuze: Ah.... Tell us! Do you have it with you? Give us the rundown. Is it a long article?⁷

Speaker: A column.

Deleuze: You've marked the important passages? Right? Oh, it's long. (Laughs). I mean, it's long, it's not... uh... You've read it... you have...do you have another copy, or is that your copy? Does it say anything essential?

Speaker: In this paragraph, here...

Deleuze: You found it?

Speaker: There's something

Deleuze: This? This one?

Speaker: Yes, that one.

Deleuze: "During a time in which we were being taught the privileges of meaning, of the lived through [*du vécu*], the sensuous [*du charnel*], of foundational experience [*de l'expérience originnaire*], subjective contents or social significations..." See, this applies to everyone but especially to phenomenology. "[...] to encounter Boulez and music was to see the twentieth century from an unfamiliar angle—that of the long battle..." Hey—a theme very dear to Foucault... "that of the long battle around the 'formal.' It was to recognize how in Russia, in Germany, in Austria, in Central Europe, through music, painting, architecture, or philosophy, linguistics, and mythology, the work of the formal had challenged the old problems and overturned the ways of thinking. A whole history of the formal in the twentieth century remains⁸ to be done: attempting to measure it as a power of transformation, drawing it out as a force for innovation and a locus of thought, beyond the images or the 'formalism' behind which some people tried to hide it." He's telling us that this formal is less formal than it seems. "And also recounting its difficult relations with politics." Alright. "We have to remember that it was quickly designated, in Stalinist or fascist territory, as enemy ideology and detestable art." That's funny. "Boulez only needed a straight line, without any detour or mediation, to go to Stéphane Mallarmé, to Paul Klee, to René Char, to Henri Michaux, and later to (?). Often a musician goes to painting, a painter to poetry, a playwright to music, via an encompassing figure and through a universalizing aesthetic. [...] Boulez when directly from one point to another, from one experience to another, drawn by what seemed to be not an ideal kinship but the necessity of a conjuncture..."⁹ That's curious, eh? I think it's a text of... transition from Foucault—what year is this?

Speaker: '82.

Deleuze: '82? That was quick! (Laughs) Let's check... it'd be better for my case if it were '72 (laughs).

Speaker: '82.

Deleuze: Okay, okay... You don't always get what you want... So there you have it. I'd like for you all to bear with me, in these final musings, since we're putting everything together. This bit about music with Boulez, this folding business with Heideggerian ontology, this story... the movement of the fold and unfold in Foucault, with all the problems that entails... This article recalls the problem of thought's relationship with art, with a possible glimpse at painting also... How do we sort it out? We aren't even looking for coherence. First thing...

⁷ In the selections that follow I've deferred to Robert Hurley's translation of the article, including his bracketed translation notes. See Michel Foucault, "Pierre Boulez, Passing Through The Screen," trans. Robert Hurley, in *Essential Works of Foucault* vol. 2: *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*, ed. James D. Faubion (New York: The New Press, 1998), 241-244.

⁸ Hurley has "remains," where the text has it in the past tense. For what it's worth.

⁹ *Ibid*, 242-243.



uh, my first comment, is how I see it. The fold—I wouldn't say that it's a metaphor, but I would say that it's a strong term. I don't know if it's metaphorical or not. It's a strong term in... And how does it appear? What does the fold involve? As I see it, it's that the fold concerns something that's hidden at first glance. What does the folding? What does the folding is something that conceals and that folds in order to conceal. In this sense, it's not only the curtain that will fold, it's not only the lace that will fold like a so-called pleated curtain. But (even) the dust, the fog will fold. And after all, one of Mallarmé's problems was that of presence and absence, an invocation to the fold, you'll find it everywhere. Just like you constantly see lace, the fog, the fan that folds and unfolds. The movement of being folded, or the movement of folding and unfolding, is fundamental. And, if Boulez's piece is called *Fold by Fold*, it's due to a poem by Mallarmé of which I'll read the first stanza: "At times" that is, at certain times... "At times, when no breath stirs it..."¹⁰

"At times, when no breath stirs it, all
The almost incense-hued antiquity
As I feel widowed stone let her veils fall
Fold by fold furtively and visibly
Floats or seems not to bring its proof unless
By pouring time out as an ancient balm."

That's it. Fold by fold, all the commentaries will tell you, but we can't say, then, that we're still dealing with the poem... what does that mean? It concerns Bruges, the famous city in Belgium, uh... and *at times... at times, when no breath stirs it...* That is, when there isn't yet any wind, to put it plainly, early in the morning, before there is any wind. Well, there is the fog, which dissipates. The fog dissipates and "all the almost incense-colored antiquity," that is, the "widowed stone," that is, Bruges. Bruges the dead, Bruges the widow, begins to emerge as the fog's folds come undone. I mean... and at the same time, they "come to be (dissolve??)"—what "comes to be (dissolves??)", right, the fog, you see, in certain hollows or at certain times, you have the impression that its folds comes down just like the folds in a curtain. And that already takes us to something we cannot avoid... they're fundamentally linked, the fold and something we see... what, that we see through the fold, to the extent that the fold comes undone... I don't know what it'd require... We'd have to find just the right formula. Well, in relation to the fold or in the fold, something unfolds. If we say that, we've already stopped considering the fold and the unfold as two opposites. In the fold, something unfolds; Bruges emerges. In the fold of the fog, Bruges emerges. A short work by Thomas de Quincey, famous 19th century English author, was recently translated, where there are... everyone has their favorite lines—I read it: a story about an Asian people, then a part of the Russian empire, who emigrate, who all pick up and leave, a big tribe... all leave the Russian empire and head back east. And the text is sublime. It's called *The Revolt of the Tatars*. Editor: Actes Sud. And, in the end, we're shown the place where they're going to reach, through the catastrophes, they've overcome every catastrophe, and they arrive and we see them arrive. We seem them arrive at their refuge. Listen to what it says: "There arose a vast, cloudy vapor."¹¹ "There arose a vast,

¹⁰ Mallarmé, 59-61. Translation slightly modified to accommodate Deleuze's reading: e.g., "fold by fold" where the translator has it "fold *on* fold," to reflect the typical translation for the title of Boulez's piece.

¹¹ Reading the original English, Deleuze appears to omit nearly a page separating the arrival of the dust cloud and the line which begins "Through the next hour." Cf. William Edward Simonds, *De Quincey's Revolt of the Tartars, Edited with Introduction and Notes* (Boston: Athenaeum, 1899), 53-54. I have indicated the ostensible omission in brackets.



cloudy vapor [...]. Through the next hour, during which the gentle morning breeze had a little freshened, the dusty vapor had developed itself far and wide into the appearance of huge aerial draperies...” “Through the next hour, during which the gentle morning breeze had a little freshened, the dusty vapor had developed itself far and wide into the appearance of huge aerial draperies, hanging in mighty volumes from the sky to the earth; and at particular points, where the eddies of the breeze acted upon the pendulous skirts of these aerial curtains, rents were perceived...”¹²

¹² *Ibidem*. The French translation, which Deleuze reads here, has “the pendulous skirts” as “*les plis*.”