



# GILLES DELEUZE

## *Painting and the Question of Concepts*

SEMINAR AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS,  
VINCENNES-ST. DENIS, 1981

---

### LECTURE 8 2 JUNE 1981

TRANSCRIPTION BY JULIEN PARIS & DALILA SELLAMI (PARTS 1 & 2)  
AND EMRAY İLAF & CHRISTINE SPIANTI (PARTS 3 & 4)  
TRANSLATED BY BILLY DEAN GOEHRING

#### I

Today we should... we should just, well, not finish... but we should lay down some guidelines for this problem with color.

So, that's what I'd like—incidentally, I'd really like to see if they have enough time at the end, and if they're here—Paul, uh, Paul Tolli, Paul Tolli... See me, Paul, if you have time, okay? Traumer—is Traumer here? The one who gave me, who sent me a paper on Goethe. Treve... See me later, alright? Uh, Le Tortois. LeTortois is here, okay. Michèle d'Albin? Michèle d'Albin isn't here? And uh, Ms. Petitjean? Is Ms. Petitjean here? You'll come see me later?

Anyway... So it's still very complicated—it's very complicated...

It's so complicated because this is precisely our problem—where we ended up last time. It's precisely that there is... We'll put it this way, based on everything we've done before; we'll put it this way, alright: there are regimes of color... Not only are there colors, but there are regimes of color.<sup>1</sup>

That already gives us two options:

Regimes of color can accompany the spaces we saw previously, the sign-spaces we saw previously and the modulations characteristic of these spaces... Or else a whole other problem, a whole other aspect:

Aren't there regimes of color which themselves constitute a sign-space and which are subject to their own modulation?

So things are already a bit shaky, eh? Since by introducing this—for now—very vague notion of “regimes of color” (in the plural), “There<sup>2</sup> would be regimes of color that one could identify practically, historically, theoretically [?] scientifically. But these being unequal, there would be a correspondence between the scientific determination of regimes of color, the

---

<sup>1</sup> I struggled between “color scheme” (as it appears in the description of the lecture in *The Deleuze Seminars* <https://pur.purdue.edu/publications/2616/1>) and “regime of color” (as it appears in Daniel W. Smith's translation of *Logique de la sensation*), since I try to conform to precedent whenever possible. I opted for the latter only because “color scheme,” in the conventional sense, usually refers to a *modèle*, *palette*, or *jeu de couleurs*—and in order to hark to Deleuze and Guattari's “regime of signs,” found elsewhere.

<sup>2</sup> There are no closing quotation marks.



practical determination, the historical determination. There'd only be a series of correspondences.

But to start with, I see two options for regimes of color:

Either they'll correspond to a signal-space and to a modulation defined by other means...

Or else they will themselves make up a colorist, coloristic space and a chromatic modulation all their own. And color is probably capable of uh... is capable of both...?

So, what is it? How would one define a "color-regime"? The point is that a color regime doesn't mean that all the colors...it means a certain treatment of color...What is coherent about a treatment such that it'd make us say,

"Ah, yes, here we have a 'color-regime'?" And what would these "color-regimes" be?

Well, I'd want to define them in three ways... according to three characteristics... No, four characteristics:

First, for there to be a color-regime, the ground needs to be determined in one way or other... "the ground"... The ground isn't necessarily determined by color. You might see how a color-regime will imply its own coloristic space and chromatic modulation... if the ground itself is colored. But a color-regime might very well adhere to another sort of space, to another sort of modulation... So the idea of the ground, which is so fundamental in painting—the ground will be the first requirement for a color-regime to satisfy.

But what does "ground" mean, exactly? ... A ground—and I find the notion very interesting—is twofold; it's a twofold concept. On one hand, the ground refers to so-called support. What *supports* line and color... is the ground... That is the first established definition. As in when you talk about, uh, a plaster ground...or a chalk ground<sup>3</sup>... or a colored ground... Okay, and see, that's probably where our system has to keep harking back to. *Immediate echoes*<sup>4</sup> in the history of painting. For example, you have grounds from the 15<sup>th</sup> to the 16<sup>th</sup> century, well-known grounds being researched and gradually perfected—formulas for plaster, so-called "slaked" plaster<sup>5</sup> in particular, and uh, which will serve as the painting's ground, that is, they'll determine the quality of the support. But at the same time, the notion of ground refers to something else: the background—but not just any background... Not in just any regard.

On the one hand, the ground is the support's determinate quality; it's the determination of the support...and on the other hand... it's not exactly the background, but it's the determination of the background's value, the determination of "variable" value of the background. It's the very nature of the ground *qua* quality of the support which, in a way, will engender the relative position of the background. What does "the relative position of the background" mean? Well, we saw it in the sign-spaces we examined earlier.

Renaissance painting implies... this is too general but, uh, we've seen, you can always tweak it—Renaissance painting implies a background position subject to the foreground's requirements. 17<sup>th</sup> century painting, in a way, implies a sort of reversal... a shift in values... in the sense that "everything emerges from the background"; and by byzantine painting things had already shifted in favor of the background. So I'd say that the ground is both the quality of the support and the variable position of the background. That would be the first characteristic of a regime of color. What is the ground like?

---

<sup>3</sup> *Gesso*.

<sup>4</sup> Note: The transcript has "immediate echoes" in quotes. Judging from what I have, I cannot tell whether this is an artifact of the transcription process or if Deleuze was indeed citing a specific term. I've decided to treat it as an *emphasis* marker—perhaps his emphasis was construed as citation when it was transcribed.

<sup>5</sup> *Gesso sottile*.



The second characteristic: What then is the role of color in the modulation? In the modulation taking place on the surface supported by the ground... We've already covered the different types of modulation...

The third characteristic of regimes of color... It's the character of the hues...<sup>6</sup> That is, a regime of color implies a certain privilege—might as well go ahead and explain what I mean by “privilege”—privileging a type of hue. What is a type of hue? You could say that a type of hue is actually very simple, you see. There are two variables in color; we've been over it, I'm back to the schema that I asked you to, uh, to reflect on, because, the kind of terminological schema.<sup>7</sup> First, a color can be light or dark. Second, it can be saturated or washed-out... It's a bit like with alcohol, if you will. For example, it's a bit—the distinction is quite simple, you see—like the distinction between titration and dilution; anyone who drinks alcohol knows it... but even those who don't drink... It isn't hard to understand. You have an alcohol of 40%. You dilute it; your 40% alcohol is still 40% alcohol. It's diluted 40% alcohol... If you absorb it undiluted, it's saturated 40% alcohol. See, saturated/watered-down...saturated/diluted forms a pair consisting of color—it's the “purity” factor.

From there, you combine that with the pair light/dark: a hue might be light or dark, saturated or washed-out... that is, diluted. Combine both pairs, [and] the possible combinations will give you the types of hue.

The first possibility, light / washed-out... is “pale.” Light / saturated, the second possibility, light / saturated... are bright hues, “bright.” Dark / saturated: these are the “deep” hues. Dark / desaturated: these are the “muted” hues.<sup>8</sup>

I'd say a regime of color implies the dominance of one of these types of hue. I'd—then I'd say: very well, we can imagine “pale” regimes, uh... “bright” regimes, “deep” regimes, “muted” regimes. Alright, but what's this about “privilege,” “dominance”? What does that mean? It's very simple... It doesn't mean that most of the colors will be—in “pale” regimes, for example—it doesn't mean that most of the colors will be pale hues... That might be true, but I'm thinking of something else entirely...

Again, everything I'm saying—especially today, right—might be wrong. Fix it; don't just modify it, but correct it for yourselves... Uh, yes, because... It's not necessary that all the hues be pale—or see, there aren't more of them... I mean something else, that... The “pale” matrix... uh, pale hues will be the way in which, in accordance with the ground, in such a regime—it's not always like this—in such a regime, when I talk about a “pale” regime, I mean

---

<sup>6</sup> The terminology around color in both French and English can be ambiguous or inconsistent across different related fields—e.g. in art, colorimetry, etc. For example, I've found *teinte* translated as “shade” or “tint,” terms with opposite meanings in English: an artist obtains different “shades” of red by adding black and different “tints” of red by adding white. Based on the four-part model Deleuze is working with, it's a safe bet that he means *teinte* according to another of its possible translations: “hue”—the “pure” color of a pigment without any added white or black (i.e. *not* a tint or shade of the color). According to this latter usage, *teinte* is opposed to *ton* (the modification of a hue—e.g. tint or shade). *Ton*, in turn, has multiple translations. I've tried my best to be consistent in how I translate *ton*, *teinte*, and so on. The only exceptions are when I think it might mislead the reader. In these instances, I sometimes “play it safe” by using “color”—when I think differences in value, etc., do not figure into Deleuze's analysis.

<sup>7</sup> While “schema” is arguably less natural, I avoid “diagram” due to the latter's place in Deleuze's work.

<sup>8</sup> This was a model specified by the Association Française de Normalisation (AFNOR)—the standards have since changed. It's been pointed out that some of these terms—*rabattu* and *lavé*, for example—do not square easily with more conventional ways of talking about color. I've opted for “muted” and “washed-out,” respectively. See Christian Molinier, “Les adjectifs de couleur en français. Eléments pour une classification,” in *Revue Romane* 36.2 (2001), 204n8. (Note: source is pp 193-206).



that the pale hues will be the way in which, depending on the ground, all of the colors—including the “bright,” including the “deep,” including the “muted”—are distributed. So it’s not at all an sign of frequency; it’s an sign of importance. The importance of the pale hues, negotiating between the colors and the ground.

A “bright” regime doesn’t mean there won’t be any “muted” hues. Sometimes there aren’t muted hues in a “bright” regime. For example, the Impressionists avoid muted hues. Okay. But there can be some; it’s just that these hues, the colors in general, and the ground, will be negotiated by the bright hues. At that point it’d be a “bright” regime. So, I could add this third criterion to the other two.

Finally, the last criterion for regimes of color is that—this time I’m looking for a scientific, or quasi-scientific, parallel.

You haven’t forgotten that our problem is always one of analogy. Since we wanted to define analogy by just modulation and not—and not at all as conveying resemblance. So... So, then... How, scientifically...? What does colorimetry have to say about how color is reproduced? It comes down to analogy.

You see a color; you reproduce it. How do you reproduce a color? We’re told three things: that there’d be three different methods... I’m wondering whether these three methods—you see what I mean—won’t these three methods, these scientific approaches, won’t they have a practical equivalent and an historical equivalent? You know, tying everything together?

In the first approach... You’re looking at a complex beam of light. Not simple, not monochromatic, not of a single color—a complex beam. How do you reproduce it? One of colorimetry’s basic principles is that every complex beam, or every complex luminous flux, can in principle be reduced to a white beam accompanied by a monochromatic beam... Hence the formula:

$f$  (I’m getting this from some dictionary... I mean, it’s very... uh... hold onto these formulas because I’d like to tease out, you’ll need to have them in mind... if we’re going to draw anything from them.) The formula is:  $f$ —that is, the complex luminous flux, the colored flux, of a given color, equals:  $f(T)f$  (little  $d$ , up top, right? As a coefficient—little  $d$ ) +  $f$  (little  $w$ ).<sup>9</sup> What this formula means is very simple:

$f$  is the complex flux of light of a given color.

$f^w$  is... “flux of white light”—the  $w$  refers to the English.

+  $f^d$  is the monochromatic beam whose wavelength is  $l(d)$ ...  $l(d)$ , the “dominant wavelength” ...

Basically, see, the beam’s wavelength  $f$ —mark it “little  $l$ ”—and then you have the formula  $f$  (little  $l$ ) =  $f(w) + f(l(d))$ .<sup>10</sup> You’ve replaced your complex beam with a beam of white light, combined with a monochromatic beam whose wavelength is different uh... from what you started with. That’s the so-called dominant wavelength method. What’s more, in some cases, in some cases, your monochromatic, dominant wavelength beam cannot itself be included in the reconstruction of the original beam... moreover this first combination, obviously, right,

<sup>9</sup> It’s probably my own shortcoming, but I’m having trouble pinning down what colorimetric formula Deleuze is discussing here, it doesn’t quite line up with Grassman’s laws in optics, nor with any other account I can find of the dominant wavelength method of describing perceived colors. However, taking Deleuze at his word, perhaps he is only describing a basic premise or principle of such analysis rather than the analysis itself. Color science does assume that spectral colors have complex profiles, and the dominant and complementary wavelengths of the hues reflected by any given object share a so-called “white point” in common. Color science aside, I’ve attempted to preserve the formulas above as they appear: in my notes, I’ll reformat them to parse more easily as formulas.  $f(T)f^d + f^w$

<sup>10</sup> Probably:  $f^l = f^w + f^{l(d)}$



to put it another way, is: flux of white light plus a monochromatic beam, and... that can, in principle, recreate any complex beam... That's the first method... Hang onto that, okay? Because we're going to need it...

The second method... Why a second method? Because the first method is very, very theoretical. You'd have to be able to determine three primary colors very precisely... three primary colors. In the previous case, the color matrix started with white. Here, on the other hand, it's based on a tricolor system; what are the three primary colors? They are: "blue, red, green." Why blue, red, green? You'll recognize these from TV screens... why blue, red, green—you'd think it would be blue, red, yellow! It's simply because you cannot render a complex beam with blue, red, yellow... Why not? Such rendering requires that the three primary colors be such that none of them can be "counterbalanced" by the other two. So if you go with yellow, blue, red... you'd have a chance of counterbalancing red with yellow and blue. So it isn't possible... your three primary colors, then, will be: red, green... blue. There are some remarkable paintings in de Staël's work; there's a landscape that's really something. Under the title "Agrigente," a landscape with an area, I've forgotten the exact breakdown, in only three colors plus black and white. Those three colors: red, green, blue.

Well, this method, no longer a dominant wavelength method which privileges white, is a method known as "additive mixing." It corresponds to the formula: any given flux  $f$ , any colored flux, equals  $f_r$ , red flux, plus  $f_g$ , green flux, plus  $f_b$ , blue flux.<sup>11</sup> Okay, last we come to...

Thirdly, the third possible method, only now we're switching domains: this time we have to move away from the ray of light and onto the colored body, whether pigments or filters. What happens? What happens in a filter? What is the color of a body? You already know that a body's color is precisely the color that the body doesn't absorb. It's the color that the body reflects, diffuses, or transmits. Why are plants green? The standard answer, as in the Larousse, is that plants are green because they absorb red, because chlorophyll absorbs red (light)... they are green because they absorb red; chlorophyll absorbs red and so reflects green. Alright, you can imagine, then, mixtures of pigment, a synthesis of pigments, but what is this synthesis? Either yellow pigments absorbing blue and sending yellow or green back to the eye, or blue pigments... oh, what did I say? I must have mixed it up... I don't know. Yellow pigment thus absorbs blue and sends back yellow and green. Blue pigments absorb yellow and send back green and blue. You mix both types of pigment, you're left with—the blue is absorbed, the yellow is absorbed, and you're left with a purely green reflection. What do you call this mixture, or this synthesis? This synthesis will be "subtractive" mixing. It can't be done with light rays—note that subtractive synthesis, subtractive mixing, can produce whatever you want besides white. How can it render black? If each body absorbs what the others reflect, then you'll have black. So there can be black with subtractive synthesis or subtractive mixing, but you can't have white. Those, then, are my three scientific formulas from colorimetry—the simple version.

Well, but we forget, we forget these formulas from colorimetry... it doesn't matter when...

My question—listen carefully for the nuance—is whether those working in the pictorial arts haven't already been working with regimes of color. The last criterion for a regime is the means of reproducing color. We'll stop there, since it gets too abstract. That's how I'd first define a regime of color—I need the time; don't you have a watch? [...]

I would define a regime of colors by four characteristics—four characteristics.

---

<sup>11</sup>  $f_r + f_g + f_b$  or  $f_r + f_g + f_b$





First, by the state of the ground in both senses of the word: as determination of the support—the modification of the support—and as the variable position of the background.

Second, by a corresponding modulation.

Third, by a hue privileged among the four primary types: bright, pale, muted, deep.

By one of the four primary means of reproducing color:

the dominant wavelength method, compared to a white flux;

the method of additive synthesis;

the method of subtractive mixing.

That being said, it's a good thing that I went over it again, since my second characteristic actually disappears, since modulation is included in the last characteristic. So in fact there are only three characteristics. There—*when*—a short break...

Here we are. Yes, alright? Alright. Then I'll come back to my problem... If it's true that we can define regimes of colors, sometimes these regimes of color can refer to previously defined spaces and to previously defined modulations, sometimes they refer to a space peculiar to color and to a chromatic modulation that we haven't yet defined. Well, let's look at a bit of history, the history of painting. I'll try to define a "Renaissance" regime of colors, for example. We'll see how it turns out—if we can get to a little bit of technique—but really in the interest of our examination into regimes of color. Would there be a "Renaissance" regime of color, with so many exceptions, so many problems? That's how life goes with the history of painting. And well, yes! I think there is a regime of colors, but—as we've just described it, and no doubt there's more to say—but what's famous about Renaissance painting is the use of "white" grounds.

Let's talk about white grounds; let's start there... that might bring us back to our first colorimetric formula, but we can't push it too far, since they did it as *painters*, in *practice*—not as scientists. They use white grounds; what does that mean? It means that the support is coated with a layer of plaster, a special plaster, a plaster treated in a special way, or with a rather thick layer of chalk—what's going on there? Now, there is a painter known—important for the history of painting—there is a painter known for having perfected this system. And well before the Renaissance—that is, the Renaissance took up something long in the making; it's just that this particular painter was a turning point between the Renaissance and what came before. It's the great Van Eyck, to the point that—Van Eyck's secret formula is a common fixture in the history of painting—and Van Eyck's secret starts with the use of so-called slaked plaster<sup>12</sup> as a ground. Van Eyck died around 1440—I'm pulling from the dictionary—1440, that is, before the birth of Leonardo da Vinci but not by much; Leonardo da Vinci was born in 1452. There's a recent book of criticism that puts a lot of emphasis on Van Eyck and considers Van Eyck as a painter among painters—everyone's free to choose their own painter among painters, but this time it's based precisely on this mysterious white ground... because there's a lot involved in this white ground: actually, obtaining slaked plaster involved a whole process with plaster and glue, so the "pharmacy" of painting, the "chemistry" of painting, became a real concern.

It's Xavier de Langlais, Xavier de Langlais, who wrote a very interesting book with Flammarion called *The Technique of Oil Painting*, and it's terrific; it's a joy to read—uh, it's funny because it's a very particular sort of criticism you can find in every artistic discipline. I think it's literally—uh, you could call it, uh, reactionary, uh, but in a good way. You'll see what I mean by good reactionary. It's someone who halts who halts development at a certain point and says "No, no, stop there, we're done, it's all downhill from here!" Know what I mean...? They're quaint, actually—"Um, this is the cut-off point" but on second thought, actually, on

---

<sup>12</sup> Deleuze may have meant *gesso* in general, but I reckon he means the practice of applying a second layer of slaked plaster—*gesso sottile*—atop a first layer of "rough," unslaked plaster—*gesso grosso*.



second thought: “But there was still Mozart.” He wasn’t so bad... ha (*laughter in the room*) No, so in music, for example, there are many fans like this of Gregorian chanting... Bam! “There’s nothing after Gregorian chanting”—it’s a decline, a slow, slow decline... we shouldn’t joke because...

It happened in philosophy, a happy moment, with Neo-Thomism—Maritain—it was great, you had St. Thomas... after that, it was hard to... uh, Descartes, uh, if there was a little St. Thomas in Descartes, so much the better. But you’ll see there was something strange... Sometimes the ones who are frozen in time and don’t want to bother with anything else turn out to be surprisingly modern—in two regards—first, they have a lot to teach us about their cut-off point. And that’s easily explained... they’re so wound up by where they think “it’s all over” that they have a profound technical knowledge of the period where “everything” stops, after which things decline... Descend into decadence, right, but to understand what’s going on with Gregorian chanting, you have to ask someone like that. To understand St. Thomas you obviously have to ask Maritain. And then everything else is decadence. So much so that, according to them, you’re better off starting from scratch. Back to our example, because I’m fascinated by it, the example of Xavier Langlais: he’ll say that “oil painting reached its height in Van Eyck.”

Already in the Renaissance, thanks to the white ground, thanks to slaked plaster, after which everything fall apart—Already in the Renaissance, of course he [?] keeps Van Eyck’s secret but they already understand it less clearly; things are already on the decline in the Renaissance, but they nonetheless retained something of the great Van Eyck, but it’s awful after that... What’s so awful about it? Here we see Xavier de Langlais’s stubbornness, his personal obsession: craquelure. Paintings crack, so Xavier de Langlais no longer recognizes them... Paintings after Van Eyck crack more and more, and he loses it when it comes to really “cracking” painters (*laughter*). In particular, the punching bag for Xavier de Langlais is an 18<sup>th</sup> century English portraitist called Reynolds, since Reynolds—and we’ll see why, in terms of his regime of color, there’s no avoiding craquelure in Reynolds—but Delacroix gets contempt from Xavier Langlais: he doesn’t know how to do his job, as his craquelure demonstrates...

He bitterly says of the impressionists that “they had good ideas but no know-how” and that “they never could solve the problem of ground.” See, I’m coming back to my question about the regime of color; Xavier Langlais is someone for whom there is only *one* regime of color: the great regime of the dominant wavelength, that is, the white ground.

That’s not bad, but let’s make time for—there has to be something! My God. My God, there is something... Here you have the first regime of color, I’m thinking of the Renaissance which holds Van Eyck’s secret, who used it and modified his support by way of “plaster” or “a thick layer of chalk.” What happens after that? Two phases:

On the white ground, they make what’s called a “underpainting,” and they wash the “underpainting.”

The washed underpainting on the white ground—that’s the second phase; that’s how they work.

Third phase: they spread and place the colors... in what way? They put paint down in thin layers.

A quick aside—you should have understood at the beginning, but if you didn’t get it, that’s fine, you’ll understand later—a quick aside: my first two phases, white ground, washed underpainting, what does that give you? Of course, it gives you the formula, “light / washed-out,” what I described as the “privileging of pale hues,” privileging pale hues. Which doesn’t prevent the third phase; they put down colors—maybe bright colors, maybe saturated colors, maybe deep colors—but the principle remains: a thin layer of color on a white ground, such that the white ground peeks through, especially, for example, through a cloth.



The white ground will give the colors luminosity, and as for the shadows—what will they do? Well then they’ll saturate the color, the color placed on the ground. They’ll saturate the color; they’ll go through several layers and one of the first formulas is “color placed on a white ground over the underpainting,” following the lines of the underpainting—that’s the first formula of so-called “glazing”: a thin layer of color on the ground.<sup>13</sup>

But although they use the word “glaze,” as a technical term, I’d rather insist on saying “that isn’t true glazing”; it’s a glaze in a very general sense. We’ll see why I have this reservation; I’ll try to say why I have reservations. I’d prefer to save—I have every right to—save the word “glaze” for another regime. Okay.

That’s the first regime. What did I mean by calling it the Renaissance formula? What all painters—well, okay, almost all painters. See, white ground, washed underpainting, glazed color. That gives me—I’d say I’m justified in saying that—it’s a pale regime even if the pale hues aren’t dominant, even if there aren’t exclusively pale hues. It’s a pale regime because the ensemble of colors, whether they’re bright, saturated, deep, what have you, are obtained through this matrix: white, washed underpainting. Yes, it’s very clear, very clear... Now what happens [?] that’ll really belong to the Renaissance. how does that move painting? What happens is still rather intriguing: painters in the Renaissance who borrow Van Eyck’s system—in particular, the Italians get it from Flanders and then we see that through Italy it comes back to Flanders and to Holland... very odd route... and okay, okay... Something happens: Renaissance painters—I’m talking about the greats... so it’s not a critique... for Langlais that itself is a critique—they’ll tend to gradually thicken... the white ground. Their technical prowess hinges on a thickening of the white ground. The white ground becomes a thicker white, or at least more and more opaque... Very important, if you follow me—it’s the last sticking point; if you understand this, you’ll understand everything that comes after—in particular the great painter, so it bothers Langlais because, he says, obviously he’s a genius, among the greatest of painters; he’s a genius—it’s frustrating—and at the same time his technique is already setting the stage for decadence. Since it’s no longer the old Van Eyck ground, yet the greatest painter known for thickening—a visible, considerable thickening—the support’s ground is... Titian; the white ground becomes very, very thick and very opaque. You can sense that this will already be a nascent form of luminism, that it will really foreshadow certain aspects of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The white ground becomes very opaque. Even Leonardo da Vinci: bizarrely, his plaster seems—specialists say—not really thicker than Van Eyck’s but still more opaque...

It’s interesting how these differences, which really come down strictly to differences in technique—what will come of making a thicker white ground? A very thick plaster? It has some strange consequences [,] it appears to result in two things, at least, it seems... it turns out that there are two results:

1. The first thing is that washing the ground—diluting with water or with turpentine—the dilution becomes darker and darker, it’s as though color creeps back into the ground, that is, the colors of the underpainting will in themselves affect the whole ground; instead of a white ground, as it gets opaquer and thicker, the white ground starts to take on color—that’s the first major difference. A pale color, sure, the color is pale... but it is colored.

---

<sup>13</sup> Eds Note: When Deleuzes says *en respectant les lignes de l’ébauche*, I’m led to believe that he might be talking about “underdrawing” rather than “underpainting.” Along the same lines, “sketch” is a viable candidate. Van Eyck did use both underpaintings and underdrawings in his work. But at the end of the day, I stuck with “underpainting,” since it’s by far the most frequent translation for *ébauche* I can find vis-à-vis painting.





2. The second notable difference you need to understand—all else being equal, in both cases, it's the work of the painter—the underpainting is under threat, the underpainting stage is under threat... by what? Underpainting will gradually be replaced by<sup>14</sup> “working *impasto*” as the ground gets thicker; and what does it mean to work *impasto*? It ought to be opposed to the underpainting...

Working *impasto* is the method of *pentimento*, the painter's *pentimento*:<sup>15</sup> namely, instead of a well-defined underpainting, after which all that's left to do is add colors, there's a perpetual reworking, working *impasto* or if necessary, the painter... will rework everything; and with Titian, in particular, one finds such moving things—the painter's *pentimento*—or when you look very closely or when you look at it scientifically, you see the trace of a *pentimento*—for example, in a fifth leg of a horse, the leg that was covered up in order to reposition its legs.<sup>16</sup>

So I'd say that the three—the Renaissance's evolution, technically, as far as the regime is concerned, the regime of the color white, [of] the white ground, is distinguished by three things:

An gradual increase in thickness and opacity.

Grounds are more and more starkly colored.

The substitution of *pentimento* for underpainting.

Indeed, for someone like Langlais, it's all quite sad: this thicker plaster... this ground that's already colored and absorbs color directly, and abandoning underpainting in favor of working *impasto*, and so on—it leads him to think, “Ah, well, yeah—painting has taken a wrong turn...” If I say he's nonetheless a modernist, it's because he's so convinced that oil painting was already in decline during the Renaissance that he says: hurray for acrylic paints, hurray for oil-less paints, for contemporary paints—yes, so... He reverts to being very modernist, saying, “oil painting is over, so better start over with acrylic, vinyl, and so on”... Know what I mean? Well, back to what I was saying...

So, this is how I'd define the Renaissance regime: There is a, well, a regime of color—and see, that's bound up with everything from before—there's a regime of color, but by necessity this regime of color is dedicated to another sort of sign-space and modulation. The sign-space—we saw—of the Renaissance is the tactile-optical space, defined by the collective line and the primacy of the foreground. But note that the primacy of the foreground is specifically established by the white ground. Note that it's specifically the underpainting that establishes the collective line—and that doesn't prevent there being a regime of color, insofar as you “glaze,” or pseudo-glaze, whatever your colors might be—that's what I'd call the “pale” regime of color, dedicated to Renaissance space, to tactile-optical space, and to the collective line's modulation.

That's our first regime of color... alright? Yes? Not too hard?

<sup>14</sup> CTRL F clair-obscur – chiaroscuro.

<sup>15</sup> The typical translation for *repentir* in English is the Italian term, *pentimento*. One could make the case for breaking the word down into inaccurate but perhaps informative segments: to “re-paint.” That gets across the method of working with the oils, wet-on-wet, directly on the canvas. But then you'd lose perspective of *pentimento* as an actual technical term—for example, the “fifth leg” discussed below is a classic example of *pentimento*, but is not as easily connected to “repainting.”

<sup>16</sup> I assume that the *cinquième pâte* (“fifth paste”) should be *cinquième patte* (“fifth leg”). It should be noted, however, that a horse's legs are not typically referred to as *pattes*.

See, for example, the description of x-ray and microscopic evidence of just such a *pentimento* present in Rembrandt's *Portrait of Frederik Ribel on Horseback*—David Bomford, Ashok Roy, and Axel Rüger, “Works by Rembrandt,” in *Rembrandt*, eds. David Bomford, Jo Kirby, Ashok Roy, Axel Rüger, and Raymond White (London: National Gallery Company, 2006), 184ff.



Audience Member: Very much so! Very—too [?] ... (Various comments).

Deleuze: Yes, but it's hard for me, too... (*laughs*). Yes, it *is* hard. No, it's...

Well, as we make more progress, maybe it'll get uh...

I'll move on to a second stage, another regime of color; let's look at another regime of color, one that risks complicating while also simplifying things—who knows—we're going to consider the 17<sup>th</sup> century regimes of color—the 17<sup>th</sup> century. It's intriguing, because it seems like, for the sake of convenience, I was looking for a single—but I couldn't get around it—one single, varying trait, and now there are so obviously two, two that'll form a sort of clamp. Around what? Around the luminism of the 17<sup>th</sup> century.

Remember that it still won't be about a space of pure color; it'll be a regime of color subject to an optical-space, which is how we defined the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and relative to the corresponding modulation, the modulation of light and no longer the modulation of the collective line. So, the regime of color still doesn't refer to its own proper coloristic space; it's dedicated to another kind of space, the optical space of light. However, it represents a drastic change compared to the regime of the Renaissance.

A painter emerged at the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century who was incredibly important, technically, and whom sadly, predictably, Xavier de Langlais abhors so much that he doesn't even talk about him. Caravaggio—but what does Caravaggio do? What does he invent? The strangest thing: he invents—of course he had predecessors, you'd have to find them—but he invents the—I can't seem to find the right word—He invents the “dark ground,” the pitch ground, or more precisely, the “red brown” ground, a red brown<sup>17</sup>... a red brown ground, right... and what difference does that make? Then the support is modified by this sort of—how can I put this—of indefinite color.

I'll emphasize that because when uh, when Wölfflin talks about certain aspects of luminism in the 17<sup>th</sup> century he says—oh my! (*An object falls in the room*)—exactly that: the ground is an indefinite color. What does “indefinite color” mean? Well, what matters is that it's something indefinite; I can't say, strictly speaking, it's this-or-that color but it is *some* color. Whereas with the Renaissance formula you had a white ground—in other words, color obtains in a non-colored matrix—and coloring only began after the underpainting, here you have an indefinite color; you get the feeling that all the colors together in their dark nature. This fully illustrates what Goethe says—“every color is dark,” “every color is obscure”: the matrix of color and this kind of dark bath which will make up the painting's “ground.”

What is that supposed to mean? And why? You see, all of our concepts come back into play with this dark ground, with this obscure matrix. There's a good chance that it—what?—ensures the primacy of the background. This time, the ground is responsible for securing the background's primacy—what does securing the background mean? Everything springs from the background. You can already guess that it's no longer about glazing colors on a white ground... It'll come down to having every color, every gleam, all the brightness—that is, all the light—emerge from the dark ground, from this “dark matrix.”

And the dark ground will be even darker for the shadows; it will make the colors pop out, and naturally, the painter's primary task comes to be that of blending, blending. He'll blend the bright colors, the colors into the shadows—it's a whole other regime of color—and this will be one of the poles of the birth of luminism. These bright lights that burst out from a dark ground—a famous example: Caravaggio's *The Calling of St. Matthew*.

---

<sup>17</sup> One finds a good account of Caravaggio's innovative use of ground and drawing in Phoebe Dent Weil's “Technical Art History and Archeometry II: Exploration of Caravaggio's Painting Techniques,” in *Revista Brasileira de Arqueometria, Restauração e Conservação* 1.3, 106-10. In particular, p. 107.



[Question from a Student]

I'm not saying he invented blending—blending now turns into something fully a part of the second task, since inevitably—the ground will thus be colored in an indefinite way, it'll be the dark ground, the shadows will be organized in such a way that they emerge from the dark ground instead of being “placed on” it.

So, yes, Caravaggio's *The Vocation of St. Matthew* is a famous example of this, a depiction of St. Matthew in a dive, a seedy dive, in pitch-black shadow, a ray of light from a narrow window on Christ. Christ's hand points at Saint Matthew like: *you... you...!* As in, *you, follow me!* And his hand is catching the light, right— It's a great herald for luminism...

Yet in terms of technique, if we look at where these dark grounds—which Caravaggio perfected—come from, it seems that Tintoretto, it seems you'll find them already in Tintoretto's paintings, in some of Tintoretto's paintings. Well, here we have a regime of color. Just like I was saying earlier about the so-called “pale” regime, with a white ground and washed underpainting. Here, however, it's a dark ground and *impasto* color. This time it's [the regime of] the saturated-dark and of the washed-dark. In other words, it's already a mixed regime, one that's at once a regime of deep hues and of muted hues...

And while there, too, all the hues are “produced,” and if I'm looking for an equivalent, I'd say roughly that this time the matrix [is] the mixture of three colors that don't complement each other—the indefinite color is this mixture: this dark mixture of colors taken in their dark nature, in their obscure nature—that is, the three primary colors that don't counterbalance each other.

In other words, it'd be a regime of additive mixing. But in the other direction—so that luminism is doubled—in the other direction, what do you have? You have the legacy of the Renaissance that presses on, and precisely in doing so, its meaning will completely change, that is: one picks back up, starting from Titian, this thickening of the paste and this thickening of the paste will give the 17<sup>th</sup> century—I'm specifying that Caravaggio had above all a fundamental influence on the 17<sup>th</sup> century: it spread everywhere. It went to Spain: Ribera and El Greco. It was all over France. He also had influence on the Flemish—so Caravaggio was kind of a turning point. So the other path, the extension of Titian—recall that this white ground became thicker and thicker so much so that it no longer supported a underpainting but was the object of *impasto* work and took on color. Well that'll be very important; that will be the birth of “glaze,” properly speaking; going back in time, starting from painting's origins, the ground becomes more and more starkly colored, while the painting is done more and more *impasto*... It's Rubens who goes all the way—so that you'll move away from glaze, strictly speaking—to wit, colors are applied to a light ground, on a light, colored ground. In other words, glaze, in the strict sense, is [putting] “color on top of bright colors,” on top of colors that are sharp and above all “sharp and translucent colors,” and if necessary, “brilliant colors applied to a bright ground.” Why not apply bright colors: precisely because bright colors are too opaque. It's the colors that will make “the ground” and one glazes because one applies color to this bright ground. Yet if that's Rubens's formula—for example, colors like ultramarine or pitch will be applied to the bright ground. I believe one of the first to have proceeded like this in Titian's line—but who represents a deviation from Titian, a precipitation—is a Spaniard, so Spain would have these two painters who... Ribera descending from the Caravaggio formula and Herrera... who literally paints on pink grounds, often not always, on silver pink, sort of silvery pink grounds... this is glazing, properly speaking...

So, I think the strict definition of glazing is exactly the one provided by Goethe, only it rightly excludes—it's not glazing if I put colors on a white ground in the Renaissance way, strictly speaking. The definition Goethe provides for glazing—he distinguishes three grounds in his *Theory of Colors*; in a quick overview, he says well, okay, there is the white ground in



chalk—he doesn't mention plaster, but in fact it was mostly plaster—there is the white ground of the Renaissance, the dark reddish brown ground of Caravaggio, whom he does mention—he cites very few painters—he cites Caravaggio—and he says: one must also add glazing to the list. He defines glazing as what happens when one treats an already-applied color like a bright ground. So despite how the word is used, I'd rather not apply the word "glaze" to when color is applied on a ground which isn't itself already a color, a necessarily light color. It's only glazing when you place colors in thin, transparent layers on a light ground... Yet what does that give you? This...

## II

It's his other formula. What other formula? The Caravaggio formula is once again dark, saturated, or washed-out. Dark, both saturated and washed-out—saturated at times, saturated in one sense and washed-out in another sense. So it's a regime I'd call—following our terminology—a deep and muted regime, as opposed to the Renaissance's pale regime. Rubens's regime, where you put down color on a light, colored ground, is the other side of Luminism. This time it's not that the light is drawn out of a dark ground or shines a spotlight into dark ground; the light is in the background and it's... it's great stuff. There's no backlighting, nor Caravaggio's style of light. There isn't a ground; the light is always localized and either it's drawn out of the dark ground, or it shines a spotlight into the dark ground like in *The Calling of Saint Matthew*. Only an indeterminate light that bathes the background, with the foreground dark instead: that's the real form of glazing. But it goes without saying that, for example, in Vermeer you see it constantly—very often, at least: the light background and the shadow of the back... of the foreground. It's an extraordinary formula, but it's also there (I don't have time to get into it but...) it's also there in a painter who is nevertheless very, very important—it's also there in Rubens. What regime would that be? It's a bright, light regime... No, sorry, it's a saturated, light regime. It's a saturated, light regime—that is, a bright regime.

But all I want to cover... here, before we take a break. You see there are regimes of color that depend on... that come back to the space we examined before, and in particular, I touched on two spaces we'd already looked at:

The tactile-optical space of the Renaissance, modulated by the line, by the collective line. And that provides, or that entails, or that corresponds to a pale regime of color. But the color presupposes this space and this modulation.

In the 17<sup>th</sup> century: optical space, modulating light or modulated by light. Here again you have a regime of color, but there are several regimes of color: either the Caravaggio type of regime or the Rubens-type of regime. As different as they are, they both fall under luminism. They're luminist regimes; they're regimes made up of color, serving an optical space and the modulation of light.

What do we mean when we say that the true advent of colorism occurs, in western painting, in the 19<sup>th</sup> century? In my opinion, it's very simple. It's not that the other centuries lacked... all the problems with color were... they had them. Why was the problem with color posed in a new way in the 19<sup>th</sup> century? Because the regime changed? Yes. The regime of color is changing. Absolutely. Based on the criteria we've covered, along with the last criteria. And at the same time, it's not just that the regime of color changes. It's that painters of the time probably needed something their predecessors didn't. In other words, color isn't only a regime that one invents or reinvents—which in itself implies a supreme colorism—but moreover, it is color which determines a new type of space, no longer tactile-optical space, nor the optical space of light. But a space truly proper to color. And a modulation proper to color. So I'll



stress that all these accounts of color—complementary colors, diametric oppositions between complementary colors—you get the feeling that, you think, “well what exactly does it mean?” That was so important in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, [but] not anymore today—much less so, at least. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the law of simultaneous contrast, that is, the complementary and diametrically opposite relationships between complementary colors is color’s highest premise. Again, my sense is that this isn’t a problem for painters today. It ultimately culminates, if you will, with Seurat. Okay, I don’t mean that Seurat has been overcome; I mean that even when painters take something or borrow something from Seurat, they totally ignore what’s really at stake in Seurat: contrast, complementary contrast. Today that’s no longer the problem, it’s no longer a problem, but it’s, you know... An activity... It’s the same thing in philosophy, it’s the same thing in music, *etc.*, and you can’t say that work responding to a given problem are in any way overcome, but it explains why we see them in a new light. There is a sort of decentering that takes place. Something that was essential for the artist responsible for a painting stopped being essential for us from a practical point of view, such that our evaluation of the painting will emphasize things that were meaningless for... There’s a whole history inside the painting, you know? But today, right, contrasts are very interesting, but anyway, painters were much more taken... by it, for a very simple reason: they discovered things so much more... more complex in terms of color that, naturally, they weren’t content with the... this higher law.

And before that? Now, the relationship between complementary colors, you know, we shouldn’t exaggerate—we knew about them: following up on a comment just now, it’s already there in Da Vinci; already in the Renaissance. They knew all about it. They knew how to use it in practice; in a way, they knew it optically, they knew it practically. Alright. In the 17<sup>th</sup> century, in the 17<sup>th</sup> century you’ll find any combination—in Rembrandt—you’ll find any combination of complementary colors you can imagine. When Rembrandt uses dark grounds, which you’ll often find in Rembrandt, where light is drawn out, you might have a red foreground, a bright red foreground, and there’s a muted resonance with the background, in a green or greenish dark ground. It’s extremely clever, this resonance between the bright red and the greenish ground. Okay. I’m thinking of a specific painting, *Le bain de Suzanne*.<sup>18</sup> Alright. They know all about it. Then what makes us say, Aha! It kicks off in the 19<sup>th</sup> century! It’s because they only sort of knew about it in the 17<sup>th</sup> century; they didn’t really use it. I mean they knew about it in a “It’s obvious” kind of way. It’s obvious since the relations between complementary colors can be deployed (you know what I’m trying to say) complements, contrasts, oppositions between complementary colors can only be deployed in the 17<sup>th</sup> century based on a totally other sort of ground or ground treatment. À la Caravaggio, for example.

On the other hand, these same problems with complementary colors become essential once the ground’s treatment brings them to the fore. So it’s only with the 19<sup>th</sup> century that something makes this problem—despite being secondary for 17<sup>th</sup> century luminism—into the a central concern for a period known as colorism in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and for impressionism in particular. That has its day. Today the problem of color—colorists don’t take that route anymore. So what happens in the 19<sup>th</sup> century? What happens in the 19<sup>th</sup> century—you might already guess—it’s what cast Xavier de Langlais into bottomless despair—it only gets worse and worse, or as he puts it: they didn’t know how to paint. Or rather, it’s more complicated than that; they very well knew how to paint. He says they’re great painters. Yeah, great painters, but they didn’t know—as they say—how to prepare. They forgot how to prepare. So we have all the reactionary themes, speed... to hell with speed! At the end of the day, see, they wanted to work quickly—it’s not as true for the...but still. They go more quickly; they don’t prepare. They know how to paint; they don’t know how to prepare. What does “preparing” mean?

---

<sup>18</sup> *Susanna and the Elders*.





Well, it's the fundamental act of painting since it's all about the support. They stop preparing. Then there are actually some who don't prepare at all. For example...

[A student question about eggs – inaudible]

Yes, egg was the binding medium, but it was tied to the underpainting. If egg went away, it's only because underpainting concerns became obsolete with *impasto* work. Yeah?

[Another inaudible comment]

Yeah, yeah, yeah, yes, technologically, we'd have to bring up... there's also the advent of tubed paint, which changes everything. Well see, one couldn't, for example, it wasn't possible to paint outside before tubed paint. But tubed paint is very recent: the 19<sup>th</sup> century. So how did they do things before? With Rubens it's very straightforward. He prepared his paints. There were jars of prepared paint. There were jars of paint. He made his jars, three for each hue: a bright hue... No, a color, a shade, and a tone. He had his three little jars. And for gradients he painted onto the shadows, into the shadows. And then he had paints on his palette, which he used, in a pinch, to make accents. Well, I'm really getting ahead of myself, making accents. See, the process had a sort of sequence to it:

Preparing the ground, thick in the case of... preparing a thick ground

Working *impasto* on already-placed colors, potted paints with gradations, with a distribution of shadow and light, etc

And then, thirdly, crucially, dabs of paint on the palette for making accents.

So, if I were to describe the... the 19<sup>th</sup> century in very broad strokes, the techniques of the 19<sup>th</sup> century—but here I'm really going too fast. I'd say that the ground becomes less and less important. What *does* happen with the support? You even have painters who, then, work directly on the canvas. Paint on paint. Great, I think, because that's... it's the formula—the formula for real glazing. Paint on paint. There are some Signac works, for example—he's not the greatest, but some of Signac's paintings are intriguing precisely because there isn't any ground. Or in Manet, for example, there is the use of raw, so-called unworked plaster. Which in fact is rather odd; such plaster is very absorbent. In other words, it's almost the same—in my quick overview—as having a colored ground. They'll work... I mean, the advent of colorism in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, it seems to me, comes down to people, to painters, who work with paint on paint. They no longer go through a white medium, nor with... an external white medium, nor through an internal color medium, a dark medium. Now, that's great; it means that color begins to exist for itself. It comes to exist for itself on one condition: that painters are capable of constituting a coloristic space and a modulation proper to color. You get what I mean? A modulation proper to color, a coloristic space—what does that mean? It means that it'll no longer be mediated by light; light will be derived from color. The line will be derived from color, etc...

So now that we've stepped back, we can devise a series of stages going back further and further. You had three easy periods in the Renaissance: white ground, underpainting, a pseudo-glaze of color. In the 17<sup>th</sup> century you had—and it had already culminated with Titian—a thicker and therefore increasingly colored ground. Working *impasto* gets around the need for underpainting. And lastly, the triumph of color with Titian's accents. In the 17<sup>th</sup> century you time sort of contracts, and things are rushed. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, if I were to sum up the problem of colorism in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, right, color is in the accents, there's nothing left but accents. A whole world is made up of what would, for others, be final accents. Hence what I said last time: Delacroix's cross-hatching, where Delacroix still uses a Caravaggio ground. Only everything condenses, right onto the ground; he'll make cross-hatches that draw color out of the ground. And then the impressionist comma-stroke, the impressionist accent, where it's a bit like we say in music: ah, well, it's the accents that count. They discover that with color it's the accents that count. So it's no surprise that it's the comma-stroke, that the unit becomes—



this space's unit becomes—either Delacroix's cross-hatching, or the impressionist comma, or Seurat's dot-stroke.

So Langlais has a legitimate concern, but still, we have to recognize who—he says there's only one guy who makes it out—that is, whose work doesn't crack: Seurat. In other words, his treatment of the ground, his use of it, his dot-stroke, etc., prevents it from cracking; it holds up. See, there's always an expectation that things last. As Cézanne puts it: "I wanted to make of impressionism something [...] enduring," the sense that a form of painting does or does not last. It's a sort of question of time—we'll see, if we have time, why time comes up here. Painting that takes up time. If it does crack, Langlais isn't totally off; if it cracks after 20 years, it's annoying, at least. We still don't know how well the colors will hold... "petroleum" paints, acrylics, etc. We don't know. We'll have to wait, but it's already inscribed in the painting, although we can't say in advance. It's inscribed in the painting: does it last, the weight, the time, etc. Paintings have a way of being at the time, of being in time, of having weight, etc. But Cézanne's idea of making impressionism something durable and solid came down to problems with technique.

[Inaudible student question – A bleached canvas]

It's possible... There is a lovely novel by Balzac on that. Yes, yes, it's very possible... Like any problem of restoration... So it's amazing; Langlais says there are only—there are only a few beautiful works by Delacroix: it's the ones that were restored by someone other than Delacroix. Then it isn't bad, he says, since it was done by people who knew what they were doing. Alright.

See, what I want cover before our break, it's that... there's yet another regime of color in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In fact, it's one that I'd also call bright. But how is it different from the bright regime of the 17<sup>th</sup> century? It's completely different because the 17<sup>th</sup> century's bright regime, right, involved precisely a glaze on a light ground, while now they proceed with a painting of accents. Accents have completely... Here, there really—there isn't anymore glazing, there's isn't anymore... it's no longer... there isn't any ground. The ground tends to disappear or be neutralized, etc., and achieves color for itself, which from there will deploy for themselves the relationships proper to color—first and foremost, the principal relationship, the princely relationship between complementary colors. Hence the possibility of a modulation of color. And a modulation particular to color, even though, before, regimes of color were the most brilliant in the world, were just as brilliant—but they were dedicated, again, to other sorts of spaces and ultimately dedicated to colorless spaces, whether tactile-optical space or the optical space of light. And therefore dedicated to a modulation that was defined otherwise, whether the modulation of the collective line or the modulation of light. While here, we reach the opening of a space through color and of color, a space proper to color, a space united by accents. In the end, I'd say that it's no longer the underpainting nor even working *impasto*. A painting of accents is something different still. And so are led to this issue with the regime of color that, finally, for the first time in... well, I'm exaggerating... in western history, develops a space that can only be exclusively defined in terms of color, and a modulation that can only be defined in terms of color. So there's very little left for us to cover, very little—it's seeing what this space and this modulation consists in. Let's take a break.

[Chair noises and chatter]

There's not much to cover, then. I'll just lay out some guidelines. That's all. At the very least, it'd be even better to discuss, if you want, that'd be good, too. That's it... alright, some ways forward... right, yes?

Comtesse: About the question of the white or blackish ground... The Renaissance and the 17<sup>th</sup> century, for example... The problem is the shift that results specifically from this problem of the ground and of colors, of light and colors; the shift we find in contemporary



American painting, in particular in the painter Sam Francis. It's very interesting to see just where this shift is located because it's precisely in him [that] there is a white ground, and the colors of the rays, a bit like Delacroix, rays that cross the white ground like that. And the particularity, contrary to Goethe for example in his *Treaty of Colors*, where ultimately black and white are like the matrices of the color triangle, only that connotes—black and white basically stand for light and shadow. It's... whereas in Sam Francis there is another shift, inasmuch as white is in no way shadow or light. White is, he says, “the color of every color, the primitive color” and he calls it “the dazzling color,” the dazzling-distracting color and it's the very dazzling that... where the painter paints the birth of the painter's gaze onto the canvas.<sup>19</sup> It's complicated. That is to say, as opposed to white as a dazzling-distracting color, light becomes black. Or else shadow passes into light, or light returns to the shadow, either way. At any rate, it spills over binaries, and it shatters the color triangle. The color white as simultaneously white and black. And then, regarding color, the sorts of chromatic bands that it spreads across the canvas, it's totally fascinating. It's not a color somehow placed onto a white ground, nor even one lifted off a white ground; it's that colors emerge from the dazzling-distracting-whiteness. They emerge while seeming to disappear at the same time on the plane. It's a sort of simultaneity, neither presence nor absence—it's the simultaneity of the emergence and the disappearance regarding the event, the dazzling event that can at the same time be that of a black hole for the painter. Thus there is a rather extraordinary variation regarding the ideal cut you've traced in the history of painting or the history of regimes of color.

Deleuze: Very well put. Very well put. What we especially need to avoid, in effect, is believing that it's a revival of Renaissance spaces, even a modern revival. Because it's in response to colorist demands that all this modern colorism, with the role of white—it's not only Sam Francis, of course—it's because of that... Oh well, good, that's all I meant. But then I'm going very fast, to give you some guidelines and to wrap up.

I'd say, based on... If you understand the requirements of this new—both regime of color, another bright regime, and this regime's new requirements, i.e. the deployment of a corresponding space and modulation. I'll outline... I'll outline a first stage—I'm dividing it into stages like this in order to give you some points of reference. In impressionism then, by definition you get a painting of accents. The reality of the situation, what turns out to be fundamental, is the relationship between colors, which determines a new space. What makes that so fundamental? Again, relationships between colors existed well before that. They weren't displayed in a purified form. I just mean they weren't able to appear in a purified form on account of the ground's long history over the Renaissance and the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Whereas they now have free reign. You might say that what softens color, or what builds color, is another color. It's no longer mediated by a matrix or by a ground—however you define matrix and ground. In the Renaissance no less than in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, there is this mediation by the matrix or the ground. Not here. No, there is no longer any need even if the ground remains; the ground no longer serves that purpose. It's the colors that regulate each other and that are deployed for themselves, constituting a space.

So my first cue is thus... it has to begin with a method of painting bit-by-bit. It seems necessary that it begin with painting bit-by-bit, like the Impressionists, since again, the small

---

<sup>19</sup> Eds Note: I can't find an exact source for this Sam Francis quote. I've found an interview where Francis claims that he uses “all kinds of ‘colors’ to make the ‘form’ white,” and another where he claims that red “contains every other color,” and another where he calls blue “the most primitive color,” but I have not yet found an interview where he attributes all of these claims to white (as Deleuze suggests). For some of Francis's comments on color, see Debra Burchett-Lere and Aneta Zebala, *Sam Francis: The Artist's Materials* (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2019), 64-65.



pictorial unit, the comma- or the dot-stroke, is specifically what replaces underpainting and *impasto* work. Really, it's the punctual constitution of space. Punctual not because it's made point-by-point but rather because the space is thereby understood as a network, a sort of point relation. Points are fundamentally linked. Only, with this first stage I want to point out—that of impressionism—it's sort of a problem of practical privilege, since the relationships between colors, now in the foreground, have been doubled. Theoretically, you can always say that [the colors] are arranged well; practically, if you are a painter, you need to privilege one or the other. You necessarily privilege one or the other.

Remember, you can conceptualize the fundamental color-color relationships—unfortunately, my circle's been erased... You remember the color wheel; good thing I made it ahead of time, since I wouldn't have time to do it... You remember the color wheel? Well, the color-color relationships can be put either in terms of diametric opposition—the relationship between complements: for example, red/green, which defines a diameter of the circle. So, color relationships in the form of diametric oppositions are the relationships between complements: simultaneous contrast. Or it might be a peripheral relationship produced by chords, from one color to another, skipping an intermediary color—or even if it doesn't skip. So there are peripheral relations transitioning between colors and diametrically opposite relations. But see, the impressionists, whether with they're using commas or dots, are forced to... at any rate, they use both. It's for that reason that every impressionist text refers to both laws anytime color is discussed: the law of contrasts and the law of analogs—the law of contrasts designates the diametric opposition between complementary colors; the law of analogs designates the chords or the peripheral course around the color wheel. Thus: law of contrast and law of analogy. For example, in Cézanne you find it constantly, but it's in all the impressionists. You constantly see this reference to both sacred laws. Why can't they do one without the other? Well they can't deny, for example, that complementary colors... Even if you proceed along the edge, you'll reach complementary colors by going around the wheel. And complements are singular points on the circle's periphery that you'll cross along the way. So running along the periphery will pass through and will involve complementary colors, contrasting colors.

But conversely, the contrast between two complements. All that contrast implies that you don't juxtapose them. In what sense? If you overlap two complements, you wind up with gray. Opposition implies that both complements—for example, your red and green, so long as we take them in large, pictorial terms, as surfaces—are very distinct, otherwise they couldn't be opposed. They aren't juxtaposed since one has trouble shading from one to the other, into the other. When you proceed like they do with impressionism, and you saw why they worked like that, with little bits of color. When it's little bits of color and no longer in sections. For example, if you work with dots or commas, at most you could juxtapose, almost juxtapose, two spots—a red one with a green one. You can't juxtapose two dots since the juxtaposition of little bits—I won't get into it, we all know—it's precisely the definition of optical mixture as opposed to chemical mixture. That is, it's the eye that blends them. If you juxtapose little red dots with little green dots, the eye automatically performs an optical mixture; it makes gray. So it's necessary that, if you make a little red dot and a little green dot, there has to be enough space between them for you to blend from red into green and for the blend, or the gradient, from green into red. And this blending can be done in light/dark but it can obviously be done in color. There is a tonal gradient in the color spectrum no less than from light to dark.

Therefore, if you privileged contrasts, or diametric opposition, you're nevertheless bound to run into peripheral transitions in color. If you privileged peripheral transition, you're nevertheless necessarily bound to hit major contrasts, the diametric oppositions. You might say: *so what? That's well and good; we're reiterating... That's the definition of colorist space.* Yes and no.



In practice, you have a very curious decision to make. You have painters for whom, truly, everything is organized around diametric oppositions with the impressionists. And it still is in neo-impressionism. Seurat never stops telling us: what counts in the end are complementary relationships. It's the relationship between complements, and peripheral transitions are only relevant for blending from one complement to the other. And that, indeed, is the method of pointillism. It's over, I think. But—but—but there are others who greatly prefer analogy, working along the periphery, that is, they prefer the relationships between neighboring colors on the color wheel, neighbors at variable distances, depending on the chords you choose and that, that's very interesting.

So, you have to wonder with either one... Well, here's an outlier: Pissarro. Pissarro really is a painter. I'm not at all saying that there aren't any contrasts in his work, or that there aren't any complements in his work; I just mean he isn't interested in that. What interests him is building a world out of gradients of color. In other words, what interests him isn't opposition, it's transition. These aren't oppositions between tones; they're transitions from one tone to the next, with gradations in half-tones, quarter-tones, etc. And it's odd, because you may wind up with ambiguities, in impasses that are breathtaking because they are creative. Pissarro, the most benevolent painter—he's old, he's taught so much to other painters, he occupies a rather respected position in the group. *Ah, old Pissarro*, etc. The dignified, perfect, amazing Pissarro. At the same time, he really admires what... I mean it's so rare in human nature for old guys to look up to what the youth are doing, we have to commend him. It's beautiful, to have kept... Pissarro is amazed, Seurat, he finds Seurat—who to him is a very young man—he thinks what Seurat's doing is marvelous. And so he's digging Seurat's dot-strokes. And at the same time, he's uneasy. This old painter, as talented as he is, says: *well, yeah, he's right, he saw something and he saw the necessary link between the little bit, the point, the limit, the small bit and the world of color that we're all searching for. Seurat found it*, he says. Okay, well, and he's into using dot-strokes since it has to do with capturing this space of color. But he never felt comfortable with it, and you have Pissarro's famous pointillist works. He isn't comfortable with it. That's what we mean by saying, yeah, he's using a method but he isn't the one who created it; it doesn't work. Something gets in the way. But it seems to me that the hang-up is straightforward. It's straightforward. It's that the method of using dot-strokes was an excellent method for building a space of color that emphasizes opposition, diametric opposition. What interests Seurat is the other aspect of the color wheel, the peripheral line between neighboring colors. There's no reason to use dots. The dot-stroke loses its necessity; the dot-stroke is sort of gratuitous. Just like the painters who made the dot-stroke gloomy, the un-vivid dot-stroke, the un-colored dot-stroke: there is Henri Martin. At a time when everyone was coming down on and jeering at Seurat and his bright dot-strokes, there was one jackass who adopted his method, who used dot-strokes—but dots... little non-colored dots, little uncolored dots. Irrelevant. Everyone thought it was terrific—well, I'm exaggerating... Henry [sic] Martin sold a lot of paintings; Seurat didn't. It didn't work for Seurat. So it was really confusing. Here you had work completely devoid of method. Mindlessly making dots. He made dots [and] everyone said: *What pretty dots!* [And in Seurat's case:] *Ah, no, that doesn't fly. It doesn't work.* Pissarro wasn't like Martin; he adopted the method through a sort of love for Seurat. He said to himself, *there's something here I can make use of.* No, the method didn't really suit him because, again, his problem was the transition from one tone to the next.

And I'd almost say the same thing about... Then, with Cézanne, it turns into something inextricable. Cézanne made this whole colorist space, well beyond—I don't know—he brought it to a kind of absolute perfection... Last time I pointed out the coexistence in his work of the luminist method, specifically—tackling the same subject using the luminist light/dark approach, local colors, etc., blending the local color in shades, light/deep, etc.





Anyway! And then the other method that he's really the first one to pull off, the first one to even systematize—although it varies with each painting; he isn't using a formula—and that specifically involves: toss out any problems concerning light, from the get-go. Don't let any light show, don't show any lines; instead, make relief-effects with color. And the relief-in-color will be, will take, establish, a sequence—only he never uses the same sequence twice, obviously—a sequence of colors, step-by-step in the order of the spectrum. A sequence around a culminating point. So, you see that here, too, both aspects are combined. Because the culminating point will be complementary with another point, located elsewhere in the painting, but all of the volume, all of the color-volume, will be rendered by this sequence of small blotches—since he doesn't use points but fairly small blotches—a sequence of blotches moving along the order of the spectrum. So depending on the paintings of... I referenced this article by an Englishman, a very detailed article on Cézanne, where he analyzes a dozen different sequences, alongside reproductions of the paintings. Unfortunately, they're in black-and-white... But that doesn't matter. Anyway! I'd almost say that Cézanne in a way seems closer to Pissarro than to... than [there are] differences. It's Cézanne who cries out: what matters is the transition between tones! Yet what prevents him from—you see where the technique is headed, it develops into an extraordinary technique—when filling in part of a sequence, he'll forbid himself from using any mixture. He has to find the right hue every time. The gradation must be one made of color—Not... not one from... light to dark. Every time, he has to find the right tone in the sequence. Otherwise he leaves it blank. The renowned Ambroise Vollard, upon seeing a blank spot, noted, "But that's strange; this spot is blank." And he responded: "Please try to understand—if I use a blend or roughly guess at the color, it's ruined. I'll have to start over. I'd have to start over, starting with that color."<sup>20</sup> It's like he's searching for transitions. And when Cézanne frothed against Gauguin it's because, he says, "Gauguin took everything from me; he took everything, but he understood nothing." That was completely unfair, since I think Gauguin didn't take all that much, and he understood it perfectly well. He says: "Gauguin didn't understand the main problem, the problem of transitioning, transitioning between colors in the order of the spectrum." Here he tells us his method. See, I'd say that's the first stage. This space of color, made up of pictorial units or little pieces, stirs up a problem for the first time, namely, how to make two paths coexist in this this space: the peripheral path and the diametric path. And in each painter, how does that take place, how...? Alright! That would be the first stage.

What happens after that? If I make... Sorry, just some points of reference. But it was extremely important... see, this business with Cézanne's sequences, or this space made up of little bits—this colorist space made up of little bits—it's already a micro-space, pictorially, compared to previous schools. It's funny... it's a funny thing, this colorist micro-space: it's the triumph of brightness. You can see how brightness is achieved via these sequences in a totally different way from the bright regime of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. They're two completely different regimes. But then... But then... I'd say... If I were to circle back to what I said earlier. Remember that in my comments about the diagram—hopefully you remember some of it—I said that what's frustrating about the diagram is that it's continually oscillating between

---

<sup>20</sup> Deleuze cites—roughly, since it's likely from memory—a moment from Ambroise Vollard, *Paul Cézanne* (Paris: Editions G. Crès, 1914), 129. While Cézanne was working on Vollard's portrait, the latter comments on a few blank spots in the painting. As it appears in Vollard's original text: "Si ma séance [...] est bonne, [...] peut-être demain trouverai-je le ton juste pour boucher ces blancs. Comprenez un peu, monsieur Vollard, si je mettais là quelque chose au hasard, je serais force de reprendre tout mon tableau en partant de cet endroit!" Deleuze swaps out *quelque chose au hasard* for *mélange* and improvises the rest of the quote.



two poles: between code—and there might be codes grafted onto a diagram; in fact it's necessary for there to be some—and interference, pure interference. We see it clearly in the history of color such as I've tried to describe it. You'll find the pole of interferences, for example, perfectly demonstrated in Caravaggio's dark grounds. When the ground [*interruption—switching tracks?*]... in terms of the diagram regarding the other pole. It doesn't take much for it to be a code. And ultimately, ultimately, in light of some of Seurat's remarks or even some of Seurat's paintings, you think: what is he introducing to painting? A veritable code, a pictorial code of dot-strokes. With dot-strokes. It turns into a code. And in Cézanne, even in Cézanne, the sequences along the order of the spectrum—it's like the equivalent of a color code, a code particular to color, with its two main laws, its two main formulas: diametric opposition and the gradual transition between hues. Alright, then.

What happens after that? After that, what I'm getting at, it's that this coloristic space—it's wonderful. Nothing else to say—it's, it's perfect. A thing disappears, I believe, when it produces work as intended, when it was meant to... when it's saturated by its own product. Then it can disappear and die; we move onto another problem. Another way of addressing problems of space. But there were two problems with these little bits, with the first stage of using little bits.

The first problem was: what to do? You had sequences from point to point, bit by bit—types of sequences, alright. But wouldn't that destroy the architecture, the architecture of the painting? Little blotches, dots, etc.—how do you maintain structure? And really—how do you preserve the structure perpendicular to the colored sequences? Or to the diametric oppositions? How do you maintain structure? That's the problem. It isn't easy with Cézanne: there is a whole game of diagonals in Cézanne where, in a way, the line is brought back in. A Cézanne line, and so on, in order to preserve structure or to reintroduce structure into this colored field, into space-as-colored-field. [Lawrence] Gowing goes so far as to talk about a virtual architecture in Cézanne, based on examples; even if the lines aren't traced, a sort of structure of planes perpendicular to the colored sequences has to be maintained, or else the painting winds up—well—*limp*. Winds up—I don't know—it winds up... just boneless. But Cézanne pulls it off. But what? Now there's no longer any code. It's no longer a code of color; it's something else. So that's the first problem: how do you maintain structure?

The second problem: the little bits also compromise something, namely: the specific form, the singular form of the object. The singular form of the object in danger of shattering into the dust of these little bits. For Cézanne too, it's a real problem. He works out his whole theory of the culminating point, precisely in order to preserve the sort of singular volume of the object.

Well? It seems, it seems, that we've come to those who'll break with impressionism to establish a kind of... of... to establish a sort of expressionism, in particular Van Gogh and Gauguin. This is the turning point for them. It's as if—there are a thousand other things to say; that's why... they're only guidelines. My impression is that those are really their problems. Well, that's great, Impressionism gave us everything, did it all. Cézanne is a great man. They don't like Seurat. Seurat—Van Gogh did, Van Gogh is kinder; he also likes Seurat. Even he thinks that Seurat's dots and his comma-strokes—that they can work. But Gauguin is a lot harsher. He made up a funny song about Seurat, with the refrain: *one dot, two dots, three dots*. He didn't make it, no, one of his friends. I'd love to find someone who could put it to music, because it's a charming song—very, very cheerful. But anyway, he hated the stuff. And then cut to Cézanne saying, *Gauguin took everything from me [but] he didn't understand anything*.

What did Gauguin want? And what did Van Gogh also want, although maybe less... less...less pointedly. I believe this is what they wanted: to protect two things—but it'll require a new space and a new use of color. Totally new. It's what first sparks impressionism.



Preserving the architecture, that is, reintroducing solid structures, on the one hand, and on the other hand, reconstituting the singular volume of the thing in itself. And how will they do that? While they do find an interesting and elegant solution, it will in effect spell the end of impressionism. Then impressionism lives on with Signac or Seurat's neo-impressionism, but Van Gogh—already with Van Gogh, not to mention Gauguin—takes it in such a different direction that it really isn't impressionism at all. What is it then? What do they do? Well, I think they retrieve, right, they retrieve... restore architecture—what do I mean? Restore architecture, which is to say, they elevate color. It's not about going back to an Italian or Renaissance sort of architecture, what in the Renaissance was called the painting's composition—it's not about that at all. Because at that point they couldn't go backwards. They had to come back and reinvent an architecture of color and through color. How will they do that? That's the first direction: restoring architecture through color with color. They rediscover something that then had already existed, but they rediscovered it in an absolutely new context: finally, they'll discover color structure. They'll discover color structure, and in this regard they're surprisingly modern, that is, something like what Comtesse just said, citing the example of Sam Francis, but there are many American painters who use a color structure. This is kind of a triumph, I think, for a modern form of painting, more modern than impressionism.

And what is it? In simplest terms, color structure is the return to the field regime.<sup>21</sup> It's the field, color laid flat, a monochromatic color laid flat onto the canvas. And that clearly has nothing to do with a return to the Renaissance. It's actually the use of color structure, while in the Renaissance structure is maintained by something else entirely; it's maintained by an instance, a type of collective line, so it's completely different. And this restoration of the field's going to be incredible; it'll lead to all sorts of things. But the field, the field, the monochromatic field—what does that mean?

And this is about the same time, remember, that Van Gogh and Gauguin enter the fray. What does that have to do with anything? You see what Cézanne means when he says, "But Gauguin didn't understand anything about transition." Nothing at all. Or rather, you could just as well say, it's true that Gauguin didn't understand anything about transition, but that's not his problem—you can't expect people to do everything, right? On the flipside, Cézanne doesn't understand anything about Gauguin's problem. Gauguin's problem is how to make a structure out of color. The monochromatic field is the simplest form of structure; it's a uniform structure.

"Then that's no good," you might say, "In what way is a field a structure?" Well. Because something starts to take shape, something we're still dealing with, where American painting delved down and conquered a formidable coloristic space: a kind of band-structure relationship. What one might call band-structure or ribbon-structure. What does that mean? This structure... Now we can see that color turns into structure. When you combine flat structure, the field, with a band of ribbon, there's something specifically colorist going on. For example, some of Sam Francis's work is like this. One of the greatest American painters in this vein is [Barnett] Newman, who rightly, is rightly called an abstract expressionist.

What does that give us? I mean, you make a monochrome field and you're going to introduce—in cases of complex structures—you're going to introduce divisions, sections. Sections? Sections either of another color, for example a field of—it doesn't matter—a red field and... with a violet section, and you can have a field several sections. Or you just run a

---

<sup>21</sup> Ed. Note: I've gone with "field," in keeping with Dan Smith's translation of *Logique de la sensation*. If not for Deleuze and Guattari's extensive use of *bloc*, I'd also recommend "block" as a possible translation for *aplat*—some English discussion of Van Gogh's interest in Japanese prints, for example, refers to his uninterrupted fields of color as "blocks," so there is some precedence. For what it's worth.



band of a different color across your field: what happens? You get this whole interplay. It's monochrome. You can include light and dark shades in your field. There are some painters who did that, but not for long. Since the point is that the field be monochrome and that the only intervening differences be not in value—light/dark—but differences in saturation.

At what level do these differences in saturation operate? Of course, it depends on where in the field, depending on whether it's close to the ribbon or far from the ribbon.

You'll have relations of proximity between the field and the ribbon that crosses it. The field and the ribbon that crosses it or bisects it—there's any figure you can think of: a section, a rectangular section in the field, a ribbon cutting across it all the way from top to bottom or from right to left, from left to right, etc. All sorts of figures. And depending on the field's color and its relationship to the ribbon's color, what's going to happen, what kind of saturation? Once you've understood these ribbon-structure or field-ribbon sorts of complex structures, you'll come back to pure monochrome, that is, to a pure field. And at that point you'll see that it obviously makes a structure. That the differences in saturation can themselves introduce a whole framework, a whole structure, that is, they can function like sections, only non-localized sections, or like non-localized ribbons. So that's that.

Here you have a deployment of color structure. Then you might ask: what does that change? See, at this stage, this is what I was talking about earlier: they couldn't care less about complementary relationships. That's over. Why is that? You've come back to painting in broad strokes—and it's true that currently there's a very important trend to return to the large, to large-scale. Well, you come back to that: are you going to say that what motivates your sections of the field are complementary relationships, diametric oppositions? No, that's over! It's not over, it's not over—I don't mean that it's over. I mean, well, it was really... That well has run dry; it's... know what I mean? I'll reiterate that if you think about it, I think it's the same thing in philosophy, it's the same thing for... it's the same thing everywhere. There are some things that are, well... they haven't lost any of their timeliness so long as we don't repeat them; if we repeat them, it's...beating a dead horse, it's a waste of time. That well's run dry. We have to look elsewhere, we have to look elsewhere, if only to, and depending on... After all, if Cézanne did what he did, it was so no one would be able to repeat Cézanne. And it's the same with literature, it's the same with philosophy, it's the same thing everywhere. Okay, good! It's not the complementary relationships, it's differences in saturation between hues. What does I mean?

At this point I'll only briefly refer to a great text, which came after Goethe, by Schopenhauer. Schopenhauer had revised Goethe's theory in an early essay. And his revision was really interesting because he introduced the idea of a space proper to color and a weight proper to color. It was really strange, because he said that there's no reason for the color wheel to be divided in equal parts. With devilish cunning, he proposed the following division: it was generally accepted that the wheel was abstractly divided, abstractly, into three parts—the three-part color wheel. In effect there are three complements. There are three complementary relationships: blue/red—no... Sorry: red/green, blue/orange, etc. You have three complementary relationships. You divide your circle in three, in three equal parts. Then, if you follow me, every two colors, every complementary pair, occupies one third of the circle, but within each third of the circle the relationship between one complement and the other—the relationship between a color and its complement—is not symmetrical. So, for example, blue and red would be two-to-two: here the third of the circle would be divided in two, but the blue-to-orange relationship isn't even. In other words... And for example, I don't remember the numbers, it's like 2 thirds, 2 thirds and 1 third. You see? Thus, each group of complements has its own area of distribution. I think that's important because with that, we already have a sort of structuration proper to color. Color has a sort of spatializing quantity that varies from



color to color. He made a few remarks on weight that I found innovative, especially in light of how interested Americans today, American colorists, are in color having a kind of weight.

And a color theorist, a modern one named Albers, has a very, very concrete takeaway from all that, since he's a practicing painter.

It's what he calls quantity studies, color's spatializing quantity or weighable quantity, the weight of color. And Albers ends this bit by saying: "Such quantity studies have taught us to believe that, independent of harmony rules, any color 'goes' or 'works' with any other color, presupposing that their quantities are appropriate."<sup>22</sup> I believe that's what modern painting is. If you... So long as you only use diametric oppositions or gradations between colors, there were still laws. And impressionism knew how to discover these laws, develop these laws, demonstrate these laws—impressionism got as much out of them as it could. But down, down below, there was something still humming, still... I don't know what—a lawless world. And the lawless world is when you introduce new coefficients of color, spatial energy, for example, or weighable energy, and then everything goes with everything if you put the right coefficients! I really like this line, because it's a real painter's line: "independent of harmony rules, any color 'goes' or 'works' with any other color"—*that's* colorism.

And there is a text by Van Gogh that I find astonishing. When Van Gogh experiments with fields, it has—especially compared to Cézanne—that has a lot of practical consequences: a change in values. It's when Gauguin and Van Gogh—I'm not saying they stuck with it—but it's a turning point where they say: ultimately, the only thing worth painting, what it's really about, is the portrait. They say we have to develop, we have to go back to portraits and make a modern portrait. It's an about-face from Cézanne, because the Cézannian hierarchy (he wasn't shy about it—it was very clear) was: landscapes, still lifes, while portraits only, right, for Cézanne? A portrait? No, and it makes sense what with his method. It makes sense; it's integral. No way around it. There's nothing wrong with portraits, so long as you treat them like still lifes or landscapes. Which is why Cézanne's portraits are so much like still-lives. But now it's the other way around. A return to portraits.

What does that mean? It can be totally traced back to this history of the evolution of color. Of course there's a return to portraiture because (now I've run out of time, so that's perfect) because it's no longer the diametric oppositions that count, what do you get when you come to color structure? What is the color connected to? With fields it's bright hues, the bright regime. What are they going to be connected to? No longer to complementary colors, no longer to gradual transitions, but to a funny thing called "broken color." And what are broken colors? A broken color is... If two complementary colors combine, you end up with gray. A broken color is when you combine complements but one is dominant over the other. A broken blue—you'll call it a broken blue—a broken blue is a blue... a blue/orange mixture where blue dominates. You break the color. However, the same color comes up twice: as a bright and as a broken color. It's a way of overcoming both diametric opposition and gradual transition. It's very intriguing. And that will be like a... the two elements of the grammar of color: bright and broken colors. According to Gauguin and Van Gogh. But why do I say that that implies the return or brings about the return to portraits? Not out of necessity but out of convenience—it's because broken color does an excellent job of depicting skin. Bluish, reddish hues—they're made with broken colors. And Van Gogh always says that the modern portrait should be done in broken colors. But now we arrive at... You'll have the Gauguin formula, as well as the Van Gogh formula: the great modern portrait on the field, the field done in a bright color—skin, figures done in broken color. Once it represents someone, whether or not it's a

---

<sup>22</sup> See Josef Albers, *Interaction of Color* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 44. Albers's account of Schopenhauer is found on pp. 43-44.





portrait is irrelevant. Because the same bright/broken color interaction—and the extraordinary freedom that gives you, since once again, in my opinion you’ve surpassed both the limitations of diametric opposition and the limitation of gradual transition.

They conquered a new space of color as spatializing and weighable energy. Almost the weight of the broken color and the spatiality of the bright color, the idea of the bright color. Broken/bright color, the repetition of the bright color through the broken color becomes the formula for Van Gogh and Gauguin. You can leave out what you want, the formula, etc. At the end of the day we have two colors whose problems are no longer decided by complementary relationships or what have you. Gauguin says he’s a colorist—yes, *pace* Cézanne—but an arbitrary colorist, that is, having conquered the space or the relations between colors are no longer limited by contrast or transition.<sup>23</sup> It creates distances of infinite space. That still leaves us with our two elements of modern color, namely, color structure and color form! Once again, in formal terms: color structure, culminating in the monochrome field, is that of the field-ribbon or field-section—as well as broken color, which reaches its height with skin and flesh. The interplay between color form and color structure is what defines colorist space and creates a new form of modulation. Cézanne thought that this approach meant eliminating modulation. One finds a whole new modulation basically defined by repeating bright color via broken color. That’s what this kind of modulation will be like.

---

<sup>23</sup> If I’m reading this correctly, Deleuze is calling Gauguin an “arbitrary colorist.” As far as I know, it is *Van Gogh* who describes his approach to color as “arbitrary” (as opposed to faithfully coloring his subject “as it appears”). See 1880 letter.