

Gilles Deleuze – The Deleuze Seminars (deleuze.cla.purdue.edu), summaries: Charles J. Stivale

Cinema: The Classification of Signs and Time, November 2, 1982 to June 7, 1983

(23 Sessions)

In the second year of Deleuze's consideration of cinema and philosophy, he commences the year by explaining that whereas he usually changes topics from one year to the next, he feels compelled to continue with the current topic and, in fact, to undertake a process of "philosophy in the manner of cows, rumination... I want entirely and truly to repeat myself, to start over by repeating myself." Hence, the 82-83 Seminar consists in once again taking up Bergson's theses on perception, but now with greater emphasis on the aspects of classification of images and signs drawn from C.S. Peirce. This allows Deleuze to continue the shift from considering the movement-image, that dominated early 20th century cinema, toward a greater understanding of the post-World War II emphasis on the time-image.

Cinema 2.1 - November 2, 1982

After defining at length his conception of the new Seminar – exceptionally (for Deleuze) on the same topic as previously – in terms of a “rumination” on many of the topics and concepts discussed in 1981-82, Deleuze also proposes to maintain (indeed, to strongly request) a seminar of reduced size but provides no viable means by which students would “choose” to go to some other philosophy class. However, in response to his opening remarks on course reorganization, Deleuze devotes nearly an hour several students’ questions and objections, most notably discussing the notion of “speaking” (in a class, in society) as well as its dangers. He also emphasizes the importance in this regard of understanding philosophy as the creation of concepts, not statements of opinion. Then, with material developed more concisely in *The Movement-Image* chapter 4, he begins his self-imposed repetition by returning to Bergson’s *Matter and Memory*, redefining the movement-image within a plane of immanence, composed of actions-reactions between which arises an interval, and this interval or gap serves to create a center of indetermination and variation between a privileged image and those images in variation around the latter. This gap phenomenon gives rise to three types of images: first, perception-images, and as this interval, for Bergson, resides in the brain functioning as an analyzer, it operates an interval transforming reactions to images into veritable action-images. Moreover, between these two image-poles emerges a third element, an affection-image, and Deleuze thus establishes the genesis of the organizational framework for his cinema analysis. Following several responses to students’ questions, Deleuze asks them to read for the next time Beckett’s “Film”, and Deleuze provides a “practical exercise” based on this text as a way of confirming the previous development regarding the perception-image, action-image and affection-image through elements of Beckett’s film.

Cinema 2.2 - November 23, 1982

In some ways, this session again relaunches the 1982-83 seminar, with a review of many of the previous session's details, possibly necessitated by an unexplained three-week break. After announcing in the first session a return to the previous year's material on the movement-image as well as to Bergson, particularly *Matter and Memory*, Deleuze outlines the projected analysis according to several related themes, including problems of movement and time, and light and its relations with shadow as revealed in Goethe's *Theory of Colors*. Deleuze also emphasizes the importance, on one hand, of understanding the concepts of "innovation" and modernity, particularly referring to Charles Péguy's *Clio*; and on the other hand, of developing a general classification of types of images and types of signs, the focal reference text being C.S. Peirce's *Écrits sur le signe (Writings of C.S. Peirce)*. Regarding modernity, Deleuze explores different aspects of "lyrical abstraction" and "expressionism" and places these in opposition following a set of three fundamental propositions for each. Deleuze summarizes his three global research directions as follows: movement and time in relation to the classification of signs and images; intensity and time through a confrontation of expressionism and lyrical abstraction from the perspective of light; and the movement-time problem for itself, that is, what the intensity-time problem allows us to conclude regarding time for itself. However, to begin to address these, Deleuze proceeds through a careful genesis of the movement-image and its universal variation (as developed in chapter 5 of *The Movement-Image*), tracing these effects in painting and returning briefly to Beckett's "Film" and to the experimental cinema of Michael Snow. With these examples and others, Deleuze develops a first aspect of "modernity," the disappearance of the privilege given to verticality, and a second aspect, abandonment of the solid body in favor of the energetic cluster. From these observations, Deleuze returns to different facets of light, detailing particularly the Bergson-Einstein confrontation on relativity, and concludes that, for Bergson, the movement-image system is in perpetual variation of lines of light, and that whereas matter is light, and things are figures of light, conscious offers the zone of obscurity, or black screen, without which light could never be revealed. Deleuze proposes to continue considering the movement-image system in terms of light in the following class.

Cinema 2.3 - November 30, 1982

Rather than immediately approach his development of Peirce's classifications, Deleuze reflects on Bergson's *Matter and Memory* and *Duration and Simultaneity* and their role in Bergson's development of his conception of movement, plane of immanence and blocs of space-time. Deleuze's purpose is to lay the groundwork for his much-desired classification of signs and images: developing several illustrations on the blackboard throughout the session (two of which are published in *The Movement-Image* p. 228), Deleuze provides the successive definition of four types of images -- the movement-image, and group corresponding to the "living image," that is, perception-image, action-image, affection-image. In the process, he develops something akin to the genesis upon the earth's plane of immanence of these forms of perception, providing the context for his return to the detailed analysis of Beckett's "Film". In this light, Deleuze concludes that beyond the composite type of the "living image", there exists a fifth type, the

indirect time-image, and also a possible sixth type, the direct time-image, the latter being what he calls the ultimate goal for this year's seminar.

Cinema 2.4 – December 7, 1982

Having linked Bergson's works to the classification of signs and images, Deleuze opens the session by answering questions from students, and then takes up the six types of images outlined in such detail in the previous session, with special focus on the possible distinctions between movement-images and the time-image. He then draws upon Bergson again to continue the classification process, suggesting that one might also consider the recollection-image as another type. But then, Deleuze states that for the moment, Bergson's usefulness is over and that his attention now will return to his reflection from the previous year, that is, to Charles Sanders Peirce's theory of signs, and most particularly, his understanding of images as Appearing in itself, or as phenomena (or from the Greek, *phanerons*). Three categories of "phenomena" of Appearing emerge in Peirce's system, of Firstness, Secondness, and Thirdness, and their intersection with the development of images and signs. To explain these, Deleuze commences with Secondness, notably as the coupling of force-resistance or action-reaction, that is, the action-image, with particular characteristics, and this analysis introduces at once the problem of individuation and the category of the real. Then, approaching the category of Firstness, he establishes its characteristics as pure qualities of the possible and of pure immediate consciousness, and links it to the affection-image and pure affect. These categories also bring forth the importance of the event as concept, and through an analysis in which Deleuze links these categories to Blanchot and Péguy, this concept constitutes a junction point for both Firstness and Secondness. At the end, Deleuze states that Thirdness remains to be linked to these first two categories.

Cinema 2.5 – December 14, 1982

Deleuze returns to Peirce's categories of Firstness, Secondness, and Thirdness, of which the first two were developed in the previous session. Summarizing for each the "modality", the "quantity", and the "act of mind", Deleuze slowly unfolds different aspects of Thirdness, notably its "modality" (the necessary), its "quantity" (generality), and its act of mind (interpretation), as well as its three characteristics (law, sense, and logical relation). Deleuze opens up several parenthetical discussions, notably, on the place of the problem of the relation in philosophy (with reference to Plato and Leibniz); on the derivation of a logic of relations from the Empiricists (with reference to Hume and Husserl); and on processes of the mind (with reference to Bergson's *Mind-Energy* and *Matter and Memory*). Deleuze links these perspectives to the conical theory (also derived from Bergson) introduced in the previous session, the cone of becoming within the plane of the movement-image, and then reconnects these perspectives to Peirce's categories, particularly to the characteristics of Thirdness. Given these new intersections, Deleuze proposes several "practical exercises" with cinematographic examples linked to Peirce's categories, on one hand, with the burlesque or slapstick cinema (Harry Langdon, Laurel & Hardy, especially the Marx Brothers), on the other hand, with types of actors and styles. For the next session,

Deleuze forecasts employing Peirce to link the types of images already identified to signs and thus to understand how the categories might intersect with the types of movement-image.

Cinema 2.6 – December 21, 1982

With Peirce's categories of Firstness, Secondness, and Thirdness fully engaged within the types of images that Deleuze had already developed based on Bergson's texts, he reflects on how an image becomes a sign. To do so, he follows Peirce's terminology of the sign – "representamen", object, interpretant – and links these to the three categories. Then, he returns to the graph developed in the previous session with the successive sign-images, that is, nine classes of signs: the sign in itself, qualisign, synsign, legisign; the sign in relation to its object, icon, index, symbol; the sign in relation to its interpretant, immediate interpretant, or reume; the dynamic interpretant, or dicisign; and the final interpretant, or habit. Based on these nine "grand signs," Deleuze enhances Peirce's categories in light of some missing aspects, particularly regarding Thirdness. He adds a "zero degree" that might explain how and why the movement-image engenders Firstness and Secondness (special images) within the universe of the light-image. This first degree, says Deleuze, is the perception-image, a Zeroness that refers to the perception-image. And thus, Firstness links to the affection-image, and Secondness to the action-image, yet leaving aside Thirdness for the moment. Deleuze derives successive definitions of the sign: first, as a special image representing the bipolar composition of the image type to which it refers; second, as the (special) image that will represent either the composition or the genesis of the image type to which it refers. These definitions yield multiple signs for each image type, three signs of composition, two signs of genesis. Then, Deleuze offers several examples, first in light of the quality or power within the affection-image, particularly as expressed by the face and effects of faciality. Here, Deleuze calls this an "icon", thereby commencing a parallel list of signs as a sign of composition of the affection-image. But as the face has two poles, Deleuze multiplies this into facializing contour and the aggregate of discontinuous features, hence "contour icons" and "feature icons", and as signs of genesis of the affection-image, he identifies the any-space-whatever (*espace quelconque*), with two types as well, named "qualisign of disconnection" and "qualisign of vacuity". Deleuze thus begins to outline the new graph of signs that will continue in the next session after Christmas break.

Cinema 2.7 – January 11, 1983

Having laid out Peirce's nine classes of signs before the Christmas break, Deleuze starts with a recap of Peirce's three categories (Firstness, Secondness, Thirdness), the new category that Deleuze added (Zeroness), the link between these categories, and the different kinds of images previously identified (movement-image, affection-image, action-image, perception-image, pulsion-image and "mental image"), and the classes on the organization table (see the previous summary). Deleuze calls this session a "chalk session" (*séance à la craie*) since he talks from the blackboard, creating certain aspects of obscurity for the recording when he refers to the written table. With at least two signs of composition (with two poles), a sign of genesis and a sign of extinction (sometimes the same), these four signs per image type serve as departure point for expanding an open list, but of approximately twenty types of signs. Hence, the goal for the

“chalk session” is to begin filling in this classification structure. Developing the binarity necessary for each of the signs with reference to Beckett’s “Film” and Pasolini’s cinema theory, Deleuze proposes signs for the perception-image which is connected to the category of Zeroness. The perception-image’s signs of composition are the “dicensign” (of a solid state) and the “reume” (of a liquid state), and its sign of genesis is the “gramme” or “engramme” (that he likens to the photogramme), also indicating that these latter terms serve for both bipolar aspects of the sign of genesis, the liquid state and the gaseous state. Then, he begins to derive the signs for the affection-image which is connected to the category of Firstness, linked to the sense of the face and faciality. The affection-image’s sign of composition is the “icon” (the power-quality apprehended in a pure state) which is further divided into “contour icons” and “feature icons”. However, as Deleuze begins to develop the affection-image’s sign of genesis, the recording stops, but as was indicated in the previous session, Deleuze proposes two kinds of “qualisign.” The session ends, in fact, with an additional one-minute fragment that actually corresponds to a minute from the first part of session 6. Hence, in session 8, readers will have to rely on Deleuze’s usual recap in order to glean what has been lost, if anything, at the end of this session.

Cinema 2.8 – January 18, 1983

This session is another “chalk session,” since Deleuze continues to develop the table of images and corresponding signs for the movement-image. Insisting on the importance of the table to be developed during the class (and useless for tape recorders), Deleuze carefully develops the table, starting with a recap as precisely as possible of the five-fold organization table developed thus far: the perception-image as Zeroness; the affection-image as Firstness; the impulse-image as the intermediate passage 1 to 2; the action-image as Secondness; the mental image as Thirdness. Then, for the perception-image, he recalls two signs of composition (the dicensign, the reume) and the sign of genesis (engramme); for the affection-image, the sign of composition (icon, with two poles, of facial contours or of facial traits) and sign of genesis (powers-qualities, qualisign with two poles, the qualisign of disconnection and qualisign of vacuity). This aggregate constitutes the movement-image with two levels, but Deleuze understands Thirdness as creating a passage toward something else rather than closing off the aggregate.

Then, to develop the distinctions between action-image and impulse-image, Deleuze explores different facets of artistic Naturalism as distinct from Realism, both of which are linked by what Deleuze calls “originary worlds” at their basis. Insisting that the impulse is an energy that grasps hold of pieces, Deleuze points to certain forms of cinema of terror, but also to the literary Naturalism of Zola. Deleuze develops this with reference to Joseph Losey’s films, but also returning to his previous comparison of Stroheim and Buñuel. After a long development, Deleuze derives for the impulse-image the sign of composition (fetish) and sign of genesis (symptom). After a short break, he then approaches the signs of the action-image and takes as exemplary model the American film prior to World War II especially, the model of the American dream, especially the Western (John Ford, King Vidor, Howard Hawks), and designates the signs of composition (the synsign or englobing, and binomial). He reserves developing the action-image’s sign of genesis for the next session, as well as considering the action-image’s relation to

historical films, with references to several specific texts that he cites as the session ends (from Hegel's *Introduction to the Philosophy of History*, and from Nietzsche's *Untimely Meditations*).

Cinema 2.9 – January 25, 1983

Despite having ended the previous class with specific reading assignments (from Hegel and Nietzsche), Deleuze continues with the classification table, first reviewing the different types of image and corresponding signs (see previous summaries), then indicating that he needs to add a separate entry for the action-image, that is, dividing it into two different aspects. Reminding the students that the signs of composition derived for the “large 1 action-image” are the synsign and the binomial, Deleuze devotes this entire session to deriving this image's sign of genesis, revealed finally as the impression [*empreinte*]. However, to arrive there, Deleuze traverses a review of the conception of history revealed in American pre-WW II cinema, i.e., the action-image of the American dream, with particular reference to different conceptions of montage, particularly D.W. Griffith's, but also by other filmmakers of the action-image, at once American (John Ford, Howard Hawks) and Soviet (Eisenstein). Deleuze then draws on a chapter from Nietzsche's *Untimely Meditations* to develop at length two of three aspects of his conception of history: monumental conception, antique conception, and ethical conception. Deleuze provides cinematic exemplars for the first two, for the monumental and antique, Griffith's “Intolerance”, DeMille's “Samson and Delilah”, as well as Eisenstein's understanding of Griffith's use of montage. Then, he considers other historical conceptions, drawing particularly from the Soviet model of dialectical montage, yet as reflected by the American-influenced Eisenstein. Another key point about the American historical conception is how the “American dream” is reflected and nuanced in pre-World War II cinema, as much the two aspects of its ideal as the doubts arising about this dream, leading to its collapse post-World War II. Deleuze brings this detailed discussion to completion with another square of his table, the impression, and proposes to complete the table at the next session.

Cinema 2.10 – February 1, 1983

Having developed the classification through examples drawn from the action-image films, Deleuze continues with this first version of the action-image “large form”, outlining the important “great organic representation” of the S-A-S' structure, and the hero's place in meeting the challenges that eventually lead to the original situation's modification (in S'). This structure leads Deleuze to define this action-image's signs of composition, the synsign and the binomial, as well as the important sign of genesis, the impression, through which the gap between the composition signs is bridged to provide the satisfactory mutation. Deleuze examines how this mutation corresponds to the impregnation (or impression) of power within the hero who then detonates that energy into action. After responding to a long question from Georges Comtesse, Deleuze approaches the second form of the action-image, marked by the reversal of the previous form, with the formula A-S-A'. This form is characterized as an action that unveils a situation not yet revealed, with signs of composition, the two kinds of index, the index of lack and the index of equivocity (or of distance), indicating that there is often never an ultimate situation (as in S-A-S'), but the constant possibility of extending them onward, like a tightrope stretched

forward. And this image of the stretched tightrope provides the sign of genesis for this form of action-image, the vector. Deleuze derives examples of different manifestations of this “small form” from Lubitsch (“Design for Living”), Chaplin (the Charlot series), Howard Hawks, Anthony Mann, and especially Werner Herzog whose cinema, for Deleuze, reveals the connection of both types of action-image forms. Deleuze concludes by stating that the classification of signs and images is almost complete and will have to await the return from winter break.

Cinema 2.11 – February 22, 1983

After a three-week winter break, Deleuze pursues discussion of his complex classification grid and considers signs of the action-image (notably, the synsign, binomial and vector) with reference to the previous year's discussion of this type (specifically, *The Movement-Image* chapter 11 on "Two Spaces"). Referring to the 22 April 1982 session (in which the specific recording is missing), Deleuze returns to an extensive comparison between two kinds of movement-image and space, the breath-space in Kurosawa and the vector space in Mizoguchi. Deleuze then indicates that an additional column is needed on the classification grid, and to develop this, he shifts the discussion from Secondness in the action-image toward an intermediate image preceding the mental image of Thirdness. Here, Deleuze develops a lengthy comparison between Soviet filmmakers via an imaginary dialogue between Vertov and Eisenstein about their considerable conceptual differences on the dialectic. Following Eisenstein closely, Deleuze emphasizes his development of a transformational form associated with a “montage of attractions” through theatrical and plastic forms of representation within the otherwise action-image framework. To this intermediate, transformational image, Deleuze attributes the sign of “figure” in the “third image” developed by Eisenstein. Then, temporarily abandoning Eisenstein, Deleuze focuses the session’s third part (appropriately) to considering the three representations in Kant, notably Ideas and the symbol, from the *Critique of Judgement*. Deleuze emphasizes particularly Kant’s concept of the “schema” as a way of understanding, first, the direct exposition of a concept and the indirect presentation. These latter, Kant’s “Ideas”, that is, concepts without direct presentation within experience, are represented by the term “symbol”, for which Deleuze substitutes “figure”, to which he plans to join two other terms, but not until the following session.

Cinema 2.12 – March 1, 1983

Picking up the discussion of Eisenstein from the previous session, Deleuze slowly moves past the two forms, grand and small, of the action-image by proposing the “figure” as the sign for the intermediary transformation image. Hence, he considers different uses of “figures” in Eisenstein, then in Godard and Truffaut, and then shifts gears entirely to reconsider the term “figure” from the rhetorical perspective, summarizing the complex web of “figures” outlined in the classic text by Fontanier. This examination of four types of “figures” yields three kinds of signs for the previously identified category of “transformation image” (the transition image between Secondness and Thirdness), two signs of composition with references to Eisenstein, and a sign of genesis, “figures of inversion”, with reference to several Howard Hawks’s films. Deleuze identifies these first three figures as “indirect figures of thought” that prepare the path toward a

“direct figure of thought”, the mental image, characterized by inclusion of a third aspect (hence, Thirdness). Hence, Deleuze addresses the mental image directly, insisting on its close links to another concept, the “relation” as a “thought object” (*objet de pensée*), and then he considers at length Hitchcock’s cinema insofar as he is the inventor of this image form. The reflection on the relation allows Deleuze to complete the classification table, specifically the “mental image” as Thirdness, for which the signs of composition are “marks” and “demarks” for the “natural relation” and the sign of genesis, the “symbol”, for the “abstract relation”. As he concludes the session, Deleuze suggests that while the mental image’s signs complete the classification table for the movement-image, the mental image actually implies a mutation requiring, once again, that Deleuze (and the seminar) start from the beginning with yet another classification table. Hence, at the halfway mark of the second Cinema Seminar, he prepares a significant shift of focus, consistently developed from the start of this Seminar.

Cinema 2.13 – March 8, 1983

Having completed the classification of movement-images with 21 types of signs, Deleuze reminds participants that these correspond to the movement-image or its mirror, the light-image. Following this opening recap, Deleuze responds to questions from participants, one requiring Deleuze to explain the static nature of his classification and to clarify the categories of Firstness, Secondness and Thirdness (with reference again to the Marx Brothers). He also offers a detailed definition of the theory of color (with reference to Goethe), that is, of light and shadow, opacity and refraction. In response to another question, Deleuze returns to the classification categories to convert them into traits of worlds and universes. He then opens the floor to an intervention by Georges Comtesse on the topic of Eisenstein’s “montage of attraction”, then spends forty minutes responding to Comtesse’s comments. During this response, Deleuze offers his understanding of the two laws of the dialectic, how this applies to Eisenstein’s conception of cinema, and how this differs from Comtesse’s position in his intervention. Then, returning to what remains to be developed in the seminar, Deleuze takes up the category of mental image which, he suggests, in some way explodes the entire sensorimotor system and opens it to another kind of image altogether. Moreover, this shift is accompanied by another one, a way of understanding the aggregate of movement-images in terms of montage. He concludes that through montage, one obtains necessarily indirect images of time and necessarily indirect figures of thought. To this montage-image, he attributes to the former the “chronosign” and to the latter, “the noosign”. As Deleuze clearly prepares to discuss the time-image, specifically moving from *The Movement-Image* chapter 12 (“The crisis of the action-image”) to *The Time-Image’s* opening chapter (“Beyond the movement-image”), he requests that the participants prepare for the next class by reading Pascal’s text on the wager as a way of engaging with his reflection on the indirect figures of thought.

Let us note that on the transcripts provided both by Paris 8 and WebDeleuze, this session’s second part actually repeats segment 2 from session 3 (November 30, 1982); our transcription is newly completed based on the session’s recording.

Cinema 2.14 – March 15, 1983

In concluding the previous session, Deleuze indicated that the struggle of light with darkness and the struggle to grasp an idea from the shadows were linked to specific thinkers, notably Pascal, whose text on the wager would be at the heart of the next discussion. However, Deleuze instead opens with a question-answer period which finally encompasses the entire session. The first part develops a question posed by Pascal Auger, considering how experimental cinema corresponds to the classifications Deleuze has developed, to which Deleuze again links Kurosawa's cinema, about which Georges Comtesse then offers some comments. Deleuze also proposes an interpretation that Auger resists, to wit, experimental cinema's importance for inspiring techniques in so-called traditional films and also having a commonality through experimental uses of the camera. Deleuze returns then to the table of classifications and proposes, first, to define indirect figures of time that can be derived from movement-images, and that, through montage, an aggregate of movement images will yield this indirect figure. Deleuze reviews the philosophical history related to this focus by discussing time and the measure of movement in the Greeks, then the extent to which measure, magnitude and unity intersect, and how these considerations draw in celestial movements and the astronomical eternal return. However, from the session mid-point forward, Deleuze is challenged by several students, initially a student questioning this astronomical model. Then, after Deleuze introduces Descartes into the development, Georges Comtesse offers an alternate interpretation of Descartes. When Deleuze rejects this, the student who had questioned the astronomical model vociferously objects to Deleuze's response as well as, later, to his manner of approaching this topic. After responding to these objections, he responds substantively by introducing the "instant" as a here-now element of time in relation to the interval of movement. He thereby distinguishes an interval between two presents, a present defined through the interval and the instant defined as a limit. This session stands out as a rare moment when Deleuze seems overwhelmed by a cascade of objections and responds angrily to them, summed up in his final voice-off comment, "they were really nasty today".

Cinema 2.15 – March 22, 1983

Continuing from the previous week, Deleuze reviews that discussion, notably how movement receives magnitude (*grandeur*) and the unit of measure through time, constituting time as the measure of movement. He distinguishes two aspects of time, time conceived as a part through the interval, the pure variable present; and time conceived in its aggregate as "number of movement", the immensity of future and past. Deleuze recalls the ways in which he linked these poles to Greek philosophy and to Descartes, and by considering movement in its extension, Deleuze can draw from it two complementary yet distinct indirect images of time. To consider these aspects, Deleuze turns to Kant's *Critique of Judgment*, to the concept of mathematical sublime, and particularly to the measure as disproportionate (*démesuré*). This leads Deleuze to examine what forms of evaluation exist, both the numerical or conceptual form and the aesthetic form and the components of evaluation (apprehension and comprehension), which he links to the two aspects of time, the interval (the pure present, the time segment) and the aggregate of time (past and future), the latter exceeding our aesthetic comprehension. Then, returning to the cinema framework, Deleuze discusses the Cartesianism of the pre-World War II French school of

cinema (Gance, L'Herbier, Epstein, Grémillon, Vigo), particularly the way in which light is subordinate to placing into the visual image the greatest amount of movement. Deleuze explores different facets of this effort in the works of different French cinematographers in order to derive the figures of the indirect time-image: on one hand, the time interval, selecting the interval that obtains the relative maximum amount of movement in a flow of images, corresponding to the variable present; on the other hand, the demand for excess and disproportion, that is, the mathematical sublime, corresponding to the time aggregate and the immensity of past and future and constituted as simultaneity. Deleuze explores how aspects of these figures manifest in works by different artists (the Delaunay, Fernand Léger, Olivier Messiaen, Paul Klee) and directors (Gance, L'Herbier). Then, to conclude the session (before Easter break), Deleuze introduces the complementary topic to that of studying extensive movement, the study of intensive movement. He points to Medieval distinctions between three types of cause (transitive, emanative, and immanent) as causes of God, and after examining these rapidly, he begins to speculate on what might be the corresponding figures of the order of time, which he momentarily defines as collapses and returns (*chutes* and *retournements*) of the soul. To trace the foundations of this complementary perspective, Deleuze introduces (for the next class) the work of Jakob Böhme and underscores its direct influence on German Romanticism, particularly through Goethe's *Theory of Colors*, and also Böhme's eventual influence on cinema.

Cinema 2.16 – April 12, 1983

With the preceding one, this session constitutes a major shift between consideration of the movement-image and foundation of Deleuze's understanding of the time-image. Deleuze even acknowledges briefly that this subject might provide material for yet another seminar on cinema and philosophy (in fact, two more), but he also speaks briefly once again of his dream to present a seminar on "what is philosophy?". As the session follows Easter break, he approaches a summary of previous key points by considering the material conditions of the "image in movement", that is, the camera position for shots (fixed or mobile), and its transformation into the movement-image through montage. Deleuze here distinguishes cinema image and photo image, likening the latter to a "luminous mold" (form imposed on matter). In contrast, the cinema image is likened (with reference to Simondon) to a "modulation", a variable, continuous and temporal molding of light.

Here Deleuze poses the problem for the rest of the seminar, what are the conditions necessary for deriving direct time-images? Just as he had provided an elaborate classification of the movement-images, he reintroduces the "chronosign" as heading for the alternate sign system. However, he remains on the cusp of the two systems by considering aspects of the movement-image that tend toward the time-image, on one hand, mobility of movement, and on the other, modulation of light. After a lengthy parenthesis regarding questions of "taste" as regards inclinations, on one hand, toward philosophical perspectives and, on the other hand, among cinematographers for light or movement, he explains that two chronosigns emerge, one for the movement-image, another for the light-image. He proposes a first indirect figure of time obtained through composition of movement-images, the "cinechrony", with two facets previously introduced, the variable present of the "interval", and the "immense", time taken as a

whole of past-future. Then, he derives a second indirect figure of images of time through composition of “modulation-images” or intensive movement, which he calls “chronochrony” with its own signs, time as “order” and time as “instant”, to which Kant’s “dynamic sublime” corresponds.

The rest of the session is devoted to Deleuze’s development of this Kantian concept, how it wells up as surpassing sensation for the individual in the battle of nature and spirit. By emphasizing the two different forms of discordance inherent to each type of sublime (mathematical and dynamic), Deleuze returns to French cinema, notably Gance’s cinema of the mathematical sublime, but also emphasizing the expression of the dynamic sublime in his texts. Summarizing his development, Deleuze links the mathematical, extensive sublime to time elements of “interval” and “Whole”, the “immense”, and dynamic, intensive sublime to the time “order” and the “instant”. He thereby links the former to the soul of movement and the latter to the soul of light, and thus to the intersection of future and past. By reintroducing the perspectives of Jakob Böhme on soul and light, Deleuze develops four steps of this crucial intersection for the intensive movement of time.

Cinema 2.17 – April 19, 1983

Starting the session recap with what indirect images of time result in the composition of movement-images, Deleuze moves more fully into the time-image, recalling the movement-image composition as extensive movement that gives rise to indirect images of time -- under two aspects, time as a Whole (*comme Tout*) and time as interval -- and as intensive movement, the movement-image as light-movement, from which another kind of indirect image of time emerges, movement as intensity. After considering different participants’ questions, Deleuze proceeds to relate successive steps of what he calls the “tale” of the adventure at once of intensity and of light-image’s intimacy with the soul. First step, light is “the invisible”, the state of perpetual diffusion, called the “Gründ” or foundation. This gives rise to the problem of what arises beyond this foundation, an “Ur Gründ”, causing light, or infinite spirit, to become visible, and Deleuze links this at once to the neo-Platonists and to Jakob Böhme. Second step, this light or infinite spirit encounters the first condition for manifestation, to wit, splitting itself into two equally infinite and opposing forces, the will to manifest facing the condition of the abyss or shadows (*ténèbres*), or the “Ab Gründ”, that which is separated from its foundation. Examples of this opposition appears in vacillating images, Deleuze argues, as much in Romanticism as in German Expressionism (in painting and cinema). Third step, the previous step’s opposition marks a zero point, or an “Un Gründ”, a point of equilibrium that marks a point of opacity, darkness and light in balance, and the emergence of black and white, or according to Goethe, maximum and minimum opacity, degrees of opacity which will establish an intensive scale in relation to zero. As a way of tracing the successive condition of light’s and form’s “appearance” (*l’apparaître*), Deleuze provides a detailed development of successive traits of this scale: striations (an immobile scale alternating black and white series) as in German film Expressionism; mixtures through degrees of chiaroscuro on a mobile scale (especially in Murnau); emergence of degrees of “contour”; and appearance of color inseparable from intensity as light. Here, Deleuze speaks of successive colors and mixtures that slowly emerge from black-white, through yellow (darkened white)-blue (clarified black). Fourth step, the infinite works within the finite, within conditions of visibility and colors, hence the stage of the spirit of evil

insofar as it expresses God's anger, through intensification, saturation and attenuation of extant colors (yellow-blue), yielding "reddish" (*rougeâtre*). With reference to Goethe's *Theory of Colors*, Deleuze traces aspects of this emergence, through "sparkling" or fragmented reflection, with examples from Murnau, and with Goethe, shows how this color, transforming into purple, exceeds and burns nature, expressing God's anger. Deleuze suggests that this is the intensified "instant", the infinite at work within the finite, and for the next session, Deleuze asks the participants to consider how this intensity of red and the dynamic sublime are entirely equivalent, constituting a fifth step to be considered.

Cinema 2.18 – April 26, 1983

In one of the stranger sessions in the Cinema 2 seminar, Deleuze lays out some very specific goals, notably suggesting the importance of reviewing Kant's theory of the sublime (a topic already considered to some extent in previous sessions). However, he gets to that review only briefly, and instead, the session is indeed the "story of red" as Deleuze begins by saying, but also ends the session by commenting about his own performance, "I was really off the mark (*con*) today." He starts with a recap of the four steps of the light-image developed in the previous session: the autopoiesis of infinity seeking to manifest itself; its opposition from the infinite force of shadows; a zero point of equilibrium, infinity working within emergent finitude, with successive aspects of finite distance – black opposed to white, then facets of opacity and degrees of chiaroscuro, i.e., of contours, through which yellow and blue emerge -- and through their intensification, emergence of red upon red, or God's fury and that of Apocalypse. Yet, Deleuze wonders how this "red upon red" might also be the color of inner peace, even of dignity and grace, and how red could be at once choleric and peaceful, even elevating the hypersensitive being's self-awareness. This question is the basis of the development's fifth step, requiring deeper consideration both of Goethe's *Theory of Colors* and of Kant's theory of the dynamic sublime in terms of red as the operation of this sublime and foundation of the totality. That is, red as supernatural (and even supranatural) is the intensification of yellow and blue and source of this aspiration to totality of the spirit, and through which an order of time becomes evident. To justify these perspectives, Deleuze elaborates at length the chromatic wheel as explaining the derivation of colors, with references to Messiaen and Kandinsky, but also at the basis for founding the indirect image of time working through light, with its four characteristics among which Deleuze outlines the linkages interior to time. He then turns to Proust's *Time Regained* to contrast the interior of time (and the open aspect of time) with the locus one occupies in space and time, and Deleuze enters thereby more deeply into the depths of our experience of time, both in terms of the Whole and in terms of the interval and instant. Moreover, he links the final paragraph of *Time Regained* to the sublime, as developed in the cinema of Dovchenko and Eisenstein, in order to trace the path of the infinite distance that one acquires within time's interior.

Cinema 2.19 – May 3, 1983

Before continuing with the time-image development, Deleuze allows Georges Comtesse to provide a counter-perspective on "lost time" in response to the previous session's discussion of the constitution of time in Proust. In response, Deleuze undertakes a long development on the

interiority of time, requiring that he reflect on point of view in Leibnizian terms, i.e., with reference to the theory of conic sections, then to Péguy and his concept of the “A-ternal”, then to Bergson’s perspectives on lived time and duration in relation to the concept of an “interior of time”. Then, in response to another Comtesse question, Deleuze reflects on the contrast of narrative point of view between Balzac and Proust, and finally, after 90 minutes of responses to questions, Deleuze returns to the two directions he planned to undertake regarding the dual aspects of the indirect image of time. Defining this image as constituting chronosigns, he reviews previous discussion of the interval as variable present, the qualitative leap between instants, as a first type of chronosign (dynamic sublime); then, the Whole of time as the other constitutive aspect, to which Deleuze also refers as the interior of time (spiral, helix, immensity of simultaneity, mathematical sublime). Then, beyond these chronosigns, Deleuze starts to outline the corresponding indirect figures of thought, or noosigns, that is, under what figure thought is apprehended. But fundamental to this is the question, just what does a “manner of thinking” mean? Deleuze suggests that while, for some, thinking is a kind of work, for others, it is a battle with the shadows, with whatever it is within thought itself that prevents us from thinking, and that the figure for this perpetual recommencement of the thought battle is a “counterbrand” (*contremarque*). Moreover, as this first noosign suggests the thought-battle as a dialectic, Deleuze broaches Hegel in some detail, and in opposition to his thought, Deleuze finds the “heads or tail” noosign, the alternative espoused by Pascal, both (Hegel and Pascal) to be developed in the next session.

Cinema 2.20 – May 17, 1983

In outlining the itinerary for the rest of the seminar, Deleuze pursues his discussion of the history of “figures of thought”, confronting these with time-images, allowing him to move toward a principle of time and thought that would be direct. Hence, Deleuze here explains how the problem of figures of thought might, in fact, be considered as the problem of what is philosophy. For Deleuze, thought produces a figure when it manages to think of the real or of the existing (*l’existant*), the latter being the object’s position outside the concept, in contrast to the possible, that is, to the object’s essence. Hence the logical principles through which thought in itself thinks of the possible (principles of identity, of non-contradiction, and of the excluded third). But to think the real requires other principles, notably of causality and of finality, and with these basic principles posed, Deleuze emphasizes successive “great moments” in philosophy as regards figures of thought: first, Descartes and the importance of the Cogito, and the manner in which Descartes’s formulation is situated in the principle of identity within a determined portion of the real, of the existing. Second, Leibniz’s reformulation of the principle of identity such that thought might encompass the real in its totality, with each thinking “I” (“Moi”) encompassing the totality of the world, that is, each “monad” being a point of view onto the world within one’s sphere of clear and distinct expression. In this, all that exists links to a principle of sufficient reason, with identity governing essences and sufficient reason governing existences. Third, Kant and his discovery of “synthetic judgments” (in contrast to Leibniz’s “analytic judgments”), and then post-Kantian philosophers and their definition of synthetic identity, notably Fichte and Schelling, the negation of the non-“I” by the “I”, accomplished (for Schelling) through art,

constituted as the principle of non-contradiction. Then arrived Hegel, affirming that things do not contradict themselves, thus taking literally the principle of non-contradiction. Deleuze shifts the focus to distinguish the dialectic of Ancient Greece with modern dialectics. The former, says Deleuze, is a struggle with tumult and chaos in order to invent a spiritual life with its own forms, and this notion emerges in modern times through Romanticism (e.g., Novalis, Hölderlin) and especially later, in Expressionism, through the cry -- the qualitative leap, the elevation of the instant to the power of two -- for which Deleuze provides several privileged examples: in cinema, Murnau, Lang, Eisenstein; in opera, Alban Berg; and also in Kandinsky's theories. However, he asks: what other paths might exist beyond this Expressionist struggle with chaos, particularly a path that might reconcile thought and the existing at the level of the excluded third? This, says Deleuze, would be the thought of alternance, the "either-or" thought, the player's or gambler's thought, in which the thinkers and artists take on responsibility for the entire universe, and Deleuze simply prepares the next session by indicating several examples: in cinema, Dreyer and Bresson; in philosophy, Pascal the Catholic, Kierkegaard the reformist, and Sartre the atheist (a philosophy of choice); and in literature, the numerous choices of Proust's narrator, to which Deleuze links Pascal's text on the wager, since in both cases, a superficial choice seems to hide a deeper one. And by linking Pascal to Sartre, Deleuze ponders the situation that some choices occur only under the pretext that no choice is possible. Yet, given that, in these cases, the choice is in fact between different modes of existence, each philosopher's distinct approach needs additional discussion in the next session.

Cinema 2.21 – May 24, 1983

This session could be entitled "the choice" since it follows the previous session's outline of artists and thinkers of the "alternative" or "either-or" lineage of thought. To construct the concept of "alternative", Deleuze first develops different facets of the Pascalian lineage of "the wager," Kierkegaard of course, but also several now little studied 19th century thinkers, notably Charles Renouvier and Jules Lequier, with their theme of "freedom-choice" which then will link to Sartre's emphasis on the existential choice. Deleuze's question is: what kind of figure does this lineage of thought take on through its different phases? Deleuze considers the manner in which Pascal develops "orderings" (*classements*) of different sorts -- most notably for conical sections, based on discernment of points of view -- and how this approach exemplifies "either-or" thinking. Moreover, Deleuze provides a parallel analysis, on how this thinking leads directly to contemporary approaches to organization of cases and practices within jurisprudence. He then returns to "either-or" thinking in filmmakers, notably Dreyer and Bresson as well as the Expressionists, particularly with a battle between light and shadows and the alternance between black, white, and gray. Having established this "typology," Deleuze emphasizes that the orderings occur not based on essences (which are classified), but on "modes of existence", examples of which he draws from different fields: from Pascal, the conic sections on a plane of projection and other ordering within the *Pensées*; from Proust, the ordering of "young ladies in flower" as likely sweethearts in *A l'ombre des jeunes filles en fleur*. Deleuze concludes that the alternation of cases connects to alternatives of modes of existence, and hence subjective point of

view connects to modes of existence of the persons making the choice, using Pascalian terms, or “stages of existence” using Kierkegaard’s, or “the authentic and inauthentic” using Sartre’s.

The second half of the session consists of a systematic development of these sets of terms, starting with the formula, to exist is to choose modes of existence, but what happens when one has no choice? Deleuze provides several examples and moves progressively toward the Sartrean analysis of choice, which indicates that despite some justifiable situations of no choice, there are indeed some that arise only by someone convincing him/herself of there being no choice, whatever the circumstances, which is, in fact, a choice, hence the Sartrean category of “bad faith”, or Pascalian category of “diversion” (*divertissement*), or Kierkegaard’s “aesthetic stage”. For each, Deleuze examines several examples and analyses of “the inauthentic”, returning finally to Kierkegaard and the “aesthetic stage”: the choice I make under the condition that I affirm that I have no choice. But he moves on to another phase, to wit, the choice of choice, implicitly meaning a choice of mode of existence. In this light, Deleuze discusses in Sartrean terms the French people’s “choices” during the Nazi Occupation. He also considers why writers of this “choice lineage” rejected morality and its implicit transcendental values, and instead emphasized the individual’s chosen immanent modes of existence. In this light, Deleuze turns to Pascal’s famous “wager” which, in fact, consists not in an alternation between choosing whether or not God exists, but rather in the alternative of two modes of existence, one of the man of faith, the other of the atheist, and the stakes of these modes of existence. Deleuze finally indicates the direction for the next session, to consider the case of someone who deliberately chooses “divertissement”, i.e., for evil, the devil, for example, an inveterate fascist willing to die for an evil cause. Let us note that some of these reflections are succinctly included in *The Movement-Image*, chapter 7.

Cinema 2.22 – May 31, 1983

As Deleuze reaches the seminar’s final sessions, he continues discussing philosophers of alternative thinking or choice, delving into what he calls the mysteriously religious aspect of this thought, but to emphasize the direct links between matters of faith and aesthetic issues as well. He first considers different shades, as it were, of alternation within Dreyer’s and Bressons’s films: “men of white”, that is, according to Pascal, the “pious” (*les dévots*); “men of gray”, or the uncertain, those unable to choose; “men of black”, who opt for evil; “men of true choice”, opting for choice; and the ass, the creature of non-choice, incapable of choosing. Deleuze maintains that this line of thinking consists of both alternation and the alternative, the former as basis, the latter as act, and shifting from the alternation of terms, these thinkers and artists jumped to alternative of modes of existence. And it’s in the true choice of a mode of existence -- in which the private relation with the living God is established, that is, the choice of choice -- that one mysteriously receives everything, through faith. Here, Deleuze evokes a Russian philosopher, Lev Shestov (or in French, Léon Chestov) who, like Kierkegaard, established the opposition of two types of thinking, public versus private, the latter being Job and Abraham in their private relationship with God. Through this choice, says Deleuze, what is rendered is an “in-between” (*entre-deux*) that is neither incertitude nor hesitation, and in cinema, Deleuze points to the “women’s trilogy” in Dreyer (“Ordet”, “Day of Wrath”, “Gertrud”) as revealing this attainment of choice. Deleuze

turns at this point to Charles Péguy not only for a different kind of Christian perspective, but also for his links to Bergson as the latter's disciple. Deleuze insists on parallel aspects in Péguy's writing, not simply on the problem of faith, but also (even especially) on the aesthetic problem, notably in Péguy's stylistics of repetition, examples of which Deleuze provides with lengthy excerpts from two works (most importantly, from *Clio*). These excerpts reveal Péguy's Bergsonism, his theorizing of a mass of successive vertical instants along the horizontal line of time, through which potentializations of events accrue. This theorizing corresponds in Deleuze's reading to his previous discussions of the dual aspects of the event, its actualization and its potentialization, corresponding to the Bergsonian dual components of duration. Developing this intersection in the final minutes of the session, Deleuze indicates that these overlapping aspects help provide a long-awaited encounter with the direct image of time.

Cinema 2.23 – June 7, 1983

At the end of the Seminar, Deleuze begins by providing an overview of the year's arguments and then returns to Bergson and certain "schémas" or illustrations in *Matter and Memory*. Specifically, Deleuze's main purpose in year 2 was to develop a fuller classification of images and signs, starting from movement-images and light-images, assigning centers of indetermination. These then yielded three types of images, perception-image, action-image, and between these, an affection-image. The composition of these images as modulation and mobile cuts yielded an indirect image of time and, from the perspective of the genesis of these images, yielded indirect figures of thought. Shifting then to Bergson, Deleuze extracts a parallel to the plane of the movement-image in what Bergson calls the memory-image, the importance of recollections. In this light, Deleuze examines in detail successive illustrations derived from Bergson in order to illuminate aspects of the movement-image developed during the year in relation to the Bergsonian apparatus regarding memory. By teasing out the complex movements of memory between actual present and the past as these aspects fold back over one another, Deleuze reaches a direct image of time in the coexistence of past with present, or what he names (borrowing from Guattari) the crystal of time. Anticipating no doubt his future work in *The Time-Image* (and the following seminars), he adapts the time crystal to the Bergsonian framework as the folding back of the present, yielding a direct figure of thought as well, plunging one into deeper levels of reality through a circuit process. Deleuze offers examples from Fellini ("Amarcord") and Rossellini ("Europe '51", "Stromboli"), and then returns to Bergson's illustrations to reorganize them so that the direct time-image reveals at once regions of being and regions of thought, a thought-being or being of thought. Clearly, the establishment of these facets of a direct time-image will require two more Seminars on cinema to explore fully.