

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

**Cinema, Truth and Time: The Falsifier, November 8, 1983 to June 12, 1984**  
(22 Sessions)

In contrast to his rather apologetic return at the start of year 2 to the Cinema material discussed in year 1, Deleuze commences year 3 with a forthright proposal to discuss the intersection of cinema with the theme of truth, time and the falsifier. Adopting this topic, that constitutes the specific focus of chapter 6 in *The Time-Image*, means that Deleuze intends to situate these thematics within the broader framework of the concepts introduced in years 1 & 2 as well as those that inform his development of *The Time-Image*.

**Cinema 3.1 - November 8, 1983**

Deleuze's introduction includes the theme, "truth, time, and the falsifier", and the dual faceted approach, discussions of six texts and students' own parallel research directions on Melville (*The Confidence Man*); Plato (specific dialogues); Nietzsche (*Twilight of the Idols* and *Beyond Good and Evil*); specific filmmakers "of the false" (e.g. Welles, Resnais, Robbe-Grillet); crystallography and its possible relations to philosophy; and the French New Novel. Deleuze asks three global questions: What is the strange relationship between the cinematographic image and time and the falsifier? Why is the falsifier a fundamental character from the cinema perspective? And what is the special relationship between cinema and the power of the false? Deleuze then reflects on the Classical distinction between true and false, noting that even if the false has no form, it does indeed have a power of action (*puissance*), defined as the indiscernibility of the real and the imaginary. Deleuze considers various facets of indiscernibility (cf. Robbe-Grillet & Resnais's film "Last Year at Marienbad" and Robbe-Grillet's commentary on the film in *For a New Novel*), quickly introducing "the falsifier" as the "ideal viewer", the one who constructs the indiscernibility of the real and the imaginary. Considering this "concretion" of real and imaginary (cf. Welles's "The Lady from Shanghai"), he proposes the obverse term to "organic" for the true, a "crystalline formation". Finally, forecasting developments to come later in the seminar, Deleuze proposes that what one glimpses within the crystal is nothing other than aspects and accents of Time. [NB: See Chapter 6 of *The Time-Image*, "The powers of the false," notably Melville, Nietzsche and Godard]

**Cinema 3.2 - November 22, 1983**

After reviewing material developed in the previous session, Deleuze justifies the crystalline formations in contrast to organic forms by drawing from Bergson's *Matter and Memory*, then links crystalline formations to "descriptions" through Robbe-Grillet's comments on "Last Year in Marienbad", particularly his theories of description and narration. Developing a distinction between "organic description" and "crystalline description", Deleuze adds "the falsifier" as the creator of the crystal-image or crystalline formation, a first definition that he then examines within cinema (Robbe-Grillet, Fellini, Godard). Concluding that this creation leads to "voyance" (illuminated vision) and thus to power of the false, Deleuze suggests that the falsifier author inserts himself within the crystalline formation and, in fact, (second definition) exists not in the singular, but in a multiplicity, a chain of falsifiers. Then starting "applications", that is, examples of the falsifier and powers of the false in description and narration, Deleuze considers Melville's

*The Confidence-Man*, then powers of the false in Welles, Robbe-Grillet and Resnais, and in certain directors of Third World cinema. Deleuze thereby prepares the important encounter between the problem of time and powers of the false, insofar as the powers of the false overlap with filmmakers of the direct time-image. [NB: This session's three parts is entirely confused both at Paris 8 and WebDeleuze: the part 2 transcription (approximately 60 minutes) is missing entirely given that the opening transcription (listed as part 1 at Paris 8) does not belong at all in this session but rather as the opening section of the following, 29 November session.]

### **Cinema 3.3 - November 29, 1983**

After restating the premises developed in sessions 1 and 2, Deleuze proposes to “tell some tales” based on the distinctions that he derived from crystalline formations on two levels: descriptions (both organic and crystalline) and narrations (truthful and falsifying). Starting with Alain Bergala's 1983 “Faux-fuyants”, he then returns to contemporaneous trio, Welles, Resnais (“Stavisky”), and Robbe-Grillet, pondering why these “auteurs” develop the series of powers of the false while colliding with the problem of time. Deleuze shifts focus to trace the history of the “crisis of truth” in philosophy, starting with the Ancient Greek Stoics, a reflection that results in Deleuze adding two more definitions of “falsifier”, and to clarify these definitions, he pursues the “tales”, first, from Leibniz's *Theodicy*, then from Borges's *Fictions*, finally from a novel by Maurice Leblanc (cf. also the Leibniz and the Baroque seminar, session 8, 27 January 1987). These “tales” lead Deleuze to conclude, for the future sessions, that truth's interrogation can only occur at the same time as a pure line of time is revealed, since it is time that formally places into question the form of the truth. [NB: The order of this session's three parts is entirely confused both at Paris 8 and WebDeleuze: the part 1 transcription is inappropriately located in session 2 with its first segment, while part 2 appears twice on each site.]

### **Cinema 3.4 – December 6, 1983**

A session for summarizing the previous sessions, here emphasizes three themes: first, the indiscernibility of the real and the imaginary (cf. Robbe-Grillet's *For a New Novel*), then a discussion of Italian Neo-Realism and Antonioni's objectivist, distanced view of characters as well as the disconnected spaces therein, linked to Fellini from the opposite direction, i.e., respectively, objective distance in contrast to intense subjective sympathy. Second, the indiscernibility of true and false, with two paradoxical aspects: from the possible emerges the impossible; and second, that which is or has been, is not necessarily true, thus two extremes between which the powers of the false are developed (cf. Welles). Third, the crisis of truth is linked to the emergence of the time-image (cf. Welles, Resnais, and Third World cinemas). Then, referring to links between truth and time, he considers two interviews with Antonioni in which the filmmaker, and then introduces three texts from Nietzsche's *The Gay Science* as a means of summing up the previous development. The session then shifts to a question-answer session, most notably a key intervention by Georges Comtesse, and then Deleuze concludes by soliciting volunteers from the participants to undertake oral and/or written projects on an expanded list of projects: 1) crystallography, 2) Melville's *The Confidence-Man*, 3) the time-image in Welles & Resnais, 4) Nietzsche's *The Gay Science*, *The Twilight of the Idols*, and *Zarathustra*; 5) five dialogues by Plato (cited on 8 November) and 6) for any logicians, consideration of theories of description and narration, particularly from the perspective developed by Gérard Genette.

### **Cinema 3.5 – December 13, 1983**

Still reflecting on time's relation to powers of the false as developed in the history of philosophy, Deleuze pauses, first, to discuss his recurrent topic, "what is philosophy?", notably the triad of concept-affect-percept, and then to provide two key expressions summing up Kantian thought, the Hamlet quote, "time is out of joint", and the Rimbaud quote, "I is an other", the latter as a response to Descartes's Cogito, but also a fundamental transformation of our relation with time. Returning to the session's main theme — truth comes into crisis once it confronts time, but something in the order of morality forces truth into this confrontation —, Deleuze defines the "true world" inhabited by the "truthful man", a concept, says Deleuze, hidden in plain sight throughout Classical philosophy. With the "truthful man" and Nietzsche's moral perspective (*The Gay Science*), Deleuze considers again the falsifier, concluding that the form of the true gave way to the power of the false. In light of the importance of increasing one's power of life (*puissance*) for increasing powers of perception, he calls on Virginia Woolf (*Mrs. Dalloway*), Melville, and Henry James, then turns to Spinoza's general definition of affects (book III of the *Ethics*), and then to Nietzsche's formulation: "it's what makes us lighter and lighter," which brings Deleuze to consider love and the power of existence, optical point of view and perception, time as a force of affect. These aspects of the crisis of truth and powers of the false stand in contrast to ancient philosophy's trait of seeking to discover an a priori truth, and Deleuze emphasizes modern philosophy's idea of comprehending innovation (notably, Bergson, Whitehead, Sartre), as the very possibility of creating truth.

### **Cinema 3.6 – December 20, 1983**

Deleuze ends the year by linking the Seminar's main philosophical texts (notably, by Plato) with the main literary texts (notably, by Herman Melville). First, recalling Nietzsche on the theme of the real world becoming a fable (*Twilight of the Gods*) and his phrase "abolish your venerations" *The Gay Science*, Deleuze links Platonism, Nietzsche and Melville together through the following follows the five-step tale of the truthful man: the truthful man's emergence in Plato and Melville (*Pierre, or the Ambiguity* and *Bartleby*); Maurice Leblanc's character Balthazar, holding the discourse of the law, but also the Nomos-Physis in *The Protagoras*, to the ordinary man; the remarkable man linked to Melville's Ahab (and Claggart in *Billy Budd*), Don Quixote, the importance of *kairos* (the favorable occasion) in Plato's *Gorgias*, and the final part of *Zarathustra*; finally, the emergence of something new, Nietzsche's "overman," Melville's *Pierre or the Ambiguity*, the object of modern philosophy versus the object of ancient philosophy, the truthful man now transformed as inventor of the new.

### **Cinema 3.7 – January 10, 1984**

After recalling the seminar's theme — the crisis of truth under the effects of time —, Deleuze insists that the notion of truth is put into through time's force in the form of the paradox of contingent futures (with its two paradoxes), with the organic form of the true entering into crisis. With a list in place of five oppositions between truth and its questioning, Deleuze returns to previous seminars to contrast the sensorimotor recognition with attentive recognition which are linked, respectively, to organic description and the crystalline formation. For cinema, Deleuze states that the collapse of sensorimotor linkages gives birth to the recourse to disconnected spaces which define crystalline linkages, a shift leading to the final distinction, between organic or truthful narration and falsifying narration under the power of the false. To study how the form

or force of time operates in order to place truth into question, Deleuze proposes to focus, first, on the time-movement's reversal that liberates the pure force of time, and second, on how modern cinema was created as a form of placing movement into question. After considering ways that this reversal arises in different film authors (Welles, Resnais, Mankiewicz), Deleuze concludes that what is in question is at once a reversal of time's subordination in relation to movement and in relation to memory, with how this occurred in Kant's philosophy as well as in Ozu's cinema for study at the next session.

### **Cinema 3.8 – January 17, 1984**

Deleuze proposes studying the process of a reversal of time's subordination in relation both to movement and memory in philosophy and cinema, outlining a two-faceted historical set, four philosophical moments (from Antiquity to the 17th century; the Kantian reversal, and beyond) and four within cinema. Opting to start on the cinema side through different cinema authors (Pasolini, in particular), he notes the importance of montage in relation to the movement-time intersection. He recalls the sensorimotor linkages in the movement-images that assure the three specific types previously studied and engender an indirect image of time, but he also insists that through numerous movement-image aberrations occurring during this era, one could glimpse aspects of the direct time-image. Referring to Jean-Louis Schefer's *L'Homme ordinaire du cinéma*, Deleuze emphasizes that what changes is disturbance added to movement, thanks to which cinema is the sole experience where time is rendered as a perception. Following Deleuze Schefer's theses with reference to cinema authors (again, Renoir, Pasolini, Dreyer, Epstein, Rossellini, Visconti), Deleuze provides an outline for next session: the sensorimotor situation linked to the indirect image of time; the disconnected situation of its sensorimotor extension linked to the direct image of time; these two levels corresponding to Bergson's two forms of recognition, sensorimotor recognition and "attentive" recognition (of an object's optical and sound description). In this session, Deleuze is interrupted by university management and then returns to announce that henceforth the course will meet in a larger room, that Deleuze describes as "our dream house".

### **Cinema 3.9 – January 24, 1984**

After reviewing the four characteristics of the reversal of the relations of movement and time developed in the previous session, Deleuze hypothesizes that through these anomalies of movement, a *direct* time-image might emerge and offers examples of anomalies of movement (cf. Epstein, Dreyer, Italian Neo-Realism, French New Wave). Deleuze reflects on "two manners of being powerless" that emerged following World War II — one in classical cinema, the other transforming into a cinema of "clairvoyance," with new facet of "seeing" (cf. Antonioni, Fellini and Visconti). Then, after shifting briefly to the initiation of pure optical-sound situations, suggesting that an entire pedagogy of the image emerges, Deleuze again shifts toward a direct time-image with the four phases of burlesque in cinema, on one hand, Jerry Lewis and Jacques Tati, and on the other, musical comedy. Through Bergson, Deleuze proposes a system of circuits (physical and mental, real and imaginary) through which the crystalline description emerges as well as the falsifying crystalline narration (e.g., Godard, Antonioni and Ozu). Suggesting the possibility of developing "a new pedagogy of the image", Deleuze seeks an alternate means to analyze the image, differently from how the movement-image was analyzed, through the image's conditions and through an entirely new relation with thought. Ozu serves to examine the direct time-image, contrasted with Antonioni and an article by Paul Schrader. Finding in Ozu two types

of ordinary (the banal, the visionary), Deleuze links him to the development of still life in Cézanne, notably that what Cézanne achieved with apples, Ozu achieved with the vase, i.e., a “bit of time in pure state”, the unchangeable form of what changes, the pure optical sound situation, the direct time-image.

### **Cinema 3.10 – January 31, 1984**

Discussing circumstances that determined the revolution resulting in questioning the sensorimotor situation, Deleuze includes Rossellini, Resnais and Ozu in this reversal and emphasized the need to shift this very discussion into the philosophical domain. Two Japanese students (one unidentified, the other Hidenobu Suzuki, responsible for the seminar recordings) intervene and challenge Deleuze’s conception of the time-image as still life, introducing the concept of indirect free style in Ozu’s images. In response, Deleuze reviews the distinctions he has already detailed to distinguish the optical-sound situation (empty interiors and exteriors) from the direct time-image (still life) and emphasizes how Ozu’s film technique shifts entirely from the sensorimotor schema. Returning to previous distinctions on “chronosigns”, “lectosigns”, and “noosigns”, he suggests that while Suzuki’s remarks emphasized the “lectosigns” in Ozu while Deleuze is more interested in the “chronosigns” (the direct time-image through the optical and sound system more specifically). Then, Deleuze carefully reviews the previous session’s four stages of the burlesque with specific traits and representatives, the fourth stage presenting the “new burlesque” of the pure optical and sound situation (Jerry Lewis & Jacques Tati) with the rise of diverse forms of electronics. Returning to philosophy, Deleuze recounts the Greeks’ indirect image of time through a vast cosmic machine, the “planetarium”, with aberrations of movement within movement threatening to tip the world into time freed of movement. With these reflections, Deleuze outlines the Greeks’ conception of different sorts of aberrations — at once mathematical, physical, psycho-political, and economic — and following Aristotle, he develops the hierarchy of beings, in which anomalies exist between each level.

### **Cinema 3.11 – February 7, 1984**

Still considering aberrations in movement, Deleuze reintroduces the “cry” that “everything is ordinary,” and considers how, along this axis of the daily, philosophy stands in contrast to and rises above the daily, juxtaposed through reflection on the eternal, thereby linking it to production of the new. With references from Heidegger’s *Being and Time* and Bergson, Deleuze develops a philosophical montage as a means of obtaining time from movement, and then devoted the session to reviewing the Greeks on different facets of movement vis-à-vis time, with reference to Hesiod’s *Theogony*; Plato’s *Timaeus*; Aristotle’s hierarchy of “sublunar creatures”; Anaximander, Aeschylus, and Sophocles, and representations of the complexity of aberrations as they relate to Time. Finally, Deleuze summarizes theories developed by Eric Alliez linking the Marxist system of circulation to Aristotle, and then with Alliez contributing, he and Deleuze close the session, first with Alliez commenting on Deleuze’s presentation, then in a dialogue, with Deleuze proposing that Alliez continue his intervention at the next session following break.

### **Cinema 3.12 – February 28, 1984**

After winter break and reviewing key point on time and the hierarchy of “sublunar creatures”, Deleuze concludes that the closer one gets to the Earth, the more movement has anomalies, and the more time takes on independence, that is, a value in itself, transforming itself and becoming more concrete, movement depending on it, hence the import of Hamlet’s cry, “time is out of

joint”, time on a tangent. Moving beyond Greece to Plotinus and Neo-Platonism, no longer the world and its movement, but the soul (time’s *ratio essendi*), Deleuze contrasts the Egyptian monoplanar perspective, to conceptions of volume and depth, between the Greek formal configuration and the element of light with the particular chromatism of Egyptian and Byzantine art. Returning to Plotinus and the depth or profound as “depthless” *sans-fond*, and how for Plotinus, light creates form, Deleuze links this to a more contemporary artist influenced by Byzantine art, Delaunay, to his transformations beyond cubism in order to make a connection to the Plotinian revolution regarding Time: Time is the indirect image of movement, but that of the soul, the movement of light itself, hence two philosophical distinctions for further consideration.

### **Cinema 3.13 – March 13, 1984**

Starting with a review of four key points of distinction between Plato and Plotinus and their eras, Deleuze then addresses the basic problem: what is the nature of the movement of the soul as an intensive movement? Arguing that time is inseparable from a collapse (*chute*) of the soul, Deleuze explores the differences of this term from Plato to Plotinus, and then in a lengthy discussion of Plotinus’s *Ennead*, he links this to understanding the shift of light that falls or collapses (in several senses). Drawing on Bergson’s comments on Plotinus, Deleuze notes that in the intensive quantity, each unit is actual and encompasses a virtual multiplicity, in a spiral fashion. Asking whether this intensive quantity encompasses the distances to which it is both inferior and the superior, he also asks: in what sense is disaggregation or the fall real and/or ideal? With the focal problem being how to reconcile an ideal collapse with a real collapse, Deleuze returns to the questions of powers, noting that at each degree of power is contemplation and that the conversion of virtual multiplicity occurs by linking superior and inferior powers within a spiral returning infinitely to contemplation (cf. Byzantine art, Maldiney, Seurat). Concluding that the intensive movement of the soul is an aggregate, with time as the new number or measure of this special movement and as a synthesis operated by the soul, Deleuze proposed for the next session to comment on Kantian innovation in contrast to Neo-Platonism and intensive movement.

### **Cinema 3.14 – March 20, 1984**

Hoping to finish the philosophical aspect of the time-image, Deleuze proposes a deeper analysis of the crystal-image, expressing the need to consider both its optical and sound properties as well as their links to time. With Guattari’s *The Machinic Unconscious* cited as a source for the crystal as concept, Deleuze reflects on music in film, notably the western (“High Noon”), musical comedy, the Fellini-Rota intersection, and creation of different kinds of refrain-gallop pieces (cf. Clément Rosset on the refrain-gallop), and then the refrain qualities of Ravel’s “Boléro”. Then, returning to his discussion of the intensive movement of the soul following the series of powers, Deleuze points particularly to Nicholas of Cusa’s concept “possest”, that is, immanence, power (*puissance*), hypostasis, a path of emanation from one degree to the next in a complex movement of procession, emanation, and conversion. He then emphasizes Kant’s debt to the Neo-Platonists for his understanding of this concept, and moving into a “second part,” Deleuze asks: how is time going to emerge as number of this movement? To answer, he draws details from Neo-Platonists’ distinctions, notably from Damascius, on “aiôn”, regarding eternity and powers in order to reach the fundamental activity of the soul, that reaching the “pure now” (or *nûn*). Citing Paul Claudel on the knowledge of time, Deleuze moves forward with the generative difference for movements of time linked to “the fear of God” as well as to the time of crisis. To conclude,

he asks for the next session: how will the synthesis of originary time itself operate and then bring forth fear? To address this, Deleuze suggests finishing the consideration of Plotinus, then proceeding to consider Saint Augustine, followed by Kant.

### **Cinema 3.15 – March 27, 1984**

Deleuze first returns to several previous points: the Greek *nûn*, or the “pure now”; the late Neo-Platonists term *complicatio* for all the intersecting degrees of power or copresence belonging to eternity (the *aiôn*). Concluding that the *nûn* is power-action which also engenders time through a process of self-distinguishing, Deleuze argues that time will be the measure of intensive quantity and movement of the soul, and then considers the effects of power’s zero degree and the ideal collapse (*chute*), matter’s extension into space. He thus sees a pure instant creating a synthesis between past and future and links this synthesis to a solemn fear of these forms of time throughout history, drawing from Plato’s *Parmenides* and from the Russian novelist Mikhail Saltykov on the pure nothingness of the drunken stupor. At the session’s 90-minute mark, Eric Alliez intervenes to discuss St. Augustine, outlining points in which Plotinus and St. Augustine overlap to some degree, and Alliez and Deleuze engage in dialogue about distinctions that St. Augustine developed in syntheses of time in contrast to the Neo-Platonists. After Deleuze’s summary of three indirect images of time, he lists a sequence of anomalies as possible difficulties and offers alternative responses, notably, saving the harmony of the soul or accepting time being “out of joint”. Emphasizing the disturbance and crisis of truth with the powers of the false, Deleuze says the result for cinema after World War II is to reconstruct direct time-images, with Kant on deck for the next session, the philosopher who constructed the first time-image.

### **Cinema 3.16 – April 17, 1984**

To consider Kant’s role in the reversal of movement and time, Deleuze first summarizes earlier work, time’s place in Antiquity depending on movement, but also anomalies of movement marked in Antiquity. Deleuze then considers “how Kant operates” by following his path through the *Critique of Pure Reason* in several points: movement is in time and not the reverse, time depending on nothing but itself, i.e., “time out of joint”. Kant creates a radical change in the status of truth, with everything under time collapsing and time’s synthesis bearing on its modes: succession, simultaneity, and permanence. Linking this to the matter of the “I” and “me” as phenomena in time, Deleuze applies Rimbaud’s “‘Je’ est un autre” [I is an other] as identical with Kant’s position, in contrast with Descartes’s philosophical “Je pense, donc je suis,” suggesting that the Kantian cogito is “cracked” (*fêlé*) by the thread of time. Deleuze notes three deepening levels for time’s independence, with the third as truth losing its ancient model of privileged positions and instants, appearing instead as the production of “the new”. Deleuze announces that henceforth the seminar will confront direct images of time, first asking: what precisely are these?

### **Cinema 3.17 – April 24, 1984**

Stating his annoyance at losing the two following Tuesdays (1 & 8 May) to national holidays, Deleuze summarizes the year’s work to date, with the session’s third segment to be a double inquiry: to see how a direct image of time or time-image is constructed, as well as “time” as a concept, and to understand the relations between this concept as philosophical and this image as aesthetic. Taking issue with Robbe-Grillet, Deleuze asserts that cinema’s time is instead an indeterminate temporality, and that the more that aberrations of movement gain independence, so

too the time-image ceases depending on movement. To demonstrate that montage becomes the operation through which time relations are determined in a direct time-image, Deleuze first points to Welles, Fellini, and Dreyer and considers the problem of depth of field as a cinema technique (cf. Bazin and Jean Mitry; the history of painting; and then diverse filmmakers). Referring to “Citizen Kane”, Deleuze considers depth of field as a function of temporalization, inserting the viewer into a direct time-image (cf. Visconti, Robbe-Grillet and Resnais’ “Marienbad”). Deleuze then shifts to the “flat image” that causes an experience of time in a pure state (cf. Dreyer and Ozu), i.e., cases of an indeterminate direct time-image. This leads Deleuze to the emergence of pure optical and sound situations, a “clairvoyant cinema” (*cinéma de voyant*), also a “cinema of strollers” in any-spaces-whatever (*cinéma de balade*). Deleuze proposes decors in American musical comedy as developing their own value, hence dancers emerging within these pure optical and sound situations, i.e., the rhythmic relations of time-image (cf. Donen). Deleuze closes on the importance of non-localizable links evident in dance cinema, between pure optical and sound situations and world movements, i.e., direct time-images or rhythms creating circuits across different planes of actual images linked to virtual images, to be discussed at the next session.

### **Cinema 3.18 – May 15, 1984**

Deleuze explores facets of the direct time-image in cinema, turning to the special conditions of the crystal-image, i.e., the means to grasp a direct time-image in person, “a bit of time in a pure state”. Drawing on crystallography to define the crystal-image as something consolidated from two images thereby creating a crystal circuit, Deleuze argues that the actual becomes virtual while the virtual simultaneously becomes actual, thus a crystal-image as a time seed in which time is visible. To develop these hypotheses, Deleuze returns to the sensorimotor situation of the movement-image with its characteristics, and this review lets Deleuze turn to the other side, the non-sensorimotor situation, cut off from sensorimotor extensions. Then, to examine such situations, Deleuze considers different examples, e.g., manifestations of “pure description”, e.g., decors in musical comedy (cf. Donen), exteriors (cf. Italian Neo-Realism and French New Wave). Moreover, other types of space emerge, notably disconnected parts and jump cuts (cf. Resnais, Antonioni, Cassavetes), and Deleuze points to the possibility of linking images in a circuit between actual and virtual images, maintaining that what the non-extended situation connects with is the recollection-image. Here, with Bergson’s term “attentive recognition”, Deleuze outlines the circuit process between actual and virtual, coalescing a consolidation of levels of recollection (cf. Marcel Carné’s “Le Jour se lève”), a virtuality attempting to be actualized as a function of an actual present. Distinguishing the recollection-image from the flashback, Deleuze suggests (cf. Mankiewicz) how the filmmaker employs fundamental bifurcations of time in the recollection-image. Explaining the virtual-actual circuit process, Deleuze shifts toward the role of the dream-image (cf. Bergson’s explanations of sleep and dreaming; cf. René Clair, Buñuel, Harry Hathaway, Buster Keaton). Deleuze concludes by promising to continue to explore the actual-virtual circuit and then to enter fully into the crystal-image in the following class.

### **Cinema 3.19 – May 22, 1984**

Deleuze reviews the shift toward the actual image that ceases its linkage with other actual images, entering into a circuit with the virtual image, forming a consolidated coalescence of actual image and virtual image. He asks: what is this virtual image? and then reviews the three

conclusions regarding the recollection-image and the dream-image. Deleuze moves beyond this frame by considering the movement from being-in-the-world to a “societizing” (*mondanisation*) giving rise to states of estrangement or enchantment (*féerie*). Drawing from various filmmakers (cf. René Clair, Murnau, Donen, Minelli), Deleuze suggests the shift from sensorimotor linkage to pure optical and sound situation, then focuses on the inner circuit to find the coalescence between actual image and virtual image. With Bergson’s help, Deleuze grasps this coalescence as the objective coexistence of present and past, subjective coexistence of perception and recollection, and contemporaneity of both. Deleuze argues that Bergson’s “mirror reflection” is a coalescence between an actual and *its own* virtual image, called a crystal-image, the site of an actual-virtual exchange. To develop its 360-degree effect, Deleuze refers to different filmmakers (Losey, Max Ophuls), then expands the crystal-image definition with three pairs or dimensions (virtual-actual; clear-opaque; seed-milieu), and while he had intended to stop, an invited speaker, Jouanny (first or last name not indicated), who considers the variability of the crystal’s properties (anisotropy) and aspects of the process of crystal germination and crystallization, consideration of which Deleuze will continue, both the spatial aspects of the crystal image as well as a possible non-chronological time.

### **Cinema 3.20 – May 29, 1984**

With the help of an invited lecturer, Jouanny, Deleuze explains him to discuss crystallography as a means to form a philosophical concept from the “crystal-image”. To Jouanny’s suggestion of two axes for the crystal-image (a light-color axis and a space axis), Deleuze states his preference for three axes, with Welles’s “The Immortal Story” fulfilling these aspects (cf. *The Time-Image*, ch. 4). Recalling the three pairs of circuits previously proposed (actual-virtual, clear-opaque, seed-milieu), Deleuze opts for the latter as a viable axis, referring in this regard to a Polish filmmaker, Krzysztof Zanussi’s film “Illumination,” to illustrate the clear-opaque circuit within the dramatic importance of actors, with other circuits considered (Tod Browning’s “Freaks,” films by Hitchcock and Kon Ichikawa). Then Deleuze proposes the boat as a third site for circuits (cf. in paintings by Turner; in literature, Melville’s “Benito Cereno”) which also links to the germ-milieu pair, then returning to cinema (cf. Fellini’s “And The Ship Sails On”, and in opposing ways, Herzog’s “Heart of Glass”, and Tarkovski’s “The Mirror”), Deleuze takes up spatial considerations within geometry, notably Riemann spaces where the interconnection of its spatial parts remains undetermined (cf. Resnais, Ozu, Antonioni, Bresson). Summing up the yearlong analysis, Deleuze contrasts action occurring within the movement-image which corresponds to an indirect representation of time and the crystal-image which one “sees” within it, namely, the pure optical and sound image corresponding to a direct presentation of time. With time seen in its very foundation, Deleuze summarizes four states of the crystal-image (cf. Ophuls, Renoir, Fellini), multiple entries requiring additional reflection in the final sessions.

### **Cinema 3.21 – June 5, 1984**

As he did previously, Deleuze identifies “regimes of crystal-images”, several already identified (the perfect crystal-image, Ophuls; the cracked crystal-image, Renoir) and a third regime (the germinal crystal-image, Fellini) in which the signs of time are reversed, where the gallop of passing presents leads to death while the conserved pasts are those leading toward salvation through the refrain. Then, introducing a fourth regime (the crystal-image in decomposition, Visconti), with Visconti’s conception of “mondanité” (worldliness) likened to Proust’s, Deleuze calls this a world outside the laws of nature and God, one that is also a “pure crystal”, a world of

aristocrats imbued with knowledge of art which, ironically, separates them from any possibility of creation. In Visconti's films, Deleuze suggests that History, while not itself in decomposition, accelerates the crystal's decomposition process, and approaching the topic of what it is that "sees" within the crystal, Deleuze suggests that a direct time-image reveals itself in this crystal, i.e., time's essence, leading him to the hypothesis of two direct time-images, one founded on the present, the other on the past. Deleuze considers each figure: first, the conserved past, and returning to Bergson's schema of the inverted cone, Deleuze argues that time is the coexistence of all one's sheets (*nappes*) of the past, but each section of this past has a particular limit, one's actual present. This coexistence of virtual sheets of past (as distinguished from recollection-images), i.e., the first figure of the direct time-image, leads Deleuze first to Resnais's "Je t'aime, je t'aime", then to consider how these sheets of the past emerge from paradoxical spaces reveal time's perpetual state of crisis (cf. Welles, from "Citizen Kane" to "A Touch of Evil"). Deleuze concludes by suggesting that projective geometry, i.e., depth of field, explains choppy, brief montage, and that shadow is introduced through depth of field as a correlate of projective geometry.

### **Cinema 3.22 – June 12, 1984**

In the absence of an invited guest speaker (an American friend of Georges Comtesse knowledgeable in science fiction), Deleuze summarizes the two forms of direct time-image, with several examples (cf. Robbe-Grillet) and defines the two formulations of the direct time-image as coexistences: simultaneity of deactualized points of presents (present of present, present of past, present of future), and coexistence of sheets of virtual past (cf. Welles compared to Classical and Baroque thought and art) and sheets of virtual past without centers (cf. Resnais's and Welles's preoccupations). Following a brief, quite awkward intervention by the invited guest, Deleuze lists end-of-year conclusions: 1) the distinction between organic description and crystalline descriptions, or pure optical and sound descriptions; 2) relations between the real and the imaginary, leading Deleuze to define a "philosophy of the crystal"; 3) organic or spatial narrations (those of sensorimotor linkages) as distinct from crystalline narrations the latter linked to modern films with passion as theme, a space of disparate yet adjoining aggregates. Here Deleuze joins eight facets of this space to different filmmakers considered during seminars 2 and 3; 4) the regime of an indirect time-image devolving from movement, and a crystalline regime of a paradoxical direct time-image devolving from anomalies; 5) truthful narration (linked to organic descriptions, organic narration, hodological and Euclidean spaces) and the falsifying narration (linked to the direct time-image) which points to the crisis that disturbs truth. Through these five points, Deleuze has detailed two great regimes of the image, especially their intersections, and he points out the two regimes constantly impinge on one another. To illustrate artists' creative originality, notably of the powers of the false linked to description and narration, Deleuze points to several film examples (Varda's "Documenteur", Robbe-Grillet's "L'Homme qui ment", Welles's "F for Fake") and also indicates how Nietzsche endowed falsity with the power of the false. Here, Deleuze recalls the two texts studied earlier, Melville's *The Confidence-Man* and Nietzsche's "Zarathustra", book IV (cf. Fritz Lang, Welles). Pointing to Nietzsche's will to power as power of the false and, at its highest degree, as a will to metamorphosis, a force to create truth, Deleuze insists this is not the "truthful man's" truth, i.e., a truth to be created, just like the task of philosophy. Deleuze closes by contrasting these two senses of truth and, indeed, of knowledge.