Gilles Deleuze

On Cinema, Truth and Time: The Falsifier, 1983-1984

20th session - May 29, 1984 (Seminar 64)

Transcription: La voix de Deleuze, Guadalupe Deza (Part 1), Magalí Bilbao Cuestas (Part 2), Suellen Muniz / Revision: Nadia Ouis (Part 3); additional revisions to transcription and time stamping, Charles J. Stivale

Translation: Graeme Thomson & Silvia Maglioni

Part 1

I come back to the practical exercise we were doing… a practical exercise that I would even like to stretch out, extend. I mean, what we are doing… is not our essential subject, but we can take advantage of what we are doing here to ask ourselves an additional, methodological question that would concern – and this is what I would like to extend – that would concern the relation, the possible relationships – but these relationships are to be constructed, because they don't pre-exist – the possible relationships there can be between philosophy, science, literature, and also art.

If I try to define as vaguely as possible – that is, in terms of purely nominal definitions – art, philosophy and science, I would say that science is a system of operators, and it would be up to me – if that was our subject – to define these operators. But I'll I just call them operators, even if we don't know what these operators are, though you understand, they have a much greater extension than, for example, the five mathematical operators. In mathematics, anyone can give a content to this term. In the most elementary mathematics, we give a content to the meaning of the notion of operator. But to draw a definition, an adequate determination of a science, one must be able to explain in what way there are physical operators and chemical operators, and what the differences are between mathematical operators, physical operators and chemical operators.

But at the point we have reached, since what interested us was the crystal… the way crystallography speaks to us about the crystal is, in fact, a scientific notion that concerns physico-chemical operators. I would say that the role of philosophy, and the problems it deals with, is not to reflect on science, nor to compose the history of science. If that's what it was, it would be a disaster. Once again, scientific scholars are sufficient for this, as they think very well about science. But that is not philosophy's concern. The role of philosophy, the field of philosophy, is to compose a systematics of concepts, and by systematics I mean the art of inventing, discovering and creating concepts. If this was my subject, it would be up to me to show that a philosophical concept, as a philosophical figure, is something very different from the operator as a scientific figure. Science is devoid of any concept, that is not its concern. So, what I would like to say here is that if I were to talk about the relationship between philosophy and science, I would need to develop this further.[1]

If I were to attempt in the same rudimentary fashion to pose the question: what is art? And also: what is literature? I would start from a similarly basic definition. And I would say that, in spite of the objections that immediately come to us, art is the activity that consists in discovering, creating, inventing characters. And this notion of character seems fundamental to me. To this, one might immediately say: yes, but nonetheless, we shouldn't exaggerate. The notion of character works at best only for the most superficial novels, or for the most superficial theater plays. So we cannot really define literature, and even more so art, in terms of this notion of character. But we shall see. We should really make an analysis of this third figure, the character.

I suppose one might raise the following objection: you want to define art through the figure of the character, but it isn't clear this works in the case of music. To which we would say, well, at first glance, it's true it's not clear as regards music. But you have to look more closely. It goes without saying that in opera, there are characters. Of course, opera is not music. At least it's not the whole of music. But I think, for example, of a little text by Debussy on Wagner, an interesting text where he says oh, Wagner's leitmotivs are something that annoys me – this is what Debussy himself says. Because musically speaking, they are exactly like signs. They are signs. They are like signs that mark the appearance on stage of a character: the Wagnerian leitmotif. It's a way of saying… it's not that Debussy was wrong, it simply means that he wasn't interested in using Wagner's procedures. But anyone who loves Wagner knows that the leitmotif is something much more than just a sign to mark the appearance and reappearance of the same character.

What is the leitmotif? I would say, for example, that it is a rhythmic theme that has become a character in itself. Olivier Messiaen, trying to define something which for him is essential in music at the level of rhythmic values, tells us that the musical act, or one aspect of the musical act consists in the fact *that rhythms are no longer attached to characters; it is they themselves who form characters*, and they constitute a very important musical figure, which he himself refers to as a "rhythmic character". It's in this sense that we might be led to consider the figure of the character as no longer purely attached to the usual sense we give to characters, although we would also keep this ordinary meaning, but as something that should be extended in a sense perhaps be more appropriate to painting, independently of the question of whether it is figurative or not. In painting, we might speak of colors becoming characters. There are rhythmic values in painting where the rhythms themselves function as characters.

So, let's suppose that this is the case. I am confronted with scientific operators… in culture, throughout culture, I find myself confronted with scientific operators, with artistic figures, and with philosophical concepts. In my view there is no reason why there shouldn't be a rich current of exchanges among them, provided that it is never conceived in an applied sense. It is not a question of applying something from one field to another. Everyone knows that if you take a scientific operator and apply it to philosophy, it only leads to disasters. But there are also – how can I put it? – translations, or transductions, that would lead from a scientific operator to a philosophical concept, and vice versa. And vice versa.

I would say, for example, that there is no point in applying the Bergsonian concept of time, or duration, to science, since this would be an operation that would make no scientific sense, yet it can inspire new scientific operators. I would even say that philosophical concepts can inspire literary or artistic characters. Conversely, under what conditions can a relationship between literature and philosophy exist? Can we extract a philosophical concept from a character, or from a type of character, for example in a novel? That would be a way to

establish a kind of relationship where different disciplines could work together, each in its specific role, without one being a reflection on the other.

And so, if today I'm adding literature, it's because I'd like to talk about it a little bit in terms of the problem we are faced with. Because our task didn't fall from the sky, it continues from everything we've done so far. We reached a point where we were trying to form a philosophical concept: the crystal-image. A philosophical concept... On top of that we added the history of cinema and so on. Okay. We thought that cinema would perhaps offer us applications, or direct transductions of this. But we still had to form our concept of the crystal-image. And so we began to call science to our aid by asking ourselves, in terms of a fairly open field of research that could vary considerably and where each of us could pursue their own path. So now we should make a table of... This is why I'm not asking you to learn from science since, for most of us it's too late anyway. But you don't have to learn it in order to make use of it. You don't even have to understand it in order to make use of it.

We all know so little about crystallography… so my first question was: well, what can we draw from crystallography? That is to say, what character could we extract that would work with – – that would work with a possible philosophical concept? We didn't ask anything more. Perhaps, then, we can now turn to the other side and ask: What in literature, what character, what mode of narration, would allow us to extract, to enrich… what could we draw from literature that would be capable of nurturing or multiplying the characters of our concept of the crystal-image? Do you see? If you understand that, I believe that you... it can help you advance in your own research. So, this was the point we'd got to. Really, it's like a kind of… it's not a game, it's a kind of research. Fine. So you, you and you… what can you draw from crystallography?

So last time Jouanny had started to speak about something very interesting, and I think that if he wants to finish, we can take up the question again, keeping in mind all you said the last time. If it was a question of sketching, or trying to form, a concept of the crystal-image, a philosophical concept, what would you draw from crystallography, even as a very separate matter? We have operators in crystallography, fine. But which ones are we going to draw upon in order to extract from them a conceptualizable character that, if need be, would even be cause for much amusement among a society of crystallographers? It doesn't matter, it's of no importance, no importance at all. What science laughs at, philosophy takes seriously, and vice versa, and vice versa. And with a vengeance, always with a vengeance. So...

Jouanny: To go back to the order of the different operators that we could use, the… [*indistinct words*] for example, which you mentioned last time...

Deleuze: I would actually prefer to hear your own...

Jouanny: Mine? Well, precisely, I take back this one in particular because… [*indistinct words*] it is richer… [*indistinct words*] We spoke about cinema since… [*indistinct words*] the limpid and the opaque, and the stone, the quartz or crystal… [*indistinct words]* In any case… [*indistinct words]* since we spoke a lot last time... and I believe that there are very interesting things in this mechanism of the limpid and the opaque. Because it plays a lot on a certain construction of this… that is to say the physical particularity which I had heard a lot about last time… [*indistinct words*] And it's very interesting to see how diamond dealers talk, or people in general, the way they talk about stones. For them… the way they regard them as individuals with their own character, their clarity, their... way of being alive.

Deleuze: No, individual is better, they are individuals...

Jouanny: They are all different from each other, they all have a rich particularity, they all have flaws that sometimes give them a very interesting quality of… [*indistinct words*] which makes them less commercial. So this is… [*indistinct words*]

Deleuze: This aspect of individuation is good, because it's something I had dropped, you see? So, it's very, very good... Yes, it's very good... So, you would retain the individuation aspect.

Jouanny: It's very interesting because when you talk to someone… [*indistinct words*] At least for them, they really feel like they've met people with an interior richness… [*indistinct words*]. And even regarding the exterior, it's the same. They feel capable of something, they are very proud of what they have done and very happy. They can't stop talking about the reflection of such and such a stone that they have managed to find, how… [*indistinct words*] perception, how they are going to manage to use it, by what trick, what mirror effect, what facet effect they are going to manage to magnify or increase the… [*indistinct words*] of stones. All this… [*indistinct words*] of the operators.

Deleuze : Yes, yes, yes…

Jouanny: [*indistinct words*] Especially when we started talking about the color of stones. Because at the beginning, well, I thought that the color of stones was relatively defined, that obviously diamond… [*indistinct words*] had blue minerals, ruby had red minerals, emerald had green minerals, whereas we've seen, on the contrary, that the diamonds that have the most interesting… [*indistinct words*] blue color… [*indistinct words*] red color… [*indistinct words*] yellow color, because we can get much more interesting mirror reflections from them. Diffracting the light of each color is more interesting because if the light was white you could make the… [*indistinct word*] that was red or yellow pass through, you often get very interesting reflections, especially with diamonds… [*indistinct words*] for the opaque, precisely… [*indistinct words*]

As for rubies and emeralds, there are rubies and emeralds that can be crystallized from two different colors. That is, a ruby can be both… It will change color according to the light it reflects, and this is exciting for diamond dealers. And for certain qualities of emeralds, we have emeralds that can, quite frankly, be of two different qualities, of both green and blue. We can have a sampling of colors that is very, very interesting because by cutting the stone in… How shall I put it? We can have a sampling of colors that is very, very interesting because by cutting the stone in… in crystalline, we manage to obtain effects of variation in tone which may go from light green to a very dark blue. And for them this is obviously something… [*indistinct word*] Then, they have a stone that they are particularly interested in, it is the alexandrine, which has a power – it is a kind of emerald – which has the peculiarity of being composed of three colors at the same time, and which can pass from an emerald green color in sunlight, to a ruby red color in artificial light. And we can clearly see a whole spectrum appearing through this stone. We really have something quite rare here, quite difficult to find, something exceptional.

So, what interests them in particular are the effects of light that can be obtained from different stones, in terms of changes in color. In any case, for rubies and emeralds, it is this capacity to make use of a double constitution, a triple constitution of the crystal which, when we look at it, gives different colors because precisely… [*indistinct words*] When light arrives,

we can have a mixture of a kind of white with a little yellow in it, with a kind of white which veers towards green and a white that… [*indistinct words*]. So, we arrive at a mixture of colors that is very interesting because since people have two eyes, they never see a stone from a just one angle, and the effects that can be obtained from a stone multiply more and more… [*indistinct words*]. But essentially, they are interested in… [*indistinct words*] of the stone, that is to say there are no imperfections of the stone that could make it slightly… [*indistinct words*].

On the other hand, the second quality… [*indistinct words*] of sapphire, that concerns other stones as well, is that if it has some types of imperfection, that is to say when there are, inside its structure, light metallic effects, light metallic atoms inside, thanks to this small peculiarity of the stone we manage to obtain… [*indistinct words*]. It is because, it is interesting… it is because it allows us to see… [*indistinct words*] It is quite big, and it manages to move on different planes. That is to say, each of the different planes of the structure that we cannot see with the naked eye and that we feel in the planning of the star form, takes off and moves on the surface of the stone, it passes from plane to plane and causes an effect that we call shooting star, several shooting stars that move inside the stone. So, in the same… [*indistinct word*], there are two effects that interest us a lot. It's what we call polychromy, which happens when a stone tries to be… [*indistinct words*] by several atoms of different colors, or sometimes… [*indistinct words*] which is preferable, or slight metallic alterations, atoms that… [*indistinct words*] and they can cause either… [*indistinct words*] effects, or effects like cat's eyes, which is to say outright metallic… [*indistinct words]* that have developed inside the stone, and develop straight, in a straight shape, and give the impression, when you look at it, that an eye opens up, a bit like a cat's eye… [*indistinct words*] able to see inside… [*several indistinct phrases*] And for them, indeed… [*indistinct words*] And this is when one recognizes this… [*indistinct words*], that one recognizes the individual, each time through accidents of crystallization which can be completely original.

So, speaking of diamonds, I want to go back to the problem of the opaque, because in stones which are not very limpid, that are quite thick, where the material is not very translucent or transparent… these stones can be cut very thin, very, very fine, so that one can still try to obtain a slight transparency so we have the impression that light can pass through them. So, when we are dealing with stones that are translucent, like diamonds, we always try to cut it so that it is deep, and we obtain a black… [*indistinct words*] in the background. Or, in any case, a thickness that can become opaque. Thus sometimes, dealing with extremely opaque stones, we end up cutting them into hollows, obtaining a dark… [*indistinct word*] and on one side of the stone a certain thinness. On the side where it's thicker, we obtain a rather interesting effect in terms of light. One can make it slightly translucent in the middle, while the sides remain completely opaque. As for diamonds, it's completely the opposite, that is to say, it's usually cut in the shape of a sliver, a bit like an arrow, and so you wouldn't look at the tip of the arrow but you would look at its base. In this way, if you look at the cut stone from the middle, you have the maximum depth at the bottom, and yet you can get a slight opaque effect, which is multiplied by the fact that the facets on each side are… [*indistinct words*] on both sides of the arrow, and the mirror effect reflects the light back to… [*indistinct words*]

Deleuze: That is useful in helping us draw a possible definition of a crystalline space.

Jouanny: [*indistinct words*] the shape of the crystal… [*indistinct words*] and it's a cone, if you like, it's a cone so you could bring it to participate… [*indistinct words*] not the tip… and these cones are going to be cut either into… [*indistinct words*] on the facets, or… [*indistinct*

words] The most talented diamond cutters try to make wafers that fit inside this cone so that they obtain more brilliance on the surface… [*indistinct words*] and on which they try to… [*indistinct words*] opacity in the center and a mirror effect on the sides. Something very important to bear in mind is… [*indistinct words*] the size is actually the cone on the surface. The cone on the surface contains a very small part that could be… [*indistinct words*] a square that can be made on the surface, and we can cut it very slightly, obviously at a point that is a very small cone which is tiny, but that we can still see with the eye in order to reconcentrate… [*indistinct words*] It's interesting to see this play between the opaque and the limpid, where the stones that are the most limpid and the most transparent can be worked in a kind of opacity in order to… [*indistinct word*] the depth… [*indistinct words*] extremely transparent and one can try to make them deeper, and thus the stones that are opaque can be made… [*indistinct words*]

Deleuze: Yes, it's very clear. Yes.

Jouanny: So, these phenomena interested me… [*indistinct words*]. But there are a lot of ways for diamond dealers to work, and to make diamonds of lesser quality they have rubies… [*indistinct words*] Several diamonds of different qualities. However, what I didn't know was that you can make… [*indistinct words*] you can mix crystals with each other. That is to say, we can have a diamond which has a part which is limpid and a part which is… [*indistinct words*] So, in this case, we would cut the diamond at a certain height, and between the two places we would put… [*words indistinct*] another diamond that would be sealed in the metallic attachment and not through the stone's embellishment. That would allow us, with these two diamonds, to make one, in order to… [*indistinct words*]. Or one can even mix emeralds with diamonds to obtain a kind of diamond emerald… [*indistinct words*] which can be placed between two diamonds, usually right at the top of the cone… [*indistinct words*] and can be replaced by a colored stone or a good quality diamond, even if this doesn't have the ideal clarity… [*indistinct words*] and so the other part is slightly… [*indistinct word*] There is a whole gymnastics of light going on here… [*indistinct words*]

Deleuze: I'm very interested in all of this. It's perfect for us because, if we retain the essence of what you just said, you can draw two axes from it: a light/color axis and a space axis. That's good because I didn't keep these in mind, I didn't think of them. So this could be added to... and when you defined this particular space, that we could call crystalline space, I would say that regarding our concern, our specific concern about cinema, it seems to me like an exact description, I'm not saying of space in general, but of certain spaces in the films of Orson Welles, where you have a certain opacity in the centre and in the background… for those of you who have seen one of Welles' films where he plays a lot on crystalline colors… *The Immortal Story*.[2] I mean, it's not a question of applying, you see… He just extracted two characters... Fine. So, I would like to follow up on this but I don't know if, of course... He drew out two axes, he identified two axes. As I was saying, I had three, I had three axes. But that doesn't prevent... obviously, we'll now have to add the two he came up with.

So, you remember our starting point? Independently of these axes, our starting point was this: a crystal-image is a two-sided image, or what we called, taking up a term of Gaston Bachelard – but giving it another meaning – a *mutual image*. Indeed, for Bachelard, a mutual image means an image that participates in several elements. According to him the crystal-image always participates in at least two elements: earth-air, earth-fire, earth-I don't know what… and it is mutual, or bifacial.[3]

We ourselves said that a mutual image is the coalescence of an actual image and its virtual image.[4] And we relied on Bergson to be able to grasp this coalescence. But for us this also corresponded to the phenomenon of paramnesia, that is to say the coexistence of an actual image, of an image that is present, and its coexisting past. The coexistence of the present and its *own* past is what Bergson presents as the recollection of the present, the coalescence of the present and its recollection, the coalescence of the past *with the present that it was*. We must add to this that according to Bergson the past does not come after the present but is strictly contemporary with the present that it was. This gave us our starting point: the coalescence of an actual image and *its* virtual image.

But that was only our starting point. In order to obtain a crystal-image, we said, it is not enough simply to have this coalescence. It is necessary that this coalescence determines an exchange: namely that the virtual image becomes actual and that the actual image becomes virtual. In other words, the crystal is a circuit... [*Tape interrupted*] [31:57]

... occurs. Starting from the coalescence of an actual image and its virtual image, that is to say its mirror image, the circuit is established as if by itself. The virtual image becomes actual, the actual image becomes virtual. But in what way? The virtual image, namely the mirror image, will become actual and will become all the more actual as the mirror multiplies its facets – either through two facing mirrors, or through Venetian mirrors, or a multiplicity of mirrors. So, to go back to what he just said… to what Jouanny just said regarding size: the more the mirror multiplies its facets, the more the virtual image becomes actual, that is to say, it captures the actual image to the point that the actual image becomes virtual. In what form? The real character is no longer distinct from their mirror images. Not only are they no longer distinct from their mirror images, but they have passed into the mirror images, yet at the same time are repulsed by the mirror images to the point that the actual character is pushed out of field and becomes virtual.

As I was saying, it seems to me that one of the greatest creators of crystal-images in cinema is Orson Welles. Take for example the famous ending of *The Lady from Shanghai*. The multiplication of mirrors has made the two characters, the man and the woman, indistinguishable from their multiplied images. Each of them shoots into the mirrors until all the mirrors are broken and the characters regain their actuality and realize that they were standing side by side all the time, and so can finally shoot each other. So, they only recover their actuality by killing each other. So here we have a circuit: actual image-virtual image. Do you see? The virtual image becomes more and more actual as it absorbs and captures the character, while the actual image becomes more and more virtual as the character is pushed out of field, at least momentarily. He will only regain his actuality by breaking the mirror. We have a circuit. This circuit I call crystal-image, and the famous ending of *The Lady of Shanghai* is a prime example.

So this is my first axis. But we sense that this is not enough to found a concept of the mirror-image. It would be too thin. It's already something, but it's too thin, so fortunately we can't stop there. Because I am saying something simple here: the exchange will be renewed according to a second axis, the exchange will be renewed according to a second axis. Namely, if I were to summarize, I would say that the virtual image which has become actual *presents itself as limpid* while the actual image that has become virtual *passes into opacity*. It remains abstract for the moment, but it is a very comprehensible form of abstraction. You see, it works... it's a second axis.

And at the same time, it renews the exchange. Why does it renew the exchange? I repeat, since we can understand... To understand is to understand the abstract. While the concrete is something else, you have to feel it. The virtual image that has become actual becomes limpid at the same time as the actual image that has become virtual passes into opacity. But, but… perhaps under the influence of certain factors, the limpid is called upon to become opaque, and the opaque to become limpid. I would therefore have a second circuit: a circuit of the limpid and the opaque that would form the second axis of the crystal-image and that would follow the determination of the crystal-image as a mutual image, that is, as an image within which an exchange takes place. For that is essentially what it is: a mutual image is an image that is inseparable from an exchange.

Now, what I retain from crystallography, just as Jouanny drew out certain characters, is a character that I present to you in the most rudimentary form possible. Listen, there's nothing to understand. I take as an example a body like sulfur, a crystallizable body. Sulfur can crystallize, crystallography tells us, you don't need to have studied to be able to grasp that. Sulfur can crystallize in several forms, including two principal forms: a form called… – this is self-explanatory, even if you don't know the meaning of the words, that's good, you can also look it up in your dictionary later – it can crystallize either in a form they call "octahedral" – you know what an octahedron is… you may know what it is, or you can look it up in the Larousse – or in a form called "prismatic".

Why am I delving into this? You see, under normal conditions – I emphasize, *normal* conditions, but what do we mean by normal conditions? – under normal conditions, octahedral sulfur, which has crystallized in octahedral form, octahedral sulfur is said to be *stable*. And what does stable mean in this case? It means something very simple: it means that the formation thus prepared remains limpid. Under these same conditions, prismatic sulphur is metastable with respect to the octahedral. What does *metastable* mean here? Never mind, you can look it up in your dictionary, but a good one… such as the Larousse, okay? It means that such a preparation, after a certain time, becomes opaque. And why does it become opaque? Because on its lattice, small octahedrons are formed which make it opaque, tiny octahedrons which make it opaque.

I can therefore say that my two mutual crystalline forms – octahedral and prismatic – are distributed, one being limpid, remaining limpid, while other becomes opaque in normal conditions. Here, by normal conditions – and this will be of concern to me, obviously, this will be of concern to me for the future – I refer to the conditions of the *milieu*. So, you see, I've introduced the notion of milieu, and it comes as a surprise. We'll have to justify it, especially in terms of the temperature of the milieu. Namely, what I have just described, between the two crystalline forms of sulfur, one limpid and the other opaque, is valid for so-called ordinary temperatures, that is to say, if one wants to be scholarly about it, up to about 95 degrees. What happens above that? The following marvel occurs: it reverses. It's the prismatic sulfur that is in stable equilibrium, and that remains limpid, while the octahedral sulfur becomes opaque. Well, you can see that here I have my abstract circuit. I no longer have an actual-virtual circuit, where the actual becomes virtual and the virtual becomes actual. I have a limpid-opaque circuit where, depending on the conditions, *the limpid becomes opaque and the opaque becomes limpid*. In what way does this second circuit follow on from the first? We trust in the abstraction of the concept, and yes, it proceeds automatically.

I repeat my initial formula: when the actual... No, sorry, *when the virtual becomes actual,* in accordance with the first axis, *there is limpidity. When the actual becomes virtual, it passes into opacity.* You see how here, just as happened before with the actual and the virtual, the limpid and the opaque change places.

It's time to make all this concrete. But before I make it concrete, we have to make one last effort. I introduced the idea of *milieu*. I'm not allowed to introduce it. Why did I introduce the idea of *milieu*? I introduced it, invoking temperature conditions. Fortunately, to save everything, we realize that the notion of milieu participates in a third axis: a third crystalline axis, and that in the end there is no crystal. There are crystal-images, yes, but there is no crystal. Why is that? Because the crystal itself is not a relation. That's why this is a mutual image.

So, you will tell me yes, it is a relation between the actual and the virtual. And I will tell you, Yes, but not only. As a relation, it is something else. As a relation, it is essentially something else: it is the third axis. There is no crystal, *there are only seeds and the milieu.* And *the crystal is a pure limit between a seed said to be crystalline and a milieu said to be crystallizable.*

Can we say, then, that seed-milieu inevitably constitutes a third axis? Can we say that there is a circuit there too? Yes, there is a circuit. For a very simple reason, it is the simple continuation through the three axes. Because the actual and the virtual do not cease to change places under different forms. Why is that? It's because I can also say, as for this last couple – no longer actual-virtual, no longer limpid-opaque but seed-milieu – I can say, and I must say, two things at once: the seed is the virtual element that causes an actual amorphous milieu to crystallize.

What does amorphous mean here? You see how joyful this is. We travel in abstraction, but it's a very, very vivid abstraction. There is no need to lay anything concrete underneath for the moment. You have to trust that the concrete will follow. What does amorphous mean here? We know, we saw it last time. The amorphous is that which does not have any privileged direction. We recall that the crystal was defined, in the most general way, by having a privileged direction. Thus, the amorphous is that which does not present a privileged direction. I would say, in the operation of crystallization, the seed is a virtual element that causes an actual amorphous milieu to crystallize.

As soon as I say that, I don't want to say the opposite occurs, but I want to talk about the other half of the circuit. Namely, this amounts to saying that there must be a condition. For the amorphous milieu to crystallize, what does it require? It must have a *crystallizable structure*. And crystallography defines very well this potentiality of the crystallizable structure. I would therefore say that the seed is the actual element that causes a matter, or a milieu, that is actually amorphous to crystallize. I now say that the seed is the *actual* element that causes a milieu to *virtually* crystallize. At the level of the seed and the milieu, the actual and the virtual have changed places under or upon a third circuit. So now I have my three circuits.

Now we could add a color circuit, and why not. Well, all this may feel like it doesn't mean anything. It may not mean anything, but we cling to our concept. I would call the concept of the crystal-*image the determination of an image possessing three axes according to which the actual becomes virtual and vice versa, the limpid becomes opaque and vice versa.* So, we

have two exchanges. Plus, an exchange between seed and milieu also takes place. So here we have the three developments of our starting definition: the coalescence of the actual and the virtual. Okay? So, it will obviously become clearer if we look for concrete examples. The concrete, as we saw in the case of the first axis, is not difficult. It was very clear, and if it is not clear, I'll start again, right? So, since you don't want me to start again…

Second axis: what's going on? What is happening here? I would say, according to my first axis, that the virtual image becomes actual. But in which case does it happen? We are forgetting here the whole history of crystallography. We are forgetting... We think about everyday things, alas, not yet. We will try to make a detour. We'll pay one last tribute to science. Well, yes, the scientist… I mean, it's no longer about science, it's about the character of the scientist. The scientist offers us a limpid image of himself. Because the scientist says to us: what do I do if not pure science? I have nothing to hide, I am a man of science. We will need Nietzsche to discover that, under the limpidity of the scientist, strange opacities are hidden, opacities with which we have become very familiar. The scientist produces a limpid image of himself, even when he is not specialized in crystallography. Good.

But this is the luminous scientist of official science. And we know that this limpid image can arise only if there is another image that comes to the surface. The luminous scientist of official science forms a kind of couple with a more obscure scientist who has renounced the light of official or pure science, who confines himself to quite humble tasks in the darkness of a small laboratory, and who no longer believes so much in pure science. What is this story? A limpid image and an opaque image of science. Ah, yes… the luminous scientist of pure science, the obscure scientist of the small hidden science.

There is a rather odd filmmaker, a Polish director, very odd, whose name is Krzysztof Zanussi.[5] He claims – and I tell you this can be verified – to have a scientific background, and the fact is that most of his films feature two scientists who become characters. And there's always a scientist with a bright future ahead of him who's involved in pure science, and who goes to international symposiums which are places of light. And he has a former schoolmate who was as brilliant as he was, but who has given up any luminous career, and works at obscure little tasks, usually in meteorology.

And Zanussi is part of that Dreyer tradition… I mean, where sometimes you have science, sometimes religion in Dreyer's case, sometimes faith, sometimes philosophy, as part of the story and these become the subject of the most ordinary… what are literally the most banal and everyday dialogues. This was Dreyer's incredible, incredible achievement. Zanussi too, in terms of scientific discourse, gives us these two scientists who converse with one another, and who explain themselves, and the more they explain themselves, the more the limpid becomes opaque, and the more the opaque becomes suffused with a very strange light, a light that is not so clear, because, is it the light of science or is it rather the light of something else that would be closer to faith? And in a beautiful image, a beautiful case of the mutual image, Zanussi creates a relation between a shot that representing a the luminously drawn human brain lit up on a blackboard, which would be the scientific brain... [*Tape interrupted*] [59:06]

Part 2

... the limpid image, which he follows with an image of the opaque cranium of a monk at prayer, seen from behind. You can see immediately what he is getting at. The film is called *The Illumination*.[6] Illumination is an Augustinian theme, from Saint Augustine. Zanussi, like

all Poles, is an Augustinian. So why… Serge Daney wrote what I think is a very good text on the situation of cinema in Eastern European countries where he says that, after all, not surprisingly it's not only Zanussi who proceeds in this way. Because in the end, writers and film-makers are only allowed to criticize science. As for the other powers… the power of science is something they can prod and attack. But the other powers, such as the political power, are something they cannot criticize. So, indeed, they take it out on what they can. Zanussi for example will criticize the power of science. Meaning that while you can criticize Trofim Lysenko[7], you can't criticize Stalin. Well, we'll let you criticize Lysenko, yes, we'll let you criticize science.[8]

Hence, we have this very strange entity that is Zanussi's cinema, where all of history, then science-faith, will be placed under the rubric – alas a Nietzschean one – *In what way, we too, are still pious…*[9] In what way are we too still pious? it is... here, when the limpid image of science becomes opaque. Why does this happen? At the same time, Zanussi will show that these scholars who claim to embody pure science, limpid science, are in fact animated by an extremely dubious and opaque will to power and are conducting a business which, for sure, is not clear. And at the same time, the opaque scientist, reduced to small obscure tasks, becomes limpid and enjoys a strange light which is perhaps no longer that of science but that of illumination. In what way are we still pious? The limpid has become opaque and the opaque has become limpid. Or rather, is it like that? Not quite, not quite. There is always a measure of uncertainty, uncertainty between the two, a kind of uncertainty principle. And who ultimately depends on what? I'm introducing the third axis here, and we'll see that it depends on the milieu.

And what is interesting in Zanussi's cinema are the exteriors, the milieu, the milieu that is fundamentally a meteorological milieu, a meteorological milieu that is very related, snowy landscapes, very, or liquid landscapes, that constantly risk tipping the limpid into the opaque and the opaque into the limpid. And here, I don't know, I think I've already said this, there is something, in fact, that is very striking in Eastern European cinema or in Soviet cinema, it's that precisely because it's not based on movement-images like American cinema, they have an extraordinary taste for materials.[10] It is a cinema of materials, a cinema of heavy materials. This they owe to Alexander Dovzhenko[11], a great elder statesman of cinema. And, in general, they will retain this Russian tradition of bringing heavy materials into cinema. The close-ups in their films will not be close-ups of Greta Garbo. They will be close-ups of pumpkins – see Dovzhenko – and pumpkins in the wet earth, heavy matter, dense still life compositions. This never occurred in American cinema, because, for other reasons… because of its very virtues, it went so far in pursuing the movement-image that materials could not follow. The taste for materials, for heavy materials, if you think today of someone like Sergei Parajanov or Andrei Tarkovsky, or Zanussi himself, who is Polish, this taste for heavy materials is the characteristic of an image that does not regard movement as the essential element of the image.

So okay... I'll leave it at that before making a transition to something else. In Zanussi's cinema, if you have been following me, you could say that he presents us with scientists, but what are these scientists? He makes them into actors. Yes, obviously, he makes them into actors, he makes them dramatic beings par excellence. Now, the dramatic being par excellence is the actor. And everything that seems unusual to us in Zanussi, in terms of these men of science confronted in their limpid-obscure, limpid-opaque couple, with the opaque becoming limpid and the limpid becoming opaque, would surprise us less if we were informed that they are actors.

Why? What is the first face of the actor? The actor… let's try to construct a paradox of the actor, which has nothing to do with Diderot's paradox…[12] There are many possible paradoxes. What is another paradox of the actor? You can sense that the actor's paradox is *the adventure of the limpid and the opaque*. This will confirm what we are saying. Why? The actor is attached to their role. Yes, the actor is attached to their role but what does this mean? We romanticize, we dramatize things. The actor is a monster… well, it's not that the actor is a monster, *it is monsters who are actors*. Monsters are born actors. Why? Because they are by nature attached to their role. The actor is only attached to their role by will and by chance, but the monster is attached to his role by nature and fate. Why? Because their role is made up of their shortcomings or what they have in excess. The limbless man or the Siamese twin. You should already understand what I'm getting at here, as far as cinema is concerned.[13]

Okay, but whether we're speaking of a natural actor, that is to say the monster, or an accidental actor, that is to say the actor by profession… what does it mean to be attached to one's role? The role is the virtual image. Indeed, *the role is a virtuality*. The role is a virtuality, the role is a virtual image. The actor is an actual character. The actor as an actual character gives their actuality to the virtual image, that is to say to the role. They make the role exist, or one may say they embody the role. To the extent that the actor is attached to their role, they make the virtual image actual, and the virtual image of the role becomes limpid. This is the clarity, the sublime clarity of art.

So, what Zanussi told us about the man of science was true, but it was much more true about the actor, and it is more familiar and much more concrete to us when we're speaking about the actor. But what happens here? Now the actor has given all their actuality to the virtual image of the role, and thus, the image of the role has become limpid. This is Hamlet in person. From then on, the actor's actuality has gone elsewhere. The actor's actuality has passed into the virtual, the virtual becoming actual and by the same token limpid, while the actor's actuality as a person is pushed off-screen, it is pushed back, and falls back, into the opaque. Behind the mask, that is to say, behind the role, is a dark and somber face. This has been said a lot about clowns. Well, you can fill in the blanks yourself. The somber face behind the clown's mask, is something whose actuality has passed into the opaque, and thus has become virtual. At the same time that the virtual image of the role becomes actual, that is to say limpid, the actuality of the actor becomes virtual and passes into the opaque.

Passes into the opaque? What do we mean by this? A dark and somber face behind the mask? We are left with no choice, we are left with no choice. In terms of this other aspect, the actor is a criminal. Under their private aspect, which is repressed by their public role and which passes into the opaque, their private activity can only be that of a criminal. This is the actor's opacity, the criminal project that inspires them as a private person. And though this criminal project may be of a very different nature, it doesn't matter what it is, it will always be criminal. It can be the project of a vigilante, it can be an act of revenge, it will always be a criminal activity. But let's not overdo it. No, we must not exaggerate. It's the *idea* of the actor that I'm talking about, it's not the actors themselves, right? It's the concept of the actor. I would say that the concept of the actor is the mutual relationship between two images: the limpid image, the image of the public role that has become limpid, and the image of a secret and private criminal activity that has become opaque.

A great genius of cinema built his entire oeuvre on this theme and on this circuit. This is the American filmmaker Tod Browning[14], whose film *Freaks*[15] is particularly well known in France, but he made many other movies, as early as the silent era. He straddles the gap

between silent and talking films. And what can be found in all of Browning's work is a reflection on the circus monster or the clown, on the circus artist, the circus actor who, for him, condenses the essence of the actor. And what is the kind of story that Browning's films recount? He is a truly great director because he brought to the screen this type of story, which to my knowledge would have no equivalent in French except perhaps in the great 19th century popular novels of Gaston Leroux[16], to give one random example.

Freaks is particularly well known: the actors are the freaks, the monsters of the Barnum circus. All their actuality passes into the virtual image of their role, they are attached to their role and by this measure, becomes actual. The two Siamese twins, the limbless man, the… I, I don't mean to make fun of them, but also the adorable morons, the incredible duo of morons, the hydrocephalic ones and so on, they all perform their roles in the full light of the circus stage. And they are simultaneously led to undertake a private revenge, in the night beneath flashes of lightning, when they will pursue the able-bodied woman who has despised and deceived them, and they will converge towards her during the night, pursuing their opaque, criminal activity of taking revenge, following which the normal woman will find herself transformed into a monster more pitiable than themselves. You remember how beautifully this is shown under the lightning… well for those who have seen the film.[17]

There are other Browning films that show how obsessed he was with this. One story, one of the most beautiful of all stories happens in *Freaks*, where there is a fake limbless man who really does have his arms cut off, that is, he makes his role limpid, he gives the role all of his actuality by becoming a freak. He really does have his arms cut off for love, because he is in love with a horsewoman who cannot bear the hands of men. Only in Gaston Leroux do we find an equivalent of these proofs of love of a similarly high degree of poetry. To have one's arms cut off because one is in love with a woman who cannot bear the hands of men, that is to say, a cold horsewoman. What story could be more beautiful? But at the same time, as he passes into the limpidity of limblessness, he somehow reconquers something of his actuality by pursuing a private revenge, namely, in the attempt to assassinate his rival, since the horsewoman has meanwhile allowed herself to be seduced by a man who has arms. It's one of the most beautiful love stories in the world. Okay.

In another Browning film[18], we have the ventriloquist Echo, who can only speak through the mouth of his puppet... [*Tape interrupted*] [1:18:04]

… he pursues a criminal enterprise. Here he is disguised as a lady, he becomes a transvestite. And the crime committed – opaque activity – this opaque activity will become limpid at the moment the role is interrupted, when the role becomes again opaque and the opaque activity bursts into the open. Because it is an innocent who is arrested and the criminal Echo is a good man in the end, he will confess his crime through the mouth of the one who is unjustly accused. Here once again, we have some splendid images. All of Browning's work turns around this. It is not at all, as has sometimes been said, a reflection on the spectacle. It's a circuit. There will be filmmakers who will make such a reflection… but Browning doesn't do this at all. What interests him is neither the theme of the theater nor the circus. What interests him is the status of the actor and the relationship between the actor and the monster. And why is he interested in the freak? He is interested in this transformation, this limpid-opaque, opaque-limpid exchange. Not surprisingly, here we have a type of image that one can recognize in advance, a completely stifling kind of atmosphere, an abnormal slowness as if everything took place in a kind of glass cage, in a kind of... well, what else can be said.

Browning's atmospheres have marked the history of cinema, and you will recognize them immediately. So okay.

Is this enough for us? Immediately I say to myself, this is a theme that has continued throughout time. There are two great films, two very interesting films that indirectly derive from Browning: a film by Hitchcock called *Murder*[19], and the film I mentioned earlier by Kon Ichikawa, *An Actor's Revenge*.[20] In both films we find the Browning pattern to the point that – I can't believe that Browning didn't have an influence both on Hitchcock and on Ichikawa – where the role, the crystalline role, the limpid role, passes into the opaque, that is to say, into private revenge, into crime, at the same time as the opaque is discovered in broad daylight and interrupts the role. And we have an opaque-limpid, limpid-opaque exchange.

Hitchcock's *Murder* is the story of a transvestite, and even more so Ichikawa's *An Actor's Revenge* also turns around the figure of a transvestite. Moreover, Ichikawa goes very far, since he combines what at that time, it seems to me, was something very new, in terms of European cinema at least. He combines landscapes with hermetic black backgrounds. There are some splendid black backgrounds in *An Actor's Revenge* that show very precisely the succession of the limpid and the opaque and their exchange. And this becomes very refined, that is to say that at the level of the technique used to produce the images you have this limpid-opaque circuit.

So let's continue, let's keep our momentum. We can no longer... What is it that resembles a circuit or I might say a ring, a circular track, what is it that resembles a ring? We had the scientific amphitheatre with Zanussi, but the amphitheater ends up becoming a circus ring. We have the stage or the circus ring as a place, a place where the genesis of the crystal-image occurs. What could we add to this? There is no need… we can make the list as heteroclite as we want as long as the coherence of this heteroclite list is guaranteed by the concept.

Perhaps there's a third thing that can function as a circuit. What would this be? It's a ship, a ship. A ship is a crystal. That's odd, yet it seems so obvious to me. A ship is a crystal, do you see? The ship is a crystal-image. Not necessarily, you might say. Even in cinema, there are ships that are not necessarily crystal-images. Well, if there are ships that are not crystal-images, it is because they are not really ships. When they are *real* ships, then they are crystal-images. And this for the simple reason that the ship as ship is a crystal. You'll say, yes but this is like saying... it's like we're turning in circles.

Why is it a crystal? It doesn't look like one, yet those who know about ships also know that they are crystals. I added something, those who know about ships… What do they know, knowing about ships? They know something that the greatest painter of ships and boats knew: splitting in two is not an accident that happens to the ship, although it is a catastrophic accident. It is one of the powers of the ship: to split and sink is one of the powers of the ship. Oh really! In fact, the greatest painter of ships is Turner[21]. Turner's favorite situation is – and here we can talk about the crystal-image in painting – is a ship splitting in two from the middle, as a result of a boiler explosion or a cannonball hit, a ship in flames that splits from the middle. I'm not doing justice to the paintings… if I had to speak about the paintings themselves, I would obviously draw something else from Turner, because what is interesting is the following: what does he do with such a figurative situation, as far as painting is concerned, that is to say, in terms of the regime of color and the regime of light? Turner is undoubtedly one of the greatest colorists and perhaps the greatest painter of light in the whole the history of painting. In any case, we cannot say that the ship splits by accident. The ship is

only realized in its essence as a ship by splitting in two, or by exploding. This is what Turner makes us believe, this is what he offers us.

Well, it splits in two. Does this really help us? Yes, because it's clear that the ship has a limpid side and an opaque side, and that being a ship means having a limpid side and an opaque side, and that nothing can do this better than a ship. You will tell me, why not a house? Why couldn't a house be a circus? A ship is a circus, that is to say a circuit. A house is neither a circus nor a circuit. One can make a circuit in a house, of course one can. But at that point, you're treating it like a ship. Why does a ship have a limpid side and an opaque side? Namely, why is a ship a crystal?

The greatest ship writer – parallel to the greatest painter of ships – the greatest writer about ships is, as we all know, the American writer Hermann Melville. And Hermann Melville asks this question, he never ceases to ask this question, in all of his work: what, in the end, is a ship? It's not possible to write about ships after Melville. I mean, anyone who writes about ships after Melville is a brazen writer. There are subjects that should be considered exhausted once a genius has confronted them. So, yes, I say to myself that novelists who still talk about ships are a lost cause.[22]

So, what does Melville tell us concerning what a ship really is? He says that a ship, well yes, he says a ship may look like a house but it is not a house. Why isn't it a house?

"In the case of the ship there is this addition" – as opposed to the house – "that the living spectacle it contains, upon its sudden and complete disclosure, has, in contrast with the blank ocean which zones it" – allow me to comment as I go along – "in contrast with the blank ocean" – here he is forced to introduce the idea of the milieu. It is in relation to a milieu, in relation to the liquid milieu on which it sails, that the ship will reveal its strange crystalline property.

In any case, let's continue. "The living spectacle it contains, upon its sudden and complete disclosure, has, in contrast with the blank ocean which zones it, something of the effect of enchantment." – He doesn't speak as if he's observing a ship from afar, does he? He's there, he's lived on ships – "The ship seems unreal; these strange costumes, gestures, and faces, but a shadowy tableau just emerged from the deep, which directly must receive back what it gave." [23] Is there a better expression for this than that the limpid becomes opaque? Why does the limpid become opaque on a ship, "in contrast with the blank ocean"? But we are not able to say what this means, this "in contrast with the blank ocean", the empty ocean for which the ship has a limpid face and an opaque face.

Indeed, in terms of one of its sides, everything on a ship must be visible, nothing must escape, first of all because everything must be tidy as in a Japanese house. Everything must be visible to the eye of the captain, and everything can be visible only to the extent that the sailors coincide with their roles. It seems as if a real dramaturgy takes place on the ship, and it is only to the extent that this limpid dramaturgy rises up on the boat, that the eye of the captain sees everything, that everything is in order. The dramaturgy of departure. Of course, things are no longer like that, there are no more sailing ships, but this is all about sailing ships. Think about the captain's orders, this kind of pantomime in which the sailors indulge, climbing the rigging and so on, all this, this, what is all a kind of real liturgy that ascends into the limpid sky. This is what Melville will call the ship above decks and this is the limpid face of the boat. The sailors are attached to their roles and pass into their roles. The virtual image

of the role becomes actual and presents itself as a limpid image. Phantasmagoria, a real liturgy or dramaturgy, a phantasmagoria where everything is visible.

But the ship above decks, where everything is visible and limpid, is opposed to the black ship below, the black ship below decks. So, according to its height, the two sides, there is what is above the water and what lies under the water? Because what's down there? What's down there is the settling of scores between the crewmen. It is the obscure violence of the crewmen, the settling of scores between the sailors who go down into the hold to settle their accounts. It is all the invisible and the opaque, and the two will not cease changing places. The settling of accounts will be discovered and the roles interrupted, the limpid roles interrupted, and as the opaque is discovered, it will become limpid. But, as the role is interrupted, the limpid will slip into the opaque and a circuit will be formed of which Melville knows the secret, and which you will find in *Moby Dick*. The limpid face of the ship is the whale hunt, where everything is in order, everything is visible. On a whaler, everything must be in order, it's a matter of life and death; not a single piece of rigging can be out of place, or a crewman could be swept overboard. We're talking about old-time whaling, of course. Right. What about the opaque ship? The opaque side is the dark madness of Captain Ahab, the dark madness of Captain Ahab, who betrays the laws of whaling and leads his crew to their deaths.

So, in this great short story "Benito Cereno" there is the limpid side of the ship, the ship above decks, with the Spanish captain who is assisted by a crew of black sailors who are extremely attentive to him, and everything is moving, this kindness of the black sailors towards their Spanish captain seems extremely touching. And to the American captain, who has boarded the ship, and who sees this spectacle, it all seems strange to him, and yet everything is visible. This is the limpid side. And it is only at the last moment that he will discover the opaque side, that this drama is in fact a black comedy, and that these black sailors, so kind to the Spanish captain, are in fact rebels who seized the ship, overwhelming the crew – who slipped into the opaque side – and who all the time remained close to the captain, but armed with knives – and this too is the opaque side – so that if the captain made one wrong move, he would die and all the crew would die with him. The great short story "Benito Cereno" shows you the circuit: limpid side of the ship-opaque side, opaque side-limpid side, and here we have a circuit where the opaque becomes limpid and the limpid opaque.

Well, whether or not this is an obsession of Melville's, this play of the limpid and the opaque on the ship, what it does is to make the ship into a crystal-image. But we are already on our third axis, since this is not independent of the ship's situation. Alone on an immense sea, the boat is like a seed about which we can ask ourselves: Will it manage to seed the sea or not? And a recent film – I'm making a bit of a detour here, but it's to try to be concrete – there's a recent, quite beautiful film by Fellini, *And the Ship Sails On*,[24] that has taken on board something of Melville's genius. For those of you who have seen *And the Ship Sails On*, you will certainly remember that the ship keeps splitting, and that it even splits along three axes, where each time the limpid and the opaque change places. I would say that *And the Ship Sails On* is a typical case of a crystal-image film.

First axis: the ship above decks and the ship below decks, the dark side of the stokers and the limpid side… of what? Of the drama that the passengers are supposed to play: they have brought the ashes of a singer to scatter at a precise spot. And there is already an exchange when the passengers go to see the stokers and the stokers coerce them to… the stokers coerce

them into have a singing contest in front of them. So here, something about the stokers becomes limpid while the others slip into opacity, in what is a very, very beautiful scene.

The second axis of the ship's splitting, this time on deck, no longer up and down but across, not across, I don't know what, I can't find the word… yes, laterally, laterally. The boat takes refugees on board, shipwrecked people, politically shipwrecked people. And on the deck, ropes are set up so as to avoid mixing. The limpid side: the passengers; the opaque side: the poor proletarian castaways. The opaque will become limpid and the limpid will become opaque with the great moment of the dance where there is a mixing of passengers to a Bartokian folk theme, and where the two groups mix and exchange their determinations.

Third axis: the dark warship arrives, the admirable warship constructed by Fellini that is completely opaque, that has only small firing slits, tiny loopholes, and it claims the poor shipwrecked proletarians as prisoners of war or worse, rather as... And the two ships confront each other, like the limpid side and the opaque side. And the exchange is so well realized that a young terrorist cannot help himself from making a last gesture – in the end the shipwrecked people are to be delivered to the warship – and in a final gesture that, as usual, happens all of a sudden, just like that, the little terrorist throws a bomb, and God forbid, it has to fall right into a loophole of the opaque warship, and the two ships are blown apart, and in their destruction they are returned to the sea like sterile seeds. They will not sow the sea. End of the world, end of the film. Okay, very good!

This is the story of the ship, and it is in this sense that the ship is a crystal. But we still have a last point to examine. You will have noticed it yourselves, we brought in the idea of the milieu, and indeed, if the ship is a crystal, it is in the sense that it forms a seed in relation to the milieu, namely the sea. And here we find our last actual-virtual cycle, our last circuit. We must say at the same time that the seed is the virtual element of which we ask ourselves: Will it sow the amorphous milieu, for example the sea? And we must also say that it is the actual element which, if it succeeds, will sow the sea, but this time as a virtually crystallizable milieu and no longer as an actually amorphous milieu. The actual has become virtual at the same time that the virtual has become actual. We always come back to this same confirmation of the crystal-image.

And who would they be, who are they, these great authors who grasp hold of a crystal-image, not at an actual or at a virtual level, not at the limpid-opaque level, but at the level of seed-milieu? In terms of literature, it would again be Melville. But if I think of cinema – to hurry things up because I don't have much time, we must go quickly – a splendid film that without a doubt gives us one of the most beautiful crystal-images, I think, among the most beautiful in the whole history of cinema, is *Heart of Glass*[25] by Werner Herzog.[26] So how does Herzog's *Heart of Glass* unfold? The search for the ruby glass, the search for the secret of the ruby glass, well… the crystal-image contains all that Jouanny said about colors, it would be necessary to re-examine *Heart of Glass* in this respect, to find this ruby glass. So, presumably it would confirm Jouanny's analysis, in terms of the search for ruby glass.

But there is more to it than this. It appears there is another story. Actually, it's not another story, it's the same one. The search will take on catastrophic proportions, namely, the glass factory will be consumed by flames. Okay. But at the same time, the milieu does not remain indifferent, and under hallucinatory visions that accompany the film, admirable hallucinatory visions of landscapes, one passes from a state of the world to another state of the world, I mean from the world-milieu, from a state of the world-milieu to another state of the world-

milieu. The first state of the world-milieu is a flat world that ends at the edge of an abyss. And here Herzog's images are sublime. But this vision of the world, or this first state of the world, gives way to hallucinatory visions of another type. Which is to say, at the same time as the text says: "I see a new land, I see a new land", there arise crystalline landscapes, eminently crystalline landscapes, which testify to the existence of an infinite world and which, not surprisingly for Herzog, derive straight from German Romantic painting. If you think of the great crystalline landscapes of German Romanticism... [*Tape interrupted*] [1:46:38]

Part 3

... I would say that there is a passage between the world as an actually amorphous milieu, the flat world that ends at the edge of a chasm, to *a world endowed with infinite crystallizable potentialities*, that is to say to *the virtually crystallizable world*. And it is the ensemble that composes the seed-milieu, the seed being the ruby glass, and the milieu passing from its amorphous state to its crystalline state. This time the seed will have sown the milieu, though admittedly at the price of a catastrophe, the universal blaze of the factory.

And what is so open in Herzog's work… I fear we will find – it is not that the two directors are similar – but we will find an equivalent – and this shouldn't surprise us – in Russian cinema, but this time a closed and dark equivalent, whereas in Herzog's work things are quite radiant. But when we move to Russian cinema, it becomes… it obviously becomes less, less... it closes in. Because if there is an author, if there is a Soviet… a contemporary Russian director who works with the crystal-image, it seems to me that it is Tarkovsky[27]. But with Tarkovsky, it goes without saying… I mean, it goes without saying that we're dealing with a crystal-image. Take *Mirror*[28] for example. A film like *Mirror* is entirely composed of a revolving crystal, a revolving crystal that, if you wish, you can – depending on the circumstances – grasp as two-sided or four-sided, two-sided or four-sided.

The two-sided crystal is composed of the two women, the hero's mother and the hero's wife. The hero is off-screen. There are only two sides. But there is also a four-sided crystal, if you bring in the two couples: the hero's mother and the child that the hero was, the hero's wife and the child that the hero has with this woman. And it's a crystal that's barely solid. Even in the houses, we feel the dampness of Tarkovsky's images. And you have those beautiful images of the woman washing her hair against a wall that is itself completely dripping. It's always raining in Tarkovsky's houses, always. It's a crystal, but *one that has barely condensed from its liquid state*. And yet this crystal holds like a seed in a milieu.

Herzog seems almost optimistic since Herzog has the vision of a universe that crystallizes. Tarkovsky, on the other hand, is unable to believe in this, and his personal four-headed crystal – the mother, the child he was, the woman, the child he has – *this rotating crystal turns through all points of the horizon to question the milieu*… What question does it ask the milieu? It asks the milieu the following question: *What is Russia? What is Russia? What is Russia?* A question that must clearly be understood as a metaphysical question, one in which we are still metaphysicians: what is Russia?

And what will be the answer? There will be no answer because the question will mean: what burning bush – and here we have the theme of the perpetual burning bush in Tarkovsky – *what fire would be capable of staunching this wet earth*? Not a heavy liquid vision at all. The

crystals are liquid crystals, and everything closes. It closes in on itself. Think of the end of *Solaris*,[29] what we have is always this questioning of the milieu: the milieu won't crystallize, it's too liquid for that. What is Russia? What is Russia? It is a question, for Tarkovsky, it is a metaphysical question as it is for all Russians. The Russians are the only people to have framed the question of their country as a metaphysical question. This is already the case in Dostoyevsky: What is Russia? as a metaphysical question. In France, it is hard to imagine a French author asking himself: *What is France?* in the sense of a metaphysical question because that would just make everybody laugh. But in Russia, it seems quite normal to everyone. It's *the* ultimate metaphysical question: What is Russia for them? It's strange... Yes, but... well, what does all this mean?

Well, you see, this is what we have just introduced. If you remember all that we did on disconnected spaces, empty spaces, now we have to add this... We're not finished yet, since I had mentioned probabilistic spaces, topological spaces, which are not scientific notions. Once again, I insist on this: I am not applying science to aesthetics, which would be stupid. Again, remember our method. When I was talking about Riemannian spaces, what did I mean? What I was doing… following the method I was proposing, I extracted a scientific operator from Riemannian operators which defined a scientific space. Okay. We're not going to get mired in this because otherwise we'd be doing mathematics, and I wouldn't be able to get involved. I simply extract a character, of whom I obviously ask whether what I'm doing makes any sense. But not even a mathematician could answer this. And after all, mathematicians are quite nice people. They will tell me that it is not a misunderstanding, no. It's of no interest to us as mathematicians, but it's not a misunderstanding.

So, I would say that as regards Riemannian space, the character I extract from it in the interests of philosophy would be a space the connection of whose parts is not determined, or not predetermined, that is to say a space whose parts are connected to one another, but which can be so connected in an infinite number of ways. So, I'm not doing mathematics here. I propose that by way of convention we call this a Riemannian space, because it is a case to which a certain number of Riemannian operators refer. So, if I find these in art, it will not be because artists apply Riemann's mathematical formulas. I will find that, for example, cinema produces very peculiar spaces through its own means, spaces whose parts are disconnected or can be connected in multiple ways.

In previous years, I 've tried to show, for example, Bresson's spaces, where connections are made from one to the other and are not predetermined. Here I would say, well, this is the aesthetic equivalent of a Riemannian space. Regardless of whether or not Bresson knows what a Riemannian space is, it doesn't really matter. It's obvious that there are probabilistic spaces, for example, in Alain Resnais' work. But this does not mean that Resnais applies probability calculations to make his films. Or that there are spaces we should call amorphous, in a very specific sense, meaning empty spaces, spaces that are fundamentally, essentially empty. We have seen this in Ozu, or in Antonioni, but it is not that they apply anything either. It is through their own means as artists that they produce spaces with this conceptual character.

And again, you could ask yourself what the role of the hand is in Bresson, and in what way this would constitute the originality of Bresson, since disconnected spaces, spaces whose parts are not connected in a univocal way are what you find in all kinds of films today. It's a constant of modern cinema. But what I think is unique to Bresson is this idea of the hand, that the connections between spaces will be tactile and that it is the hand that will connect one

piece of space to another. So, it's not a prehensile hand. It is, oddly enough, *a space-constituting hand*, and this is why Bresson's cinema is tactile, almost entirely tactile. And it's also why Bresson's close-ups are not close-ups of faces, they're close-ups of hands. Only the hand connects different parts of space.[30] Okay. With Ozu, what you have are empty spaces. And to this we can now add the crystallized milieu. In the work of a certain number of directors also the crystallized milieu has this function.[31]

So if you allow me this whole idea of the crystal-image, I would say that what we have seen is a crystal-image based on three or four axes. Three, if you content yourself with mine, or four if you add Jouanny's axis concerning light and color, bearing in mind that his other axis, that of space, coincides, I think, with my milieu… so, crystallized milieu, that's all fine. And then what you can all do is add other axes, find things other than the ship, other than the circus or the ship. So, we would now have one last problem to tackle which is… an important one. But one which defines the different axes, you could almost say the elements of the crystal. And I would say that the major elements of the crystal are *actual-virtual, limpid-opaque, seed-milieu*. There would be one last study to make, a very different one, concerning crystal states. Every crystal state unites all these elements. But there are very different crystal states depending on how these elements are brought together.

Would you like a little rest? Yes? Not too long… You can go out, but come back or I'll... [*Tape interrupted*] [1:58:19]

... Here we enter… I want to say, therefore, that owing to an excess of professional conscience I will be giving two more courses. And so, between today and the other two sessions, could you please give me, those who want the credits, could you please give me your little green cards. The little green cards. There you are. The time has come.

So, you see, we've reached, fortunately we've still got two and a quarter more sessions, we've reached our last problem of the year. But regarding this last problem of the year, we're so far ahead in it that I wonder if we couldn't shorten it by one class now. Because once we have established all the axes of the crystal-image, we know what we see in the crystal-image, and as I was just reminded, all this forms part of a world in which the movement-image has collapsed, that is to say, where cinema has ceased to be a cinema of action *in order to become a cinema of the seer*. Because one does not act in the crystal. You can move a lot, you can move around in the crystal, right? There are many things that happen in the crystal, but we don't *act* in the crystal. We act in real milieux but we don't act in crystalline milieux. On the other hand, what we do in the crystal, which is as valuable as acting, is *to see*. We *see*. And it is this cinema of seers that sometimes in a very simple sense – and someone reminded me that, indeed, *Heart of Glass* runs under the sign of hypnosis[32], but it is not the only case, it's not the only case where hypnosis will intervene since, for example, hypnosis, in a very different sense from Herzog's, is also a major theme in Alain Resnais' films. His is a cinema of seers.

Now, if it is true that we *see* in the crystal-image, while we *act* in the movement-image, what exactly do we see? Our answer is... you have known this from the very start, since everything has been focused on this… *we see the direct time-image*. So, we shouldn't confuse the crystal-image with the time-image. The crystal-image concerns paradoxical organizations of space. That is to say, it seems to me, that we should still consider the crystal-image a type of space – whether it be disconnected spaces, empty spaces, crystallized milieux and so on. These are still spaces, but the kind of spaces which, contrary to Euclidean space, have a

character that can no longer be explained spatially, that require factors other than space to account for their own spatial character.

So, we again come back to our formula, that what derives from the movement-image is an indirect image of time. But, on the other hand, in the pure optical and sound image, or in the crystal-image, what we see is a direct time-image. It is the direct presentation of time as opposed to the indirect representation of time. To the movement-image there corresponds an indirect representation of time. To the pure optical and sound image, or to the crystal-image, since the crystal-image is the development of the pure optical and sound image, to the crystal-image there corresponds a direct presentation of time. This is what we see in the crystal. But in what form do we see it? Let me recapitulate: we already have our answer, there is no need to go back to this, it is Bergson who gave it to us, or at least he gave us our starting point.

What we see is *time in its very foundation*, that is to say, time in so far as at each moment it differentiates itself at the same time into two dissymmetrical jets: the present that passes and tends towards the future, and the past that is preserved. The past does not come after the present, the past does not occur after the present, it is coexistent with it. So that time is divided at every moment into the present which passes and the past which is preserved. The past is not preserved in our heads, *it is preserved in time itself*. Time is not the movement of the loss of the past or the destruction of the past... [*Tape interrupted*] [2:04:13]

...in quotation marks because it is not a movement. This *élan* that splits into two dissymmetrical jets and that makes all presents pass, that on one side makes all the presents pass and on the other side simultaneously preserves all of the past… this is what we see in the crystal.

But before going on, we should very quickly review the states of the crystal in relation to... It's as if I had two, two contemporary aspects of time, the aspect under which all presents pass, the aspect under which all the past is preserved. And here... the splitting of these two aspects is never complete, and we know why it is never complete. It is never complete because each time it is reinjected into the actual-virtual circuit. So it's a tendency, it's a redoubling that never ends. As Bergson will say, it is a redoubling that does complete itself or that only completes itself in exceptional circumstances – we will have to see what these are. Okay, so all this is clear.

So what we should do today – but I would like to go very, very quickly – is to look at these crystal states so that next time, I mean the next two times, the last two times, we will be able to tackle this question of the direct image of time. In this way, we will inevitably encounter *the powers of the false*, because it is obvious that the image of time is the power of the false. And we will be very happy because we will have completed our year.

I would say, I imagine – again, you can make your own list – I imagine four states of the crystal. So it has to work, it has to work at all costs, at all costs for me, I mean! You can create other states, in which case you will have to come up with other examples, or other research. I myself see four states of the crystal.

There is a perfect crystal – which doesn't exist, though it doesn't matter since we are talking about concepts – a finished crystal. As we have seen, there is no such thing as a finished crystal, since the crystal always denotes the limit between a crystalline seed and a milieu to be crystallized. There are only crystals which have been arrested in their development. But

we can forge the ideal concept: the ideal crystal would be a completed crystal, a perfect crystal. The second state of the crystal is a crystal that has defects – Jouanny has just spoken about this – so here I will use what Jouanny said. If we think of the diamond, it's what we call with a very pretty word, for example, the flaw in a diamond, like a kind of crack at the bottom of the diamond, a little feathering, the feathering of a break. This is the second state of the crystal, cracked crystal, flawed crystal. The third state of the crystal is the crystal in formation. You can see that this is very different from the finished crystal, because here it is only grasped in terms of its seeds and then returned to its seeds. Then the fourth state of the crystal would the crystal in decomposition. I don't seem to see any others.

So, we could say, well, we must... If we're not able to find clear examples, if this doesn't work very well… but then again if we do find examples, it's because they are more than just examples. It's because we already had them in our heads before we formulated these four crystal states. So, I would say – to go very quickly… I'm concentrating entirely on cinema for the end of this session, and we will find the... so, what's going on here? Among the directors who concern themselves with matters that are close to the circus, since we have taken the circus as a particular case of a crystalline place par excellence, among the great directors of the crystal-image, the first that immediately springs to mind is Max Ophüls. Well, this perfect… What is going on in the films of Ophüls? It seems obvious to me. He makes crystal-images that refer to perfect crystals. Crystals that are frozen, cold, perfect. I'm exaggerating of course, this is just my impression.

What shows us that here we have a perfect crystal? The fact that one does not enter it and one does not leave it. In literature it's a little bit like what we find in Raymond Roussel's *Impressions of Africa*, where you have characters who perform their feats in glass cages.[33] And in the perfect crystal, there can only be one sole movement, the circuit, that is to say Ophüls's *La ronde*[34]. Here there is no outside, there is no milieu. In the perfect crystal, there is no longer any milieu. There is only a milieu in relation to the seed. In a supposedly perfect crystal, there is no longer any milieu, the milieu is inside the crystal. The milieu is inside the crystal, and there is no other. As one might have said of Ophüls, there is no outside of the set with Ophüls, there is only a reverse side of the set.

And the other side of the coin gathers up the dead. The living move around in the crystal. On the other side of the set are the ones who die, while those who live are reinjected into the crystal. Perpetual reinjection of the fellow into the crystal, remember in *La ronde*, where you have the very beautiful episode of the masked old man who dances, who dances in the crystal. He dies and the doctor takes him home and removes his mask, in this splendid image where he undoes the mask and we realize that behind this frozen mask of a young man is the face of a repulsive old man, and the doctor can thinks of only one thing, to return to the ball and re-enter the round; he is reinjected into the round. In *Lola Montès…* [35] the images that move me the most in *Lola Montès* are when the ringmaster, who has this very strange relationship with Lola, a combination of ruthless exploitation and love, keeps putting Lola Montès back on stage, who, drunk and feverish at the same time, having drunk and having the flu, can no longer take it. And he makes his affectionate asides, saying things like: "Lola, are you alright? Are you alright, Lola, are you okay?" And every time, he puts her back in the ring.[36]

I could talk about the waltzes, the famous waltzes of Ophüls, which go completely in this direction and in this figure of the round as, precisely, the only thing that can happen. I could invoke the whole of *Madame de…*[37], and in particular the role of the earrings, of the circuit of

the earrings in *Madame de…* and so on, in order to establish this idea of Ophüls' cinema as a state of a perfect crystal. So that there is no way out. The two aspects of time, the presents that pass and the past that is preserved, recreate the round in the circus ring – see *Lola Montès*. All of Lola's former presents, her princely loves, her royal loves, her riches, etc., were already tending towards the circus as their final goal. And the circus collects and preserves them all as virtual images. Okay, fine.

To hurry things up some more, I would say we have one more step to make. Which is fine. I'm not saying it will be any better; it's up to you to see in which state of the crystal you situate yourself, in which you recognize yourself more. I say to myself, we have one further step to take, let's suppose that the crystal is cracked, what would this mean? It would mean that everything would still be there happening in the crystal, but in such a way that at least some element would probably leak from it, and it would leak from the base.

In the crystal we still have the round, but it is unraveling. And how does it unravel? It becomes a gallop, to return to the theories we looked at before of the refrain and the gallop. Now the refrain, the round, will give way to a gallop that plunges to the bottom of the crystal and escapes.[38] In other words, the past that is preserved – and this is what interests us concerning the future image of time – the past that is preserved will remain in the crystal, in all its vain uselessness. Whereas the present that is passing will go for a gallop that will let it escape from the crystal and create a future, create a new reality outside the crystal. It's as if in the crystal the characters had tried out different roles and that, as a result of these roles, they will either remain stuck in the crystal because they failed in some way, or they will slip through the crack in the crystal because they will have succeeded, having found their true role. Here we can find the whole question of the actor at another level, where acting is about trying out roles until you find the right one, and the right one would be when you're no longer an actor. What would this idea refer to? You recognized it, of course. It seems to correspond precisely to the cinema of Jean Renoir.[39]

With Renoir we have crystal-images of a very particular type. Renoir, Renoir, Renoir… who could we compare him to in literature? In literature, he could be compared to Guy de Maupassant. Alas, he wanted to be an Émile Zola, but Zola doesn't work for him. That's why *The Human Beast*[40] isn't one of Renoir's best films, though it's still better than a bad film. But it's not the element of Zola that... So, what was the Maupassant element? You could say that in the 19th century, you know, the French novel, it achieved something amazing. It attained a kind of fusion with poetry. This was something fantastic since it was able to take the form of the stanza and make it into a basic element of the novel. This is one of Flaubert's strokes of genius. And all that has been said, all that Proust, for example, remarked on so beautifully regarding Flaubert's use of the imperfect and the role of the imperfect in Flaubert's work, must, in my view, be understood in terms of this fantastic discovery, to have introduced the stanza form into the novel so effectively, and to have reached a kind of identity between the novel and poetry.

Except that Flaubert's stanzas – if it's true that Flaubert, Maupassant and Zola, all compose in a kind of stanzaic form, which would the fundamental element of their style, splendid in itself – we don't see the same type of stanza form in each of the three. I don't have time to go into this... I just want to mention an element in Maupassant that we don't at all find in Flaubert. Maupassant's solution – and it's certainly not the best, because he's in no way the greatest of the three – his solution is, I think to construct his stanzas… – and this is why the use of the imperfect tense in Flaubert's work which is not the same as in Zola's work, is certainly not the

same as it is in Maupassant's work – Maupassant is quite amusing. *The way I myself see it*, the verse begins as a kind of description within the interior monologue of someone who sees something behind glass. A window separates him, and the whole of Maupassant's stanza is as if the window "thawed" and became flowing water, water that flows where something happening. The sequence of description-narration in Maupassant is composed in a very specific way, description as though through a window, narration as if borne along the current of water, and the two combine wonderfully in Maupassant's art because it is as if the window had liquefied and become a stream of water.

I believe that this is what characterizes Renoir's cinema. Things are presented as if through a glass window, and they are imperceptibly transformed into a narrative on a waterway. I would say that the glass is the crystal, the crystal-image, but there is always a crack through which a stream of water forms and passes, a galloping stream of water that carries away the characters who will be saved. The others will remain behind the glass. The others will remain in the crystal. What am I thinking about here? I'm thinking of a constant idea in Renoir and in his handling of actors. There's been a lot of commentary among those who are not fond of Renoir, and who always criticize Renoir's use of improvisation, the way the actors seem to improvise. That there's no direction of the actors and whatnot. And of course, André Bazin has written some very wonderful things about this, showing that – and this goes without saying – that this element of improvisation is fully intentional on the part of Renoir, because in his cinema actors never play a role. The actors play a role that consists in playing another role, which indeed gives the impression of an amazing improvisation.[41]

For those who remember *The Rules of the Game*, Julien Carette[42] plays a poacher, but a poacher who himself plays the role of a butler; this is pure Renoir. It's not simply a doubling of roles, it's much more, it's much more clever than that, it's much more alive in Renoir's mind. If you take *Boudu Saved from Drowning*[43], Michel Simon plays the role of a tramp, but a tramp who reluctantly tries to play roles, the roles that are imposed on him by the intimate theater and the fantasies of the bookseller and the bookseller's wife. So an actor plays a role that consists in playing other roles. This is the great trying-out of roles. That's what happens in the crystal, and what will emerge from this? Something will emerge if the character has found his or her true role. It will come out in the form of a gallop, or if you prefer, it will come out along the stream of water, which amounts to the same thing. When Boudu tires of acting out the fantasies of the bookseller and his wife, he will escape along the stream of water.

In *French Cancan*[44], when the little girl has found the role of her life, she returns to the stage and participates in the final gallop. It is the gallop that pulls along the presents that pass and that will save them, while the round is what remains for the roles of the condemned. In *The Rules of the Game*, obviously… depth of field is such a key component of *The Rules of the Game*, where it arranges the appearance of a crack in the very background. Here everything is organized in the form of a crystal-image, of a circuit where the exchange between actual and virtual never ceases. You have the actual image of the guests and the virtual image of the hunted animals, if you recall the scene of the hunt, or again the actual image of people, of the living, and the virtual image of the automata that are collected in... here we see Renoir fascination with automata. Then you have the actual image of masters and the virtual image of servants; actual image of servants, virtual image of masters. A whole system of rhymes that are distributed in the depth of field. Good. The whole of *The Rules of the Game* is based on this.

And then a question arises. It's Truffaut who poses it, but it's amazing how bad the answer he gives is. Now I'm sure... Truffaut asks: Who is it that doesn't play by the rules? I think the question is good. There is someone who doesn't play by the rules of the game. But his answer is that it's the aviator. For those who remember the film, this is a completely idiotic and irrational answer! The aviator is acting completely within the rules of the game. When the woman says to him: "Come on, take me away from here, let's go", the aviator says: "Oh listen, first I have to introduce you to my mother", that is to say that he is completely within the rules of the game: he refuses to escape, he remains in the crystal-image, he continues the round, he is completely part of the game. There is only one character who does not follow the rules of the game: this is the one who is neither outside nor inside, neither master nor servant, namely the gamekeeper. He is the only one who is banned from entering the chateau. The others are either masters or servants. Only the gamekeeper is neither master nor servant, he is the only one who is not allowed to enter the chateau, and he is the only one who will fire his gun, that is to say, who will produce a crack in the crystal, who will make the crystal shatter. So here it's through violence. When Renoir is pessimistic, it is through violence.

But Renoir has a very optimistic temperament, very optimistic both politically and as an individual. And he thinks that the crystal-image is the selection of roles so that at least a small number of people find their true role, that is, the role of their life. As Camilla says in *The Golden Coach*: "Where does the theater begin, where does life begin?"[45]

This is Renoir's question: where does theater begin, where does life begin? And in this he means something very precise. As long as you remain within the crystal, you'll play only theatrical roles, and that's all. It might be good, or it might not be good, more or less, but you'll be done beforehand. Only, this can be useful has a utility: by dint of shuffling roles, by dint of being a poacher who wants to play the butler, you will perhaps end up finding your role. And when you have found your role, you will escape with the flow of the water. You'll no longer be playing a role, you'll already be out of the crystal. This is, it seems to me, the fundamental idea of Renoir's cinema. And it's very beautiful because it is not a theoretical idea. It is an idea… an idea that is a fundamental part of how his work is constructed.

So, I would say – I'm going very quickly here, it would take long analyses each time – if you take the admirable *The River*[46], one of Renoir's finest films, it's obvious. Around the Hindu kiosk, the three young girls try out their roles. More than that, the kids try out their roles. The little brother tries out his role as a snake charmer, and he dies because he gets bitten. And then there's the little girl with her big teeth, a real little English girl, she's perfect, she tries out the role of her first love there. And then, when the little brother dies, it's dramatic, she wants to kill herself because she feels responsible. But she doesn't. Instead, she goes to the river – and we have some very beautiful images of the river – whereas the kiosk was there to observe life through a glass – but this becomes the river and so Harriet will be saved. She has found her role. She finds her role by abandoning the role she plays in her first love. Good.

So this is Renoir, well, this is part of Renoir's cinema anyway. So the action can suddenly jump. He introduces flaws everywhere in the crystal. There has to be a flaw, if necessary a gamekeeper who shoots at the crystal-image, or running water that passes through the crystal. This is salvation. So much so that for him, of the two jets of time, the past that is preserved is the one that is condemned, it will remain in the crystal where it will merge with exhausted and dead roles, with the shells of roles, while the present that passes will escape from the crystal to create life. Hence his conception of the French Revolution or the Popular Front, politically speaking.

So, let's continue. Regarding the seeds… where do we find them? In Fellini, we find them in Fellini.[47] Fellini had a formidable idea. For him it is no longer a question of getting out of the crystal the way it is for Renoir, because one can no longer escape. But neither is it the same situation we have in Ophüls of a closed and finished crystal. Fellini poses a brilliant question. But you must understand, these are not abstract questions! To create a work, you have to have a concern of your own, even if others say: Are you crazy? Why are you so obsessed with this? And then you have to stick to this concern, you have to say: I am right, I am right, I am right! Well, Fellini's brilliant idea, and it took him a long time to realize is this: the only problem is how to enter. It's not how to remain inside or how to get out, it's how to *enter*, how to get *into* something.

If you push this idea far enough, this idea of how I can enter, of course by enter we mean the crystal, we find that *there are only entrances*? How to enter *what*? No answer because there is nothing but entrances. So, what is the crystal here? It is *the totality of its seeds*. And what constitutes the set of seeds? It is the set of entrances. The crystal is the transversal line connecting all the entrances. There are only paid entries, as they say, only paid admissions. And how does Fellini make his films? The film is finished when he has juxtaposed all the possible entrances. Then it's finished. And when someone asks him: how long will this film last? he replies, for as long as the money lasts. But money is the other side of the crystal. Yes, it is! As long as there are paid entries, there will be film. When the money supply is switched off, the entries will cease. It's very simple.

Hence, what the critic Barthélemy Amengual has clearly identified as the structure, what he calls the honeycomb structure in the films of... the niches, the successive niches, the honeycomb structure we find in *Satyricon*[48], which shows that there are only entrances. That there are only entrances, I give very quickly two, three typical examples. *8 ½* … but this applies to all of Fellini's cinema, beginning from a certain period, again he didn't find this idea right away. An idea like that, you understand, is something you have for life. It's enough to create an entire oeuvre, an idea like this. When I say it, it sounds completely flat, but when it becomes work of art, well, it's a work of art. It's successful.[49]

8 ½, *The Clowns*, *Roma*. What is *Roma*? But literally speaking, we will never see Rome. What we will see is the list, according to Fellini, of all the ways one can enter Rome. So, there is the historical entrance: you can enter Rome through its history. Archaeological entrance: you can enter Rome through its frescoes. Urban entrance: you can enter Rome by the ring road. Memorial entrance: you can enter Rome through childhood recollections. Sometimes two entrances are mixed. The crossing of the Rubicon, the historical entrance to Rome, is presented in the form of a ridiculously tiny stream that a school class crosses, led by a priest – a childhood memory – and so we have two entrances that contaminate one another. There is the entrance by the ring road, the entrance by the frescoes, the entrance by anything you want. And the film *Roma* is made by threading all these entrances together, the transversal line of all these entrances will be Rome. Rome is the transversal line of all the entrances to Rome, and of all the ways one can enter Rome. The crystal is no more than the set of these seeds or the ordination of these seeds, the putting in order of these seeds. Simply, what is very important for us is that not all entrances are equal. But we can't know this in advance. There are some that don't work. Luckily for us, there are some that turn out to be limpid, though others become obscure and opaque, closing up on themselves, such as the entrance by way of the frescos, where the frescos fade and everything falls into opacity.

Well, I think there's another seminar now. We'll see… this is the point we've got to now, and that's all for today.

Notes

[1] One recognizes here the terms and principles that Deleuze and Guattari will develop for their final collaboration, *What is Philosophy?* – though in this work they prefer to speak of science in terms of producing "functions" rather than "operators". See *What Is Philosophy?* (trans. Hugh Tomlinson, Graham Burchell), NY: Columbia UP, 1996.

[2] *The Immortal Story* (1968) is a film by Orson Welles, based on a short story by Isaac Dinensen (Karen Blixen) and starring Welles himself and Jeanne Moreau. It tells the story of a rich, dying merchant who becomes obsessed with a folk tale, involving a rich old man who pays a sailor to get his wife pregnant, to the point that he wishes to turn it into reality, dispatching his friend to find two young people who will take up the roles of the tale. Initially produced for French television and intended to be the first part of a two-part anthology film of Blixen short stories (the second part of which was later cancelled), it was the shortest feature film Welles ever made and one of the few he made in color.

[3] See *The Time-Image* p 69, where Deleuze quotes Bachelard from his *Earth and Reveries of Will: An Essay on the Imagination of Matter* (trans. Kenneth Haltman) Dallas: Dallas Institute Publications, 2002.

[4] Regarding coalescence, Deleuze quotes from *Matter and Memory and Spiritual Energy* in *The Time-Image*, p. 68.

[5] Krysztof Zanussi (1939) is a Polish film and theatre director, producer and screenwriter. His films, which often revolve around scientific and philosophical themes, include *The Structure of Crystals* (1969), *Family Life* (1971), *The Illumination* (1973), *Camouflage* (1977), *Spiral* (1978) and *A Year of the Quiet Sun* (1984), which was awarded the Golden Lion at the Venice Film Festival.

[6] *The Illumination* (*Iluminacja*, 1973) is a Polish film drama directed by Zanussi which recounts in elliptical form the life story of a scientist who is forced by family life and economic difficulties to abandon a promising career for mundane work in a hospital, where he eventually assists in the treatment of brain-related ailments.

[7] Trofim Lysensko (1898-1976) was a Ukrainian Soviet agronomist who rose to be a powerful and feared scientific authority under Stalin, but whose Lamarckian theories regarding plant and seed heredity and health, which led to catastrophic famine in the stalinist Soviet Union, were later denounced as pseudoscientific.

[8] The text by Serge Daney to which Deleuze refers here appears in *La rampe* (Paris: Cahiers du Cinéma-Gallimard, 1983). For this reference and Zanussi's cinema in general, see *The Time-Image*, pp. 70-71.

[9] Deleuze quotes this sentence of Nietzsche twice in *The Time-Image*, p. 75 and p. 171, without specifying the source. In fact, it comes from *The Gay Science*, (trans. Josefine Nauckhoff), Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001, book 5, paragraph 344. p. 200.

[10] On the comparison between Soviet and American cinema, see sessions 9 and 11 of the seminar *The Classification of Signs and Time*, January 25 and February 22, 1983.

[11] Aleksandr Dovzhenko (1894-1956) was a Ukrainian screenwriter, film producer and director, who brought international recognition to the Soviet film industry during the 1930s. Many of his films concern the Russian Civil War (1918–20) and the collectivization period (late 1920s to early 1930s), and are characterized by emotional intensity and mystical symbolism. *Zvenigora* (1928), Dovzhenko's first important feature film, is a lyrical history of the Ukrainian people from their Viking origins to the Russian Revolution, while other well-known films include *Arsenal* (1929), *Zemlya* (*The Earth*, 1930), *Ivan* (1932), *Aerograd* (also known as *Frontier*, 1935) and *Michurin* (*Life in Blossom*, 1946).

[12] This is a reference to *Paradoxe sur le comédien* (*Paradox of Acting*, written in 1773 and published 1830), where Diderot argues that great actors must possess judgment and penetration without "sensibility", i.e., without actually experiencing the emotions they are portraying as characters on the stage.

[13] On the actor, see *The Time-image*, p. 72

[14] Tod Browning (1880-1962) was an American film director, producer and actor whose career spans both the silent and early sound eras. A former vaudeville and circus performer, Browning is best known for directing a series of exotic and grotesque melodramas the most famous of which is *Freaks* (1932) but which also include *The Unholy Three* (1925), *The Black Bird* (1926), *Dracula* (1931) and *Devil Doll* (1936). His films were a major influence on the early work of contemporary filmmakers such as David Lynch and Tim Burton.

[15] *Freaks* (1932) is a film produced and directed by Tod Browning, starring Wallace Ford, Leila Hyams, Olga Baclanova and Roscoe Ates. Set against the backdrop of a travelling French circus, the film follows a conniving trapeze artist who joins a group of carnival sideshow performers with a plan to seduce and murder a dwarf in the troupe to gain his inheritance. However, her plot proves to have dangerous consequences..

[16] Gaston Leroux (1868-1927) was a French journalist and author of detective fiction, best known for writing the novel *The Phantom of the Opera* (*Le Fantôme de l'Opéra*, 1909), which has been made into several films and stage productions, notably the 1925 film starring Lon Chaney and Andrew Lloyd Webber's 1986 musical.

[17] On the cinema of Tod Browning see *The Time-Image*, pp. 72.

[18] Here Deleuze refers to Browning's *The Unholy Three* (1925), starring Chaney as a transvestite ventriloquist who teams with a dwarf (Harry Earles), a strongman (Victor McLaglen) and a pickpocket (Mae Busch) to go on a crime spree that culminates in murder.

[19] *Murder*! is a 1930 British thriller film co-written and directed by Alfred Hitchcock and starring Herbert Marshall, Norah Baring and Edward Chapman. It tells the story of an actress in a travelling theatre group, who is murdered, while another member of the group is found suffering from amnesia standing by the body holding the murder weapon. A juror, convinced of the woman's innocence, has only a short time to discover the real murderer before her scheduled execution.

[20] See Session 18, May 15, 1984.

[21] William Turner (1775-1851) was an English Romantic painter and printmaker known for his expressive colouring and light effects, imaginative landscapes and turbulent sea paintings.

[22] Deleuze speaks about the role of the ship in Melville in *The Time-image*, pp. 72-73.

[23] The previous quote comes from Melville's novella "Benito Cereno" (1856), a fictionalized account about the revolt on a Spanish slave ship captained by Don Benito Cereno.

[24] *And the Ship Sails on* (*E la nave va,* 1983) is a film by Federico Fellini, set in 1914, which tells the story of a cruise ship that sets sail from Naples with a group of opera singers, musicians and patrons of the arts who wish to spread the ashes of a beloved soprano near Erimo, the isle of her birth. During the voyage, the eccentric passengers discover a group of Serbian refugees camped on the deck of the ship, taken on board by the captain the previous night. A camaraderie begins to develop between the two groups until the moment the ship is intercepted by an Austrian warship which demands the handover of the refugees. Entirely fabricated in Rome's Cinecittà studios with the help of production designer Dante Ferretti, the film ends with Fellini revealing the artificiality of the ship set behind the camera.

[25] *Heart of Glass* (orig. *Herz aus Glas*, 1976) is a film by Werner Herzog. Set in the 18th century it tells the story of a Bavarian glassblowing factory that produces a brilliant ruby glass. When the master glass blower dies, the secret of producing it is lost. The owner of the factory becomes obsessed with the ruby glass, believing it to have magical properties. But with the loss of the secret, he descends into madness along with the rest of the people of the town.

[26] Werner Herzog (b. 1942) is a German film director, actor, producer and writer. Along with Wim Wenders, Rainer Werner Fassbinder, Volker Schlöndorff and Edgar Reitz, he was one of the key figures in the New German Cinema movement of the late 1960s. Moving between fiction and documentary and often blurring the lines between the two, his films are known for their unorthodox shooting methods and visionary images. Among the most celebrated are *Fata Morgana* (1971), *Aguirre, the Wrath of God* (1971), *The Enigma of Kaspar Hauser* (1972), *Stroszek* (1974), *Heart of Glass* (1976), *Nosferatu the Vampyr* (1979), *Woyzeck* (1979), *Fitzcarraldo* (1982) and *Where the Green Ants Dream* (1984) .

[27] Andrei Tarkovsky (1932-1986) was a Russian film director, considered one of the most influential in the history of modern cinema. His meditative films fused narrative fiction and poetry in metaphysical explorations of the nature of time, art and memory. The relatively few feature films he made are all regarded as significant masterpieces of the form: *Ivan's Childhood* (1962) *Andrei Rubliev* (1966) *Solaris* (1972) *Mirror* (1975), *Stalker* (1979) *Nostalghia* (1983) and *The Sacrifice* (1986).

[28] *Mirror* (orig. *Zerkalo*, 1975) is a semi-autobiographical film by Andrei Tarkovsky whose nonlinear structure is interlaced with dreams, poems (those of his father Arseny), memories, archives and oneiric jumps back and forth across time.

[29] *Solaris* (1972) is a science-fiction film by Tarkovsky based on the novel by Stanislav Lem. One of the most acclaimed of Tarkovsky's works, it tells the story of a cosmonaut and psychologist who is dispatched to investigate mysterious transmissions coming from a space station orbiting the ocean planet Solaris. There the psychologist, devastated by the recent suicide of his wife, comes to experience the same strange phenomena of that afflict the Solaris crew, as the planetary energy field produces simulacra both of his wife and his childhood memories..

[30] See Session 7, January 10, 1984

[31] On Ozu and empty spaces, see sessions 9 and 10, January 24 and session 31, 1984.

[32] Whether or not Deleuze was aware of the fact, in this regard it's interesting to note that Herzog reportedly hypnotized the entire cast of *Heart of Glass*, with the exception of the actor who plays the hillside giant whose apocalyptic visions from above provide a lucid counterpoint to their delirium.

[33] Deleuze quotes Raymond Roussel discussing the cinema of Ophüls in *The Time-image*, p. 83.

[34] *La Ronde* is a 1950 film directed by Max Ophüls and based on Arthur Schnitzler's 1897 play *La Ronde*. Set in Vienna in 1900, it recounts ten amorous encounters across the social spectrum, from a street prostitute to a nobleman, with each scene involving one character from the previous episode. The French expression *la ronde* denotes a circular dance and also means circling around, doing the rounds, a round of drinks.

[35] *Lola Montès* (19550 was Ophüls' last completed film, a daring experimental dramatization of the life of the notorious courtesan and showgirl, played by Martine Carol. The film charts the course of Montès's scandalous past through the invocations of the bombastic ringmaster (Peter Ustinov) of the American circus where she has ended up performing.

[36] See the discussion on Ophüls (also in comparison with Renoir) in *The Time-image*, pp. 83-87.

[37] *Madame de…* (1953) is a film by Max Ophüls starring Danielle Darrieux, Charles Boyer and Vittorio De Sica. An adaptation of Louise de Vilmorin's fin de siècle novel, also known as *The Earrings of Madame de,* it tells the story of an aristocratic woman known simply as Madame de . . . who sells a pair of earrings given to her by her husband to pay off some debts, setting off a chain reaction of financial and carnal consequences that ends in tragedy.

[38] On the gallop and the ritornello see session 14, March 20 1984.

[39] The discussion on Renoir follows the section on Ophüls in *The Time-image*, pp. 84-88.

[40] *The Human Beast* (Orig. *La bête humaine*) is a 1938 film directed by Jean Renoir featuring Jean Gabin and Simone Simon, loosely based on the 1890 novel *La Bête humaine* by Émile Zola. It was remade in 1954 by Fritz Lang, with Glenn Ford and Gloria Grahame, as *Human Desire*.

[41] See André Bazin, *Jean Renoir*, Da Capo Press, 1992.

[42] Julien Carette (1897-1966) was a French actor who appeared in more than 120 films between 1931 and 1964, including *La Règle du Jeu* (1939), *La Grande Illusion* (1937) and *Sylvie et le fantôme* (1946).

[43] *Boudu Saved from Drowning (Boudu sauvé des eaux,* 1932) is a film by Renoir starring Michel Simon that tells the story of a homeless Parisian man who takes a suicidal plunge into the Seine and is rescued by a wealthy bookseller who brings him home for dinner. Touched by his story, the bookseller and his wife allow Boudu to live in their house so they can "reform" him into a model bourgeois citizen but an unexpected turn of events thwarts their plans.

[44] See session 14, March 20, 1984 of this seminar.

[45] Deleuze corrects his citation of this line from Renoir's *The Golden Coach*, "Where does the theater end and life begin?" in *The Time-image*, p. 295, n. 29.

[46] *The River* (Orig. *Le Fleuve*, 1951) is a film by Jean Renoir, his first in color, based on the novel by Rumer Godden and shot entirely on location in India, with Indian filmmaker Satyajit Ray as assistant director. The story follows a teenage girl's coming of age, her first love and the tragedy that befalls her younger brother.

[47] This discussion on Fellini follows that on Renoir in *The Time-Image*, pp. 88-92.

[48] *Satyricon* (1969) is a film by Fellini that follows the exploits of two pansexual young men – the handsome scholar Encolpius and his lusty friend Ascyltus – as they move through a landscape of pagan excess. Fellini described the film as "examining ancient Rome as if this were a documentary about the customs and habits of the Martians."

[49] Deleuze's cites Amengual's articles on numerous occasions in *The Time-Image*, see p. 5, 89, 184, 281 n. 8, 282 n. 15, 291 n. 21, 296 n. 31, 299 n. 21. These articles appeared in the review, *Études cinématographiques* (Minard: Lettres Modernes).