



Part of the series The Revolving Door and The Straight Labyrinth: An Initiation in Occult Time

by Amy Ireland

*A script from the absolute unknown, how do you even begin to think about that? "Meaning" is a diversion. It evokes too much empathy. You have to ask, instead, what is a message? In the abstract? What's the content, at the deepest, most reliable level, when you strip away all the presuppositions that you can? The basics are this. You've been reached by a transmission. That's the irreducible thing. Something has been received. [And] to get in, it had to be there, already inside, waiting. Don't you see? The process of trying to work it out — what I had thought was the way, eventually, to grasp it — to unlock the secret, it wasn't like that. That was all wrong. It was unlocking me.<sup>1</sup>*

*We never find those who understand philosophers among philosophers.<sup>2</sup>*

So we are confronted by a triad of mysteries: the death or otherwise of Lönnrot, the disappearance of Carter into the coffin-shaped clock, and the deliquescence of Professor Challenger as he absconds both slowly and hurriedly towards an invisible point below the strata. There is a blurry edge in all detective work that, as Borges too competently demonstrates, skirts a zig-zag threshold between apophenia and the truly canny connection of events that only appear, superficially, to be disconnected. In the name of a method that is closer to invocation than criticism, a reckless detective might refrain from determining exactly where an act of decryption lies on the ugly terrain of legitimacy and, proffering sanity as the stake, live up to the problem as it stands. The greatest puzzles are always a delicate balance of intrication and simplicity. What if a single answer were capable of resolving all three of these strange cases — blinding in its solvent consistency?

In Kant's *Critical Philosophy, Difference and Repetition*, his nineteen-seventies lectures at Paris-VIII, and in a late, expanded reformulation of the preface to the first of these works (appearing in *Essays Clinical and Critical*), Deleuze pairs and contrasts two schemata of time: the time of the 'revolving door', and the time of the 'straight labyrinth'.<sup>3</sup> Quoting Hamlet, who furnishes the first of the four poetic formulas he will relate to the innovations of Kant's philosophy, Deleuze writes

*Time is out of joint, time is unhinged. The hinges are the axis on which the door turns. The hinge, *Cardo*, indicates the subordination of time to precise cardinal points, through which the periodic movements it measures pass. As long as time remains on its hinges, it is subordinated to extensive movement; it is the measure of movement, its interval or number. This characteristic of ancient philosophy has*



*often been emphasised: the subordination of time to the circular movement of the world as the turning Door, a revolving door, a labyrinth opening onto its eternal origin. [C'est la porte-tambour, le labyrinthe ouverte sur l'origine éternelle.]*

*Time out of joint, the door off its hinges, signifies the first great Kantian reversal: movement is now subordinated to time. Time is no longer related to the movement it measures, but rather movement to the time that conditions it. Moreover, movement is no longer the determination of objects, but the description of a space, a space we must set aside in order to discover time as the condition of action. Time thus becomes unilinear and rectilinear, no longer in the sense that it would measure a derived movement, but in and through itself, insofar as it imposes the succession of its determination on every possible movement. This is a rectification of time. Time ceases to be curved by a God who makes it depend on movement. It ceases to be cardinal and becomes ordinal, the order of an empty time. [...] The labyrinth takes on a new look — neither a circle nor a spiral, but a thread, a pure straight line, all the more mysterious in that it is simple, inexorable, terrible — “the labyrinth made of a single straight line which is indivisible, incessant”.<sup>4</sup>*

The contrast between these two figures is due, first and foremost, to the relationship between time and movement they express. In the schema of the revolving door, time is twice subordinated: first, to a transcendent eternity which provides the rational model for the ordering of movement, and second, to the rationally-ordered movement from which time's number is derived (the aperture 'onto the eternal origin' constituted by the resonance of copy with model). In the schema of the straight labyrinth, movement is subordinated to time, which conditions movement, inaugurating a reversal of priority between the two and a shift from a spatialised classification of the difference to a temporal one.<sup>5</sup> The pairing of the two figures is more enigmatic. Since the former reappears as a functional attribute of the particle-clock (“the assemblage serving as a revolving door” [*l'agencement qui servait comme d'une porte-tambour*]), that strange vehicle which facilitates the disappearances of Carter and Challenger in “Through the Gates of the Silver Key” and “The Geology of Morals”, and the latter clearly invokes the straight labyrinth (“the labyrinth made of a single straight line which is indivisible, incessant”) used by Lönnrot to riddle Sharlach in the confrontation at the Villa Triste-le-Roy, both seem to conceal passageways by which escape from specific geometrical tyrannies — indexed here by extensity, cardinality, and ‘a space we must set aside’ — may be effectuated.<sup>6</sup> However, given the fact that the revolving door seems to implement the geometrical conditions it somehow also affords an exit from, and the obvious preference Deleuze (as a transcendental philosopher) exhibits for the straight labyrinth as a ‘rectification’ of time, the counterintuitive nature of this proposition is not easily brushed aside. Deeper exploration is required.



## Revolving Door I: The Time of Philosophers and Theologians

In the history of Western philosophy, the revolving door is the archetypal image of pre-critical temporality. It takes its coordinates first from astronomical movements, and then from terrestrial ones: the rotation of planets and seasons.<sup>7</sup> These revolutions, confining time to motion and phenomenality, are held in contrast to what is outside them and what has been said to have engendered them — an ever-present but non-manifest, spatiotemporally unconditioned, unified mind or essence. In his lectures, Deleuze links this figure of time, curved by the hand of a god, to “the arc of the demiurge which makes circles” in the account given by Plato’s Timaeus.<sup>8</sup>

*Since the model was an ever-living being, [the demiurge] undertook to make this universe of ours the same as well, or as similar as it could be. But the being that served as the model was eternal, and it was impossible for him to make this altogether an attribute of any created object. Nevertheless, he determined to make it a kind of moving likeness of eternity, and so in the very act of ordering the universe he created a likeness of eternity, a likeness that progresses eternally through the sequence of numbers, while eternity abides in oneness.<sup>9</sup>*

Timaeus, an expert astronomer who has “specialised in natural science” refers several times to his cosmogony as an *εἰκός λόγος* (a ‘likely account’), a play on words drawing on the relation between *εἰκόνες* and *εἰκός* meant to reinforce the notion of the cosmos as a likeness — the imperfect copy of a perfect original.<sup>10</sup> Here, worldly imperfection is due to the changeability of the contents of the copy, which unlike their eternal origin, are subject to time:

*This image of eternity is what we have come to call ‘time’, since along with the creation of the universe [the demiurge] devised and created days, nights, months, and years, which did not exist before the creation of the universe. They are all parts of time, and ‘was’ and ‘will be’ are created aspects of time which we thoughtlessly and mistakenly apply to that which is eternal. For we say that it was, is, and will be, when in fact only ‘is’ truly belongs to it, while ‘was’ and ‘will be’ are properties of things that are created and that change over time, since ‘was’ and ‘will be’ are both changes. What is for ever consistent and unchanging, however, does not have the property of becoming older or younger with the passage of time; it was not created at some point, it has not come into existence just now, and it will not be created in the future. As a rule, in fact, none of the modifications that*



*belong to the things that move about in the sensible world, as a result of having been created, should be attributed to it; they are aspects of time as it imitates eternity and cycles through the numbers.<sup>11</sup>*

There is no measurable time prior to the demiurge's imposition of order on a previously disordered cosmos, composed only of confused matter and erratic motion. Because time arises from movement, only a perfectly regular and harmonious totality of cosmic motion will install temporality in the rational manner required to produce a sufficiently faithful copy of the model. This imposition of formal regularity is not, however, without complication. Deleuze's emphasis on the motif of circularity arises from the description, first, of the demiurge ensuring that the matter of the universe is "perfectly spherical, equidistant in all directions from its centre to the extremes", "freeing" its primary motion from imbalance by giving it a "circular movement ... setting it spinning at a constant pace in the same place and within itself", and then, with the totality of the matter of the universe thus arranged, of the inauguration of a complex process of division and mixing for the purpose of imbuing the assemblage with a soul, which the demiurge creates via the combination of two media: the "indivisible and never changing", and the "divided and created substance of the physical world" (the former indexing identity, the latter, difference) obtaining a third medium with aspects of both, thus allowing for a flow of information between the formal and the phenomenal.<sup>12</sup>

He then blends the indivisible with the divisible and the alloy of the indivisible and divisible, fashioning from the tripartite mixture a homogenous whole, but not without effort, for "getting difference to be compatible with identity [takes] force, since difference does not readily form mixtures".<sup>13</sup> Despite the complexity, might and skill brought to the work of ordering by the demiurge (who is a craftsman, after all), a material remainder — what Deleuze will call "the unequal in itself" — still persists, and further blending is required.<sup>14</sup> This involves a tortured series of intervallic material distributions from which the demiurge finally extracts an obedient harmony.<sup>15</sup> The mixture is then split into strips, laid out like an X and folded together into two revolving circles, the outer circle — containing "the equal in the form of the movement of the Same" — revolves with the primary movement of the cosmos and is justly named "the revolution of identity" while the inner circle — revolving at an angle to the circle of identity — contains the eight then-known "planets" (including the sun and the moon) along with "what subsists of inequality in the divisible" by distributing it among the planetary orbits, and bears the denomination "the revolution of difference".<sup>16</sup> This latter grounds the derivation of time.

## The Great Symmetrical Cycle

Because it is "the shared task" of the heavenly bodies "to produce time", a considerable portion of the "Timaeus" is dedicated to a geometrical description of planetary ambulation, offering precise calculations of each planet's orbit which, when taken together, add up to an internally and externally harmonious totality (each orbit internally relative to the others, and the whole externally relative to the revolution of the circle of



identity): the world's year.<sup>17</sup> This single, great revolution yields “the perfect number of time” and is marked by the “moment when all the eight revolutions, with their relative speeds, attain completion and regain their starting points”, resetting the cycle of the circle of difference in relation to the circle of identity.<sup>18</sup> Pre-critical time is thus simply the organisation and rationalisation of a prior, chaotic, spatiality in response to the exigencies of a divine model which exists both outside space and time. A great compass, dividing a cosmic sphere into equal and predictable portions, priming its matter for technological and cultural capture: the seasonal arithmetic that will come to ground agriculture; the compartmentalisation of the day, the week and the year into periods devoted alternatively to the sacred or the profane; the striations of latitude facilitating oceanic navigation, cartography, imperialism, and the proportional fastidiousness of classical architecture and art.

An exclusive disjunction (the abiding feature of monotheistic religion) administrates the distinction between eternity and the cosmos as the ordered structure of secondary appearances. Held apart from the eternal and locked down by matter and movement, this turning according to number is only an auxiliary, fallen ‘image’. A simulation generated and managed by a fully exteriorised and transcendent non-time, which functions as the ultimate measure against which every determinate object falls into a static and immutable hierarchical series whose order can never be shifted, interrogated, or affected by feedback from within. Because it continues to be tethered to a transcendent realm which imposes teleological order, the most generous aberration allowed to time — one “marked by material, meteorological and terrestrial contingencies” — still remains derivative of movement.<sup>19</sup> ‘Time’ beyond revolution is transcendent, tenseless, authoritative and persistent. The revolving door is therefore a dualistic image of temporality, inserting a gap between the hierarchically organised, oppositional qualities of idea and appearance; unity and variation; identity and difference; indivisibility and divisibility; being and becoming, good and evil, inside and outside — its borders stalked by the constabulary of the laws of thought, and god. It is, as Luce Irigaray tirelessly anatomises in “Plato’s *Hystera*”, the time — as space — of the Platonic cave, a “theatrical trick” designed to inaugurate the great “circus” of representation via the circular repetition of the same. The cave’s anterior tunnel leads upward into the light.

*Upward — this notation indicates from the very start that the Platonic cave functions as an attempt to give an orientation to the reproduction and representation of something that is always already there. [...] The orientation functions by turning everything over, by reversing, and by pivoting around axes of symmetry.*<sup>20</sup>

The cardinal points of the compass, or four wings of the door’s turning hinge, exhibit the spatialisation of time inherent to the image. The law of its number is cardinality — quantitative measurement of internally homogenous content — and a representational form of numeracy. Being a sphere, it is intrinsically symmetrical. In this way, space and time are confined to the double homogeneity of extension and simultaneity — to the circus of representational reproduction and its clowns, whose comedy is always enacted



in the mode of farce, a repetition that always “falls short” of its model.<sup>21</sup> There are, therefore, only “proportions, functions, [and] relations” available inside the simulation that can be referred “back to sameness”.<sup>22</sup> And this sameness is at once the model for the beautiful, the truthful, and the good — astronomical rationality providing the exemplar for human aesthetic, epistemological and moral order.

## Truth

Man, as a rational animal equipped with the ability to observe and understand these relations, is ontologically at home in the universe of the revolving door. Human cognition and sensibility, when exercised correctly, are perfectly resonant with the structure of phenomena. Thought thus naturally inclines towards the law that the demiurge embodies and by extension, to the model from which the universe has been copied. Psychology, cosmology and rationality are bound in cosmic rhyme. This is precisely what the latter part of the *Timaeus* then turns to, linking the account it has just given of human perception, especially that of sight, to our ability to infer the universal law of the good, the beautiful, and the true, and to reproduce it on a microcosmic level, specifically through the practice of philosophy.<sup>23</sup> Plato’s cosmos is teleologically assured by the perfection of the demiurge, and opposes both accounts of cosmogenesis more sympathetic to contingency, chance and natural selection (such as those of Empedocles, Leucippus and Democritus, which offer explanations exhibiting an awkward but prescient Darwinism) and the immanent teleology of Aristotle. Revolution thus has a moral content, and *Timaeus* concludes his account of cosmogenesis by stating that,

*since the movements that are naturally akin to our divine part are the thoughts and revolutions of the universe, these are what each of us should be guided by as we attempt to reverse the corruption of the circuits in our heads, that happened around the time of our birth, by studying the harmonies and revolutions of the universe.*<sup>24</sup>

In this way, “we will restore our nature to its original condition” achieving “our goal” of living “now and in the future, the best life that the gods have placed within human reach”.<sup>25</sup> The importance of sight to the practice of philosophy is insisted upon here because it alone of all the senses provides us with access to the law of number (and by extension, a model of perfect morality) embedded in the rotations of the planets.<sup>26</sup> Vision is thus the most morally-attuned sense, the conduit of goodness and beauty, and the base upon which one can realise the latent harmoniousness of one’s own relation to the universe. These ‘corrupt circuits’ in need of correction reprise the wandering of the planets prior to the ordering of their movements by the demiurge, and not insignificantly, ‘wanderer’ (πλάνης), ‘illusion’, ‘deceit’ or ‘discursivity’ (πλάνη) and ‘planet’ (πλάνητας ἀστήρ — wandering star) all share a similar root in ancient Greek, with Plato using the term ‘planomenon’ (πλανόμενον) elsewhere to mean ‘errant’.<sup>27</sup> Truth emerges in inverse proportion to the itinerant dithyramb of



material insubordination. Timaeus completes the moral lesson of cardinality, vision and aspirational goodness with a warning. Men who live “unmanly or immoral lives” are destined to fall farther down the series of good and perfect beings in harmony with the order of the universe, being “reborn in their next incarnation as women”.<sup>28</sup>

The return to sameness, finally, ensures that the universe will not degrade or dissolve of its own accord. While “the model exists *for all eternity*”, “the universe was and is and always will be *for all time*”, unless the demiurge explicitly wishes it to be so (“anything created by me is imperishable unless I will it”); so long as the world remains in harmony, this dissolution will not occur — a threat monotheism will make much of in the epochs to come.<sup>29</sup> Hence the biblical prophecies of apocalypse such as that which suggests that when the day arrives, the heavens will depart “as a scroll when it is rolled together”, inflected back into the curved palm of its god.<sup>30</sup> Broadened beyond its exemplary delineation in the “Timaeus”, the revolving door thus becomes a cipher for temporal dualisms in general. Truth is located in a lost transcendence (the indivisible, god, eternity), obtainable only at a delay via religion or via the work of philosophical contemplation shepherded by vision — the decanting of *a priori* knowledge from empirical experience, which prior to Kant, denoted a separate and transcendent ideality. If there is knowledge of this fallenness and of the perfection of that other realm inside that of the world of motion and change, this can only be so because ‘man’ is made in the image of a god, or has forgotten something he once knew.<sup>31</sup> Thought is inherently linked with its ground via an internal isomorphism — a rhyme — acting as the guarantor of its intuitions of damnation and error, whose causes are always external. Its correlative subject is moral or epistemological: the theologian or the philosopher, compelled to discover the realm of essences behind the veil of appearances.

There is, as there always is, a sexual difference attached to the dualism. Historically, the material, fallen aspect of time-as-variation is feminised, secondary, and passive. Timaeus calls it the “receptacle”, “the mother”, “the nurse and the nurturer of the universe” and characterises it via all the emblems of lack: it is “altogether characterless”, a bare medium for the production of formed elements; passive (“it only ever acts as the receptacle for everything”); it operates through mimicry (“[i]ts nature is to ... be modified and altered by the things that enter it, with the result that it appears different at different times”) having no nature of its own, and is “difficult” and “obscure”, while the creative force untouched by temporality — that which energises representation as a condition of the feminised matter it circumscribes — is primary, active, de-substantialised, and masculine.<sup>32</sup> “It would not be out of place to compare the receptacle to a mother, the source to a father, and what they create between them to a child.”<sup>33</sup> Is there a neater epithet to describe the age-old pact between reproduction and representation?

Sensible, material, and bound in harmonious relation to a transcendent non-time, pre-critical temporality is irrevocably secondary and modal. The time of the revolving door is a *mode* of eternity, the essential structure of which appears to us as a succession of moments — extensive, cardinal, homogenous — arranged in a cyclical repetition of the same, with a spatial line delimiting outside from inside.<sup>34</sup> As Deleuze puts it, “all the time of antiquity is marked by a modal character ... time is a mode and not a being, no more than number is a being. Number is a mode in relation to what it quantifies, in the same way that time is a mode in relation to what it measures”.<sup>35</sup> In a world for which time is a mere, cardinalised image of the eternal, held apart from it in



a relation of exclusive disjunction, administered by a god, all experience is that of a subject condemned to reckon, neurotically, with its originary imperfection. The great line demarcating outside from inside assigns interiority to time and exteriority to the non-time of eternity via a spatial horizon. A definitionally *beautiful* misconception of the topology of time, but a misconception nonetheless.<sup>36</sup>

## Straight Labyrinth I: The Time of Economists and Poets

*The circle must be abandoned as a faulty principle of return; we must abandon our tendency to organize everything into a sphere. All things return on the straight and narrow by way of a straight and labyrinthine line.*<sup>37</sup>

'Rectifying' the celestial or meteorological temporality of the revolving door, the figure of time expressed in the straight labyrinth emerges in Deleuze's various accounts as "the time of the city" and also that of the "desert".<sup>38</sup> The subordination of time to space and motion dissolves into the contentless, temporal determination of the empirical by an immanent yet abstract process. Deleuze notes that Kant was able to apprehend this due to his historical and geographical situation — virtually immobilised in his Königsberg study, yet sensitive to subterranean tremors — deep in the heart of Europe during the ignition of modern industrialisation. There is an embedded double reference to capitalist temporality, brought to light by Marx's statement in the *Grundrisse*, that

*Capital by its nature drives beyond every spatial barrier. Thus the creation of the physical conditions of exchange — of the means of communication and transport — the annihilation of space by time — becomes an extraordinary necessity for it ...*

and to Friedrich Hölderlin's "Notes on the *Oedipus*", leading Deleuze to state that "it is correct to claim that neither Fichte nor Hegel is the descendent of Kant — rather it is Hölderlin, who discovers the emptiness of pure time".<sup>39</sup> If the industrial city is also a desert, it is the Athenian desert of the Sophoclean tragedies, for, as Hölderlin writes, *Oedipus* is remarkable in its uniquely modern conception of the genre, in which "God and man communicate in the all-forgetting form of unfaithfulness".<sup>40</sup> Oedipus, like the subject of the *First Critique*,

*forgets both himself and the God and, in a sacred manner, of course, turns himself round like a traitor. For at the most extreme edge of suffering, nothing exists*





*beside the conditions of time or space. Man forgets himself there because he is wholly in the moment; and God, because he is nothing else than time. And both are unfaithful: time, because at such a moment it reverses categorically — beginning and end simply cannot be connected; and man, because at this moment he must follow the categorical reversal, and therefore simply cannot be in the following what he was in the beginning.*<sup>41</sup>

Hölderlin's identification of a 'categorical reversal' in the dual turning-away of god and man is taken up by Deleuze as the mark that indicates a historical transition in the schemata of time, and in turn, the relation this reversal installs between the two sides of the disjunctive couple. With the figure of Oedipus, the initial shift from the temporality of the revolving door to that of the straight labyrinth is consecrated, and — following Hölderlin's interpretation — coincides with a truly modern sense of time, a time that is inherently tragic, but in an unprecedented way. While Plato's arc of integrated planetary motion is always returning — like the great cyclical tragedies of Aeschylus — to a state of equilibrium, ending where it began, Hölderlin's Oedipus is "traversed by a straight line which tears him along" with "murderous slowness" towards an enigmatic dissolution at an unknown coordinate in the shifting desert sands: and "Towards what? Nothing".<sup>42</sup> The distinction between ancient and modern tragic forms — and elsewhere, between farce and tragedy — is determined by the placement of the limit with which the hero interacts. In the ancient conception of the genre, tragedy conforms to the exclusive disjunction operating under the aegis of the gods. The limit with which the hero comes into conflict is external, manifested in a law that is then transgressed by some excessive act for which the hero must atone, triggering a return to order.<sup>43</sup> Deleuze sees in this cycle of limit, transgression and return, a perfect isomorphism with the schema of the revolving door.

*[T]his tragic time is modelled on astronomical time since in astronomical time you have the sphere of fixed points which is precisely the sphere of perfect limitation, you have the planets and the movements of the planets which, in a certain way, break through the limit, then you have the atonement, which is to say the re-establishment of justice since the planets find themselves in the same position again.*<sup>44</sup>

The cycle is reinforced by the act of transgression, harmony is reinstated between the realm of the gods and the realm of men, and we know in advance the lesson that will be learned.<sup>45</sup> But something different happens for Oedipus. The limit he encounters is no longer external, having shifted simultaneously closer and further away — the threshold dividing gods from men, and time from space, is both interior to Oedipus and beyond him — it has become "enigmatic".<sup>46</sup> It cleaves him in two and drives him towards an infinity that rises up to



meet him in an “all-forgetting form of unfaithfulness”, annihilating him at Colonus whilst looping him back upon himself.<sup>47</sup> Following Hölderlin’s idiosyncratic, Kantian reading of the text, the Sophoclean tragedy is condensed into an infernal play of diversion and re-orientation as Oedipus is forced to confront himself in the form of an infinite self-displacing horizon which draws him across the deflated denouement of *King Oedipus* and into the relentless modern desert of *Oedipus at Colonus*.<sup>48</sup>

Oedipus’ time is no longer the cyclical time of return to a founding order, but a simple, straight line which complicates everything. The limit manifests both as a temporal fracture interior to Oedipus’ vexed subjectivity and a point to which he tends — “the gap of an in-between, which occasions, finally, a loss of self”.<sup>49</sup> There is no atonement for Oedipus, although there is a tribunal — and a crime. He is not subject to a hero’s death, only a long and desolate exile (a little too long to be comfortable) to which he voluntarily submits in the absence of divine directive.<sup>50</sup> Thus Oedipus “turns himself round like a traitor”, but in a sacred manner — the trial becoming what Jean Beaufret (the Hölderlin commentator Deleuze draws most visibly on besides a few cursory gestures towards Heidegger, who he cites laconically in *Difference and Repetition* and the lectures on Kant), names both a “heresy” and an “initiation” — and is “returned to himself” in two ways.<sup>51</sup> First, in terms of the mythic narrative, as the cause of himself (Oedipus is the cause of the plague that causes Oedipus) and more enigmatically at the terminus of his abstractly interminable wanderings, where he ‘returns’ in such a way that he can no longer be what he was in the beginning.

When the god who “is nothing more than time”, finally, and not without an irony that is unique to Hölderlin’s translation (“*Why are we delaying? Let’s go! You are too slow!*”), enables his demise, we are denied the catharsis that typically accompanies the spectacle of the hero’s death.<sup>52</sup> “What happened?” implores the chorus of the small party that has accompanied Oedipus to the threshold beyond which only he and Theseus are allowed to pass.<sup>53</sup> The response is a brief and integrally obscure report.<sup>54</sup> It is speculated that Oedipus has vanished into “the earth’s foundations” which “gently opened up and received him with no pain” or was “lifted away to the far dark shore” by “a swift invisible hand”, the prolonged arrival of his death heralded by thunder and strange surges of lightning, illuminating, briefly, the hidden diagonal that haunts the in-between of sky and ground, the realm of the gods and the realm of men.<sup>55</sup> In the cracks of the Kantian machinery a different disjunction momentarily rears its faceless mien, whilst at the end of the line, “death loses itself in itself” and Oedipus, “having nothing left to hide” becomes “the guardian of a secret”.<sup>56</sup> Between these two returns, the modern tragic figure is split across time both intensively and extensively as its own internal and external limit and source. The Sophoclean line does not restore a temporality of lost equilibrium, as is the rule in classical tragedy, but ends unresolved, internally perturbed, and terminally out of balance.

## Shamanic Oedipus

Oedipus plays an ambivalent role in Deleuze’s writing. Like the shaman and the despot he is always double.<sup>57</sup> Carlo Ginzberg makes the connection between shamanic practices and the Oedipus myth explicit in *Ecstasies* — his trans-temporal, trans-spatial study of the witches’ sabbath — where he finds in the motif of the swollen foot (which gives Oedipus his name) the mytho-cultural stamp of the shamanic initiate whose journey leads




inexorably to the realm of the dead.<sup>58</sup> Oedipus incarnates, as such, the mythical archetype of the dying god, which links him enigmatically with Christ and Dionysus.<sup>59</sup> Moreover, the persistence of lameness, monosandalism, bodily maiming, or an unbalanced gait among the vast swathe of myths and cultural practices included in Ginzberg's study reveals a fundamental trait attributable to all beings who, like Oedipus, are "suspended between the realm of the dead and the realm of the living": "Anyone who goes to or returns from the nether world — man, animal, or a mixture of the two — is marked by an asymmetry."<sup>60</sup> This asymmetry, at once abstract and empirical, is measured against a perceived natural symmetry that keeps the social realm in harmony with the circular world of revolving seasons and astronomical cycles — coordinates that return the cycle to its beginning. "The trans-cultural diffusion of myths and rituals revolving around physiological asymmetry", writes Ginzberg, "most probably sinks its psychological roots in this minimal, elementary perception that the human species has of itself", namely the "recognition of symmetry as a characteristic of human beings". Thus, "[a]nything that modifies this image on a literary or metaphorical plane therefore seems particularly suited to express an experience that exceeds the limits of what is human".<sup>61</sup> Mythical lameness symbolises an otherworldly incursion, a problematic asymmetry that intrudes upon a so-called natural humanity and opens a passage between worlds.

Ginzberg also notes in passing (although only to point out what he considers a superficial reading indebted to an overly synchronic methodology) Levi-Strauss' connection of symbolic lameness to the passage of the seasons, where it features as part of a dance-based ritual performed to truncate a particular season and accelerate the passage to the next, offering a "perfect diagram" of the hoped-for imbalance.<sup>62</sup> If Ginzberg is warranted in discounting Levi-Strauss' hypothesis, perhaps this is not because it is wholly incorrect so much as an interpretation that is limited insofar as it remains indebted to a particular conception of time among its proponents. Ritual or symbolic lameness grasped as a spell for accelerating the seasonal series acts as a superficial interpretation covering over a deeper one, operating within an altogether different understanding of time. One glimpsed beneath the esotericism of Deleuze's statement that the "ego is a mask for other masks, a disguise under other disguises. Indistinguishable from its own clowns, it walks with a limp on one green leg and one red leg".<sup>63</sup> Read through these subterranean lines which knit it into a complex cultural history of shamanic tropes and practices, Oedipus' swollen foot condenses time compression, an initiation preceding a journey to the realm of the dead and a fundamental disequilibrium, and thereby acts as a cipher for the key aspects of the Sophoclean tragedy in Hölderlin's interpretation and the schematic shift from the revolving door to the straight labyrinth.

In "Notes on the *Oedipus*" and "Notes on the *Antigone*", Hölderlin proposes a reading that can be extrapolated from a "calculable law" opposing a discursive logic embedded in history, judgement and the mundane affairs of the human world, with an obscure notion of rhythm.<sup>64</sup> The idiosyncrasy of his reading arises from an attempt to affirm the realist paradigm (grounded in scientific and historical validity) that dominated early German Romanticism alongside an unnameable and unrepresentable "efficacy", located in "another dimension [...] beyond and below" conceptual thought, which he believed characterised the tragic in its essence.<sup>65</sup> The aim of the law was to make this obscure element momentarily graspable — not as something represented, but as the form of representation itself — a momentary "inspiration" that "comprehends itself infinitely ... in a consciousness which cancels out consciousness".<sup>66</sup> As Beaufret frequently reminds his readers, the influence of



Kant on the young poet is difficult to miss, and is particularly apparent when Hölderlin writes, for example, “[a]mong men, one must above all bear in mind that every thing is something, i.e. that it is cognisable in the medium of its appearance, and that the manner in which it is defined can be determined and taught”.<sup>67</sup> Applied to the two *Oedipus* plays, taken together as a single drama, this yields an analysis in which a rhythmic distribution of the dialogue becomes diagrammable as a speed differential broken by a caesura corresponding to the prophecy of Tiresias. In contrast to *Antigone* where the structure is inverted (Tiresias’ prophecy being withheld until the end), the caesura in the *Oedipus* plays occurs early in the drama, countering a momentum which “inclines ... from the end towards the beginning”.<sup>68</sup>



Hölderlin's rhythmic diagrams of *Oedipus* and *Antigone*. Note that the notational progression from a (caesura), to b (end), and c (beginning) implies that the caesura is logically prior to the two points given in successive time.

By the time Tiresias speaks the “pure word” that reveals to Oedipus the truth of his identity everything of significance has already taken place, and the drama is supplied by Oedipus’ apprehension and acceptance of his fate, dragged along by the line of time, in which he learns to become who he is by becoming something else (as the cause of himself he is also the cause of a difference from himself).<sup>69</sup> The narrative is, incidentally, structured like a modern detective story, in which one begins by asking ‘What happened?’.<sup>70</sup> The caesura breaks the consistency of Oedipus’ conception of himself, rewrites his memories (“*the killer you are seeking is yourself*”), and throws him into a time that suddenly becomes animate with a ‘before’ that was not previously available, and ‘after’ that sutures him to zero: “This day brings your birth; and brings your death”.<sup>71</sup> The terrible implication of his fate — the prophecy of patricide and incest that lead his parents to desert him as an infant, supposedly left to die among the elements, and the discovery that everything he had done to avoid it has in fact functioned to bring it about — rises up before him. The ground falls away and, as Hölderlin writes, the rhythmic structure of the text propels Oedipus backwards towards his beginning with an incredible momentum, simultaneously interminable, due to the indifference of the gods, whilst *slowly hurrying* him towards his death. It is not for nothing that Hölderlin would pronounce in a letter to a friend that “[t]he true meaning of tragedy is most easily grasped from the position of paradox”.<sup>72</sup> The caesura shields the first portion of the two Oedipus plays from their accelerated second portion, interfacing the differential speeds of dramatic action, and in this, wordlessly renders Hölderlin’s idea of an otherworldly efficacy rhythmically apprehensible without representing it.<sup>73</sup> The operational rule of this manifestation is disequilibrium or asymmetry, and asymmetry linearly breaks the foundational rhyme that animates the Timaeian cosmos, and inaugurates a new rule, the shamanic limp of schizophrenic auto-production. Oedipus’s initiation is a countdown that re-initiates his fatal loop.

The caesura thus produces two ‘times’ — an asymmetrical, looped, auto-productive time (one slice of which is



rhythmically compressed, generating an empirical acceleration), and the asymmetrical form of time productive of asymmetrical time (Hölderlin's modern god) — and two deaths: the horizontal death at the end of straight line, which takes Oedipus into the ground, and the secret, vertical death of the caesura, which rearranges everything in a single instant, producing and grounding the physical death of Oedipus and the time it takes place in. Hölderlin will denote both with the mathematical expression “= 0”.<sup>74</sup> In contrast to the progressive time of the heretic's trial, “the ever-oppositional dialogue”, the history and affairs of Thebes, and Oedipus' voyage of metamorphosis “in which the beginning and end no longer rhyme”, the caesura is the irruption of time as a void which produces succession and abides within Oedipus in the function of an initiation as he travels the line that will remove him “from his orbit of life ... to another world, [to] the *eccentric orbit* of the dead”.<sup>75</sup> It is, to borrow a term from MVU's resident Hyper-Kantian, R. E. Templeton, a “transcendental occurrence”.<sup>76</sup>

Split across an asymmetrical empirical succession and a far more obscure asymmetry that both grounds and ungrounds it, time indeed becomes a straight line with a subterranean labyrinth as its premise. A strange kind of homogeneity forged in war. With the shifting of the limit — the great rift that draws a threshold between two worlds, defining inside and outside — into the modern Oedipal subject, everything changes. When Hölderlin claims that in the double betrayal of man and god, “infinite unification purifies itself through infinite separation”, purification is no longer just a euphemism for catharsis but the precise characterisation of this pure and empty form of time.<sup>77</sup> Anglossic qabbala distils this insight with economic clarity: Kant is a break and a link.

“Rather than being concerned with what happens before and after Kant (which amounts to the same thing)”, writes Deleuze,

*we should be concerned with a precise moment within Kantianism, a furtive and explosive moment which is not even continued by Kant, much less by post-Kantianism — except, perhaps, by Hölderlin in the experience and the idea of a 'categorical reversal'. For when Kant puts rational theology into question, in the same stroke he introduces a kind of disequilibrium, a fissure or crack in the pure Self of the 'I think', an alienation in principle, insurmountable in principle: the subject can henceforth represent its own spontaneity only as that of an Other, and in so doing invoke a mysterious coherence in the last instance which excludes its own — namely, that of the world and God. A Cogito for a dissolved Self: the Self of 'I think' includes in its essence a receptivity of intuition in relation to which I is already an other. It matters little that synthetic identity — and, following that, the morality of practical reason — restore the integrity of the self, of the world and of God, thereby preparing the way for post-Kantian syntheses: for a brief moment we enter into that schizophrenia in principle which characterises the highest power of thought, and opens Being directly on to difference, despite all the mediations, all the reconciliations, of the concept.*<sup>78</sup>



There are three elements to this ‘furtive and explosive’ moment in Kant: the death of God, the fractured I, and the passive nature of the empirical self, all of which correspond to the introduction of transcendental time into the subject and usher in an immense complication of what we take to be human agency.


The death of god is the effacement of the demiurge, along with the essences from which he constructs the phenomenal world of appearance. Without this god, what guarantees the faithful reproduction within the image-simulation of reality of its eternal model? How can we know our experience rhymes with its ground? This leads to an ontological problem whereby ‘man’, the plaything of empirical time, can no longer assume ‘he’ is at home in the world of experience. If there is to be a disjunction between law and its material manifestation, who, if not god, administers it? Nothing is there to underwrite the Platonic values of truth, goodness and beauty, and the modern, empirical subject finds itself at sea in a murderous asymmetry that promises nothing but the cosmic fatigue of ultimate extinguishment under the second law of thermodynamics. The fractured I is even more insidious. The subject, no longer infirm and fallen, as it is for Plato, is constitutive, but “constantly hollow[ed] out”, spilt “in two” and “double[d]”, alienated from itself across the form of time in such a way that it cannot experience its constitutive power.<sup>79</sup> Worse, as Rimbaud so acutely put it — “It is false to say: I think; one ought to say I am thought ... I is another” — that shard of self, the empirical ego which registers phenomena, cannot know what its double is and must now contend with its new status of integral receptivity.<sup>80</sup> How, then, does it believe itself to act rather than simply be acted-through? On what does it found its ethics and its politics?

This is the initiatory consequence of the transcendental philosophy of time. The transition from the revolving door dramatises the modulation from transcendent to transcendental distinction, reconfigures the *a priori*, isolated notion of eternity, and moves time from a spatially subsumed cardinality to a purely formal ordinality — in which distance between numbers opens onto the realm of depth. Philosophy, of course, has preliminary solutions to all of these problems, but in solving them, it steals intermittently back and forth between schemata, recuperating certain comforts native to the time of the revolving door, and smuggling a dying theology into the explosive zones of the city and the desert.

## Initiation (Tragedy)

The straight line is the shortest path between two points. This is the example Deleuze uses to explain Kant’s development of *a priori* synthetic judgements, those “prodigious monsters” that overcome the historical *a priori* / analytic, *a posteriori* / synthetic dualism — “the death of sound philosophy” — targeted by the *First Critique*.<sup>81</sup> The straight line is thus also a diagonal one, and in this sense, the leanest diagram of critique. The first, faint sketch of a philosophy erected out of paradox.

The Lovecraftian machinery of the text follows from this primary opposition between synthetic sense experience and analytic logic by reformatting it into a division between sensibility and understanding and locating both within the bounds of the *a priori* on a transcendental diagonal.<sup>82</sup>



Receptive, presentational and constitutive, sensibility furnishes the *a priori* forms of time and space, while the active, representational and reproductive faculty of the understanding provides the *a priori* concepts (or categories), both of which will be brought to bear on the determination of empirical objects as the conditions of all possible experience, coincident with knowledge and guided by the speculative interest of reason. The form of time delineated by Kant is empty — but productive of a single dimension of successive time whose “beginning and end simply cannot be connected”, and the form of space, likewise empty, can produce only the “infinite given magnitude” of a Euclidean and co-extensive dimensionality.<sup>83</sup> Both forms are simultaneously subjective and objectively-valid insofar as they are generative of reality for us.<sup>84</sup> Time, classed as ‘inner sense’, is the form of internal affection. It envelops space, or ‘outer sense’, the form of external relation and the possibility of being affected by exterior objects, which can only occur with the presupposition of time, although the two are inseparable and arise together in the human mind.<sup>85</sup> Time can never appear to us as it is in itself and is always necessarily accompanied by space in our representations of it. Thus, we

*represent the temporal sequence through a line progressing to infinity, in which the manifold constitutes a series that is of only one dimension, and infer from the properties of this line to all the properties of time, with the sole difference that the parts of the former are simultaneous, but those of the latter always exist successively.*<sup>86</sup>

This succession is simply a mode of the form of time (along with persistence and co-existence, the three





categories of relation whose principles are procured in the *Analogies of Experience*), which is not in itself successive. Nor are the modes of time properties of objects in themselves, leaving movement — dependent specifically on modal persistence — strictly subordinate to the pure form of time. Kant is adamant about this, demonstrating that if the form of time itself were successive it would be subject to a problem of infinite regress.

*[C]hange does not affect time itself, but only the appearances in time (just as simultaneity is not a modus for time itself, in which no parts are simultaneous but rather all succeed one another). If one were to ascribe such a succession to time itself, one would have to think yet another time in which this succession would be possible.*<sup>87</sup>

Radically indeterminate, time in itself cannot be equivalent to its parts. It corresponds to the figure of the straight labyrinth insofar as it is “in(di)visible” and — because it accompanies all of our representations — “incessant”.<sup>88</sup> To confuse the form of time with time-as-succession is a grave metaphysical error. In the universe of the straight labyrinth, as Deleuze writes, “[i]t is not succession that defines time, but time that defines the parts of movement as successive inasmuch as they are determined within it”.<sup>89</sup> Space in itself, in a similar fashion, cannot be construed following a pre-supposed grammar, the eclipse of Euclidean axioms in the history of mathematics having no bearing on it as a pure form.<sup>90</sup> The fact that experience appears to unfold along a linear timeline and in three pitiful dimensions is simply a constitutive quirk of human mental structure. Insofar as we can grasp their being in themselves as pure forms, space “signifies nothing at all” and “time”, for us, “is nothing”.<sup>91</sup>

*A priori* synthesis occurs between the *a priori* categories on the one hand, and the *a priori* forms of spatio-temporal determination, on the other, before they are applied to experience, furnishing its “rules of construction”.<sup>92</sup> Since both components of the synthesis are *a priori*, they hold as universal and necessary laws for everything that can be determined in experience. To return to Deleuze’s example of the line, the Euclidean proposition, ‘the straight line is the line which is *ex aequo* in all its points’ is an analytic judgement; the statement ‘this straight line is red’ is an empirical judgement (straight lines are not universally and necessarily red). The statement, ‘the straight line is the shortest path between two points’, however, is different, because the concept ‘shortest path’ is not analytically contained within the concept ‘straight line’, nor is it simply contingent on an empirical encounter: it is *a priori* — it holds for all straight lines — and yet, it is also synthetic — something new is added in the synthesis. ‘Shortest path’ is not a predicate of the subject ‘straight line’ but a rule for the construction of a figure that requires assembly in space and time: to produce a straight line, one must find the shortest path between two points. Put differently, a spatio-temporal determination must be discovered that accords with the concept ‘shortest path’.

Kant has two texts, one written before and one written after the *Critique of Pure Reason*, in which he deals



with the problem of ‘incongruent counterparts’ or enantiomorphic bodies, using the necessity of the spatio-temporal assembly of a concept in experience to defend the heterogeneity of space-time and concepts so integral to the difference between sensibility and understanding in the *First Critique*.<sup>93</sup> A left and a right hand, for example, both of which are determined by the selfsame concept, with all its internal relations intact, are conceptually identical yet different due to their positions in space. A left hand can never be superimposed upon a right hand without exiting the confines of Euclidean dimensionality. In a similar fashion, a hand that is perceived now and a hand that is perceived in the future may belong to the same concept, but they can never be made to coincide in time. Thus, space and time are not reducible to conceptual determinations. We will return to Kant’s ‘hands’, but for now let this thought experiment of his show that, given the laws of the three-dimensional space that experience must unfold in, there is no possible way of constructing the ‘shortest path’ other than along a straight line, and to draw a line rather than a point, one requires time. Furthermore, no empirical experience will yield a straight line that is anything other than the shortest path between two points. The *a priori* forms of space and time thus harbour an irrefutable constitutive power that will underlie the empirical determination of all possible experience.

Because both successive time and three-dimensional space belong *a priori* to the faculty of sensibility, and therefore have their provenance in the human mind, they are impossible to exit from for us, and must accompany every single denomination of what will be considered legitimate knowledge, which takes its declination from the intersection of empirical experience and the restrictions imposed upon the latter by the transcendental exigency that produces it.<sup>94</sup> Dreams and hallucinations, occurring solely within the mind, constitute nothing more than a “blind play of representations” — intuitions deprived of determinate objects — and are therefore illegitimate as a basis for knowledge.<sup>95</sup> This holds equally for our non-empirically validated Ideas of God, World and Soul (objects of a concept for which there is no corresponding intuition), any concept of an object deprived of sense data, and any contradictory and therefore impossible concept — and everyone finds themselves in the same, spatio-temporal manifold, under the same categorical laws which together act as a guarantor for the universalisability of human knowledge.<sup>96</sup> Consequently, we discover that “we ourselves bring into appearances that order and regularity in them that we call nature”, and moreover “we would not be able to find it there if we, or the nature of our mind, had not originally put it there”.<sup>97</sup> Although it underwrites the operation of the transcendental apparatus at the most fundamental level, time, in the *First Critique*, is simply an inert and ultimately unknowable form which beats out a series of inexorable, successive moments in experience. It is prior to matter, movement and extension, and thus completely re-arranges or unhinges the determination of time by motion so integral to the revolving door of the pre-critical cosmos. All change, alteration and variation take place in time, but the form of time itself is invariable and inviolable.

## Time Compression (Circuitry)

Overcoming the irreconcilability of rationalist and empiricist methodologies via the innovation of *a priori* synthesis nevertheless generates a new problem for Kant, for he has simply moved its incompatibility into the subject, under the guise of the two faculties of sensibility and understanding, which are fundamentally different in kind, one being passive, receptive and immediate, the other spontaneous, active and mediate.



Kant's infamous Copernican revolution, although beginning in radical unfaithfulness — replacing god with time — resolves the duplicitous tension it cannot help but introduce between the two sides of its trademark *a priori* syntheses in a fundamental identity and a vexed harmony negotiated through the enigmatic synthesis of the imagination in the *Transcendental Deduction*, which reconstructs the syntheses along the contours of the epistemological subject / object divide, remodelled as the transcendental unity of apperception and the transcendental object = [x].

In order to connect the abstract bundle of categories in the form of the transcendental object = [x] to experience, Kant requires a link which he locates in the imagination, generative of a transcendental synthesis of the appearance of objects across space and time by stabilising their manifolds into a consistent unity for the application of concepts. The imagination performs this role via three syntheses which occur together (but are grounded in the third) in order to produce representation: the synthesis of *apprehension* which formalises sensible intuitions (diversity in time and space, and the diversity of time and space) into representable shape within a space-time grid, generating a single and uniform spatio-temporal manifold subject to extensive measurement; the *reproduction* of spatial coordinates that are not subject to instantaneous apprehension (the momentarily non-appearing parts of a volume, for example) as well as past and projected (future) coordinates in the present; and the synthesis of *recognition*, which underwrites the possibility of representably-stable conceptual traction via the relation of the prior syntheses of apprehension and reproduction to the form of the object in the understanding, the 'object = [x]', and this relative to the synthesising subject's own transcendental identity, the 'unity of apperception'.<sup>98</sup>

The first two syntheses structure a determination of space and time and the third relates it to consciousness, together supplying an *a priori* basis for the spatio-temporal unity and continuity of experience — intuited by us as one-dimensional time and three-dimensional space, only objectively actualisable in extensity, due to the envelopment of space within the inner sense of time — comprised of conscious perceptions anchored to a unified identity.<sup>99</sup> The kind of compression enacted by the synthesis of imagination is not simply a linear one, but the flattening of time and space into a homogenous metric upon which the understanding enacts its determinations — which only then provides a basis for linear compression or acceleration in extensity, such as that detailed by Hölderlin in his rhythmic diagrams of *Oedipus* and *Antigone*.

Curiously, Kant employs the example of cinnabar to demonstrate the successive, temporal aspect of the *reproductive* synthesis (which supplies the *recognising* synthesis with its input) — an intriguing reference given its long history of alchemical and esoteric use. "If cinnabar were now red, now black, now light, now heavy", he writes

*if a human being were now changed into this animal shape, now into that one, if on the longest day the land were covered now with fruits, now with ice and snow, then my empirical imagination would never even get the opportunity to think of heavy cinnabar on the occasion of the representation of the colour red. [W]ithout the governance of a certain rule to which the appearances are already subjected in*



*themselves ... no empirical synthesis of reproduction could take place. There must therefore be something that itself makes possible this reproduction of the appearances by being the a priori ground of a necessary synthetic unity of them.*<sup>100</sup>

The conceptual identity of a piece of cinnabar, along with its empirical variations, endures in time because we are able to synthesise past experiences of cinnabar with present ones via their *reproduction* as images in memory. We produce a *recognition* of categorical consistency through the relation of 'cinnabar moments' in the spatio-temporal manifold by connecting them to the object we are determining as a piece of cinnabar by means of its steady appearance across different times to the transcendental cogito, whose persistence as an identity is presupposed by the act of recognition. Meanwhile, the endurance of cinnabar perceptions must, according to Kant, be sufficiently objectively consistent for this to be possible in the first place, for if the objective world was in itself so chaotic that such consistency could not take place, neither would our syntheses of it. The Kantian 'I think' is thereby an identity which *recognises* itself as such against the differences it measures empirically and supposes objectively. A move that is only made possible through the combination of the syntheses of the unity of apperception and the spatio-temporal ordering effectuated under the faculty of the imagination. Together, the three syntheses of the imagination place the receptive faculty of sensibility that is productive of *apprehension* and *reproduction* in communication with the active faculty of understanding, which plugs them into the object = [x] and the transcendental unity of apperception, ostensibly resolving the problem of these faculties' conflicting natures in the direction of categorical tractability, and subsuming spatio-temporal difference under a conceptual unity.<sup>101</sup>

Due to this implicit vectorisation — from sensibility to understanding — the transcendental synthesis of the imagination can be grasped as an "aesthetic" function made to conform to a conceptual, *recognising* one, which gives it its axioms — something we shall find reason to return to as the mystery of Lönnrot, Carter and Challenger continues to unfold.<sup>102</sup> Its operation applies a unit of measure — Kant's 'magnitudes' — to the sensible manifold in order to relate it to conceptual elements in the synthesis of *recognition*. Kant will have cause, in the *Third Critique*, to show the fragility of the transcendental synthesis of the imagination, one that is subject to the breaking of its measure by insurgent forces erupting from below. Subterranean revolt on behalf of the cold earth's volcanic core.

With a unified conceptual identity providing the transcendental ground for the objective validity of the categories, and a consistent, extended and sequenced spatio-temporal manifold furnishing the foundation for all appearances in intuition established via the deduction, Kant will attempt to knit the two together in the application of the principles of judgement that constitute the schematism, consolidating the objectivity of the phenomenal-real. The schematism is the temporalisation of the categories, and thus works in reverse order to the operation of the transcendental synthesis of the imagination — beginning with a concept and determining the spatio-temporal manifold in accordance with it. The three syntheses of the imagination, taken together as a single mechanism, provide the rules for *recognition*; schematisation, on the other hand, gives the rules of construction for a concept in space and time. The understanding, under the guise of judgement, deploys or



expresses the spontaneous syntheses of the unity of apperception and the imagination in time, completing the *a priori* synthetic weave between expansive sense experience and categorical contraction.<sup>103</sup>

Each of the four divisions of the categories warrants a different form of expression: the three categories of quantity (unity, plurality, totality) express extensive magnitudes; the three categories of quality (reality, negation, limitation) express intensive magnitudes; the three categories of relation (inherence and subsistence, causality and dependence, community and reciprocity) establish the objectivity of time and space, and the three categories of modality (possibility/impossibility, existence/non-existence, necessity/contingency) generate the postulates of empirical thought in general. It is this penultimate group (developed in the reciprocally arising conditions of the *Analogies of Experience*) which confine all human experience to a universalisable temporality, and unfold change in time, consonant with the thermodynamic arrow.<sup>104</sup> The unfolding of all four categorial groups through *a priori* synthetic judgements constitute acts of representation, which yield the actuality of the world for us, founding all knowledge upon representation as an activity of the human mind bound to temporal succession. The schematism is therefore,

*nothing but a priori time-determinations in accordance with rules, and these concern, according to the order of the categories, the time-series, the content of time, the order of time, and finally the sum total of time in regard to all possible objects. From this it is clear that the schematism of the understanding through the transcendental synthesis of imagination comes down to nothing other than the unity of the manifold of intuition in inner sense, and thus indirectly to the unity of apperception, as the function that corresponds to inner sense (to a receptivity).*<sup>105</sup>

As a result, there are certain pieces of information we will always know in advance regarding the possibility of anything whatsoever in experience, despite the *a posteriori* nature of certain aspects of the latter. Namely, that “all appearances are, as regards their intuition, *extensive magnitudes*”, and “in all appearances the sensation, and the real, which corresponds to it in the object (*realitas phaenomenon*), has an *intensive magnitude*, i.e. a degree”.<sup>106</sup> Kant defines an extensive magnitude as ‘that in which the representation of the parts makes possible the representation of the whole (and therefore necessarily precedes the latter)’.<sup>107</sup> A unity in extensive magnitude is composed of successive or co-extensive parts that can be added together due to the fact that they share a homogenous unit of measure.<sup>108</sup> The nature of their difference is therefore external — a difference between parts. For the categories of quantity, the fact that appearances are systematically subordinated to extension is straightforward, for this is how we apprehend space and time — unified “multitudes of antecedently given parts”.<sup>109</sup> For the categories of quality, however, the surety of advance knowledge is less naturally evident because it bears on sensation and thus involves an entirely subjective, empirical input. So much so that Kant will even write, years later, in the *Opus Postumum* that



*It is strange — it even appears to be impossible, to wish to present a priori that which depends on perceptions (empirical representations with consciousness of them): e.g. light, sound, heat, etc., which all together, amount to the subjective element in perception (empirical representation with consciousness) and hence, carries with it no knowledge of an object. Yet this act of the faculty of representation is necessary.<sup>110</sup>*

Intensive magnitude is a property of the real of sensation and is therefore strictly empirical, yet we are said to have a *a priori* knowledge of it. This is guaranteed by the conspiracy of the transcendental unity of apperception and the object = [x] that gives sensation its determinate form, and it is therefore this form alone — not the determination but the *form* of determination — which can be anticipated. Thus we can know in advance that every conscious representation we can ever have will involve a degree of intensity, without knowing anything about the specificities of the intensities which will affect us. To this end, Kant defines intensive magnitude as that “which can only be apprehended as a unity, and in which multiplicity can only be represented through approximation to negation = 0”.<sup>111</sup> Unlike extensive magnitudes, which imply a continuous aggregation of homogenous parts, intensities differ internally on an infinite continuum (“of which no part ... is the smallest”) between 0 and  $n$ , and therefore must be apprehended instantaneously.<sup>112</sup> However, because of the nature of our perception, intensive magnitudes cannot be perceived separately from space and time and thus come to “fill” extended magnitudes to various degrees.<sup>113</sup> Consequently, the intensive property of internal difference is controlled by extension, locked — forever — into the extensive matrix of apprehended space-time. Most significantly of all, Kant tethers zero intensity to pure consciousness, so that the subtraction of intensive matter from experience only reaffirms, in the absence of contaminants, the immaculacy of thought.

*[F]rom the empirical consciousness to the pure consciousness a gradual alteration is possible, where the real in the former entirely disappears, and a merely formal (a priori) consciousness of the manifold in space and time remains; thus there is also a possible synthesis of the generation of the magnitude of a sensation from its beginning, the pure intuition = 0, to any arbitrary magnitude.<sup>114</sup>*

Sensation degree zero indexes the annihilation of reality, not the subject. This division, although Kant will go on to qualify it (writing that such an occurrence is not “to be encountered”, an empty concept without an object comprising one of the four classes of illegitimate “nothing”) makes the separation between sensible matter and thought inherent to the transcendental apparatus luminously clear.<sup>115</sup> Kant thinks intensity, but only in a way that renders it secondary both to the form of its appearance in extensity and to the pervasive authority of transcendental conceptualisation under the law of the understanding — “[subjectifying]



abstraction” and “[sublimating] death into a power of the subject”, all for the sake of maintaining a spurious notion of transcendental accord.<sup>116</sup>

For the Timaeian cosmos, harmony between subject and object takes the form of an external, teleologically-assured likeness between copy and model; for Leibniz, it finds its expression in the notion of final accord, and for Hume it must, no matter how reluctantly, be presupposed.<sup>117</sup> The ideal of externally sanctioned accord between subject and object is overturned in the *Critique of Pure Reason* by the necessary submission of objects to the subject, which refocuses the division between subject and object to that between active and passive faculties interior to the process of determination. We have seen above how the transcendental synthesis of the imagination operates to bridge the divide. This causes Kant to rely on the understanding to rein in the productive function of imagination, subordinating its syntheses to unified identity in the transcendental subject and unified objectivity in the transcendental object, their productions nourished by passive sensibility. Reason, the third of the three active faculties (alongside the understanding and the imagination), by analogy with the function of understanding, attempts to determine its own purely conceptual objects without the necessary components of time and space furnished by sensibility, and in so doing, exercises its powers ‘problematically’ in the production of *noumena* — illusory totalities which nonetheless have a positive role to play in systematising the knowledge produced under the aegis of understanding in its stewardship of the syntheses.<sup>118</sup> It can be seen, therefore, that it is the faculty of understanding that is charged with the task of limiting the functions of the other faculties in the production of experience, confining them to specific operations and drawing the boundary dividing legitimate from illegitimate knowledge.

Although the three *Critiques* work together to define the ends of speculative reason, “[p]ure reason”, in the *First Critique*, “leaves everything to the understanding”, casting it in the role of legislator so that, in the great critical tribunal, it might judge according to the interests of reason, even when this entails turning against reason’s own products.<sup>119</sup> Knowledge is thus lent a maximum of systematic unity via the relation between faculties delineated in the *First Critique*, which is nominally harmonious without invoking the divinity of pre-established harmony that animated pre-critical philosophy. Instead, it produces an accord of “common sense”, the “subjective condition of all ‘communicability’” — a return to the comfort of rhyme, now resonating between the faculties, mirroring thought in its objects.<sup>120</sup> Kantian accord may be understood as an innovation of pre-established harmony, but it retains lineaments of the Platonic Idea of the good in that it still sees thought imbued with health and an honourable will, naturally inclining towards truth via the “best possible distribution” of its capacities.<sup>121</sup> And why would it be otherwise? Surely reason, the “highest court of appeals for all rights and claims of our speculation, cannot possibly contain original deceptions and semblances!”<sup>122</sup> By means of the accord of common sense, we recognise ourselves in the objects of the world.

What a surprise, after all this, to rediscover our own silhouettes still flickering on the cavern wall. Common sense is “the norm of identity from the point of view of the pure Self and the form of the unspecified object which corresponds to it”, it is always related to recognition, and “relies upon a ground in the unity of a thinking subject of which all the other faculties must be modalities”.<sup>123</sup> To thinking, common sense contributes only “the form of the same”.<sup>124</sup> The democratic distribution of capacity and similitude is philosophy’s principal doxa, subtending what Deleuze will famously denounce — in *Difference and Repetition* — as “the Image of



Thought”.<sup>125</sup> If is not simply an illegitimate presupposition, saturated in humanist bias, whence does this principle arise? There is a deeper problem with the positing of fundamental accord between the faculties in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, and Deleuze will turn the legal distinction between rights and facts used in the *Transcendental Deduction* back on Kant, asking by what right the critical philosophy takes harmony as its ground for the relation of the faculties.<sup>126</sup> Kant, in the end, provided a remedy for this oversight, but it would not be enough to placate the tremors the critical system had induced.

Despite his predilection for tribunals, Kant’s recalibration of thought replaces the transcendence of god (and its models) as the ultimate arbiter of truth with the process of immanent critique, and thus transposes error into illusion. The strangeness of this new form of falsity springs from the fact that it is internal to the power of thought itself, contrary to the externality and materiality of error that informs Timeaus’ universe. Reason’s propensity to produce illusion as a consequence of its productive power brings Plato’s planomenon into thought itself, menacing it from inside “as if from an internal arctic zone where the needle of every compass goes mad”, a further disturbance of the cardinality which operates the turning of the great revolving door.<sup>127</sup> This threat, nevertheless, is immediately quarantined. With the understanding commandeering synthesis, it is no longer a question of reversing of “the corruption of the circuits in our heads”, rather it is this very circuitry that constitutes the correction of illusion by forcing everything through the transcendental unity of apperception and its object = [x].<sup>128</sup> The conservatism of the revolving door and the eruptive potential of the straight labyrinth leak into one another repeatedly throughout the *First Critique*. The labyrinth’s corrosive implications recognised then covered up, again and again, as if Kant realises the enormity of the abyss he has levered apart but cannot countenance its vertiginous depth, a “depth [which] is like the famous geological line from NE to SW, the line which comes diagonally from the heart of things and distributes volcanoes”.<sup>129</sup> But Kant is no Empedocles. He does not wish to explode the sun. Asymmetry petrifies him — and for good reason.

If the *Critique of Pure Reason* “seemed equipped to overturn the Image of thought” in its substitution of illusion for error, the fractured I for a unified and substantialised cogito, and the invocation of the speculative deaths of God and the self, Kant

*in spite of everything, and at the risk of compromising the conceptual apparatus of the three Critiques ... did not want to renounce the implicit presuppositions. Thought had to continue to enjoy an upright nature, and philosophy could go no further than — nor in directions other than those taken by — common sense.*<sup>130</sup>

Where Kant hesitates at the caldera’s edge, Hölderlin explores it with tortured determination, extracting from Oedipus what is truly radical in both “[t]he Greek image of thought” that “already invoked the madness of the double turning-away”, and the Kantian one, which launches “thought into infinite wandering rather than into error”.<sup>131</sup> Vision, the Timaeian antidote to corruption, is still insisted upon as the implicit other of the blindness Kant so frequently invokes, but it must be remembered that Tiresias’s prophetic knowledge is coincident with





his loss of sight, and at the moment of the comprehension of his fate, Oedipus blinds himself.<sup>132</sup>

## Asymmetry (Alienation)

The true innovation of the critical project, then — and that which constitutes its unprecedented modernity — is not the tiresome delineation of conditions for anthropomorphic experience productive of and produced by an intransigent conceptual faculty, but its profound reconfiguration of time. In Kant, pre-modern, cyclical, scroll-like temporality “*unrolls itself* like a serpent”, no longer subordinate to gods or nature — to logic, to reason, psychology, matter or sense — no longer subordinate to anything, save the mystery of its own inner workings, an enigmatic process of auto-affection.<sup>133</sup> An impersonal reading of the *First Critique* reveals this immediately: the subject may have a productive role in the constitution of phenomena, but it is always in the thrall of something it has no empirical access to, which, in turn, is producing its production of experience.<sup>134</sup> Both of these productive syntheses are temporal and, necessarily for Kant — who has reached for the one thing common to the two sides of the rift he has opened up inside the transcendental production of experience — only legitimately reconcilable by yet another temporal function: the application of the categories to experience in time via the faculty of judgement.<sup>135</sup> Rather than a fortification of subjective prowess in the realm of experience, the *Critique of Pure Reason* is the story of time’s relation to itself, *through itself* — and this relation takes the form of a limp.

The ruin that emerges in the wake of the critical philosophy exhibits, against its inaugurator’s best intentions, the keenness of the blade he has used to vivisect his forebears. As Kant gingerly turns the instrument over, it flashes the following message in the darkness of pre-critical dogmatism: the production of time is not in time. (*The killer you are seeking is yourself.*) Kant, the reluctant hepatomancer. This new configuration of the outside as time-production is further complicated by no longer being external to the subject, but an internal constitutive part of it. The transcendental outside — distinct from the exterior affection of objectified space, which is inside as an empirical necessity — is thus interiorised in a way that will not only alter the schema of time, but profoundly disrupt the subjectivity that carries it, alienating it from itself, and deeply troubling its sense of agency from the point of view of the only part of it that it can properly know or experience.

This is the tragic modern time of *Oedipus* in both its pure form as the caesura, and the inexorable linearity of the flight into the desert. An interior limit which Oedipus carries along inside himself, always escaping him, yet irrevocably ‘his’. The tormented king, like Kant’s subject, torn apart and along by an alien component which schizophrenises him, splits him off from himself, allowing him to act in a secondary manner within time, but depriving him of any ability to act on his own transcendental agency, everything Oedipus attempts to do to divert his terrible fate from its course being subordinate to something else — the prophecy of the caesura, that traitorous modern god: the pure form of time. What we know of this abstract part of ourselves cannot be anything other than this empty form, contoured by the limits of categorical distillation; a strict ordinal sequence, made countable and extensive in the schematisation of its “numerical unity”, and definitive of a specific spatio-temporal organisation.<sup>136</sup> Contrary to the spatialised exteriority of time relative to the revolving



door with its cardinal points, the contentless ordinality of the abstract 'I' is static, an inhuman domain within the human, transcendental and not transcendent and therefore not eternal in the same way. It is immanent and productive: an immobile, black motor generates the inexorable and, for Kant, *insensible* excess of the labyrinth composed of a single, straight line.

The byzantine architecture of the Kantian cogito threatens to suppress what is truly radical in his arrangement of the relation of thought to its determinations. In *Difference and Repetition*, Deleuze relates it to the Cartesian cogito in order to better show its novelty. Prior to Descartes, definitions of the thinking subject are either formed in reference to an eternity which produces it as its externalised other — an infinite unextended mind related to extended finitude, a fully disjunctive difference circumscribed by space — or distilled from relations between pre-determined concepts, those of generic and specific differences ('man is a rational animal').<sup>137</sup> But Descartes effectuates his own innovation, a logic of implication in which the thinking subject grounds itself. The Kantian cogito takes up this logic, but where the Cartesian cogito precedes by a three-step determination: the determination 'I think' determines the undetermined 'I am' as thinking substance (*I think, I am* — determination, the indeterminate, the determined; the indeterminate determined by determination), the Kantian cogito inserts an additional step which corresponds to the form of determination. Stripped down to its bare mechanism, it proceeds as follows: determination, the indeterminate, *the form of determinability*, the determined. The transcendental subject or abstract I of the transcendental unity of apperception in relation to the object = [x], both active elements of the understanding, commits a "spontaneous" act of determination which implies an indeterminate existence.<sup>138</sup> Because the transcendental I is also subject to the passive faculty of sensibility it must make its determinations in time as the form of inner sense.<sup>139</sup> Time, therefore, is the form of determinability which then yields the completely determined empirical subject.

The Kantian cogito begins in action, but because it is bound to pass through the pacifying form of time, it can only represent itself to itself in experience as a passive subject, which holds the same status in relation to the transcendental subject as any other empirical object. Against the Cartesian cogito, which determines the I am as substance, the innovation of the Kantian transcendental subject coincides, for Deleuze, with the "liberation" of the subject from substantiality, and the strange and fecund domain of the unconscious swerves into philosophy for the first time. What we are left with is "a synthesis which separates" — *a link which is a break* — and the inauguration of something else completely new: constitutive alienation.<sup>140</sup> Where the productive other of the revolving door is strictly outside — the "other of alterity" — drawn apart by a limit which corresponds to space or extension (and its ordering, from which temporality is derived), the other of the straight labyrinth is one's own self, an interior outside to which one is bound in a relation of fundamental alienation.<sup>141</sup>

Marx will install the same constitutive rift in the transcendental division between labour and labour-power, as the alienation of the subject that abides between them in his analysis of capitalism: "The alienation of labour-power and its real manifestation ... do not coincide in time."<sup>142</sup> Capital production, like the Kantian cogito, abstracts and axiomatises the value of its products by subsuming them under a homogenous metric, substituting use-value for exchange-value; a qualitative measure for a quantitative one. Exchange-values are "mutually replaceable" because they are of "identical magnitude".<sup>143</sup> It follows from this, adds Marx, in a particularly Kantian passage, "that, firstly, the valid exchange-values of a particular commodity express



something equal, and secondly, exchange-value cannot be anything other than the mode of expression, the 'form of appearance', of a content distinguishable from it".<sup>144</sup>

Just as it is for Kant, whose system forces experience into a temporalised series of extensive magnitudes, furnishing a *a priori* knowledge as the form of determination, fully independent of content, the measure of universal equivalence for exchange-value is a temporal one, in which all of a commodity's "sensuous characteristics are extinguished" — what Marx calls "socially necessary labour-time".<sup>145</sup> The transcendental, auto-productive, alienating circuitry of modernity is tragedy uncut, generative of nothing but episodic travesties of fast-burning empirical conflagration, and its material form is M-C-M'.<sup>146</sup> Capital emerges as the concretised shadow of the furtive and explosive moment of the *First Critique*, before it is drowned in the epistemological structure that limits the syntheses to the production of identity-driven representation and confines it to legitimate knowledge. From a strictly philosophical perspective, it is the complication bound up with determination across the form of time via the implicative logic of transcendental production which grounds the unconditional accelerationist notion of anti-praxis. One cannot be anything other than a passive subject as long as there is time. A tragic thought, but this is the full import of tragedy — a dramatic form whose other face is fate — for the modern subject. Oedipus split by the line of time; "infinite unification purifie[d] through infinite separation".<sup>147</sup>

## The Edge of Space and Time

When the Antarctic fog lifts one sees the machine for what it does. Kant's critical philosophy introduces for the first time three great components: a tragic initiation, circuitry and compression, and the alienation of auto-productive asymmetry. The time of the revolving door draws the line of the outside along the edge of space; the time of the straight labyrinth draws the line of the outside along the edge of time. Cognition, in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, is an abstract machine — and because its enveloping form of determination is temporal, it is, more profoundly, an abstract machine for the production of transcendental time.<sup>148</sup> In *What is Philosophy?* Deleuze and Guattari diagram the schematism as a circuit, "a moving wheel" partially immersed in "the shallow stream of Time as the form of interiority, in and out of which [it] plunges".<sup>149</sup> If the stream is shallow, it is because it is still all too human. As the circuit of transcendental production or application of rules for construction, the schematism disrupts the philosophical dualism of essence and appearance definitive of the revolving door with the unilateral and conjunctive couple 'apparition' (conditions of appearance) and 'phenomena' (that which appears) — one could equally say Id and Ego.<sup>150</sup> A "bolt of lightning" generating a more complicated disjunction between time and what appears in time.<sup>151</sup>

On the other side of the limit of knowability, time in itself as something other than succession is accorded a negative status — a blank cipher, slight as zero, outside the walls of transcendental subjective security. It courses through us as an abstract yet immanent outside which conditions experience via asymmetrical auto-production, but is fortified against our determinations, which have no purchase on it. The philosophical problem at the core of critique abides in this strange circuitry, no longer requiring a god for its productions, no longer sustaining hard truth / error, essence / appearance distinctions, reconstituted in a dark zone of the



subject itself — the abstract I. But “God survives as long as the I enjoys a subsistence, a simplicity and an identity which expresses the entirety of its resemblance to the divine”.<sup>152</sup> Kant “replaces harmony with circuitry” yet retains the residue of a rhyme — his betrayal of God is not yet fully double.<sup>153</sup> Time in the *First Critique* is intellectually subjective, and while it is infinitely troubling for any spontaneous notion of subjectivity, it is nonetheless too anthropomorphic, too constrained to the unifying identity of transcendental apperception, too geared towards the speculative ends of reason, too functionally masculine, too centralised and regulated. Deleuze, writing of Kant but thinking of Nietzsche, issues a caveat to those humanists among us who would yet profess to lay a claim to inhumanity: “the death of God becomes effective only with the dissolution of the Self” — a self that Kant has skewered, broken and scattered across the sand, but which logically envelops, by the circumference of its epistemological horizon, that “panic desert of time and space” the Kantian subject, like Oedipus, reluctantly casts itself into.<sup>154</sup> Schizophrenisation is a voyage of initiation that plunges all the way to zero, that “transcendental experience of the loss of the Ego” which Deleuze and Guattari link to shamanism via R.D. Laing in *Anti-Oedipus*.<sup>155</sup> The tragic voyage of transcendental time loops asymmetry infinitely back to initiation, and the subject limps through its circuitry, replaying the silence of the gods, until it learns how to betray not only their law, but its own.

Reality is reconfigured by transcendental time in terms of a double relation, a primary and generative form and a superficial, secondary experience: process and product, action and reaction, infinity and limitation, time and what is in time. By understanding this abstract, transcendental subject as a unity, Kant uses the conjunctive couple as if in the service of a god — or a father — reining in its explosive potential by bringing synthesis and schematisation back to recognition and representation, leaving consciousness, so resolute in its refusal of blindness, “blinded by all knowledge that does not find cause in the mind itself”.<sup>156</sup> There is still a division between form and matter in Kant’s apparatus, a basic hylomorphism which locates activity in form and consigns passivity to matter — an intensive matter which subtends the reproductive function of the syntheses of the imagination but does not appear in its own right and is of no transcendental consequence — its destabilising volatility confined within the extensive grid of apprehension. The model of the transcendental, once applied to experience, is eternally set, the categories definitive, as if the system “would thenceforth just continue, without disruption, in an innocent confirmation of itself”.<sup>157</sup> Reason officiates from on high, understanding controls the factory floor, everything is known in advance, ushering in “so deadly a boredom that ... one might finish by wishing to die ... rather than just have things go on ... forever”, and death is not even only empirical.<sup>158</sup>

## Into the Volcano

*A philosopher terrified: this does not exist.*<sup>159</sup>



The critical project may be the “most elaborate fit of panic in the history of the Earth” but “panic is creation”.<sup>160</sup> Poetry and capitalism take this as their rule. Hölderlin, operating a subtle betrayal of his own, discovered the true radicality of Kant, just as Rimbaud, poet-economist *par excellence*, would best articulate the cogito for a dissolved self. Land too, quoting Bataille, evokes the secret of Oedipus in relation to poetry, but not without that element of terror that will be so fundamental for the next torsion in the history of the schemata of time.

*Meanderings in extension remain trapped in the maze unless they cross over into a 'blind slippage into death', 'this slippage outside oneself that necessarily produces itself when death comes into play'. A 'slippage produces itself' we do not do so, a chasm opens, chaos (= 0), something horrific in its depth, a season in Hell that 'slips immensely into the impossible', 'the intensity and intimacy of a sensation opened itself onto an abyss where there is nothing which is not lost, just as a profound wound opens itself onto death'. Poetry is this slippage that is broken upon the end of poetry, erased in a desert as 'beautiful as death'.<sup>161</sup>*

The unfaithful, urban and un-coordinated temporality of the straight labyrinth as it appears in Kant is a not a time to be apprehended by philosophers or theologians. It is the time of economists and poets. It is they who see the subterranean opportunities to which the philosopher of the model is blind. Empedocles, the eponymous hero of Hölderlin's unfinished modern tragedy throws himself — twice — into the volcano in Kant's place, but the volcano returns a single sandal to its edge, an omen of an asymmetry yet to be mastered. “Poetry does not strut logically amongst convictions, it seeps through crevices; a magmic flux resuscitated amongst vermin. If it was not that the Great Ideas had basements, fissures, and vacuoles, poetry would never infest them. Faiths rise and fall, but the rats persist.”<sup>162</sup>

The outside will shift again, in a way that once more alters the human relation to it. Our mystery has become infinitely more complex, and curiously in this, more tractable, but it is not yet twisted enough. Kant, at the very least, has taught us the dubiousness of conclusions. We have procured certain keys, a fistful of half-deciphered diagrams, and a sense of the limit, but we are still hopelessly trapped in the maze. These explorations are just overtures to the journey that is about to begin, and they have done little more than confer upon the investigation an additional set of questions. We are yet to understand why the particle-clock is a revolving door, and how to move from this great turning figure, with its aperture open onto eternity, to those other, “successive doors”, that “bar our free march down the mighty corridors of space and time” to that ultimate threshold which “no man has crossed”.<sup>163</sup> Does Kant's elaboration of time as an infinite extended magnitude give us sufficient means to decipher Lönnrot's riddle? Is the straight line all that it seems? Why is the revolving door ‘coffin-shaped’? Does Hölderlin's invocation of aorgic panic somehow connect to the expression on the young woman in the lecture hall where Challenger executes his trick, and which Aspinwall also wears? Why does rhythm increasingly seem to play such an important role? There is nothing for it but to leave the



philosophers, the theologians, the poets and the economists, and bore deeper into the heat of the earth. To solicit counsel from that thing, which — feigning compliance with the laws of time and space — succeeds them, guardian of the door in the back of the cave we have marshalled these unfinished rituals to access.

Thrown out of eternity, cursed by a faceless god, blinded, insulted, injured and abandoned, we find ourselves with Oedipus, lurching catastrophically across the desert in uneven, hesitating steps, following the curse of an incomplete exile. Towards what? Thunder roils in the distance, electricity volatises the desolate pre-dawn fog, something rumbles underfoot. Nothing for πλέθρα. But if we know one thing about the desert, it is this. Expelled from the labour of Kantian critique, accused by Plato of sophistry, this is where the nomads go.<sup>164</sup> The initiation has just begun, and like the voyage consigned to Oedipus, its path leads underground.

---

Series Navigation

← The Revolving Door and The Straight Labyrinth: An Initiation in Occult Time (Part 0)

1. Nick Land, *Chasm* (Shanghai: Time Spiral Press, 2015), \$25.
2. Gilles Deleuze, “Synthèse et temps 14/3/1978”, trans. Melissa McMahon, *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/66>.
3. The ‘revolving door’ motif persists throughout Deleuze’s work from 1963 to 1993, preceding *Difference and Repetition* and succeeding *A Thousand Plateaus*, the two works that will be most consistently drawn upon here, despite differences in the accounts of transcendental production given in both. The historical evolution of temporal modelling condensed into these two images appears in the *Logic of Sense*, *The Fold*, and it also frames the *Cinema* books, although the revolving door as a specific motif disappears in these texts. Gilles Deleuze, *Kant’s Critical Philosophy*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam (London: Continuum, 2008), vii-viii; *Difference and Repetition*, see “Repetition for Itself” and “The Asymmetrical Synthesis of the Sensible” specifically; “Synthèse et temps 14/3/1978”, and “Untitled lecture 21/3/1978”, *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, trans. Melissa McMahon, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/groupes/4>; “On Four Poetic Formulas that Might Summarise the Kantian Philosophy”, in *Essays Clinical and Critical*, trans. Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco (London: Verso, 1998), 27-29; *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*, trans. Tom Conley (London: Continuum, 2001), 3, 6, 18-19, 70; *The Logic of Sense*, trans. Mark Lester (London: The Athlone Press, 1990), 176; *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), xi.
4. Deleuze, “On Four Poetic Formulas that might Summarise the Kantian Philosophy”, *Essays Clinical and Critical*, 27-35. The final quotation is from Borges’ “Death and the Compass”, examined in Part 0 of this series. Here Deleuze shifts from “invisible, incessant” (*Différence et répétition*, 147) to “indivisible, incessant”. “Sur quatre formules poétiques qui pourrait résumer la philosophie kantienne”, *Critique et Clinique*. (Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1993), 40.
5. This is a framing contention of Anna Greenspan’s unpublished doctoral dissertation *Capitalism’s*



*Transcendental Time Machine*, from which this essay draws some of its key ideas. Anna Greenspan, *Capitalism's Transcendental Time Machine* (University of Warwick, 2000).

6. Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 82; *Mille plateaux*, 94. Translation altered to reflect original. (See Part 0.) Deleuze, "On Four Poetic Formulas that might Summarise the Kantian Philosophy", *Essays Clinical and Critical*, 28.
7. The constitutive role of planetary motion is even more overt in the first of Deleuze's 1978 lectures on Kant: "What is the joint? The joint is, literally, the hinge. The hinge is what the door pivots around. But the door? We have to imagine a revolving door, and the revolving door is the universal door. The door of the world is a revolving door. The door of the world swings and passes through privileged moments which are well known: they're what we call cardinal points. North, South, East, West. The joint is what makes the door swing in such a way that it passes and re-passes through the privileged co-ordinates named cardinal points. Cardinal comes from *cardo*; *cardo* is precisely the hinge, the hinge around which the sphere of celestial bodies turns, and which makes them pass time and again through the so-called cardinal points, and we note their return: ah, there's the star again, it's time to move my sheep!" Deleuze, "Synthèse et temps 14/3/1978", *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/66>. I have occasionally made small modifications to the translation of these lectures, and have indicated where this occurs in the following citations.
8. Gilles Deleuze, "Untitled lecture 21/3/1978", *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/67>.
9. Plato, "Timeaus", *Timaeus and Critias*, trans. Robin Waterford (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 25/37d.
10. Plato, "Timaeus", 15/27a; 18-19/29d-30b.
11. Plato, "Timeaus", 25-26/37d-36a.
12. Plato, "Timaeus", 21/33b; 22/34a.
13. Plato, "Timaeus", 23/35a.
14. 'δημιουργός' (demiurge), from δήμιος (belonging to the people) and -εργος (a suffix indicating a worker), literally denotes 'a skilled workman, a handicraftsman' in Ancient Greek; Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 233.
15. Here is the sequence — which will play an important role in *Difference and Repetition* — in full: "[H]e divided up the whole mixture again, this time into as many portions as he needed, with each portion being a blend of identity, difference, and substance. He began the division by first taking a single portion from the mixture; next he took a portion which was double the quantity of the first, and then a third portion, which was one-and-a-half times the quantity of the second and three times the quantity of the first; then he took a fourth portion which was double the quantity of the second, and a fifth which was three times the quantity of the third, and a sixth which was eight times the quantity of the first, and then a seventh portion which was twenty-seven times the quantity of the first. After this, he filled up the double and triple intervals by cutting off further portions from the mixture and inserting them into the gaps, so that in each interval there were two means, a mean that exceeded one of its extremes by the same fraction of the extremes as it was exceeded by the other extreme, and another mean that exceeded one of its extremes by the same number as it was exceeded by the other extreme. These links created, within the first set of intervals, further intervals of 3:2, 4:3, and 9:8, and then he filled up all the 4:3 intervals with the 9:8 interval, leaving in each case a portion, and the portion that remained was an interval whose terms, expressed numerically, were 256 : 243. And so at this point the mixture, from which he was cutting these portions, was all used up." Plato, "Timaeus", 23-24/35a-36b.



16. Deleuze, *Difference and Reptition*, 233; Plato, "Timaeus", 24/36c-d.
17. Plato, "Timaeus", 27/38e.
18. Plato, "Timaeus", 28/39d.
19. Deleuze, "On Four Poetic Formulas that might Summarise the Kantian Philosophy", *Essays Clinical and Critical*, 27.
20. Luce Irigaray, "Plato's *Hystera*" in *Speculum of the Other Woman*, trans. Gillian C. Gill, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985), 244-5. The thing, "always already there in the den" is the matrix or womb, which again, following the injunction of cosmic horror — muted and covered over by the schema of the revolving door — can never quite be shown, seen, or described. Within the realm of representation (or the specular economy) the anteriority of the hystera is displaced and oppositionalised as a posteriority in the image before the men in the cave, generative of a telos which appears linear but is, in fact, cyclical. Linearity hides an exoteric return, which in turn hides an esoteric involution. Mark Fisher and Suzanne Livingston marshall a similar argument to counter Baudrillard's defeatist reading of seduction in his book of the same name: "Yet what of seduction itself? For as a Process it is far in excess of its writings. For Irigaray, these circles which constantly return to the point at which they first began are not what they appear. For the female zero, vulva, circle never finally closes up in the shape of a ring." Livingston and Fisher, "Desiring Seduction", *Ccru.net*, <https://web.archive.org/web/20011211011651/http://www.ccru.demon.co.uk:80/archive/seduction.htm>.
21. "According to Marx, repetition is comic when it falls short — that is, when instead of leading to metamorphosis and the production of something new, it forms a kind of involution, the opposite of an authentic creation. Comic travesty replaces tragic metamorphosis. However, it appears that for Marx this comic or grotesque repetition necessarily comes after the tragic, evolutive and creative repetition ('all great events and historical personages occur, as it were, twice ... the first time as tragedy, the second as farce'). This temporal order does not, however, seem to be absolutely justified." Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 91-2.
22. Irigaray, "Plato's *Hystera*", 247; "[The demiurge] endowed each of the gods [the planetary bodies] with two kinds of motion: even rotation in the same place, to enable them always to think the same thoughts about the same things; and forward motion, under the sovereignty of the revolution of identity and sameness.' Within the teleological account tendered by the *Timaeus*, to act for the best is to always act in the same manner. Plato, "Timeaus", 29/40a-b.
23. "[T]he visibility of day and night, of months and the circling years, of equinoxes and solstices, resulted in the invention of number, gave us the concept of time, and made it possible for us to enquire into the nature of the universe. These in their turn have enabled us to equip ourselves with philosophy in general, and humankind never has, nor ever will be granted by the gods a greater good than philosophy." Plato, "Timaeus", 38/47a-47b.
24. Plato, "Timaeus", 96/90c-90d.
25. Plato, "Timaeus", 96/90c-90d.
26. "[T]he gods invented and supplied us with vision to enable us to observe the rational revolutions of the heavens and to let them affect the revolutions of thought within ourselves (which are naturally akin to those in the heavens, though ours are turbulent while they are calm)." Plato, "Timaeus", 38/47b.
27. αἴτιον πλανόμενον (errant cause). Thanks to Jake Hamilton for this insight and for help with translations from the Greek.





28. Plato, "Timaeus", 96/91a. Incidentally, the formulation of truth, which lists a short taxonomy of external madnesses as afflictions to thought ("shamelessness, stupidity, mental illness, willingness to lie, or an indifference to truth") which is otherwise naturally oriented towards its object in @parallaxoptics' piece, "Exit Accelerationism" exactly reprises the premises of the universe generated through this figure of time — with the "Outside" mapped by a theologically conditioned exclusive disjunction separating a fallen, temporalised interority from a transcendent, perfect exteriority — and the accompanying, dogmatic, image of thought. Thus explicitly anchoring the fundamental axioms of what has come to be known as R/Acc (along with some of its R/Dec variants) in an ancient, theological conception of reality self-consciously at odds with the process of modernisation and capitalistic temporality the term originally (and perhaps more correctly) invoked. It will be seen that R/Acc, in want of a better articulation, disbars itself from any real purchase on the demonic, Lovecraftian imagery it so frequently delights in calling forth, insofar as Lovecraft relates the insurgency of the Old Ones to time. The question the above post dearly wants to answer: "[H]ow to access, or conceive of this [non-human] intelligence? What is its relationship to human spacetime?" is not discoverable by venturing outside the Platonic cave (as it advises), but rather, by boring deeper into the cave and its illusions, unearthing an altogether different model of truth and an alien conception of time. *The only way out is in*. The inward trajectory of this limit defining outside from in occurs in several steps, which the following parts of this essay will attempt to bring — darkly — to light.
29. Plato, "Timaeus", 26/38c, 30/41a, 18/29e. Italics added.
30. *The Bible*, King James Version, Revelation 6:13-15.
31. Plato, "Meno" in *Plato: The Collected Dialogues*, eds. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), especially 363-374.
32. Plato, "Timaeus", 40/49a, 43/51a, 90/88d, 43/50e, 42/50b, 50c/42, 49a/40. Philosophically, the receptacle is graspable only by "a bastard kind of reasoning" and is something like what one apprehends in a dream (25b/45). The sexualised nature of the dualism is both the target and the weapon that annihilates it in Irigaray's "Plato's *Hystera*".
33. Plato, "Timaeus", 50d/40.
34. Space, too — as coexistence or simultaneity — is just another mode, coexistence and simultaneity graspable only as arrangements, erratic or ordered, relative to the positing of eternity. As well as the specific schema of the "Timaeus" and a figure denoting fundamental aspects of monotheism, the revolving door also extends to index a prevalent trend in pre-Kantian philosophy applicable to rationalist thinkers such as Leibniz, who deems space and time to be modal expressions of an infinite, conceptual intellect, confusedly perceived by finite minds (monads). "I have said more than once that I hold space to be something purely relative, as time is — that I hold it to be an order of coexistences, as time is an order of successions. For space denotes, in terms of possibility, an order of things that exist at the same time, considered as existing together, without entering into their particular manners of existing. And when many things are seen together, one consciously perceives this order of things among themselves." Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz and Samuel Clarke, *Correspondence*, ed. Roger Ariew (Cambridge: Hackett, 2000), 15.
35. Deleuze, "Untitled lecture 21/3/1978", *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/67>.
36. "We have misconceived the topology of time, and in doing so closed the gates connecting time with eternity. The recovery from this greatest of errors will sift the strong from the weak, setting the capstone of the 'Great Politics' that open at the end of nihilism. Eventually, the philosophy of time will *decide*." Nick Land,



“Nietzschean Shards”, *Outside In*, <http://www.xenosystems.net/nietzschean-shards/>.

37. Michel Foucault, “Theatrum Philosophicum”, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), 166.
38. “Time is no longer the cosmic time of an original celestial movement, nor is it the rural time of derived meteorological movements. It has become the time of the city and nothing other, the pure order of time.” Deleuze, “On four Poetic Formulas that Might Summarise the Kantian Philosophy”, 28; “And time will be this sort of form which is also pure, and this kind of act by which the world empties itself, becomes a desert.” Deleuze, “Synthèse et temps 14/3/1978”, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/66>.
39. Karl Marx, *Grundrisse*, Notebook V, <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1857/grundrisse/ch10.htm>. Italics added.; Friedrich Hölderlin, “Notes on the *Oedipus*” in *Essays and Letters*, trans. Jeremy Adler and Charlie Louth (London: Penguin, 2009), e-book; Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 87.
40. Hölderlin, “Notes on the *Oedipus*”, §3.
41. Hölderlin, “Notes on the *Oedipus*”, §3. The reversal is that of the ‘caesura’ (see the following), which marks an inversion of “*the striving out of this world into a striving out of another world into this one*”. Friedrich Hölderlin, “Notes on the *Antigone*” in *Essays and Letters*, trans. and ed. Jeremy Adler and Charlie Louth (London: Penguin, 2009), e-book, §2. Thanks to Thomas Murphy for his insight regarding this problem of temporality in *Difference and Repetition* and for catalysing the magmic inclusion of Hölderlin in this essay.
42. Deleuze, “Untitled lecture 21/3/1978”, *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/67>, translation modified; “[L]a tragédie d’Œdipe est dans sa lenteur meurtrissante presque une tragédie moderne.” Jean Beaufret, “Hölderlin et Sophocle” in Friedrich Hölderlin, *Remarques sur Oedipe, Remarques sur Antigone* (Paris: Union Générale d’Editions, 1965), 50. The above, and all following translations of Beaufret’s untranslated text are my own; Deleuze, “Untitled lecture 21/3/1978”, *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/67>.

Oedipus’ demise holds significant parallels to Empedocles’ dissolution in the volcano that forms the crux of Hölderlin’s unfinished tragedy, *The Death of Empedocles*, which he had abandoned just prior to writing “Notes on the *Oedipus*”, and these latter are generally understood to be the completion of the inchoate theory of tragedy advanced in the Empedocles texts. Empedocles’ volcanic dissolution haunts the whole of modern tragedy, and Hölderlin’s own struggle with the infinity it called up in his writing will become more than just the personal struggle of an alienated and ambitious poet in the history of dramatic thought. See Friedrich Hölderlin, *The Death of Empedocles: A Mourning-Play*, trans. David Farrell Krell (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2008).

43. “Sophoclean tragedy, for Hölderlin, is not the tragedy of Aeschylus or Euripides. It is the singular tragedy of divine withdrawal. Everything that is tragic in Sophocles enciphers the fact that the frontier between man and God has become enigmatic. Thus it is different from the tragedy of Aeschylus, for whom the limit is hardly an enigma. Here [in Aeschylus], man surpasses the limit, and often does so despite the counsel of the gods. [...] Tragic action is thus the history of a return to order which demands the violation of a limit.” Beaufret, “Hölderlin et Sophocle”, 15-16. In farce, it is the clown’s inability to reach the limit (which is clearly defined by what has gone before) — and thus to perform his or her acts adequately — that subtends the relation between



agent and limit as both Marx and Deleuze will define it. Farce begets only an inferior representation, rather than a real alteration. See note 21 above.

44. Deleuze, "Untitled lecture 21/3/1978", *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/67>; See note 43.
45. In Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, for example, "Agamemnon has hardly entered his palace before Cassandra sees, as if through the walls, the exact course the crime will take, and predicts the return of Orestes. But here, the clamour of the prophetic voice does not carry the significance of the 'caesura'. Rather, it confirms only what was already expected. [...] In the triumphant king who descends from his chariot to tread the blood-red carpet Clytemnestra unfurls beneath his feet, we have already recognised the figure of one who is sentenced to death. There is nothing more Aeschylean than a tragic act prefaced by the words 'It is done' — before having even begun. Everything unfolds from one end to the other, right up to the exoneration of Orestes by the tribunal of the Eumenides, without a 'lacuna', certainly, but also without a 'caesura'. Such is the march of a destiny that does not cease to subsume everything into its most precise image from the point of an initial transgression." Beaufret, "Hölderlin et Sophocle", 31-2.
46. "Oedipus, the most economical formula of interiorisation (Case). It's all in your head." Ccru, "Flatlines" in *Ccru: Writings 1997-2003* (Falmouth, Urbanomic, 2017), (:):(:):/108. Aeschylus and Euripides may "understand better how to objectify suffering and anger", but it is Sophocles who truly grasps "the sense [*sens*] of man, in his voyage towards the unthinkable."; Hölderlin, *Remarques sur Oedipe, Remarques sur Antigone*, quoted by Beaufret in "Hölderlin et Sophocle", 16.
47. Hölderlin, "Notes on the *Oedipus*", §3.
48. The bulk of French and German commentary on Hölderlin's interpretations of Sophocles read Hölderlin's work as a subversion of Hegelian self-consciousness, despite the former's alleged youthful participation in "The Oldest Program toward a System in German Idealism" alongside Hegel himself. See Kathrin H. Rosenfield, "Le conflit tragique chez Sophocle et son interprétation chez Hölderlin et Hegel", *Les Études philosophiques*, 77:2 (2006), 141-161, for a survey of this difference.

This essay follows the former tendency, which is consonant with Deleuze's own approach. See, for an example beyond those given in *Difference and Repetition* and "On Four Poetic Formulas that Might Summarise the Kantian Philosophy", *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, where Deleuze writes, "Dialectics in general are not a tragic vision of the world but, on the contrary, the death of tragedy, the replacement of the tragic vision by a theoretical conception (with Socrates) or a Christian conception (with Hegel). What has been discovered in Hegel's early writings is in fact the final truth of the dialectic: modern dialectic is the truly Christian ideology". This bears heavily on his readings of tragedy and farce in Marx. Gilles Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson (New York: University of Columbia Press, 1983), 18. This is also Beaufret's approach (see Beaufret, 'Hölderlin et Sophocle', 38) and is supported by more recent commentaries in English, including (but not limited to) that of Véronique M. Fóti, who writes "whereas Hegel situates tragedy, or tragic conflict and its resolution, within ethicality (*Sittlichkeit*, as a surpassed self-actualization of spirit), Hölderlin decisively withdraws it from the ethical domain. ... The twisting free of tragedy from the grip of Hegelian ethicality does not mean that the concerns normally classed as ethical are cast to the winds ... but rather that they are resituated against a vaster horizon — the horizon, perhaps, of what lies 'beyond good and evil', of the dispropriative trait in the propriative event (*Ereignis*), or of the tragic structure in the instauration and



despoilment of hegemonic principles. [...] [F]or Hegel, reconciliation remains the guiding aim of tragedy and defines its cathartic work, the late Hölderlin sees ultimate reconciliation — the reconciliation of man with divinity — not as the ideal of a differential interrelation, but as a hybristic union, destructive of the singular, and motivated by ‘eccentric enthusiasm’, which is fundamentally a passion for death. The cathartic work of tragedy therefore becomes for him a work of dispersive separation”. *Epochal Discordance: Hölderlin’s Philosophy of Tragedy* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006) 2-3; Henry Somers-Hall, for whom Hegel’s privileging of ethical action cleaves too closely to ancient conceptions of drama and fails to see the novelty in Hölderlin’s reading, “Time Out of Joint: Hamlet and the Pure Form of Time”, *Deleuze Studies*, Volume 5 (2011), 64-7; and David Farrell Krell, who wrests Hölderlin from the grip of German Idealism via the notion of intensity in Friedrich Hölderlin, *The Death of Empedocles: A Mourning-Play*, especially 304-6.

49. Beaufret, “Hölderlin et Sophocle”, 16.

50. “OEDIPUS: Cast me away this instant

Out of this land, out of the sight of man.

CREON: Be sure it would have been done without delay,

But that I await instruction from the god. [...]

OEDIPUS: I have your promise, then?

CREON: What promise?

OEDIPUS: To send me away.

CREON: God will decide, not I.

OEDIPUS: No god will speak for me.

CREON: Then you will have your wish.

OEDIPUS: And your consent?

CREON: I do not speak beyond my knowledge.”

Sophocles, King *Oedipus* in *The Theban Plays*, trans. E. F. Watling (London: Penguin, 1974), 65; 67-8.

51. Hölderlin, “Notes on the *Oedipus*”, §3. Italics added. Beaufret, “Hölderlin et Sophocle”, 50; 53. Beaufret’s untranslated commentary is drawn upon repeatedly by Deleuze in his evocations of Hölderlin in *Difference and Repetition*, and its influence is heavily apparent in Deleuze’s 1978 lectures on Kant (if not also elsewhere, “On Several Regimes of Signs” in *A Thousand Plateaus* being one site that bears the mark of its impact). Deleuze’s circumlocutionary references to Heidegger’s reading of Hölderlin can be found in *Difference and Repetition*, 32 (note 4), and Deleuze, “Untitled lecture 21/3/1978”, *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/67> and in *A Thousand Plateaus*, 138.

“A trial for heresy” is taken from “Notes on the *Oedipus*”, §3. Beaufret explains that a heretic, for Hölderlin, is one “who aorgically and without mediation attempts to seize the very essence of the divine”. “Hölderlin et Sophocle”, 50. The ‘aorgic’ is a term of Hölderlin’s own making, and it is deployed to encipher the effusive, infinite, disordered and discordant power of Nature in opposition to the structured, finite and organising principles of Art — or the ‘organic’ — in the context of his theory of tragedy. The aorgic is closely linked to the dissociative experience of panic by Beaufret and related to the “passion for death” by Fóti who writes that, “ever hostile to man”, the aorgic “manifests [an] ambiguous aspect: although it may appear welcoming and



life-sustaining, it is an alien and unfathomable power that — for all the effort to conceal it behind the screens of cultural and intellectual constructs — fatally attracts sensitive individuals. Somewhat like the Freudian death drive, it impels the individual toward dissolution or a return to the unformed. Hölderlin relates the aorgic element to the unconscious (or, perhaps, nonconscious) dynamics of the psyche, which means that it now infiltrates the supposed organicism of subjectivity, eroding its boundaries and affecting it with alterity". Fóti, *Epochal Discordance: Hölderlin's Theory of Tragedy*, 21; 61; 47. The organic and the aorgic "inter-penetrate most profoundly and touch one another in their uttermost extremes" in a manner not dissimilar to Nietzsche's formulation of tragedy with its opposition of Dionysian and Apollonian impulses — their unification bringing about an epochal transition that gestures towards a "still inchoate world to come". Hölderlin, 'The Basis of Empedocles' in *The Death of Empedocles*, 147; Krell, *The Death of Empedocles*, 170.

In his notes to the Empedocles manuscript, Hölderlin drew a number of diagrams meant to evoke this unification. Krell reproduces them in his translation of the play, accompanied by the following caption:



"The one on the left refers to the dispersion from the midpoint undergone by both art (the organizational) and nature (the more aorgic), a dispersion that occurs in the most radical enmity ... while the one on the right tries to demonstrate some sort of higher unification or reconciliation of the two". (Krell, *The Death of Empedocles*, 257-8.)

Hölderlin thus saw aorgic infinity as the necessary corrective to contemporary Germanic tendencies, which overemphasised the organic, organisational power of Art and culture, whilst, for the Greeks who naturally overstated the aorgic at the expense of the organic, the attraction of dissolution and excess was "especially danger-fraught because it destroys the protective lucidity and measure that Greece had cultivated, unleashing the full wildness of the fiery, aorgic element. Since the Hesperian formative drive tends toward this very fire and sense of destiny, the Greek dys-limitation constitutes for Hesperia a warning example which holds it back from following the sheer onrush of its own formative drive". Fóti concludes this part of her analysis with a comment which presages and (according to Hölderlin's identification of the orgic as the primary Germanic drive) inverts certain passages of *A Thousand Plateaus* with its warnings against the "fourth danger" of the line of flight — the pure line of abolition and destruction: "One can reflect here on what it may have meant — beyond Hölderlin's historical horizon — for twentieth-century Germany to maximise the tendency of its cultural formative drive in a quest for grandeur and a sense of destiny, while neglecting the free and creative (rather than obsessive or servile) cultivation of its natal tendency to lucid ordering. It remains, of course, a



consummate historical irony that Hölderlin's thought and art were themselves (without benefit of attentive explication) annexed and exploited by the Third Reich". Foti, *Epochal Discordance: Hölderlin's Theory of Tragedy*, 82. Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 252-5.

Finally, the aorgic seems to appear as the 'orgiastic' in *Difference and Repetition*, (Holderlin's 'aorgique', from Beaufret's French translation, becoming 'orgique' in Deleuze's original French) and is similarly opposed to the 'organic'. To wit: "When representation discovers the infinite within itself, it no longer appears as organic representation but as orgiastic representation: it discovers within itself the limits of the organised; tumult, restlessness and passion underneath apparent calm. It rediscovers monstrosity." And, significantly, from the conclusion, "The greatest effort of philosophy was perhaps directed at rendering representation infinite (orgiastic). It is a question of extending representation as far as the too large and the too small of difference; of adding a hitherto unsuspected perspective to representation — in other words, inventing theological, scientific and aesthetic techniques which allow it to integrate the depth of difference in itself; of allowing representation to conquer the obscure; of allowing it to include the vanishing of difference which is too small and the dismemberment of difference which is too large; of allowing it to capture the power of giddiness, intoxication and cruelty, and even of death. In short, it is a question of causing a little of Dionysus's blood to flow in the organic veins of Apollo". *Difference and Repetition*, 42; 262.

52. Quoted by Beaufret, "Hölderlin et Sophocle", 50.
53. Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus*, in *The Theban Plays*, trans. E. F. Watling (London: Penguin, 1974), 121.
54. "MESSANGER: When we had gone a little distance, we turned and looked back. Oedipus was nowhere to be seen; but [Theseus] was standing alone holding his hand before his eyes as if he had seen some terrible sight that no one could bear to look upon; and soon we saw him salute heaven and the earth with one short prayer. In what manner Oedipus passed from this earth, no one can tell." Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus*, 121.
55. Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus*, 121.
56. Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense*, 174; Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 320; Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 90.
57. "Oedipus is almost unique in the Greek world. The whole first part is imperial, despotic, paranoid, interpretive, divinatory. But the whole second part is Oedipus's wandering, his line of flight, the double turning away of his own face and that of God. Rather than very precise limits to be crossed in order, or which one does not have the right to cross (*hybris*), there is a concealed limit toward which Oedipus is swept. Rather than interpretive signifying irradiation, there is a subjective linear proceeding permitting Oedipus to keep a secret, but only as a residue capable of starting a new linear proceeding. Oedipus, his name is *atheos*: he invents something worse than death or exile, he wanders and survives on a strangely positive line of separation or deterritorialization." Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 138.

For the ambiguity inherent in the role of the despot, see Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem and Helen R. Lane (London: Penguin, 2009). Thanks are due to Edmund Berger for the many conversations we shared concerning this point, particularly on the relationship between Oedipus and Cain as scapegoat figures in the fifth plateau of *A Thousand Plateaus*. This is a reading supported by Ronald



Bogue in "The Betrayal of God", *Deleuze and Religion*, ed. Mary Bryden (London: Routledge, 2000). Ed is also responsible for providing the references making the link between schizophrenia and shamanism in *Anti-Oedipus* and R.D. Laing's work explicit below.

58. "We may suppose that in the most ancient version of the myth of Oedipus (identified as we have indicated, with a fable about magic) the wound to the feet, the exposure, the period spent on the margins of the world of the polis on the wild heights of Mount Cithaeron, the struggle with the Sphinx — later mitigated by the solution of the riddle — marked the stages of an initiatory journey to the beyond." Carlo Ginzberg, *Ecstasies: Deciphering the Witches' Sabbath*, trans. Raymond Rosenthal (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 228.
59. Ginzberg, *Ecstasies*, 237-8. See also James George Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 396-404.
60. Ginzberg, *Ecstasies*, 232; 247.
61. Ginzberg, *Ecstasies*, 241-2. See also Tom Moynihan's excellent comments on the connection between bilateral symmetry and faciality in evolution, "The Gastrulation of Geist: or an Extended Meditation upon the World-Historical Connection Between Digestion and Simulation", *Vast Abrupt* (2018), <https://vastabrupt.com/2018/02/08/gastrulation-of-geist/>.
62. Ginzberg, *Ecstasies*, 226; 239.
63. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 110. The source of the strange attribution of green and red to the "legs" in the image can most likely be exhumed from Salomon Maimon's critique of Kant in the *Essay on Transcendental Philosophy*, where the origin of the difference between perceptions of the colours green and red resurfaces consistently as problem troubling Kant's attempts to extract *de jure* principles for experience, and is ultimately marshalled in support of an argument that a philosophy concerned only with the conditions of *possible* experience does not go far enough when it comes to questions of transcendental production. Salomon Maimon, *Essay on Transcendental Philosophy*, trans. Nick Midgely, Henry Somers-Hall, Alistair Welchman and Merten Reglitz (London: Continuum, 2010), see for example, 22; 27-8; 74; 97-8.
64. Hölderlin, "Notes on the *Oedipus*", *Essays and Letters*, §1.
65. Arkady Plotinsky, "The Calculable Law of Tragic Representation and the Unthinkable" in *At the Edges of Thought: Deleuze and Post-Kantian Philosophy* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015), 130; Kathrin H. Rosenfield, "Hölderlin et Sophocle: Rythme et temps tragique dans les Remarques sur *Ædipe et Antigone*", *Philosophique*, 11: 2008, 20. This and all following translations from the text are my own.
66. Hölderlin, "Notes on the *Antigone*", *Essays and Letters*, §2.
67. Hölderlin, "Notes on the *Oedipus*", *Essays and Letters*, §1.
68. "[I]f this rhythm of ideas is so constituted that in the rapidity of enthusiasm the former are more torn along by the later ones, the caesura (a), or the counter-rhythmical interruption, must lie from the front, so that the first half is, as it were, shielded from the second; and then, precisely because the second half is initially more rapid and seems to weigh more heavily, as a result of the caesura's counter-action the balance will tend to incline from the end (b) towards the beginning (c). If, however, the rhythm of ideas is so constituted that the following are, rather, compressed by the initial ones, the caesura (a) will come to lie more towards the end, because it is the end which must, as it were, be shielded from the beginning; and then the balance will incline more towards



the end (b), since the first half (c) extends further, but the balance sets in later.” Hölderlin, “Notes on the *Antigone*”, *Essays and Letters*, §1. Hölderlin’s diagrams are reproduced above.

69. Hölderlin, “Notes on the *Oedipus*”, §1. In contrast, *Antigone*, singled out by Hegel as the crucial specimen in the Athenian trilogy and from which he draws a dialectical, ethical lesson, has a more straightforward narrative structure, inclining from “the beginning towards the end”, its caesura arising intelligibly at the end of the play (when Tiresias advises Creon to allow the interment of Polynices).

Hölderlin, in an earlier essay, relates the tragic heroism of *Antigone* to the lyric mood in its privileging of the subjective, cultural and “organic” side of the division between the gods and man, while that of *Oedipus* is more thoroughly tragic, privileging the objective, natural and “aorgic” side of the divide — its law proceeding from the “necessary arbitrariness of Zeus”, “father of time” divine avatar of the rift in the unity of being. Hölderlin, “Notes on the *Antigone*”, §1; Friedrich Hölderlin, “The lyric, in appearance idealic poem ...” in *Letters and Essays*, trans. Jeremy Adler and Charlie Louth (London: Penguin, 2009), e-book. *Antigone* is also classed as the “more Greek” of the two because of the swift incarnation of time as death, whilst the death of Oedipus is maximally prolonged, and in this, “modern”. “For this is the tragic thing about us [moderns], that we should quietly leave the world of the living, packaged in a simple box. Such a destiny is not so imposing, but it is deeper.” Beaufret, “Hölderlin et Sophocle”, 49; 22. See note 48 on the rejection of Hegelianism in Hölderlin’s readings.

70. And Deleuze will write in “The Philosophy of Crime Novels” that “[w]hile *Oedipus* is the only Greek tragedy that already has this detective structure, we should marvel that Sophocles’s Oedipus is a detective, and not that the detective novel has remained Oedipal”. In *Desert Islands and Other Texts, 1953-1974*, ed. David Lapoujade, trans. Michael Taormina, (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2004), 82.
71. Tiresias to Oedipus, in Sophocles, *Oedipus the King*, 36; 38.
72. Friedrich Hölderlin, *Samtliche Werke und Briefe*, ed. Jochen Schmidt (Frankfurt, Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1994) vol.2, 561. Quoted by Rosenfield in “Hölderlin et Sophocle: Rythme et temps tragique dans les Remarques sur *Ædipe* et *Antigone*”, fn8.
73. The caesura “thus abolishes the distinctions and the understanding ensured by succession (in human or physical time), insofar as the rhythm makes appear a more all-embracing connection — and a timelessness, not subject to the segmentation of the successive alternations. The rhythm makes one see-feel-guess the unfathomable dimension that ensures the connection of everything. Thus, paradoxically, the tragedy presents, as equivalent and concomitant, the movements of two forms of language: that of the arguments situated in the temporal succession and the pure language of the seer (the counter-rhythmic movement). What is accessible to knowledge and what is removed from human mastery are presented simultaneously”. Rosenfield, “Hölderlin et Sophocle: Rythme et temps tragique dans les Remarques sur *Ædipe* et *Antigone*”, 82.
74. Hölderlin, *Samtliche Werke und Briefe*, vol.2, 561; Quoted in Rosenfield, “Hölderlin et Sophocle: Rythme et temps tragique dans les Remarques sur *Ædipe* et *Antigone*”, 92, and Krell, *The Death of Empedocles*, 299-300.
75. Hölderlin, “Notes on the *Oedipus*”, §3; Deleuze, “Untitled lecture 21/3/1978”, *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/67>; Hölderlin, “Notes on the *Oedipus*”, §1. My italics.
76. Ccru, “Glossary”, *Ccru: Writings 1997-2003* (Falmouth, Urbanomic, 2017), (((::)))(:)(:)/369. See also, “The





Templeton Episode” which contains an extended meditation on auto-productive Kantianism and cyclical time control, (::::)-(:)(:)(:)/53-4. The occulted relationship of Professor Randolph Edmund Templeton (“the model for H.P. Lovecraft’s Randolph Carter”) to the dissolution mystery outlined here provides vital clues that will be returned to. Ccru, *Abstract Culture: Digital Hyperstition*, 55.

77. Hölderlin, “Notes on the Oedipus”, §3.
78. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 58. Patton’s ‘categorical abduction’ for ‘détournement catégorique’ has been changed to ‘categorical reversal’ for the sake of maintaining consistency across English translations of Deleuze.
79. Deleuze, “On Four Poetic Formulas That Might Summarise the Kantian Philosophy”, 31.
80. Arthur Rimbaud, “Letter to Georges Izambard, 13 May 1871” in *Selected Poems and Letters*, trans. Jeremy Harding and John Sturrock (London: Penguin, 2004), 236. Translation modified.
81. Kant’s indices for these two tendencies, which he indirectly names ‘dogmatic rationalism’ and ‘sceptical empiricism’, in pre-critical philosophy are Leibniz and Hume. “We have here presented to us a new phenomenon of human reason — an entirely natural antithetic, in which there is no need of making subtle enquiries or of laying snares for the unwary, but into which reason of itself quite unavoidably falls. It certainly guards reason from the slumber of fictitious conviction such as is generated by a purely one-sided illusion, but at the same time subjects it to the temptation either of abandoning itself to a sceptical despair, or of assuming an obstinate attitude, dogmatically committing itself to certain assertions, and refusing to grant a fair hearing to the arguments for the counter-position. Either attitude is the death of sound philosophy, although the former might perhaps be entitled the euthanasia of pure reason.” Immanuel Kant, *The Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. Kemp Smith (London: Macmillan, 1929), 385 A407/B433. For Deleuze’s exposition of a *a priori* synthesis via the example of the straight line see “Synthèse et temps 14/3/1978”, *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/66>.
82. In his lectures, Deleuze’s preliminary description of the *First Critique* reads as if it were a passage taken directly from “The Mountains of Madness”, and there is good reason to suppose this parallel with Lovecraft is deliberate: “It’s an excessive atmosphere, but if one holds up ... all this Northern fog which lands on top of us starts to dissipate, and underneath there is an amazing architecture ... in this fog there functions a sort of thinking machine, a creation of concepts that is absolutely terrifying.” Deleuze, “Synthèse et temps 14/3/1978”, *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/66>.

Compare Dyer and Lake’s discovery of the alien city beneath the shifting Antarctic mists in H.P. Lovecraft, “At the Mountains of Madness”, *Tales*, ed. Peter Straub (New York: Library of America, 2005) 508; 523: “I had seen dozens of polar mirages during the preceding weeks, some of them quite as uncanny and fantastically vivid as the present sample; but this one had a wholly novel and obscure quality of menacing symbolism, and I shuddered as the seething labyrinth of fabulous walls and towers and minarets loomed out of the troubled ice-vapours above our heads. The effect was of a Cyclopean city of no architecture known to man or to human imagination, with vast aggregations of night-black masonry embodying monstrous perversions of geometrical laws and attaining the most grotesque extremes of sinister bizarrerie. [...] We had previously dismissed, so far as serious thought was concerned, any theory that the cubes and ramparts of the mountainsides were other than natural in origin. How could they be otherwise? Yet now the sway of reason seemed irrefutably shaken, for this Cyclopean maze of squared, curved, and angled blocks had features which cut off all comfortable



refuge. It was, very clearly, the blasphemous city of the mirage in stark, objective, and ineluctable reality. That damnable portent had had a material basis after all — there had been some horizontal stratum of ice-dust in the upper air, and this shocking stone survival had projected its image across the mountains according to the simple laws of reflection. Of course the phantom had been twisted and exaggerated, and had contained things which the real source did not contain; yet now, as we saw that real source, we thought it even more hideous and menacing than its distant image.”

83. Hölderlin, “Notes on the *Oedipus*”, *Essays and Letters*, §3; Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. and ed. Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 159 A25/B39
84. Both forms can equally be deployed in a strictly ideal capacity outside of empirical determination, i.e. “when they are considered in themselves through reason” but this is illegitimate from the point of view of both knowledge and experience. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 160 A28/B44.
85. “Time is the *a priori* formal condition of all appearances in general. Space, as the pure form of all outer intuitions, is limited as an *a priori* condition merely to outer intuitions. But since, on the contrary, all representations, whether or not they have outer things as their object, nevertheless as determinations of the mind themselves belong to the inner state, while this inner state belongs under the formal condition of inner intuition, and thus of time, so time is an *a priori* of all appearance in general ... all objects of the senses, are in time, and necessarily stand in relations of time.” Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 163-164 A34/B50-51.
86. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 163 A33/B50. Italics added.
87. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 300 A183/B226.
88. See note 4 regarding the shift from ‘invisible’ to ‘indivisible’ in Deleuze’s citations of Borges’ text.
89. Deleuze, “On Four Poetic Formulas that Might Summarise the Kantian Philosophy”, 28. Kant provides the counter-argument and dismisses it in the “Elucidation” that follows his exposition of the *Transcendental Aesthetic*, concluding, alongside an explicit refusal of Leibniz’s purely intellectual forms, “that the transcendental aesthetic cannot contain more than these two elements, namely space and time, is clear from the fact that all other concepts belonging to sensibility, even that of motion, which unites both elements, presuppose something empirical. For this presupposes the perception of something moveable. In space, considered in itself there is nothing moveable; hence the moveable must be something that is found *in space only through experience*, thus an empirical datum. In the same way the transcendental aesthetic cannot count the concept of alteration among its *a priori* data; for time itself does not alter, but only something that is within time”. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 165-7 A36-41/B53-58.
90. This is only a problem for the explication of space once it has passed through the syntheses of the imagination and been subjected to the categories of the understanding in the schematism. Hence Kant’s careful distinction of *forms of intuition* (space and time as they are given in themselves) from *formal intuition* (space and time as magnitudes). Without schematisation, which applies its concepts synthetically as rules of construction, mathematics is simply a logical science, operating in a realm isolated from experience. “Thus in the concept of a figure that is enclosed between two straight lines there is no contradiction ... rather the impossibility rests not on the concept in itself, but on its construction in space, i.e., on the conditions of space and its determinations.” Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 323 A220-21/B268.
91. “We can accordingly speak of space, extended beings, and so on, only from a human standpoint. If we depart



from the subjective condition under which alone we can acquire outer intuition, namely that through which we may be affected by objects, then the representation of space signifies nothing at all.” And “[t]ime is therefore merely a subjective condition of our (human) intuition (which is always sensible, i.e. insofar as we are affected by objects), and in itself, outside the subject, is nothing”. Furthermore, “we cannot judge at all whether the intuitions of other thinking beings are bound to the same conditions that limit our intuition and that are universally valid for us”. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 159-160 A26-7/B42-3; 164 A35/B51; 160 A27/B43.

92. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 289 A165/B206. “[T]ranscendental propositions can never be given through construction of concepts, but only in accordance with *a priori* concepts. They contain merely the rule in accordance with which a certain synthetic unity of that which cannot be intuitively represented *a priori* (of perceptions) should be sought empirically.” Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 634 A721/B749.
93. Immanuel Kant, “Concerning the Ultimate Foundation for the Differentiation of Regions in Space” in *Selected Pre-Critical Writings*, trans. and ed. G. B. Kerferd and D. E. Walford (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968); Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*, trans. Gary Carl Hatfield (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). Both arguments are constructed to refute Leibniz, although in fact contain conflicting arguments (something we will revisit later). Deleuze draws out the key point: “Kant will say that this [non-superimposability] is what finitude is.” Deleuze, “Synthèse et temps 14/3/1978”, *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/66>.
94. Within Kant’s model of time as it is expounded in the *First Critique*, even time travel would still be perceived by its subject as a succession, moving consistently from T1 to T2 to T3, etc. If the time traveller began her journey at point B and travelled backwards in history to point A, prior to B, her temporal experience would still give her T1 at B, T2 at A, and so on.
95. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 634 A721/B749; 235, A112. “From the fact that the existence of outer objects is required for the possibility of a determinate consciousness of our self it does not follow that every intuitive representation of outer things includes at the same time their existence, for that may well be the mere effect of the imagination (in dreams as well as in delusions); but this is possible merely through the reproduction of previous outer perceptions, which, as has been shown, are possible only through the actuality of outer objects”. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason* 328 B278. The same status applies to any epistemological traction one would hope to gain on the pure forms of space and time themselves. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 382 A291/B347.
96. These four permutations together make up Kant’s divisions of nothing, each division corresponding to one of the four sets of categories, respectively (as listed above): *ens imaginarium*, *ens rationis* (the *noumena*), *nihil privativum* (things-in-themselves) and *nihil negativum*. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 383 A292/B348.
97. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 241, A125.
98. When Deleuze says of Oedipus that Tiresias’ prophecy “constitute[s] the pure instant, the pure present from which a past and a future will be produced on a straight line, which is to say a before and after which no longer rhyme”, it is this ‘pure present’ — the conditioning of the synthesis of reproduction in the imagination that supports and is grounded by the transcendental unity of apperception, the subjective form of auto-affection being premised on the latter, which affects its empirical counterpart across the form of time. With the caesura, the pure form of time and the asymmetrical auto-affection of the subject flash, for the first time, into view, illuminating all the parts of time at once: process *and* product. Deleuze, “Untitled lecture 21/3/1978”, *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/67>.



99. Alfredo Ferrarin, in his “Construction and Mathematical Schematism: Kant on the Exhibition of a Concept in Intuition” restates Kant’s argument especially cogently with regards to temporality: “Time is given, as the indeterminate form of our intuition (as the possibility of a serial order): but the order of the succession (its sense) is the result of our positing a relation among representations. This relation, the order thus produced, is itself the unity of a representation of a *quantum*, the whole that combines the parts given in the succession. Inner sense *per se* does not contain any determinate (formal) intuition. It is the apperceptive activity of the understanding ... that connects intuitions in time and *produces* the manifold of time as the representation of before and after. All our representations of objects in sensible intuition are subject to the order of inner sense [the pure form of time] determined by our spontaneity [the understanding].” *Kant-Studien* (January, 1995) 86:2, 143.
100. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 229-230 A101. Deleuze and Guattari also cite Kant’s cinnabar passage in the conclusion to *What is Philosophy?* to invoke the image of thought, referring to the reproductive synthesis of the imagination as an “objective antichaos”, by which we “make an opinion for ourselves, like a sort of ‘umbrella’” against the war below. Deleuze and Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, trans. Graham Burchell and Hugh Tomlinson (London: Verso, 1994), 202.
101. Ferrarin’s analysis of the troubled distinction between the reproductive imagination (which shepherds empirical associations) and the productive imagination (which apprehends and schematises) is instructive here. Despite conflicting descriptions in the *First Critique*, Ferrarin concludes that the syntheses of apprehension and reproduction, and their application in schematisation, are functions of the *productive* imagination. Alfredo Ferrarin, “Construction and Mathematical Schematism: Kant on the Exhibition of a Concept in Intuition”, *Kant-Studien* (January, 1995) 86:2, 151-3.
102. Gilles Deleuze, “Untitled Lecture 04/04/1978”, trans. Melissa McMahon, *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/65>.
103. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 268 B171/A132.
104. “Arising and perishing are not alterations of that which arises or perishes. Alteration is a way of existing that succeeds another way of existing of the very same object. Hence everything that is altered is *lasting*, and only its *state changes*. Thus since this change concerns only the determinations that can cease or begin, we can say, in an expression that seems somewhat paradoxical, that only what persists (the substance) is altered, while that which is changeable does not suffer any alteration but rather a *change*, since some determinations cease and others begin. [...] Substances (in appearance) are the substrata of all time-determinations. The arising of some and the perishing of others would itself remove the sole condition of the empirical unity of time, and the appearances would then be related in two different times, in which existence flowed side by side, which is absurd. For there is *only one* time, in which all different times must not be placed simultaneously but only one after another.” Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 303 A187-9/B230-2.
105. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 256 A145/B185-5.
106. Here Kant again gives the example of the line: “I cannot represent to myself any line, no matter how small it may be, without drawing it in thought, i.e., successively generating all its parts from one point, and thereby first sketching this intuition. It is exactly the same with even the smallest time. I think therein only the successive progress from one moment to another, where through all parts of time and their addition a determinate magnitude of time is finally generated.” Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 286 A162/B202; 290 A166/B207.



107. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 287 (A162;B203).
108. Thus, “space consists only of spaces; time of times”. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 292 A169/B211.
109. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 288 A163/B204.
110. Immanuel Kant, *Opus Postumum*, trans. Eckart Förster and Michael Rosen, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 141.
111. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 291 A168/B210.
112. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 295 A175/B217; 292 A169/B211; 291 A167/B209.
113. Deleuze, “Untitled lecture 21/3/1978”, *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/67>.
114. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 290 A166/B208.
115. Intuition = 0 corresponds to *nihil privativum*, the second division of nothing relative to the categories of quality. See note 96. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 290 A166/B208; 383 A292/B348.
116. Nick Land, *The Thirst for Annihilation* (London: Routledge, 1992), 117.
117. Deleuze, *Kant’s Critical Philosophy*, 12.
118. Reason produces its Ideas by totalising the categories of relation provided by the understanding. From substance it conceives the absolute subject (Soul); from causality, the completed series (World); and from community, the whole of reality (God). Reason “reserves for itself only the absolute totality in the use of concepts, and seeks to carry the synthetic unity, which is thought in the categories, all the way to the absolutely unconditioned”. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 401-2 A326/B383. Kant refers to the Ideas of reason as ‘problems’ consistently throughout the text. See, for example, 605 A669/B697.
119. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 401 A326/B383.
120. Deleuze, *Kant’s Critical Philosophy*, 18.
121. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 36.
122. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 605 A669/B697.
123. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 133.
124. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 134.
125. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 129-167.
126. “Jurists, when they speak of entitlements and claims, distinguish in a legal matter between questions about what is lawful (*quid juris*) and that which concerns the fact (*quid facti*), and since they demand proof of both, they call the first, that which is to establish the entitlement or the legal claim, the *deduction*.” Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 219 A84/B116.
127. Deleuze and Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, 52. See, note 27.
128. Plato, “Timaeus”, 96/91a.
129. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 230.
130. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 136.
131. Deleuze and Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, 54.
132. The most famous invocation of this image being the oft-repeated maxim, “Thoughts without content are empty, intuitions without concepts are blind”. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 193-4 A51/B75. Manus, an Egyptian hierophant, and the ‘Old Man’ of Hölderlin’s third and final draft of *The Death of Empedocles*, who says to Empedocles “Oh, tell us who you are! and who am I? ... are you quite sure of what you see?” (ll. 391, 483) too, is blind, and according to Krell, acts both as Empedocles’ double and a precursor of Tiresias as Hölderlin will figure him in his notes on the Sophocles translations. Hölderlin, *The Death of Empedocles*, 183;



187.

133. Deleuze, "Synthèse et temps 14/3/1978", *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/66>. Deleuze, following Nietzsche, will make much of time no longer abiding by the laws of nature — a point which will be extremely important for the role of thermodynamics in his writing and which we shall return to, in time. "While the laws of nature govern the surface of the world, the eternal return ceaselessly rumbles in this other dimension of the transcendental or the volcanic *spatium*." Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 241.
134. Kant refers to this effect as the "paradox ... of inner sense": "[N]amely, how this presents even ourselves to consciousness only as we appear to ourselves, not as we are in ourselves, since we intuit ourselves only as we are internally *affected*, which seems to be contradictory, since we would have to relate to ourselves passively." Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 257 B152-3.
135. "In all subsumptions of an object under a concept the representation of the former must be *homogenous* with the latter. [T]he pure concepts of the understanding, however, in comparison with empirical (indeed in general sensible) intuitions, are entirely un-homogenous, and can never be encountered in any intuition. Now how is the subsumption of the latter under the former, thus the *application* of the category to appearances possible, since no one would say that the category, e.g. causality, could be so intuited through the senses and is contained in the appearance? [I]t is clear that there must be a third thing, which must stand in homogeneity with the category on the one hand and the appearance on the other, and makes possible the application of the former to the latter. [A] transcendental time-determination is homogenous with the *category* (which constitutes its unity) insofar as it is *universal* and rests on a rule *a priori*. But it is on the other hand homogenous with the *appearance* insofar as *time* is contained in every empirical representation of the manifold. Hence an application of the category to appearances becomes possible by means of the transcendental time-determination which, as the schema of the concept of the understanding, mediates the subsumption of the latter under the former." Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 271-2 A137-9/B176-8.
136. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 288 A163/B204. It is perhaps unnecessary to add that counting inevitably takes on a wholly different significance in the Kantian schema of the straight labyrinth. For Kant, counting is premised on ordinality, yet retains a fidelity to cardinality insofar as the reproductive synthesis cardinalises the succession of temporal apprehension. The "numerical unity" leant to the synthesis of apprehension by the transcendental unity of apperception grounds the possibility of number itself, which Kant defines as "a representation that summarises the successive addition of one (homogenous) unit to another" and "nothing other than the unity of the synthesis of the manifold of a homogenous intuition in general", because "I generate time itself in the apprehension of the intuition" (274 A142-3/B182). The synthesis of reproduction, in counting the manifold, produces time as number. It gives us a definition from which we extrapolate the natural numbers, and therefore, all higher mathematics. This is what underlies Kant's use of arithmetic and his famous example of "5 + 7 = 12" to illustrate *a priori* synthetic judgement. (144 B15-16). Importantly, the synthetic genesis of number *necessarily starts from 1 rather than 0*, which is not a magnitude and therefore falls under the class of *nihil privativum*. (See note 96.) In the original apprehensive synthesis of the manifold under the form of time, we generate an intuition which corresponds to 1, and take from this synthesis the unit of measure or magnitude for all following synthetic operations. The "successive addition" of units presupposes this given unit and in turn, the unity of consciousness that acts on its synthesis. Ferrarin likens the synthesis of succession to the workings of "a metronome" which "makes time assume the shape that it wants" — "it determines its length, its cadence." And, like a metronome, it does so by "disciplining a given one-dimensional



flux” — time as a homogenous continuum. This, Ferrarin argues, reveals the extent to which Kant is unable to truly think plurality. Alfredo Ferrarin, “Construction and Mathematical Schematism: Kant on the Exhibition of a Concept in Intuition”, 166.

If number belongs to mental synthesis, one cannot help but imagine a foreign form of intuition and an attendant, alien, construction of number. A thought experiment that becomes infinitely more interesting when one applies it to the problem of extra-terrestrial communication.

137. See Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 85-6 and Deleuze, “Untitled lecture 28/3/1978”, *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/68>.
138. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 228 A97.
139. In contrast to space (outer sense), time is the form under which auto-affection necessarily takes place.
140. Deleuze, “Untitled lecture 28/3/1978”, *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/68>.
141. Deleuze, “Untitled lecture 21/3/1978”, *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/67>.
142. Karl Marx, *Capital Volume I* (London: Penguin, 1990), 277. It is the opening of Book One, Part Three, “The Production of Absolute Surplus-Value” (where the reader is suddenly ushered behind the curtain of commodity fetishism and onto the factory floor) that dramatises this transition in *Capital Volume I*: “The consumption of labour-power is completed, as in the case of every other commodity, outside the market or the sphere or circulation. Let us therefore, in company with the owner of money and the owner of labour-power, leave this noisy sphere, where everything takes place in the surface and in full view of everyone, and follow them into the hidden abode of production, on whose threshold hangs the notice ‘No admittance except on business’. Here we shall see, not only how capital produces, but how capital is itself produced. The *secret* of profit-making must at last be laid bare.” Marx, *Capital Volume I*, 279-80. Italics added.
143. Marx, *Capital Volume I*, 127.
144. Marx, *Capital Volume I*, 127.
145. Marx, *Capital Volume I*, 128; 129.
146. Marx differs from Kant insofar as capital, as a critical process, is materialised, which leads him to the following conclusion in *Capital Volume III*: “Capital comes more and more to the fore as a social power, whose agent is the capitalist. This social power no longer stands in any possible relation to that which the labour of a single individual can create. It becomes an alienated, independent, social power, which stands opposed to society as an object, and as an object that is the capitalist’s source of power.” Karl Marx, *Capital Volume III*, Chapter 15, “Exposition of the Internal Contradictions of the Law”, *Marxists.org*, <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1894-c3/ch15.htm>.
147. Hölderlin, ‘Notes on the *Oedipus*’, §3.
148. “The abstract machine in itself is destratified, deterritorialized; it has no form of its own (much less substance) and makes no distinction within itself between content and expression, even though outside itself it presides over that distinction and distributes it in strata, domains, and territories. An abstract machine in itself is not physical or corporeal, any more than it is semiotic; it is diagrammatic (it knows nothing of the distinction between the artificial and the natural either). It operates by matter, not by substance; by junction, not by form. Substances and forms are of expression ‘or’ of content. But functions are not yet ‘semiotically’ formed, and



matters are not yet “physically” formed. The abstract machine is pure Matter-Function—a diagram independent of the forms and substances, expressions and contents it will distribute.” Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 156.

149. Deleuze and Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, 57.
150. “When Freud comes up and says that there are certain phenomena which appear in the field of consciousness, what do these phenomena refer to, Freud is Kantian.” Deleuze, “Synthèse et temps 14/3/1978”, *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/66>. This is explicitly confirmable in Freud’s own writings, for example: “The psychoanalytic assumption of unconscious mental activity appears to us as an extension of the corrections undertaken by Kant.” Sigmund Freud, “The Unconscious” in *The Freud Reader*. ed. Peter Gay (New York: WW Norton & Company, 1989), 173.
151. Deleuze, “Synthèse et temps 14/3/1978”, *Les cours de Gilles Deleuze*, <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/66>.
152. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 86.
153. Greenspan, *Capitalism’s Transcendental Time Machine*, 21.
154. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 58. “[Oedipus’] destiny was a forced correspondence with the categorical reversal, being called forth, says Hölderlin, in a climate of plague, of confusion of mind, of universally excited prophetism, in the middle of a dead time, to live the reciprocal communication of the divine and the human in the all-forgetting figure of infidelity as it opens a panic desert of time and space, where hitherto Homeric time reigned, which is to say a time ‘where the heavens and the earth, walked and breathed together in the people of the gods’.” Beaufret, “Hölderlin et Sophocle”, 29-30.
155. Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 84. Laing quotes Bateson — “It would appear that once precipitated into psychosis the patient has a course to run. He is, as it were, embarked upon a voyage of discovery which is only completed by his return to the normal world, to which he comes back with insights different from those of the inhabitants who never embarked on such a voyage. Once begun, a schizophrenic episode would appear to have as definite a course as an initiation ceremony — a death and rebirth — into which the novice may have been precipitated by his family life or by adventitious circumstances, but which in its course is largely steered by endogenous process” — and proposes a therapy for schizophrenia that enables patients to “find their way further into inner space and time, and back again”. Laing, following Bateson, labels this process an “initiation” which “[p]sychiatrically ... would appear as ex-patients helping future patients to go mad.” His sketch of the steps such a process would involve reads as a synopsis of the Oedipus plays, including later, a confrontation with the Sphinx: “(i) a voyage from outer to inner,  
(ii) from life to a kind of death,  
(iii) from going forward to a going back,  
(iv) from temporal movement to temporal standstill,  
(v) from mundane time to aeonic time,  
(vi) from the ego to the self,  
(vii) from being outside (post-birth) back into the womb of all things (pre-birth),  
and then subsequently a return voyage from  
(1) inner to outer,  
(2) from death to life,  
(3) from the movement back to a movement once more forward,  
(4) from immortality back to mortality,





- (5) from eternity back to time,
- (6) from self to a new ego,
- (7) from a cosmic foetalisation to an existential rebirth."

R. D. Laing, *The Politics of Experience and The Bird of Paradise* (London: Penguin, 1970), 97; 106; 111.

- 156. Luce Irigaray, "Paradox A Priori" in *Speculum of the Other Woman*, trans. Gillian C. Gill (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1985), 211.
- 157. Nick Land, "Art as Insurrection" in *Fanged Noumena: Collected Writings 1987-2007* (Falmouth: Urbanomic, 2012), 147.
- 158. Irigaray, "Paradox A Priori", 213.
- 159. Jon Roffe, *Muttering for the Sake of Stars* (Melbourne: Surplus, 2012), 22.
- 160. Land, *The Thirst for Annihilation*, 2; Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 81.
- 161. Land, *The Thirst for Annihilation*, 203-4. Italics added.
- 162. Nick Land, "Shamanic Nietzsche" in *Fanged Noumena: Collected Writings 1987-2007* (Falmouth: Urbanomic, 2012), 227.
- 163. Lovecraft, "Through the Gates of the Silver Key", *The Dreams in the Witch House and Other Weird Stories* (London: Penguin, 2004), 268. See Part 0.
- 164. "In the beginning, under the administration of the *dogmatists*, [metaphysics'] rule was *despotic*. Yet because her legislation still retained traces on ancient barbarism, this rule gradually degenerated through internal wars into complete *anarchy*; and the sceptics, a *kind of nomads* who abhor all permanent cultivation of the soil, shattered civil unity from time to time. But since there were fortunately only a few of them, they could not prevent the dogmatists from continually attempting to rebuild, thought never according to a plan unanimously accepted among themselves." Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 99-100 Aix; "As for the sophists, I believe them to be true experts at making all kinds of wonderful speeches on other subjects, but I'm afraid that, perhaps because *they roam from city to city without having made homes for themselves in one particular place*, they miss the mark when it comes to describing the many different kinds of things that men who are both philosophers and statesmen achieve in the real world in warfare and on the battlefield, and put into words in their negotiations with other individuals." Plato, "Timaeus", 6/19e. Italics added.