

Williams, James.

Gilles Deleuze's Philosophy of Time: A critical Introduction and Guide. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011

3

The second synthesis of time

A TIME WITHIN WHICH TIME PASSES

In *Difference and Repetition*, after his study of the first synthesis of time, Deleuze moves on to the second synthesis which we can loosely describe as a synthesis of the past. This synthesis stands as a condition for memory. Like the first, the second synthesis is passive and it is also a condition for active syntheses. Time is therefore manifold for Deleuze, with different syntheses interacting in a fractured and complex manner, allowing for dislocations and changes in perspective. These fractures and rifts are constitutive of his philosophy of time. Time is radically fragmentary; as are those processes making and made by time. Much as things exist as time-makers, they also exist as made by fractured and dislocated times, themselves made by other processes. Time and process coexist like reflections in a hall of broken mirrors, offering multiple perspectives to follow and recreate, but never a full image.

When he passes from first to second passive synthesis, Deleuze straight away tackles the difficult question of why a second synthesis of time is necessary. This is important, because it could seem that given the past and future as dimensions of the present, itself defined as a contraction of time, there is no need for any further times. It also invites the question of the relation between the two times. Are they dependent upon one another? If so, how do they interact? Does one take precedence over the other?¹ Is there an order of times, perhaps a priority of the present over the past? More precisely and more awkwardly, what is the relation between the second passive synthesis of time, defined as the synthesis of memory, and

the past as dimension of the synthesis of the present? What is the difference between active and passive memory in this contraction of time? Finally, should the two times be considered distinct, and if so, exactly how distinct, or should they be seen as part of one and the same broader time that includes both of them?

The first step in Deleuze's argument for the second synthesis of time is based on his work on the first and returns to three features we noted in the previous chapter: *the first synthesis is originary but not a pure origin; the present in the first synthesis of time is a passing present; the present is constituted of many durations or stretches that overlap.* The first of these features sets the scene in terms of the relations between times and introduces an important argument on foundations to follow later. The first synthesis is a process that makes time, it is originary, but that does not mean it is original, in the sense of a pure origin, and independent of any other time. This therefore leaves it free to be founded on another time. It also means that the question of foundations and structure of these times will have to be considered in depth and explained further, in order to explain how an originary time depends on another. The question of foundations is critical for understanding Deleuze's work on time, but more importantly for applications of that work. Despite its status as an originary process, the present in the first synthesis of time is not eternal, it passes and it passes in a very particular way. The present of the first synthesis of time is a multiplicity of syntheses, of stretches or durations. This leaves open the difficulty of how all its stretches are related, a problem concerning the wholeness and completion of the synthesis, but also concerning order of priority and interactions in time. We saw this latter problem in the problem of selection in the previous chapter: is it contingent as to which duration or synthesis we begin with and relate to all the others?

Once again, the key statement in Deleuze's argument is italicised in his text: 'We must not reject the necessary conclusion: *there must be another time in which the first synthesis of time operates*' (DRf, 108). The statement is based on a paradox, itself drawn from the three features outlined above. As we saw in the deductions in the first synthesis of time, paradoxes have a two-fold function in Deleuze's work. On the one hand, they have a critical function demonstrating the limits of given claims and positions, most often those based on common sense and on hidden presuppositions about identities. On the other hand, paradoxes have a generative function, that is, the paradox generates a problem which itself leads to series of crea-

tive and speculative partial solutions, where partial means that the problem recurs but transformed.

The paradox of the present is 'to constitute time, but to pass into this constituted time' (DRf, 108). It is paradoxical because it sets up a fork of two contradictions. How can we pass into something we have constituted, if we have to constitute it before we can pass into it, yet if we are already passing away while we constitute it? If the present passes away first, then it cannot constitute the past, since the present is already gone and a new present must constitute the past. If the present constitutes the past first, then it must pass away into a past that it has not constituted, since there will be an interval, a difference, between the constituted past and the one the present passes away into. *Drop a leaf into a river (constitute the past), then drop another leaf (pass away) and the two leaves will remain separate, thereby contradicting the idea that you constituted the past as you passed away.* It could be answered that passing away and constituting take place at the same time, but this would not be satisfactory because Deleuze's account of the first synthesis of time sets it out as a contraction involving dimensions that are not simultaneous, a stretch or synthesis of the past and a synthesis of the future. Perhaps then it could be answered that though the syntheses are not simultaneous, they are indivisible. Therefore constituting and passing away cannot be treated separately (*there are never two distinct thrown leaves*). This answer is unsatisfactory because it would imply that no present ever passes because it is eternally prolonged into the future it expects, which would contradict Deleuze's arguments against the eternity of the present in his work on the first synthesis of time and his account of the element and case structure of synthesis, as shown in the previous chapter.

Deleuze's answer to the paradox is to separate the time into which the present passes away and the originary first synthesis. In a characteristically rapid move, he therefore claims that there must be another time in which the first operates. There is a translation issue here since in the current translation this is given as 'another time in which the first synthesis can occur' (DRe, 79). The use of occurrence is not quite right, since it loses the process-like quality of the syntheses of time. It is not that they happen, but rather that they make and do. This is important because it could seem that the first synthesis simply passes away into another time as locus or unchanged receptacle. That is not correct since he is going to show how there is a transformation in this passing away of the first synthesis of time with the second. It is a two-way reciprocal determination,

rather than a passing into an inert and unchanged medium or collection. Both syntheses of time are active in many different ways and passivity must itself be understood as a process in Deleuze, rather than inertia or indifference. So the meaning of 'to pass away' should not be seen as an inert falling into disuse. It is quite the contrary. *To pass away is to pass away in a synthesis of the past as memory defined as the second synthesis of time.* Reciprocally, though, this second synthesis will have a return determination on the first. We shall see this in the next sections when we discuss memory or pure past as completed by the living present.

It is now possible to observe two important principles of Deleuze's speculative metaphysics: he does not allow for nothingness or a void as an explanatory principle; all processes are at least two-way, but as such they are asymmetrical and, even where they appear to be symmetrical as in the case of causality, it is because they are considered incompletely. We can see both these assumptions at work in the passage from first synthesis of time to the second. In deducing this passage, Deleuze refers to necessity in two consecutive sentences ('necessary consequence' and 'necessary referral', though the second is omitted from the English translation). However, this is no simple logical necessity, since it does not follow from formal logical operations. Rather, it is speculative because it follows logically only if we accept the structure of a complex speculative metaphysics. This shows strongly when we voice the objection to the deduction that the passing present does not necessarily have to pass into anything. Why could it not simply fall into nothingness or be voided? Such an option is never considered as valid within Deleuze's metaphysics. When things pass, they pass into something else according to a process: *the first synthesis of time must operate in another.*²

There are at least two ways in which this premise can therefore fail. First, if there is empirical evidence of the kind of void or nothingness that would make a reference to passing away into something unnecessary – memory, in this case. Second, if another metaphysics including nothingness provides an explanatory structure that is more creative (intense and enriching) and more satisfactory (more consistent and more comprehensive). For the first, passage into complete nothingness seems unpromising, though perhaps some cases can be found in cosmology – black holes, for instance. However, it might not be necessary to seek out a case of absolute nothingness or pure void, since given Deleuze's characterisation of the second synthesis of time as memory and given his requirement

for two-way processes, evidence of annihilation of things seems to offer a good counter to his position.³ Why say that it is necessary to assume that there is a second synthesis of time as memory into which the first must pass, when contractions such as a beating heart stop, rot, disintegrate and disappear not into memory but into ashes and far-spread organic matter? This means that in following Deleuze's work on the second synthesis of time, it will be important to find answers to the objection that present syntheses do not pass into a second synthesis but are annihilated, at least as far as any two-way process or active return of them is concerned. The passing of time would then not be a passing into memory but a passing into oblivion, joining the forlorn ranks of billions of dead and forgotten beings.⁴

The next steps in Deleuze's argument appear doubtful from the point of view not only of this objection, but also of the second concern listed above on whether Deleuze offers us the most robust metaphysics. It is at first sight dubious because he uses what seems like highly rhetorical and metaphorical language to draw a distinction between two processes: foundation and founding.⁵ Foundation is described as 'concerning the soil' while founding 'comes rather from the sky' (DRf, 108).⁶ Nonetheless, there is a rigorous interpretation of the distinction; it begins with the earlier originary and original division. The first synthesis of time is a foundation because it is a process of 'occupation' and 'possession', that is, it determines an open space according to patterns and to differences. For instance, the animal marking of a territory or the occupation of a patch of earth by weeds is a process of foundation. A space is occupied by a repetitive pattern. It operates through repetitions and habits, and therefore works through the first synthesis of time as living and passing present. Yet the foundation is still confused. Since the durations of living presents overlap, and since they all pass away, the form and determination of that passing away are still not given. The animal pushed from its territory by a predator and the plant overtaken by a hardier weed seem to fall away together into an indeterminate chaos, a nothingness exactly in opposition to Deleuze's concern with memory. Yet, each can also be recalled, so what is the condition for that recall of past things, for the fact of such recall?

Deleuze's preliminary answer is that this must be a process that determines the 'property' and 'appropriateness' of foundation in relation to a summit (DRf, 108). It shows how a passing present belongs with others. What this means is that founding determines

the relation between the passing presents and living presents. Instead of having a perpetually shifting ground, or one that remains eternally the same, the second synthesis assigns proper well-determined relations between passing presents. It does not make them pass by engulfing or consuming them, but rather makes them pass by giving them a well-determined relation to what is to come. This can be understood through an example of two opposed procedures. Two monasteries collect books from two rival cities whose conflict threatens their records of their past victories and of their cultural achievements. One monastery, in the grips of an extreme piety, views all human records as a sinful attempt to usurp the divine function of final reckoning. It therefore incinerates every book bequeathed to it, ditching hot ashes down the cliff edge it stands upon. The other order sees human memories as a way to honour the divine plan. It therefore constructs a great library, carefully organising books according to date and subject, in a vast edifice destined to outgrow all other monastic buildings. After the battles, one city will have seen its history pass, but only in the sense of destruction and forgetting. The other has also lost earlier times into the past, but this time they have been made to pass according to a determination of a proper relation of past to present. For Deleuze, only the more tempered holy order has truly made the present pass through a founding, because each present can only pass if it already has a determined relation to other presents, and this is provided by its passing away as given as appropriate rather than consumption into oblivion.

There is an important distinction to be made here in reading Deleuze's concept of foundation, defined as making things pass in a determined and appropriate manner. It should not be understood as meaning that there is a single proper and determinate manner, free of the test of doubt and standing alone as the one true foundation. This is a view of foundation in philosophy running counter to his speculative and inherently multiple approaches. *The necessity of foundation is only a requirement for a determination of appropriateness, not the final complete determination.* This is a far-reaching point because it sets up oppositions to other philosophical positions, for instance, to Cartesian foundationalism;⁷ yet it also sets very difficult restrictions on Deleuze's work on the second synthesis of time. This is because the second synthesis of time as that which makes the present pass through a process of foundation cannot depend upon or lead to a finally established and identified true foundation. It has to allow the present to be determined differently as proper and appropri-

ate. This allows us to understand his later work on the pure past as second synthesis of time and on destiny and freedom, to be covered respectively in the next two sections. The pure past will be defined as determining the form of the passing present – that it must pass, and how it must pass – but it does not determine or cause the content of any particular passing present. The pure past cannot be the cause of the present or completely determine it. Deleuze's philosophy cannot be deterministic.

An objection to Deleuze's argument helps us to understand its direction but also its difficulty. Why claim that a founding of passed presents is necessary, if recall depends not on going back to past presents, but rather on inspecting present codes and signs? There is no actual going back in time when a genetic code from earlier ages still operates in present organisms. There is no going back in time when an archaeologist unearths forgotten settlements, or when a pathologist reads signs of earlier violence on a shattered skull. There is no going back in time in scree shaped by a long-gone freezing and thawing of rocks. All such reference points are inspected in the present and have no reverse effects on the past. So the model of memory taken by Deleuze might be a misleading one, if we agree that memory is not a container of representations of the past that we can access and use to go back into the past. If memory is a *present* store of codes, presumably laid out in the past, but operating in the present, it looks like a very bad candidate for the function of determining past presents, because memory *causes* the current present to change into the future but does nothing to the past. This is also shown by the monastery example: they only make the past by keeping it for the present in the present. It is matter of current record, rather than a process relating a present to something into which it is supposed to pass.

The answer to this objection draws on two aspects of Deleuze's work on time. First, the second synthesis of time is, like the first, a passive synthesis. The objection turns on appeals to active cases of memory or the use of recorded code, where active does not necessarily mean deployed by an active subject, but rather a process passing from a larger set of particulars to a smaller representative set; for instance, in the way a record of shades of colours might consist of fewer types than the many variations actually encountered, or in the way a technical museum collects only the most representative machines from earlier periods. For Deleuze, however, the passive synthesis making the passing presents appropriate does not pass to representations, nor does it pass to a limited number

taken from within a greater set. Instead, the passive synthesis of the past is a synthesis not of particulars but of levels, that is, not of the passing presents themselves, but of the conditions for any ordering of them. For all passing presents to be ordered and related the successive levels created by their passing have to be connected or, to use Deleuze's term, they have to be encased in one another. This brings us to the second dominant aspect of his work on time operating in the second synthesis. His argument for the second synthesis is a transcendental deduction. He is deducing the conditions for an empirical process in relation to necessary principle. Here, this means deducing the synthesis required to determine how active memory through representation is possible given the passing of presents.

So though the first moves towards the second synthesis of time appear rhetorical, they lead into a careful deduction. The helpful clue for following this deduction lies in Deleuze's use of 'Memory' as capitalised for the process of the second synthesis and 'memory' for active memory: 'Habit is the originary synthesis of time, constituting the life of the passing present; Memory is the fundamental synthesis of time, constituting the being of the past (making the present pass)' (DRf, 109). The being of the past is not the representations, records or codes of an active memory in the present. It is the condition of possibility for all the different active memories, their differences, but also their connections, above all their connections with the passing presents that came before them – all of them. Note in passing how the English translation for '*faire passer*' in the last quoted passage can be misleading in this context. '*Faire passer*' must not be understood as 'causes the present to pass' (DRe, 80). It is instead a making understood as a process of determination; to determine the form of all passing presents rather than causing particular ones.

According to a transcendental deduction, 'to be the condition of' is above all not to be a cause, because what is sought is a general condition for all manifestations of something (passing presents and active memories). So it is a deduction of a process different from the processes of the forms it is the condition for. This therefore leads to two important consequences repeated throughout *Difference and Repetition*. Condition and conditioned must be distinguished. This is because they interact according to different processes, not only internally, in the sense that the relations between habits are different from the relations between memories, but also between themselves, in the sense of the determining relation

of Habit to Memory and the determining relation of Memory to Habit. Deleuze's transcendental deductions do not lead to separate realms. They lead to distinctions between processes such that they condition one another asymmetrically (or do not determine one another in the same way, or according to one and the same relation – such as cause, for instance). Causal processes are symmetrical in the sense that they can be reversed and run in exactly the same way: from cause to effect, or from effect to cause, the pattern will be the same. This explains the difficulty for causal accounts in terms of explaining the arrow of time, since there is no reason to assign an arrow from past to future. The whole pattern of causes and effects is fully determined and as such is neither asymmetrical nor placed in time, if time is considered to be irreversible. For Deleuze, as we have seen in the previous chapter, the arrow follows from an asymmetry in the living present. A different asymmetry governs the relations of Habit to Memory, of the first synthesis of time to the second. It is internal to the first synthesis that time must necessarily go from past to future. Once further asymmetrical processes are taken account of, we shall see many further consequences, such as the impossibility of a satisfactory representation of the past and the impossibility of a complete obliteration of anything that has been present.

THE DEDUCTION OF THE PURE PAST

Deleuze's deduction of the pure past as the second synthesis of time begins with a distinction drawn on the basis of an opposition between particular and general. As we saw in the previous chapter, he used a similar move when explaining the distinction between the syntheses of the past and of the future in the living present, where the former retained particulars and the latter expected generalities. His argument for the second synthesis reverses this order by distinguishing the past as that which a present passes into, from the past as that which is synthesised in the present. The past for passing presents is general and not particular, because it is a condition for any passing present which can then be aimed at and represented in active memory. Thus the aiming present as active memory is now particular, since it approaches the past in a particular way and for a particular aim, whereas the past as condition for any possible past present that could then be aimed at is general: 'By contrast from the point of view of the reproduction of memory, it is the past (as mediation of presents) that has become general, and the present (former as well as present) that has become particular' (DRf, 109). The

past as mediation of present is the condition for their relations, for instance, the aiming at a past present from an actual one. In terms of the objection to the need for a second synthesis, the problematic move here is the distinction between particular and general. Why claim that the past is general rather than a collection of particulars? Thus, for instance, when selecting from a set of past elements according to a present code in order to build or evolve a new being, we could say that the past elements are in no way general; they are a very precise particular set, carried in the present, that we need to select within according to a code and perhaps a further set of environmental constraints (*What needs to be taken from this list of elements for a successful being to be constructed in this environment?*).

Deleuze first answers these objections by looking at active memory in the human mind as described by Hume's associationism. The point is not to build an argument on the association of ideas through resemblance and contiguity such that an active memory searches through the past for things that are either close to or resemble current ones because that is the only way any ideas can be associated.⁸ Instead, it is to demonstrate the limits of active memory as representation in terms of what it can pick out from the past. Active memory, as association, only picks out artificial signs. As shown in the previous chapter on the first synthesis of time, these signs are not about the synthesis of the past in the living present, but instead depend on a distinction drawn between past and present such that something in the present is taken to represent something in the past. There is therefore a disconnection in operations of active memory between the representation and what it must pick out from the past. Active memory is representational in its mode of operation because unlike a process of passive retention, where a whole series is drawn together in one stretch or duration, active memory is a divided process: there is an identification of a set of current requirements which are then taken into the past. Therefore a representation is necessarily taken into the past.

After an argument with your work colleagues, you slam shut the door to your lab and storm off, only to realise that you forgot to bring the controversial experiment results with you. Standing outside the lab, you try to remember where you put them, so you can sneak back in and out as quickly as possible, avoiding further recriminations. Before opening the door again, you have to remember exactly where the research folder was placed. You represent it to yourself and its place in the lab. It might be there, it might not; you cannot be sure. So the lab – the past – becomes a general locus,

not fully grasped or represented, where you can position a representation in relation to an actual representation of yourself and of the missing dossier. The human focus of such an example is not relevant, since a machine searching through a database involves the same separation when the searched-for item is first input prior to its identification in the database. At that point the item is held in relation to a general database, that is, one where its presence in the database is not yet given as an output. Before it is confirmed, that position is a representation of a searched-for item and a general database where it is a possible item. Once it is confirmed it remains a representation in relation to the general database associated with the first enquiry though it is assigned a particular place in the output. Deleuze's answer to the objection that the past is a set of particular pasts is therefore that this is not the case in relation to an active process setting off into the past in search of something. The search, the aiming towards the past, is directed at a general past. His next move towards the second synthesis of time will then be to deduce the form of this general past with greater precision.

When a past present is actually represented, this representation also includes a representation of that actual representation to itself. This is because once a past present has been selected in the general past through memory it is also positioned in relation to the aim or search in the present that set out to find it. For instance, when you run through your memories of the inside of the lab and settle on a particular location for the folder of data, you presuppose the first state where you actually did not remember where the folder was. You can reflect on this state as well as on the later search. Similarly, the output screen responding to a database request presupposes and has to relate to the initial request for it to make any sense. Otherwise, we would have to cope with Dadaist computers, randomly announcing search results with no initial request or source (*The answer might well be '342' but what was the question?*). Or searches between two levels of machine memory would break down at the point where the searched memory returned to the initial one which had not recorded the object of the search in some way.

So any active memory increases the past by a level, that is, it makes the initial enquiry into the past become an indexed part of the past. However, the status of that initial moment is different from all others within the represented memory. The passing actual present that set out to recollect has a different status to the ones it set to search within: 'The actual present is not treated like the future object of a memory, but as that which is reflected at the same time

as it forms the remembrance of the former present' (DRf, 109–10). This leads Deleuze to conclude – in a very rapid step – that two processes are at work in the active synthesis of memory: reproduction and reflection. This is comprehensible though when we look at the two distinct ways in which the presents are represented. When it is a particular former present represented as the aim of a search, we have recollection and memory. When the present that embarked on the search is represented we have reflection, because it is represented to itself with the added element of the memory. The moment of reflection is also one of understanding, for instance, because it allows for an understanding of whether the searched-for item has been successfully identified or not.

Active memory therefore implies successive levels in the past, as each reflexive moment becomes past and indexes another layer: (((Past + R') + R'') + R'''). These layers contain one another and Deleuze searches for the condition of this property of containment: 'The whole problem is: under what condition?' (DRf, 110). On first reading, it is not obvious why he needs to search for a further condition here, since he has already explained how the levels are constituted and indexed on active memory. However, the key to this is that the study of the particular example of active memory is but a case of a wider property that needs to be explained in terms of its formal conditions: how is it possible for any past present to be reproduced in the actual present? Here is Deleuze's answer: 'A former present is reproducible and an actual present can be reflected through the pure element of the past, as past in general, as *a priori* past' (DRf, 110).

For any former present and any possible actual present to be reproducible, the past cannot be a particular collection of former presents, since this could discount some further possibilities. It must instead be a general past, that is, one that allows for any reproduction. It must therefore not be a past dependent on a particular experience of presents, a subset of occurrences, and must hence be *a priori* (prior to any given experience). Furthermore, since it is not a collection of particulars, it is pure, in the sense of not characterised by or limited by any particular set. Deleuze frequently uses this special meaning of pure in *Difference and Repetition*, where pure means free of actual identities, of particular beings and of any representations. The conditioning process ('another (transcendental) passive synthesis proper to memory itself') does not involve the same processes as the conditioned: 'the (empirical) passive synthesis of habit' (DRf, 110).

Deleuze then develops the idea of the pure past on the basis of a reading of Bergson's *Matter and Memory*. This should not be seen as implying that Deleuze's concepts and arguments are the same as Bergson's. On the contrary, they are developments of them. This is an important point for the study of Deleuze's work on cinema in relation to his work in *Difference and Repetition*, since as we shall see in Chapter 7 Deleuze's cinema books are closer to Bergson's version than his earlier interpretation. The explicit aim in *Difference and Repetition* is to explain exactly what the pure past is, in relation once again to a series of paradoxes. The pattern of this construction on the basis of critical and productive paradoxes is instructive in terms of understanding the general traits of Deleuze's philosophy of time, since we might have expected a philosophy to seek to avoid such paradoxes, or reject hypothetical theories of time because they lead to such paradoxes. In fact, one of the distinctive features of Deleuze's philosophy of time is to embrace paradoxes for their productive power. This is related to the power ascribed to problems in *Difference and Repetition*; like problems, paradoxes cannot be resolved but must rather be transformed creatively within a necessarily speculative model. It could be said that paradoxes prepare the way for problems through a critical clearing of the commonsense certainties of a field and through the generation of a structure of opposed, yet connected and irreducible principles. Deleuze identifies three paradoxes relevant to the pure past in *Matter and Memory*. These are: the past must be contemporaneous with the present that it was; all the past must coexist with the new present in relation to which it is past; and the pure element of the past pre-exists the passing present. Rephrased in more simple terms, the first three paradoxes are: since the past adds nothing to the present that passes into it, it must be contemporaneous with that present; since the past must be contemporaneous with each passing present, all the past is contemporaneous with each passing present; and since all the past is contemporaneous with each passing present, the past is contemporary with all of time and pre-exists any passing present.⁹

In order to understand the way these paradoxes work in Deleuze's argument, it is helpful to separate their critical and productive functions. Critically, they work against the idea of the past as a collection of particular past presents and hence against the idea of active memory as sufficiently determined by such an idea, as the power to recall such past presents. They therefore also support the transcendental deduction of another version of the past, the pure past, not resembling such a collection. For instance, the past must be

contemporaneous with the present since otherwise the past would have to be different from the present it was. If we could then take time travellers back in time, they would necessarily find situations different from those they had experienced in the present (*I was not standing there!*): 'We cannot believe that the past is constituted after it has been present, nor when a new present appears' (DRf, 111). Yet, this is difficult because then we have no way of explaining how a present passes if there is no difference between the past and the present that it was. As soon as the time travellers landed back in time, they would be completely back where they were and time would begin at that point, necessitating an erasure of their memories, disappearance of the time machine and so on: 'If the past had waited for a new present in order to constitute itself as past, the former present would never pass nor the new one arrive' (DRf, 111). This is because the new present can change nothing in the former one.

The move to the pure past in this first paradox is then to set the past within the passing present contemporaneous with it but not identical to it. However, though the past and the passing present are contemporaneous, they have different forms. So the creative move is to replace the idea that the past is the same as the present that was, with the idea that the past is a different kind of condition for the passing of the present occurring with the present or contemporaneously: 'A present would never pass, if it was not past "at the same time" as it was present; a present would never be constituted, if it was not first constituted "at the same time" that it was present' (DRf, 111). Deleuze has therefore replaced a notion of simultaneity where two things of the same kind are simultaneous, with a relation of contemporaneity between an actual present that can be represented (as present or past) and a different element, the pure past, accompanying every present and making it pass. In deducing the pure past as different in form from the present, Deleuze avoids the paradoxes generated by the identity of the past and present. This, however, does not tell us much about the pure past, about how it makes the present pass, or what it is. So he proceeds to the next paradox, about the coexistence of all of the past with any present, in order to show further aspects of the pure past.

This second paradox depends on the same assumptions as the first. If there is no difference between the past and the present that it was, then the whole of the past must accompany each new present, since otherwise we would have a way of distinguishing the past and the present on the basis of the new present. If we travel

back in time at different yet close times to different pasts, then we will have to explain how those pasts became different and we cannot do so without contradiction of the identity of the past and the present that it was (*Last time we came back to this time, the sky was grey and the phone box was bigger. How can that be?*). So it is the same time and the whole of time that accompany each new present. Yet this whole of time cannot be a collection of representations, as has already been shown. So now we know that the pure past is the whole of the past and cannot change in relation to each new present in the way a collection of copies of presents might: 'That's why, far from being a dimension of time, the past is the synthesis of the whole of time and the present and future are only its dimensions' (DRf, 111). Here, the relations of times in terms of dimensions have changed from the first synthesis of time, where the past and future were dimensions of a contraction in the present. In the pure past, the present becomes a dimension of the past.

The importance of the idea of dimensions is two-fold: it stresses how in each synthesis there is only one time, respectively the present and the past, for the first and second synthesis; it also specifies different processes within that unique time, allowing different dimensions to be defined. This is where Deleuze's path into the second synthesis is necessarily somewhat misleading since, because it begins with the active memory and the search for the condition for the passing present, it leads us to retain the present as independent of the past within the second synthesis. This is not at all the case. In the second synthesis, the present is the most contracted state of the passive synthesis of all of the past. It is no longer a synthesis of a particular pattern from the past in the present, but rather a dimension of an ongoing synthesis of all of the past in the past. We therefore have two sides of any present (as we shall see, there will be another with the third synthesis of time). There is the present as contracted synthesis, a particular stretch in the present, and there is the present as the most contracted state of the all of the past, of the pure past. Neither of these times can be reduced to one another and Deleuze's philosophy of time is therefore one where time is only complete when taken from different sides or perspectives: a time of the living present and a time of passing present in relation to the pure past.

The present as first synthesis of time is necessarily accompanied by a synthesis of all of the past. This means that any present determined as a limited stretch or contraction must pass, because the past as synthesis is an ongoing process of becoming that determines

every such present as passing. In turn, this provides the response, in terms of the pure past, to the paradox stating that the past must precede the present that it makes pass or engulfs. It precedes it because the present is only a dimension of the pure past that must therefore pre-exist it. The pure past is synthesised before each present:

The paradox of pre-existence therefore completes the other two: each past is contemporary to the present that it was, the whole of the past coexists with the present in relation to which it is past, but the pure element of the past in general pre-exists the passing present.

(DRf, 111)

We must pay very close attention to the choice of vocabulary here. There is a shift through this quoted passage along different relations of past and present. The past is *contemporary* to a present that *has past*. Contemporaneity is posited on a present that is no longer a living present. The whole of the past *coexists* with a present *in relation to which it is past*. Coexistence is posited on a present that can return to it in active memory. It is the condition for such activity; active memory could not return to the past unless they coexisted. The past in general *pre-exists* the *passing present*. Pre-existence is in relation to a present that is made to pass. Pre-existence is the condition for the passing present. *A rotten apple falls. When fallen it is contemporary to the whole of the past. As it is falling, it coexists with the pure past; both changing with the fall. The apple can only become past, though, because the past pre-exists it.*

However, when viewed from a present independent of the past, the paradox of pre-existence remains. How could the past precede the present it is the past of? It must do so, if the whole of the past comes before each new present. In the second synthesis of time, the importance of the statement that the present becomes the most contracted dimension of the past lies in the reversal of the roles of maker. When the past is the dimension, as in the living present studied in the previous chapter, events in the present make the past as a synthesis in the present. On the other hand, when the present is the dimension of the pure past, the present becomes something made. It is not made in the sense of the creation of particular characteristics, but rather in terms of essential properties, the main one of which is that every present must pass and is accompanied by the pure past. According to Bergson's metaphor, as reported by Deleuze, the present is the tip of an infinite cone which stands for the pure past:

The present is only the most contracted degree of the past coexisting with it, if the past first coexists with itself at an infinity of degrees of relaxation and diverse contraction, at an infinity of levels (therein lies the sense of the famous Bergsonian metaphor of the cone, or fourth paradox of the past).

(DRf, 112)

According to the metaphor, the present must pass because the cone is itself a process of becoming that is misunderstood if we take an identification or representation of it or of the present as true representations of the cone. Such representations are necessary yet always miss that which they try to represent: 'But truth is that the general idea always escapes us, as soon as we attempt to fix one or other of these two extremities' (Bergson, 1959: 302).

These last lines are Bergson's and it is instructive to read his versions of the situation of the present as a dimension of the past, since they are more dramatic and less formal and paradoxical than Deleuze's: 'Practically, we only perceive the past, the pure present being the ungraspable progress of the past gnawing at the present' (Bergson, 1959: 291). Bergson's much greater emphasis on observation distances the two treatments of memory. He studies memory through a close analysis of consciousness and in terms of a critique of various accounts of mind, in particular associationism. Bergson's argument does not strictly identify paradoxes, but rather demonstrates incoherence in representational, content-driven and spatial accounts of consciousness and of time by showing how they lead to contradictions. Each *reductio ad absurdum* is then shown to be avoided if we give a different account of the workings of consciousness, such as the claim that 'we only perceive the past', that is, we only perceive a duration or stretch of time limited by an empty pure present.

This contrast with Bergson draws out a number of features of Deleuze's mode of argument and suggests a further series of critical points to be made against it. The following passage from *Matter and Memory* involves a different use of the concept of condition to the transcendental one at work in *Difference and Repetition*:

Our entire past psychological life conditions our present state, without determining it in a necessary manner; it also reveals itself in entirety in our character, although none of the past states is manifested explicitly in the character. Together, these two conditions ensure a real, though unconscious, existence to each of the past psychological states.

(Bergson, 1959: 289)

We can see here that 'condition' has a different meaning to Deleuze's. Bergson is not deducing a general transcendental condition for a formal process (such as the passing away of the present). Instead, like Deleuze, he is offering an alternative to the concept of cause, but unlike Deleuze, he is doing so in order to give an account of how each individual consciousness relates to its past as shown in the true operation of memory. This is where we can raise the question of the legitimacy of Deleuze's work when compared with Bergson's. What is the validity of an account of the past that does not base itself on a scientific account of causality (or some other contemporary candidate for explaining relations between states of affairs scientifically) but equally does not observe the operations of memory in detail or offer a full theory of memory in relation to consciousness, but instead constructs a speculative transcendental frame with abstract terms such as the pure past?

DESTINY AND FREEDOM

One of the answers to an objection to Deleuze on the grounds that he does not observe memory or consciousness in a thorough or consistent way combines two features of his work in *Difference and Repetition*. He is not primarily concerned with human memory or consciousness, but rather in a general study of repetition in relation to time. He is not constructing a philosophy according to an empirical approach, but rather combining a minimal observational element with a series of transcendental deductions guided by a speculative conceptual frame. These features are brought into his work on time immediately after his study of the role of paradoxes in the deduction of the pure past as the second synthesis of time.

First, Deleuze draws a distinction in the way repetition works in the first and second syntheses and therefore in the passive syntheses of habit and of memory. The difference is important because it develops the idea of repetition much further in the direction of his new conception of its form. This is made possible by focusing on the difference between a repetition based on the succession of elements (as explained in the previous chapter) and a repetition understood as degrees of contraction of a whole 'that is in itself a coexistent totality' (DRf, 112). The distinction is more easily approached through an analogy. If you take a shelf of books by your favourite authors and add the latest one to be published, you contract a series of elements in a novel manner, for instance, in drawing out an unforeseen comic element in all of them. This would be an

analogy for the first synthesis, where the past is a dimension of the present as contraction. However, if you take all the past degrees of emotions that could potentially be reawakened in a new reading of any book, you have a totality in itself. Nonetheless, this totality can be contracted differently in terms of the degrees of its internal relations in relation to different circumstances. For instance, some relations can become more important, others less so. When the present contraction, with its novel comic element, is made to pass into the whole it constitutes a new level for it where all the degrees are present but in a novel set of relations. There is no repetition of elements in this whole, nor can it be organised into a sequence. It does though allow for variations in degree where the most contracted variation, the one at the highest level, is defined as the present.

Second, Deleuze applies his work on levels and dimensions of time to the example of 'a spiritual life' in order to show its implications for the way we understand repetition, destiny, determinism and freedom in such a life (DRf, 113). The choice of words here is somewhat awkward, since contemporary definitions of 'spiritual' associate the term primarily with the idea of a religious life, a life of the soul, or a life of devotion. The French term '*esprit*', though it can mean 'soul', also has a more neutral sense as 'mind', mainly if this latter is understood as disembodied. It is thus closer to 'spirit' in its non-religious sense. The 'spiritual life' he turns to at this point of the book is therefore best understood as the life of a mind or spirit that has a consistency through time; it is the life we indicate in expressions such as 'I have lived my life to the full' or 'My life has always been governed by curiosity'. It would be a mistake, therefore, to assume Deleuze is talking about a mystical life or taking such a life as the paradigm of all lives. Though Deleuze is working from a basis in Bergson, his method cannot be associated with any purported Bergsonian mysticism.¹⁰ Instead, the point of Deleuze's reference to the life of mind is to draw attention to our reflection back upon a life as ours – the life of a mind – rather than a predetermined causal series of material facts.

Deleuze's initial move is to consider a common definition of destiny that he will then alter in relation to the first synthesis of time and in relation to this notion of a spiritual life: 'Nevertheless, we have the impression that, however strong the possible incoherence or opposition of successive presents, each one plays "the same life" at a different level. This is what we call destiny' (DRf, 113). The living present is multiple and consists of many overlapping durations and stretches of different lengths. We have relatively

short durations: *the time to finish this coffee*. We have, relatively, very long ones: *my life as a daughter; my life as father*. They have possible oppositions and incoherence: *his life as a queen's council and his life as a republican traitor and his life as expert on the baroque and his life as a mathematician*. This preliminary definition of destiny is explicitly loose and Deleuze is careful to point out that it is based on an 'impression', that the incoherence and opposition are 'possible'. He is also cautious in setting the same life in scare quotes. This is for two reasons: he will show later that this life cannot be considered the same through time or indeed at any time; he will also show that this life cannot be considered as someone's life, or a particular life. Much later than *Difference and Repetition*, Deleuze returns to the problem of how to convey this novel idea of life in his last essay, 'Immanence: a life . . .' There, the scare quotes are replaced by the much more sophisticated usage of 'a life . . .' (*une vie . . .*) separating it more strongly from associations with individual persons and with a continuous and represented identity.¹¹

From the starting point of this common definition, Deleuze then goes on to construct a much more sophisticated version. First, he opposes destiny and determinism. Destiny is never to be determined, in the sense of causally determined or, more simply, in the sense of a predetermined order of successive presents. There is instead a place for freedom in this novel understanding of destiny. The initial reason for this can be found in the multiplicity of the first synthesis of time as it relates to lives.¹² As we have seen, the first synthesis implies overlapping durations or stretches that cannot be reduced to a single line, or to a dominant narrative. The traditional conception of a life as a single continuous time line in a continuous well-ordered space is therefore replaced by a fragmentary life, with jumps, returns, gaps and resonances resistant to a satisfactory situation on a single continuous line: 'Between successive presents, it implies non-localisable links, action at a distance, systems of replay, of resonances and of echoes, objective chance, signals and signs, roles transcending spatial situations and temporal successions' (DRf, 113).

The key to understanding these broad claims is that Deleuze moves from the observation of the different levels implied by this irreducible multiplicity of durations to the condition for their participation in the 'same life'. Without such a move he would be open to the criticism that his position is straightforwardly contradictory because it combines a claim about an irreducible fragmentation with a claim about unity. How can we call the fragments 'the same

life' if they cannot be considered as belonging to an identical time line and space associated with that life?¹³

Deleuze's answer avoids this problem by not looking at the overall identity of a life, but instead moving even further away from this sense of actual identity and towards the second synthesis. The condition for connecting fragmentary durations into a life is that they are playing the same life but at different degrees and levels. This reference is to the degrees of contraction of the pure past, and the condition for the connection of different durations is that they are all conditioned by the pure past because each one is a passing present made to pass by the pure past and existing as contraction of the pure past:

The succession of actual presents is only a manifestation of something deeper: the manner in which each one retakes the whole life but at a different level or degree than the preceding one, all levels and degrees open to our choice from the bottom of a past that was never present.

(DRf, 113)

I have translated '*reprend*' by 'retakes' in this passage, rather than the original translation's 'continues'. This is because each present replays the whole life and transforms the earlier ones, a sense we find in the English word 'reprise' and a conception of a repeat of a musical work that is very important to Deleuze: 'Each one chooses its pitch or its tone, perhaps its words, but the tune is indeed the same, and beneath all the words a same tra-la-la in all possible tones and all pitches' (DRf, 113–14; DRe, 83–4). Continuation keeps too much of succession and sequence and leads to a contradiction with the idea of taking on the whole life, rather than simply continuing on from the preceding moments. The meaning of freedom in relation to destiny in Deleuze is then not the freedom to add to a sequence, for instance, when a new director adds a new film to an established franchise (*My Life IV*). Instead, we are free to make a new cut of an existing film (*My Life, The Director's Cut*).

The analogy with making a new cut of a film, or of staging a new version of a play, draws out many of the oddities and difficulties of Deleuze's ideas on freedom and destiny. In his model, you can make a new cut, but no reel or even frame can be left out, no new scene can be added and no old one can be shot again. This is because we replay the pure past in relation to all the passing presents and, as we have seen, the pure past is all of the past. This explains why we have to make a reprise of all of the past, as stated in the passage quoted above. It also explains Deleuze's at first sight strange statement that

this is a past 'that was never present'. The past we have to retake is pure; it contains no particulars or actual presents. What is more, this pure past can only be replayed in terms of its degrees and levels, that is, in terms of degrees of relations between levels. Retaking the past is therefore never changing actual events that have happened. It is rather to select the intensity of degrees we assign to different levels which then operate in the passing of all presents. This in turn means that the value and significance of those passing presents vary with the changes in degrees. A present that appeared to be at a high level and dominant degree can find itself at a lower one. A present that appeared to be both insignificant and distant in time can grow in importance and find itself at the centre of a nub of intense relations. Drawing back to the film analogy, though a new cut retains all of the scenes from the earlier versions, it can change their sense, value and emotional significance through a novel ordering (*put death in the middle and birth at each end*). There are risks in such examples, though, because for Deleuze's philosophy oddity is really in analogical thinking rather than in the creation of novel concepts such as the pure past. We can only ever repeat all the past, not as representations, such as frames from a film, but as relations of level and degree. This shows the inherent danger of analogy for transcendental philosophy. Despite its advantages in explanation, analogy has too strong a dependence on representation and symmetry to fully express differences in realm and relations so important for transcendental deductions. So long as our pedagogical culture depends on analogy and representation, the explanation of the validity and form of the transcendental will remain difficult and prone to misunderstandings.

Freedom exists in relation to destiny and determinism for Deleuze because we are free to change the relations of level and degree given to all past events through our present acts. We are not free to change determined relations between actual presents. Here, changes in level and degree can be understood as changes in the intensities of distinctness and obscurity of relations in the pure past, that is, some relations in the past will be made more distinct as others become more obscure. For example, an act of atonement in the present can change nothing of the actual acts it seeks to atone for. It is free, though, to change the hold such acts have on new passing presents, perhaps by making them less significant in their relations to other events, or by making them more obscure and distant, and thereby diluting their hold on novel ones. Thus, to heap betrayal upon betrayal might increase the intensity of treach-

ery as a line leading from the past to the present, whereas to forgive might weaken it. Within Deleuze's metaphysics, this freedom exists because the pure past makes all presents pass and coexists with them. When our acts are made to pass they too interact with the pure past and thereby interact with all passing presents. The reason this does not contradict causality lies in the distinction he makes between the empirical character of presents, 'their associations according to causality, contiguity, resemblance and even opposition', and their noumenal character, the relations of 'virtual coexistence between levels of a pure past' (DRf, 113).

Deleuze picks up on Kant's concept of the noumenal and Bergson's idea of the virtual in order to distinguish the second synthesis of time from actual presents. The pure past is noumenal; it is a condition for the passing of actual passing presents, but it is not itself actual. The pure past is virtual, that is, ideal but not in the sense of ideas in active consciousness, but rather in the sense of relations between levels in the pure past. It is worth noting that this combination of Bergson and Kant is highly original and surprising, given Bergson's critique of Kant's transcendental philosophy.¹⁴ However, the combination works because Deleuze departs from Bergson's work on consciousness and human memory and from Kant's description of the noumenal as the realm of things in themselves beyond our understanding. He therefore arrives at a new philosophical position with a transcendental pure past (the second synthesis of time) in a relation of reciprocal determination with the present (as first synthesis of time). The noumenal then becomes a realm that all actual things determine and are determined by. It becomes a virtual and ideal realm as condition for all events and not just those of human memory.

This deduction of the second synthesis of time is then concluded on two important but very different remarks. One is practical and concerns an application of the second synthesis as synthesis of the whole of the past. The other is speculative and explains the role of difference in the diverse syntheses and repetitions of time. If misread, the application of the second synthesis of time can lead to another interpretation of Deleuze as a mystical philosopher. This is because he seeks to explain metempsychosis, reincarnation or the transmigration of souls, on the basis of his account of time. Given that any passing present is the most concentrated state of the synthesis of the whole of the past, each present is a reprise of all the lives that preceded it:

Since each one is a passing present, a life can take another on, at a different level: as if the philosopher and the pig, the criminal and the saint played the same past, at different levels of a giant cone. This is what is called metempsychosis.

(DRf, 113)

The reference to the philosopher and the pig might be Deleuze's humorous reply to Mill's famous and often misquoted dictum on human beings, pigs, Socrates and fools: 'It is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied; better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied' (Mill, 2002: 12). Since in the pure past all lives replay each other at different levels, the human is in the pig and the philosopher in the fool. More deeply, for Deleuze, humans are not fully human until they express the pig within them and the true philosopher is one who is also or even foremost a fool.¹⁵ The reference to the criminal and saint might be an echo of Sartre's book on Jean Genet, *Saint Genet: comédien et martyr*.¹⁶ This is not mysticism, though, and it is important not to miss the 'as if' in Deleuze's sentence. The pervasive idea of transmigration can be explained because each life communicates to all others as actual presents through the shared medium of the pure past. It is only as if we replay actual lives though, because we really replay the levels and degrees of the pure past, which contains nothing actual. The use of real in opposition to actual is important here (and throughout *Difference and Repetition*). The transcendental virtual is real and not imaginary or abstract. It is real because it completes the actual in real processes of reciprocal determination. Deleuze's philosophy is radically inconsistent with actual reincarnation, since every actual present passes and can never return. It is, however, consistent with a novel and very difficult notion of return through the return of difference in relation to the pure past.

This return of difference is the second important remark made after Deleuze's work on repetition in the second synthesis of time. In material repetition, the synthesis of the living present or first synthesis of time, difference is subtracted, because a selection is made of a particular series within many differences. In 'spiritual repetition', the second synthesis of time, difference is included, because all differences are taken up, but at a particular level and degree. What is important, though, is that these different presents and syntheses belong together and complete one another:

The present is always contracted difference; but in one case it contracts indifferent instants; in the other, by passing to the limit, it contracts a

differential level of the whole that is itself relaxation and contraction. This is such that the difference of the presents themselves is between the two repetitions, the one of the elementary instants that it is withdrawn from, and the one of the levels of the whole in which difference is included.

(DRf, 114; DRe, 84)

Note how this study of difference in relation to repetition is a direct echo of the closing remarks on the first synthesis of time. Difference is not an intrinsic property or essence of any repetition. It is rather the reason why each repetition is conditioned by another, where the condition explains how a repetition of the same elements requires the adding in of a variation to that same repetition and how the repetitions of pure variations or differences requires a subtraction of difference in order to be determined.

Note also that this role of difference in itself in both repetitions is also the reason why neither repetition can be represented, because the difference they either subtract or add cannot be represented, since it is always between two realms. When repeated elements are represented the subtraction that representation depends upon is erased. When repetition within the pure past is represented a subtraction is imposed on it such that it is no longer the whole of the past. Though Deleuze's argument and structure can seem loose, in fact, they are highly rigorous and there is a careful pattern to his deductions: beginning each time with a cursory observation; deducing transcendental conditions revealing syntheses dependent on repetition; then reflecting on the principles emerging with these syntheses; applying these back in a novel way to actual cases (such as metempsychosis); then finally drawing all the syntheses together through an explanation of the role of difference in itself in repetition. It is because difference is between the living present and the passing present that they belong together. One subtracts from the other while the other adds it back, but always differently in an ongoing creative process.

HOW TO SAVE ALL THE PAST FOR US?

Through this study of the second synthesis of time we have seen how it provides a response to a series of objections. It explains how there can be an account of the whole of the past and a conception of a complete account of time without reducing time to a set of disparate elements or to a hermetic and fully determined whole. We have also seen how Deleuze avoids having to posit nothingness or

a void in his account of time, yet does not fall on to an account of eternal beings. Things pass, yet they do not pass into nothingness. We have also seen how 'Memory' or the pure past is a foundation for time without being an unchanging ground. On the contrary, the past is in continuous flux and therefore induces each present to pass. However, this raises a practical question that leads into a practical problem. How should we act, given this relation between past and present? Does the impossibility of a full representation of the pure past absolve the present and in particular the present as active memory of any responsibility to the past?

Deleuze's answer to these questions will lead him to consider a third synthesis of time. He leads us into this conclusion through the presentation of a practical problem, where practical can be understood as meaning a moral problem or problem of moral action. Moral, here, should not be understood as connected to specific moral dilemmas. His work is not primarily concerned with questions of the right action in this or that social situation. Instead, it is to reflect on some of the properties of the second synthesis of time in relation to action. Can we penetrate into the pure past, even though we cannot represent it? Can we live with the pure past as we do the living present, as an ongoing synthesis we can learn to accomplish through an apprenticeship to signs (as studied in the previous chapter, here)? Deleuze follows these two reflections with a further one requiring much more interpretation, since it introduces new concepts that have not yet featured in his deductions of the synthesis of time or in his speculative framework:

The whole past is conserved in itself, but how to save it for us, how to penetrate into that in itself without reducing it to the old present that it was, or to the actual present in relation to which it is past. How to save it *for us*?

(DRf, 115)

I have given the French '*pour nous*' as 'for us' here, rather than the original translation of 'for ourselves' (which would have been given as '*nous-mêmes*'). This is to avoid the idea that Deleuze is concerned with the quite traditional idea of preserving the past in memory as a benefit to the self, so it may know itself through its past.

The way Deleuze has introduced the problem tends to the idea that it is a question of how to live with the past. He has introduced two new terms in his study of time, two rare terms in *Difference and Repetition*: 'save' and 'us'. The emphasis on the italicised *us* is important, as is the choice of 'to save', which is further from conserve,

or preserve, or keep than in English. It has a stronger sense of salvation, peril, preserve (in the sense of preserve from something) and avoidance of a specific loss (loss at sea for instance). This is a dramatic moment in Deleuze's book and treatment of time. The second synthesis of time leads to a problem of representation, which itself leads to a problem of how to live with the past. These then lead into the question of how to save the past, to save it from loss, *for us*, that is not for itself but for us, for our living present. The past needs to be saved from oblivion for the benefit of the living, or more precisely, for living beings together.

This is also a dramatic shift into a moral problem with its characteristic plurality (it is a problem of togetherness) and its characteristic difficulty (things are at peril in a way that is difficult to resolve). The shift is accompanied by a change in lead thinkers. Deleuze moves from Bergson to Proust, a figure he has turned to often in *Difference and Repetition*, harking back to Deleuze's earlier book on Proust, *Proust and Signs*. Though Bergson has shown the limits of representation in relation to virtual memory through his critique of consciousness and of active memory, he has not shown the way to live with the past, given the failure of representation – at least in *Matter and Memory*. Proust, however, through his study of reminiscence, has shown how the past can be saved for us without reducing it to representations of a former age or to representations of our age (the past as how it could be). Instead, the past is given 'as it was never lived, as a pure past revealing its double irreducibility to the present that it was, but also to the actual present that it could be, in favour of a telescoping of the two' (DRf, 115). Reminiscence shows that the past is lost and forgotten as a past present. It accepts it. Nonetheless, it still saves the past by taking the past representation and the present representation and, without making them the same, it makes a third image with them. It is in this special kind of forgetting and recreating that the past is lived with in forgetting. In the more technical treatment we have been following, the condition for this telescoping of the two images is the pure past. It makes both presents pass, contemporary to them and pre-existing them.

The answer to Deleuze's questions therefore lies in his understanding of the process of the second synthesis of time as pure past. It is because the pure past is a process on all passing presents that it can be saved for us. It is because it cannot be represented that it must be saved as forgotten, that is, as recreated in the present. But it is also because it pre-exists all presents that a pure forgetting, an obliteration, cannot save the past. Only as a recreation of past presents

a void in his account of time, yet does not fall on to an account of eternal beings. Things pass, yet they do not pass into nothingness. We have also seen how 'Memory' or the pure past is a foundation for time without being an unchanging ground. On the contrary, the past is in continuous flux and therefore induces each present to pass. However, this raises a practical question that leads into a practical problem. How should we act, given this relation between past and present? Does the impossibility of a full representation of the pure past absolve the present and in particular the present as active memory of any responsibility to the past?

Deleuze's answer to these questions will lead him to consider a third synthesis of time. He leads us into this conclusion through the presentation of a practical problem, where practical can be understood as meaning a moral problem or problem of moral action. Moral, here, should not be understood as connected to specific moral dilemmas. His work is not primarily concerned with questions of the right action in this or that social situation. Instead, it is to reflect on some of the properties of the second synthesis of time in relation to action. Can we penetrate into the pure past, even though we cannot represent it? Can we live with the pure past as we do the living present, as an ongoing synthesis we can learn to accomplish through an apprenticeship to signs (as studied in the previous chapter, here)? Deleuze follows these two reflections with a further one requiring much more interpretation, since it introduces new concepts that have not yet featured in his deductions of the synthesis of time or in his speculative framework:

The whole past is conserved in itself, but how to save it for us, how to penetrate into that in itself without reducing it to the old present that it was, or to the actual present in relation to which it is past. How to save it *for us*?

(DRf, 115)

I have given the French '*pour nous*' as 'for us' here, rather than the original translation of 'for ourselves' (which would have been given as '*nous-mêmes*'). This is to avoid the idea that Deleuze is concerned with the quite traditional idea of preserving the past in memory as a benefit to the self, so it may know itself through its past.

The way Deleuze has introduced the problem tends to the idea that it is a question of how to live with the past. He has introduced two new terms in his study of time, two rare terms in *Difference and Repetition*: 'save' and 'us'. The emphasis on the italicised *us* is important, as is the choice of 'to save', which is further from conserve,

or preserve, or keep than in English. It has a stronger sense of salvation, peril, preserve (in the sense of preserve from something) and avoidance of a specific loss (loss at sea for instance). This is a dramatic moment in Deleuze's book and treatment of time. The second synthesis of time leads to a problem of representation, which itself leads to a problem of how to live with the past. These then lead into the question of how to save the past, to save it from loss, *for us*, that is not for itself but for us, for our living present. The past needs to be saved from oblivion for the benefit of the living, or more precisely, for living beings together.

This is also a dramatic shift into a moral problem with its characteristic plurality (it is a problem of togetherness) and its characteristic difficulty (things are at peril in a way that is difficult to resolve). The shift is accompanied by a change in lead thinkers. Deleuze moves from Bergson to Proust, a figure he has turned to often in *Difference and Repetition*, harking back to Deleuze's earlier book on Proust, *Proust and Signs*. Though Bergson has shown the limits of representation in relation to virtual memory through his critique of consciousness and of active memory, he has not shown the way to live with the past, given the failure of representation – at least in *Matter and Memory*. Proust, however, through his study of reminiscence, has shown how the past can be saved for us without reducing it to representations of a former age or to representations of our age (the past as how it could be). Instead, the past is given 'as it was never lived, as a pure past revealing its double irreducibility to the present that it was, but also to the actual present that it could be, in favour of a telescoping of the two' (DRf, 115). Reminiscence shows that the past is lost and forgotten as a past present. It accepts it. Nonetheless, it still saves the past by taking the past representation and the present representation and, without making them the same, it makes a third image with them. It is in this special kind of forgetting and recreating that the past is lived with in forgetting. In the more technical treatment we have been following, the condition for this telescoping of the two images is the pure past. It makes both presents pass, contemporary to them and pre-existing them.

The answer to Deleuze's questions therefore lies in his understanding of the process of the second synthesis of time as pure past. It is because the pure past is a process on all passing presents that it can be saved for us. It is because it cannot be represented that it must be saved as forgotten, that is, as recreated in the present. But it is also because it pre-exists all presents that a pure forgetting, an obliteration, cannot save the past. Only as a recreation of past presents

as forgotten, as in need of being lived differently, can the past be saved for us. It needs to be saved for us because our living presents are made to pass by the pure past and are pre-existed by it. Yet this is exactly the point where he detects the need for another synthesis, because though the pure past shows us *what* we must create with, it does not show us *how*: the echo of the two presents only forms a persistent question, developed in representation as the field of a problem, with the rigorous imperative of searching, answering and resolving (DRf, 115). In Proust, the answer to the 'How?' question is through Eros: it is always through an erotic attraction that we are led to an answer as to how to save the past. Deleuze says that Eros shows us how to penetrate Mnemosyne or Memory (the second synthesis of time). This is learned from Proust's signs. To answer the questions of why it is Eros, Deleuze passes to the third synthesis of time.