

YVONNE SPIELMANN

# Intermediality in the Cinematographic Panorama Installation *Alias Yederbeck*

*Alias Yederbeck* is a cinematographic installation in a panorama projection format. It interlocks elements of *expanded cinema* and of animation film in a spatial-immersive presentation. This evokes a new genre that demands fresh terms and descriptions. The author Frank Geßner, the initiator, artist, and protagonist, who also multiplies himself in the work in several dimensions and functions, appears in this artistic-aesthetic presence like every other of his painted, drawn, and reanimated figures in the mode of a re-mediatised repetition. “Figure” here means: original copy without an origin, a multiplicity of real/virtual aliases, which are motivated prototypically and yet specifically by an arbitrary biographical context. From this hybrid production perspective, which is the equivalent of an encyclopedic trek through media-historical and auto-(author-)biographical events and in this way interactively couples a wide range of material properties (like those of canvas, celluloid, electronic signal processes, and the mathematical operations of the technical simulation of digital matrix images), Geßner calls his installation-like presentation “*expanded animation cinema*”.

It consists of twelve panoramically arranged film sequences following each other in a clockwise manner in linear connection and in a precise temporal

progression. The arrangement in a circle results in a formal aesthetic continuum, but not in semiotic closure. Unlike the usual painted, cinematographic, or computer-animated virtual 360° spatial image form, here no visual-narrative coherence is achieved. Rather, difference and discontinuity among the twelve cinematically animated image positions stands in the foreground; they abut each other abruptly, thereby also communicating the gap, the interval in the passage from image block to image block. These blocks, each made up of 21 image positions, are each based on a respective central portrait and image position that, as central alias figure, stands also for the virtual forms of appearance of the multiple self (“I are many”) in digital culture. The then cinematically proceeding image positions present various experimental studies: for example, of the panel picture; seriality; horizontal and vertical layering; the condensation of time and space levels in a moving picture, on animated sculpture, and the tableau vivant; and the transition from analog to digital compositing. Finally, the artistic-creative research engages in an aesthetic discourse on the interactive potential of simulation space in panorama painting and on temporal succession in the projection of film. In the condensed pictorial spaces, with accelerated and decelerated depictions of motion, this form of interaction and dialogicity brings the core positions of painting and film into play with each other and configures them anew in the digital mode of animation. The result is hybrid, crisscrossing connections of real/virtual and fictional/simulated image fields and narrative spaces, which can be cited, reworked, mixed, and networked in completely different ways, like building blocks from a digital archive.

This creates a network that tests simultaneously pre- and post-cinematographic perceptions and experiences of immersively designed pictorial spaces. Unlike virtual reality’s baroque or three-dimensional aesthetic of overwhelming, the viewers, who here are mobile and positioned in the middle of the depiction, are offered a sensually accessible discourse on the specifics of the respective materials and media. And this proximity results in powerful media frictions when the media forms used (drawing, painting, photo, film, also

Super-8, video, and computer graphics, as well as references to various picture formats) are subjected to a systematic structural analysis in a renewed tour of the archives of Western forms of the artistic image and perception. To be mentioned are the re-mediaticization and extensions of sculpture, here in relation to the relief of the Pergamon Altar; of painting, for example Claude Monet's wide-format *Nymphéas*; of film, for example Abel Gance's multiple projection and Paul Sharits' and Kurt Kren's picture editing and double exposures in structural film as films. Depiction modalities of the medium of video become apparent in its open technical structure, for example in the fusion of side relationships and in the dissolution of before-after and interior-exterior relationships, especially clearly carried out in resemblance to Peter Campus' video performances. Re-mediaticizing means a fundamental reworking of previous media forms (Bolter and Grusin) and then expanding all these structural references in computer animation, when elastic pictorial spaces are created out of the static and dynamic pictorial instructions. This creative practice erodes the media-specific structures of the given individual medium as well as of the intermediate forms between the media, intermediate forms that we have gotten to know in many places in recent media history in the contact of painting and photography with film or of film with video. For now, plural and multiple mixtures arise in the expansive and excessive re-presentation of pictorial instructions. These mixtures bring along their references like a permeable foil, but they expand the cinematographically organized pictorial field, in which the alias-author has condensed his and, more generally, our cultural experiences with pictorial perception and media forms, in new dimensions and directions. This is why Frank Geßner's *expanded animation cinema* necessarily demands a corresponding, hybrid presentation site. Geßner creates this conceptual site by shifting the cinematographic principle, which is based on linear narrative development, to a nonlinear order. The decisive factor is that it can present the condensed spatio-temporal "material" of the twelve dynamic narrative positions in a circularly tied way. The idea of presenting the twelve autonomous films in formal connection leads

almost inevitably to the form of a panorama installation. What is special about the *expanded animation* is that each screen in the angularly circular panorama is given a different starting position on the horizontal time axis, while at the same time this axis dissolves in the twelve-fold multiplied projection of the same sequence. Multiplication also appears in the synchronization of the horizontal repetition, which makes use of the cinematographic principle of multiple projections in the digital production aesthetic of endless duplication. Pulling these procedures together generates the structure of the *expanded animation cinema*, starting from the idea of deciding on a cinematographic presentation and reflection site beyond the tried and tested media. From a film-historical perspective, the new genre term *expanded animation cinema* refers to the original context of the cinematographic moving image as a “living, ensouled picture”. Here, animation is related to *anima*, the puff of air as the breath of the soul and motor of the enlivening of figures that, re-presented on the two-dimensional projection screen, appear as actually living. In the media context, the design of animation has experienced great acceleration with computer animation; in the Japanese *anime*, it has founded its own genre and developed into a central building block in narrative fictional cinema. From a structural-conceptual standpoint, the new configuration of the animation film in *Alias Yederbeck* undertakes a re-dimensioning and updating of the *expanded cinema* that Peter Weibel (1966), Sheldon Renan (1967) and Gene Youngblood (1970) recognized as a new type of film practice, starting with the spatio-temporal boundary-crossings of experimental film and going beyond the limits of technology and depiction in film. It works with mixed media, includes computer programming, screens film without any film, draws the audience in to participate in spatial projection and action with film, and finally expansively-immersively shifts the standardized givens of the *cinematic institution*. The method of intermedia mixtures and the chosen formal unity of the panorama construction make pictorial-technical expansions possible, whereby the joining of intermedia procedures and the panorama form engenders surprising new configurations of the visible.

## Intermedia Configurations

The artistic method of temporally and spatially condensing static, dynamic, and computer-animated procedures of depiction in *Alias Yederbeck* takes place in an intermedia recourse to a number of heterogeneous pictorial media. First, they are set in relation to each other, overlain, and processually mutually transformed in terms of how they can be aesthetically brought together and, even more important, in terms of their basic material qualities. Second, the work stands in discourse with contemporary transmedia pictorial concepts that are increasingly appearing in multiple sites like television, the Internet, and cell phones and in mixed, crossmedia contexts, in particular when film and computer games fuse.

Both approaches of the *Alias Yederbeck* installation – intermedia condensation and transmedia heterogeneity – point in the aesthetic direction of film as a heterogeneous object (Burgin) that no longer needs a cinematographic presentation site. Followed by photography, which genealogically wanders between aesthetic and social modes of use and is perceived independently from its surroundings, film takes on the character of a heterogeneous object in diverse spatio-temporal contexts as soon as it moves as a building block from cinema into other media formats. Thus, if the givens of the *cinematic institution* seem outmoded to the same degree that the duality of film in the space of art, as either White Cube or Black Box, has proven to be constraining, then, in the tradition of the *expanded cinema*, film can continue to diversify and to enter into novel, i.e., flexible, connections and mixtures.

Frank Geßner's cinematographic installation works with this concept of a liquefaction of the picture's cinematic-photographic qualities. The goal is to produce synergy among the painting panorama, the framing function of photography and film, video, and the elasticity of the two- and three-dimensional pictorial space in computer animation. The fluid medium of video thereby proves to be a heterogeneous object par excellence because, appearing as videotape, video sculpture, or video installation, it has neither a spe-

cific presentation site nor a standardized presentation format. With its variable pictorial formats, the cinematographic installation therefore wanders between cinematic and art-specific production forms of visuality, now programmatically foregrounding the coupled twelve projections, now overriding this materiality and pictorial limitation with a 360° panoramic image. At the same time, the work integrates the viewer, who is always positioned in the middle of the panorama picture, in various intensities from immersive illusion to self-reflective distance.

The theme of self-reflection plays a central role in this context also because the fictitious alter ego figure named “Paul Yederbeck” leads through the sequences of the installation like a leitmotif and thereby condenses time pseudo-biographically. Unlike a pseudonym, this alias figure has an invented biography, or more precisely a simulated existence that can be varied and expanded at will in this scheme of simulation. Accordingly, the figure of the alias Yederbeck belongs in the category of the heteronym and can create an oeuvre of its own within the artist’s oeuvre as an “art of fiction”.

The approach of re-mediatization, finally, means the expansion of all these structural references in the vocabulary of computer animation, which creates elastic pictorial spaces out of static and dynamic pictorial givens. This comprises variable pictorial sequence speeds, condensation, and horizontal stretching, as well as the transformation of pictorial methods, sound methods, materials, and references from the used archive of the artist’s own material, which in turn includes all the formats that are interwoven in this work. With Geßner, this programmatically executed self-referentiality, which means a plurality of aliases and everymans, is born out of his dealings with the Western artist subject, who has become problematic and is represented by the fictitious art figure “Paul Yederbeck”.

In this new configuration of the concept of work, picture, and space, two components are remarkable. Conspicuous is the significance of the video-graphic image concept, which mediates between film and computer images, because it operates with formal flexibility and entails the erasure of bounda-

ries in the horizontal stream as a characteristic of the medium. The pictorial information wandering horizontally across the edges of the picture in the video, called “horizontal drifting”, produces a connection in the installation between frame-tied, painted types of images and types of images that are not tied to a frame – which is not possible in the vertically fixed projection flow of the material bearer, film. Beyond that, the lack of fixation of the electronic type of image not only comes close to the possibilities of computer animation; it also transports the endlessness of the picture that is associated with the panorama form. This is triggered by the serial 252-part painting matrix with its twelve key images, which Geßner calls “auto-(author-)constructs” [*Auto(r)-konstrukte*] and which correspond to the twelve sequences and run through the entire panorama like a standing wave. Here, too, the intermedia construction process par excellence is seen, for the self-reflectively motivated auto-(author-)constructs, first, emphasize the respective image blocks’ separation from each other and, second, simultaneously convey the panel pictures’ connection with each other.

The opening portrait in the sequence “Entertainer” appears in the video-graphic presentation not only *live* as a painting, but also “overpainted” through two- and three-dimensional computer animation, so that, with a view to Henri-Georges Clouzot’s well-known film about how Picasso painted (*Le Mystère Picasso*, 1956), the media rupture takes recognizable shape. In the installation, the liquefaction of media boundaries that takes place in animated film is joined by an expansion of the non-cinematic projections already tried out in *expanded cinema*, in which the picture is taken out of its frame. This is media-technically important because attention to the frame – on the one hand, as a window onto the world and, on the other, as an architectonic fencing in of a two-dimensional depiction of three-dimensional space – has underlain artistic thinking about image compositions from early modern times up to virtual reality (Friedberg). Unlike the computer monitor, which multiplies the function of the frame and presents intra-image frames within frames, in this cinematographic installation computer animation serves pri-

marily the variable opening of the picture surface to the pictorial space, until the circuit is closed horizontally in the panorama. This happens when the opening portrait expands to 360° like the lens of a surveillance camera and, at the same time, inverted into a panopticon, overwhelmingly implodes.

A boundary situation of these formal conditions is presented in the sequence “Projektion”, which – following the model of historical artists’ and experimental films – adapts the sound, light, and projection conditions of early cinematography, Super-8 film, silent film aesthetics, burlesques, etc. and gathers direct film quotations, surreal tableaux, image superimpositions and negativ effects in a potpourri: cinematic building blocks that have become relevant for the developmental history from experimental film to *expanded cinema*. The interaction between image and sound are anchored in this process of retrospection, deconstruction, and reconstruction. The sound behaves homologously to the visual concept of the installation, varying re-stagings and re-mediating of music and noise that aim to sound partly like historical “originals” and partly like something synthetically produced. Like the visual program, these can be assigned to a single screen or to several screens and also form a panoramic spatial sound. In the depiction of technical and material divergences, i.e., of film material, painted and animated individual pictures, and video- and computer-graphical simulation images, the artist consistently chooses the panorama form. The visual reproduction of the intermedia conjunction of painting, drawing, photo, film, video, and computer graphics with sound or music can thus be carried out in such a way that the continuities and discontinuities can be experienced in an audio-visual perceptual context.

Intermediality thus means that the interfaces between the individual, abruptly abutting projection panels flow into each other in the viewer’s perception to create an overall impression of a circularly running picture book and appear seamless like a panorama picture actually painted on a circular canvas. This effect arises in particular through the re-mediating and expansions of sculpture in the sequence “Schauspieler” (actor), when an actor,

whose body is photographed in the blue-screen technique, takes the positions of the various figures of the Pergamon frieze. In relation to the “model”, the relief of the Pergamon Altar, the actor’s reanimation means that he indefatigably seeks to make the pictures of the altar’s figures projected onto his body coincide with his own body position, which is multiplied and whose figures are overlain until the recognizability of the figuration tips into abstraction. This effect is heightened by the twelve projections of the same process in the sequence “Schauspieler” until the entire panoramic pictorial space is seamlessly filled. With the means of digital animation – in repositioning, multiplication, and overlaying – a new frieze of real/virtual overlaying results, this time running entirely around the viewer, without beginning or end. By multiplying this and other fictional identities at will, for example those of the dancer in “Transzendente Animation” (transcendental animation), space is condensed when figures multiply and seem to step on each other’s toes in the same space of the Blue Box. The sequence “Schauspieler” makes explicit the approach of intermedia condensation through repetition not only in that the same actor imitates all the chosen figures from the Pergamon Altar in the Blue Box, but also because the heads of all the depicted figures are replaced by the same Roman sculpture and thereby de-individualized.

These animations of sculpture that take recourse to a real original were filmed in a real site, as were the imaginings of another reality in Monet’s water lily paintings. That means that Geßner’s procedure of photographing or filming non-cinematic pictorial spaces, once in Berlin’s Pergamon Museum and once in the oval exhibition room of the *Nymphéas* in the Orangery in Paris, was guided by the idea of understandably depicting the transformation of pictorial processes like a transport mechanism from one medium into another. Narratively-dramaturgically, the cinematographic presentation of non-cinematic pictorial spaces such as the frieze and panorama painting are underlain with the staged memories of the alias figure, which simulates biographical coherence and media-historical continuity. The result is an increase in complexity, for the combined or condensed components remain recogniz-

able as such and are exhibited in formal and thematic referentiality. This formal construction of the transposition of specific pictorial contexts of painting and of film into other temporal spaces of digital animation creates the frame for an intermedia shift to the panorama.

### Panoramic Perspectives

In terms of conceptual history, the decision to present a cinematographic installation in panorama format takes up striking positions of the experimental de-framing of cinematic projection formats. The developmental history of *expanded cinema*, in particular, leads to the oversteppings of the frame format that aim at the perspectival expansion of the field of vision and that have helped shape the rise of a panoramic-cinematographic pictorial thinking. Overall, the panorama has a salient role in constituting and expanding novel media forms, beginning with the spatialization of the two-dimensional pictorial space of painting. In the medium of moving pictures, multiple projections lead to an expansion of the pictorial field corresponding with the panorama, historically pertinently in the simultaneous projection of adjoining pictures in Abel Gance's *Napoleon* (1927) and later in Andy Warhol's *Chelsea Girls* (1966). In today's virtual installation, the panorama takes on a prominent function in the creation of immersive perceptual environments that work with spatially closed pictorial forms like Jeffrey Shaw's interactive panorama cinema and that are navigable. Geßner's panorama construction differs from this in its doubled presentation concept. The aim is to initiate an aesthetic dialog that interlocks intermedially condensed pictorial formats with immersively extended forms of perception.

From an intermedia/immersive perspective, Warhol's film/video installation *Outer and Inner Space* (1965), in particular, offers a media-historically interesting starting point, because in its double-screen film presentation for the first time a media-internal dialog is set up between the same person, Edie

Sedgwick, in her video image and in her film image. This is done by projecting the initial video portrait, life-sized, onto a screen. In the second filming, Edie Sedgwick sits in front of the video projection and thus of her own image, thereby being placed in relation to herself and speaking with and about herself at the same time.

Reminiscent of this construction is the time-shifted and mixed-media interview form of the sequence “Auflösung” (dissolution) in the *Alias Yederbeck* installation, because the alias enters into a spatially and temporally shifted, assembled dialog about art and painting – in two types of variation: an artist alias and a critic alias – which thereby comes to a standstill not only thematically, but also visually. What is staged here by means of a digital single-lens reflex camera and large-scale photos and emphasizes a cubistic multi-perspectivity with the relation between sharpness and fuzziness points to a structural incongruence between spatially expansive presentation and repetitive representation. The indeterminacy of verbal statements continues in the constant unrest of the openly constructed poly-focal pictorial field and underscores the cinematographic mechanism of perceiving a cubistic moving image in contrast to a mono-focal one-point perspective. In accordance with the videographic live character of the overarching reference medium for this installation, at this point of the image of a dialog among media triggered by aliases, too, everything is in visual flux, quite unlike the frozen, mono-focal liveliness of a conventional filmstrip, which, in repetition, only briefly illuminates the liveliness of the living images. In an overview of the intermedia modus operandi of the installation, we can note that the level of the seemingly traditional form of the panorama provides the re-presentation of static and dynamic media images with the conceptual advantage of offering a variability of visibility that goes beyond the limits of the individual media.

The example of Claude Monet’s wide-format *Nymphéas* stands for the extreme multiplication of perspectives in painting; as an immersive pictorial experience and with its contemplative aesthetic, it is “transposed” to the austere framework of a board fence with a fade-over that wanders around the

panorama. It should be emphasized that Monet explicitly placed his *Nymphéas* paintings as a sensual-aesthetic experiential space in contradistinction to post-World War I everyday reality. The cinematic installation of the mural in the “Flaneur” sequence, by contrast, transplants this contemplative space into a trip through time to the present day and interlocks it with a current Berlin street scene. This is done by fusing the concept of a perambulator’s gaze with the cinematic technique of mobile framing. The mutual transparency of filmed painting and the displayed mobility of film unfolds against the “backdrop” of a board fence filmed for the purpose; the fence appears calculatedly visible and permeable. The aim of this is, despite this banalization, to make the formal closure of the 360° paintings work through the panorama form of the film or to make the re-staging immersively experiencable.

The film installation uses Abel Gance’s multiple projection, Paul Sharits’ and Kurt Kren’s film editing and double exposures in the structural film as film, and the overlaying of video images in Peter Campus’ performances in the same way. The references begin with direct quotations and re-stagings of film scenes (Gance) and video performances (Campus), present a deconstruction of these procedures, and finally achieve a reconstructing transfer into the chosen panorama form. This becomes clear when Geßner uses multiply exposed 16mm film pictures of a portrait with cigarette to take up the motifs of the experimental aesthetic of Kurt Kren’s *36/78: Rischart* (1978). The parallels go further, for there is also a transfer of Kren’s idea of film as a system in terms of the assemblage of individual images in the camera, on the one hand, and the mathematical ordering principle of the length of shots and the number of frames per shot, on the other. Kren takes the mathematical system of the Fibonacci series as the foundation; it, in turn, derives from the golden section, a basic principle of painting on which Geßner’s cinematographic installation focuses in the context of comparative exploration of the fundamental principles of static and dynamic types of images.

This is where Geßner’s interest in Paul Sharits’ film editing comes in. The sequence “Happy End” operates in clear reference to Sharits: the kissing cou-

ples recall the motifs of Hollywood film shots, but the presented material quality, in which the filmstrips are scratched to the point that the depicted subjects cannot be recognized, goes back to Sharits' material-structural deconstruction of the filmstrip in *S:TREAM:S:S:ECTION:S:ECTION:S:S:ECTIONED* (1971). Scratches are constantly inflicted on it – three scratches through the entire picture every time the material is shown, until in the end twenty-four scratches make the footage of water unrecognizable and the content of the film that is self-referentially presented to us, the viewers, is twenty-four images per second running through the projector. In the *Alias Yederbeck* installation, this kind of material processing is programmatically re-mediatized and the image is taken away from the viewer.

In a re-staging of Peter Campus' video performances *Three Transitions* (1973), expectations about the visible in the video image are also undermined in the sequence "Doppelgänger" (doubleganger), but here in the fusion of the relationships between the sides and in the dissolution of before-after and interior-exterior relations. In the image, a canvas is thereby cut up, visible from the front and the back at the same time, so that the currently visible image and the virtual image converge when the artist steps through the canvas. The simultaneous motion in both directions is spread across twelve screens in the round space and makes two things explicit in terms of media technology. First, as in Campus' work, the possibilities of paradoxical spatial relationships resulting from overlaying are depicted in the video. Second, the re-articulation in temporal intervals points to current options of digital image composition with which physically impossible perspectives have become technologically realizable in simulation. Peter Campus is quite obviously quoted and digitally extended in the sequence "Anima Techné", as well: in the video image of the face covered with blue paint, Campus' videographic self-dissolution is performed again in order to key in a second video sequence at this point. The result is that here the electronic image's quality as object moves into the foreground, unlike in the closed pictorial field of painting and film. At the same time, the transfer of video projection to 3D computer animation also means a reinter-

pretation of the artistic principle of creation, because in allusion to the endless duplication that has become possible in the digital realm, the sequence sets a self-creation of the alias in motion.

The projection format of a panorama provides a closed framework for these paradoxes; within it, a creative tension of diametrically opposed motions and simultaneous interior and exterior perspectives runs its course. It begins with the de-framing of the painted, photographic, and cinematic pictorial type that is conventionally found with vertical and horizontal limits, but here oversteps the pictorial field's lines of demarcation as defined by the frame and opens itself horizontally. Joining this horizontal boundary-overstepping, for example when the panoramic pictorial space reverses the usual viewer-picture relation and physically surrounds the audience, is, in parallel, a vertical expansion through the condensation within the pictorial field, for example by means of reduplications of the same figure at the same image position in the trance-dance sequence "Transzendente Animation". The repetition of the same elastic, stretchable and rotatable figures conceptually epitomizes the identity concept mentioned above, "I are many". In terms of pictorial aesthetics, the motion-capture process employed in 3D computer animation has a parallel in the production of immersive spatial images in the real-time video performance *Warp* (2000) by Steina Vasulka. There, image segments are compacted and stretched in a digital real-time process in the computer while the artist turns on her own axis *live* in front of the camera. Here, in "Transzendente Animation", the principle of transmedia repetition stands in the foreground for Geßner, which means that the multiplication of the same figure is a self-referential process and at the same time generates heterogeneous objects.

What is meant by this is techniques that exteriorize the points at which two-dimensional pictorial composition tips over into three-dimensional pictorial effects and thereby make the variability of re-mediatized, recurrent prototypes visible. Both – the reduplication in "Transzendente Animation" and the endless overlaying in "Schauspieler" – spatialize the image and are comparable to electronic or digital feedback. In the panorama, finally, an ef-

fect of depth resembling historical panorama painting arises in the field of vision, but the media-immanent illusionism of spatial depth is blocked in favor of the markedly displayed construction process of the assembled technical image. The visible paradox of this hybrid construction is the extension of the boundaries of the media by means of directional stretching (horizontal-vertical) and dimensional deepening (three-dimensional) while at the same time maintaining technical and material givens that respectively underlie specific conditions of depiction and presentation, like painting, photography, and film. This making visible of intermedia transformations, on the one hand, and of trans-media multiplications, on the other, also displays how, in the present day, media images can appear as heterogeneous objects.

### **Heterogeneous Objects**

The cinematographic installation *Alias Yederbeck* expands the view of film as a heterogeneous object: on the one hand, dimensionally in the pluralization of time-based media forms like film, when the individual horizontally abutted projections fuse together across the screen until they turn into a plastic, immersive spatial image; on the other hand, directionally in the vertical multiplication of mixed, real/virtual figures and figurations that are staggered above and behind each other, but flowingly. These placements transpose the modern principle of time-based seriality into the digital principle of the space-condensing simultaneity of times and sites in the same place.

The visual or visionary presentations of a continuous journey through types of images that transition into each other, or are layered over each other, or – when the projected screen is sliced – appear to be split into a front and rear view are contrasted with interruption and discontinuity based on a person. The latter alludes to the controller situated outside the panorama, ultimately the author, initiator, and director. But in *Alias Yederbeck*, this controller is entwined as a multiple figure with the composition in such a way that, unlike in

the conventional panorama, the interior and exterior perspectives coincide. The sequence “Reminder” provides a model of this kind of extension; in it, video is the reference medium for a processed rapid passage through the material used in the installation. Thematically, this presented method of repetition can be characterized as expanded self-referentiality. A doubling comes about in which the work’s own material, i.e., an intermedia processing, and at the same time the creative fundamental concept of the work, i.e., the variation of a scheme of repetition, copy, and multiplication, becomes recognizable. This also characterizes a transition from cinematic seriality to electronic variability, because the scheme of film and moving image is no longer varied; rather, the endless variation of the scheme stands in the foreground (Eco, 1990). Joining this crisis of referentiality are the technical-formal and another level. Because video, as an electronic medium, can produce a copy without an original, which marks the transition to the digital realm, the use of this medium reinforces a critical distance and is an ironic reflection on the role of the “original” author and artist. The latter can become identical to his “aliases”, which allows him to appear again and again without any problem and varies the same scheme of repetition, like electronic feedback that runs endlessly. With each variation in the repetition, the *Alias Yederbeck* installation displays the principle of endlessness, but with the extension of the pictorial fields it also shows the variability of the realization of media forms. Finally, in “Reminder”, an intermedially motivated “material testing” is carried out, for the fluid and disturbance-prone quality of electronic signal processes is shown in the loss of quality of the repeated video material, with dropouts or glitches in the image and sound. This remains integrated in the overarching discourse of re-mediatizing, so that such aesthetic extreme positions do not indeed lead to a disturbance of the picture and sound, but rather simulate the potential for such possibilities in another medium. This suffices to make the connection between electronic variability and the digital re-duplication stand for those levels of composition that guarantee the recourse to time-based media images. This means that a temporal progression of twelve

sequences based on narrative dramaturgy determines that the snatches of memory anchored in the fictional alter ego / alias of the fictional author are connected in a clockwise series and respectively opened on the respective next screen as starting position with a central image. At the same time, spreading the respective contents of the sequence across all twelve screens produces a standstill, or at least a countermovement to the successive progression we are familiar with from film projection. For the same information is disseminated on all projection fields, which comes closer to the principle of electronic and computer-controlled synchronization, starting with the interconnecting of televisions, and fosters the simulation of progressing development.

Together, interest in the interfaces among the media and the procedure of self-reflection in regard to the characteristics of the media determine a form that can depict the difference as well as its overcoming. The angular panorama thoroughly fulfills this demand, because it enables the twelve individual screens to either appear as respectively independent images that are individually composed or to fuse in a circular spatial image and be present as a difference-overcoming overall composition. This method of producing tension through friction is to be understood also in difference from the conventional boundary dissolution of the cinematographic realm in digital film image composition, which is based on the unrecognizability of the seams and is employed in the commercial sector and in computer games.

In this conceptual-systematic framework, horizontal-vertical standardizations of various media images and their picture formats are employed to set image fields in them into flowing motion and to make them look like floating pictorial bands in the almost suspended architecture of the installation. In this, the media and the animated actors perform as if on a multiple stage in the space of a theater. The actor is one form of portrait among many, and the portrayed series shows a spectrum of possible aliases. One could say that a self-referential circle arises, an endless passage from figure to figuration to figure, etc. Another level of reflection is integrated, for the play of the forms of depiction corresponds with the exhibited self-reflection of the fully uti-

lized media and their conditions of presentation. They form an expanded field of association that condenses itself by interlocking references and new articulations of components of the media languages of painting, sculpture, film, video, and computer graphics. To put it in another way: with Geßner, animation means a high degree of condensation, which essentially results from the contraction of the simultaneous space of painting with the successive image of film and leads to a synesthetic, audiovisual fusion.

To be underscored are the core points associated with the cinematic-cinematographic aspect: film's taking itself as a theme, film as film, film within film, and the investigation of the relation to the event, i.e., the viewer's distance and loss of distance from the pictorial space. Here, the integration of the viewer in the pictorial space, i.e., the interior-exterior relations and the perspectives taken, assume a central role. Part of this is also the central issue of liveliness in the sense, first, of *live* as immediate transmission and, second, of *life* as enlivenment. In this context, the medium of video, which originated as a live medium, has an important position, because in it the digital media forms and the historically preceding media forms are brought together. That's why, in the eleventh sequence, "Reminder", video, as a fusion medium, stands for historical, current, and still developing media forms and materialities, which are brought together here in rapid sequence. This is interesting also because the discussion of media has often viewed video as an intermediate medium, a not fully matured medium somewhere between film and the computer.

*Alias Yederbeck*, Frank Geßner's *expanded animation cinema*, shows that each medium has its own site, its own position. In the comparison, this evokes renewed localizations of the cinematographic, the installational, the analog, the digital, the interior space, the exterior space, the linear and successive image, and the possibilities of the latter's nonlinear presentation. This characterizes the work as a cinematographic installation with various facets, points of friction, media and material overlays, condensations, deepenings, and dealings with the artist's own artistic experiences, with theoretical positions, and with today's media landscape in the mirror of its genealogy.

## Bibliography

- Bolter, Jay David and Grusin, Richard, *Remediation. Understanding New Media*, Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press, 1999.
- Burgin, Victor, "The Noise of the Marketplace", in: *Situational Aesthetics. Selected Writings by Victor Burgin*, ed. Alexander Streitberger, Leuven: University Press, 2009.
- Eco, Umberto, "Die Innovation im Seriellen", in: idem, *Über Spiegel und andere Phänomene*, Munich and Vienna: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1990.
- Friedberg, Anne, *The Virtual Window. From Alberti to Microsoft*, Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press, 2006.
- Renan, Sheldon, *An introduction to the American Underground Film*, New York: E. P. Dutton & Co, 1967.
- Shaw, Jeffrey and Peter Weibel, Eds. *Future Cinema. The Cinematic Imaginary after Film*, Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press, 2003.
- Spielmann, Yvonne, *Hybrid Culture*, Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press, 2013.
- Spielmann, Yvonne, *Intermedialität. Das System Peter Greenaway*, Munich: Fink, 1998.
- Spielmann, Yvonne, *Video. The Reflexive Medium*, Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press, 2008.
- Youngblood, Gene, *Expanded Cinema*, New York: E. P. Dutton & Co, 1970.

## YVONNE SPIELMANN

Since 2012 Yvonne Spielmann (Ph.D., Dr. habil.) has been the Dean of Faculty of Fine Arts at Lasalle College of the Arts in Singapore and previously was Chair of New Media at the University of the West of Scotland, UK. Her work focuses on interrelationships between media and culture, technology, art, science and communication, and in particular on Western/European and non-Western/South-East Asian interaction. Milestones of her published research output are four authored monographs and about ninety single-authored articles. Her book, *Video. The Reflexive Medium* (published by MIT Press 2008, Japanese edition by Sangen-sha Press 2011, Polish edition in 2013) was awarded the 2009 *Lewis Mumford Award for Outstanding Scholarship in the Ecology of Technics*. Her most recent book *Hybrid Culture* was published in German by Suhrkamp Press in 2010, English edition from MIT Press in 2012. Spielmann's work has been published in German and English and has been translated into French, Polish, Croatian, Swedish, Japanese, and Korean. She holds the 2011 Swedish Prize for Swedish-German scientific co-operation.