Notes on Unstable Cinematic Horizons: Depth, Frontality, and Circularity in Cinematic Art Installation

Sara Castelo Branco
Université Paris 1—Panthéon Sorbonne, France
Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas — Universidade Nova
de Lisboa, Portugal

18+

Notes on Unstable Cinematic Horizons: Depth, Frontality, and Circularity in Cinematic Art Installations

Sara Castelo Branco

Adopting a transhistorical and interdisciplinary approach, this article seeks to reflect on the multiplicity of contemporary screens and their influence on today's modes of vision. Questioning the relational ontologies between screen, moving images, and body-technology, this article analyzes three exhibitions that incorporate non-linear practices, reconfiguring the screen in three essential dimensions: depth (*Baklite*, 2016, Alexandre Estrela), laterality (*Pedra* *Pedra*, 2018, Hugo de Almeida Pinho), and circularity (*Olho Zoomórfico/ Camera Trap*, 2018, Mariana Silva). The article also addresses changes undergone by the images' frames and the consequent paradigm shift in how the viewer physically relates to these images in order to consider perceptive, cognitive, and topological reconfigurations in moving image exhibition formats in museums and art galleries.

The intensive assimilation of screens in our daily experiences establishes a viewing space that shapes the way the body is mobilized. Don Ihde (1990) suggests that our body-technology relationship with visual devices projects a 'mediated presence' that defines and transforms our techno-perceptual experience. Our ways of seeing are thus shaped by interaction with certain spatial, environmental, and visual culture elements, which also invoke what Martin Jay (1999) defines as a 'scopic regime': the particular behavior of a society's visual perception, arising from its social, historical, and cultural practices and values. On the other hand, if we consider certain scientific studies related to animal behavior, namely visual ecology, we can even claim that body movement, and its surrounding environment, influences physiologically the way humans see: 'the field is everywhere alive with motion when the observer moves' (Gibson 1966: 196). The observer is thus someone who sees within a set of possibilities subjected to a system of conventions, which regulates and delimits what in a society is or is not visible—allowing certain images and hiding others.

Ernst Cassirer's (2001) notion of 'symbolic form,' which designates the great intellectual and social constructions through which humans relate to the world, was used by Erwin Panofsky (1997) to demonstrate that each historical period had 'its' perspective, that is, a symbolic form of apprehension of space, adequate to a conception of the visible and the world. *Perspectiva artificialis* founded the laws of a particular gaze that was preserved until the twentieth century, serving for centuries as a common protocol by which the visual world was conceived, perceived, and represented by Western art. In this sense, Hubert Damisch (1994) affirms that perspective does not have a *story*, but *stories*—and it was through these stories that perspective created a vision of the world, an exercise in thought and a certain conception of the visible. However, the authority of this paradigm of visuality is being supplemented by the advent of multiple perspectives, overlapping windows, and divergent vanishing points:

'Perspectives are twisted and multiplied. New types of visuality arise. [...] Our sense of spatial and temporal orientation has changed dramatically in recent years, prompted by new technologies of surveillance, tracking, and targeting' (Steyerl 2011).

This alteration in the field of the visible and in its frames presupposes the adulteration of that interior and abstract space that was continuously occupied in European art by Renaissance perspective—and continued by this perspective's integration into photography and cinema.

By providing this context, this article seeks to reflect on the volatility of contemporary screens and their influence on today's modes of vision that

'not only watch and display us from behind as we watch the display of others in front, but they also do so from the front and the sides and above, and even sometimes (perhaps perversely) from below' (Sobchack 2016: 158).

Questioning the relational ontologies between screens, moving images, and body movement, this article addresses the way art has become a space for reflection on contemporary transformations in how we look at images and discusses the emergent new spatialities of screens. The article approaches this topic through the analysis of three themes that correspond to three exhibitions: depth (*Baklite*, 2016, Alexandre Estrela), circularity (*Olho Zoomórfico/Camera Trap,* 2017, Mariana Silva), and frontality-laterality (*Pedra Pedra*, 2018, Hugo de Almeida Pinho).[1] These artists were chosen because their works intrinsically deal with matters of technology and its contemporary relationship with spatiality, framing, and the body. In this respect, the article also addresses changes undergone by the image's frames and the consequent paradigm shift in how the viewer physically relates to them in order to consider perceptive, cognitive, and topological reconfigurations of moving image exhibition formats in museums and art galleries.

Contemporary Screens: Devices of Display and Visibility

Artificial perspective is inscribed in the most primal principle of the word *space* itself, which, derived from the Latin *spatium*, expresses the notion of distance and interval: 'a painted thing can never appear truthful where there is not a definite distance for seeing it' (Alberti 1970: 59). Perspective itself is also made in a separation between the world represented and the world of the viewer: in a spatiality mediated between two points and intersected by a sort of diaphanous fold between the gaze and the represented scene (Damisch 1994: 447). Similarly, Brunelleschi inferred the projective coincidence of the point of view and the vanishing point through the mirror apparatus, where the observer's monocular view would face the painting in the exact same position as the vanishing point (Bousquet 2018). This mutuality was defined by Pélerin Viator as the 'point of subject' (*point du sujet*): the artist and the observer are at the same fixed position in relation to the plane of the still image, where the stillness of the painting is also that of its observer, who assumes the monocular view of the painter (Damisch 2006).

Under the sign of Alberti's pictorial window, this paradigm of the Renaissance's artificial perspective defined an ordering of the space of images that would be technically virtualized from the twentieth century onwards through window-screens that, culminating in Microsoft's Windows, reversed the representations of materiality and temporality (Friedberg 2006). Alberti's perspective was produced by a divergence in human vision: it reduces the eye's mobility and innate binocular position to a static and monocular point of view, which likewise has become the dominant mode of experiencing the moving image (a single image viewed in a single fixed frame). Today, however, this paradigm is being transformed by a breaking of this continued pattern of perspective, where the immobile position of the subject's body is often in motion, leading the subject to observe images in multiple layers and framings. If cinema has preserved this perspectivist symbolic form to the present day, the screens of new technologies seem to invert the canon of perspective that prevailed in the moving image, shattering Alberti's metaphorical window into an infinity of window-screens:

'Screens are now everywhere—on our wrists, in our hands, on our dashboards and in our backseats, on the bicycles and treadmills at the gym, on the seats of airplanes and buses, on buildings and billboards. Our position is no longer fixed in relation to the virtual elsewhere and else-whens seen on a screen. As the screen has become ubiquitous, the virtual window is mobile and pervasive' (Friedberg 2006: 86—87).[2]

Thus, we are experiencing a paradigm shift that, according to Hito Steyerl (2011), has given rise to 'vertical perspective'—floating, immaterial, ubiquitous, and omnipresent representation. Steyerl refers to contemporary visual representations that manifest a delinearization of horizons and perspectives, such as multi-screen installations or 3D

technologies: 'cinematic space is twisted in any way imaginable, organized around heterogeneous, curved, and collaged perspectives' (Steyerl 2011). In contrast to this transitive and transient relationship with the image, the *screens* of smartphones, computers and tablets are are increasingly private and portable, thus implying a union: either a physical link between body and vision, or the coexistence of different media that come together in these screens in the prism of the digital. This leads Matteo Treleani (2014) to point out that these screens no longer represent things: they are true 'visibility devices' (*dispositifs de visibilité*) that cease to be objects of the eye, becoming only 'seen.' The relocation of cinema to other devices changes the very nature of the screen, which is no longer a surface on which reality is represented, that is, a 'site of *epiphany*' (Casetti 2015: 5), but

'functions rather like a *display*, which is to say that it has become a place on which free-floating images stop for a moment, make themselves available to users, allow themselves to be manipulated, and then take off again along new routes' (Casetti 2015: 5, original emphasis).

Today, there is an axial repositioning of the screen from horizontal to vertical, or from vertical to horizontal, which produces a layered spatiality that leads to an opposition to the traditional frontal viewing mode of the screen. On the other hand, action no longer just takes place onscreen: it also takes place outside of it. 'These screens push us to act outside the limits drawn by the device' (Treleani 2014: 67).[3]

In this context, the screen departs from its conventional framing to enter a kinetic visual regime that breaks the idea imposed by perspective since

'it decodes and flattens the world, giving us immediate access to the speed, laterality, and peculiar superficiality of the images, allowing allowing them to accelerate towards the gaze and configuring them' (Loureiro 2014: 2).[4]

If Treleani declares that we are too impregnated by the culture of the screen under the auspices of the Albertian window to be able to imagine a support that is not anchored to this notion, he also speaks of a change in the framing of the image, which moves from the interior of the painting to its surroundings:

'One only has to look at people in the subway, glued to their smartphone games, to realize that the real issues are no longer within the frame of the screen but outside it. [...] The screen, in the end, blinds us, because by analyzing it, we easily lose sight of the relationship that content and applications have with the space that surrounds them' (Treleani 2014: 70).[5]

Cinematic Art Installation: Multiple Views and Movements

In this new space of visuality enhanced by new technologies, mobility is essential to the configuration of cinematic experiences. In this sense,

contemporary screens establish spatial and perceptual limits linked to a visual navigation regime: 'visuality in today's culture is tightly connected to mobility—corporeal by means of physical travel, and virtual through media and communication' (Verhoeff 2012: 29). This enveloping experience is opposed to distance, contemplation, organization, and fixed ordering of perspective, forming a spatiality not of position, but of action, as it is in the movement of the body and the gaze that the image is realized.

In the text *En Sortant du Cinéma* (1975), Roland Barthes writes about a cinema that fascinates twice—through the image and its contiguities—as if the subject had two bodies simultaneously: a body that looks, lost in a mirror implicated in alienation and in the immersion of the projected image, and the emancipatory possibility of another body, ready to fetishize what exceeds the image (the grain of sound, the room, the dark, the obscure mass of other bodies, the rays of light, the entrance, the exit). In this way, this forgetting of self-awareness in cinema is made possible by an equal omission of the body, as the spectator is asked to be passive enough to forget about the device's framing. If cinema spectators are compelled to disregard spatiotemporal reality during the film, installation works encourage an awareness of the exhibition space through movement—thus transforming viewers, in the sense of Dominique Païni (2002), from 'homo-spectators' to 'homovisitors' who interact directly with the film, deciding on the angle, distance, position and duration of their experience, and perhaps allowing them to be editors of the film's own narrative.[6]

If today's spatiotemporal experience is fractured in virtual windows that are based more on the multiple and the simultaneous than on the singular and sequential (Friedberg 2006), the different visual apparatuses in art installations have made primitive use of several possibilities of the screen, perhaps announcing (even if unintentionally) this fragmented and accelerated regime that takes precise form precisely in the space outside the screen. Disembodied from the flatness of the screen, these screens are dissolved in the spatial principle of the installation. Installations with moving images presented in museums and galleries appear thus as an indicative site for this dynamic of multiplication, dissolution, or continuity of screens, constituting a plural device for managing different visualities.

This multiplicity of points of view leads to the emergence of an open space (in contrast to the spatial closure of Renaissance perspective) that is activated by visitors' movements. Intercepting optical practices with spatial experiences, cinematic installations encompass perceptual and bodily processes that

> 'involve an intriguing aesthetic problem insofar as it is the site where two different spatial ontologies meet: the intangible with the physical; the enclosed and framed with the continuous and open; flat space with deep space' (Hagman 2010: 21).

In this way, optical visuality becomes a haptic perception where the contemplative look gives way to a subject-object connection:

'Optical visuality depends on a separation between the viewing subject and the object. Haptic looking tends to move over the surface of its object rather than to plunge into illusionistic depth, not to distinguish from so much as to discern texture' (Marks 2000: 162).

It is therefore a kind of spatiality that involves not only the spatial orientation of the screen, but also the way in which the viewer's movement can occur along different spatial axes related to it.

Hito Steyerl (2009) associates this multiple movement with certain modes of distraction, stating that this is an experience no longer 'collective, but common, which is incomplete, but in process, which is distracted and singular, but can be edited into various sequences and combinations' (Steyerl 2009). In a similar perspective, Kate Mondloch (2010) argues that this spatialization of screens can produce a contrived response, rather than a sense of co-production:

'While installation art's bid for the spectator's involvement is routinely understood to constitute an open-ended invitation that constructs a critically aware viewer, the "invitation" runs the risk of demanding a predetermined and even compulsory response' (Mondloch 2010: 26).

Given this context, we can affirm that such installations with moving images herald and are symptomatic of this contemporary state of transition to other visual paradigms, constituting a plural device for the management of different visualities and spatiotemporal reconfigurations.

BAKLITE (2016): Depth

Alexandre Estrela's (born Lisbon, 1971) work is based on the observer experiencing an experimental and processive state, an *image-state*, which does not end after the evidence of the first viewing, but opens up upon rereading in an ongoing action of discovery. Since the 1990s, Estrela has been working on the formal and conceptual issues involved in video, moving image, and the matter of images, developing synesthetic, visual, and auditory explorations of mechanical and digital phenomena. The solo exhibition *Baklite*[7] continued the artist's distinctive line of work, drawing on the ability of technological devices to reconfigure the visible in order to deconstruct and mislead the viewer's perceptual apparatus. If the filmic image is commonly flat and framed, Estrela's work diverges from this supposed leveling of the screen and the immateriality of the video image, intersecting it with matter and physicalizing the projection surfaces. The screen is unsubmissive and resists its preordained passive function, acting on the projections.

This ability of the image to materialize itself from physical qualities is present in some of Estrela's works at this exhibition, like *IKEBANA* (2016),

a video projection that outstretches the limits of its screen, expanding it materially to the surface's reverse and obverse. In an insulated space that is not visually contaminated by the other works of the exhibition, *IKEBANA* consists of a video projection XGA on loop, with color and no sound, projected on a small screen of wood leaning against a wall on the floor. This work is composed of a quick succession of photos that trigger a three-dimensional illusion: a bouquet of dried flowers appears, and its shadow is projected on a surface with two eyes that stare at the viewer (actually two holes), suggesting a space behind the projection plane.

When we enter the exhibition, *IKEBANA* seems to be a simple video projection, but as we physically come closer to the screen, a materiality is revealed. A three-dimensional object piercing the screen (the dried flowers) creates an illusion of depth, thus invoking Japanese *ikebana* floral arrangements, whose translation ('live flowers') seems to refer ironically and symptomatically to this particular and dynamic nature of images. This issue is triggered by the presence of a shadow in the video that does not correspond to the flowers, mobilizing a spatiotemporal delay between the matter and its silhouette, between the object's materiality and the video image and shadows. Although they are apprehended as spatial movements, what is close or distant also has a temporal dimension: by perceiving what precedes and what comes after, the subject performs a spatial displacement that gives rise to a measure of time. In *IKEBANA*, the look takes place precisely in this time and spatiality built between the movement of a first sighting, and the visuality of a second sighting when we approach the video installation.

Whether in the negative space of the holes in the screen surface or in the dried flowers that depart from it, this work insists on an expansion towards the 'outside,' breaking the traditional surface-frame separation—despite being fully realized in a physical approximation between the looking and the work, followed by a shift in the gaze that allows the screen to enunciate itself as a discourse. While the works maintain a rectangular frame that separates the real space from the virtual space of the image, the artist's work, on the other hand, three-dimensionalizes and expands the elements of the screen's surface. The frame is no longer just an object of geometric circumscription, but a field of gradations (carried out in front, in the middle, and behind), introducing the objectness and virtuality of the moving image twice.

Although Gilles Deleuze (1986) states that framing is, above all, a limitation, he also recognizes that its limits can be understood in two ways: one, mathematical; the other, dynamic. If, in the first case, the picture is made in geometric variations, the latter suggests 'imprecise sets, which are now only divided into zones or bands. The frame is no longer the object of geometric divisions, but of physical gradations' (Deleuze 1986: 14). Deleuze states that it is with the appearance of sound that the 'out-of-field' reveals its transformation into an image, which fills the visual unseen with a specific presence. The out-of-field thus articulates what is contiguous to the visual image: the sound that betrays what is not seen, but which is perceptible

by the preceding image or by the image that will follow (Deleuze 1986). The author therefore demonstrates that the out-of-the-field establishes 'direct relationships with visuality systems, from the relationship between viewer and image: it is lateral and frontal, it is superficial and immersive' (Loureiro 2014: 4).[8] Anticipating characteristics of viewers' relationships with screens today, Deleuze invokes electronic and numerical images, where there is a gradual annulment of the perspectival regime because the out-of-field has been dissolved in an increasingly kinetic experience:

> 'The new images no longer have any outside (out-of-field), any more than they internalized in a whole; rather, they have a right side and a reverse, reversible and non-superimposable, like a power to turn back on themselves. [...] And the screen itself, even if it keeps a vertical position by convention, no longer seems to refer to the human posture, like a window or a painting, but rather constitutes a table of information, an opaque surface on which are inscribed "data," information replacing nature, and the brain-city, the third eye, replacing the eyes of nature' (Deleuze 1989: 265).

As with the notion of the out-of-field, the concept of the frame appears in another way in the composition of artistic installations, involving a certain variable framing, which seems to be symbolically revised in the dynamic frame as defined by Deleuze (2009). These dynamics of framing emerge in installations through the arrangement of the works in space in different relationships and intensities. If the installation is an artistic form that takes place in the function of space, the frame serves here to define a spatial organization that dictates the distance or depth of the works in relation to the viewer, causing the latter to create a certain mental composition. From this perspective, in Alexandre Estrela's installation, the occurrence of the image is articulated through a perceptual and physical involvement, without visual guidelines, as happens in our relationship with screens today in which

> 'both spectators and screens are primarily mobile and responsively "smart" in relation to each other now, their movements and interactions almost completely destabilizing the fixed position and physical passivity initially associated with watching cinema (or television) from a distance and sitting down' (Sobchack 2016: 158).

Olho Zoomórfico/Camera Trap (2017): Circularity

Our vision has often been subjugated to the rectangle or the square, disregarding the particularities of the geometry of the eye:

> 'The visual field is round, yet movable: in its movements, it describes weird geometrical shapes, which are not always modeled according to Euclid's diagrams. [...] To cage the eye between the rigid 25 x 19 squares is hence a crime against aesthetics, against logics, against physiology' (Toddi 2016: 28).

Based on this return to the circular and mobile condition of vision, the solo exhibition *Olho Zoomórfico/Camera Trap* (2017)[9] by artist Mariana

Silva (born Lisbon, 1983) proposed a reflection on the mass extinction of animal species, having as a starting point our representations of nature and animal ecosystems through image capture practices in their natural habitat—that is, by the application of hidden cameras with their predatory ancestry to monitor the animal environment.

Mariana Silva's artistic work is marked by a strong conceptual component that reflects her concern with cultural and sociological issues, particularly with the boundaries between culture and nature. The exhibition *Olho Zoomórfico/Camera Trap* was longitudinally sectioned by the work *Media Insecto (Flocks, Herds and Schools)* (2017), a curtain cut into wide sheets, on which the artist printed archival and computerized images of large masses of bird migrations detected on radar at different times of the night. The exhibition was completed by two looped video installations, *Camera Trap* (2017) and *Zoomorphic Eye* (2017), composed of round and convex screens, presented side-by-side, whose images dealt with the human relationship with nature and virtual images and technology. Developed within an indeterminate future temporality, the film *Olho Zoomórfico* presents images of the daily life of Ngueve and Margot, two biologist friends who share a house with a cat, and Gani, an animal photographer. These characters debate subjects related to the extinction of species following the arrival of a virtual reality device that allows Ngueve to experience different representations of the world, displayed on an adjacent screen:

> 'The characters live in a time when universal basic income has been implemented, as well as limiting human entry into nature reserves. If greater equality between humans looms on the horizon, the rights of registration of animals no longer seem to be within the reach of men, but only of machines and computers' (Nunes 2018).

The film *Camera Trap* displays several pages of the book *How to Hunt with the Camera, A Complete Guide to all forms of Outdoor Photography* (1926), from an approach to the camera trap to the beginnings of the modern technique of wildlife photography. The book mentions how the first conservationists captured images through devices linked to upper-class hunting. Camera traps track animals using a kinetic dimension, as the photographic record is activated by the movement of organisms in their environment. In an interaction between the human, the animal, and the technique, this film projects a three-dimensional perspective and convex distortion onto images of ostrich, bears, moose, cougars: animals that look back at us. In this way, the film problematizes and questions different power structures—the colonial, predatory, and mercantile relationships associated with the representation of animals by the camera.

The concave circular structure in which the videos are shown evokes the similar system in which their images were filmed: the fisheye lens is an ultra-wide angle that produces a strong panoramic or hemispheric visual distortion. The term 'fisheye' was coined in 1906 by the American physicist and inventor Robert W. Wood based on the supposed ultra-wide hemispherical

view fish would have when looking from the inside out of the water. This lens produces images with straight lines of perspective (rectilinear images) but uses a special mapping that gives the images a convex non-rectilinear appearance. Likewise, these two screens question the perspectivist nature intrinsically inscribed in the camera, leading us to reflect on, according to Silva's exhibition statement (2017), to what extent the perspective system associated with it is adequate to perceiving the true interactions of species in real ecosystems and the different scales at which climate change is expressed. The circular and volumetric viewing space of these screens also seems to evoke the embodied experience of contemporary perception: the screen appears as an object in itself and as a place of spatial extensions. According to Vivian Sobchack (2016), if screens were once a 'screen-scape,' they have now entered a 'screen-sphere':

> 'a newly configured domain of two connected but radically different kinds of phenomenological and phenomenal space—the one three-dimensional, the other of an additional but non-Euclidean and undetermined "n-dimension," each enfolded one in the other. This is what I call our "screen-sphere"' (Sobchack 2016: 162).

Contemporary screens are a phenomenon that breaks the horizontal plane of a scape, as their omnipresence surrounds us on all sides and in all directions, like the circumference of a circle or a sphere 'adding volume to what once was regarded as only a planar topography' (Sochack 2016: 165). This disorientation is due in part to the loss of a stable horizon of orientation, arising from the decrease in the importance of the dominant paradigm of linear perspective, which has given rise to the growing importance of the 'God's-eye view' of Google Maps or Satellites (Steyerl 2011).

Spheres were introduced to sciences in the nineteenth century to describe the physical and inorganic realms of the Earth in an ideal spatial form. In 1875, Austrian geologist Eduard Sueß conceived the term *biosphere*, a sphere that encompassed all life on Earth: 'Sueß reflected on the "zone" on an Earth "formed by spheres" to which organic life was constricted; "on the surface of continents," he asserted, "it is possible to single out a self-contained biosphere"' (Höhler 2015: 55). If the lines of circular shapes invoke questions related to involvement, totality, convergence, integration, or return, they also appear in *Olho Zoomorphico/Camera Trap* as an element of conscious interconnection with nature and animals—a physical and symbolic reflection outside of square limits.

Stein (2018): Laterality/Frontality

The etymology of the word *screen* derives from a noun that describes an object of protection against the heat of fire, thus encompassing

> 'the ideas of protection, divider, barrier, interposition, interceptor, filter, moderation, mask, or surface

that one inevitably encounters in attempting to define the word screen through its multitude of synonyms' (Chateau and Moure 2016: 13).

It would only be at the end of the nineteenth century that the term *screen* began to be used in the language of 'the physicist, the illusionist, and eventually the cineaste—the meaning of a white or opaque reflective surface onto which images are projected, displayed, or attached' (Chateau and Moure 2016: 13). This origin of the word—associated with protection, obscurity, and concealment—refers to the relationship between what is shown and what remains under cover (Chateau and Moure 2016). Georges Didi-Huberman (2007) thinks along similar lines, identifying the image as having a *visual* and a *visible* that do not coincide: what is *visible* in an image would be the manifest, which is in accordance with the established criteria and codes that aim to order the vision, while the *visual* is latent and illegible; it is the uncertain and the non-knowledge. Therefore, the image succeeds precisely because of this understanding that there is always something that is unseen in what is seen.

Hugo de Almeida Pinho's (born Ovar, 1986) works deal with modes and methods of collaboration between science, art, and emerging social forces, as well as dynamic relations that shape the complex transformation processes between human beings, the environment, and technology. The artist's solo exhibition *Pedra Pedra* (2018)[10] linked the idolatrous image with the technical one to reflect on how technology intervenes in the reality of images, apprehending them as cult, magical, or shamanic figures—elements that mediate the absent and the present, the visible and the hidden, and whose use today seems to fulfill the place of man's transcendence to the world. On the other hand, the exhibition inscribed an idea of duality between primitive and contemporary technology: although silex and silicon have the same Latin etymological origin (Vann 2008), they symbolize the first and latest moments of a possible history of stone. If silex was the paradigmatic tool for hunting and fire, the silicon resulting from the purification of stone is now one of the crucial elements of computer microtechnology and solar energy.

Pedra Pedra addresses a volatile characteristic intrinsic to images— and a constituent sense of the screen itself, which, as we have seen, is perceptually organized 'in the game of showing/hiding, a game of the visible or the invisible in which the gaze lodges' (Caccamo and Catoir-Brisson 2016).[11] In the exhibition, the work that best exemplifies this articulation between the visible and the hidden is the light box *Stein* (2018), which presents an image of silicon still in its pure state overlaid by a 'privacy filter,' a film that keeps the screens of smartphones or tablets hidden for those who look at them from the side. Citing this place where images remain invisible and hidden on their sides, this image is linked to the word 'lateral,' which derives from the Latin *lateralis*, sharing a similarity with 'latency,' which, from the word *latere*, expresses a 'bending down to hide,' a 'being secret' or 'unknown' (Harper 2021). Latency is shaped in the hidden, but always potential, character

of something that is not active, but can become so. Thus, this light box comes under the sign of *laterality* (of looking in another way) and *deviation* (of moving in a different direction), and therefore the possibility of another movement and, above all, the primordiality of action—because the word deviation implies the idea of detour, of change of direction and an alternative route in the presence of a more convenient pattern.

In *Stein*, the transformation into an image on the screens takes place through spectators' own motion, as the image is manifested or covered by their movements, making them more self-aware of their own process of viewing. This open and inconclusive encounter with the viewer seems to symbolically inscribe the transformation in the viewer's experience of contemporary digital media itself, media which conceive a visual style that 'privileges fragmentation, indeterminacy, and heterogeneity and emphasizes process or performance rather than the finished art object' (Mitchell quoted in Bolter and Grusin 1999: 31). On the other hand, *Stein* attempts to reproduce the linear and frontal monocular regime by cancelling the laterality and in this way critically questioning a kind of subjugation and blindness in the relationship that we have with contemporary technology.

Although contrasting depth with a certain flatness of the spatial differences between the near and the far, Friedrich Kittler (2010) groups Alberti's window and computer windows into a single lineage, stating that it is

'the ancestor of all those graphic user interfaces that have endowed computer screens with so-called windows for the past 20 years. Alberti's window—like Microsoft Windows—was naturally rectangular and could thus be easily broken down into smaller windows' (Kittler 2010: 62).

However, the computer changed the unique framing of perspective to a multiplicity of windows within windows, frames within frames, screens within screens. If the variations in scale, position, and angle of the cinematographic camera somehow distort the fixity of vision, they occur, however, in a sequential way and not in the same plane (Friedberg 2006). Although *Stein* involves a frontal look so that the image can be seen, paradoxically, movement is an essential condition for its definitive fulfillment: its focus is as much on what is seen as on what is unseen. In this way, this work invokes both a continuity of the perspectivist window announced by Kittler and its deconstruction by the spatiality created by the spectator's movement suggested by Friedberg.

Rudolf Arnheim (2002) distinguishes several different types of center in the image—the geometric center, the '"visual center of gravity," the secondary centers of the composition, the diegetic-narrative centers— which vision organizes relative to a center of reference ("absolute") that is the spectator subject' (Arnheim 2002).[12] Arnheim also demonstrates the existence of two visual systems, the *centric* and the *eccentric*, present in architecture, painting, and sculpture. If film stresses a fixed frontality that inevitably works towards a center—even when internally unframed—the kinetic and spatialized condition of the installation decenters the screen in favor of a spatial

condition recentered on the relation between body and work (Arnheim 2002). Hugo de Almeida Pinho's work is shaped precisely in this spatiality between the observer and the object, which distorts the fixed paradigm of artificial perspective in order to add variations of movement towards the screen. This allows for an *eccentric* movement in relation to the screen, where, like in eccentric motion in mechanics, the axis of rotation is placed off-center or in a different center: it is intended to transform a continuous rotation movement into a different kind of movement.[13] Consequently, this work is made visible by bodily movements in space, as happens in the new spatialities of twenty-first—century screens:

> 'Whereas we foreground and focus here on on-screen space, on-screen space is seen to both reflect and partake in an overall shift in the production and perception of space as such' (Soether and Bull 2020: 15)

Conclusion

A *parergon* is an ancient Greek philosophical concept defined as a supplement or as something that is separate, not only from the thing that frames it, but also from what is outside that frame. In Greek, the term *parergon* (*para* = against; *ergon* = work) means 'beyond, additional, or beside the ergon' or 'outside the work' (Oxford University Press 2021). This expression was defined by Jacques Derrida (1987) as what

> 'comes against, beside, and in addition to the *ergon*, the work done (*fait*), the fact (*le fait*), the work, but it does not fall to one side, it touches and cooperates within the operation, from a certain outside. Neither simply outside nor simply inside. Like an accessory that one is obliged to welcome on the border, on board (*au bord, à bord*). It is first of all, the on (the) bo(a)rd(er) (*Il est d'abord l' à bord*)' (Derrida 1987: 45).

The three screens in this article invoke this similar idea of a frame that goes beyond the frame: the focus is no longer just on an image inscribed between certain limits, but on a trans-screen dimension made by an eccentric relationship that involves a certain spatiality and bodily involvement. These particularities made these screens find affinities in the multiplicity of nuances of the term 'para,'

> 'an antithetical prefix that simultaneously designates proximity and distance, similarity and difference, interiority and exteriority [...]. These works thus rearrange the intrinsic/extrinsic to the work, the unstable threshold between inside/outside, and it will not only be the frame of a painting, but it is also organized on the inside/outside pair' (Rodrigues 2013: 31).[14]

Summoning the particularities of the *parergon*, Victor Stoichita (2019) writes about framing in art, in particular about the effect of the frame within the frame, and the representation of doors and windows in modern

painting, where the window opens the interior to the outside, letting in light and offering a view to the outside:[15]

'It is the window and not the door that, since Alberti, has played the role of metaphor for the painting. But if the window structurally implies looking from the inside at the outside [...], the door can also be the object of a visual investment, but in the opposite direction. If we look through a door to the outside, it only functions as a pseudo-window. It's the inward look that defines it' (Stoichita 2019: 109).[16]

It is thus possible to conclude that in the works discussed here, the outline of the screen, far from closing off perception, opens onto a field of possibilities in an ambition to 'go beyond the frame.' Therefore, these works are experienced as events in space between transitive (representing something) and intransitive (showing something being represented) dimensions. In this sense, these installations address the condition of the screen as an image-state that takes place in the duration and spatiality of an experience, imposing certain laws of presence and multiple points of view related to our own contemporary experience:

'We live today primarily *in* and *through* screens, rather than merely *on* or *with* them. They no longer only mediate our knowledge of the world, ourselves, and others; beyond representation, they have now become the primary means by which our very "being" is affirmed' (Sobchack 2016: 161).

1. My decision to analyze these three Portuguese artists in this article is also related to the doctoral research on Portuguese contemporary art that I am currently doing.
2. Although there have been scattered examples of images in multiple frames and screens throughout the history of cinema and television, it was only with the advent of digital technologies that, according to Friedberg (2006), the 'window' began to include multiple perspectives within a single framing, that is, an everyday relationship with a vernacular system of visuality that is fractured, multiple, and synchronous in space and time.
3. Translation from the original French by the author.
4. Translation from the original Portuguese by the author.
5. Translation from the original French by the author.
6. However, contemporary discourses that propagate the notion that the movie spectator is passive, while the gallery visitor is inherently active, rest on a deterministic mystification that 'mythifies both cinematic spectatorship and the exercise of power into ahistorical constants, ignoring their status as historical contingencies that change over time' (Balsom 2013: 50). In likening the gallery and museum visitor to a flâneur, Dominique Païni originates one of the most evoked associations in studies on the moving image in the context of contemporary art (Païni 2002: 69). Raymond Bellour affirms, however, that this spectatorial condition, concretized in a constant

attentive and inattentive apprehension, can lead the spectator to establish interesting connections, or offer a simple accumulation 'wherein eminently disposable moving images provide a kind of video wallpaper for a stroll through a technological wonderland' (Belllour quoted in Balsom 2013: 54). Similarly, Hito Steyerl associates the multiple spatialization of screens with modes of distraction, separation, and difference, which is no longer 'collective, but common, which is incomplete, but in process, which is distracted and singular, but can be edited into various sequences and combinations' (Steyerl 2009).

7. Exhibition presented at CAV—Centro de Artes Visuais, Coimbra, 2016, curator Sérgio Mah.
8. Translation from the original Portuguese by the author.
9. Exhibition presented at Museu Calouste Gulbenkian—Project Space, Lisbon, 2017, curator Leonor Nazaré.
10. Exhibition presented at Appleton Square, Lisbon, 2018, curator David Revés. For more information, see appleton.pt/hugo-de-almeida-pinho (21/10/2021).
11. Translation from the original French by the author.
12. Translation from the original Portuguese by the author.
13. Centering and decentering are concepts that are intrinsic to the installation, especially in relation to a kind of 'emancipatory' activation that, in contrast to a purely contemplative experience, implies a 'viewer's engagement in the world. A transitive relationship therefore comes to be implied between "activated spectatorship" and active engagement in the social-political arena' (Bishop 2005: 11). This decentering of the spectator contradicts what is, for Panofsky, the rational and self-reflective Cartesian subject of perspective: 'In the 1960s and 1970s the relationship that conventional perspective is said to structure between the work of art and the viewer came increasingly to attract a critical rhetoric of "possession," "visual mastery" and "centring"' (Bishop 2005: 11).
14. Translation from the original Portuguese by the author.
15. According to Stoichita (2019), doors can also function as a kind of window in the Albertian sense when they offer us a view of the space behind the door.
16. Translation from the original Portuguese by the author.

Bibliography

1. Alberti LB (1970) *On Painting*. New Haven/London, Yale University Press.
2. Arnheim R (2002) *O Poder do Centro* [*The power of center*]. Lisboa, Edições 70.
3. Aumont J (2014) *A Imagem. Olhar, Matéria, Presença* [*The Image. Look, Matter, Presence*]. Lisboa, Edições Texto & Grafia.
4. Balsom E (2013) *Exhibiting Cinema in Contemporary Art*. Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press.

5. Barthes R (1975). En Sortant du Cinéma [Leaving the Movie Theater]. *Communications*, 23: 104—107.

6. Bazin A (1958—1959) *Qu'est-ce que le cinéma?* [*What is Cinema?*]. Bourges, Éditions du Cerf.

7. Bolter JD and Grusin R (1999) *Remediation: Understanding New Media.* Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

8. Caccamo E and Catoir-Brisson M (2016) Métamorphoses des écrans: Invisibilisations. *Interfaces Numériques*, 5(2): 9—22.

9. Casetti F (2015) *The Lumière Galaxy: Seven Key Words for the Cinema to Come.* New York, Columbia University Press.

10. Cassirer E (2001) *Metaphysics of Symbolic Forms: A Philosophical Commentary*. New Haven, Yale University Press.

11. Chateau D and Moure J (eds) (2016) *Screens*. Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press.

12. Damisch H (1994) *The Origin of Perspective.* Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

13. Damisch H and Bann S (2016) Hubert Damisch e Stephen Bann: uma conversa [Hubert Damisch and Stephen Bann: a conversation]. *ARS (São Paulo)*, 14(27): 16—53.

14. Bousquet A (2018) The Perspectival eye. *Glass Bead*, glass-bead.org/research-platform/the-perspectival-eye (20/08/2021).

15. Deleuze G (1986) *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image.* Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

16. Deleuze G (1989) *Cinema 2: The Time-Image.* Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

17. Derrida J (1987) *In the Truth In Painting.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

18. Didi-Huberman G (2007) *L'Image Ouverte: Motifs de L'Incarnation* [The *Open Image: Motives of the Incarnation*]. Paris, Gallimard.

19. Friedberg A (2006) *The Virtual Window—From Alberti to Microsoft*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

20. Gibson JJ (1966) *The Senses Considered as Perceptual Systems.* Boston, Houghton Mifflin.

21. Harper D (ed) (2021) lateral (adj.). *Online Etymology Dictionary*, etymonline.com/word/lateral (21/10/2021).

22. Hagman H (2010) The Molyneux problem remediated. In: Autelitano A (ed), *The Cinematic Experience: Film, Contemporary Art, Museum*. Pasian di Prato, Campanotto Editore.

23. Höhler S (2015) *Spaceship Earth in the Environmental Age, 1960—1990*. New York, Taylor & Francis.

24. Ihde D (1999) *Technology and the Lifeworld*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

25. Jay M (1999) Scopic Regimes of Modernity. In: Foster H (ed), *Vision and Visuality.* Seattle, Bay Press: 3—28.

26. Kittler F (2010) *Optical Media: Berlin Lectures*. Cambridge, UK, Polity Press.

27. Loureiro LM (2014) ecrã|screen|inter|face—da imagem-mapa à imagem-libido [ecrã|screen|inter|face—from the image-map to the image-libido].

Revista ArtCiencia, 17: 1—9.

28. Marks L (2000) *The Skin of Film—Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment, and the Senses*. Durham, NC/London, Duke University Press.

29. Massey D and Lury K (1999) Making connections. *Screen* 40(3): 229—238.

30. Mondloch K (2010). *Screens: Viewing Media Installation Art*. Minneapolis, MN/London, University of Minnesota Press.

31. Mulvey L (2006) *Death 24x a Second: Stillness and the Moving Image*. London, Reaktion Books.

32. Nunes S (2017) Mariana Silva: Olho Zoomórfico/Camera Trap. *Contemporânea*, contemporanea.pt/edicoes/01-2018/mariana-silva-olho-zoomorficocamera-trap (02/07/2021).

33. Omodeo P (2018) The origin of the idea of material and life cycles in the ancient cosmos of concentric spheres. *Technosphere Magazine*, anthropocene-curriculum. org/contribution/the-origin-of-the-idea-of-material-and-life-cycles-in-the-ancient-cosmos-of-concentric-spheres (02/07/2021).

34. Oxford University Press (2021) Definition of parergon. *Lexico*, lexico.com/definition/parergon (21/10/2021).

35. Païni D (2002) *Le Temps Exposé—Le Cinéma de la Salle au Musée*. Paris, Cahiers du Cinéma.

36. Panofsky E (1997) *Perspective as Symbolic Form*. New York, Zone Books.

37. Richardson I (2010) Faces, interfaces, screens: Relational ontologies of framing, attention and distraction. *TRANSFORMATIONS: Journal of Media & Culture*, 18(1), published online first at transformationsjournal.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Richardson_Trans18.pdf (21/10/2021).

38. Rodrigues C (2013) A literatura entre Derrida e Lacan: dentro\fora das relações de poder [The literature between Derrida and Lacan: Inside\outside power relations]. *Viso. Cadernos de estética aplicada*, 13: 25—38.

39. Silva M (2017) Olho Zoomórfico/Camera Trap. *Calouste Gulbenkian Museum*, gulbenkian.pt/museu/en/agenda/mariana-silva (21/10/2021).

40. Sobchack V (2016) From Screen-Scape to Screen-Sphere: A Mediation in Medias Res. In: Chateau D and Moure J (eds), *Screens*. Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press: 157—175.

41. Soether S and Bull S. (eds) (2020) *Screen Space Reconfigured*. Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press.

42. Steyerl H (2011) Free fall: A thought experiment on vertical perspective. *e-flux*, e-flux.com/journal/24/67860/in-free-fall-a-thought-experiment-on-vertical-perspective (06/07/2021).

43. Stoichita V (2019) *A Instauração do Quadro: Metapintura nos Inícios dos Tempos Modernos* [*The Self-Aware Image: An Insight into Early Modern Meta-Painting*]. Lisbon, KKYM.

44. Toddi E (2019) Rectangle-Film [25x19] (1918). In: Chateau D and Moure J (eds), *Screens*. Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press: 25—28.

45. Treleani M (2014) Bientôt, la fin de l'écran [Soon, the end of the screen]. *Revue INA Global,* 1: 64—70.

46. Vann M (2008) *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. Leiden, Brill Academic Pub.

47. Verhoeff N (2012) *Mobile Screens: The Visual Regime of Navigation*. Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press.

Author's bio

Sara Castelo Branco (born 1989, Porto, Portugal) is a PhD student in Arts and Sciences of Art and Communication Sciences at the Université Paris 1—Panthéon Sorbonne (Paris) and Universidade Nova de Lisboa (Lisbon) and an FCT grantee. She investigates relations between art and cinema in the context of Portuguese contemporary art and has programmed screenings of artists' films and experimental cinema in institutions such as Arsenal—Institut für Film und Videokunst (Berlin), CRIPTA 474 (Turin), Galerias Municipais de Lisboa (Lisbon), and ZDB (Lisbon). She holds a master's degree in Art Studies—Art Theory and Criticism (Faculdade de Belas Artes da Universidade do Porto) and a bachelor's in Communication and Cultural Sciences (Universidade Lusófona do Porto).

Email: saracath1@hotmail.com.
ORCID: 0000-0001-9930-7472.

Institutional affiliation of the writer in ICNOVA - NOVA Institute of Communication, NOVA School of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal.