

Introduction: Hybridity as an Inescapable Condition of the Arts

Introdução: Hibridismo como uma condição inevitável das artes

FÁTIMA CHINITA

Lisbon Polytechnic Institute | UID ICNOVA

fchinita@estc.ipl.pt

Abstract

The introductory essay to the special issue of the journal *Rhinocervs – Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater* (June 2025), titled *Intermedial Connections: Impurity in the Arts*, explains the rationale behind the theme of artistic hybridity from two seemingly opposite perspectives, those of art forms and mediums, that, nevertheless, conflate in the concept and practice of Intermediality.

Keywords: Hybridity – Art forms – Mediums – Intermediality – Media fusion

Resumo

O artigo introdutório ao número especial da revista *Rhinocervs – Cinema, Dança, Música, Teatro* (Junho 2025), intitulado *Nexos Intermediais – O Estado Impuro das Artes*, explica a lógica subjacente ao tema do hibridismo artístico a partir de duas perspetivas aparentemente opostas, a das artes e a dos *mediums* (em português: meios), que, no entanto, se mesclam no conceito e na prática da Intermedialidade.

Palavras-chave: Hibridismo – Artes – *Mediums* – Intermedialidade – Fusão medial

Author's short bio

Fátima Chinita is the equivalent of an Associate Professor with habilitation at the Theater and Film School of the Lisbon Polytechnic Institute, where she lectures in Film Studies (BA level), Film Narratives (MA level) and Interarts and Intermediality (PhD level). She conducted her post-doctoral research at the IMS – Intermediality and Multimodality Center of the Linnaeus University in Sweden, under Lars Elleström's supervision. She publishes regularly on Intermediality and Interarts and is currently writing two monographs on the subject, one for Peter Lang and another for Amsterdam University Press.

This journal issue stems from a conference that took place in Portugal from 8 to 10 May 2024, held at the Theater and Film School of the Lisbon Polytechnic Institute, under the title of *Intermedial Connections: Impurity in the Arts* [or, in Portuguese, *Nexos Intermediais: O Estado Impuro das Artes*]. It was conceived by the organizers, as the subtitle lets on, as an ode to medial and artistic impurity.

| Side One: The arts

Usually regarded negatively in many sciences and other fields of knowledge ruled by exactness, in the artistic landscape impurity is often synonymous with hybridity and may be the cause for much originality and creativity, thus acquiring a positive connotation. In this sense, the word points to “contamination” or “cross-pollination,” two recurrent terms in the present intermedial debate. The conference title means to emphasize this. Inversely, impurity brings forth reminiscences of the older Italian Renaissance *paragone* debate,¹ which is the obverse to this condition and, as such, an inherent part thereof. Thus, hybridity may be considered, both for aficionados and detractors, a fundamental operative term in the equation of the arts and is posited here as a natural condition of all art forms, either traditional (i.e. high culture or “art” objects) or more down to earth (i.e. popular or “non-art” objects).

The immediate empirical reason for this importance is that artistic hybridity is all around us and, in fact, has always been. For example, dance requires the complement of music, although as a series of ritual or expressive gestures it may do without it. Additionally, some art forms are deemed intrinsically more hybrid than others, which is the case of theater (indeed, ancient Greek tragedy is often cited as a combination of text, acting, music, and dance) and cinema (Ricciotto Canudo, who coined the expression “Seventh Art” in relation to cinema in 1921, perceived it as perfect combination between the “rhythms of space” and the “rhythms of time” – 1995, 32). Diachronically, some arts or genres have institutionalized themselves in relation to other artistic systems, as happened with photography after cinema had been validated and with opera owing to the combination of theater and music. To top it off, Lars Elleström (2018) and W.J.T. Mitchell (2015) contend that perception of media—whose relation to arts I will explain later—is

¹ It consists of the comparison of arts—especially painting and sculpture—by the artists themselves for the purpose of sociocultural valorization. Briefly, this debate opposed painting’s mimetic faithfulness to sculpture’s tactile three-dimensionality. The matter, which was extensively approached in writing from 1817 onwards, is beyond the scope of this Introductory essay.

always subjective and formative due to its sensorial and semiotic basis. Elleström argues that “there is no such thing as a media product ‘as such’” (2018, 18); artworks need to be conceptualized and apprehended. Mitchell, in turn, posits that “[A]ny notion of purity seems out of the question with these ancient and modern media, from the standpoint of the sensory and semiotic elements internal to them and what is external in their promiscuous audience composition” (2015, 125).

As such, the specificity debate, which was undertaken from the eighteenth century onwards had an originally ideological intent: to convince the readers, from a philosophical standpoint, of the superiority of one art form over the rest. This presumption constituted their “purity.” G.E. Lessing (1729–1831), in his treatise *Laocoon* (published in German in 1767), was a notable protagonist on that front. He took on the dichotomy of painting (in which category he included “the plastic arts generally” – 1887, xi) and poetry (which stood for “those other arts whose imitation is progressive” – 1887, xi). In other words, he opposed the attribute of simultaneity in space to that of consecutiveness in time, fuelling a major topic of discussion in art history. And yet some interesting inferences about (non)specificity can be drawn based on aesthetic discourses such as this one. For the sake of brevity, I will provide just three other examples.

In the Renaissance, Leonardo Da Vinci (1452–1519), both an outstanding painter and sculptor, gave his contribution to the *paragone* debate by siding with painting, upset that it should be considered a “mechanical art” (i.e. simple manual labor). He championed painting by claiming that it was, in fact, more intellectual than sculpture as it could create *all* shapes, either from nature or from the imagination, being able to convey likeness, size, colors, height, distances, transparency, luminosity, aerial perspectives, and so on (2008). In the same notes on the arts—not on his *Treatise on Painting*, contrary to common assumption—Da Vinci also compared painting to music and poetry, intuitively establishing a descending hierarchy among this trio of art forms. “Music may be called the *sister* of painting, for she is dependent upon hearing, the sense which comes second,” he wrote (2008, 186 – my emphasis). Unbeknownst to him, this was an entry point into another famous philosophical debate, that of the sisterhood of the arts, which entails an equivalency among art forms.² Seemingly paradoxical, the coexistence of the *paragone*

² In 1849 the composer Richard Wagner presented, in theoretical form, his *Gesamtkunstwerk* (i.e. Total Art), aimed at elevating his music dramas, as he called his operas. He first elaborated on this impurity, that required music to congregate with other art forms, in terms of artistic sisterhood: “The arts of *Dance*, of *Tone*, and *Poetry*: thus call themselves the three primeval sisters whom we see at once entwine their

with the sisterhood of the arts is really the evidence of a broader two-sided phenomenon having to do with (non)specificity, as the emergence of Intermediality would later reveal.

G.W.F. Hegel's (1770–1831) system of the arts, for instance, also presupposed each art's specificity, as well as an implicit hierarchy among them, with sculpture and poetry in a broad sense being deemed the most valuable, as a representation of ideal beauty (taken as a summation of a body in space and an action in time), and architecture as the least interesting (due to its abstract nature and lack of spirituality). Nevertheless, Hegel argued that each of the now so-called traditional art forms (architecture, sculpture, painting, music and poetry—the latter comprising literature and theater), shared characteristics and had affinities with at least another art form, beyond their common function of creating beauty. Staged drama, as a form of Poetry (*Poesie*), was considered the most complete, containing all the others.

J.C. Friedrich von Schiller (1759–1805) whose aesthetic conception was also based on beauty, like Hegel's and Kant's, did not establish a hierarchy of the traditional art forms but went farther than Hegel in claiming that the arts shared certain features. In his *Letters Upon the Aesthetic Education of Man* (1794) he states that the arts and their objects are “not pure and complete” because they lack a proper balance between the senses and reason. For example, music is for him the most spiritual and yet it “presents a greater affinity with the senses than is permitted by aesthetic liberty” (2002, 20 – 2nd par.). In Schiller's theory, the closer an art comes to perfection, the more it is comparable with others. Hence his claim that “[A]t its highest degree of ennobling, music ought to become a form, and act on us with the calm power of an antique statue” (2002, 29 – 2nd par.). Ideally, the more universal an art is, the less specific it becomes. However, Schiller's aesthetic beauty is not without contention as the author himself confesses in Letter XXII, writing that “in reality no purely aesthetical effect can be met” (2002, 29 – 2nd par.).

Centuries later, from the 1960s onwards, medium specificity per se became less the norm than the exception. In the essay “Art and the Arts” (1967), Theodor W. Adorno claims that “the boundaries between the different arts have become fluid or, more accurately, their demarcation lines have been eroded” (2003, 368). Similarly, Stefan Deines contends that the interaction of art forms begets new artistic constellations: “It belongs to the condition of the art forms that they are part of a complex constellation of

measures wherever the conditions necessary for artistic manifestment have arisen.” (1993, 95 – emphasis in the original).

interplay between a multiplicity of arts” (2017, 124). Increasing phenomena of overlap, mixture, exchange, and influence are now common currency. Such is, in fact, the very nature of Rosalind Krauss’s “post-medium condition,” in the era that followed Modernism and Post-modernism (1999, 20). For Krauss, Modernism was a setback in art history because it once more looked for the arts’ purity in their essence, i.e. in their media specificity.

Nowadays the artistic scene begets new formal and sensorial artistic configurations in what, according to Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s concept (2013, 1-27), seems to be a truly rhizomatic way. The art forms have become chaotic and heterogenous, destabilizing the traditional territory of all media, open to all interrelationships and points of entry, calling forth new uses and variations. Indeed, the acceleration of contemporary society triggered an experimental impetus of hedonistic contours that translates into a multiplication of forms, meanings, and sensations with artists merely expressing the flavor of the times. Ongoing technological development contributed to this scenario as well.

Interestingly, the superiority that some commentators may still perceive in some art forms is no longer dependent on their purity, but rather the opposite. For example, Alain Badiou considers cinema to be the *plus-one* of the arts because it collects properties from its predecessors in the process of rising above them: “There’s a power of revelation of the arts, a power of subjugation of the arts in cinema that truly makes it the seventh art” (2013, 7). Michel Serres perceives music as the summation of all the arts: “Music, which is derived from all the Muses, cannot be confused with an art; she is the sum of all the arts. None of these succeeds, individually, when devoid of music; she looks over them all and brings them onto existence” (*Les cinq sens*, 1985, qtd. Goehr 2017, 145 – my translation). Chiel Kattenbelt, in turn, says that theater is a possible hyper-medium because it provides the stage for other arts to manifest in a “performative situation” (2005, 37). He is clearly thinking of cross-media theater,³ but the mere fact that artistic subgenres with the prefix *cross* are emerging is quite telling.

³ Also known as mixed-media theater and intermedial theater, this theatrical variety is characterized by the coexistence of flesh-and-blood actors and pre-recorded images/sounds at the same time-space continuum of the live performance and for intrinsic dramaturgical purposes rather than mere spectacle.

| Side Two: Mediality

Approaching the issue of artistic hybridity from the perspective of media in general (spelled here in the plural as “mediums” to avoid confusion with the mass media of communication sciences) may be perplexing, but it must be done. The word intermediality was, after all, featured prominently in the conference title that led to this journal issue. It evokes (artistic) relationships between two or more different mediums. Should this sentence, then, be construed as an admission that arts and mediums are synonymous terms? The correct answer is no, forcing me to further delve on this conundrum.

The main problem, for this purpose, is the definition of “medium,” upon which there is no consensus among the commentators in the field of intermediality, which encompasses issues belonging both to Interart(s) Studies and to Media Studies (Clüver 2007 and other of his writings). The former academic field has lost traction upon the increment of new digital technologies, whereas the latter is increasingly being subsumed in the broader designation of Film and Media Studies, probably to avoid a direct connection with mass media.

Broadly speaking, researchers of Intermediality Studies, an academic subject which boomed in the 1990s, believe it is fundamental to explain what a medium is to clarify what intermediality may be. The problem is that they fail to do so, because medium does not have a single stable meaning; it is applicable to different entities/things/activities in different contexts and fields of knowledge. Jürgen Müller (2010) avoids the definition altogether and approaches the subject from an historical perspective; Irina O. Rajewsky points out that a medium is always something relatively abstract and that what can be perceived are specific “medial configurations” (2010, 53); for Jens Schröter (2011) a medium is not something that exists a priori, but rather something which is constituted in action. As bluntly put by Lars Elleström, “I will not produce a two-line definition of ‘medium’. I find such definitions counterproductive when it comes to complex concepts” (2010, 12). From this I conclude that it is possibly more productive to see how mediums *work*, instead of trying to encapsulate them in a short definition that risks imprecision and abstraction.

Yet, however one looks at it, impurity (i.e. hybridity) is the condition par excellence of intermediality. For clarification-sake, Ágnes Pethő (2018) identified three theoretical tendencies in the field of intermediality: (a) a crossing of intermedial borders,

(b) an in-betweenness, and (c) a cross-pollination between real and intermedial. All of them presuppose the existence of other mediums, being distinguished from one another mostly by their goals and the intensity of hybridity implied. So, whereas the stance of crossing media borders insists in the existence of limits which need to be transposed—entailing a media specificity that is occasionally cancelled and yet essential for the appreciation of medial differences; the stance of the in-betweenness takes mediums to be inseparable and unstable from the outset—corresponding, in fact, to a downright media fusion. Cross-pollination tends towards an evaluative analysis, perceiving impurity as the key to a given medial superiority over other scenarios. What is most revealing about the elusiveness of “medium” per se is that it appears to sabotage categorizations, albeit the extreme effort and accuracy that enters many of these.

For example, in Claus Clüver’s (2007) typology of mediums, “medium” contains the art forms, but also other forms in which the material element is predominant, such as verbal speech, writing, typography; “public media” places the emphasis on the production technologies and refers to what is usually known as mass media, some of which are also art forms, such as cinema; “physical medium” encompasses vehicles for complex signs, such as body, paper, marble, and musical instruments, all allowing the art forms to exist. Clüver’s attempt immediately highlights the existence of several layers of mediums, implicating materials, technologies and activities all closely interrelated with one another. For example, the production of music requires a material base—a musical score, printed out in musical notation or saved electronically; musical instruments to make it *sound*, and a given situation to be *heard* as such, possibly in an auditorium or using a sound system of some sort; if featured in a television program or in a film, it becomes part of a mass medium.

| **Inter mediality**

So far, I have not related the arts and the mediums directly, which I will proceed to do now. First, it is important to re-emphasize that the arts have *always* been hybrid, and it is not the emergence of new media or digital supports that has caused this phenomenon; it merely added to it, opening new avenues of expression. Indeed, new technologies did give rise to new artistic genres, such as *musique concrète*. Therefore, “the range of material and physical media increased vastly” (Clüver 2007, 29), but non-technological artworks continue to be made. The label of “media art(s)” is, thus, misleading because it refers to artworks that incorporate (advanced) technology and not to the existence of a

correlation between arts and mediums. That correlation has always existed but is now submerged by an unforeseen profusion of created signs.

Probably, one reason for choosing to abandon the word “arts” in favor of the newer “mediums” is that aesthetic considerations such as beauty and value are no longer as important as they used to be, and certainly not the criteria for appreciation in arts at large anymore. The grotesque (Griffin 2012)⁴ and the ugly (Adorno 2002, 45-52)⁵ have become acceptable and even expected as a reaction to former practices and aesthetic discourses. Also, art is now confronted by its evil twin “non-art” (Arthur C. Danto), for example in ready-mades, found objects, and everyday items exposed in galleries (Pop art);⁶ and high art must contend with its low kin “popular art”—mass-produced popular culture geared towards consumerism, such as rock music and comics strips.

The ongoing change is not only technical, but also foremost cultural, having to do with social, economic and ideological turns. The materiality contained in the artworks (e.g. textures and ingredients) is more relevant than ever, together with the multiple supports available to disseminate them—as are, of course, at another level, the channels, institutions and agendas typical of a consumerist society, which will not be dealt with here. Rosalind Krauss dislikes the use of the word *medium* in the context of the arts, considering it “too discursively loaded” with Modernism, by which she refers to the existence of a specific technical support and a required set of conventions (1999, 5). However, she ultimately uses it, recognizing, after Stanley Cavell, that medium specificity is really a fallacy: it is impossible to think of “an aesthetic medium as nothing more than an unworked physical support.” (1999, 6).

From a semiotic perspective, mediums and arts are related. In fact, it is quite telling that several intermedial commentators—such as Lars Elleström, Irina O. Rajewsky

⁴ “Little wonder that the grotesque is as popular today as it was in the fifteenth century. It allows us to get (at least a partial) handle on some of the most unspeakably vile and frightening categories of human experience, and it does so with humour and a sense of the absurd.” (Griffin 2012, n.p.). For an overview of Mikhail Bakhtin’s concept of the “carnavalesque” and folk humor in relation to visual arts, more specifically film cf. Robert Stam’s *Subversive Pleasures* (1989).

⁵ “The perpetually recurring [ugliness] becomes that antithetical other without which art, according to its own concept, would not exist; appropriated through negation, this other –the antithesis to beauty, whose antithesis beauty was – gnaws away correctively on the affirmation of spiritualizing art.” (Adorno 2002,47).

⁶ “[...] artworks, can be imagined, on in fact produced, which look exactly like mere real things which have no claim to the status of art at all [...]. There is no a priori constraint on how works of art must look—they can look like anything at all” (Danto 1995, 15-16). In fact, Arthur C. Danto calls the art that followed Modernism “post-historical art,” a period of information disorder, a condition of perfect aesthetic entropy and perfect freedom.” (1995, 12).

and Werner Wolf—come from the field of Comparative Literature. Comparativism is what art forms and mediums have in common under the umbrella term of intermediality. In fact, among the issues that have transitioned from Interart(s) Studies, one may find aspects concerned with sources, genres, themes, and imitation—typical of intertextuality and all forms of adaptation; transformations among media, or transmediation, as this process is usually known—such as representation of one medium in another, narrativity at large, matters of space and time; reception and authorship under the guise of intradiegetic occurrences (e.g. implicit author and ‘reader’) (Clüver 2006, 16). This is not an exhaustive list but serves to lay bare the shared identity.

As posited by Lars Elleström: “Art might be seen as a complex blend of information and entertainment (Horace’s *utile dulci*) so it should be fully possible to include the art forms among other media.” (2010, 13). Some conditions need to be met, which I will abbreviate here, using Elleström’s rationale as my compass. First, legally, an object can only be considered an artwork if it is tangible, tangibility being hence the condition for its *existence*, and inherent protection.⁷ Elleström considers “technical media” to be “the very tangible devices needed to materialize instances of media types” (2010, 12). Nevertheless, if not made public in some way an art object does not fulfil its destiny beyond mere self-serving authorial expression. It would not be entertainment, as Elleström, puts it, because it would fail to provide satisfaction to others. Note that entertainment is being used here in a broad sense, unrelated to consumerism and/or mainstream futility. Not made to be secret, art objects thus need to be conveyed by certain means, vehicles that allow the authors to share them. At a very basic and somewhat abstract level, because they can materialize in many ways, “[A] medium is a channel, some might say” (Elleström 2010, 14). To be able to materialize into something that exists for a purpose and resembles an activity, the tangible channels need some “qualifying aspects” that may be present in artistic and non-artistic mediums alike. Consequently, art forms and other sign systems, such as Morse code, need to possess certain qualitative aspects, which are produced (and, likewise, disappear) “in specific historical, cultural and social circumstances” (Elleström 2010, 24), being contextually bound to “determined practices, discourses and conventions” (Elleström 25). In short, to be considered mediums

⁷ *Copyright Act*, Chapter I, Section 102a (1976) reads as follows: “Copyright protection subsists, in accordance with this title, in original works of authorship fixed in any tangible medium of expression, now known or later developed, from which they can be perceived, reproduced, or otherwise communicated, either directly or with the aid of a machine or device.” Ideas are not protected under the copyright law.

art forms need to be tangible channels that communicate and entertain according to certain conventions and in a given context.

Possibly, whenever one is inclined to the operationality of arts, the word “medium” might be more to the point, whereas when one contends with the aesthetic properties, “art form” may be preferable. Also, there is a technological leaning implied in the term *medium*, responsible for the most recent art forms usually being named “new media” because they essentially congregate digital forms. This is a simplistic relationality, as comics do not need to be digital to be recent, and many hybrid artworks in the form of installations may resort to strictly mechanical means. Sometimes the choice of words is biased by ideological conceptions, mediums often being associated with cutting-edge phenomena, whereas materials and art forms are more connected with old-fashioned, outmoded products or events. This is a misguided notion because from the perspective of media archaeology there are no old media,” as Simone Natale provocatively claims (2016). This simply means that all emerging mediums have always sprang from preexisting ones. Mediums do not exist in a void.

Nevertheless, three general tendencies seem to exist, not in respect to the commentators’ theoretical stance and their positioning in the intermedial landscape (see Pethő above) but concerning the interrelationship of the mediums themselves. Claus Clüver sums up the matter by claiming the existence of three main kinds of media relations. These are: (a) “general relations among the media,” (b) “transformation from one medium to another,” (c) “the combination (fusion) of media” (2007, 32). A commentator such as Irina O. Rajewsky, who is a strong advocate of the theoretical stance of crossing media borders, presents a personal categorization consisting of: (a) “medial transposition,” (b) “media combinations, and (c) “intermedial references” (2005, 51-52). The former relates to transmedial phenomena, the latter to a special type of quotation of certain medial characteristics, and the intermediate one (no pun intended) pertains to the plurality of combinations and mediums involved, including not only hybrid art forms from the beginning—such as opera, cinema and theater, but also multimedia, mixed media, and intermedia—fusional works in which the components cannot be separated from the rest without the obliteration of the artwork as such.

Hence, the phenomenon of media fusion cannot be ignored, particularly since its identity is somewhat unclear, comprising different medium constellations and/or with dissimilar combinatory intensities. It tends to be more prominent at historical key periods

in the arts that correspond to a disruption of prevailing forms and discourses (e.g. the 1960s in the US), or to the emergence and spreading of new technologies, or indeed the combination of both—as is the case in the new millennium. Either way, it entails extreme creativity. As observed by Jürgen Heinrichs and Yvonne Spielmann, in relation to the digital scenario: “Conceptually, intermedia denotes a fusion instead of an accumulation of media. Thus, the convergence of elements from different media implies a transformation which is superior to the sum of its parts” (qtd. Pethő 2011, 29). However, if one follows Fluxus cofounder and artist Dick Higgins concept of “intermedia” to the letter, one realizes that this phenomenon self-cannibalizes itself in its perpetual search for originality, ultimately jeopardizing the creation of stable art forms. “No reputable artist could be an intermedial artist for long,” claims Higgins’s (1965/1981, n.p.). Jens Schröter includes the phenomenon in his “synthetic intermediality,” which is a model of *discourse* and not an activity per se. He highlights an extremely pertinent point, when he observes that if “old forms are inextricably blended in a new form,” this obviates “the naming of the original forms from which the intermedium is generated.” (2011, n.p.). It may be said, then, that in this literal meaning fusion is as much creative as it is disruptive. Perhaps another non-literal meaning of fusion (i.e. extreme hybridity) exists that may reinforce the intrinsic connection of the art forms without leading to their self-inflicted demise, an issue I will approach elsewhere (Chinita, forthcoming).

| Cases in point

All the essays contained in this bilingual issue of the journal—very much like the conference itself from which it stems—can be said to integrate Irina O. Rajewsky’s category of “medial combinations,” here established as being broad enough to accommodate a large spectrum of different phenomena. Their approach is twofold, involving both practical and theoretical considerations on both arts and mediums, or as Lars Elleström would put it, as qualified media.

Chiel Kattenbelt’s essay uses hybridity to pose the art form of theater as “the paradigm of all arts” because the spectacular variety of theatrical mixed medium—which, in his view, amounts to a hypermedium—can mingle with other technical mediums, namely audiovisual ones. However, whereas Kattenbelt is mostly concerned with the *staged* production, Clara Gomes’s piece on cyberformance—which emphasizes the crucial role of technologies in artistic practice—prefers to focus on audience reception, as well as on the interactivity entailed by that type of performance. Both authors, however,

consider the fundamental dramaturgical implications of such creative theater practices. Jitka Ciampi Matulova's essay verses the theatrical alternative practices of the company *Divadlo na provázku* (in English: Theatre on a String) in Czechoslovakia in the 1980s, before the fall of the Iron Curtain and the abolishment of censorship in that country. Beyond a well- documented account of the company's *modus operandi* in relation to a case study titled *Project 1985*, this essay also highlights the subversive ethical goals of such practices in that context.

Social ideology equally enters Judit Pieldner's essay on the relationship between painting and cinema in the analysis of Céline Sciamma's film *Portrait of a Lady on Fire* (2019) in which gender plays a central role. This reflection on the female gaze calls forth the intermedial issue of "intersensuality," a sensorial dialogue among art forms that in this case emulates the diegetic relationship between the two female protagonists. Jorge Santos and Mirian Tavares joint essay is quite engaged in gender issues as well, but from another, more practical, perspective. They approach curatorship as a tool for raising consciousness and promoting social transformation, focusing on a particular case study: the project *Parallel 3*, and more specifically the exhibition *Mulheres no Desporto* (in English: *Women in Sports*) that uses fictional characters created through IA and interactive installations.

Without any technology whatsoever, the project *Imemorial: Passos no Cativoiro* (in English: *Immemorial, Steps in Captivity*)—performed in downtown riverside Lisbon, where the slave ships used to dock—is the departing point of Rui Filipe Antunes's essay, with its colonial overtones. The author, who also conceived the sound design for the project, provides ample account of its concept and constitutive elements, in a deliberately sinuous way that mimics walking as a performative practice. Inversely, Ana Cláudia Munari and Miriam Paiva Vieira's essay concerns memory from the perspective of time passing upon a subject that stands still. The subject in this case is none other than a specific corner in a living room, bearing witness to different generations of people coming and going. Such is the topic of Richard McGuire's graphic novel *Here* (2017) in which architecture and comics combine to provide a reflection on time and space, one of Lars Elleström's modalities of media, used here as the essay's theoretical base.

Interestingly, two of the essays of this journal issue concern unrelated artists named Pina, the art form/medium of film, and the way one creator's practice was inspired by someone else. Pedro Florêncio's article proposes the concept of "modular cinema," as

the means through which cinematic praxes may be interpreted as affective responses to other artworks (be they scenic, plastic, visual or audible). The essayist is particularly interested in one specific correlation, namely the one between German choreographer/dancer Pina Bausch and Belgium filmmaker Chantal Akerman, via a film the latter dedicated to the former, *Un jour Pina a demandé* (1983) (in English: *One Day Pina Asked*). Rejecting the idea that said work is a mere documentary, as happens with other preexisting films on Bausch, Florêncio argues that Chantal's authorship emerges through Pina's. In turn, Alice Duarte's essay centers on Henrique Pina's film *Body-Buildings*, that brings together six choreographies by reputed artists performed in six different Portuguese renowned architectural sites. The film implicitly conveys the notion that art creation is a sort of *architecture*, metaphorical meaning that the essayist does not fail to appropriate and use in the title of her article, rendering the relation between film, dance and architecture explicit.

Although this selection could be complemented by many other theoretical and practical instances, it nevertheless works as a sample of the artistic profusion and broad possibilities contained in the field of Intermediality and its inherent hybridity.

| Works Cited:

- Adorno, Theodor W. 1967. "Art and the Arts" Translated by Rodney Livingstone. <https://pt.scribd.com/document/390869870/theodor-w-adorno-art-and-the-arts-pdf>. Last accessed May 5, 2025.
- , 2002. *Aesthetic Theory*, edited by Gretel Adorno and Rolf Tiedemann; translated by Robert Hullot-Kentor. New York: Continuum.
- Badiou, Alain. 2013. *Cinema*. Translated by Susan Spitzer. Cambridge (UK) and Malden (US): Polity Press.
- Canudo, Ricciotto. 1995. *L'usine aux images*, edited by Jean-Paul Morel. Paris: Séguier and Arte Éditions.
- Chinita, Fátima. 2026 [forthcoming]. *The Tableau Aesthetics: Intermedial Performativity in Fusional Cinema*. Oxford, Lausanne et al: Peter Lang.
- Clüver, Claus. 2006. "Inter Textus / Inter Artes / Inter MediA," *Aletria* (July-December): 11–37. <https://doi.org/10.17851/2317-2096.14.2.10-41>.
- , 2007. "Intermediality and Interarts Studies." In *Changing Borders: Contemporary Positions in Intermediality*, edited by Jens Arvidson, Mikael Askander, Jørgen Bruhn, and Heidrun Führer, 19–27. Lund: Intermedia Studies Press.
- Copyright Law. 1976. *Copyright Law OF THE United States and Related Laws*

Contained in Title 17 of the United States Code. <https://www.copyright.gov/title17/title17.pdf>. Last accessed May 23, 2025.

- Danto, Arthur C. 1995. *After the End of Art: Contemporary Art and the Pale of History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Da Vinci, Leonardo. 2008 [1952]. “Comparison of the Arts.” In *Notebooks*, selected by Irma A. Richter, edited by Thereza Wells, translated by Jean-Paul Richter, 184–196. Oxford, New York et al.: Oxford University Press.
- Deines, Stefan. 2017. “On the Plurality of the Arts.” *Proceedings of the European Society For Aesthetics*, vol. 9: 116–127. https://www.academia.edu/38087968/On_the_Plurality_of_the_Arts. Last accessed May 6, 2025.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 2013 [1987]. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. London et al: Bloomsbury.
- Elleström, Lars. 2010. “The Modalities of Media: A Model for Understanding Intermedial Relations.” In *Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality*, edited by Lars Elleström, 11–48. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- , 2018. “Identifying, Construing, and Bridging over Media Borders.” *Scripta Uniandrade*, vol. 16, no. 3: 15–30. <https://revistahom.uniandrade.br/index.php/ScriptaUniandrade/article/view/1162>. Last accessed April 22, 2025.
- Griffin, Jonathan. 2012. “Rudely transgressing the boundaries between the elevated and the profane.” *Tate etc.* October 1, n.p. <https://www.tate.org.uk/tate-etc/issue-26-autumn-2012/rudely-transgressing-boundaries-between-elevated-and-profane>.
- Goehr, Lydia. 2017. “‘All Art Constantly Aspires to the condition of Music’—Except the Art of Music.” In *Insistence of Art: Philosophy and Aesthetics after Early Modernity*, edited by Paul A. Kottman, 140–169. Fordham University.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. 2009 [Reviewed in 2016]. “Hegel’s Aesthetics,” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Based on *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*, translated by T.M. Knox, Oxford University Press. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hegel-aesthetics/#HegKnArt>. Last accessed April 4, 2025.
- Higgins, Dick. Originally 1965, with additional text in 1981. “Synesthesia and Intersenses: Intermedia.”: n.p. *UbuWeb* | *UbuWeb Papers*. <https://pt.scribd.com/document/476076698/Dick-higgins-intermedia-intersenses>. Last accessed May 23, 2025.
- Kattenbelt, Chiel. 2006. “Theatre as the Art of the Performer and the Stage of Intermediality.” In *Intermediality in Theatre and Performance*, edited by Freda Chapple and Chiel Kattenbelt, 29–39. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- Kraus, Rosalind. 1999. *“A Voyage on the North Sea”: Art in the Age of the Post-medium Condition*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. 1887. *Laoccon. An Essay Upon the Limits of Painting and*

Poetry, with Remarks Illustrative of Various Points in the History of Ancient Art.
Harde Press, Facsimile of the original published by John Wiley & Son.

- Mitchell, W.J.T. 2015 [2005]. “There Are no Visual Media”. Chap. 10 in *Image Science: Iconology, Visual Culture and Media Aesthetics*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Müller, Jürgen E. 2010. “Intermediality Revisited: Some Reflections about Basic Principles of this *Axe de pertinence*.” In *Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality*, edited by Lars Elleström, 237–252. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Natale, Simone. 2016. “There Are no Old Media.” *Journal of Communication*, vol. 66: 585–603. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12235>.
- Pethő, Ágnes. 2011. *Cinema and Intermediality: The Passion for the In-Between*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- , 2018. “Approaches to Studying Intermediality in Contemporary Cinema,” *Acta Universitatis Sapientia, Film and Media Studies*, vol. 15: 165–187.
- Rajewsky, Irina O. 2010. “Border Talks: The Problematic Status of Media Borders in the Current Debate about Intermediality.” In *Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality*, edited by Lars Elleström, 51–68. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schiller, Johann Christoph Friedrich von. 2002. *Letters Upon the Aesthetic Education of Man*. Blackmask online, no translator, 44 pages. <https://openspaceofdemocracy.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/letters-on-the-aesthetic-education-of-man.pdf>. Last accessed April 12, 2015.
- Schröter, Jens. 2011. “Discourses and Models of Intermediality,” *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, vol. 13, no. 3: np.
- Stam, Robert. 1989. *Subversive Pleasures: Bakhtin, Cultural Criticism, and Film*. Baltimore and London The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wagner, Richard. 1993. “The Art Work of the Future.” In *The Artwork of the Future and Other Works*. Translated by W. Ashton Ellis. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Wolf, Werner. 2011. “(Inter)mediality and the Study of Literature.” *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, vol. 13, no. 3: 1–9 PDF. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.1789>.