Introduction

Christer Johansson and Sonya Petersson

In the present volume, intermediality is inclusively defined as *relations between media conventionally perceived as different*. It covers themes such as relations between old and new media, intermedial concepts such as remediation and illustration, and explorations of mixed-media objects as well as of objects in intermedial networks.[1] These and other intermedial issues are elaborated in this volume's fourteen individual chapters that bring together a number of highly diverse cases, ranging from present-day installation art, to twentieth-century geography books, to renaissance sculpture, and to public architecture of the 1970s.[2] This inclusive understanding of intermediality makes it possible for each individual study to narrow it down and specify it according to particular demands, methods, and research questions. Instead of stipulating a fixed definition, our shared concern is precisely to

---

[1] Cf. Irina O. Rajewsky's characterization of intermediality in the broad sense as "a generic term for all those phenomena that (as indicated by the prefix *inter*) in some way take place *between* media." Irina O. Rajewsky, "Intermediality, Intertextuality, and Remediation," *Intermediality: History and Theory of the Arts, Literature and Technologies*, no. 6 (2005): 46, 43–64. Italics in the original. See also note 37 below for a reference to Rajewsky's discussion about the assumption of conventional media differences included in the concept of intermediality.

[2] The authors are with few exceptions affiliated with the cross-disciplinary Department of Culture and Aesthetics at Stockholm University, where "Mediality" is established as a profiled research area.

---

explore the concept of intermediality. The key is to combine it with other perspectives, to provide it with particular methods and materials, and to make it the object of both aesthetic and media-historical approaches. While we take "aesthetic" to include issues of formal analysis, the arts, and experience, "media-historical" designates the specificity of media practice in time, space, and particular environments. Our aim to integrate these two lines of inquiry is intended to overcome what we understand as an unhappy divide between, on the one hand, the intermedial subfields of semiotically and formalistically oriented studies and, on the other, media-historical ones.[3] Consequently, "intermediality" in this volume is not only a concept employed to cover an inclusive range of cultural objects, cultural contexts, and methodological approaches, but is also modelled out by the particular cases it is brought to bear on.

The following introduction has a three-part structure. First, in the most general section, we discuss intermediality as a field of research in a broad and cross-disciplinary sense. Then, in the second section, the perspective is centered upon the present volume and its overarching objectives. The third and last section is the most specific and introduces the volume's outline and individual chapters.

---

[3] In this ambition, we complement a range of available edited volumes on intermediality, as, e.g.: *Changing Borders: Contemporary Positions in Intermediality*, eds. Jens Arvidson, Mikael Askander, Jørgen Bruhn, and Heidrun Führer (Lund: Intermedia Studies Press, 2007); *Framing Borders in Literature and Other Media*, eds. Werner Wolf and Walter Bernhart (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006); *Intermedial Arts: Disrupting, Remembering and Transforming Media*, eds. Leena Eilittä, Liliane Louvel, and Sabine Kim (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012); *Intermedialitet: Ord, bild och ton i samspel*, ed. Hans Lund (Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2002); *Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality*, ed. Lars Elleström (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); *Intermedialities: Philosophy, Arts, Politics*, eds. Henk Oosterling and Ewa Plonowska Ziarek (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2011); *Media Inter Media: Essays in Honor of Claus Clüver*, eds. Claus Clüver and Stephanie A. Glaser (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009).

Intermediality as a Field of Research: Traditions, Rationales, and Subdivisions

The term "intermediality" may variously designate 1) certain cultural phenomena involving the interrelations between two or more media; 2) a cross-disciplinary subfield usually termed intermediality studies, starting to evolve during the 1990s; and 3) a larger field of research, including not only subfields like intermediality studies, but also allied fields like media theory and media history. Our presentation of the field of intermediality is informed by the third, inclusive, sense of the term.

Starting with intermediality studies in the narrower sense, as we know it today, it is often demonstrating its dependence on three interrelated research traditions: intertextuality, semiotics, and interart studies.[4] Its reliance on the first two, intertextuality and semiotics, is, for instance, clearly manifested in Werner Wolf's well-known model of intermedial relations, where intertextuality and intermediality are conceived of as two analogous phenomena of semiotic referentiality, or "intersemiotic relations."[5] For Wolf, intertextuality is the "mono-medial" variant of these

---

[4] This account of traditions is fairly presentist. Of course, it could be added that discussions on and investigations of media and relations between media are as old as Western thought. The examples that immediately come to mind are Horace's for centuries rehearsed phrase from *Ars Poetica*, "ut pictura poesis" ("as is painting so is poetry") and Lessing's *Laocoön*, still often acknowledged as an important instance of media studies *avant la lettre*. Both texts are available in early translations: Quintus Horatius Flaccus, *Q. Horatius Flaccus: His Art of Poetry*, trans. Ben Jonson (London: 1640 [c. 19 BC]); Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Laokoön: An Essay upon the Limits of Painting and Poetry*, trans. Ellen Frothingham (Boston: 1887 [1766]). For a discussion on the concept of medium in early modern and modern philosophy, see John Guillory, "Genesis of the Media Concept," *Critical Inquiry* 36, no. 2 (Winter 2010): 321–362.

[5] Werner Wolf, *The Musicalization of Fiction: A Study in the Theory and History of Intermediality* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999), 46, 35–50. For a historiographic overview and a critical discussion of the concept of intertextuality, see Mary Orr, *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts* (Cambridge: Polity, 2003). For an introduction to semiotics, see Daniel Chandler, *Semiotics: The Basics* (London: Routledge, 2002).

co-working and meaning-producing relations, while intermediality is the "cross-medial" one.[6] The third tradition, interart studies, has been especially significant in the disciplines of comparative literature and art history, and may broadly be characterized by its comparative approach—not to media—but to the arts. The comparative approach proceeds from investigating how separate art forms differ from or resemble each other,[7] often under the guidance of concepts such as ekphrasis ("the verbal representation of visual representation," e.g., poems about paintings), so-called artistic *Doppelbegabungen* (artists expressing themselves in more than one art form), or adaptation (a transfer of qualities from novel to film, from music to poetry, etc.).[8] A typical product of the interart tradition is the edited volume *Interart Poetics: Essays on the Interrelations of the Arts and Media* (1997).[9] Besides its typicality, the book should also be noted as an example of the differences between interart and intermediality studies and the emergence of the latter. The chapter written by Jürgen E. Müller, "Intermediality: A Plea and Some Theses for a New Approach in Media Studies," already in its title launches intermediality as a "new approach" and further describes it as a challenge to "specialized disciplines for different arts/media."[10] Intermediality is

---

[6] Wolf, *Musicalization of Fiction*, 46.

[7] For a critical evaluation of the comparative tradition, see W. J. T. Mitchell's chapter "Beyond Comparison: Picture, Text, and Method," in *Picture Theory: Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 83–107.

[8] The definition of *ekphrasis* is taken from Mitchell, *Picture Theory*, 152. For studies on ekphrasis and adaptation, both in line with the interart tradition and deviating from it, see *Pictures into Words: Theoretical and Descriptive Approaches to Ekphrasis*, eds. Valerie Robillard and Els Jongeneel (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1998); Stephen Cheeke, *Writing for Art: The Aesthetics of Ekphrasis* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008); *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions*, eds. Jørgen Bruhn, Anne Gjelsvik, and Eirik Frisvold Hanssen (London: Bloomsbury Academy, 2013).

[9] *Interart Poetics: Essays on the Interrelations of the Arts and Media*, eds. Ulla-Britta Lagerroth, Hans Lund, and Erik Hedling (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1997).

[10] Jürgen E. Müller, "Intermediality: A Plea and Some Theses for a New Approach in Media Studies," in *Interart Poetics: Essays on the Interrelations of the Arts and Media*, eds. Ulla-Britta Lagerroth, Hans

thus presented as the successor of interart studies, which replaces the comparative tradition with a more wide-ranging crossing of borders between media and disciplines. Instead of making the canonized art forms the center of attention, the rationale for intermediality studies is to foreground the more inclusive concept of medium, embracing not only the arts but also medial multimodality, different forms of popular culture, and new digital media.

The traditions of intertextuality, semiotics, and interart studies are especially interwoven in the intermedial subfield oriented toward formal analysis mentioned above.[11] Again, Wolf's model of intermediality is one of the prime examples, since it is concerned with schematizing media interrelations in typologies based on formal qualities, such as "intracompositional" as opposed to "extracompositional," "overt/direct" as opposed to "covert/indirect," and in modes of "showing" as opposed to "telling."[12] Similarly, Irina O. Rajewsky's distinctions between "medial transpositions" ("transformation" in Wolf's terminology, or the production of one media object out of qualities of another, "first," medium), "medial combinations" (two distinct media present in one object in their own materiality), and "intermedial references" (references to an absent medium by way of the first medium's own media specific means), are structured by formal qualities of absent or present media objects.[13]

A rationale for studying intermedial relations that is not so much based on formal typologies but more pointing to the role and function of sensory, perceptual, and interpretative interaction

Lund, and Erik Hedling (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1997), 295 (quote), 295–304.

[11] Cf. Jørgen Bruhn's discussion of the "'formalistic' line of intermediality studies." Jørgen Bruhn, "Heteromediality," in *Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality*, ed. Lars Elleström (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 231, 225–236.

[12] Wolf, *Musicalization of Fiction*, 37–46; for "intracompositional" and "extracompositional" cf. Werner Wolf, ed., "Metareference across Media: The Concept, its Transmedial Potentials and Problems, Main Forms and Functions," in *Metareference across Media: Theory and Case Studies* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009), 19–20, 1–85.

[13] Rajewsky, "Intermediality, Intertextuality, and Remediation," 51–53. See also Irina O. Rajewsky, *Intermedialität* (Tübingen: Francke, 2002). Cf. Wolf, *Musicalization of Fiction*, 42.

with media is developed by W. J. T. Mitchell and Lars Elleström and may be called the multimodal conception of mediality. This concept recognizes media as operative by what Mitchell calls "sensory, perceptual and semiotic elements" and what Elleström terms "modalities." Mitchell's argument, in the article "There Are No Visual Media" (first published in 2005), is basically that a medium and its mediation always entail some mixture of the sensory, perceptual, and semiotic elements.[14] All media are necessarily approached by the senses (sight, hearing, touch, etc.) and prompted by "semiotic operators," such as the Peircean triad of iconic, indexical, and symbolic signs.[15] Mitchell's point is therefore that all media are "mixed media," but all media are emphatically not "mixed in the same way."[16] The latter, and sometimes forgotten, part of Mitchell's famous phrasing is perhaps the most important, since it entails a more qualified concept of medium specificity than is warranted by the traditional mono-modal perspective. For Mitchell, the acknowledgement of the mixedness of all media makes it urgent to describe and analyze individual objects by their various specific media elements or making a "more precise differentiation of mixtures."[17] Elleström's multimodal concept follows the logic of Mitchell's: four "modalities" are understood as present in all media, but in different ways, to different degrees, and in different combinations. Elleström distinguishes between "the material modality," "the sensorial modality," "the spatiotemporal modality," and the "semiotic modality."[18] The

---

[14] Mitchell's article "There Are No Visual Media," *Journal of Visual Culture* 4 (2005): 257–266, has later been reprinted with minor amendments in W. J. T. Mitchell, "There Are No Visual Media," in *MediaArtHistories*, ed. Oliver Grau (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2007), 395–406 and in W. J. T. Mitchell, *Image Science: Iconology, Visual Culture, and Media Aesthetics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015), 129 (quote), 125–135.

[15] Mitchell, *Image Science*, 130. In Peirce's semiotics, symbolic signs work by convention, iconic by resemblance, and indexical by cause and effect or existential relations. Cf. Charles S. Peirce, "Logics as Semiotic: The Theory of Signs," in *Semiotics: An Introductory Anthology*, ed. Robert E. Innis (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), 1–23.

[16] Mitchell, *Image Science*, 129.

[17] Mitchell, *Image Science*, 129.

[18] Lars Elleström, ed., "The Modalities of Media: A Model for Understanding Intermedial Relations," in *Media Borders, Multimodality*

latter coincides with Mitchell's semiotic element in its reliance on Peirce's sign functions. The sensorial modality regards the physical and mental acts of perceiving the medial interface, the material modality includes the "latent corporeality of the medium," whereas the spatiotemporal modality covers "the structuring of the sensorial perception of sense-data of the material interface into experiences and conceptions of space and time."[19] In other words, Elleström's modalities, just like Mitchell's elements, enable media to function as media; that is, to mediate and signify. The material interfaces condition sensory inputs, which give rise to perceptions that are structured in space and time and understood as signifying.[20] It should also be stressed that the multimodal concept of medium designates intermedial relations as present from the start: media objects, from television shows to epic poems, are media specific only by virtue of their perceived mixtures.

The field of intermediality thus offers a range of terms and approaches designed to describe and analyze media and media interrelations. Nevertheless, there is one fundamental question that needs to be answered by anyone taking an interest in using the tools on offer: Why should they be used in the first place? Are formal, synchronic investigations of medial modes and intermedial relations in artworks and other kinds of artefacts motivation enough, or are the intermedial categories and concepts just tools to be used in studies with additional and greater ambitions? No doubt the formalistic answer to these questions will differ from an answer with media-historical, diachronic, points of departure—a subdivision of the intermedial field that will be more directly addressed in the next section. Here, it should only be noted, firstly, that media history and what is commonly called media theory rarely approach relations between media as ends in themselves, but rather as means to explore larger questions of, for instance, media's role in maintaining or subverting social and cultural power, performing cultural agency, or taking part in the formation of epistemological ruptures and traditions.

---

and Intermediality (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillian, 2010), 17–24, 11–48.

[19] Elleström, "Modalities of Media," 17 (first quote), 18 (second quote).

[20] Elleström, "Modalities of Media," 17–24.

Secondly, we insist on including media history and theory in intermediality as an area of research, since these fields' exploration of media history cannot but take relations between media into consideration.[21] Such relations are, for example, those between oral and written media on the one hand, and between old and new media on the other. The relationship between oral and written media have been frequently discussed in the context of diachronic relations, media revolutions, and historical junctures and networks by the pioneering media theorists Eric A. Havelock, Walter Ong, and Marshall McLuhan (as well as by later exponents of the field, such as Friedrich Kittler and Jan Assmann).[22] The relationship between old and new media have both been understood as a question of what Lisa Gitelman calls media-historical specificity (see more in the next section),[23] and closely associated with Jay

---

[21] This is also the case with the field of media archaeology (not to be confused with media history in the sense of, e.g., Lisa Gitelman). In his account of the rationales and interests of the media-archaeological project, Jussi Parikka singles out "intermediality" as one of its issues. Jussi Parikka, *What is Media Archaeology?* (Cambridge: Polity, 2012), 10, 19, 25–27, 34, 37, 38, 154.

[22] Eric Alfred Havelock, *The Muse Learns to Write: Reflections on Orality and Literacy from Antiquity to the Present* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986); Walter J. Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London: Methuen, 1982); Marshall McLuhan, *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man* (London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1962); Friedrich A. Kittler, *Gramophone, Film, Typewriter* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999); Jan Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*, 1st English ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

[23] Lisa Gitelman, *Always Already New: Media, History, and the Data of Culture* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006), 1–22. For further discussions of media-historical approaches to old and new media see Lisa Gitelman and Geoffrey B. Pingree, eds., "Introduction: What's New About New Media?," in *New Media, 1740–1915* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003), xi–xxii; David Thornburn and Henry Jenkins, eds., "Introduction: Toward an Aesthetics of Transition," in *Rethinking Media Change: The Aesthetics of Transition* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003), 1–16. The historical perspective on new media in these volumes is opposed to the view that new media are confined to present digital media and that its distinguishing factor is its unprecedented possibilities of embodiment, as in Mark B. N. Hansen, *New Philosophy for New Media* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2004), 21–46.

David Bolter and Richard Grusin's concept of "remediation."[24] The latter designates a kind of intermedial relationship in which both old and new media, by way of processes of medial refashioning, are involved in "competition or rivalry," and struggling for cultural status, either through "immediacy" (concealing media) or through "hypermediacy" (foregrounding media).[25] Investigating digital media, Bolter and Grusin argue that "all current media function as remediators," and thus pay homage to as well as rival earlier media through the particular ways in which they refashion them.[26] The same is however true of old media: "remediation operates in both directions: users of older media such as film and television can seek to appropriate and refashion digital graphics, just as digital graphics artists can refashion film and television."[27] Bolter and Grusin maintain remediation to be a "defining characteristic" of the new digital media and, at the same time, a fundamental characteristic of all medial practices.[28]

The previous attention to relations between doublets such as orality and literacy, and old and new media, motivates the method of triangulation introduced by Mitchell and Mark B. N. Hansen in a recent textbook in media studies.[29] At its most general level, the method is designed to sidestep the binarism exposed above and, more particularly, explore the way media do more than just passively participate in culture—that is, have actual agency in interconnecting the specific cultural and historical domains of aesthetics, society, and technology. The question "[h]ow are media distributed across the nexus of technology, aesthetics, and society, and can they serve as points of convergence that facilitate communication among these domains?" deliberately seeks to bridge

---

[24] Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin, *Remediation: Understanding New Media* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999). The concept is defined on p. 45.

[25] Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation*, 45, cf. 5. "Immediacy" and "hypermediacy" are explained on pp. 11–12, 21–44, 54–55, 70–71.

[26] Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation*, 55, cf. 14–15.

[27] Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation*, 48.

[28] Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation*, 45, 65.

[29] W. J. T. Mitchell and Mark B. N. Hansen, eds., "Introduction," in *Critical Terms for Media Studies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), vi–xxii.

conventionally un-bridged areas.[30] Mitchell and Hansen make the concept of media their rationale for bridging and interconnecting, by recognizing it as that which "mediates" between binaries and also, relying on McLuhan, as that which impacts experience through its content as well as through its formal and technological qualities. Ultimately, media are envisioned as opening "onto the notion of a form of life, of a general environment for living— for thinking, perceiving, sensing, feeling."[31] Mitchell and Hansen's reconceptualization of media as an environment for living is not only based on the obvious fact that media are "everywhere," from human bodies to newspapers, but also on the way it both conditions and makes experiencing and understanding possible.[32]

So far, we have presented intermediality as a much wider field than intermediality studies in the narrower sense. The gained insight, which informs our objectives below, is the benefit of moving between subfields rather than fixing our position in one of them.

Exploring Intermediality as a Tool for Aesthetic Analysis and Critical Reflection

The function of intermediality in this volume can be described as a "travelling concept."[33] First, it travels between different disciplines. It is employed in studies emanating from art history, comparative literature, theatre studies, musicology, and history of ideas. But more to the point of our aim to explore it and fuse it with other perspectives, the concept of intermediality travels from

---

[30] Mitchell and Hansen, "Introduction," viii.

[31] Mitchell and Hansen, "Introduction," xii.

[32] Mitchell and Hansen, "Introduction," x–xiv. Closely connected to Mitchell and Hansen's widened concept of medium is John Durham Peter's conceptualization of media as environments or ecosystems: "Once communication is understood not only as sending messages—certainly an essential function—but also as providing conditions for existence, media cease to be only studios and stations, messages and channels, and become infrastructures and forms of life." John Durham Peters, *The Marvelous Clouds: Toward a Philosophy of Elemental Media* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015), 14.

[33] "Travelling concept" as defined in Mieke Bal, *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), 22–55.

Jørgen Bruhn and Henriette Thune's combination of it with the Bakthinian aesthetic object, to Peter Gillgren's connection of it to Kristeva's intertextuality, and to Elina Druker's insertion of it in a Baudrillarian socio-ideological economy of signs. Throughout the volume, intermediality is both the concept that informs the studies and a concept modelled out in encounters with their particular materials, methods, and research questions.

However inclusive, in all cases intermediality concerns something that takes place *in between* media.[34] One first sense of the in-between is that it is *productive*. For instance, in Bruhn and Thune's study of Sophie Calle's exhibition *Rachel, Monique*, the authors demonstrate how the space in between the media objects juxtaposed in the exhibition gives rise to "formal content," or themes that not only correspond to more explicit themes in the exhibition, but also add values like multiplicity and irony to the latter.

Anything that is in-between is also about the *crossing of borders*. As noted above, intermediality has, from its launch in the 1990s, been promoted as a field of research that transgresses borders between disciplines as well as between the specific media conventionally studied within them.[35] If keeping with the conventional view that disciplines are fairly separated and that their objects are fairly media specific, one could say that this volume testifies to the often-recognized promise of exchange over disciplinary borders. It includes, for example, literary scholars working with an art exhibition, art historians working with text and film, a musicologist studying film, and a historian of ideas studying images. But one could also leave the conventional view and, to paraphrase Mitchell, say that the disciplines are just like media in being mixed from the outset. Take art history and one of its traditional objects, painting, as an example: Has not painting

---

[34] Cf. the discussion of "in-between" in relation to the etymology and historiography of the term in Stephanie A. Glaser, "Dynamics of Intermedial Inquiry," in *Media Inter Media: Essays in Honor of Claus Clüver*, eds. Claus Clüver and Stephanie A. Glaser (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009), 12–15.

[35] The latter is a pattern of association that permeates Werner Wolf's discussion about "metareferentiality" as a transdisciplinary and transmedial category in Wolf, "Metareference across Media," 1–85.

"always" been the object of art historical/academic interpretation in words, disseminated in the medium of writing and in the package of books? Has not painting, by the practices in and of art history, been reproduced in slides and photographs, not to mention by digital interface?[36] This is not an argument that in any way denies the infrastructural compartmentalization of the academy, but points to the already mixed character of *both* the disciplines *and* their assumed media objects. The very difference between the traditional, comparative approach to intermedial phenomena and the mixed-media approach is that the latter conceives of the object—a sculpture or a painting just as well as a comic strip or a film—as always a product of more than one medium. Accordingly, that which takes place in between media may also take place *within* one object, as distinct from between two separate objects, taken to represent specific media. But importantly, in each case there must still be, as Irina O. Rajewsky writes, an "assumption of tangible borders between individual media, of media specificities and differences."[37] In short, the concept of intermediality—relations between media conventionally perceived as different—demands that media borders and differences are presupposed from the start. Otherwise there would be no borders to transgress, destabilize, and challenge.

The idea of the in-between as a transgression of borders is not restricted to the borders between disciplines or between media. As will be demonstrated in detail in the chapters that follow, it may, by analogy, be transferred to various other conventionally separated categories. For instance, Anna Dahlgren takes Walter Benjamin's classic argument further and highlights the transgression between the original work of art and its reproduction,[38] Peter

---

[36] For disciplinary/institutional practices, "protocols," structuring media use, cf. Lisa Gitelman, *Always Already New*, 7–8.

[37] Irina O. Rajewsky, "Border Talks: The Problematic Status of Media Borders in the Current Debate about Intermediality," in *Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality*, ed. Lars Elleström (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 52 (quote), 61, 63, 51–68.

[38] The new translation of Benjamin's essay "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility: Second Version" is available in *The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility and Other Writings on Media*, eds. Michael W. Jennings, Brigid Doherty, and

Gillgren makes a point of transgressing the border between past and present by analyzing the themes of night and sleep as "migrating" between renaissance sculpture and present-day photography, while Daria and Kim Skjoldager-Nielsen's argument about media embodiment transgresses the border between object and subject. These are indeed examples of the power of the in-between.

Our attempt to integrate aesthetic and media-historical approaches to intermediality is, as noted, an attempt to integrate formal and historical lines of analysis. Needless to say, the benefit of Wolf's and Rajewsky's typologies of intermediality is a fine-tuned terminology that specifies the complexities of formal relations. Nonetheless, it should be stressed that neither Wolf's nor Rajewsky's elaboration of distinctions need to be media-historically framed or demonstrated as culturally, socially, politically, epistemologically, or institutionally embedded in the particularity of time and space. The latter approach is precisely what Lisa Gitelman argues for when she succinctly writes that "specificity is key."[39] Rather than essentializing media as, well, "media," Gitelman calls for the specificity of media in history. To take another example from the present volume, this corresponds to the difference between what would, in Sara Callahan's study, be digital photography in general as opposed to the specificity of the present-day artistic genre of digital photography, discursively established as a new medium against the preceding medium of analogue photography. Our conviction is that the call for historical specificity does not rule out, but may very-well include attention to formal qualities. Likewise, formal considerations of media interrelations may very-well be simultaneously treated as issues of social, cultural, and political use and abuse in particular media environments. Throughout this book, our integrative perspective also takes different forms. One example is Johanna Ethnersson Pontara's close analysis of the "formal imitation" of opera in Ingmar Bergman's film *The Hour of the Wolf*. The author pays considerable attention to how media combination and intermedial references interact with the modalities of sound, image,

Thomas Y. Levin, trans. Edmund Jephcott, Rodney Livingstone, Howard Eiland, and Others (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008), 19–55.

[39] Lisa Gitelman, *Always Already New*, 7.

and speech. The formal analysis is, however, intersected by considerations of the film's narrative (which is another perspective combined with intermediality) and its early reception (which is a historical issue). Another example is Magdalena Holdar's study, in which the argument is built around the performative character of Yoko Ono's work *Space Transformer*. In Holdar's case, intermediality takes on exactly the historical role Lisa Gitelman and Geoffrey B. Pingree has described as an "agent […] of cultural definition and cultural change."[40] For Holdar, the historical articulation of a theory of intermediality (by Dick Higgins) and the artistic and political intermedial practices of the Fluxus movement are cultural-historical factors that contributed to make the radical agenda of Ono's work possible.

The last aspect to highlight here is the critical potential of media history, a recurring theme in Mitchell's writings. In discussing text and image relations in film, Mitchell presents them as "a site of conflict, a nexus where political, institutional, and social antagonisms play themselves out in the materiality of representation."[41] Put differently, any mix of media and modalities matter, as vehicles for, or signs of, corresponding social, ideological and discursive borders, convergences, and power relations.[42] These are critical considerations of media and of qualities in media that are historical through and through: As when, for example, Elina Druker examines how a network of references between the inter-war era's avant-garde film, music, window display, artistic styles, and branded advertising furthered a market-driven media aesthetics in the service of the ideology of the "welfare state."

Artefacts, Networks, and Concepts

The present volume is divided into three parts, under the headings "Artefacts," "Networks," and "Concepts." These headings are intended to describe how intermedial considerations enter and are

---

[40] Gitelman and Pingree, "Introduction: What's New About New Media?," xvi.

[41] Mitchell, *Picture Theory*, 91.

[42] Cf. Mitchell, *Image Science*, 167–179.

put to work in the different contributions. In characterizing the authors' use of intermediality, they both target the objects studied and the way the objects are approached. It goes almost without saying that all studies include medial artefacts, concepts, and networks, even if not to the same extent. Nonetheless, the criterion for inclusion is in all cases qualitative. The studies are included under the heading that best corresponds to their approach and line of argument, rather than to any quantitative amount of artefacts, networks, and concepts.

The first part, "Artefacts," includes six studies that all focus on a particular object or exhibition. This is the case in Johanna Ethersson Pontara's analysis of Bergman's film *The Hour of the Wolf*, Peter Gillgren's analysis of Michelangelo's sculpture *Night*, Magdalena Holdar's analysis of Yoko Ono's instruction artwork *Space Transformer*, and Rikard Hoogland's analysis of a photomontage of a Swedish late nineteenth-century theatre performance. In these studies, the intermediality of one particular object is targeted and determines other considerations. In Bruhn and Thune's and Daria and Kim Skjoldager-Nielsen's contributions, dealing with Sophie Calle's exhibition *Rachel, Monique* and the theatre group Hotel Pro Forma's exhibition *Today's Cake is a Log*, relations between media are studied within the totality of the exhibitions.

All studies further demonstrate different approaches to intermediality. While Ethnersson Pontara is making a careful formal analysis of operatic qualities in the film, Gillgren's focus is on the themes of night and sleep. Spurred by Kristeva's concept of intertextuality, these themes are examined as realized in the sculpture's sixteenth-century multimodal environment and "migrating" across then contemporary poetry and philosophy as well as into present-day culture. Holdar's case, which centers on the performative transgression of human and non-human agency, makes the argument that part of the performative force of Ono's work stemmed from the intermedial theory and practice in the artistic milieu of the Fluxus movement. Daria and Kim Skjoldager-Nielsen share Holdar's interest in performativity, but combine it with attention to remediation as an aesthetic strategy in the Hotel Pro Forma exhibition. Hoogland makes a theatre historical case

of the complex "layers" of the photomontage, layers that are traced to the media practices of illustrative drawings, light, play script, and theatre photography. Bruhn and Thune share the interest in intersubjectivity with Gillgren, but derive it from Mikhail Bakhtin (rather than Kristeva). Besides making an analysis of Calle's exhibition as a Bakhtinian aesthetic and notably intersubjective object, the authors also use the study to develop a method of analysis where the introductory step is to make an inventory of "medialities" as a framework for analyzing meaning production.

The four studies in part two, "Networks," more symmetrically deal with, on the one hand, networks of different media, and, on the other, networks of media in networks of societal distribution and ideological, political, and scientific discourses.[43] Both aspects of networks are present in all four studies, albeit not equally stressed. Anna Dahlgren and Staffan Bergwik emphasize networks of media. In Dahlgren's case, the central issue is the reproduction of art. One of the important points demonstrated by Dahlgren challenges any notion of a direct relationship between art and reproductive media. The late nineteenth-century lithographic album, around which she builds her media network, is a reproduction. It is, however, shown to remediate not only the original works of art, but also photography as yet another medium of reproduction. In Bergwik's case, the widely distributed geography books by the Swedish explorer Sven Hedin are analyzed as media technological nexuses of "descriptive layering." Bergwik investigates how the book's interlayered photographs, drawings, and texts are both transgressive of any particular media technology and merging with the idea of a "panoramic vision" in early twentieth-century geographical discourse. Elina Druker and Fredrik Krohn Andersson, respectively, lay stress on networks of media as vehicles for ideology and politics: the consumer society of the inter-war era and the Swedish cultural policy of the 1970s. Druker shows how the mass advertising of branded picture books and short films echoes avant-garde and entertainment media genres and thus not only interconnects media but also traditionally

---

[43] Cf. the double sense of "networks of remediation" in Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation*, 65–84.

separated categories like art and advertising. Krohn Andersson traces the mediations of "the new cultural policy" in governmental bills, the architectonic space of the newly built cultural center in Stockholm, and an information film as media channels for the infected political issue of culture's inherent openness. However, it is Krohn Andersson's contention that these mediations do more than just realize the "new cultural policy"; in less controllable ways, they introduce an element of uncertainty to it.

Part three, "Concepts," also consists of four studies, that all have a concept (or concepts) as object of study, although it is derived from and elaborated against various materials. In this last section, the reader will get acquainted with, in Sarah Callahan's case, the contemporary art genre of digital photography and criticism of analogue photography; in Sonya Petersson's study, historiographic texts on the genre of illustration and the late nineteenth-century illustrated press; in Erik Wallrup's text, intermedial theory and a song by Arnold Schoenberg; and in Christer Johansson's case, media theory or, more specifically, the conceptualizations of the relations between old and new media in the well-known books of Bolter and Grusin and Lev Manovich. Callahan's name for the conceptual category she both tentatively starts out from and offers as outcome is "the analogue." It refers both to a corpus of texts revealing a cluster of associations around analogue photography and to an analytical strategy. From the point of view of relations between old and new media, Callahan importantly points out that "the analogue" is made visible by being folded against digital photography, which also means that the later medium has, *a posteriori*, created that which preceded it. The remaining three studies are all in different ways engaged in critical readings. Petersson deconstructs the concept of illustration by attending to the inherent ambiguity of the "conventional concept" and offers a demonstration of a tentatively defined alternative concept. Wallrup's concern is with the "song as event" or an argument elaborated in reconsideration of what the author argues to be "a semiotic overstatement" in intermedial theory, where meaning in music is reduced to a sign. Lastly, Johansson undertakes a "metatheoretical" re-reading of the works by Bolter and Grusin and Manovich that discloses the internal architecture

of the texts: their conceptual transfers, use of metaphors, and patterns of inference. The analysis shows how Bolter and Grusin's and Manovich's concepts are a mix of traditional theorizing and postmodern strategies, underpinning the author's concluding suggestion of new directions for future explorations of the relations between old and new media.

References

Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions, edited by Jørgen Bruhn, Anne Gjelsvik, and Eirik Frisvold Hanssen. London: Bloomsbury Academy, 2013.

Assmann, Jan. *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination.* 1st English ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Bal, Mieke. *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility: Second Version." In *The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility and Other Writings on Media*, edited by Michael W. Jennings, Brigid Doherty, and Thomas Y. Levin, translated by Edmund Jephcott, Rodney Livingstone, Howard Eiland, and Others, 19–55. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Bolter, Jay David, and Richard Grusin. *Remediation: Understanding New Media.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999.

Bruhn, Jørgen. "Heteromediality." In *Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality*, edited by Lars Elleström, 225–236. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Chandler, Daniel. *Semiotics: The Basics.* London: Routledge, 2002.

Changing Borders: Contemporary Positions in Intermediality, edited by Jens Arvidson, Mikael Askander, Jørgen Bruhn, and Heidrun Führer. Lund: Intermedia Studies Press, 2007.

Cheeke, Stephen. *Writing for Art: The Aesthetics of Ekphrasis.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008.

Durham Peters, John. *The Marvelous Clouds: Toward a Philosophy of Elemental Media*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015.

Elleström, Lars, ed. "The Modalities of Media: A Model for Understanding Intermedial Relations." In *Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality*, 11–48. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Flaccus, Quintus Horatius. *Q. Horatius Flaccus: His Art of Poetry*. Translated by Ben Jonson. London: 1640 [c. 19 BC].

Framing Borders in Literature and Other Media, edited by Werner Wolf and Walter Bernhart. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006.

Gitelman, Lisa. *Always Already New: Media, History, and the Data of Culture*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006.

Gitelman, Lisa, and Geoffrey B. Pingree, eds. "Introduction: What's New About New Media?" In *New Media, 1740–1915*, xi–xxii. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003.

Glaser, Stephanie A. "Dynamics of Intermedial Inquiry." In *Media Inter Media: Essays in Honor of Claus Clüver*, edited by Claus Clüver and Stephanie A. Glaser, 11–31. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009.

Guillory, John. "Genesis of the Media Concept." *Critical Inquiry* 36, no. 2 (Winter 2010): 321–362.

Hansen, Mark B. N. *New Philosophy for New Media*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2004.

Havelock, Eric Alfred. *The Muse Learns to Write: Reflections on Orality and Literacy from Antiquity to the Present*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

Interart Poetics: Essays on the Interrelations of the Arts and Media, edited by Ulla-Britta Lagerroth, Hans Lund, and Erik Hedling. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1997.

Intermedial Arts: Disrupting, Remembering and Transforming Media, edited by Leena Eilittä, Liliane Louvel, and Sabine Kim. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012.

Intermedialitet: Ord, bild och ton i samspel, edited by Hans Lund. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2002.

Intermedialities: Philosophy, Arts, Politics, edited by Henk Oosterling and Ewa Plonowska Ziarek. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2011.

Kittler, Friedrich A. *Gramophone, Film, Typewriter.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. *Laokoön: An Essay upon the Limits of Painting and Poetry*. Translated by Ellen Frothingham. Boston: 1887 [1766].

McLuhan, Marshall. *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*. London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1962.

Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality, edited by Lars Elleström. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Media Inter Media: Essays in Honor of Claus Clüver, edited by Claus Clüver and Stephanie A. Glaser. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009.

Mitchell, W. J. T., and Mark B. N. Hansen, eds. "Introduction." In *Critical Terms for Media Studies*, vi–xxii. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Mitchell, W. J. T. *Image Science: Iconology, Visual Culture, and Media Aesthetics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015.

Mitchell, W. J. T. *Picture Theory: Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Mitchell, W. J. T. "There Are No Visual Media." *Journal of Visual Culture* 4 (2005): 257–266.

Mitchell, W .J. T. "There Are No Visual Media." In *MediaArtHistories*, edited by Oliver Grau, 395–406. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2007.

Müller, Jürgen E. "Intermediality: A Plea and Some Theses for a New Approach in Media Studies." In *Interart Poetics: Essays on the Interrelations of the Arts and Media*, edited by Ulla-Britta Lagerroth, Hans Lund, and Erik Hedling, 295–304. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1997.

Ong, Walter J. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London: Methuen, 1982.

Orr, Mary. *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. Cambridge: Polity, 2003.

Parikka, Jussi. *What is Media Archaeology?* Cambridge: Polity, 2012.

Peirce, Charles S. "Logics as Semiotic: The Theory of Signs." In *Semiotics: An Introductory Anthology*, edited by Robert E. Innis, 1–23. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Pictures into Words: Theoretical and Descriptive Approaches to Ekphrasis, edited by Valerie Robillard and Els Jongeneel. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1998.

Rajewsky, Irina O. "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: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Rajewsky, Irina O. "Intermediality, Intertextuality, and Remediation." *Intermediality: History and Theory of the Arts, Literature and Technologies*, no. 6 (2005): 43–64.

Rajewsky, Irina O. *Intermedialität*. Tübingen: Francke, 2002.

Thornburn, David, and Henry Jenkins, eds. "Introduction: Toward an Aesthetics of Transition." In *Rethinking Media Change: The Aesthetics of Transition*, 1–16. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003.

Wolf, Werner, ed. "Metareference across Media: The Concept, its Transmedial Potentials and Problems, Main Forms and Functions." In *Metareference across Media: Theory and Case Studies*, 1–85. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009.

Wolf, Werner. *The Musicalization of Fiction: A Study in the Theory and History of Intermediality*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999.