

Kamil Lipiński

Doctor of the humanities in the field of Philosophy. An alumnus of Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań. Second place in a competition for the best essay in English awarded by the Postcolonial Studies Association. His research interests include the methodology of visual arts, esp. the discourses of space.

Migrations of Images and the Presence of Cinematic Illusion in the Space of Artistic Culture

Expansion of cinema to the “new territories”, noted in earlier years, as “migration of moving images from theaters to the museum” coupled with an increased presence of cinematic projection as both medium and message, have inspired artists and filmmakers in diverse ways. Several conclusions can be drawn from the above claim. Attention should be given to the migration of cinematic illusion to trigger the tensions relied upon sets, often opposing each other freed from aesthetic regimes. What ties the theoreticians of art and film at some point is the attempt to theorize the shift from the screening rooms to the museum. This two-stage process encompasses both the search of new projection territories and the institutionalization of moving images within contemporary art. This orientation can be explained in Jacques Rancière’s terms as the “mutation of spaces” to reflect how the moving images are “what-takes-the-place-of-painting” (*ce-qui-prend-la-place-de-la-peinture*). This “change of sites” makes it possible to redistribute the avant-garde idea of the *correspondance des arts* which brings together the spaces of cinema and art. Accordingly, experimental cinema or video installations of the 1970s enter into the “new territory” of the moving image as a part of vivid manifestations of contemporary art”. Following this line of inquiry, it is interesting to note that artistic cinema seems to be “more and more expanded” - says Raymond Bellour - as “cinema defined according to its traditional system; the other «migratory», whose installation is the artistic mode which elevates cinema to a second dimension (random, deterritorializing, heterogeneous)”¹.

» 1 R. Bellour, *La Querelle des dispositifs. Cinéma – installations, expositions*, P.O.L. Paris 2012, p. 35.

In discussing these shifting configurations of a moving image, Francesco Casetti emphasized that cinema “relocation” means any process that “transmigrates” from one place to another. Relocation implies, in equal measure, “both permanence and transformation: an event or a situation is re-proposed and different functions emerge”. This shift is marked with “symbolic processes that imply a move, a transfer, a restructuring or broadening the field”. Significant features of the appreciation of a moving image in the spaces of the arrangement include an attempt to capture how “cinema and contemporary art jointly entered a new mutual relationship, through which one influences the other”. The mutual influence of both forms of expression reflects an attempt to confuse the order of cinema with contemporary art, blurring the borders set in the tradition of the “Imaginary Museum” by Andrè Malraux. It may invert the relationship between arts in the spirit of Marcel Duchamp’s legacy by finding their artistic legitimacy in museums. Conversely, contemporary films generally intended for display in galleries and museums are screened in a cinema, as evidenced by the film works of James Benning and Péter Forgács. These configurations reflect a broader narrative to transcend the modernist regimes of arts derived from avant-garde interventions of a ready-made object implemented in the spaces of artistic culture.

Beginning from neo-avant-garde, the perception of the film within artistic spaces is re-evaluated in line with a specific attempt to transplant certain solutions from the expanded cinema of both experimental cinema or video installations of the 1960s to reformulate cinema within “new territory” of opened spaces of modern art. A more comprehensive and accurate definition of the cinema in the museum was offered in the mid-1990s in museum spaces by Raymond Bellour, Dominique Païni, and Jean-Christophe Royaux. The last coined the term “exhibition cinema” (*cinéma d’exposition*) to further describe the difficulties of the spatialization in the museum. This “relocation” encompasses both projection and installation and is evaluated here as an attempt to revive and preserve the aesthetic legacy. Shifting emphasis on the relocation to outside the cinema room, the moving image annexes the museum space and enters into relationships with other forms of expression. In Raymond Bellour’s view, such an ambivalent, interrelated presence of film forms in the museum evokes a specific impression of otherness. These relatively unique contextualizations pursue a new language of new arrangements that can be explained, in Philippe Dubois’s terms, as the “cinema effect” (*l’effet du cinéma*) in museums, galleries, and public spaces.

The work of Guy Sherwin is discussed in this article in terms of de-territorialization and reterritorialization of impression in the moving projection presented in the Art Station Gallery in 2005. However, several

artists work in similar areas. Controlled by his hands, the light appeared in manifold projections around the entire room. The above is relevant to an examination of certain predilection being experimental art today. I venture to argue that this tendency reflecting Aby Warburg's idea of wandering images (*Wanderungen*) has been most probably elaborated by Gertrud Koch who stressed that "mediated experience migrates between the arts". This discourse and practice perceived as the subject of mutations and creative transformations can be described as "migratory images", which reflects the broader artistic tendency of *ars combinatoria* being a trigger of new perceptual situations shaped in multi-screen arrangements. This shifted cinematic illusion, therefore, turns to the "spatialization of ideas" – as Bellour points out – in contemporary art, thereby expanding new forms of audiovisual expression. This move beyond the aesthetic regime towards the new arrangements finds their expression in the spaces of art culture by Hans Georg Gadamer called building in (*hineinbilden*). ●