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Paolo Granata

Chapter 6: Video ergo sum: Video Art as Symbolic Form

Introduction

By explicitly hinting in my title at Erwin Panofsky’s essay “Perspective as symbolic form” (1991 [1927]), I try to understand in this article if it is possible to develop a discourse on the situation of contemporary visual culture that echoes the one proposed by the German art historian. The following arguments try to prove that it is indeed possible to do so, by referring to the relations currently binding art, aesthetics and the new media, from the interdisciplinary perspective as developed by the field of cultural studies.

Although, as correctly noted by René Berger, “neologisms are irritating” (Berger 1991, 113), they may sometimes be essential as semantic tools to build or prove a certain case. One of such neologisms is ‘videomorphosis’, that I will use in this article in order to validate the assumption that video is now the prevailing symbolic form of contemporary visual art. In my view, it is the symbolic form best suited to represent a quintessential “factor of style” – to use Panofsky’s words (1991, 40) – of the current scientific and technological imagination.

In order to better define the term ‘video’ in this context, it could be best described as a device; a technological but also and foremost a cultural device acting in the relation of reciprocal mediation that traditionally exists between humankind and the world. A technological-cultural device with an aesthetical value is nothing but a medium, as it has been defined almost unanimously by the media studies. Yet, it is important to understand the aesthetics of video in its own right; as a way of feeling and perceiving the world, an extra-somatic extension of the human sensory network – as conceived by McLuhan – with a consequent feedback effect on humans and their ‘vision of the world’. It thus pertains to the set of historical-cultural factors that twentieth century philosophers have defined as Weltanschauung.

The video-form – video as a symbolic form, or videomorphosis in this context – is moreover to be perceived as a meta-medium, a system of expressive forms, a seamless media surface shared by the different material and intellectual
components that shape the entire contemporary cultural system. From cinema to TV broadcasting, from computers to portable devices, from video games to the electronic displays disseminated across the urban space, everything is video. Not coincidentally, the video-prefix is common to many expressions of daily language such as video-games, video-phone, video-surveillance, etc., where ‘video’ always stands for images shaped by movement. They form, in fact, a whirl of images flowing in a single visual stream, an unstoppable and fluid visual continuum, a form of exchange, relation, interaction between viewer and object that Nicholas Mirzoeff has defined as ‘visual event’ (Mirzoeff 1999, 13). Others have created even more original neologisms for this phenomenon such as ‘vidéosphère’ (Debray, 1992) and ‘videoscape’ (Canevacci 1995).

In this essay I will compare the perspective culture of the modern age and the videomorphic culture of the contemporary, postmodern, age. I thus hope to be able to highlight the specific characteristics of videomorphic culture. But let me first set out the argument of video culture as the convergence between science and visual art.

Videomorphosis

What is the role of video art today? On the basis of the arguments illustrated in this essay, I can affirm that the role of video art today is its bringing to light, its revealing the relation between symbolic culture and material culture in our age. In fact, explaining this relation, achieving this connection represents a mission shared in various ways by the entire history of art of the twentieth century; and perhaps it is a role that belongs to art tout court. In particular, video art represents a border area between several contemporary art languages. It is a constantly evolving realm within which the symbolic workings of this perceptive stream, this continuum, this visual event – vidéosphère, videoscape or whatever name one chooses for it – is revealing itself to us.

In fact, video art seems to re-run in slow motion many phenomena of contemporary visual culture that are evidence of the videomorphosis process now under way. The process I call videomorphosis is the result of the convergence of the technologies of vision conceived over the ages; it is a process that may take on any kind of form, and video art includes almost all of these forms. The symbolic value of these different artistic forms, performed in many different ways, becomes the foundation of the argument inspired by Panofsky’s essay that forms the centre of this text.

Panofsky’s notion of symbolic form – indebted by the positions of the Marburger Schule and its main proponent, Ernst Cassirer – has the well-known merit of having elevated a geometric-philosophical process of visual representation to
the status of symbol. Resulting from the convergence of several theoretical-technical disciplines, the perspective may be viewed as a symbol in that it is an expression of a cultural construct, an arbitrary conceptual structure resulting from a historically defined and defining vision of the world. Panofsky wrote: “Indeed, [perspective] may even be characterized (to extend Ernst Cassirer’s felicitous term to the history of art) as one of those ‘symbolic forms’ in which ‘spiritual meaning is attached to a concrete, material sign and intrinsically given to this sign’ (Panofsky 1991, 40 – 41). In this way a spiritual (or ‘super-sensible’) meaning becomes sensible, a material sign that can be experienced, a technical fact. The symbolic form has the specific advantage of reconnecting the sensible, etymologically aesthetic component of the material culture to the super-sensible (or symbolic-spiritual) component pertaining to the realm of ideas, concepts, thought or culture tout court. Moreover, the symbolic activity – or the ‘symbolic faculty’, as it was defined by Leslie White (1949, 33) – is the particular element that enables man to exist in that specifically human substrate that is culture; we may refer here to the well-known definition of man as animal symbolicum proposed by Cassirer himself (1944). The most reliable researchers on this issue (for example Durand 1964) have also suggested that symbolic forms have an arbitrary character – since their value is conferred within the cultural system that defines them as such – that is markedly historicized, or dependent on space-temporal factors connected to a certain age or civilisation. In other words, any symbolic form is connected to, or shaped by, the cultural subsoil that produces it. As explained by René Berger: “The symbolic systems are devices that help a concept of the real become the very object of a perception from which it gets in turn its validation as a concept.” (Berger 1991, 165, translation mine). For this reason, the perspective space – or, in Panofsky’s words, “a fully ‘perspectival’ view of space” (1991, 27) – is not just a visual process but also a cultural device in that it connects the material dimension of Renaissance culture to the corresponding symbolic dimension, at the same time amplifying the potential of both and also influencing the entire season of Western civilisation known as the Modern Age.

If then, for the above mentioned reasons, the entire conceptual construct of perspective can be considered as a qualifying, and founding, cultural device of the Modern Age – the expression of a vision of the world and not just a visual process of technical-material nature – there is probably a similar device playing the same functional role in relation with the contemporary, or postmodern, age. In this sense, there could be no better device, no better symbolic or material form, no better synthesis of conception and perception than the video form, so much more than a technical device and so defining in its specific linguistic features. And there could be no better replacement of the perspective vision than
the kind of vision we may precisely define as ‘videomorphic’, the symbolic-perceptive prosthesis of contemporary man.

In order to provide evidence for this assumption, I will now indicate some functional points in common shared by the perspective vision and the videomorphic vision as well as some circumstantial differences that may support the role of video as the symbolic form of the contemporary, or postmodern, age.

**Similarities between perspective and videomorphic cultures**

Starting with the functional points in common, it is important to note that both perspective and videomorphic vision share a similar technological-structural dimension. In other words, visual culture of the last few centuries is deeply indebted to, and has been made possible by, scientific and technological developments. As field experts know, even the most up-to-date digital devices – scanners, video- and photo-cameras used by most video makers who work with live broadcast – are based on the old principle, at least as old as perspective, of the *camera obscura*. It was already used by artists as early as the fifteenth century, and its principles were known since the time of Chinese philosopher Micius and of Aristotle. Today, the optical-light signals channelled in one focal point are transformed in electromagnetic impulses and then codified in the system of digital representation, essentially sharing the same basic principle that led to the invention first of photography and then of cinema. In the case of traditional photography and cinema these signals are fixed on film rather than on the electromagnetic devices used by digital products. Also, we should not forget that even the more up-to-date techniques of 3D simulation and modelling – frequently used in the production of video art – are essentially based on perspective rules and principles.

What appears evident is the common dimension shared by old and new technologies of vision, a bearing principle rooted in the governing and rationalising impulse typical of the Modern Age. The fundamental difference is that, while the perspective representation of the Modern Age relies on the artist’s painterly-manual skill, with the invention of photography this process becomes mechanized, automated, relying on the intrinsic possibilities of the technical device. There is, as suggested by Lev Manovich, an additional element of continuity with the past that should not be forgotten. Even the most refined techniques of digital image processing may be interpreted as nothing but a sort of electronic painting, a technologically advanced version of the pictorial elements typical of the early expressions of cinema developed in the nineteenth century interestingly defined by Manovich as ‘cinegratography’ (Manovich 2001, 312).

Following Manovich’s arguments, we may add that a further element of con-
tinuity between perspective and videomorphic vision is to be found in what he calls “a general tendency of the Western screen-based representational apparatus” (2001, 104). In fact, the screen, viewed as an interface of the videomorphic vision, as well as a mere technical device, is well-suited to represent an up-to-date version of that powerful metaphor conceived during the Renaissance that is the frame/painting/window. In this regard, I can quote as example the work entitled **From Alberti to The Thief** created by Belgian artist Francis Alÿs in 1999 for Dia Art Foundation in New York.

A further point in common related to the cultural substrate that led to the birth of both perspective and video forms, each in its particular historical context, is the fact that both express themselves as transdisciplinary forms (Berger 1991, 165). They are the result of the intersection, convergence and exchange of disciplines and skills belonging to the technical-scientific realm as much as to the art-humanities realm and deriving from the concerted effort of artists, philosophers, engineers, scientists, mathematicians. This becomes even clearer when Jonathan Crary suggests that optical devices such as the camera obscura and the stereoscope are “points of intersection where philosophical, scientific, and aesthetic discourses overlap with mechanical techniques, institutional requirements, and socioeconomic forces” (Crary 1992, 28). In all these cases, they are not one-off inventions but the result of a shared need to express a new vision of the world. This is made clear by a series of close collaborations – also widely illustrated by Martin Kemp (1990; 1999) – between the arts and sciences fields. If what Panofsky defines “an intuition of ‘real’ space” is the result of a coincidence of aesthetic taste and the particularly Italian synergy between the world of science – Leon Battista Alberti’s rationalistic, geometric-mathematic vision – and the world of art – the role of the Florentine Innovators, Brunelleschi, Donatello, Masaccio or Piero della Francesca –, a similar process takes place in the years of the early experiments about video. In this regard, we should not forget that video technology began with the scientific researches developed in Europe at the end of the nineteenth century; the Elektrisches Teleskop, the first electronic device that mechanically scanned moving images, was patented in 1884 by Paul Nipkow, a science student in Berlin (Briggs and Burke 2000, 141). From that moment onwards, the following technological development proceeded in parallel with the season of Italian divisionism and French pointillisme, two movements that, while belonging to the art field, first interpreted the same processes of breakdown and scanning of the image visual and chromatic components underlying the video technology.

Having quoted Martin Kemp (1999), I want to make a brief digression on the convergence of science and visual art in the history of the Western scientific thought. Kemp underlined the paramount function of images, particularly since the Modern Age, in the processes of knowledge formation and construction.
This role is all the more important today. As an example, we may indicate the cutting-edge techniques of simulation mostly used in the scientific field – but also in the entertainment, video game and cinema industries – to reconstruct and simulate extremely complex phenomena, models and processes. The field of simulations effectively reflects the possibility, but most of all the need, to translate, observe, manipulate in visual form what is not visual to begin with. This field has proved essential in the observation, understanding, study but also the modification of reality and its possible manifestations (Parisi 2001). During the 1990s, this area of study has evolved into the so-called ‘information visualisation’ (Card, Mackinlay, and Shneiderman 1999), which is the visual and interactive representation of information, data and knowledge, either real or abstract, or of not directly verifiable theories. Its field of interest is not simply visualisation – the use of images to represent existing or abstract forms of reality – but cognitive manipulation. This implies the use of images as tools for thought processing, as a sort of cognitive maps for a shared visual language; using vision to think, as suggested by Stuart Card and other researchers of the PARC (Palo Alto Research Center; see also the next essay by Michel van Dartel on recent developments in this field). We could say, instead, using video to think, as a way of reconnecting all this to the concept of videomorphosis proposed at the beginning and recognise the cognitive usefulness of video – in terms of symbolic forms on one side and of the scientific imagination on the other side – as a knowledge device typical of contemporary visual culture. This is certainly a \textit{sui generis} kind of knowledge expressing itself in self-representative form that can in many ways be related to what the anthropologist Johannes Fabian has defined ‘visualism’, or the translation into a visual form of the experience, knowledge and understanding of a certain culture or society (Fabian 1983, 106). Here, I want to stress again the convergence between science and visual technologies.

\textbf{Differences between perspective and videomorphic cultures}

Let me now move on to point out the differences between the perspective and videomorphic cultures. A first important element can be found in the abandonment of the single point of view, or the renunciation of the perspective illusion first anticipated by Cubism. As Edmond Couchot (1982), among others, has remarked with reference to the ontological status of the electronic image, the expressive trend inaugurated by the Cubist school, aimed at eliminating all kinds of optical-perspective representation, conveys the reflection of a more general cultural significance. The loss of perspective was the result of a wider aesthetic research driven by the need to penetrate the essence of things and present them in their fragmentary nature. Rejecting the rationalising and totalising aspira-
tions of the perspective culture – a single point of view – the art interventions performed in the context of video art show the typically contemporary need for visual fragmentation – several point of views; historical videos as *Slow Angle Walk* (1968) or *Revolving Upside Down* (1969) by Bruce Nauman express this concept well – resulting in the breakdown and fragmentation of the aesthetic experience in many different meaningful units. The fragments, like the pieces of a mosaic or the faces of a cube, enable the explorative and cognitive dimension of the eye to form a coherent view of space. In this regard, a perfect example is the video *Sunstone* (1979) by Ed Emshwiller or *TV Cubisme* (1985) by Wolf Voltell.

To pay homage to Cubism’s conceptual heritage, what I have just described could be summarised by the antinomy between the so-called 'exogenous' function of vision – the vision from the outside – and its opposite, 'endogenous' function – the vision from the inside. In his photographic book *The Medium is the Massage* (1967), McLuhan wrote: "The Renaissance legacy. The Vanishing Point = Self-Effacement. The Detached Observer. No Involvement! The viewer of Renaissance art is systematically placed outside the frame of experience. A piazza for everything and everything in its piazza" (McLuhan and Fiore 1967, 53). Following this intellectual stimulation, we might say that video art – as the expression of videomorphosis and the endogenous function of vision – appears to offer the viewer endless opportunities to 'get into the frame', in the sense that the visual experience, with all its aesthetic implications, becomes an exploration rather than a simple interpretation. If the perspective culture belongs to a symbolic universe where space is narrated, portrayed or represented, videomorphosis transforms the symbolic universe into something that can be accessed, explored and interacted with. Keith Sonnier expressed this concept in several video works as *Positive/Negative* (1970), *Tv in and Tv out* (1972), *Color Wipe* (1973).

With regard to this, it is interesting to refer to Crary’s research on optical devices and techniques, and on the forms of visual imagery in the nineteenth century, and on the stereoscope in particular. Crary sees in the stereoscope the first tool that began to express the activity of observation as an action, and more precisely as a process of immersion in what one sees, a real merging of viewer and object. “No other form of representation in the nineteenth century – Crary categorically affirms – had so conflated the real with the optical, an object with its image” (Crary 1992, 124). Therefore, the appearance of the stereoscope may represent the crucial moment of passage from the real to the optical, or from an objective kind of vision that aims at giving order to reality (perspective vision) to a subjective kind of vision that aims at building forms of thought and knowledge not constrained or necessarily subjected to reality (videomorphic vision). In this sense, I particularly refer to the study *Expanded Cinema* (1970) by Gene
Youngblood and to the idea of ‘expanded consciousness’ he illustrates there, precisely as the result of an expanded vision (Youngblood 1970, 41).

A further element of difference between perspective and videomorphic cultures concerns the ontological status of the image itself as it is filtered, processed, mediated by a technological viewing device. In other words: the frame/painting/window versus the screen/monitor/display. If, to quote Albrecht Dürer’s words in the incipit of Panofsky’s essay, the symbolic significance of perspective is based on the process of “a fully ‘perspectival’ view of space”, when “the entire picture has been transformed into a ‘window’, and when we are meant to believe we are looking through this window into a space” (Panofsky 1991, 27), the video operates instead as a space that requires to be looked into in itself. The frame/painting/window symbolising the perspective universe is an inclusive, all-embracing medium that tends to normalise and bring order to the chaos. Videomorphosis, as represented by the screen/monitor/display, acts, instead, by excluding, by cutting, thus proceeding in the opposite direction, from order to chaos. Therefore, while the theoretical approach of perspective culture hinges on the concept of representation, the foundation of videomorphic culture is reification. The former implies the transformation of one thing into an image (or video), the latter implies an image (or video) becoming a thing. This is one of the essential meanings of the videomorphosis process, that is the above mentioned connection between symbolic culture and material culture of our age. With their works, the video artists more or less voluntarily give shape to this transformation: they create new things from images. Again we can remember Vasulka’s works Artifacts (1980), or Cartographie des Contrées à venir (1979) by Swiss artist Silvie Defraoui.

The comparison between perspective and videomorphic cultures would not be complete without the most significant oppositional couple expressed by sequentiality versus simultaneity. A step backwards is required at this point. McLuhan is well-known for having indicated the technological-material context where the printing process was developed as the epiphanic moment of the perspective culture. In fact, he has underlined the specific contribution given by the printing medium to the collective acceptance of the symbolic values inherent in the visual canons of the perspective space. The linearity, sequentiality, seriality, uniformity of the printed page, together with the whole set of material values related to the so-called Gutenberg Galaxy appear to be perfectly attuned to the expressions of the Renaissance Weltanschauung that gave birth to perspective. As McLuhan explained on several occasions, the printed book “intensified perspective and the fixed point of view. Associated with the visual stress on point of view and the vanishing point that provides the illusion of perspective there comes another illusion that space is visual, uniform and continuous” (McLuhan 1964, 172). The symbolic value of sequentiality in the perspective
culture finds its counterpart in the simultaneity that is the primary element of the electronic and postelectronic galaxy. It is therefore in McLuhan’s term a 'cold' medium, that is a highly participative medium like television. Simultaneity and participation are the quintessential expression of the videomorphosis process. A famous video by Urs Luthi, *Self Portrait* (1974), seems to show so clearly the symbolic value of simultaneity, as well as *Primarily Speaking* (1981) by Gary Hill or *Juste le temps* (1983) by Richard Cahen.

**Haptic visuality**

The comparison between the two symbolic universes I am considering here – perspective culture (Modern Age) and videomorphic culture (contemporary age) – is also supported by several other antinomies such as natural vision versus artificial vision, manual skills versus mechanical skills, or even figuration versus abstractionism. Perspective painting is intrinsically related to the idea of natural vision, while this relation does not necessarily apply in the case of video. The automatic nature of perspective’s geometric-painterly processes aims at the reconstruction of a visual experience. The video, instead, is a visual experience in itself not constrained by figuration; the well-known *Global Groove* (1973) by Nam June Paik is perhaps the best example of this.

Another antinomy is distance versus proximity; the former is one of the symbolic values related to the perspective culture, the latter represents an essential value of videomorphosis. I will therefore explore more fully this characteristic of video culture. Just as detaching oneself from one object and approaching it are two opposite actions, the strategy of detachment – the world seen from far away, the vanishing point as perspective's main element – has its counterpart in the approaching strategy inherent in video, the world seen from up close, in full scale, or even the intrusion that looks for the detail, the foreground, the zoom, the visual fragment, the pixel. Examples here are the first video performances by Vito Acconci, such as *Open-Close* (1970) or *Theme Song* (1973). We can find something quite similar in the emphatic and relational dimension expressed by the definition of vision or haptic space introduced further in the past by Riegl (1893) – the Latin word *apto*, 'touching', as opposed to traditional optical vision –, implying a vision that can even touch and establish a contact surface that is highly interactive, exploratory, penetrating. With regard to this – especially considering the Studio Azzurro’s ‘sensitive enviroments’ as *Tavoli* (1995) – we could quote Deleuze and Guattari, who insist on the distinction between close-touching-vision (haptic) and disembodied-distance-vision (optic). And it is interesting to quote here their terminological clarification: “‘Haptic’ is a better word than ‘tactile’ since it does not establish an opposition
between two sense organs but rather invites the assumption that the eye itself may fulfil this monoptical function” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987 [1980], 492).

Further developing the longer critical tradition of phenomenology and sensory theory stemming from Riegl, Deleuze and Guattari, the Canadian media theorist Laura Marks proposes an updated version of the concept of haptic visuality. Her intention is:

restoring a flow between the haptic and the optical that our culture is currently lacking [...] An ancient and intercultural undercurrent of haptic visuality continues to inform an understanding of vision as embodied and material. It is timely to explore how a haptic approach might rematerialize our objects of perception, especially now that optical visuality is being refitted as a virtual epistemology for the digital age (Marks 2002, xiii).

Derrick de Kerckhove, among others, has explored this line of interpretation and, following in McLuhan’s footsteps, has defined the process of almost tactile, as well as visual, intrusion brought about by the new electronic technologies. To that end he has introduced the concept of ‘point-of-being’ as a new type of environmental, and thus inclusive, aesthetic involvement: “My point-of-being, far from distancing me from reality as my point-of-view used to do, is my point of entry into the sharing of the world” (Kerckhove 1991, 192). Régis Debray has also chosen entry and sharing as fundamental values of a new media environment, the above mentioned vidéosphère, which marks

The end of the ‘society of the spectacle’ (...). We used to be in front of the image, now we are in the visual (...). The term ‘landscape’ was related to the eye and the term ‘environment’ was related to the ear. Now the visual has become an almost resounding atmosphere, while the ancient ‘landscape’ is a synaesthetic and embracing environment (Debray 1992, 229, my translation).

The synaesthetic vocation of videomorphosis in its manifold expressions, the first of which could rightfully be considered the production of video art and in particular of video installations, implies an involvement of the entire perceptive system, with a consequent recognition, as explained by Merleau-Ponty phenomenology, of a reciprocal subsistence of the tactile and visual spheres – “La vision est palpation par le regard” (Merleau-Ponty 1964, 177). Not coincidentally, intimacy, contact, physical dimension, corporeal involvement have long been core issues of video art production and are still its main concerns. Video art would thus seem to decree the end of visual perception’s hegemony in favour of a plural, global, embracing involvement of the senses, including, according to Debray, the sense of smell (1992, 179). This is an evolution from the idea of (visual) landscape to that of (sound, tactile, corporeal) environment. “We are
back in acoustic space”, explained McLuhan (1969), for whom the acoustic realm had a particularly tactile, corporeal value capable of directly touching the skin and even reach the nerve-endings.

Video art’s ‘pulsion par le regard’ marks its emancipation from the mere status of moving image. It absorbs, overcomes, integrates and mocks the simply narrative dimension that is still at the core of both the cinema medium and the television environment in all its entertainment and information declinations. Instead, in its incompleteness and imperfection, in its arbitrarily low definition, it offers itself as a hybrid surface that needs to be completed, touched, interacted with, that seduces us at the sensorial rather than cognitive level. It almost fulfils the failed forecasts that were at the basis of the entire debate developed during the 1980 s and 1990 s about the oxymoron represented by the so-called virtual reality. The best examples of video art can be defined as virtual realities in the sense of the above mentioned reification process that transforms images into things. Such video images can generate realities that are not supposed to be seen or represented, but explored and interacted with and that stimulate all our senses, not just our cognitive functions. One example among many is The Reflecting Pool (1977) or Anthem (1983) by Bill Viola.

Conclusion

This last passage leads us back to the key concept of the videomorphosis process and the assumption that forms the core of this essay. If we accept that video is the prevailing symbolic form of the contemporary technological-cultural cycle, video art and its operators are necessarily called to reify its corresponding ‘spiritual contents’. Video art can thus connect the symbolic and material dimensions of contemporary science and technology culture by using the ever changing forms and experimentations offered by the medium itself and allowed by the expressive opportunities induced by the latest image processing technologies. Video art is additionally tasked with deliberately reconnecting the sensorial – visual, sound, tactile – component of the aesthetic experience to the super-sensory, or cognitive, realm of ideas, thought, culture tout court, within the delicate, continuing process of constitution of contemporary man’s Weltanschauung unavoidably related to the individual and to the self. This is precisely what the American artist and video maker Peter Campus seems to have captured in 1999 with his brilliant expression video ergo sum, that sounds laconically as 'We are what we see'.
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