



# MISTRAL

Journal of Latin American Women's  
Intellectual & Cultural History

---

## **Interrupted Frames: Gender and Intermediality**

Inela Selimović, Wellesley College, US

Camilla Sutherland, University of Groningen, Netherlands

To cite: Inela Selimović & Camilla Sutherland. 2023. "Interrupted Frames: Gender and Intermediality." *Mistral: Journal of Latin American Women's Intellectual & Cultural History* 3 (1): 1-13, <https://doi.org/10.21827/mistral.3.41248>

# Interrupted Frames: Gender and Intermediality

Inela Selimović, Wellesley College, US

Camilla Sutherland, University of Groningen, Netherlands

*...all media are mixed media.*  
(W. J. T. Mitchell 1995, 5)

*[...] all artistic competences step out of their own field and exchange their places and powers with all others. We have theatre plays without words and dance with words; installations and performances instead of 'plastic' works; video projections turned into cycles of frescoes; photographs turned into living pictures or history paintings; sculpture which becomes hypermediatic show...*

(Jacques Rancière 2009, 27)

This special issue is an interdisciplinary meditation on the role of intermediality in the selected works of Albertina Carri, Paula Markovitch, Monique Gardenberg, Natalia Smirnoff, Melisa Liebenthal, and Lucía Sbardella.<sup>1</sup> Its contributors explore the ways in which these well-established and emerging artists from Argentina and Brazil have generated singular relationships with other artforms, including photography, sculpture, painting, literature, audio archives, installations, and video. Such relationships unite the works of these practitioners, for they all not only unsettle aesthetic or genre-based crossovers in singularly intermedial ways, but in so doing also reveal novel layers, spaces, borders, and fissures for sociopolitical, historical, and cultural undertones.

Although relatively small in scope, this constellation of articles has innovatively engaged intermediality while building on relevant scholarly contributions in theoretical and cross-cultural ways. The fundamental understandings of intermediality in this issue revolve around several interconnected but also subtly different conceptualizations. While an exhaustive rehearsal of intermedial practices in and beyond Latin America exceeds the objective of this issue, the richly

---

<sup>1</sup> Latin American women (and non-binary) filmmakers continue to garner critics' attention across the region as well as internationally. See Gustavo Noriega, *Estudio crítico sobre Los rubios* (2009); Parvati Nair and Julián Daniel Gutiérrez-Albilla, eds., *Hispanic and Lusophone Women Filmmakers: Theory, Practice, and Difference* (2013); Deborah Martin, *The Cinema of Lucrecia Martel* (2016); Deborah Martin and Deborah Shaw, eds., *Latin American Women Filmmakers: Production, Politics, Poetics* (2017); Traci Robert-Camps, *Latin American Women Filmmakers: Social and Cultural Perspectives* (2017); Inela Selimović, *Affective Moments in the Films by Martel, Carri, and Puenzo* (2018); Ana Forcinito, *Óyeme con los ojos. Cine, mujeres, visiones y voces* (2018); Gerd Gemünden, *Lucrecia Martel* (2019); Natalia Christofolletti Berrenha, Julia Kratje, and Paul R. Merchant, eds., *The Films of Lucrecia Martel* (2022), and Daniel Mourenza and Mirna Vohnsen, eds., *Contemporary Argentine Women Filmmakers* (2023), to mention but a few. In addition, see Matt Losada's *Before Bemberg: Women Filmmakers in Argentina* (2020), in which he traces "the relatively abundant participation of women in Argentine film in the 1910s, then moves to the exclusion of women from creative roles in the cinema industry until the final crisis of the studios in the late 1950s" (5). Losada's book then bridges the artistic contributions of Argentine women filmmakers from the 1950s through the 1990s, including those by Vlasta Lah, María Herminia Avellaneda, María Elena Walsh, Eva Landeck, Narcisca Hirsch, Lita Stantic, and María Luisa Bemberg.

diverse approaches to intermediality in the ensuing essays signal the need for a concentrated unpacking of the concept itself. According to Irina O. Rajewsky, intermediality “may serve foremost as a generic term for all those phenomena that (as indicated by the prefix *inter*) in some way take place *between* media” (original emphasis 2005, 46). “Intermedial,” she further clarifies, “therefore designates those configurations which have to do with a crossing of borders between media, and which thereby can be differentiated from *intramedial* phenomena as well as from *transmedial* phenomena (i.e., the appearance of a certain motif, aesthetic, or discourse across a variety of different media)” (original emphasis 2005, 46). Jürgen Heinrichs and Yvonne Spielmann have also theorized about intermediality, particularly regarding the concept’s distinction from intertextuality. “Whereas intertextuality explores a text-text relationship,” clarify Heinrichs and Spielmann, “*intermediality* addresses the merger and the transformation of elements of differing media” (original emphasis 2002, 1). These scholars, above all, insist on the concept’s transformative vigor. “Intermediality,” in accordance with Heinrichs and Spielmann, “represents a concept of dynamic change and transformation that alters existing media forms by inserting new elements. This transformation describes a process during which previously distinct media merge with each other, resulting in the creating of a new (art) form and shaping the form of a new medium” (2002, 2). For Lars Elleström, furthermore, the concept of intermediality, above all, “must be understood as a bridge between media differences that is founded on media similarities” (2021, 5). In accordance with Elleström’s definition of intermediality, the “betweenness,” which Rajewsky underscores as being at the heart of all “*intermedial*” relationships, does not manifest at the expense of media resemblances. These brief—yet directly relevant—theoretical characterizations of intermediality already demonstrate the concept’s heterogeneity that inhibits prescriptive transactions epistemologically.

The individual articles of this special issue engage diversely with these—and other—theoretically nuanced approaches to intermediality. Inspired by this existing theoretical scholarship in direct and subtle ways, the issue explores different forms of what might be termed *intermedial dynamism*, a concept that not solely permeates but also forcefully constitutes the studied works. The notion of intermedial dynamism reveals and congeals singular forms of aesthetic reinvigorations of intermediality and, in this manner, illuminates newfound forms of epistemological revitalization. Although the exploratory aura of the issue resonates with what Florencia Garramuño denominates as “una crisis en la especificidad del medio” in Latin American contemporary contexts, the essays respond to such cultural innovations from intermedially specific vantage points (2015, 25). While these articles directly or indirectly engage established concepts such as “remediation” (Pablo Boido, Fernando Valcheff García, and Agustina Wetzel), “adaptation” (Fernanda Guida), and “in-betweenness” (Anna Castillo and Inela Selimović), they also offer fresh examples of what Jørgen Bruhn and Beate Schirmacher refer to in *Intermedial Studies* (2022) as the “heterogeneous relation between different forms of meaning-making” (3-4).<sup>2</sup> In so doing, the notion of intermedial dynamism ties the issue to other contemporary debates on intermediality in Latin American production in pioneering ways.

In addition to Garramuño, critics such as Ben Bollig, David M. J. Wood, Lúcia Nagib, Ana Forcinito, Jordana Blejmar, and Cynthia Tompkins, among others, have innovatively contributed to scholarly debates on the transformative potential of intermediality across contemporary Latin American cultural expression. Several directly relevant scholarly works warrant additional consideration. In the 2014 special issue, “Film-poetry/poetry-film in Latin America. Theories and

---

<sup>2</sup> Raymond Bellour coined the concept of cinematic “in-betweenness” in *L’Entre-images: Photo, Cinéma, Vidéo/Between-the-Images* (2012) (cf. Knowles and Schmid 2021, 2).

practices: An Introduction,” Bollig and Wood summoned a group of scholars to “examine the aesthetic and political effects of film’s adaptation of poetry, and the mutual and productive relationship between the two forms” (116). The issue’s co-editors highlight the aesthetic interactions between poetry and film in order to broaden the prevalent combinations in studies of adaptation—namely, “film and novel, or film and drama” (2014, 118). These critics approach the relationship between poetry and film from a multidimensional standpoint:

Film can adopt one or a combination of approaches to poetry. It can maintain or change the details of the narrative and the presentation of characters; and it can reflect or ignore aspects of prosody or poetic form. Such a decision may reflect both the status of and the film-maker’s attitude to the poem or poems in question and the artistic, commercial or political motivations of the film. Meanwhile, our taxonomy, drawing on the work of [Robert Scott] Speranza, allows us to situate the films being studied in relationship to the wider field of film-poetry and studies of film adaptation.

(Bollig and Wood 2014, 121)

Such foci reiterate different and intricate possibilities when centralizing the crux between poetry and film, just as they illuminate the need for an exploratory precision in order to uniquely “complicate such theoretical considerations [...] be it political, cultural or indeed literary” through adaptation (Bollig and Wood 2014, 121). These analyses of diverse poetry-film configurations are revisited through an even broader contextualization of intermediality in Bollig and Wood’s *The Poetry-Film Nexus in Latin America: Exploring Intermediality on Page and Screen* (2022) in order to trace and study “diverse modes of intermedial exchange between both forms” (1). The act of “filming” poetry is at the heart of *Moving Verses: Poetry on Screen in Argentine Cinema* (2021) in which Bollig engages with intermediality in order to “move away from theories of adaptation (and ideas of originality and fidelity) toward something more flexible, respecting and interrogating both specific features of given media and the creative exchanges and encounters between them” (2). In accordance with Bollig’s analysis, imaginative interactions come to life when “actual poetry appears on screen”, thus highlighting its “aesthetic, technical, and practical specificities” (Bollig 2021, 3). In the final remarks of *Moving Verses*, the author reiterates the importance but also presence of intermediality in Argentine cinema as a “long-standing feature” that demands deeper readings of the sociopolitical and cultural subtleties at work (Bollig 2021, 207).

Although Ágnes Pethő’s work is not directly tied to the Latin American region, she has written extensively on cinema’s intermedial encounters with other art forms as, among other, intricate opportunities for cross-disciplinary analyses. According to Pethő’s *Cinema and Intermediality*,

Although the idea that film has indissoluble ties with other media and arts is one of the oldest concerns of theorizing about the movies, it is the theory of intermediality that has brought into the spotlight the intricate interactions of different media manifest in the cinema, emphasizing the ways in which moving pictures can incorporate forms of all other media, and can initiate fusions and ‘dialogues’ between the distinct arts.

(2011, 1)

Apart from its cross-disciplinary-focused implications, Pethő's remark on "intricate interactions of different media in the cinema" also highlights the multifariousness of close readings when engaging intermediality. Pethő's work on intermediality is grounded in a subtle nod to André Bazin's classic notion of "impure cinema," which, as Marion Schmid's *Intermedial Dialogues: The French New Wave and the Other Arts* (2021) reminds us, "laid the foundation for modern theories of cinematic intermediality, [and] are concerned with the cross-fertilization and hybridization between the arts" (6). Lúcilá Nagib and Anne Jerslev build on Bazin's notion in order to highlight intermediality as a theoretical occurrence in progress. In *Impure Cinema: Intermedial and Intercultural Approaches to Film* (2014), Nagib specifies that "the intermedial phenomenon [is] not [...] an accomplished project to an end in itself, but [...] a problem, that is to say, the site of a crisis, or a default of means, that requires other, metaphorical procedures in order to fill in a gap which is at the very core of artistic creation (21). Nagib continues to tease out analytically this "gap" in *Realist Cinema as World Cinema: Non-Cinema, Intermedial Passages, Total Cinema* (2020) as well. Nagib's analysis of Raul Ruiz's *Mysteries of Lisbon* (2011), for instance, focuses on the film's "intermedial morphings" as pathways to "the real, through which drawings, paintings, sculptures and murals change into live action and vice versa, silently subverting the idea that the story could have one single end, or an end at all" (2020, 153). Cynthia Tompkins's study of Brazilian Jorge Furtado's *O homem que copiava / The Man Who Copied* (2003) is another intricate instance of cinema's interaction with other arts. In *Experimental Latin American Cinema: History and Aesthetics* (2013), Tompkins unpacks intermedial tendencies in Furtado's film as a complex merging of "cartoon panels, animated cartoons, television clips, and self-reflexive sections" but also as a phenomenon that is underpinned by intertextuality (65). More recently, Jordana Blejmar addresses the intricacy of cross-pollination of different genres and artistic expressions in *Playful Memories: The Autofictional Turn in Post-Dictatorship Argentina* (2016) as an innovative form of mnemonic reflections on the country's relatively recent political violence (1976-1983). According to Blejmar, at the heart of *Playful Memories* rests a "controversial tension between trauma, play and humor, and it accords an unprecedented centrality to contemporary films, photography, literature, plays and blogs that have changed the whole panorama of mourning, remembering and representing trauma over the past decade" (2016, 2). Albeit indirectly, Blejmar's main argument brims with intermedial potential, especially as a renewed "site of crisis," wherein a particular kind of artistic cross-pollination has congealed among artists and filmmakers in order to remember aesthetically and generationally said political violence in Argentina in novel ways (Nagib, 2014, 21). Put differently, Blejmar underscores a kind of artistic insurgency in Argentina's post-dictatorial era that borders on (and in certain cases directly embraces) intermediality.<sup>3</sup> Ana Forcinito's *Intermittences: Memory, Justice & the Poetics of the Visible in Uruguay* (2018) similarly has evoked Pilar Calveiro's appeal to the "kaleidoscope as a metaphor that can be used to represent memory as an epistemic revolt" (5). Forcinito's own metaphor, "intermittences," invites the reader to "rethink the idea of visual framing, but also the idea of the framework of memory: the visible and the invisible, the remembered and the forgotten,

---

<sup>3</sup> See also *El pasado inasequible. Desaparecidos, hijos y combatientes en el arte y la literatura del nuevo milenio* (2018), eds., Jordana Blejmar, Silvana Mandolessi, and Mariana Eva Pérez. In their introduction, these critics indirectly highlight, without naming them as such, different forms of intermediality among contemporary Argentinian writers and artists in their attempts to revisit and reconnect meaningfully and innovatively with the country's political trauma (1976-1983). According to Blejmar, Mandolessi, and Pérez, "las nuevas generaciones, en particular, exploran en sus escritos, películas, fotografías y obras de teatro, formas originales de escrituras del yo como la autoficción, la adaptación al contexto latinoamericano de géneros como la fábula infantil, el relato fantástico y la novela policial, y el uso de medios no tradicionales como los blogs y las historietas" (2018, 14).

the tangible and the intangible, and the link between the law (both domestic and international) and the framing of images and memories” (2018, 8). Albeit differently anchored in theoretical and analytical terms, Forcinito appeals to aesthetic expressions as “advocates of alternative forms of justice” (2018, 9). Such aesthetic expressions primarily manifest in the “visual arts, literature, philosophy, or cultural critics” (Forcinito 2018, 9). Forcinito’s discursive juxtaposition and crisscrossing of different genres within the metaphor of “intermittences” is another latent example of intermedial capacity only this time to study transitional justice processes in Uruguay.

In her seminal *Mundos en común. Ensayos sobre la inespecificidad en el arte* (2015), Garramuño, as alluded to already, juxtaposes certain contemporary works—such as those by Diamela Eltit, Lola Arias, Luiz Ruffato, Tamara Kamenszain, Nuno Ramos, Alan Pauls, Fernando Vallejo, João Gilberto Noll, to mention but a few—as carriers of “una desapropiación de la especificidad [artística]” (41). The notion of artistic “divestment” stems from productive aesthetic contentions in terms of genre-based boundaries and expectations. Such contentions exemplify how the porosity between artistic boundaries may lead to outbursts of aesthetic hybridization. Garramuño details that “[e]xploraciones literarias que establecen puntos de conexión y fuga entre ficción y fotografías, imágenes, memorias, autobiografías, blogs, chats y correos electrónicos, así como con el ensayo y el documental [...] son cada vez más numerosas, y relacionan esa puesta en crisis del medio específico con toda una exploración de la sensibilidad en la que nociones de pertenencia, individualidad y especificidad son continuamente desplazadas” (2015, 13). She highlights the “points of connection and release” among different media and genres in literature and visual arts as an important instantiation of “understanding the proliferation of these forms of *disbelonging* in Latin American Aesthetics” (original emphasis, Garramuño 2013, 246). Her notion of “non-specific art” and aforementioned scholars’ commitments to intermediality have inspired the subsequent scholarly reflections.

### Intermedial Verve

The following essays build on said “proliferation” by calling attention to the specificities of dynamic intermedial relationships from equally layered gendered perspectives.<sup>4</sup> The focus on the heightened specificities of intermedial dynamism across the works studied here subtly insists on *a new kind of belonging altogether*. Such an insistence—present in the works of Carri, Markovitch, Gardenberg, Smirnoff, Liebenthal, and Sbardella—similarly bolsters new ways of confronting issues of a sociopolitical and cultural nature. The following reflections consequently single out some of the most discernable theoretical filaments across the special issue, putting the analyses’ intermedial verve in direct conversation. By manifesting intermedial dynamism directly or indirectly through *adaptation*, *in-betweenness*, and *remediation*, these essays also consolidate their common denominator sub-divisionally without straightjacketing their individual theoretical approaches.

Remediation interlinks several essays in the issue. While the term remediation paradoxically does not appear in their theoretical framework, these essays’ analyses are latently nestled around remediation-oriented processes. At the heart of their study, *Remediation:*

---

<sup>4</sup> We lack the space in this introduction to refer in detail to other Latin American filmmakers who engage cinematic intermediality in original ways, including Lucrecia Martel’s *La ciénaga* (2001), Alvaro Delgado Aparicio’s *Retablo* (2017), Paula Markovitch’s *Cuadros en la oscuridad* (2018), Albertina Carri’s *La rabia* (2018), and Jayro Bustamante’s *La llorona* (2019), to mention but a few.

*Understanding New Media* (1999), Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin state that “all current media remediate” (55). These processes occur, in accordance with these critics’ postulations, by “appropriating and refashioning the representational practices of these older forms” (Bolter & Grusin 1999, 14). Two remedial attributes—“appropriating” and “refashioning”—are essential for thinking about the notion of intermedial dynamism in the articles by Boido, Valcheff García, and Wetzel, particularly when we engage Astrid Erll’s discussions on remediation. For Erll, remediation points “to the fact that memorable events are usually represented again and again, over decades and centuries, in different media: in newspaper articles, photography, diaries, historiography, novels, films” (2010, 392). Indeed, Erll fundamentally refers to differently imagined aesthetic returns across various media. As already noted at the outset of the introduction, Erll’s discernment of remediation is what Rajewsky deems to be another layer of intermediality—namely, “*transmedial phenomena* (i.e., the appearance of a certain motif, aesthetic or discourse across a variety of different media” (2005, 46). Remediation, in a broad sense, then, is effortlessly connected to memory (personal, social, historical) as well as the inability to remember with certitude.

In *Memory and Intermediality in Artists’ Moving Image* (2021), Susan Durcan studies the ways in which moving image installations reveal and problematize certain synergies between cinema and memory. Durcan explains that “within the embodied spaces of installation, artists’ moving image generates new ways of reflecting on both cinema and the mnemonic qualities of the moving image” (2021, 9). Boido’s analysis likewise cuts into the deeper layers of several underexamined works of Albertina Carri in order to exemplify how the filmmaker’s returns to the disappearance of her parents-dissidents in transmedial ways (via installations, performances, texts, films) generate a particular kind of intermedial dynamism that emphasizes the impossibility of closure. His analysis of Carri’s remedial processes evokes Elizabeth Jelin’s *Los trabajos de la memoria* (2002) and her comments on the inevitable sociopolitical currents of “re-signification” when remembering the past. “Los procesos históricos ligados a las memorias de pasados conflictivos,” clarifies Jelin, “tienen momentos de mayor visibilidad y momentos de latencia, de aparente olvido o silencio. Cuando nuevos actores o nuevas circunstancias se presentan en el escenario, el pasado es resignificado y a menudo cobra una saliencia pública inesperada” (2002, 74). Valcheff García’s examination of Smirnoff’s *La afinadora de árboles* (2019) is another case in point regarding remedial tendencies. The film’s diegetic space remediates certain creative flows in transmedial ways in order to reignite the protagonist’s imagination. The very structure of the film can be viewed as a transmedial collage in flux. According to Pethő’s “(Re)mediating the Real,” “[c]ollages always bear the physical marks of manual craftsmanship: by assembling bits and pieces, the materiality of the medium of expression is shown up as [an] integral part of a palpable reality” (2009, 50). Valcheff García shows how intermedial dynamism emerges from within the film’s textures, where individual and collective drawings, paintings, and animations contribute to a larger creative effort. In *Screening Statues: Sculpture and Cinema* (2017), the writers remind us that “sculptures more generally represent remnants of the past as they are closely connected to history, memory, and even melancholy” (Jacobs et al. 2017, 174). Wetzel’s analysis aligns with said constation as it traces the complexities and rich intermedial relationships between a monument site and a multidimensional installation. Although Wetzel does not engage directly with Rudolf Arnheim’s work in general and his statement in *To the Rescue of Art* (1992) in particular—“much sculpture lacks the essential quality of life, namely, motion” (83)—her article points to the ways the Sbardella’s installation supplements motion intermedially in discursive and aesthetic ways. As Wetzel dissects Sbardella’s transgressive remedial processes,

we are dealing with a particular kind of “refashioning” that serves to reinscribe subversive modes of commemoration.

Adaptation is likewise at the heart of Guida’s article for this issue. Adaptation, Linda Hutcheon reminds us, is “not new to our time, however: Shakespeare transferred his culture’s stories from page to stage [...] Aeschylus and Racine and Goethe and da Ponte also retold familiar stories in new forms” (2012, 2). Surpassing much of the outmoded aesthetic commitment to “fidelity” when adapting any source-text, Hutcheon chooses to study adaptation as a phenomenon rooted in allure. In *A Theory of Adaptation* (2012), she suggests that adaptation ultimately holds a certain kind of appeal which “comes simply from repetition with variation, from the comfort of ritual combined with the piquancy of surprise” (4). This approach echoes what Dudley Andrew considers to be the antidote to “mechanical” adaptations, underscoring instead the need to seek a different kind of fidelity—namely, the pledge to “the spirit, to the original’s tone, values, imagery, and rhythm” (1992, 423). In *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions* (2013), moreover, its co-editors appear to echo Hutcheon’s theoretical stance and broaden it by stating that “not only telling, but also retelling a story, passing it on, can be considered valuable or even a gift” (Bruhn et al. 2013, 2). These postulations seek to underscore what might be called a reconciliatory approach to that which Robert Stam in *Film Adaptation* (2000) considered to be an unnecessarily beleaguered standoff between “iconophobia,” a distrust of the visual, and, “logophilia,” or love of the consecration of the word (58). These (and other) theoretical conjectures on adaptation (Rajewsky 2005; Clüver 2011) intersperse Guida’s essay and shed light on the dynamic processes of “crossing borders” (novel-film) in a two-directional way.

Guida’s analysis more precisely captures said notion of “gift” upon studying Gardenberg’s decision to bring Chico Buarque’s novel, *Benjamim* (1995), to the screen in 2003. Although Guido’s article centers on the filmmaker’s scarce—but intermedially significant—thematic and aesthetic divergences from the source-text, the interpersonal meditation on loss between the writer and the filmmaker resonates most of all with said theorization on adaptation as an aesthetic offering. Loss, as a thematic ingredient of Buarque’s novel as well as an intimate experience of the filmmaker, solidifies this particular intermedial relation in unexpected ways. The unforeseen element of such an intermedial relation comes into focus when we consider Hutcheon’s discussions as well as those by Jørgen Bruhn, Anne Gjelsvik, and Eirik Frisvold Hanssen in *Adaptation Studies*. These critics highlight the need for both renewed and supple theoretical dealings with adaptation so that it be “viewed within a more comprehensive understanding of the cultural and textual networks into which any textual phenomena is understood” (Bruhn et al. 2013, 8). This observation is particularly relevant to Guida’s analysis, which is grounded from the outset in Gardenberg’s deeply personal experiences (the passing of her sister), which compel her to engage with the core of the novel’s essential themes. Guida’s anchoring of her analysis in the film’s heightened gendered dimensions additionally instantiates an intermedial dynamism that reveals adaptation as “a two-way, dialogic process” (Bruhn et al. 2013, 4). Gardenberg’s adaptation of Buarque’s novel also serves as a gentle reminder of the filmmaker’s predecessors and successors from across Latin America, who have engaged with adaptation in similarly layered ways, including María Luisa Bemberg’s biopic of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, *Yo, la peor de todas* (1990), Andrés Wood’s *Violeta se fue a los cielos* (2011) on Chile’s folklorist and singer, Violeta Parra, Suzana Amaral’s adaptation of Clarice Lispector’s novella *A hora da estrela* (1977), and Lucrecia Martel’s adaptation of Antonio di Benedetto’s 1956 homonymous novel *Zama*, to mention but a few.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> For an intermediality-oriented analysis of Bemberg’s film, see Bollig, *Moving Verses*, 2021: 93-105.



Yet another intermedial pillar in the issue stems from the notion of “in-betweenness” in accordance with Pethő’s theorizations. Intermediality, Pethő (2011) suggests, inherently precludes neat and stiff aesthetic divisions between centers and peripheries, thus facilitating persistent intersections of different focal points and stimuli between and among interacting artforms. Drawing on phenomenological practice, Pethő further specifies that intermediality manifests as “a phenomenon of in-betweenness that resists containment and allows glimpses into an unstable and densely layered world experienced with often contradictory perceptions” (2011, 18). The Argentine filmmakers Liebenthal and Markovitch both emphasize such “contradictory perceptions” initially through a crisscrossing and interlocking of artforms and different media, only to further raise their commitment to intermediality from radically different aesthetic angles. For Liebenthal, as Castillo compellingly argues, the foundational “in-betweenness” remains fluid, thus meaningfully transfiguring the film into a hypermedia-infused artefact. “Hypermedia,” to return to Heinrichs and Spielmann, “denotes the mode of exchange between different media and the transfer of information in non-linear ways. Multidimensional connectivity and interactivity represent essential features of hypermedia” (2002, 7). Castillo studies such forms of “multidimensional connectivity and interconnectivity” by dissecting their seemingly chaotic presence in Liebenthal’s film. In Markovitch’s documentary, on the other hand, Pethő’s notion of “in-betweenness” aids in Selimović’s examination of the layered interactions between paintings and audio archives for commemorative purposes.

Although these two essays pursue intermedial dynamism in different ways, their explorations of intermediality allude to that which Knowles and Schmid denominate as “considerations of sensuous in-betweens” (2021, 4). Knowles and Schmid define these “considerations” in *Cinematic Intermediality: Theory and Practice* (2021) as stemming from distinct shifts “between the haptic image on the screen and the lived experience of making and thinking between one art form and another” (3-4). The films that Castillo and Selimović analyze make room for thought-provoking standpoints from within distinct intermedial crevices while also illuminating “a variety of sensuous or intellectual modes for addressing important issues of art and society, identity, and history” through these documentaries (Pethő, 2021 18). The analytical implementation of Pethő’s conceptualization of “in-betweenness”—either as elevated aesthetically and interpretatively to “hypermediacy” (Castillo) or explored through the notion of “sepulchral intermediality” (Selimović)—also highlights “how words and images, stories and performances, can change something of the world we live in” (Rancière 2009, 23). While Castillo focuses on Liebenthal’s imaginative critique of as well as culturally playful invitation to reimagine femininity in present-day Argentina, Selimović explores Markovitch’s intricate contemplations about the parents’ past internal and quietly conducted political dissidence. In both cases, the spectator witnesses how “intermediality can deliver inexhaustibly rich resources for introspection” (Pethő, 2021 14). Albeit in different aesthetic ways, both films bring to light their own forms of “introspection” through singular forms of intermedial dynamism.

### **Configurations of Intermediality**

The ensuing articles simultaneously highlight differently articulated intermedial amalgamations and propose intricate pathways towards epistemologically liberating and aesthetically revitalizing spaces for sociopolitical and cultural critiques. Laura Sava argues that “translating (inter)medial experiences into analysis is a necessary exercise, which brings us closer to understanding how

media reflect on themselves and on each other” (2019, 5). This special issue indeed reveals such multidirectional reflections by engaging different intermedial modalities. More specifically, while *adaptation*, *remediation*, and *in-betweenness* represent theoretical contact points across the issue, each article encapsulates the notion of intermedial dynamism distinctly.

Anna Castillo’s “Lo-Fi Femme: The Messy Hypermediacy of Aspirational Femininity in Melisa Leibenthal’s *Las lindas* (2016),” examines the filmmaker’s usage of hypermediacy in order to highlight the possibility of unfinished, anti-prescriptive, and unfixed forms of femininity. Castillo approaches Leibenthal’s autobiographical documentary through the lo-fi aesthetic as an “intermedial palimpsest,” which, in turn, exposes the filmmaker’s questions on “the imposition of feminine conformity” from within the intimate spaces of her early adolescence to adulthood (14). Departing from rich interdisciplinary discussions on intermedial studies by Henk Oosterling, Ágnes Pethő, Henry Jenkins, Klaus Bruhn Jensen, and others, Castillo argues that Leibenthal’s tangled hypermediacy turns the notion of what might be perceived as normative femininity on its head with the purpose of reimagining and practicing its freer, peripheral, and culturally porous forms.

By anchoring his analysis in Antonio Gill González’s and Pedro Javier Pardo’s discussions on the differences and interconnections between the manifestations of “intrinsic and extrinsic intermediality” (*intermedialidad intrínseca y extrínseca*), Fernando Valcheff García analyzes Natalia Smirnoff’s proliferation of media crossovers in *La afinadora de árboles* (2019) as a way of visualizing the awakening of her protagonist’s dormant muses. More specifically, Valcheff García’s “Intermedialidad, imaginación creadora y experiencia vital en *La afinadora de árboles* (2019) de Natalia Smirnoff” focuses on the ways in which the film aesthetically and thematically combines different media and modes of artistic expression (drawings, paintings, and animations) in the protagonist’s immediate settings with the intention of unlocking her creativity. Smirnoff’s intermedial features consequently gain more traction as the protagonist reengages her search for literary inspiration through different non-literary artistic articulations. Valcheff García’s article shows how Smirnoff’s manifold layering of different media and artforms ultimately holds *La afinadora de árboles*’s core together in a vision of intermedial and collective praxis.

Fernanda Guida’s “(Re)creating *Benjamim*: Authorship Marked by Intermediality” traces Monique Gardenberg’s 2003 adaptation of Chico Buarque’s novel *Benjamim* (1995) by situating her analysis at the theoretical crossroads of Claus Clüver (2011), Irina Rajewsky (2005), and Linda Hutcheon (2006). The article departs from Rajewsky’s theoretical postulations on different sublayers of intermediality (“medial transposition,” “media combination,” and “intermedial reference”). Guida juxtaposes the two works (Buarque’s novel and Gardenberg’s film), above all, with the intention of highlighting their singular interdependency through interpersonal and culturally-oriented forms of loss. According to Guida’s analysis, the crucial interdependency-driven contact points primarily lead to a series of subtle shifts in terms of gender-focused power dynamics and political undertones (specifically the 1964 coup d’ état in Brazil) in the film. Guida views these particular facets as the most poignant instances of how intermediality illuminates Gardenberg’s creative choices.

In his article, “Un montaje desviado: el uso del documento autobiográfico para una memoria afectiva en *Restos, Cuatrerros y Punto impropio* de Albertina Carri,” Pablo Boido underscores the importance of remediation when seeking to unpack Carri’s creative treatments of her parents’ dissident past in Argentina (1976-1983). In converging different media in order to remediate the parents’ brutal disappearance, incarceration, and Roberto Carri’s intellectual contributions, Carri generates what Boido calls *montaje desviado* (“deflected montage”) (69). This

notion entails a series of intermedial amalgamations that simultaneously stem from and challenge both fuller but also incomplete archival processes regarding the historical period in question. For Boido, Carri's inherently intermedial tendencies ultimately defy any kind of totalizing narratives regarding Argentina's recent national trauma in general and her parents' complex subjectivities in particular.

Agustina Wetzel's argument rests interdisciplinarily between Ann Cvetkovitch's discussions on trauma and Garramuño's notion of "la inespecificidad en el arte." Upon contextualizing the historical significance and sociocultural incompleteness of the source site (Luis Perloti's "Monumento a Mitre"), Wetzel centers her discussion on Lucía Sbardella's remediation-focused aesthetic in order to unsettle the built-in allusions of Perloti's monument. In "Archivos de arcilla y afectos políticos en la instalación *Cautivas: ejercicios para desarmar un monumento de Lucía Sbardella*," Wetzel highlights the polyphonic subversiveness of the installation, above all, through its fragile materiality (clay) but also its affective potency (intermedial composition). By analyzing the installation as a rebellious remediation of the monument through a queer theory lens, Wetzel illustrates how the installation's intermediality (the relationship among the site, material, water, texts, images, sonorous attributes, and fragmented clay body parts) disrupts said expectations. Such an approach consequently engenders fresh perspectives on the represented women's subjectivities, social belonging, and historical significance.

Inela Selimović explores Paula Markovitch's first documentary, *Armando y Genoveva*, as an aesthetic space for bereavement as well as political contemplations. Selimović's article, "Sepulchral Intermediality in Paula Markovitch's *Armando y Genoveva* (2013)", engages with Pethő's notion of "in-betweenness" as an aesthetically revitalizing force in examining the intermedial relations among audio recordings, paintings, and engravings for commemorative purposes and political reflections. The author argues that Markovitch's turn to intermediality in an aesthetic way to revive and remember her parents—the artists Armando Markovitch and Genoveva Edelstein—and their work, functions as an attempt to understand their long-lasting social invisibility. As a result, *Armando y Genoveva*'s intermedial attributes transmogrify it into an intricate artifact of mourning, discovery, and homage.

In the ensuing essays, intermediality often points toward the sensuous, the changeable, and the unutterable as if it were a cross-disciplinary nod to W. J. T. Mitchell's postulation on the impossibility of divorcing sensorial flair from communication across different media. In *Caught-in-Between* (2021) Pethő has remarked that the "potential of intermediality [is also] to elicit controversies through a clash of expectations, and to provoke discussions about the relationship between art and life" (14). The notion of intermedial dynamism in the works of Carri, Markovitch, Gardenberg, Smirnoff, Liebenthal, and Sbardella has indeed shed light on the complex relationships between "art and life," particularly vis-à-vis their unique choices to intersect gender, class, politics, and sexuality. These scholars' contributions have also reaffirmed the additional need for scholarly pursuits of intermediality in Latin American contexts in interdisciplinary ways.

## Works Cited

- Andrew, Dudley. 1992 (1984). "Adaptation." In *Film Theory and Criticism*, edited by Gerald Mast, Marshall Cohen, and Leo Brady, 420-29. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Arnheim, Rudolf. 1992. *To the Rescue of Art: Twenty-Six Essays*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Blejmar, Jordana. 2016. *Playful Memories: The Autofictional Turn in Post-Dictatorial Argentina*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Blejmar, Jordana, Silvana Mandolessi, and Mariana Eva Pérez, eds. 2018. *El pasado inasequible. Desaparecidos, hijos y combatientes en el arte y la literatura del nuevo milenio*. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.
- Bollig, Ben, and David M. J. Wood, eds. 2022. *The Poetry-Film Nexus in Latin America: Exploring Intermediality on Page and Screen*. Cambridge, UK: Legenda.
- Bollig, Bollig. 2021. *Moving Verses: Poetry of Screen in Argentine Cinema*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Bolter, David J. and Richard Grusin. 1999. *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Bruhn, Jørgen, and Beate Schirrmacher, eds. 2022. *Intermedial Studies: An Introduction to Meaning Across Media*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Bruhn, Jørgen, Anne Gjelsvik, and Eirik Frisvold Hanssen. 2013. "“There and Back Again”": New Challenges and New Directions in Adaptation Studies." In *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions*, edited by Jørgen Bruhn, Anne Gjelsvik, and Eirik Frisvold Hanssen, 1-16 London: Bloomsbury.
- Durcan, Sarah. 2021. *Memory and Intermediality in Artists' Moving Image*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Erll, Astrid. 2010. "Literature, Film, and the Mediality of Cultural Memory." In *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, edited by Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning, 389-398. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Forcinito, Ana. 2018. *Intermittences: Memory, Justice & the Poetics of the Visible in Uruguay*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Garramuño, Florencia. *Mundos en común. Ensayos sobre la inespecificidad en el arte*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 2013. "Forms of Disbelonging in Contemporary Latin American Aesthetics." *Journal of Latin American Cultural Studies* 22. 3: 245-257.
- Heinrichs, Jürgen and Yvonne Spielmann. 2002. "Intertextuality vs. intermediality." *Convergence* 8. 4: 5-10.
- Hutcheon, Linda. 2012. *A Theory of Adaptation*. London: Routledge.
- Jacobs, Steven, Susan Felleman, Vito Adriaensens, and Lisa Colpaert, eds. 2017. *Screening Statues: Sculpture and Cinema*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Jelin, Elizabeth. 2002. *Los trabajos de la memoria*. Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno de Argentine Editores.
- Losada, Matt. 2020. *Before Bemberg: Women Filmmakers in Argentina*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Knowles, Kim, and Marion Schmid, eds. 2021. *Cinematic Intermediality: Theory and Practice*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Mitchell, T. W. 1994. *Picture Theory*. Essays on Verbal and Visual Representations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Nagib, Lúcia. 2020. *Realist Cinema as World Cinema. Non-cinema, Intermedial Passages, Total Cinema*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Nagib, Lúcia and Anne Jerslev, eds. 2014. *Impure Cinema: Intermedial and Intercultural Approaches to Film*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Pethő, Ágnes. 2011. *Cinema and Intermediality: The Passion for the In-Between*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- \_\_\_\_\_, editor. 2012. *Film in the Post-Media Age*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- \_\_\_\_\_, editor. 2015. *The Cinema of Sensations*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- \_\_\_\_\_, editor. 2020. *Caught In-Between: Intermediality in Contemporary Eastern European and Russian Cinema*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2009. "Remediating the Real: Paradoxes of an Intermedial Cinema of Immediacy." *Acta University Sapientiae. Film and Media Studies* 1: 47-68.
- Rancière, Jacques. 2009. *The Emancipated Spectator*. London: Verso.

- Rajewsky, Irina O. 2005. "Intermediality, Intertextuality, and Remediation: A Literary Perspective on Intermediality." *Intermédialités* 6: 43-64.
- Sava, Laura. 2019. *Theatre Through the Camera Eye: The Poetics of an Intermedial Encounter*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Schmid, Marion. 2019. *Intermedial Dialogues: The French New Wave and the Other Arts*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Stam, Robert. 2005. "Introduction: The Theory and Practice of Adaptation." *Literature and Film: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation*. 1-52. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tompkins, Cynthia. 2013. *Experimental Latin American Cinema: History and Aesthetics*. Austin: University of Texas Press.