

FOUNDATIONAL QUESTIONS FOR A FILM AND VISUAL MEDIA PROGRAMME

Honorable Vice-Rector,

Honorable Dean,

Professor Human,

Distinguished guests here as well as abroad who are following this ceremony online,

Distinguished colleagues, dear students and friends, here as well as abroad,

Dearest members of my family, here as well as abroad,

Let me first apologize for the Dutch weather I seem to have brought you. Normally South-Africa to many of you may look like in the crop duster scene in the Hitchcock classic *North by Northwest* (1959) – in one scene Gary Grant looks like he is in the Karoo (at its dry-est). I want to show you a clip from that scene: where Gary Grant plays the part of a Manhattan businessman trapped in a landscape which looks quite a bit like the Karoo (at its dry-est) when he is trapped by a small plane dusting crops.

[FILM CLIP]

I will get back to the scene in a sec.

Our fine arts were developed, their types
and uses were established, in times very
different from the present [...]. But the amazing

growth of our techniques, [...] the ideas
and habits they are creating, make it a
certainty that profound changes are impending
in the ancient craft of the Beautiful. In
all the arts there is a physical component
which can no longer be considered or treated as
it used to be, [a physical component] which cannot remain unaffected by our modern
knowledge and power. [...]

We must expect great innovations
to transform the entire technique of the
arts, thereby affecting artistic invention itself and
perhaps even bringing about an
amazing change in our very notion of art.ⁱ

This statement on the impact of technology on the arts was presented by Paul Valéry
in “The Conquest of Ubiquity” in 1928 and reiterated in his inaugural lecture at the
Collège de France in 1945.ⁱⁱ It seems to me that the statement still holds relevance
today. As you may know, Walter Benjamin was quick to point out its significance to
his contemporaries in the 1930s in his seminal work on *The Work of Art in the Age of
Mechanical Reproduction*.ⁱⁱⁱ In fact, it was not the well-known Benjamin text that took
me back to Valéry’s statement but my good friend Dominique Chateau, professor of
Aesthetics at Paris 1, Panthéon Sorbonne, who pointed out to me just recently, within
the context of the current debate on technologies and their impact on the field of film
studies, how utterly valid and productive Valéry’s words still are in the context of the

ongoing digitalization of today's cinema.^{iv} Valéry's assumption that technique radically changes the arts, the techniques used in the arts, and even the very notion of art, was presented in a cultural context which was also, as many felt, profoundly saturated by new technological devices, the relatively new "cinema machine"^v among them. Moreover, Valéry developed and reiterated his statement in an academic context which was dominated by reflections on aesthetics. At that point in time, as Dominique Chateau clarified, the connection between the arts and aesthetics was considered a given; the new element in the debate on the arts was essentially technology.^{vi}

Let me address a few clarifying words about the terms technology and technique, before we take a closer look at the relation between the two.

The word *techniques* (derived from the Greek word *technē* for art or craft) originally indicates ways of doing. The word *technology* first entered the English language in the 17th century and then referred to a field of study, not an object of study.^{vii} The object was the machinery, the *mechanical* and *optical* devices to be studied at that point in time.^{viii} In other words, the term *technology* referred to the knowledge or *logos* needed to study, invent, develop, produce and use the material devices. Whereas, the word *techniques* strictly referred to the methods or procedures and not the hardware, as we call it today.^{ix} The term *technology* relates to the discourses about techniques -- discourses which can be studied as a cultural object in themselves.^x

The technological revolution of the 19th century however brought us the elevator, the steam engine, trains and the railway system, and last but not least the photo camera

and the new “cinema machine” or “cinematograph.” The term *techniques* now came to connote both the machines and the ways those machines were used. Today, techniques and technologies are often used as synonyms. From a scientific point of view, however, it is important to also acknowledge that the understanding of the specific dialectics between the knowledge and development of machines and the development of their (artistic) use is nullified from the start “by any theory which reduces to one those practices that interact as two,” as Rick Altman has convincingly argued for the fields of film theory and the theory of cinema history.^{xi} The histories of technological inventions and their artistic use can only partly be written separately. Let me clarify this with the Hitchcock example.

Improvise on **Cary Grant in the Great Karoo – the George Clooney of the 1950s**

USE THE SLIDE indicating the complex dynamics between TECHNOLOGIES & TECHNIQUES

If we take a closer look at the famous crop duster scene from *North by Northwest*, from 1959, with Cary Grant in what may look to you like the Great Karoo, we can identify a complex dynamics between on the one hand the mechanical and optical tools to shoot, edit, and project the scene – the hardware put in the hands of the master – and on the other hand the artistic practice he was working in as part of a studio (even a studio system), which itself was embedded in a fully developed and highly efficient film industry that was part of the entertainment industry of the 1950s. The big film studios, such as Paramount, MGM, Warner Bros. for which Hitchcock

was working at the time, were fully equipped and tended to put the newest technologies at his disposal.

MILITARY COMPLEX Note also that the optical devices in this field, such as special wide-angle and macro lenses, as well as light-weight cameras, are innovations fuelled by the military branches as the field of warfare was and always is in need of the best binoculars, night vision devices and so on. The war industry is a major drive behind the technological innovations appropriated by and used in the communication and entertainment industries, as media scholars such as Friedrich Kittler and Paul Virilio have argued.^{xii}

In other words: technological devices have their own history. Put in the hands of the master of suspense, they began a history of their own as part of a very specific dynamics created by the use Hitchcock made of them as an artist, who himself was part of a specific artistic practice (the studio) and artistic systems, the so-called studio system among them. All practices and systems have a history of their own. Hitchcock was famous for his studio work and particularly for his set designs which were, under his supervision, developed to a degree of utter perfection. The dozens of artistic techniques he applied or invented were in part mechanical and optical, but they also partly stemmed from very different artistic traditions and systems (which he partially renewed): the system of classical narration; the continuity editing system; a specific system of suspense; and last but not least there is his photography: his specific use of light, coloring, and framing.

On a thematic level ... The crop-dusting scene draws on the contrast between the country (the Midwest, for Hitchcock) and the city (Manhattan). In the scene the technologically developed city life is embodied by Cary Grant's character, who, up to

that point in the film, is able to stay contained and keep his suit clean. The moment this clean-cut business man is dropped in the middle of nowhere, however, things go horribly amiss. The stark contrast between busy city life and country is further achieved by the use of lighting and the use of long tracking and high-angle shots. The long shot, showing the horizon, and the natural light help to make the country look as dry, dusty, flat, and deserted as the Great Karoo may seem to a Manhattan business man. So when Cary Grant's character is attacked by a small airplane on this quiet sunny day in a setting far removed from the high-tech world he is dream, or a nightmare rather, as Hitch was the first to admit.

Let us go back now to an early phase in Film in history... The Early Phase

In retrospect, looking back at the earliest phase of the history of film, we can see that the new machines from the 19th century – these new machines themselves – were destined to leave profound traces on the arts. There are at least three reasons for this:

Firstly, these new machines (such as the train), changed people's sense of time and space altogether and that was to affect the arts in terms of the representation of space and time (Proust, the avant-gardes).

Secondly, technological innovation put new resources in the hands of artists and empowered them to create (or produce, if you will) artworks in new and different

ways. Moreover, some of the new “turn of the century” machines, such as the new cinema machine, made them envision and invent new artistic techniques and new art forms (such as collages and photo montages) they would perhaps not have envisioned without them.

Thirdly, many of the new technological devices themselves affected the senses and were found to have a distinct aesthetic impact of their own, which was not crafted or shaped by artists. This indeed changed aesthetics and art theory profoundly.

Let me elaborate a bit more on this last point: first about the spark created by the devices themselves; then about the impact this had on Art, Art Theory, and Aesthetics respectively.

The New Cinema Machine = SLIDE

The new cinema machine or cinematograph invented by the Lumière brothers is an example of a new, turn-of-the-century technological device which had an instant impact on the senses and is known to have spurred the imagination. Just recently,^{xiii} I have pointed at clear evidence of the ways in which ENGINEERS, too, were stirred by the Lumière invention. In a Surinam newspaper of February 25, 1898,^{xiv} an anonymous journalist summed up the more than fifty different terms that were used by technicians to label the new technical inventions (and patents). SLIDE The long list of terms clearly indicates the powerful impact of the new Lumière technology on other technicians' imaginary:

[...] kinegraaf, kinetograaf, kinematograaf, kinematoterm, kineoptoskoop, kineoptikon, kinematoskoop, kinebleposkoop, kinegrafoskoop, kinevivagraaf, kinesetograaf, photokinematograaf, fotoskoop, motophotoskoop, phoiotroop, mutoskoop, motorgraaf, movendoskoop, mouvementoskoop, manimatoskoop, theatograaf, vitagraaf, vitaskoop, vitaphostoskoop, eieroskoop, kathoskoop, magniskoop, mutoskoop, phonendoskoop, geriaalgraaf, sterioptikon, fammograaf, zoograaf, biograaf, heligraaf, velegraaf, rollograaf, artograaf, vivendograaf, vitamotograaf, kinestereograaf, badizograaf, heliecinegraaf, phautograaf, panoramograaf, pantobiograaf, pantomimograaf, chronofotograaf, photochronograaf, scenamatograaf, pictorialograaf.^{xv}

The journalist's point was to show how deeply the Lumière Brothers had affected and inspired the other inventors, and also how quick all the others were to jump on the bandwagon in hopes to profit from this lucrative invention themselves by slightly changing the new technology and putting the seemingly new invention under the protection of a patent of their own. The long list of terms also suggests the many different ways in which technicians envisioned the new technology to be further developed for a great variety of future uses.

ELECTRICITY... There are other examples of new technologies which of themselves have had a great impact and provoked a sense of bliss or exhilaration in

people, also beyond the circle of engineers. Just the other day, I bumped into an example while reading the diaries of the writer of *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina*, Lev Tolstoy. He remarks in a diary entry of April 26, 1895, that he took his daughter Sasha and a friend to the theater: the two little girls were apparently so excited and affected by the new invention of the electric lights that they could hardly take in much more of the matinée.^{xvi}

One may indeed wonder: if these new inventions were able to create such a stir among technicians as well as Tolstoy's little girls, then how about the artists in the field, who particularly would have had an interest in the ways in which their techniques could affect an audience? Indeed, they were eager to experiment themselves with the transformations in perception these new devices seemed able to create.

Russia provides a case in point. It is perhaps the best example to be explored within this context, as studies provide very detailed insights on the first cinema screenings as well as on the impact on artists and culture as a whole. An excellent study is Yuri Tsivian's analysis of the cultural reception of early cinema in Russia.^{xvii} In fact, there are numerous studies which help to historicize and contextualize the development of the cinema in Russia, e.g., by Richard Taylor, Jay Leyda, Yuri Tsivian, David Bordwell, Kirstin Thompson, Jacques Aumont, and last but not least my good friend Ian Christie from Birkbeck College, London, who was essential in starting our first key debate on this topic. Our objective was to reconsider the very early phase of the cinema in Russia in order to reassess its impact on the avant-gardes and on Russian Formalist theorizing to explore its

productivity for film and media studies today.^{xviii}

One of the most detailed responses to a first demonstration of the Lumière brothers' cinematograph ON ARTISTS comes from the eminent Russian writer Maxim Gorky, who reported his experience in great detail in two extensive newspaper articles published in 1896.^{xix}

[DIT HIERNA KAN IK IMPROVISEREN] [SLIDE]

[SLIDE] If you only knew how strange it felt. There were no sounds and no colours. Everything [...] was portrayed in a grey monotone: in a grey sky there were grey rays of sunlight; in grey faces – grey eyes, and the leaves of the tree were grey like ashes...^{xx}

Basically, Gorky tells his readers how “strange” the experience was for him as a first-time viewer. He essentially tells them to go experience this for themselves. It was strange, yet also excitingly new and real, with an operator who suddenly put that static world into motion with his new cinema machine. Gorky of course was familiar with the things he saw on the screen, but he had never seen them moving on a screen in front of him before. The people onscreen had unfamiliar proportions, were even distinctly disproportioned and looked weird when too close to the camera. Something that would hardly register with us today, since we are all too familiar with the close-up. This strangeness effect or novelty effect inspired artists...

[READ READ READ:]

In Russia, within a decade, the new invention spurred the avant-gardes into

experimenting with the new effects on the senses as well as on the imagination. They experimented with new artistic techniques. They tapped into old sensibilities in new ways (such as being sensitive to motion and natural proportions). They envisioned new artistic techniques, new forms of art, and an altogether new future and function for the arts – and they did so loudly, playfully, even outrageously, and erratically. Futurists poets provocatively presented non-grammatical verses and non-sense poetry at a very early stage.^{xxi} Alexander Rodchenko chose unusual angles for his photos and created photo collages and montages. [SLIDE] Avant-garde artists manifested themselves in groups, in ways which were orchestrated to attract attention, much the same way the first film shows were organized by the operators who carefully crafted their shows to lure in the biggest audience. [IMPROVISE... The young poet Vladimir Mayakovsky; 2 metres; formal suit; radish in button hole, recite loud: A cloud in trousers.. love poem...]

Mayakovsky's friend...

The young Viktor Shklovsky [= SLIDE] not only happened to be part of the early avant-garde movement of the Russian Futurists (who started in 1908, 1909), he also happened to be one of the most gifted theorists in their midst. He showed a “brash irreverence” towards tradition; he was brash but brilliant -as Viktor Erlich once stated.^{xxii} As early as 1913, Shklovsky explained to his avant-garde friends (Mayakovsky among them) during a lecture in their hang-out, the Stray Dog in Petersburg, how art “works.”^{xxiii} He theoretically framed the relation between art and techniques by drawing from the young discipline of psychology and more specifically from the study of perception. In ART AS TECHNIQUE, the famous manifesto which started off so-called “Russian Formalism,” Shklovsky may be said to have provided

the theoretical framework for explaining the impact of new techniques from the revolutionary new perspective of perception. Thus he created a new research focus for the arts by approaching them from the perspective of techniques which affect the senses. However rudimentary his new theory of art, several of his concepts are nevertheless still relevant and productive today.

I. He introduced the twin terms of automatization and de-automatization to point at the mechanism that *new* techniques (as used in the arts) by making the seen (or heard) strange, de-automatize, complicate and prolong the perceptual process and thus create a typical “art experience” (as he labeled it).^{xxiv}

II. Automatization, on the other hand, in the arts as well as in real life, is the mechanism by which we save mental energy by creating efficient short cuts in the perceptual process. This mechanism is created by repetitive viewing (or listening).

[SLIDE] MANY READERS SEEM TO HAVE MISSED THIS PASSAGE:

“If we start to examine the general laws of perception, we see that as perception becomes habitual, it becomes automatic. Thus, for example, all of our habits retreat into the area of the unconsciously automatic [...]. **In this process, ideally realized in algebra, things are replaced by symbols.** [...] The process of “algebraization,” the over-automatization of [the perception of] an object, **permits the greatest economy of perceptive effort.** Either objects are assigned only one proper feature—a number, for example—or else they function as though by formula and do not even appear in cognition.”

Shklovsky’s manifesto was often wrongly understood: it is essentially about technique, not about form; it is about art and the art experience, not specifically about literature (though many examples are taken from literature); it provides a theory of art and not merely a (prescriptive) poetics for the avant-gardes. To my mind, the manifesto created the conceptual space for studying the new – new artistic

techniques as well as new machines – in the unifying terms of perception to study the impact: why we are sensitized to it; and how we get de-sensitized. To a certain extent, this helps us to explain why technological innovations – such as that new cinema machine, but also the current digital revolution – affect the arts so deeply. In fact, technological innovations did and do continue to create transitions in our fields by changing the very notions our research and education are based upon.

The Impact on Aesthetics [= new slide]

In Valéry's terms: the growth of our techniques indeed profoundly changed "the very notion of art" and "the antique craft of the Beautiful." [= SLIDE] This "antique craft" fully depended on the skills and poetics of the artists. Aesthetics (or so-called "classical aesthetics") was by tradition a discourse about the beautiful, which was both reflective and prescriptive. However, it became a philosophical discipline that primarily dealt with "sensation, sense perception and sensibility"^{xxv} in the course of the last two centuries, the two centuries which were so deeply affected by technology and new techniques. Valéry acknowledges these changes and (like Shklovsky) points at the "physical component" in the arts which needs to be reconsidered, and he, too, asks attention for the transmission device itself insofar as it works on human perception. Dominique Chateau formulated the hypothesis [SLIDE READ LOUD:]

"that such an impact [on human sensibility] will initiate a new mode of perception, or, better still, that each technology has its own sensible characteristics, which lay the accent on the sensory data they select and

process, as much as on the way our own receptive device integrates them. Esthetics [=everything relating to the reception of artworks] may thus be differentiated according to the various reproduction technologies.^{xxvi}

One only needs to look at the research on technology and aesthetics by Edmond Couchot (on how new modes of production, perception, and representation are triggered by new technologies) to understand that some profound changes of the discipline are already taking place; Couchot himself speaks of *techno aesthetics* or *technesthesics*.^{xxvii}

Envisioning the Future

If ever there was a field (apart from the fields of art studies and aesthetics) that, for all these reasons, might profit from a further conceptualization of “technique” and “technology,” and how they sensitize and de-sensitize viewers to their specific features and material properties, clearly, it must be the field of Film and Visual Media Studies, as the two notions open up new ways to frame the impact of the *new* in culture. They can be made more productive and suitable for studies in the field of the arts and visual media, in which new technologies help to shape the viewing experience and constantly interfere with the creation of new genres and art forms, and the notion of art in general. We need theoretical tools to describe and analyze the process of appropriation of new technologies in culture, and we must bring to light that the genealogies of art and technology are intertwined because they are inherently connected.

Technology was basic to the field of film studies from the start. Ongoing innovations affected the field and incidentally even touched upon the foundations. Some transitions affected the field deep enough to rename the object of studies. The word “film” refers to that thin layer (or film) of light-sensitive material on the celluloid strip. What simply was called “film studies” was renamed “film and cinema studies” in the early 1970s, to include that typical viewing environment which, over time, had proved to be so effective for enjoying film. Recent changes have created new names for the object, such as in “moving image studies” (to broaden the field without labeling or excluding the viewing venue) and “screen studies” (to acknowledge the prominence and dominance of the current practice of using a great variety of screens for watching film, mobile screens included; acknowledging, too, that each of these screens has an entirely different impact on the viewer.^{xxviii}

[IMPROVISE: MOBILE – how many of you do HAVE ONE ON YOU now? With access to YouTube? What I personally like... is miniature versions of the world and of films... In fact the mobile not only changes our relation to the cinema... It IS a cinema .. Very different impact from large screens [up to 200 square metres.. Conclusion: New research needed on this – on how these screens affects us.]

In light of the programme in Film and Visual Media we are starting, it is relevant to note that many students have hands-on experience with mobile phones, which were disseminated more quickly and more widely in South-Africa and throughout this continent than in many other parts of the world, Europe included. It means that many students are already sensitized to mobile screens and other moving image devices.

The Film and Visual Media programme will allow us to tap into the substantial reservoir of knowledge they gathered during their daily trainings. [I am not ironic: they ARE being trained on a daily basis.] They have inside knowledge of these devices, their specific features and procedures, their material properties and practices of use. Most knowledge will be implicit. It is valuable knowledge, though, which can be made explicit in their studies with the help of theorizing the object, by analyzing, historicizing and contextualizing newer moving image devices which will connect them to the traditions and historical practices of use of older devices, and to the academic disciplines we touched upon today.

The question of technology in Faculties of the Humanities has never before been a prominent one. As universities are places of knowledge with a make-up that goes back to the Reformation and a typical culture of the WORD - as the words *lecturer*, *lecture* and *lesson* still indicate today – most faculties of the humanities worldwide tend to still be almost fully language-oriented, with traces of a lack of interest in the visual and in the technical. This orientation deepens the evident epistemological gap between the humanities and the sciences; they do not share their explanatory models. Considered from this perspective, new generations with inside knowledge of technological innovation are priceless in the hands of the Faculty of the Humanities and – if you allow me to dream – they may help us to close the knowledge gap created by the diverting and incompatible explanatory models used to explain innovations and transitions in the arts and in culture by and large.

I am aware that South-Africa is more deeply in transition than most other countries

and that its future is perhaps more pressingly connected to the innovation of research and education than Europe's (though I admit, this is a daring assumption). But if so, I hope to contribute to its future. I am extremely grateful for the honor bestowed upon me today to fulfill a role in your University and this Faculty and to be accepted in your middle.

Paul Valéry is said to have spent the early hours of every morning of his adult life on thinking and writing in his Notebooks (*Cahiers*) – and his reflection on this practice is always quoted everywhere, currently at least on a dozen sites. And though I am not sure the source is sound, as I could never find the original quote in French, let me not keep the quote from you. Valéry is supposed to have said that studying in the early morning is advisable, because [I QUOTE] “[h]aving dedicated those hours to the life of the mind, I thereby earn the right to be stupid for the rest of the day.” [END OF QUOTE] So let us keep in mind that there may also be very practical reasons to study, and let us be grateful for what he did for the field.

Acknowledgements

My heartfelt thanks go to the rector, Jonathan Jansen, and the dean, Lucius Botes, for support and inspiration; to Suzanne Human, Head of the Department of Art History, and director of the programme in Film and Visual Media; to Albert Weideman for his role as mentor; to colleagues from the departments of Art History and Visual Culture Studies, Drama and Theatre Arts, English and the Department of Afrikaans, Dutch, German and French – for their commitment; to my film colleagues and PhD students in Groningen and colleagues from the Department for Arts, Culture, and Media in Groningen – for inspiration. I warmly thank the executives of the ceremony for *live-streaming* the event, and Ernst Bruinsma and Viola ten Hoorn for making this publication possible under severe deadlines. Lastly, I sincerely thank Dominique Chateau, Ian Christie, Laura Mulvey, Ed Tan, and Giovanna Fossati for our ongoing dialogue on the topics discussed in this lecture today.

About the Author

Professor Annie van den Oever is an internationally recognized film and media scholar. She is the founding editor of the international book series *The Key Debates* and an editor of *NECSUS. European Journal of Media Studies*. She is an advisor of Amsterdam University Press for Film and Media. Her research on film theory, television, narration, media technologies, aesthetics, and the grotesque, published in *Leonardo* (MIT), *Cinema & Cie*, *Critical Insights*, *Film Philosophy*, *Image & Text*, and *Dalkey Archive Press* (Scholarly Series), is widely acknowledged. Her major works include *Life Itself* (2008), *Ostrannenie* (2010), *Sensitizing the Viewer* (2011), and *Technē/Technology* (2013).

About the Film and Visual Media Programme

In collaboration with Professor Annie van den Oever, the Faculty of the Humanities is in the process of designing and accrediting a new postgraduate programme in Film and Visual Media. The programme aims to satisfy the need for interdisciplinary study in the analysis, interpretation, history and theory of the moving image, in combination with practical training in film-making. The programme is developed in partnership with the departments of Art History and Visual Culture Studies, Drama and Theatre Arts, English and the Department of Afrikaans, Dutch, German and French. The University of The Free State hopes to take in the first film students in 2015.

ⁱ Paul Valéry, "La Conquête de l'ubiquité," in *Aesthetics*, trans. Ralph Manheim (New York: Pantheon Books, Bollingen Series, 1964), 225. Also quoted in: Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" [1936], in *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt (London: Fontana, 1968), 217. Available at .

ⁱⁱ Paul Valéry, PIÈCES SUR L'ART, "La Conquête de l'ubiquité" (inaugural lecture at the *Collège de France* in Paris, France, 1945). For the complete text see, Paul Valéry, "La conquête de l'ubiquité" [1928], in *OEuvres, Pièces sur l'art*, vol. 2 (Paris: Gallimard, Bibl. de la Pléiade, 1960), 1283-1287. Available at

http://classiques.uqac.ca/classiques/Valery_paul/conquete_ubiquite/valery_conquete_ubiquite.pdf.

ⁱⁱⁱ Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" [1936], in *Illuminations*, 1968. See

http://www.udel.edu/History/suisman/611_S05_webpage/benjamin-work-of-art.pdf, or

<http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic235120.files/BenjaminWorkArt.pdf>.

^{iv} Dominique Chateau, "The Philosophy of Technology in the Frame of Film Theory: Walter Benjamin's Contribution," in *Technē/Technology: Researching Cinema and Media Technologies – Their Development, Use, and Impact* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2013), 29-49.

^v Laura Mulvey, *Death 24x a Second: Stillness and the Moving Image* (London: Reaktion Books, 2006).

^{vi} Chateau, "The Philosophy of Technology in the Frame of Film Theory," 35.

^{vii} See Leo Marx, "Technology: The Emergence of a Hazardous Concept," *Technology and Culture* 51, no. 3 (July 2010): 562.

^{viii} For a full overview, see Benoît Turquety, "Toward an Archaeology of the Cinema/Technology

Relation: From Mechanization to 'Digital Cinema,'" in *Technē/Technology: Researching Cinema and*



Media Technologies – Their Development, Use, and Impact (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2013), 52-53.

^{ix} *Ibid.*

^x *Ibid.*

^{xi} Rick Altman, "Toward a Theory of the History of Representational Technologies," *Iris* 2, no. 2 (1984): 115.

^{xii} See dialogue with Geoffrey Winthrop-Young, "Rethinking the Materiality of Technical Media: Friedrich Kittler, *Enfant Terrible* with a Rejuvenating Effect on Parental Discipline – A Dialogue," in *Technē/Technology*, 240-257.

^{xiii} See Annie van den Oever, "Introduction: Researching Cinema and Media Technologies," in *Technē/Technology*, 15-16.

^{xiv} N.N., "Het succes van de Kinematograaf," *Suriname: koloniaal nieuws- en advertentieblad*, Februari 25, 1898, <http://kranten.kb.nl/view/article/id/ddd%3A010340255%3Ampg21%3Ap003%3Aa0017>. See also Van den Oever, "Introduction: Researching Cinema and Media Technologies," in *Technē/Technology*, 15-16.

^{xv} As the journalist broadly refers to an anthology of terms published in the (German) journal *Laterna Magica*, it seems most likely that the list of terms cited is taken from this issue: *Laterna Magica* 21, no. 50 (April 1897): 25. See Van den Oever, *Technē/Technology*, 15-16.

^{xvi} Lev Tolstoy's diary entry of April 26, 1895, quoted in: A.N. (Angus) Wilson, *Tolstoy* [1988] (London: Atlantic Books, 2012), 430-431. See also Van den Oever, *Technē/Technology*, 15-16, and Annie van den Oever, ed., *Ostrannenie. On "Strangeness" and the Moving Image: The History, Reception, and Relevance of a Concept* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010).

^{xvii} See Yuri Tsivian, *Early Cinema in Russia and Its Cultural Reception* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994).

^{xviii} See Annie van den Oever, ed., *Ostrannenie. On "Strangeness" and the Moving Image: The History, Reception, and Relevance of a Concept* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010).

^{xix} Maxim Gorky quoted in Tsivian, *Early Cinema in Russia and Its Cultural Reception*, 1-14.

^{xx} *Ibid.* See also Van den Oever, *Ostrannenie*, 35.

^{xxi} See Annie van den Oever, "Ostrannenie, 'The Montage of Attractions' and Early Cinema's 'Properly Irreducible Alien Quality,'" in *Ostrannenie*, 33-58.

^{xxii} Victor Erlich's "Russian Formalism," *Journal of the History of Ideas* vol. 34, 4 (October – December 1973): 638.

^{xxiii} Van den Oever, *Ostrannenie*, 11, 34. Richard Sheldon's research was very helpful with regard to this point.

^{xxiv} *Ibid.*, 44-52.

^{xxv} Chateau, "The Philosophy of Technology in the Frame of Film Theory," 35.

^{xxvi} *Ibid.*, 35-36.

^{xxvii} Edmond Couchot, *La Technologie dans l'art. De la photographie à la réalité virtuelle* (Nîmes: Jacqueline Chambon, 1998).

^{xxviii} For an overview of names and changes, see André Gaudreault's "The Future History of a Vanishing Medium," in *Technē/Technology*, 261-271. See also Nanna Verhoeff and Heidi Rae Cooley, "Performativity/Expressivity: The Mobile Micro Screen and Its Subject" in the same book for a thorough reflection on the special impact of mobile screens.