

---

INTERVIEW WITH HEIDRUN FÜHRER (LUND UNIVERSITET, SWEDEN)

---

*Entrevista com Heidrun Führer (Universidade de Lund, Suécia)*

DOI: 10.14393/LL63-v37n1-2021-22

Érika Viviane Costa Vieira\*

Miriam de Paiva Vieira\*\*

---

ABSTRACT: Interview with Heidrun Führer (Lund University, Sweden), granted to Érika Vieira and Miriam Vieira on December 17th, 2020.

KEYWORDS: Intermediality. Teaching. Literature.

RESUMO: Entrevista com Heidrun Führer (Universidade de Lund, Suécia) concedida a Erika Vieira e Miriam Vieira em 17 de dezembro de 2020.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Intermidialidade. Ensino. Literatura.

---

---

\* PhD in Literary Theory and Comparative Literature from Poslit/FALE/UFMG. Assistant professor in the undergraduate program in Literature and Language at UFJM. ORCID: 0000-0003-3082-8805. E-mail: erikavcv(AT)gmail.com

\*\* PhD in Literary Theory and Comparative Literature from Poslit/FALE/UFMG. Assistant professor in the undergraduate program in Literature and Language at UFSJ. ORCID: 0000-0001-9851-0217. E-mail: miriamvieira(AT)ufsj.edu.br

## Introduction



Heidrun Führer is an Associate Professor and Senior Lecturer at the Department of Arts and Cultural Sciences, Divisions of Intermedia and Fashion Studies at University Lund, Sweden. Her research is located in the field of intermedial studies, and centered around how an intermedial focus might improve the broad field of older and modern literature, and other cultural products. She explored the intermedial relations by focusing on topics that centered around the concepts of emblematic, ekphrasis, theatre and performance.

She visited<sup>1</sup> Belo Horizonte, in 2014, when she taught at Poslit / FALE / UFMG as a guest professor intermediality in a course, called “Media and Intermedial culture: from ancient times to the Digital Age”. This experience gave her the opportunity to meet the Brazilian group of intermedial research – Intermídia: estudos sobre a intermedialidade (CNPq), led by profs. Claus Clüver and Thaïs Flores Nogueira Diniz, and to intensify the international contacts and cooperation for further projects.

---

<sup>1</sup> She was invited to teach a course and give lectures by Grupo Intermídia, Programa de Pós-graduação em Estudos Literários da Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Programa de Pós-graduação em Letras da Universidade Federal de Santa Maria and Instituto de Ciências Humanas e Sociais da Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto. She was sponsored by Programa de Pós-graduação em Estudos Literários, Faculdade de Letras da Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, and Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico – CNPq.

**1. In Brazil, Language and Literature courses, the so-called Letters, are derived from the French Belles lettres tradition, having Literature as one of the pillars for mother and foreign languages. Throughout time, several paradigms were overcome by content inclusion, i.e., Cultural Studies, and exclusion, i.e., Greek. So, what is the Swedish tradition?**

Actually, the situations are very similar. When studying Swedish literature, the students will intensify your knowledge in Swedish as mother language likewise regarded as a pillar for learning foreign languages, in particular when they are also introduced in linguistics. What you denote “content inclusion” and “exclusion” as a development at your Universities, I can affirm as a general tendency. Older and newer disciplines and institutions strive to outline their specific field of expertise by setting borders and excluding other disciplines, in particular older languages, called dead languages as if they merely haunt modern scientific studies. In my ears, this sounds much like the voices from 18<sup>th</sup> century Enlightenment, when scholars wanted to finish with the old religious stuff and turn to empiric observation, mathematical, logical and scientific thinking.

However, the fragmentation into multiple disciplines at the into multiple different disciplines at the University has both advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, the canonised core disciplines like Philosophy, Literature and Art became also a new life because of the competition of the smaller newcomers, like film studies, cultural studies, fashion studies, game studies etc. On the other hand, the tradition to study the old languages, as cultural source for our recent media products, became marginalised, a development that also partly due to old-fashioned, even normative methods, that needed to be critically questioned. But when throwing the baby out of the bathwater, one has to pay for it.

May this as it, studying Swedish literature or language today means often that the tradition of writing and studying poetry, literature and language, is restricted to the historical development in Sweden. Its ancient traditions and the first theoretical approaches to literature as Aristotle’s *Poetics* are something that the students might have heard, but can hardly contextualise, although Greek notions such as *mimesis*, *diegesis* or *catharsis*, to name just some, are frequently used. However, we also need a historical and diachronic view both on language and literature and know something about the history of ideas, meaning how theoretical notion, classifications and distinctions had been understood and used throughout

history. Think about the distinction of concepts like “fact” and “fiction”, so important for students, not only when studying literature, but also when discussing “documentaries” or modern “fake news”. You might recall here Bakhtin’s old saying that “the boundaries between fiction and non-fiction ... are not laid up in heaven” (BAKHTIN, 1981, p. 33), but you can also study the British Classicist Stephen Halliway who in multiple articles embeds the Greek notions mentioned above not only in the historical context before and after Aristotle’s *Poetic*, but also in their always shifting understanding and usages in different disciplines.<sup>2</sup> For students in intermedial studies who should be able to discuss the problems of adapting novels to films or the other way around, it is necessary to learn that *diegesis* means something different in film studies as in literary studies. Just this notion exemplifies an academic trend – that of heavily theorizing. Without this historical context, Swedish culture seems to come from nowhere, although already the language is a mixture of the always changing languages English, German and others. And when it comes to studying literature, I cannot really understand how students can develop new critical ideas and interpretations can do this without contextualising a literary text with respect to other cultural products, film, music, but also to fashion, visual arts and media in general.

## **2. Lund University has a bachelor’s degree in Intermediality, right? In which context was it created?**

For that, I hark back to the fragmentation of disciplines at Universities. The birth of intermedial studies as an institution of its own is actually one result of splitting off from literary studies, nearly at the same time, also film studies became a separate institution of their own. Lund is not alone in institutionalizing an intensified interest in studying the interrelationships between the arts and the new media technology allowing for new cultural activities and media products.

I experienced a similar development in Germany where I studied old and modern Germany literature, linguistics and Latin during the 70s and 80s. At the beginning film adaptations were

---

<sup>2</sup> See for instance Halliwell’s differentiations between *diegesis* and *mimeses* at <https://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/node/36.html> (accessed on 10 Jan. 2021), a text I always use when teaching intermedial studies in Lund. See also HALLIWELL, 2015).

studied, taking literature as a starting point, but later film studies fought for an institution of their own. A bit later, media studies became popular and Intermedial questions were discussed since the 80s and 90s in Germany.

### 3. What was the context of its curriculum design?

Responsible for the existence of an institution for intermedial studies in Lund and the popularization of the concept is Hans Lund. Coming from literary studies, he established and organized the curriculum for intermediality and taught in multiple of these courses the development of the mediated culture throughout times with much enthusiasm. He was not alone, but always in both academic and friendly contact with other pioneers in the intermedial field, such as Claus Clüver, Steven P. Scher, Ulrich Weisstein or Bernhard Scholz, to name just some of the scholars who are famously guided the young discipline on its way from their own home Universities. Hans Lund, whom I have personally much to thank for, succeeded in designing a curriculum, that later was transformed into a bachelor's degree, but the institutionalization of a professor in intermedial studies unfortunately failed at the end because of many unfortunate economic conditions.

Hans Lund is the only one who succeeded in institutionalising the study intermediality as a discipline from the basic level to a degree. Lund is the only University where you can do this. Because the topics and the method taught in intermedial studies demand much cultural background knowledge, there are not many students able and daring to invest time and money and time into studying these interesting topics. However, there are multiple possibilities to introduce intermediality to students, not only to those who come to us from literature, media studies or Visual Arts to complement their education with an intermedial perspective. We teach also in other institutions, such as courses in the master class for literature in or in digital and Fashion studies where we also try to integrate the intermedial focus onto these disciplines.

The difference to other Swedish universities is that Lund does not restrict intermediality to take literature as starting point. Famous for developing media theory is, for instance, the Linnaeus University in Växjö where we cooperate with Lars Elleström and Jørgen Bruhn,

#### 4. How are the courses now organized? What do the students study?

Lund University offers both single courses and a bachelor's degree in Intermedial Studies. Within the larger department of Arts and Cultural Studies, the Division of Cultural Management and Intermediality the institution offers students today fascinating courses about modern popular culture and about studying interart relations in the sense of Horace's "*ut pictura poesis*" to Oscar Walzel's programmatic writing about of the mutual illumination of the arts to modern media questions.<sup>3</sup> Students can take courses about the intermedial rhetoric of Advertising, digital and life culture or the development of the total work of art, guiding them from ancient theatre to modern architecture by discussing the development of concepts such as art and media. In other words, intermedial studies in Lund broaden the field beyond literature and the classical questions of how music, paintings or films might be integrated in literary texts.

As a result, our courses can integrate topics such as the soundscape of a city, where we also find advertising, flash mobs and street art, performing all different perspectives on what once was called "nature", but now most often "reality". Other Swedish universities, however, such as Göteborg and Stockholm, continue with linking intermediality to literature.

However, we have also some didactical challenges when teaching the highly complex field of intermediality, in particular to students coming directly from high school. These freshmen lack much background knowledge on literature, history and culture apart from what they grew up with, films, football, video games, social media and music. Our task is to start from their experience and make them critically aware of their transparent presumptions, such as discussing an assumed "pure content" as something all will understand in the same way and without recognising how it is "mediated". Creating this awareness is one of our didactical aims. It creates the foundational intermedial questions with roots in Aristotle's generic distinction in matter and form, called "hylomorphism", is intensively discussed, for instance throughout the Romantics between Schiller and Goethe, but even today by so different scholars and field such as the anthropologist Tim Ingold and the physicist Karen Barad.<sup>4</sup> They argue that the forms of

---

<sup>3</sup> See WALZEL, 1917. For an excellent overview over the development from interart to intermedial studies, see CLÜVER (2007) or CLÜVER (2006) published in Portuguese.

<sup>4</sup> INGOLD, 2010; BARAD, 2003.

things arise within fields of force and flows of material and reject the old idea of defining a thing or a concept by its “essence”. But instead of discussing these problems theoretically, we introduce case studies in which we can practice different theoretical approaches. For that, we teach basic knowledge of different fields, such as narratology, anthropology, rhetoric, phenomenology or semiotics, always balancing these different perspectives against each other. For example, while Saussure’s sign theory is a method that helps analysing language and linguistics, the interest of Charles S. Peirce was to outline a logical and pragmatic process of understanding, semiosis.<sup>5</sup> This sign theory is broadened with the cultural thinking about representation of Stuart Hall and his interest in subcultural phenomena. However, one semiotic theory is bound to language, the other to logic. In comparing both, we see what the other are missing. For example, the concern in materiality, as mentioned above, in multimodality or in affects so important when working with fan studies. In other words, we approach intermediality from the focus of different case studies that allow us to make the students practically feel the new difference intermediality can also theoretically introduce to. The more recent interest in multimodality extends the classical intermedial approach to step beyond the autonomous artwork and the idea of “pure” media by differentiating on object not only into the basic media organised into sign systems but also into modalities which influence the communication.

**5. Regarding students and society’s response to Intermediality as a bachelor’s degree: How has intermediality gained the status of a bachelor’s degree? Does society absorb the people who graduate on Intermedial Studies? What are the opportunities for students with an Intermedialist degree?**

On the one hand, as I mentioned at the very beginning, there was a development in in the 1980s and 1990s to break down the large disciplines in smaller, special disciplines. In this flow Hans Lund established the institution of intermediality. On the other hand, the Bologna process, aiming at “harmonising the architecture of the European Higher Education system” (Sorbonne Joint Declaration... 1998),<sup>6</sup> is responsible for introducing and reforming the existing

---

<sup>5</sup> For a good introduction to semiotics see CHANDLER (2002).

<sup>6</sup> Available at: <http://www.ehea.info/page-sorbonne-declaration-1998>. Accessed on: 10 Jan. 2021.

intermedial courses for a bachelor's and a master's degree. At the same time, being allowed to organise such a series of courses was administratively problematic and a highly competitive challenge, as the University in Lund did not want to pay for many master classes, so different from the 1990s, when the University was flourishing and accepted the establishment of new institutions. These are political decisions that at the end weakened the initiative of Hans Lund to establish courses in intermediality in an increasing system of continuous levels. Hans Lund actually came so far that he organised a professorship for Lund. However, it was bad luck that the applying professor from Germany finally denied the position and made the construction fall apart. However, thanks to Hans Lund, Claus Clüver became, at least, professor of honour in Lund University, in 2003. We are very proud.

Intermedial students in Lund mostly continue and take the next step and study visual culture, archaeology, film or in cultural studies to read a master's degree at the end. However, there are also students leaving the University after the Bachelor, looking for jobs in advertising agencies, museum, libraries or jobs they can take, because of the broad education in different media and cultural concerns. As I see it now, most of them got jobs, even though the Corona situation has made life hard.

**6. You have mentioned Claus Clüver a few times already. Since the dossier readership is likely to have heard of him, and even have read him, could you please comment a bit further on his contribution, from your perspective, in a foreign wider scenario?**

I cannot overstate his impact, both on me personally and in the scholarly field, developing intermedial theory further. I met him during the time I wrote my PhD on a Baroque drama in Latin and he supported me in my curiosity to consider the drama in its materiality beyond the "immaterial" Christian ideas, with its images and the music, the typography and all the details which are neglected when studying Latin as language. I was frustrated that this discipline – and it is not the only one – is so restrictive in outlining its field without allowing other questions. Therefore, I appreciated the support of Claus Clüver introducing me into intermediality as a new field developing new questions and seeing neglected phenomena rather than directing people into one standardised knowledge. Your creativity lies in asking questions, never ever to repeat what we have already known. This was during the time when



he worked together with Hans Lund to develop and teach courses in intermediality, Clüver with the strong interest on visual arts and Lund on music and visual art. He and Hans Lund were a good team. They are the ones who really shaped the Nordic understanding of intermediality and who experienced the transformation from Interart studies into Intermediality. Clüver wrote several seminal overview articles about this change and to topics I am interested in, such as ekphrasis, always having an eye on objects that are not institutionalised as art. The same goes also for Hans Lund. Their articles are always obligatory parts of the reading lists, although the technical development goes so fast that both – due to their age – are not speaking about e-books, music videos or Shakespeare dramas on twitter or cultural productions like that. These things are for the next generation of intermedialists to detect and to discuss. While Clüver is the internationally active promotor of the intermedial questions demonstrating what intermediality can do and broadening its international platform, Hans Lund has the same position in Sweden with his introduction book in intermediality in Swedish. However, when I'm opening a new course in spring in English, I use Claus Clüver's article to introduce into intermediality before taking the more recent publications of Werner Wolf, Lars Elleström or Jørgen Bruhn. So, the first lecture is about Claus Clüver, and then we start further.

## **7. How has intermediality actually influenced literary studies and vice versa?**

The interrelationship between literature and intermedial studies is partly competitive, partly constructive in that both sides can use the other's methods and results. When we look back, the term intermediality was a newcomer in the 80s and 90s, but it was even hardly known in other institutions in Lund when I started working at in 2003. However, in particular when looking outside of Sweden to the German speaking countries of Germany, Austria and Switzerland, the term became popular by broadening the interest in intertextuality in literature to a general interest on the influence and interrelation of cultural media products and the impact of modern media technology. Thus, we can observe different branches, one starting from literature (Werner Wolf, Irina Rajewsky), others from film studies (Paesch, Müller), another with a philosophical focus on a philosophical media theory rather than on artworks or media products (Sybille Krämer, Erich Hörl, Lars Elleström). All try to map the ground how

intermediality and literature are interrelated fields by formalising and schematising all new tendencies in detail in order to specify theory and methods.

Crucial is to see that one media discourse foregrounds the bearer and transmitting channel of information emphasising the technical and digital development while the other discourse underscores the interdependency of the material and technological aspects with the composing of “immaterial” ideas, that what is often called “content”. Still, the technological media discourse, drawing from Friedrich Kittler, Marshall McLuhan and, philosophically, also from George Simondon and Bernhard Stiegler, helps as see that the physical medium is more than a storage medium (a paper, a vinyl, a disc).<sup>7</sup> Rather, these materialities influence the “outcome” of the media product. Just imagine to listen to a Schubert song in a live concert, on vinyl, on TV, or youtube. You feel the differences, intermedial studies researches. So, without drawing a strict borderline between analogue and cybernetical thinking, which Erich Hörl called the “new ecological paradigm”,<sup>8</sup> I appreciate reading texts from this site of media studies to understand the development in digital advertising, the entanglement of technology in postdramatic theatre or the “adaptations” of traditionally canon literature in modern technological media formats.

When asking about how intermedial studies influenced literature, I would say that literary studies questioned their single focus on artworks written in literary language, understood as a sign system in the sense of Saussure to represent something and thus to create meaning. So, not only meaning was prioritised, but also a generalised structure giving the students the key to “unlock” the mystery of the verbal text of, let’s say, the Swedish playwright, novelist, poet essayist and painter August Strindberg (1849-1912), the English playwright, poet and actor William Shakespeare (1564-1616) or the German-Swedish poet and playwright Nelly Sachs (1891-1970) after classifying it into the traditional epic, dramatic and lyrical genres. While the listed authors work and think creatively in different modes, sign systems or basic media, literary studies insisted in a linguistic priority, regarded as mono-media. By contrast, an intermedial perspective emphasizes more dynamically the multiple interrelations with other “distinct media”, as I explored by taking a novella of Thomas Mann as example.<sup>9</sup> For many, text and

---

<sup>7</sup> For an introduction see SWAN (2014).

<sup>8</sup> BURTON; HÖRL, 2017.

<sup>9</sup> FÜHRER, 2007

image, which we call the basic media, are distinct and different sign systems. For instance, so called illustrated literature was a combination of two sign systems, whereby the notion “illustration” already implies a subordination of the image to the text. Many studies about ekphrasis and “iconotexts” (Wagner) changes this view. Still, other questions need to be raised such as: what is the relationship between literature and a book? What impact has the materiality of a book or literature? And impact has a live or mediated performance on our understanding? When studying literature, the starting point is the text as a closed unity, representing the meaning(s) of the work, rather than the shifting materialities and multimodalities of performances in theatre. Moreover, theatre foregrounds the body as basic medium apart from the classical triad of word, image and sound, the human body and the gestures of the actors and the audience in the shifting spatiotemporality of the theatre building. In cooperation with Linnaeus University in Växjö, we are just working on these intermedial complexities for a new book introducing students into intermedial studies.<sup>10</sup>

## 8. Which cultural studies concepts are at stake when we talk about an intermedial approach to literature?

I see one problem in focusing too much on **semiotics** as a super theory, that always strives to look for signs giving meaning via representation. Literature is, as said before, discussed mainly as **mono-medium** according to the dominating sign system of words. Describing a painting becomes in this approach then ekphrasis, as least as long we move within “The Modern System of arts”, as outlined by Paul Oskar Kristeller.<sup>11</sup> The ekphrasis discourse shows in particular the transparent normative assumption about how and why we want to understand something as a medium or art, what we exclude and include in meaning-giving process.<sup>12</sup> This leads to another problem I see: an intermedial discussion of literature that starts from the pregiven idea of a “distinct medium” (Wolf) on which further classifications - such as “intra- or

---

<sup>10</sup> Forthcoming, Routledge.

<sup>11</sup> KRISTELLER, 1951.

<sup>12</sup> Ruth Webb opened the discussions about the shortcomings of modern understanding of ekphrasis by simply pushing away the historica of the notion. See WEBB, 2009 Her text is often taken as starting point to reformulate the notion. See, for instance, VIEIRA (2019, 2020), who questions the restriction of the definition by integrating architecture as a historically relevant topic that had been neglected. However, in the strive to purify an abstract definition in the sense “a verbal representation of a visual representation”, see HEFFERNAN (1993).

extracompositional intermediality” (Wolf); “intermedial transposition” (e.g. from a novel into a film) and “transmediality” as analogy between different media (Rajewsky), or “media modalities” (Elleström) – are grounded.

When mentioning media modalities I name shortly the four Elleström outlines<sup>13</sup>, the material, the sensorial, the spatiotemporal and the semiotic modality which allow him to distinguish between a semiotic and the pre-semiotic sensation, one sensation when we try to make sense of and the first impact, maybe a result of affect thought of as a force of its own (Massumi). While all modalities need further consideration, Elleström’s model the first intermedial models and is much more dynamic than those grounding themselves on technology or state that the medium always disappears in the consumption of the message (Krämer, Mersch).

## 9. When you talk about teaching intermediality, what are you talking about?

When teaching intermediality we choose a text genre, for instance comics, and consider its institutionalising process making us accept comics today as literature, but as a form that is historically not bound to a “book” but to the magazine where it started out with a series of images with text in its own space to the pleasure of only some groups of readers. Interestingly, comics is not so much an autonomous (art-)work but, like the newspapers, an ephemeral text in a series. In saying that I point to the qualifying aspect coming with the book format. I remember the difference between “real” books and “paperbacks” that allowed me as a student to buy my own books. But I also own many older books, heavy in its materiality in leather and gold, qualified by the social value given to this physical format and its materiality. By contrast, we have sheep newspaper in your hand, or a special magazine offering you specific comics. In any case, the seriality, ephemerality and the everyday form of newspaper is a material bearer for many texts we qualify as literature today: Charles Dickens was not alone in publishing his stories in a series, in an ongoing process during which he went out on the street, speaking with

---

<sup>13</sup> Model proposed in *Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality* (2010) and revised in *Beyond Media Borders*, volume 1 (2020). Note the difference between Elleström’s concepts of multimodality and that of Günther Kress and Theo van Leeuwen (2001). For a critical approach to the research of Kress and Leeuwen, see Prior (2005).

people claiming “hey, you cannot make this guy die, he was so important for me!”. And he changed his work that was not only his own.

Discussing this process with the literary students, makes them aware how what we call “a medium” is not one and not static “thing”. While we always need a physical and material element for creating literature, its “content” is never static, a pre-given idea moulded in a form, but a multimodal and dynamic media product rather than a finished “artwork”. The serial form is as an open and dynamic system of its own is something, many students are aware of from in TV, Netflix or other. To make this more concrete: when I teach, for example, graphic novels the students immediately understand the dynamic interrelation between text and image as words appear in different visual forms in and outside a balloon, taking visually the mode of different voices. We study also the impact of choosing different perspectives and frames in images, that might be black-and-white or colored, or more or less realistically be drawn. Thus, students learn to see the details which are often marginalized in abstract classifications.

When I teach Satrapi’s *Persepolis*, for instance, we discuss where, when and why this series of comics was published in different material formats, why it is written in black and white, when and why the drawings are self-reflectively pointing to its production and the author and how one can relate the printed, now even digitalized versions of *Persepolis* with the animated film in 2007 (directed by Marjane Satrapi and Vincent Paronnoud). These are the processual conditions that will be then related to how the narrative is unfolded. This allows us to discuss how concept such as aesthetics, gender and political questions are intertwined with their intermedial materialization in an intertextual context.

**10. You mentioned the materiality of book. Besides the paper support, nowadays we also read books on e-readers, tablets, and even on the cell phones. Due to the Pandemic, authors have increasingly been producing on social media. Even consolidated authors have been taking advantage of social media as a support, such as Twitter and Instagram. What do you have to say about it?**

Indeed, what we might mean with literature or text broadens as much as the material and technical platform, necessary for “bearing”, recording or disseminating it. The fast

development in technology deconstructs fast the scholarly models trying to map all media aspects neatly in fixed abstract systems.

We speak about our literature, we also need to speak about language, both are in flow. It is a process and what we have to learn and what perhaps is coming up with the idea of transmediality, I'm kind of doubtful, but nevertheless, it is bringing up this kind of a flow instead of fixing things that: this what the word Aristotle wanted to do. He wanted to put a grid onto things by defining: this is the matter, so you know the four courses, and then the matter is a medium, the medium is a matter. As if we just are doing statues, working with wood, things have changed. So we have to be more open and this openness can be just approach - having a theory, and the theory is not just one theory, it is an aggregation of its collects different theories. So, it is not one view, different views are very important. So therefore semiotics, a phenomenological approach, a materialistic approach, and always interrelation to the change of aesthetics coming from Greek *aesthesis* to this system of arts in the Enlightenment and changing art. When I'm speaking about the aesthetics, about popular culture, then I can read books like Kate Brown's *Plutopia* (2015), for instance, when I'm working it, or Svetlana Alexievich's Nobel Prize book about the *Voices from Chernobyl* (1997). Both books are concerned with "translating" multiple oral witness reports into a consistent reflection about modalities of a reality, many do not want to see. These books guide us then to a conventional understanding of a documentary genre, of medium and truth, narrative and meaning making and fact and fiction. By so doing, we question easy going definitions of literature as make-believe world and fiction, created by a (genial) author in a closed work in contrast to the facts of a pre-given reality. An intermedial perspective on literature will most of all discuss the relativity and constructiveness of borderlines in the hope to be less normative and allow to see the marginalized. That's the main idea.

**11. Last but not least, regarding your own career: since you hold a PhD in Latin and an Ma in Modern and Classic Literature, how has intermedial studies been integrated into your researcher and professor career?**

Actually, intermediality is for me so important because I always was trying to push the door to learn more. In respect to my Baroque Drama, I was not allowed to speak about the

emblems, an artful composition of text and allegorical images, that played an important role in the religious argumentation (*propaganda dei*), as known from emblem meditation books, from church and theatre architecture at that time. Not to mention the music that was part in the appendix of a drama meant for me that one loses an important affective access to the rhetoric enfolded in the performance. The “medium” of a drama is not language alone, this is for sure. But I had to meet Hans Lund to be able to express and theorize about this complexity, I took his courses at the university in Lund, where I met both Claus Clüver and Bernhard Scholz, the latter an expert on emblems. More than words and language, intermedial literature means for me to see details, in this case the typography, the language mistakes, the positioning of the emblems within the text, asking how was the image made, where and why are they printed? Who was allowed to print images and texts like this? The historical question of censorship, I met there, is not outdated when you think about the writing of literature in Eastern Germany for example.

Because I started my career on the University with theatre, I'm very much into performance studies and I would like to open up the text into the “doing” of performance. Ekphrasis is another of my topics trying to challenge the idea of literature in a monomedial approach. As I wrote ekphrasis under the header, “Leaving the White Cube” and about Matta-Clark's *Conical intersect* as ekphrasis, I strived to challenge traditional ideas about how scholars absorb ancient notions, not only to functionalise them for their theories, but also to create their models. Architecture is interesting in this case because for many architecture is a material, perhaps decorative shelter but not art or medium in the sense of transferring meaning and thus not worthy to be integrated in a literary ekphrasis discourse. However, coming with the eyes of an intermedialist, one can see things like this creatively different as you did, Miriam.

So rather than making disciplinary border lines, my suggestion would be, my utopian hope would be, that we could consider we could work together much more in this way of opening up our research.

#### Credits:

Transcription from Zoom video interview: Lívia Maria Gimenez Pereira (UFSJ)

**References:**

ARISTOTLE. **Poetics**. translation and commentary by Stephen Halliwell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986. Disponível em: <https://meliduvom.files.wordpress.com/2013/12/2dlc0b5.pdf>. Acesso em: 3 ago. 2021.

ARVIDSON, Jens; ASKANDER, Mikael; BRUHN, Jørgen; FÜHRER, Heidrun. Introduction. **Changing borders: contemporary positions in intermediality**. [s.l.]: Intermedial Studies Press, 2007. p. 13-16.

BARAD, Karen. Posthumanist performativity: toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. **Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society**, v. 28, p. 801-831, 2003. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1086/345321>

BAKHTIN, Mikhail. The dialogic imagination: four essays. *In*: HOLQUIST, Michael. (Ed.). **The dialogic imagination; four essays by M. Bakhtin**. Translation by Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

BURTON, James; HÖRL, Erich (Ed.). **General ecology**. The New Ecological Paradigm. New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017.

BRUHN, Jørgen. **Intermediality and narrative literature: medialities matter**. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-57841-9>

CHANDLER; Daniel. **Semiotics for beginners**. London: Routledge, 2002. Disponível em: <http://www.visual-memory.co.uk/daniel/Documents/S4B/>. Acesso em: 3 ago. 2021.

CLÜVER, Claus. A new look at an old topic: ekphrasis revisited. **Todas as Letras**, São Paulo, v. 19, n. 1, p. 30-44, 2017. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5935/1980-6914/letras.v19n1p30-44>

CLÜVER, Claus. Intermediality and Interarts Studies. *In*: ARVIDSON, Jens; ASKANDER, Mikael; BRUHN, Jørgen; FÜHRER, Heidrun. Introduction. **Changing borders: contemporary positions in intermediality**. [s.l.]: Intermedial Studies Press, 2007.

CLÜVER, Claus. Inter textus / Interartes / Inter mídia. **Aletria**, Belo Horizonte, v. 14, jul-dez, p. 9-39, 2006. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17851/2317-2096.14.0.10-41>

ELLESTRÖM, Lars (Org.). **Beyond media borders, volume 1: intermedial relations among multimodal media**. 1. ed. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49679-1>

ELLESTRÖM, Lars. **Midialidade: ensaios sobre comunicação, semiótica e intermedialidade**. Porto Alegre: EdIPUCRS, 2017. p. 49-100; p. 229-239. Disponível em: <http://ebooks.pucrs.br/edipucrs/livro/midialidade/>



ELLESTRÖM, Lars. **Media borders, multimodality and intermediality**. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230275201>

FISCHER-LICHTE, Erika. Culture as performance – developing a concept of performance. *In*: GULLESTAD, Anders M.; LOMBARDO, Patrizia; SAETRE, Lars (Ed.). **Exploring textual action**. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2010.

FÜHRER, Heidrun; KRAUS, Anna. Leaving the white cube of ekphrasis: Gordon Matta-Clark's conical intersection. *In*: SALMOSE, Niklas; ELLESTRÖM, Lars (Org.). **Transmediations: communication across media borders**. 1. ed. New York: Routledge, 2020. v. 1, p. 97-117. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429282775-6>

FÜHRER, Heidrun. Take the beuys off – reconsidering the current concept of ekphrasis in the performative poetry of Thomas Kling. **Aletria**, Belo Horizonte, v. 27, n. 2, p. 157-188, 2017. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17851/2317-2096.27.2.157-188>

FÜHRER, Heidrun. Intermediality in culture: Thomas Mann's *Der Tod in Venedig*. *In*: ARVIDSON, Jens; ASKANDER, Mikael; BRUHN, Jørgen; FÜHRER, Heidrun. Introduction. **Changing borders: contemporary positions in intermediality**. [s.l.]: Intermedial Studies Press, 2007. p. 207-238.

FÜHRER, Heidrun; BANASZKIEWICZ, Bernadette. The trajectory of ancient ekphrasis. *In*: JEDLICKOVA, Alice. **On Description**. Prague: Akropolis, 2014. p. 45-75.

HALL, Stuart (Ed.). Representation. **Cultural representations and signifying practices**. London: Sage, 2012 [1997].

HALLIWELL, Stephen. Fiction. *In*: DESTRÉE, Pierre; MURRAY, Penelope (Ed.). **A companion to ancient aesthetics**. [s.l.]: Wiley, 2015. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119009795.ch22>

HALLIWEL, Stephen. Diegesis – mimesis. *In*: UNI-HAMBURG. **The living handbook of narratology**. Hamburg: Uni-Hamburg, 2012. p. 129-137. Disponível em: <https://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/node/36.html> (accessed Jan. 2021)

HEFFERNAN, James. **Museum of words: the poetics of ekphrasis from Homer to Ashbery**. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1993.

HÖRL, Erich. **Sacred channels: the archaic illusion of communication**. Preface by Jean-Luc Nancy, translation by Nils F. Schott, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvcj3048>

GENETTE, Gerard. **Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

INGOLD, Tim. The textility of making. **Cambridge Journal of Economics**, v. 34, n. 1, p. 91-102, 2010. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/bep042>

KITTLER, Friedrich A. **Aufschreibesysteme 1800-1900**. Munich: Fink, 1985. Disponível em: [https://monoskop.org/File:Kittler\\_Friedrich\\_Aufschreibesysteme\\_1800\\_1900.pdf](https://monoskop.org/File:Kittler_Friedrich_Aufschreibesysteme_1800_1900.pdf). Acesso em: 3 ago. 2021.

KRÄMER, Sybille. **Medium, messenger, transmission**. An approach to media philosophy. Translated by Anthony Enns. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press 2015. Disponível em: <https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/id/761778d5-8853-4ca8-8813-b34a6b0ed3a8/628133.pdf>.

KRESS, Gunter; VAN LEEUWEN, Theo. **Multimodal discourse: the modes and media of contemporary communication**. London: Arnold, 2001.

KRISTELLER, Paul Oskar. The modern system of the arts: a study in the history of aesthetics. Part I. **Journal of the History of Ideas**, v. 12, n. 4, p. 496-527, 1951. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2707484>

LUND, Hans. (ed.) **Intermedialitet**. Ord, bild och ton i samspel. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2002.

LUND, Hans. Text as picture. Studies in the literary transformation of pictures. Lewiston: Mellenpress, 1992.

MITCHELL, W. J. T. **Picture theory**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

MÜLLER, Jürgen E.: Intermedialität. Formen moderner kultureller Kommunikation. Münster: [s.e.], 1996.

OOSTERLING, Henk; PLONOWSKA ZIAREK, Ewa (Ed.). **Intermedialities: philosophy, arts**. Lanham: Politics Lexington Books, 2010.

PAECH, Joachim. Intermedialität als Methode und Verfahren. In: MÜLLER, Jürgen E. (Ed.). **Media encounters and media theories**. Münster: [s.e.], 2008. p. 57-75.

PAECH, Joachim. Intermedialität. Mediales Differenzial und transformative Figurationen. In: HELBIG, Jörg (Ed.). **Intermedialität, Theorie und Praxis eines interdisziplinären Forschungsgebiets**. Berlin: [s.e.], 1998. p. 14-30.

PRIOR, Paul. Moving multimodality beyond the binaries: a response to Gunther Kress' 'Gains and Losses'. **Computers and Composition**, v. 22, n. 1, p. 23-30, 2005. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2004.12.007>

RAJEWSKY, Irina. **Intermedialität**. Tübingen: Franke, 2002.

RAJEWSKY, Irina O. Intermedialidade, intertextualidade e "remediação": uma perspectiva literária sobre intermedialidade. Tradução de Thaís Flores Nogueira Diniz e Eliana Lourenço de Lima Reis. In: DINIZ, Thaís Flores Nogueira (Org.). **Intermedialidade e estudos inter-artes: desafios da arte contemporânea**. Belo Horizonte: FALE-UFMG, 2012. v. 1, p. 15-45

SATRAPI, Marjane. **Persepolis 2: The Story of a Return**. Translation by Anjali Singh. New York: Pantheon, 2004. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/4024475>

SATRAPI, Marjane. **Persepolis: the story of a childhood**. Translation by Mattias Ripa and Blake Ferris. New York: Pantheon, 2003.

SCHER, Steven Paul (Hg.). Comparing literature and music: current trends and prospects in critical theory and methodology, in: Konstantinovic u.a. 1981, 215-221.

SCHOLZ, Bernhard F. **Emblem und Emblempoetik**. Historische und systematische Studien. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 2002.

SCHRÖTER, Jens. The politics of intermediality. **Acta Univ. Sapientiae, Film and Media Studies**, v. 2, p. 107-124, 2010. Disponível em: [https://www.theorie-der-medien.de/text\\_detail.php?nr=12](https://www.theorie-der-medien.de/text_detail.php?nr=12)

SWAN, Melanie. Personhood and subjectivation in Simondon and Heidegger. **Journal of Evolution and Technology**, v. 24, n. 3, p. 65-75, 2014.

VIEIRA, Miriam P. Architectural ekphrasis: unveiling a Brazilian Wall-Less House in contemporary fiction. In: SALMOSE, Niklas; ELLESTRÖM, Lars (Org.). **Transmediations communication across media borders**. 1.ed. New York: Routledge, 2020. v. 1, p. 118-135. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429282775-7>

VIEIRA, Miriam P. Out of space: the complexity of contemplative and performative architectural ekphrasis. In: PAWELEC, Andrzej; SZPILA, Grzegorz; SHAW, Aeddán. **Text-Image-Music: crossing the borders. Intermedial conversations on the poetics of verbal, visual and musical texts**. [s.l.]: Cracow Studies in English Language, Literature and Culture, in press.

WALZEL, Oskar F. Wechselseitige Erhellung der Künste. **Ein Beitrag zur Würdigung kunstgeschichtlicher Begriffe**. Berlin: Reuther & Richard, 1917.

WAGNER, Peter: Introduction: ekphrasis, iconotexts, and intermediality – the state(s) of the art(s). In: WAGNER, Peter. **Icons – texts – iconotexts: essays on ekphrasis and intermediality**. Berlin: [s.e.], 1996. p. 1-40. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110882599.1>

WEBB, Ruth. Ekphrasis, imagination and persuasion in ancient rhetorical theory and practice. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.

WEISSTEIN, Ulrich. To frame or not to frame, that is the question: an intermedial study of Achim von Arnim's "Die Majoratsherren," its Frontispice and Robert Campin's "Mérode Altarpiece". In: ARVIDSON, Jens; ASKANDER, Mikael; BRUHN, Jørgen; FÜHRER, Heidrun. Introduction. **Changing borders: contemporary positions in intermediality**. [s.l.]: Intermedial Studies Press, 2007. p. 189-205.

WOLF, Werner. Entry on 'intermediality'. *In*: HERMAN, David; JAHN, Manfred; RYAN, Marie-Laure. **Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory**. London: Routledge, 2005. p. 63-91.

WOLF, Werner. Intermedialität – ein weites Feld und eine Herausforderung für die Literaturwissenschaft. *In*: BERNHART, Walter (Ed.). **Selected Essays on Intermediality by Werner Wolf (1992–2014)**. [s.l.]: Brill, 2002. p. 63-91.

Received on: 29.01.2021

Accepted on: 10.05.2021