



University of HUDDERSFIELD

University of Huddersfield Repository

Lewis, Chara, Mojsiewicz, Kristin and Pettican, Anneké

Brass Art: A house within a house within a house within a house

Original Citation

Lewis, Chara, Mojsiewicz, Kristin and Pettican, Anneké (2014) Brass Art: A house within a house within a house within a house. *Journal of Writing in Creative Practice*, 7 (3). pp. 375-386. ISSN 1753-5190

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/26081/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

Name Brass Art: Chara Lewis, Kristin Mojsiewicz & Anneké Pettican

Affiliation Manchester School of Art at Manchester Metropolitan University,
Edinburgh College of Art at the University of Edinburgh, University of
Huddersfield (respectively)

Title Brass Art: A house within a house within a house within a house.

Keywords Archive, the double, the uncanny, the unconscious, Freud, Kinect

Abstract

Performances from Brass Art (Lewis, Mojsiewicz, Pettican), captured at the Freud Museum, London, using Kinect laser scanning and Processing, reveal an intimate response to spaces and technologies. 'A house within a house within a house within a house' links historical and cultural representations of the double, the unconscious and the uncanny to this artistic practice. The new moving-image and sonic works form part of a larger project to inhabit the writing rooms of influential authors, entitled *Shadow Worlds | Writers' Rooms*.

The Messenger

Love, most beautiful
Of all the deathless gods. He makes men weak,
He overpowers the clever mind, and tames
The spirit in the breasts of men and gods.

(Hesiod, 1973: 27)

A small information card beside the statue of a diminutive winged figure states that this figure alone was sent on as a forward party in advance of the Freud family as they fled Nazi persecution in Vienna. Easily overlooked in his glass case – Eros: the love force who emerged after chaos; competitor with the Thanatos death drive; the triumph of self-preservation over self-destruction; the fetish object undergone transfer from material object into the sphere of the divine: a fitting herald.

The Collector

It must be kept in mind that, for the collector, the world is present, indeed ordered, in each of his objects. Ordered, however, according to a surprising and, for the profane understanding, incomprehensible connection [...]. It suffices to observe just one collector as he handles the items in his showcase. No sooner does he hold them in his hand than he appears inspired by them and seems to look through them into the distance, like an augur.

(Benjamin, 1999: 207)

Walter Benjamin describes the conflation of an object's history, provenance, and in Freud's case symbolic meaning forming a 'whole magical encyclopaedia, a world order' for the true collector. Freud's study is famously full of the antiquities he collected, with many positioned along his desk in two rows, like sentinels. These objects clearly embodied a greater significance and meaning than a mere scholarly pastime for the psychoanalyst. Their original set up in Vienna was captured for posterity by photographer Edmund Engelmann (Engelmann, 1998), at the behest of August Aichhorn. Doubtless this photographic documentation helped Anna Freud to ease her father's transition to London, configuring his spatial set-up with as little disruption as possible to his work, but it can also be read as an insurance against their destruction – specifically a doubling which works against death.

The specific relationships (instigated by Freud) between the objects, and their relations to each other, as they were rearranged on his desk, were contingent on his mood and preoccupations. Even on holiday he was unable to part with his collection of antiquities, packing up hundreds of the most favoured pieces to travel with him, and arranging them in his new destination as a child might carry and arrange a transitional object. Michael Molnar, former Director of the Freud Museum, reported that Freud habitually handled the pieces whilst speaking, savouring both the look and feel of them. Freud himself stated in 1907:

As people grow up, then, they cease to play, and they seem to give up the yield of pleasure which they gained from playing. But whoever understands the human mind knows that hardly anything is harder for a man than to give up a pleasure he has once experienced. Actually we can never give anything up; we only exchange one thing for another.

(Freud, 1989: 437-438)

The body's material interaction with objects from the past, grasping a remnant of another time and place, provokes the mind and the imagination into flights of fancy. Encountered in the here-and-now, the collected figures signify both an uncanny familiarity and an unknowable past:

It is though, as collector, Freud assembles and arranges these enigmatic objects from "elsewhere" in order to map and re-order his whole (psychic) world.

(Calderbank, 2007: 10)

Our interest in Freud's London home originates with the 'saved' collection and belongings – ostensibly in exile and elevated to mythical status due to its perilous journey. Had they not been allowed to leave Austria it is worth

considering what substitutes would have been created or collected in their place. Freud himself was unwilling to trust that his collection really would be safely shipped out of Nazi-occupied Austria, remarking, ‘There is often a slip ‘twixt cup and lip...’ (Freud, 1992: 247). The possibility of obliteration is omnipresent, and we can read Freud’s fear for his collection as part of the wider trauma of persecution.

The Artists

Time and again we have crossed the barrier, peeked behind the scenes, stayed beyond closing time, accessed parts unseen by the public-at-large. Our presence ostensibly does not make a mark or leave a trace, except for the data or the image captured during our sojourn. Our collaborative entity emerged from a shared desire to occupy inaccessible vantage points. Assisted by digital compositing, shadows, drawings and model making, we created our doubles to dance and loom over imaginary landscapes¹. The artist is often afforded privileged access by dint of their audacity to ask, and ability to re-animate a collection with a fresh perspective. Thus we interject, interpose or interrupt the equilibrium, the narrative, the silence, the spaces between and beneath. We enter a dialogue to discern what we can touch, move, displace, juxtapose, unlock, open up, or reveal.

At the Museum we occupied Freud’s vantage point at his desk, face-to-face with his collection, opened his drawers and found non-invasive ways to insert ourselves momentarily into his space. The winged antiquities drew our attention – reminding us of the metamorphosis we have assumed in our

phantasmagorical cut-and-paste depictions of reality and fantasy². In Freud's study, we selected and slowly rotated a sculptural figure, Eros, picked out by the laser, to 'cast' an occluded shadow on the wall. Freud's artefact – so reminiscent of the figure in our installation *Moments of Death and Revival* (2008 and 2010), and its brief transformation into a winged form at the moment of the light's turning – is both one thing and another: inanimate and moving, dead and alive, revealing a double truth.

The uncanny twin

Within Freud's house we can experience most clearly the *mise en abyme* – an important motif within our collaborative practice – in this instance the *house within the house*. The artefacts and furniture from the original study in Freud's home on Berggasse in Vienna were transposed to Maresfield Gardens in London to create *a house within the house*. When it became a Museum (in 1986) it became *a house within a house within a house* – a threefold recursive frame. Freud Museum Director Carol Seigel³ suggests that we can take this a step further: the status of the analyst's couch, chair and desk (with attendant statues) form such a distinct core of the Museum, and of the publics' interest in Freud's work, can be seen as an additional casement to the Museum, and consequently then produces a fourfold recursive framing of the housed collection – *a house within a house within a house within a house*.

The positions of major items, such as consultation room furniture and cabinets of artefacts, in the London study mirrored those in Vienna as closely as possible. This mirroring of London and Vienna is significant for our approach

to working with the Freud Museum and returns again to the idea of the copy. The flat in Central Vienna – the symbolic seat of Austrian psychoanalysis, and the site of Freud’s groundbreaking studies and writing – haunts the house in North London. The return of some of Freud’s objects and furniture to Vienna in the 1970s undertaken by his daughter Anna, re-states his presence on Berggasse, but essentially proclaims absence.

Inge Scholz-Strasser, Former Director of Freud Museum Vienna, confirms this:

There is no replacement, no reconstruction; one just realizes that there are empty rooms [in the Sigmund Freud Museum, Vienna], and one has to find one’s way through them. [...] The challenge of the last 25 years has been to communicate through space (rather than objects) and ask questions of space, its histories etc.

(Scholz-Strasser cited in Morra, 2013: 89)

Art Historian Joanne Morra, writing on the differences between Freud’s two former homes and collections, follows Scholz-Strasser in suggesting that the Freud Museum Vienna is a ‘conceptual museum’ – largely empty of any objects or archived collection. Her suggestion is that we consider the ‘empty’ Museum as a living archive of the Freud family’s life and work, and that ultimately the Viennese Museum can be understood as ‘modeled [sic] on conceptual art’ (Morra, 2013: 89).

Our approach to the house in Maresfield Gardens, full as it is of artefacts, furniture and books, has been to attempt to open up the space. A virtue of using laser capture is that it has a limited range and depth of field so that

artefacts become part of the architecture and multiple viewings are required to discern domestic features and objects of significance. The Museum itself has a long-standing dialogue with contemporary art, inveigled within the confines of a domestic scale museum. We recall images of Freud's rooms; of artworks (by Bourgeois, Rego, Lucas) inserted there to challenge received twentieth century gendered narratives. Siegel described⁴ visitors unaware that artificial tree-stumps⁵ in the consulting room were neither part of the house nor of the psychoanalyst's *oeuvre*. It seems pertinent that these visitors were seemingly unperturbed by their presence – perhaps already expecting to be unsettled by the unhomely in Freud's house.

These Museums – empty or full – are bound together, each orbiting the other on a helix. We can view the two archives, collections, Museums, homes as inextricably linked, but it would be unproductive to see them as binary opposites. As uncanny twins they are each present in the existence of the other. The lexical ambivalence of the uncanny means that even in negative connotations, it remains in the unconscious. Anneleen Masschelein maintains that, 'denying something at the same time conjures it up. Hence, it is perfectly possible that something can be familiar and unfamiliar at the same time' (Masschelein, 2011: 6). The unhomely is accessed and understood only *through* the homely. It is these 'multiple significations' of the *unheimlich* that Anthony Vidler claims were most interesting for Freud, returning, as it did, to the scene of the domestic; the home and dynamics of the family. Furthermore, as Freud approached the *unheimlich* through the *heimlich* he 'exposed the disturbing affiliation between the two'; that their interchangeability was

perhaps the most uncanny aspect of all (Vidler, 1996: 23).

*Shadow Worlds | Writers' Rooms*⁶ (2011-) as an investigation of simple, domestic spaces creates the possibility of thinking about the everyday, the ordinary and the familiar as the most vivid potential sites for uncanny revelation and transformation. In re-animating the 'familiar' domestic spaces of our authors – familiar in the sense that we all understand what a bedroom is, or what a staircase is for – our sojourns invite a re-evaluation of these spaces, their particularities and peculiarities. Our performances with capture technologies, create an unfixated and constantly evolving form: a direct copy of the original space – a double – but with shifting and unexpected points of view in immeasurable time periods, and our doubles the surprising and submerged occupants.

Up the Staircase

In 1899, Freud wrote:

I was very incompletely dressed and was going upstairs from a flat on the ground floor to a higher storey. I was going up three steps at a time and was delighted at my agility. Suddenly I saw a maid-servant coming down the stairs – coming towards me, that is. I felt ashamed and tried to hurry, and at this point the feeling of being inhibited set in: I was glued to the steps and unable to budge from the spot.

(Freud, 1976 335-6)

The hall staircase at 20 Maresfield Gardens, Freud's London home, is the central, pivotal element in the house. Stairs, with their vertical axis, offer a literal passage up or down. They are measured against and designed for the

body. Thus, in moving vertically through space we are able to incrementally measure ourselves against the flight of time: moving up or down, either ascending or descending. A staircase is a structure of everydayness. It is no place: a transitional or liminal zone between two or more distinct zones that offer a division between a public and a private realm. However, dreaming can transform these seemingly characterless domestic byways into sites of vivid power. Morra suggests that: 'Through dreams the various dwelling-places in our lives co-penetrate and retain the treasures of former days' (Morra, 2013: 84). And so in our sleep, paradoxically, we sometimes recall specific interconnected passageways as both intimate and personal symbols of cherished sites in our past.

Can we consider that a dream *is* an archive? In dreams, our ability to consciously construct and measure time is lost. However, there is a rich suturing between our lived-experience and dreaming. For Freud, dreaming necessitates the loss of one of our mental activities 'namely our power of giving intentional guidance to the sequence of our ideas'. He states, 'not until we wake up does the critical comment arise that we have not experienced anything but have merely been thinking in a peculiar way [...]' (Freud, 2001: 50).

We did not deviate from using the main staircase, with its ninety-degree turns, as a feature of our performative work. In our consideration of the 'atemporal pursuing the temporal' and our established interest in the Uncanny, we

wanted to see if it was possible to mimic one another in a two-step 'dance', using this formal structure as our measure. In reference to Freud's theory of the Unconscious, we sought to be responsive to the spaces of the house⁷ and allow them (and the artefacts contained therein) to guide and shape the sequence of our performances. We sought 'to turn belatedness into becomingness' (Foster, 2004: 22) and re-animate the archive and museum. A new feature of this performative work was the bespoke software, developed for our Freud sojourn by Spencer Roberts⁸.

In dreams, 'Steps, ladders or staircases, or, as the case may be, walking up or down them, are representations of the sexual act' wrote Freud, and rooms are usually denoted as female – '*Frauenzimmer*'. In the Maresfield house, we wanted to extend the possibilities afforded by the capture technology and experiment with 'threshold' performances: by conjoining and editing data, captured by several Kinect devices located at different points within a scene, we could move freely between rooms, thereby fully animating the house as the lasers captured points of entry and exit. Simultaneously, composer Monty Adkins coaxed sound recordings from the largely silent spaces. The audio recordings made by Adkins in Freud's house were captured 'to order' in a very deliberate way. These binaural recordings (designed to give the 'natural' sense of hearing in stereo) highlight the realistic affect of intimately heard voices, whilst simultaneously heightening the unnatural sensibilities of the moving image – archaic-looking digital revenants.

'I'll dance with you... wearing a river's disguise' (Cohen, 1988)⁹

To perform 'the double' we donned the same androgynous disguises. Doubling has provided a motif for us to examine intimate ideas and move beyond the private self. As Marina Warner posits, 'Doubling offers another disturbing and yet familiar set of personae in ways of telling the self; permutations of inner and outer selves catalyse uncanny plots about identity' (Warner, 2004: 163). Our intention to copy and perform 'others' actions, was important from the outset. The idea of using repetitive actions and sonic refrains meant that we gave ourselves the opportunity to create a piece that would flow through the spaces of the house – moving both in and out of step with time. Thus 'the double' in this work is a signifier of the uncanny experience, triggering a sense of the familiar yet strange. Attempting to mimic each other's movements and gestures, results in a mirror-image performance where the protagonists 'refuse' to replicate their doubles. Thus, in the editing and re-drawing process¹⁰ something surprising occurs – the protagonists switch, move in and out of step with linear time, and extend the dream-like register of the piece. Retrospectively we cannot always be sure who is cast in a particular role, and thus the doubling succeeds in ungrounding us. In terms of our creative process this playfulness is crucial.

'To make the invisible visible is uncanny' (De Man, 1986)

The laser creates a direct trace. It deliberately fashions space more precisely than a photograph which Susan Sontag suggests 'is not "an interpretation" of the real; it is also a trace directly stencilled off the real, like a footprint or a death mask' (Sontag, 1990: 154). This notion of 'stencilling off the real' creates a second doubling – an opportunity to copy that which is real through

a light-based inventory. Having established through research for our ongoing *Shadow Worlds | Writers' Rooms* project that processed Kinect cloud data gives the appearance of 'seeing round corners', we foresaw opportunities to extend the reach of the technology capturing performances that bridged conscious and unconscious movement – revealing what the naked eye cannot see. Thus the films unfold sculpturally through intimate touch: ourselves converging on the spaces and holding archived objects, and the lasers stroking all in their range. This haptic 'measuring' elicits something new which bisects a literal (measured) and an oneiric (poetic) view of the space.

Acknowledgements

Spencer Roberts, University of Huddersfield
Dr Alistair MacDonald, The Royal Conservatoire of Scotland
Prof Monty Adkins, University of Huddersfield
Carol Seigel, Director, The Freud Museum, London
Sophie Leighton, Curator, The Freud Museum, London
Bryony Davies, Acting Curator, The Freud Museum, London
Jenna Holmes, Curator, The Brontë Parsonage, Haworth
Dr Susannah Thompson, Edinburgh College of Art at the University of Edinburgh
Dr Anna Powell, University of Huddersfield

References

Benjamin, W. 1999. *The Arcades Project*. Trans. H. Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.

Calderbank, M. 2007. 'Freud's Sculpture, Henry Moore Institute, Leeds, 2006. [Exhibition Review]. In. *Papers of Surrealism*. 5, pp.1-11. [Accessed 25 February 2015] Available from:

<http://www.surrealismcentre.ac.uk/papersofsurrealism/journal5/index.htm>

Cohen, L. 1988. 'Take This Waltz' *I'm Your Man*. [CD] Montreal; Los Angeles: Columbia.

De Man, P. 1986. 'The Resistance to Theory' In. *The Resistance to Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Engelman, E. 1998. *Sigmund Freud, Berggasse 19, Vienna*. Vienna: Christian Brandstätter Verlagsgesellschaft.

Foster, H. (2004) 'An Archival Impulse'. *October*. 110 (Fall), pp.3-22.

Freud, S. 1989. 'Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming (1907)' In. Peter Gay (ed.) *The Freud Reader*. London: Norton & Company.

Freud, S. 1992. *The Diary of Sigmund Freud 1929-1939: a Chronicle of Events in the Last Decade*. Trans. Michael Molnar. London: Hogarth Press.

Freud, S. 1976. *The Interpretation of Dreams (1953)* Pelican Books.

Freud, S. 2002. 'The Scientific Literature on Dreams' In. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud - The Interpretation of Dreams*, Trans. James Strachey. Vol. 4. London: Random House, pp.1-95.

Hesiod, 1973. *Theogony*. Trans. Dorothea Wender. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Masschelein, A. 2011. *The Unconcept: the Freudian Uncanny in Late Twentieth-century Theory*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Morra, J. 2013. 'Seemingly Empty: Freud at Bergasse 19, A Conceptual Museum in Vienna'. *Journal of Visual Culture*. 12 (1), pp.89-127.

Sontag, S. 1990. *On Photography*. New York: Anchor Books/Doubleday.

Vidler, A. [1992], *The Architectural Uncanny: Essays in the Modern Unhomely*, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press. (1996)

Warner, M. 2004. *Fantastic Metamorphoses, Other Worlds*. London: Vintage.

Brass Art. 2000 and 2005. *Phantasmagoria* [Video projection and installation, neon signage, dimensions variable, 7 mins, looped, colour, silent; 2005 version with soundtrack by Brass Art and Matt Wand]

Brass Art. 2007. *Out of Thin Air* [video, colour, single screen, with sound, 10 mins, looped]

Brass Art. 2011. *Still Life No.1* [3D objects in acrylic polymer, polypropylene, table and light source in black box environment. Dimensions variable]

Brass Art. 2012. *Trine Messenger* [7m long inflatable: ripstop nylon, plastic, integral fans, timer]

Brass Art. 2013. *The Air Which Held Them*, [three 3m inflatables: ripstop nylon and plastic with integral fans and timers]

Contributor details

Biography:

Brass Art is Chara Lewis, Kristin Mojsiewicz and Anneké Pettican, a collaborative trio based in Manchester, Glasgow and Huddersfield. Working together since 1999, they have exhibited in Berlin, New York, Washington as well as Yorkshire Sculpture Park, Bloomberg Space London, the Tatton Park Biennial and The Whitworth Gallery, Manchester. They have presented their artistic research at numerous conferences including ISEA and Siggraph.

¹ *Phantasmagoria*, 2000 and 2005; *Out of Thin Air*, 2007; *Still Life No.1*, 2011

² *Trine Messenger*, 2012; *The Air Which Held Them*, 2013

³ Seigel, C. in conversation with Brass Art, Freud Museum, <18/06/14>

⁴ Seigel, C. in conversation with Brass Art, Freud Museum, <18/06/14>

⁵ Artwork by Matt Collishaw for *Hysteria* (2009), curated by James Puttnam. "In the context of the study, Collishaw's tree stumps allude to theories of repression, loss and the nature of memory developed by Freud". Freud Museum press release 07/10/09

⁶ The work produced at the Freud Museum can be seen as second iteration of larger project *Shadow Worlds | Writers' Rooms* (2011-), an ambitious, ongoing project in three chapters: Chapter 1 – the Brontë Parsonage, Haworth, Chapter 2 - The Freud Museum, London, Chapter 3 – Monk's House, Rodmell (former home of Virginia Woolf). Brass Art used a Kinect scanner to capture their movements through the interior space of the Brontë Parsonage and Wycoller Hall during a series of nocturnal visits between 2011- 2013. They realized the potential to exploit its 'flaws' to produce their own shadow plays. The shadows are formed when an object obstructs the laser, and the resulting occlusion appears as black shadow but is in fact a lack of data – something the eye cannot perceive. The shadows cast by the artists' figures and 'seen' by the lasers, are entirely unseen by the eye during the process. The video reveals the scene but simultaneously records an unseen shadow realm.

⁷ We remained conscious of 'the landing': a special feature of the hall staircase which was designated as 'the Womens' space'.

⁸ This allowed us to use Processing to seamlessly edit the material (data) captured from each of the three Kinect sensors, positioned around each scene.

⁹ The lyrics of this song are Cohen's translation of Federico Garcia Lorca's poem 'Pequeno Vals Vienés'. It was written for a tribute album compiled to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of Lorca's murder by Franco's fascist soldiers in 1936.

¹⁰ In this instance 'drawing' refers to the treated laser capture. The bespoke software created in Processing apprehends a set of x, y, z points and plots them as marks in space/time. This is why we allude to this as drawing, and the editing as re-drawing.