



"Figure 1.8 Yongseok Oh, *Classic No. 1915* (detail), single handed video looped, separate furniture set (table, poster frame, shoes, books, postcards). Source: Courtesy of the artist." (Schneider 2021, p.14 [my scan]).

When an image *crosses over* from an image-frame to move *alongside* it, and claim an adjacent *vantage point* to the first (while also changing in such a way that a *change* occurs, an *effect* of the shift) there occurs simultaneously a *re-effecting* of the image contents in the first frame. An example of this is the work *Classic No. 15 [recto]* by Yongsok Oh. Itself an example of highjacking.

That is, *détournement*. But no longer in a broad sense: a *precisation* of *détournement* is within reach—[precisation](#) in the sense of a *clarification on how the problem is set*. In the cover image *[recto]* the movement from the *first* to the *second frame*, is marked by the change of the scenery. In the second frame only the shoes are left, and materials on the table: the poster is gone.

The second frame re-effects the first, because it is now not just a *video-loop*, but a part of a *sculptural* installation. So, moving the image to the second frame—the changes *marking* the transportation—changes the perception of what we see in the first frame: the *ontology* changes, and the gap between them is *temporal*. What we are seeing are at *different* times. Is it past/future?

An explanation for why they materialise differently—the one video, the other present objects—is *time*: the viewer is thereby offered the alternatives of understanding the contents of the second frame as *second* in time; or, alternatively, the second frame *preempts* the contents of the video (in which case it comes before). The work shows and demonstrates the workings of a *mirror*.

Not a mirror in narrow sense—as displayed as a *third* within the first frame—but based on an understanding of what a mirror *does*: which is to re-effect the relationship between two developments. In this case, two *narrative* developments. But which also could be two technological sequences: as *sequence* and *con-sequence* they head to the *same* place, but follow *different* paths.

A case in point of a mirror is therefore *metalepsis*. A trope based on the notion and perception that the two frames are *causally* connected. *Classic No. 15* relies—in this sense—on *metalepsis*. In this aspect of how the problem is set, it doesn't matter whether the two frames are causally *entangled* (as they *could* be) or we *think* they are. We are meant to read the work this way.

The fact that we *cannot* decide which one it is, determines the *material*: this undecidability is therefore part of the materiality of the work. And for this reason they are *out of the orbit* of montage: the unity of *time*, *place* and *action* cannot be established. The possibility of agency is resident of the *gap*, while the unity of time and place are disrupted. It is intended: action is *imminent*.

In sum, there is a play between 3 frames: however, at the difference between the triangle discussed in [leaflet 4/7](#), we are nothing to support/disclaim the reality of what we see. Rather, we are seduced by something that might be an optical illusion: a mirror-trick, of sorts. The *optical illusion*, of course, already exists in the first frame. An ontological shift, however, prompts *fiction*.

Contrary to the illusion, fiction is marked by the real. Which is why the Yongsok Oh's work taunts the *viewer* with a narrative. The viewer cannot decide whether/not s/he is part of this narrative, or somehow implicated by it. Virtually it is something that could happen. This is where we are here. Actually it is something that *occasionally* will happen. Cf, the next/final [leaflet 7/7](#).