

Ontology of the Virtual

How much is the notion of “film” – whose “material being” as a celluloid tape fades away – in its increasingly metaphorical presence decisive for understanding art, now marked by multiple signifiers of “virtual reality”? In the first move to answer such a question, one cannot help but agree with the following:

It is difficult to speak about only one cinematographic aesthetic experience, because digital demands, or allows, different kinds of perceptual experiences. Nor is it about annihilating our previous experiences, since hybrid qualities give way to flexibility and assimilation. Therefore, the mere expression ‘let’s go to see a movie’ implies a ritual or habit: to visit a movie theatre and see the current film. This action remains inside us as an idea (Gómez, 2015: 251).

Transcending cinema, therefore, at first glance runs rather smoothly. It is taking place almost exactly in a manner of the Hegelian *Aufhebung*. The reason for such an appearance should be sought in the fact that we still have to deal with the frame – no matter in what kind of apparatus, which could be a cinema screen or a range of screens of diverse digital devices. “Theorists of new media have made much of the notion of cinema as the dominant language of culture and of the computer desktop as a cinematic space: ‘screen culture’ is posited as the hegemonic cultural interface” (Nakamura, 2008: 63). To what extent is virtual reality undermined by the