

ATLAS OF EMOTION: JOURNEYS IN ART, ARCHITECTURE, AND FILM

Giuliana Bruno

Professor of Visual and Environmental Studies at Harvard University

I would like, first of all, to express special thanks to Samuel Boreuil for inviting me here to speak about my new book, *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture, and Film*. Today, in presenting a premise of this work that addresses the topic of this seminar, I will consider the relation between modernity, the city and movement, and map how the “traveling eye” came into place. I will emphasize the role visual culture played in choreographing a “site-seeing,” (misspelled site)—a mobilization that shaped the modern experience of the city. In outlining a genealogical panorama of urban culture, I will set the city in the broader context of a history of moving images.

On the eve of cinema’s invention a new spatiovisuality was produced. Alongside panorama paintings and dioramas, architectural venues such as arcades, railways, department stores, the pavilions of exhibition halls, glass houses, and winter gardens incarnated the new geography of modernity.¹ They were all sites of transit. Mobility—a form of cinematics—was the essence of these new architectures. By changing the relation between spatial perception and motion, the new architectures of transit and travel culture prepared the ground for the invention of the moving image, the very epitome of modernity.

Panoramic art, the architectures of transit and cinema are thus bonded on the map of modernity. They are related there as forms of moving, lived space. They embody a haptic sense of space—a practice of “transport” that conveys a relation between motion and emotion. Let me now clarify the terms of this haptic transport mapped in *Atlas of Emotion*.

Haptic refers to the sense of touch. (**SLIDE**, Breughel, 1616) As Greek etymology tells us, *haptic* means “able to come into contact with.” As a function of the skin, then, the haptic—the sense of touch—constitutes the reciprocal *contact* between us and the environment. It is by way of touch that we apprehend space, turning contact into communicative interface. As a sensory interaction, the haptic is also related to kinesthesia, or the ability of our bodies to sense their own movement in space. In this sense, then, I take the haptic to be the main agent in the mobilization of space – both geographic and architectural – and, by extension, in the articulation of the spatial arts themselves, which include motion pictures. Architecture and cinema, usually confined to optical readings, are thus remapped in the realm of the haptic. Moving from optic to haptic, *Atlas of Emotion* pursues a tangible sense of space, including affective space, and addresses the movement of habitable sites.

The major premise of the book is that motion produces emotion, and that, correlatively, emotion contains a movement.² This reciprocating principle informs my cultural journeys between the urban map, the architectural wall, and the film screen. The Latin root of the word *emotion* speaks clearly about a “moving” force: it stems from *emovere*, an active verb composed of *movere*, “to move,” preceded by the suffix *e*, “out.” The meaning of emotion, then, is historically associated with “a moving out, migration, transference from one place to another.”³ Emotion is, literally, a moving map. (**SLIDE**, situationist map, ‘57)

Extending this etymology, we can create our own theoretical emotion, enhancing the migratory sense of the term: the haptic affect of “transport” that underwrites the formation of cultural travel. It is there, in this very *emotion*, that the moving image was implanted, with its

own psychogeographic version of transport. Cinema was named after the ancient Greek word *kinema*. Interestingly, *kinema* means both motion and emotion. Claiming that film is a means of transport, I use “transport” in the full range of its meaning. “Transport” includes the sort of carrying that is a carrying away by emotion, as in transports of joy, or in *trasporto*, which in Italian encompasses the attraction of human beings to one another. Cinematic motion carries a haptic, affective transport. It implies more than the movement of bodies and objects, as imprinted in the change of film frames and shots, the flow of camera movement, or any other kind of locomotive shift in viewpoint. Motion pictures move, not only through time and space or narrative development but also through inner space. Film moves, and fundamentally “moves” us, with its ability to render affects and, in turn, to affect. It also moves to incorporate, and interface with, other affective spaces. Proceeding from this kinematic premise, the book shows that the emotion of cinema extends beyond the walls of the movie house. It is implanted, from precinema to postcinema, in the urban itinerary, in landscape design, and in the performative space of the museum. Hence, in the spirit of the book’s theoretical crossovers, and in response to the topic of the conference, I will now map this encounter between film and architecture focusing on the role of movement in the making of modern space. Let us then take a few architectural walks through modernity and its cultural memory. (**SLIDE** Vatican Map Room)

Film and Mnemonic Architecture

The work of the urban historian Lewis Mumford can enlighten the interface between film, art, and architecture in modernity, and guide us in theorizing it. It was Mumford who, in 1937, articulated an interaction between cinema, the city and the museum as products of the modern era. He spoke of modernity as a site of cultural memory:

Starting itself as a chance accumulation of relics, with no more rhyme or reason than the city itself, the museum . . . presents itself to use as a means of selectively preserving the memorials of culture. . . . What cannot be kept in existence in material form we may now measure, photograph in still and moving pictures.⁴

The urban historian recognized that cinema has an active place in the “memorials of culture.” In particular, this view of modern memory passes through a joined image of the city and film, and invokes urban motion. (**SLIDE**, Wings of Desire ‘87) It offers us a moving picture. The urban rhythm and the geographic narrative of cinema are joined in cumulative assemblage. Mumford identifies cinema as a moving imprint and an active mnemonic “measure”: that is, as a mapping of an archive of images. Rhyme and rhythm accrue to the collection of relics mobilized in urban forms of exhibition. On Mumford’s moving map the celluloid archive can thus join the city and the museum.

Film Genealogy and the Emergence of Site-Seeing (**SLIDE**, magic lantern 1646)

Indeed, cinema emerged from a mobile “architecture” of vision: the interactive geovisual culture of modernity. The museographic spectacles and practices of curiosity of early modernity gave rise to the very architecture of interior design that became the cinema.⁵ This composite genealogy was characterized by diverse georhythms of site-seeing. It was a spectacular theatrics of image collection that activated recollection. The spaces for viewing that became filmic architecture included (**SLIDE**>) cosmorama rooms, cabinets of curiosity, wax and anatomical museums (**SLIDE**> Bologna), performative tableaux vivants, (**SLIDE** Great Globe 1851>) georamic exhibition, (**SLIDE** Panorama of Rome 1804>) panoramic and dioramic stages, maps and surveys (<**SLIDE**, D’Annunzio’s Vienna 1918) fluid and

automated spectacular motions, vitrine and window display, (**SLIDE**, blv. Wallpaper '885>) view painting, and (**SLIDE** apparatus wallpaper>) other techniques of urban viewing.

Film exhibition developed in and around these intimate sites of public viewing, within the history of a mobilized architectonics of scenic space in an aesthetics of fractured, sequential, and shifting views. Fragments were crystallized, serialized, and automated in the cabinet of curiosity, the precursor of the museum; objects that were cultural souvenirs offered themselves to spectatorial musing; views developed into *vedutismo*, an actual art of viewing, becoming a gallery of *vedute*. This absorption in viewing space then became the georamic architecture of the interior that represented a form of art "installation" *avant la lettre*. Panorama paintings literally turned into "light installations." Cinema descends from this travel of the room—a waxed, fluid geography of exhibition that came of age in the nineteenth century and molded the following one.

What turned into cinema was an imaginative trajectory that required physical habitation and liminal traversal of the sites of display. The establishment of a public in this historical itinerary in which art became housed in a salon made art exhibition cross over into film exhibition.⁶ Cinema, an intimate geography born with the emergence of such a public, is architecturally attached to this notion. The movie house signals the mobilization of public space with its architectonics of display and architectural promenade, experientially implanted in the binding of imaging to spectatorial life.

Site-seeing: Filmic and Urban Promenades

To further explain the journey of the imagination that links cinematic to urban space, it is helpful to revisit Eisenstein's essay on "Montage and Architecture."⁷ Here, Eisenstein envisioned a genealogical relation between the architectural ensemble and film. He designed a moving spectator for both, while taking the reader, quite literally, for a walk (**SLIDE**, Tschumi):

The word *path* is not used by chance. Nowadays it is the imaginary path followed by the eye and . . . the mind across a multiplicity of phenomena, far apart in time and space, gathered in a certain sequence . . . ; and these diverse impressions pass in front of an immobile spectator.

In the past, however, the opposite was the case: the spectator moved between [a series of] carefully disposed phenomena that he observed sequentially with his visual sense.⁸

The film spectator moves across an imaginary path, traversing multiple sites and times. Her fictional navigation connects distant moments and far-apart places. Film inherits the possibility of such a spectatorial voyage from the architectural field:

An architectural ensemble . . . is a montage from the point of view of a moving spectator. . . . Cinematographic montage is, too, a means to 'link' in one point—the screen—various fragments of a phenomenon filmed in diverse dimensions, from diverse points of view and sides.⁹

The filmic path is the modern version of the architectural itinerary, with its own montage of cultural space. Film follows a historical course—that is, a museographic way to collect together various fragments of cultural phenomena from diverse geo-historical moments that are open for spectatorial recollection in space. In this sense, film descends not only historically but also formally from a specific architectural promenade: the geovisual exploration of the architectures of display. The consumer of this architectural viewing space is the prototype of the film spectator.

The Architectural Paths of the Art of Memory

Eisenstein's "imaginistic" vision of the filmic-architectural promenade follows a mnemonic path. It bears the mark of the art of memory and, in particular, its way of linking collection and recollection in a spatial fashion. Let us recall that the art of memory was itself a matter of mapping space and was traditionally an architectural affair. In the first century A.D., Quintilian formulated his landmark understanding of the way memory works architecturally.¹⁰ To create a memory, one would imagine a building, and, peripatetically, populate each room and part of the space with an image; then, to recall the memory, one would mentally retrace the building, moving around and through the space, revisiting in turn all the rooms that had been "decorated" with imaging. Mobilized in this way, memories are motion pictures. As Quintilian has it, memory stems from a narrative, mobile, architectural experience of site.¹¹

The art of memory is an architecture of inner writing in which places are constantly reconfigured.^{12 13} The art of memory bears the peculiar celluloid texture of a filmic "set"—a site of constant redrawing, a place where many stories "take place" and take the place of memory. Before motion pictures spatialized and mobilized discourse—substituting for memory, in the end—the art of memory made room for a montage of images. By means of an architectural promenade, it enabled this process of image collection to generate recollection.

To pass through the doors of the memory archive, memories must be affectively charged. (**SLIDE**, emotion lantern 1750-80) Emotionally striking images are able to "move" us as they chart the movement of the living world. As its own "art of memory," film itself draws these moving memory maps. In its memory theater, the spectator-passenger, sent on an architectural journey, endlessly retraces the itineraries of a geographical discourse that, reading memories as places, "sets" memory in place and in motion. As this architectural art of memory, filmic site-seeing, like the museum's own version, embodies a particularly mobile art of mapping: an emotional mapping.

Tender Geography

The notion that memory, imagination, and affect are linked to movement was advanced in yet more geographic ways in seventeenth-century emotional cartography. (**SLIDE**) In 1654 Madeleine de Scudéry designed the *Carte du Pays de Tendre*, a map of the land of tenderness.¹⁴ The *Carte de Tendre* was a geo-psychic architecture. This map visualized, in the form of a landscape, an itinerary of emotions.

The haptic map was "designed" as a place that evoked emotion in the shape of motion as one traveled through it. Scudéry's map designed a landscape of emotions to be experienced as a series of sensational movements. In a "moving" way, it made "sense" of the place of affects, as it traced their movement in space. The emotional map produced an *emotion*, and the motion inscribed therein was not only kinetic or kinesthetic. As in garden design, there was a liminal passage. It made it possible for the exterior world of the landscape to be transformed into an interior landscape, and vice versa. Emotion materialized as a moving topography.

To traverse this land is to visit the ebb and flow of a personal and yet social psychogeography. The borderless map creates this itinerary for anyone who navigates its tender landscape. There are no rigid directives for this map tour, based on an interplay between natural and architectural setting. Functioning as places for the inhabitation of the *emotion*, villages and even cities are designed on the map to *house* sentiments. They function as resting places along the map tour, places of lodging for the emotional movement. Several such movements are possible and encouraged in a touring that produces a cumulative

emotional effect. The spectator/passenger is at times even led astray in this garden of *emotions*.

Haptic Routes

As it emerges out of these haptic routes, cinema has its spatial roots in the new “fashions” of spatiality that marked the rise of early modernity, and, in turn, shaped the very development of modern movement. (**SLIDE**: The urban screen of *Things to Come*) Following the movement of “*Things to Come*” that was taking place in cultural traveling, we traverse a terrain that extended from affective mapping to topographical view painting to landscape design and, eventually, panoramic vision and filmic site-seeing. As it was located and dislocated, vision was transformed along the route of urban mapping. (**SLIDE** Richter’s Atlas, city-screen) The new pleasure afforded by site-seeing was not the effect of an incorporeal eye, for it was a “matter” of space. The eye/I that was designing—“fashioning”—the new visions was a traveling one. As space was absorbed and consumed in movement by a spectator, a new architectonics was set in motion: sites were set in moving perspectives, expanding both outward and inward. The new sensibility engaged the physicality and imagination of the observer who craved this mobilized space.

During the eighteenth century, the production of travel discourse began to grow and took on a variety of forms, from literary to visual and spatial configurations. Journey literature, view paintings, and garden views combined a sensualist theory of the imagination with the touch of physicality. A haptic consciousness was being produced. The broadening of visuality inaugurated at this time essentially joined space with desire: it effectively “located” affects in space and articulated desire as a spatial practice. There was an increased yearning for capturing sites in the form of “-scapes.” Scanning cityscapes, moving through and with landscapes, this opening of spatial horizons fashioned an expanded interior landscape. This “collective attraction for views” was the force that shaped the cultural movement which proleptically led to the cinema.¹⁵ The new mechanisms for spatiovisual (e)motion, that is, expressed the desire for the moving image.

Cinematic motion descends from the fascination for views and the physical hunger for space that led the subject from vista to vista in an extended search for urban and environmental pleasure to open mental maps. Spatial curiosity and the practice of site-seeing, consolidated in eighteenth-century culture, designed a route that ranged across topographical views and maps to the architectonics of gardens and led to the opening of travel to more people, the circulation of travel narratives, and the rise of a leisure industry. This included the grand tour, with its voyage to Italy, as well as the amusement of peering into cabinets of curiosities and browsing through the composition of natural settings or their depictions. Moving along the path of modernity from view painting to garden views, from travel sketches to itinerant viewing boxes, from grand tours to panoramas and other geographical “-oramas” to forms of interior/exterior mapping, from the mobile views of train travel to urban streetwalking, the subject was “incorporated” into motion pictures. It is this moving, haptic space that created the (e)motion picture and its spectator—a social body of “passengers.”

The Art of Viewing the City: Vedutismo

To understand the origins of the moving image’s emotion—its inner “transport”—we must therefore take a step back, and further explore the aftermath of early modernity, especially the flourishing of topographical representation of cities and of urban view painting. The effect of these forms was to carry away—transport—the spectator into the landscape or cityscape depicted, powerfully creating atmosphere, mood and the feeling of

imaginative travel. The art of viewing sites assumed different forms, from the display of architectural sites as emotional matters, in the tradition of the Neapolitan artist Salvator Rosa (1616–73), to a more descriptive mode that circulated widely as paintings, prints, illustrations published in travel accounts and also as atlases and topographical mappings.

Foregrounded by a growing interest in architectural forms, paintings of city views were recognized as an autonomous aesthetic category in the late seventeenth century. The Italian art of imaging the city, called vedutismo¹⁶ evolved from a veritable pandemic of urban imaging and furor geographicus that took place from the fifteenth century onward, establishing a hunger —a “taste” —for viewing sites. Inseparable from the history of travel culture, the veduta embodied a touch of space, and a taste for motion.

As an art of viewing, the Italian veduta used different codes in its description of the city than the Dutch city view.¹⁷ In the veduta, the portrait of the city was staged. Masters of this type of representation included Canaletto (1697–1768) and Giovanni Paolo Panini (c. 1691–1765) (**SLIDE**, Panini, View of Rome, 1755). Working closely with topographical representation, this genre of view painting emphasized the drama of location; the portrait of the city in Italian vedutismo, that is, tended toward a narrative dramatization of sites, characterized by a heightened sense and a tactile texture of place.

As they merged the codes of urban topography and landscape painting, city views also incorporated the cartographic drive, creating imaginative representational maps. The city was approached from different viewpoints. These ranged from profile and prospective views to plans, map views, and bird’s-eye views, which were often even combined. Factual accuracy was not the aim of these urban views, which exhibited an interest in rendering a mental “image of the city” and proposed not one “cognitive mapping” but diverse observational routes.¹⁸ Imaging a city involves a cluster of diverse maps that are inhabited and carried around by city dwellers within themselves. View painting inscribed this moving, inhabited, inner space within its mapping of the city.¹⁹

City views were part of the everyday narrative of urban life.²⁰ From the sixteenth century on, city views and maps were produced as objects of display suitable for wall decoration and thus became a feature of interior urban life.²¹ (**SLIDE** Palazzo Vecchio, Florence) Urban views even migrated from forms of architectural decor and decoration all the way to the decorative arts. From the mid-eighteenth century on, they literally entered the public taste. They shaped table manners in the form of embellishment on plates, bowls, glasses, cups, and trays and illustrated the tops of dining room tables or were inscribed on their surfaces. They “illuminated” pieces of furniture such as writing desks and decorated ladies’ jewelry boxes and fans. (**SLIDE** fan) City views traveled from the outside to the inside, mapping out the space of the urban interior.

The art of viewing followed the older touristic drive to survey and embrace a terrain: the compulsion to map a territory and position oneself within it that led to the climbing of church towers, mountains, and buildings to take in the panorama. From the beginning, the city view adopted this practice and transcended its real-life limits, as shown, for instance, in the exemplary Bird’s-eye View of Venice attributed to Jacopo de’ Barbari, produced back in 1500. (**SLIDE**) The all-embracing view was not a totalizing vision in this multi-sheet mapping of the city, which was designed for wall decoration and served touristic aims. This was an impressively imaginative enterprise of topographic rendering, for the overall view was assembled from a number of disparate drawings made from different high points throughout the city.²² There is no clear focal point in this imaginary view, which is rather constructed as a *montage* of different vanishing points. The observer is not positioned at a set distance but appears free to wander in and around the space. This imagined dislocated view,

made possible much later by the spatiovisual techniques of cinema, attempted to free vision from a singular, fixed viewpoint, imaginatively mobilizing narrative visual space.

In view painting, the city was part of a sequence of mental maps, an integral part of cultural travel. A geographical rendering of the imagination, the bird's-eye view was an imaginary map for both those who knew and those who had never seen a city; both spectators encountered the site in mobilized form. The wide vistas of prospect and profile views also functioned in a way that pushed perspectival boundaries. These vistas strove to overcome the limitations of perspective by creating a wider horizontal expanse, often made of aggregate views, that eroded the notion of a single, prioritized perspective.

Thus the image of the Western city expanded, “unlimiting the bounds of painting.”²³ Such expansion—rupturing the containability of borders and frames—made it impossible for the ideal city of Renaissance perspective to remain representationally intact, to be captured in a single image. Beginning in the eighteenth century, urban *vedute* were produced in several parts, even as different viewpoints. (SLIDE NYC from Picturesque America) The image of the city underwent an intense process of fragmentation and multiplication before being refigured in the all-embracing views of the panorama, which extended the very borders of the frame. “The urban organism shatters in multiple views.”²⁴ The body of the city is cut into partial, serialized views and a fractured montage is set in motion in this imaginary urban mapping.

Such montages of views, combined with the panoramic impulse, spoke of things to come: motion pictures. By presenting multiple, mobile perspectives and suggesting a mobilized observer, these urban views exhibited a protocinematic attempt to expand the field of vision itself. It was this cartographic mobilization of perspective, inscribed in the movement of urban imaging, that led to 19th century panoramic culture, with its metropolitan transit, arcade life and railway travel, eventually becoming the very “transport” of motion pictures.

Mobile Mappings: Views in Flux (SLIDE View from Steeple, Boston, 1874)

In early modernity, the techniques of observing architectural views articulated a relationship between space, movement, and narrative, thus mobilizing spatial storytelling. The flow of history entered representation. By representing the life of the site, view painting captured its affective atmosphere. Depicting space as inhabited by events and moving with the dynamics of the city, the rectangular space of the view was extended into film; before the film strip, architectural pictures began to tell stories in long formats. This enlarged perspective extended into the full view of nineteenth-century panoramas, where the subjects of history and narrative realism featured large. In the evolution of perspectival practice, an aspect of tactile experience—space that is lived—became charted in observational, prefilmic “moving” practices.

The multiple perspectives that rendered haptic space and made landscape inhabited turned urban sites into filmic “-scapes.”²⁵ The techniques of observation themselves mobilized.²⁶ Drawing distant objects closer and pushing back close ones, the views filmically rendered space, as if separating it into parts to be read as a whole. Picturing space as an assemblage of partial views—a montage of spatial fragments linked panoramically by a mobile observer—cartographic art pictured (pre)filmic space. It pictured “sensational” transitions from kinetic to kinesthetic to kinematic. The emotion of movement was made palpable.

As the views captured movement, they attempted to make it material and to graft it physically onto the picture surface. (SLIDE Giovanni Carafa, Topographical Map of Naples,

1775, folio 8 11.6) + (**SLIDE** Giovanni Carafa, folio 9, no. 11.7) Such kinetic embodiment was also exhibited in the mobile cartographic activity that charted the sky and the movements of the waters, viewed in relation to currents and winds. These were forms of mapping that inscribed in their design an “atmospheric” transport, charting the unmappable before visual technology could. The cityscape was expanding as the practice of the urban pavement extended to aerial flotation in a new perspective of shifting atmospheric spaces. Haptic wanderings were transferred from the feet to “the wings of desire,” well before motion pictures fully enabled their moving montage, created their own “transport,” and even celebrated their “Voyage to Italy,” (**SLIDE** no. 11.12), here pictured in the moving vedute from the windshield of Roberto Rossellini’s atmospheric city film.

In the voyage of modernity, a terrain of urban transformations led into filmic site-seeing. In prefilmic times, urban space became documented at the meeting point of city and territory as aerial mapping, nautical cartography and fluvial topography merged with urban mapping. (**SLIDE** Robert Havell Costa Scena, 1823) The resulting representations sought to capture motion with a moving image, and this search for the status of movement followed a course. Creating a beautiful mobile architectonics at the interstice of land and water, this type of cartography, drawn from direct travel experience, strove to materialize motion, making it not only visible but tangible. It was precisely this passage that the filmic flow of images would haptically materialize, establishing its own cartographic course. Portable maps drawn on skin, the portolan nautical charts were consulted as they unraveled, prefiguring the materiality of the film strip and its own cartographic movement on the cinematic reel.

Fluvial prospect or profile views extended picture borders into a fluid prefilmic narrative format. The representations of nautical cartography and, by extension, fluvial topography reproduced the movement of vessels. After all, as Gertrude Stein put it, “geography includes inhabitants and vessels.”²⁷ Viewing an urban space by moving in and out of its bordering sea, or through its fluvial architexture, one experiences the sensation of cinematic emotion. As one moves with the flow of the current, the view develops into a flow of images.²⁸ When the point of observation shifts into a sequence of viewpoints that create a geographical route, this is a filmic route. A route where motion is emotion.

Moving through Inner Landscapes

As the traveling eye came into place, motion became clearly bound to emotion. Such emotion was consolidated within a grand epistemic resurgence of the sense of touch starting in the second half of the eighteenth century. Motion was craved as a form of stimulation, and haptic sensations were at the basis of this geographical impulse to expand one’s inner universe. Urban viewing joined garden theory in the articulation of this interior landscape. The garden was a privileged locus in the pursuit of erotic, haptic, emotive space. (**SLIDE**) Diversely shaped by associative philosophies, eighteenth-century landscape design embodied the very idea that motion rules mental activity and generates a “fancying.” The images gathered by the senses were thought to produce “trains” of thought.²⁹ This philosophy of space embodied a form of fluid, emotive geography. Sensuously associative in connecting the local and topographic to the personal, it enhanced the passionate voyage of the imagination. “Fancying”—that is, the configuration of a series of relationships created on imaginative tracks—was the effect of a spectatorial movement that evolved further in cinema and the museum. It was the emergence of such sensuous, serial imaging (an affective “transport”) that made it possible for the serial image in film and the sequencing of vitrines to come together in receptive motion, and for trains of ideas to inhabit the tracking shots of emotion pictures.

The legacy of the picturesque, in particular, was “to enable the imagination to form the habit of feeling through the eye.”³⁰ Sensational movements through the space of the garden “animated” pictures, foregrounding the type of haptic sensing enacted by film’s own animated emotion pictures. Not unlike cinematic space and the display of collections, picturesque space was furthermore an aesthetics of fragments and discontinuities—a mobilized montage of multiple, asymmetrical views. These fragments turned into a passion for ruins and debris. Relics punctuated the picturesque map, preparing the ground for more modern experiences of recollection.

A memory theater of sensual pleasures, the garden was an exterior that put the spectator in “touch” with inner space. As one moved through the space of the garden, a constant double movement connected external to internal topographies. The garden was thus an outside turned into an inside; but it was also the projection of an inner world onto the outer geography. In a sensuous mobilization, the exterior of the landscape was transformed into an interior map—the landscape within us—as this inner map was itself culturally mobilized. (SLIDE, Eberson ‘29) In this “moving” way, we came to approach the kind of transport that drives the architectonics of film spectatorship and of museum-going. No wonder moody, mnemonic architecture became the mark of the movie palace. The atmosphere of the “atmospheric” movie theater created a sensory affective remake. Here, one could walk, once again, in the imaginary garden of memory.

The Architectural Journey and The Garden of Memory

The picturesque promenade extended into modern itineraries of re-collection.³¹ “Picturesque” views were adopted and transformed into peripatetic vision by Le Corbusier and Eisenstein, who conceived of a filmic-architectural promenade in modern picturesque terms. Claiming that “architecture and film are the only two arts of our time,” the architect affirmed: “in my own work I seem to think as Eisenstein does in his films.”³² Indeed, Corbusier and Eisenstein fashioned their thoughts similarly. (SLIDE) Their itineraries follow the same mnemonic path, which engages the labor of imagination.³³ From a moving perspective, in the architectural journey, one performs an imaginative traversal. (SLIDE Libeskind) As Le Corbusier put it, revealing his cinematic vision of architecture³⁴: “The architectural spectacle offers itself consecutively to view;. . . you play with the flood of light.”³⁵ . . . A true architectural promenade [offers] constantly changing views, unexpected, at times surprising.”³⁶ An architectural ensemble is “read” as it is traversed by light. This is also the case for the cinematic spectacle, for film—the screen of light—is read as it is traversed and is readable inasmuch as it is traversable. (SLIDE Turrell shape of the screen) As we go through it, it goes through us and our own inner geography. A practice that engages psychic change in relation to movement was thus *architected*, in between the wall and the screen.

Atlas and Topophilia: A Voyage of the Room

The desire to make a private “album” of moving views for public consumption created *kinema*, an intimate traveling room. Cinema—a nomadic archive of images—become a home of “moving” exploration. A haptic architecture. A topophilic affair. A place for the love of place. A love of place that holds the residual texture of time.³⁷ (SLIDE Polidori, peeling layers) As we come to the close of our topophilic exploration of modernity’s moving geography, we might stress that this landscape is a work of the mind.³⁸ A cultural landscape is in many ways a trace of the memories, the attention, the imagination, and affects of those inhabitant-passengers who have traversed it at different times. It is an intertextual terrain of

passage that carries its own representation in the threads of its fabric, weaving it on intersecting screens. "(SLIDE Cardiff Movie Theatre) A palpable imprint is left in this moving landscape; in its folds, gaps, and layers, the geography of cinema, heir of modernity, holds remnants of what has been projected onto it at every transit, including the emotions.

Space—including cinematic space—emoves because, charged with layers of toponilic emotions, it is invested with the ability to nourish the self. This psychic process involves making claims and demands on the site. (SLIDE, Callan, Seurat's Wood 2000) In the history of mobilized space we have described, a traveler seeking a particular landscape may go there, imaginatively, even filmically, to be moved, replenished, restored, held, and fed.³⁹ In the hub of filmic traveling and dwelling, we are absorbed in the stream of emotions and experience an embracing affective transport. The city is itself such a psychogeographic landscape. And it is akin to the museum, for, as we argued earlier in discussing Mumford, the city and the museum share the ability to function as chance accumulation of relics. Indeed, the cinema, the city, and the museum are linked in this collective itinerary of recollection. They are toponilic places that can hold us in their geopsychic design and navigate our story. (SLIDE Turrell layers) In this interface between the architectural wall and the film screen, memory places and affects are searched and inhabited throughout time in interconnected visual geographies, thus rendering, through cumulation and scanning, our fragile place in history. This modern architecture breathes in the passage and the conflated layers of materially lived space in motion. This architexture is an absorbing screen. (SLIDE, Sugimoto '98). It is screen of moving pictures. An atmosphere of moods. An atlas of emotion. A *kinema*, indeed.

¹ See Anne Friedberg, Window-Shopping: Cinema and the Postmodern, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993.

² Giuliana Bruno, *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture, and Film* (New York: Verso, forthcoming, 2001).

³ *Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), V: 183.

⁴ Lewis Mumford, "The Death of the Monument," in J. L. Martin, Ben Nicholson, and N. Gabo, eds., *Circle: International Survey of Constructivist Art*, New York: E. Weyhe, 1937, p. 267.

⁵ The museographic archeology of cinema and cinematic "transport" are treated further in my *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture, and Film*, New York: Verso, 2001.

⁶ On this exhibitionary culture, see Patricia Mainardi, *The End of the Salon: Art and The State in The Early Third Republic*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

⁷ Sergei M. Eisenstein, "Montage and Architecture" (c. 1937), *Assemblage*, no. 10, 1989, with an introduction by Yve-Alain Bois, pp. 111–31.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

⁹ Eisenstein, "'El Greco y el cine,'" (1937–41), in *Cinématisme: Peinture et cinéma*, ed. François Albera, trans. Anne Zouboff, Brussels: Editions complexe, 1980, pp. 16–17.

¹⁰ Marcus Tullius Cicero's version of the art of memory is outlined in his *De Oratore*, trans. E. W. Sutton and Harris Rackman, London: Loeb Classical Library, 1942. Marcus Fabius Quintilian's rendition of the subject is laid out in his *Institutio oratoria*, vol. 4, trans. H. E. Butler, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1922.

¹¹ Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, vol. 4, pp. 221–23.

¹² See Yates, *The Art of Memory*; and Yates, "Architecture and the Art of Memory," *Architectural Design*, vol. 38, no. 12 (December 1968), pp. 573–78.

¹³ For an extension of this reading of the wax texture of memory see Plato, *Theaetetus*, trans. Harold N. Fowler, London: Loeb Classical Library, 1921; and Sigmund Freud, "A Note on the Mystic Writing Pad," in *Complete Psychological Works*, vol. 9, London: Standard Edition, 1956.

¹⁴ *Carte du Pays de Tendre* [the map of tenderness] was published in Madeleine de Scudéry, *Clélie* (Paris: Augustin Courbé, vol. 1, 1654), engraving by François Chauveau. For general information on this map, see Claude Filteau, "Le Pays de Tendre: l'enjeu d'une carte," *Littérature*, no. 36 (1979), 37–60.

¹⁵ The quoted phrase is Corbin's, *ibid.*, p. 138.

¹⁶ On this subject, see, among others, Cesare de Seta, ed., Città d'Europa: Iconografia e vedutismo dal XV al XIX secolo, Naples: Electa, 1996; de Seta, "Topografia urbana e vedutismo nel Seicento: a proposito di alcuni disegni di Alessandro Baratta," Prospettiva, no. 2, July 1980, pp. 46–60; de Seta, "Bernardo Bellotto vedutista e storiografo della civiltà urbana europea," Quaderni dell'Istituto di Storia dell'Architettura, nos. 15–20, 1990–92, pp. 813–18; de Seta, L'Italia del Grand Tour da Montaigne a Goethe, Naples: Electa, 1992; Giuliano Briganti, The View Painters of Europe, trans. Pamela Waley, London: Phaidon, 1970; and The Origins of the Italian Veduta, Providence, R.I.: Brown University, 1978 (exhibition catalogue). A bibliography on view painting was compiled by Elisabeth Chevallier and published in the proceedings of the conference "Archéologie du paysage," Caesardunum, vol. 1, no. 13, 1978, pp. 579–613.

¹⁷ On Dutch methods of description and mapping, see Svetlana Alpers, The Art of Describing: Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

¹⁸ On the notion of the mental image of the city, see Kevin Lynch, The Image of the City, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1960. On cognitive mapping as developed from Lynch, see Fredric Jameson, "Cognitive Mapping," in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, eds., Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988; and Jameson, Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism, Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1991, especially pp. 51–52.

¹⁹ The letter is cited in Juergen Schulz, "Jacopo de' Barbari's View of Venice: Map Making, City Views, and Moralized Geography Before the Year 1500," The Art Bulletin, vol. 60, no. 3, September 1978, p. 458.

²⁰ The East Prospect of London Southwark and Bridge and The West Prospect of London Southwark and Bridge (c. 1734) are so described in John Bowles's 1731 and 1736 catalogues of London Printed and Sold. Cited in Ralph Hyde, Gilded Scenes and

Shining Prospects: Panoramic Views of British Towns, 1575–1900, New Haven: Yale Center for British Art, 1985 (exhibition catalogue), p. 88.

²¹ See Christian Jacob, L’empire des cartes: approches théorique de la cartographie à travers l’histoire, Paris: Editions Albin Michel, 1992, especially chapter 1; and Joy Kenseth, ed., The Age of the Marvelous, Hanover, N.H.: Hood Museum of Art, Dartmouth College, 1991 (exhibition catalogue).

²² See Schulz, “Jacopo de’ Barbari’s View of Venice.”

²³ On prospect views as precursors of panoramic vision, see Ralph Hyde, Panoromania!: The Art and Entertainment of the ‘All-Embracing View’, London: Trefoil, in association with the Barbican Art Gallery, 1988. The expression cited is the title of the book’s introduction.

²⁴ Cesare de Seta, “L’iconografia urbana in Europa dal XV al XVIII secolo,” in de Seta, ed., Citta d’Europa, p. 46.

²⁵ On the architectonic imaginary of painting, beyond vedutismo and cartographic art, see Giuliana Massobrio and Paolo Portoghesi, L’immaginario architettonico nella pittura, Bari: Laterza, 1988.

²⁶ Art historian Anne Hollander significantly refers to painterly scenic designs as “moving pictures.” See Anne Hollander, Moving Pictures, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991, especially chapter 8.

²⁷
²⁸ Renzo Dubbini, “Views and Panoramas: Representations of Landscapes and Towns,” Lotus International, no. 52, 1987, p. 105. See also Dubbini, Geografie dello sguardo: visione e paesaggio in età moderna, Turin: Einaudi, 1994, especially chapters 2 and 6.

²⁹ See Barbara Maria Stafford, Voyage into Substance, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1984, p. 4. See also Hohn Dixon Hunt, Gardens and the Picturesque, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.

³⁰ Christopher Hussey, The Picturesque: Studies in a Point of View, London and New York, 1927, p. 4.

³¹ On Choisy and Le Corbusier see Richard A. Etlin, “Le Corbusier, Choisy, and French Hellenism: The Search for a New Architecture,” Art Bulletin, no. 2 (June 1987), pp. 264–78. On Eisenstein and architectural history, see Yve-Alain Bois’s introduction to Eisenstein’s “Montage and Architecture”; and Anthony Vidler, “The Explosion of Space: Architecture and the Filmic Imaginary,” in Richard Neumann, ed., Film Architecture: Set Designs from Metropolis to Blade Runner, New York: Prestel, 1996.

³² This interview, the only one that Le Corbusier gave during his stay in Moscow in 1928, is cited in Jean-Louis Cohen, Le Corbusier and the Mystique of the USSR, trans. Kenneth Hylton, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992, p. 49.

³³ Eisenstein, “Montage and Architecture,” p. 120.

³⁴ See Beatriz Colomina, Privacy and Publicity: Modern Architecture as Mass Media, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1994.

³⁵ Le Corbusier and Pierre Jeanneret, Oeuvre complète, vol. 1, ed. Willi Boesiger, Zurich: Editions Girsberger, 1964, p. 60.

³⁶ Le Corbusier, Oeuvre complète, vol. 2, p. 24.

³⁷ For an introduction to this term, see Yi-Fu Tuan, Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values, New York: Columbia University Press, 1990. Although I have found inspiration in this work, I have developed the notion of topophilia along a different path.

³⁸ See Simon Schama, Landscape and Memory, New York: Vintage Books, 1995.

³⁹ For example, in the history of landscape, the sea and the seashore have functioned as lures. See Alain Corbin, The Lure of the Sea: The Discovery of the Seaside 1750–1840, trans. Jocelyn Phelps, London: Penguin Books, 1994.