REVISTA ECO-PÓS

ISSN 2175-8689

Política de Acesso Livre
Esta revista oferece acesso livre imediato ao seu conteúdo, seguindo o princípio de

que disponibilizar gratuitamente o conhecimento científico ao público proporciona maior

democratização do conhecimento.

Motion and Emotion: Film and Haptic Space

Giuliana Bruno[1]

Harvard University

RESUMO

No espírito dos últimos livros da professora Bruno, *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture, and Film* (Verso, 2002) e *Public Intimacy: Architecture and Visual Arts* (MIT Press, 2007), este artigo percorre a história de paisagem de mobilidade cultural do filme com incursões no campo da arquitetura, *design,* geografia cultural e artes. Ao traçar a origem da imagem em movimento num espaço mobilizado próprio da modernidade, este artigo retoma a força do háptico. Giuliana Bruno mostra que a arte se funde às imagens móveis, a arquitetura mobiliza visões cinematográficas e o cinema se torna uma linguagem comum na transposição das fronteiras, um novo espaço móvel – uma tela da memória cultural vital – que modela a nossa cultura visual.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Cinema ● Espaço ● Intersecção entre Arquitetura, artes e cinema ● Fronteiras ● Espaço Háptico

> Spatial design today means a weaving together of spatial elements, which are mostly achieved in invisible but clearly discernible relationships of multidimensional movement and in fluctuating energy relationships.

---

1 Giuliana Bruno é professora de Estudos Visuais e Ambientais na Harvard University. Seu campo de especialidade é pesquisa sobre as intersecções entre arquitetura, artes visuais e cinema. Bruno publicou diversos livros e artigos internacionais, incluindo seu último livro *"Public Intimacy: Architecture and Visual Arts"* (MIT Press, 2007). Seu livro *"Streetwalking on a Ruined Map"* (Princeton University Press, 1995) recebeu o prêmio de melhor livro de estudos de cinema da Society for Cinema and Media Studies. Sua obra seminal *"Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture and Film"* (Verso, 2002) ganhou o prêmio de livros Kraszna-Krausz de "melhor livro mundial sobre imagem em movimento" e foi nomeado o "Livro do Ano" em 2003 pelo jornal *Guardian*. Em 2008 Bruno figurou no *"Visual Culture Studies: Interviews With Key Thinkers"* como uma das intelectuais mais influentes trabalhando sobre estudos visuais nos dias de hoje.

László Moholy-Nagy

Couldn't an exciting film be made from the map of Paris?... From the compression of a century-long movement of streets, boulevards, arcades, and squares into the space of half an hour?

Walter Benjamin

On the eve of the invention of cinema, a network of architectural forms was producing a new spatio-visuality. Arcades, bridges, railways, the electric underground, powered flight, skyscrapers, department stores, the pavilions of exhibition halls, glass houses, and winter gardens, among other forms, incarnated the new geography of modernity. These were all sites of transit. Mobility—a form of cinematics—was the driving force of these new architectures. By changing the relationship between spatio-temporal perception and bodily motion, the architectures of transit prepared the ground for the invention of the moving image, the every epitome of modernity[2].

Cinema—the motion picture—emerges out this shifting perceptual arena, partaking in the architectural configurations of modern life. An outcome of the age of travel culture, it has much in common with this geography, especially with regard to its constant, tangible reinvention of time-space. In more particular ways, film viewing inhabits the moving urban culture of modernity: it is an imaginary form of *flânerie*. A relative of the railway passenger and the urban stroller, the film spectator—today's *flâneur*—travels through time in architectural montage.

Modern Horizons: The Celluloid City

It is in fact by way of architecture that film turns into cinema, for, in order to exist, the cinematic apparatus needs a home—a movie "house." And because housed in the city, "since the beginning of the twentieth century. . . the screen . . . became the city square" (Virilio, 1991: 25). Film was a product of the

---

2   For a more extended treatment of this subject, see Giuliana Bruno (2002, 2007, 1993), Anne Friedberg (1993) and Leo Charney and Vanessa R. Schwartz (1995).

era of the metropolis, expressing an urban viewpoint from the very origin of its history. The city is present as *mise en abîme*. Addressed primarily to urban audiences, early film fed on the metropolitan consciousness and unconscious.

An international genre of panorama films, in particular, made traveling through sites an extensive practice in the very early days of film. In a mirroring effect, the life of the street, views of the city, and vistas of foreign lands were offered for viewing to urban audiences. This travel genre was instrumental in the development of the language of fiction films and created ground for the city to emerge as fiction.

During the 1920s, the city dominated the panorama of film history, becoming the subject of a number of landmark films that narrated urban space, including *Manhatta* (Paul Strand & Charles Sheeler, 1921), *Paris qui dort* (René Clair, 1923), *L'Inhumaine* (Marcel L'Herbier, 1924), *Metropolis* (Fritz Lang, 1926), *Rien que les heures* (Alberto Cavalcanti, 1926), *Berlin: Symphony of the Big City* (Walter Ruttmann, 1927), *The Crowd* (King Vidor, 1928), *Sunrise* (F. W. Murnau, 1927), *The Man with a Movie Camera* (Dziga Vertov, 1929), and *A Propos de Nice* (Jean Vigo, 1930). The city space also became a genre in the German street drama and in the Italian cinema of the street, both of which opened the road to women.

It was René Clair, the maker of a celebrated cinematic city film, who claimed that "the art that is closest to cinema is architecture" (*apud* Virilio, 1991[3]). In his filmic view, the tempo of the city is rendered as if it were the rhythm of cinema itself. Thus, in the 1920s, the film apparatus joins the mechanics of the city. And moving with time, cinema begins to define itself historically as an architectural practice: an art form of the street, an agent in the building of city views. The image of the city ends up closely interacting with filmic representations. And thus, in the age of cinema, the streetscape is as much a filmic construction as it is an architectural one.

---

3   René Clair's statement is cited by Virilio in *Lost Dimension*, p. 69.

Material Cities

> One's body takes root in the asphalt.
>
> —Siegfried Kracauer
>
> Botanizing on the asphalt.
>
> —Walter Benjamin

The link between film and urban culture that emerged in film history was also a function of film criticism. Think of Sigfried Kracauer, whose writings paved the way for, or intersected with, the reflections of his friend Walter Benjamin. Kracauer had a career as a trained architect and, as a critic, was always attracted to the urban pavement. He called attention to the German street film by dwelling on film's *material* attraction for the street, the pavement, feet walking over stones (Kracauer, 1947: 157-160). Kracauer was interested in architectural physicality as well as material historicity. He constructed a bond between history and the street, showing that "when history is made in the streets, the streets tend to move onto the screen."(1960: 98).

Attuned to "the establishment of physical existence," Kracauer cited motion as the driving force behind this phenomenon[4]. In developing his material-based *Theory of Film,* he called attention to the transient and to refuse, and turned to the street for its potential to express "the flow of life" (Kracauer, 1960[5]). For Kracauer, the affinity between cinema and the city street pertains to the transient, for the street—like the cinema—is the site where fleeting impressions take place, along with the sense of life itself flowing. As he put it, "the medium's affinity for the flow of life would be enough to explain the attraction which the street has . . . exerted on the screen" (Ibid: 72)

Kracauer's interest in the material texture of the city is evident even in the title of his collection of Weimar essays, *The Mass Ornament*. Here, the

---

4   Kracauer devotes a whole section to the topic of "the establishment of physical existence" in his *Theory of Film*. Furthermore, as Miriam Hansen shows, Kracauer thought of film as something "with skin and hair." See Hansen (1993: 437–69). See also Heide Schlupmann (1987: 97–114).

5   Especially pp. 52–53 on the transient and pp. 71–73 on the flow of life.

affinity between the urban fabric and the filmic surface is clearly revealed. His reflections on such urban topics as the "Hotel Lobby" and the "City Map," which for him become places of "Travel and Dance,"[6] suggest how these phenomena make modernity's desire for the moving image rise to the surface as they mark the transformation of space and time. The urban dweller, at home in the hotel lobby or the city's arcade, inhabits the map of modernity; so does the film spectator, a *flâneur* who genealogically resides in the arcade, itself a place of transit[7]. For Kracauer this dance of modernity linked body to image, for, as he notes elsewhere: "it is precisely as a passage that the passageway is also the place where, more than almost anywhere else, the voyage which is the journey from the near to the far and the linkage of body and image can manifest itself" (1995: 338). It was a clever coincidence, then, that the entrance to the Berlin Linden Arcade, a *passage*, was flanked by two travel offices. The Anatomical Museum—a place of transport—towered inside this arcade amidst the world panorama. Here, cities looked like faces, and film showed its material façade.

The Architecture of the Movie Theater

The fiction of the city transfers even to the anatomy of the movie house. As Kracauer shows, a consideration of the space of the cinema must include the architecture of movie theaters, one of the most important yet least researched areas of film studies. In 1926, Kracauer wrote an article on Berlin's picture palaces of the 1920s, in which he demonstrated that "the life of the street" transforms itself there "into the street of life," giving rise to the cosmopolitan cinema audience (1995: 325). As the street turns into a movie house, the movie house turns into the street. The movie theater thus houses the city, which is itself a movie house, a theater of modernity's journeys.

This fluid urban thinking is further developed as Kracauer pictures the matter of modernity as surface. His grasp of the modern era touches upon a

---

6   See Kracauer, "The Hotel Lobby," "Analysis of a City Map," "Travel and Dance," and other Weimar-era essays in *The Mass Ornament* (1995).

7   The culture of the arcade is notably developed by Walter Benjamin (1999) and *Charles Baudelaire* (1969).

variety of surface-level experiences, of which the cinematic situation is a part[8]. As a prominent part of his discussion of the mass "ornament," he shows that the film experience takes shape both as and in public architecture, noting how "The Little Shopgirls Go to the Movies" (Kracauer, 1995[9]). Moreover, he makes clear that the architecture of the film image is reflected in the architecture of the film theater, itself home to phenomenological externality. In describing the architecture of the movie palace, he stresses the fact that "elegant *surface splendor* is the hallmark of these mass theaters. Like hotel lobbies, they are shrines to the cultivation of pleasure. . . . The architecture of the film palaces [creates a] community of worshipers" (Kracauer, 1995: 323). The movie palace shares with the hotel lobby the ability to become a modern place of worship: a place of encounter where a community of strangers gathers to practice a public intimacy. Flaunting the surface splendor of its architecture, the film theater becomes a secular church devoted to the cult of images—fleeting projections of light on an elusive surface.

By looking at that surface which is architectural décor, Kracauer most importantly arrives at an understanding of the *texture* of the film experience. In *The Mass Ornament*, he theorizes the function of architectural design in film as follows:

> The interior design of movie theaters serves only one purpose: to rivet the viewer's attention to the peripheral, so they will not sink into the abyss. The stimulations of the senses succeed one another with such rapidity that there is no room left between them for even the slightest contemplation. Like *life buoys*, the refractions of the spotlights and the musical accompaniment keep the spectator above water. The penchant for distraction demands and finds an answer in the display of pure externality. . . .
>
> Here, in pure externality, the audience encounters itself; its own reality is revealed in the fragmented sequence of sense impressions(Kracauer, 1995: 325-326).

Suspended in tension between absorption and dislocation, the film spectator is attracted to the surface, encountering herself in the sheer externality of impressions and stimuli. As subject, she "senses" a fragmented space in constant, electrifying motion.

This play of fraction and refraction, embedded in the architecture of the

---

8   For an entry on this topic, see Gertrud Koch, 2000.
9   "The Little Shopgirls Go to the Movies," in Kracauer, 1995.

theater, appears to reflect early cinema's own attraction for "superficial" experiences. Think of *Coney Island at Night* (Edwin Porter, 1903), in which New York's Coney Island becomes a play of pure externality. The amusement park is represented as a mere black surface decorated with lights, flashing and dancing across the texture of the screen. As the camera pans across this electrical landscape, the screen itself becomes a permeable surface. The electrifying experience of the city is reflected in the film as the screen itself becomes a surface encounter with the energy of urban culture.

The material fabric of the city becomes fully visible in the surface splendor of film architecture. As Kracauer puts it, the interior design of the film theater is fundamentally urban, for it keeps drawing our attention away from the center, pulling us toward the periphery and the surface. Ornament and the refraction of the light display in the movie palace keep the viewer from "sinking into the abyss." In keeping the spectator alert and afloat, the design of the movie palace serves an important function: it reflects the electric texture of the urban surface and enables our absorption in its fabric.

Street (Movie) Theater

Turning to the architecture of movie theaters—"palaces" in which a tourism of images takes architectural form—is a productive way to approach film spectatorship itself as an architectonics. Located in the public architecture of the movie theater, film is an architectural manifestation of social texture. Participants in the urban fabric, film theaters offer a variety of possible cinematic experiences and diverse means of mapping spectatorship. One can never see the same film twice, for the reception is changed by the space of the cinema and by the type of physical inhabitation the site yearns for, craves, projects, and fabricates, both inside and outside the theater. We thus can be utterly different spectators when we watch the same film in different places, for different models of spectatorship are figured in the architecture of the theater itself. The fabric of the film experience involves an intimate spatial binding—an experience always in flux.

As cities are spaces of transitions so are movie theaters, whose shape and concept have changed over time in the urban environment, yet always remain an intricate part of its fabric. Cinema is primarily of the street, even as a form of spectatorship. If we consider the history of exhibition in the early days of cinema's invention, we can better see the root of this urban bond. The motion picture was largely born out of the sidewalk and has closely participated in its urban development. At the origin of cinema, one would watch films by moving from sidewalks into cinemas that were fundamentally "storefronts." The theater was not only located at street level but also shaped like any other store. Many retail shops were remodeled and adapted for the new use of showing films—for the new urban fashion. It was true urban recycling. Watching film remained inseparable from one's activity of *flânerie*: it was part of "street-walking," a peripatetic use of the street and a variation on strutting. The reception was fluid, for one would move to and from the sidewalks, entering and exiting different kinds of stores. One would spend as much time in the storefront cinema as shopping in a store or loitering on the street. One could "suit" oneself either in new clothes or in novel images. Related in this way to the urban display of images and to the remodeling of urban patterns, the storefront theater participated in the actual "fashioning" of the street.

Film Architectures

> Film's undoubted ancestor . . . is—architecture.
>
> —Sergei M. Eisenstein

Moving along this urban route to extend the theoretical bridge between film and architecture, we turn to the seminal contribution made by Sergei Eisenstein in his essay "Montage and Architecture"[10]. Writing in the late 1930s, Eisenstein contributed to the effort to link the architectural ensemble to the language of film by offering a pioneering theoretical articulation of the

---

10 Sergei M. Eisenstein (1989), with an introduction by Yve-Alain Bois, pp. 111–31. The text was written circa 1937, to be inserted in a book-length work.

construction of these forms. In claiming that there is a genealogical relation between the two, he set out to design a moving spectator for both. His method for accomplishing this was to take the reader, quite literally, for a walk. Built as a path, his essay guides us on an architectural tour. *Path*, in fact, is the very word Eisenstein uses to open his exploration. Underscored in his text, it becomes almost an indexical mark, a street sign. An arrow points to the itinerary we are to take:

> The word *path* is not used by chance. . . . Nowadays it [is] the path followed by the mind across a multiplicity of phenomena, far apart in time and space, gathered in a certain sequence . . . 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 (Eisenstein, 1989: 116).

The (im)mobile 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, for the person who wanders through a building or a site also absorbs and connects visual spaces. In this sense, the consumer of architectural viewing space is the prototype of the film spectator. Thus, as Eisenstein claimed elsewhere, the filmic path is the modern version of an architectural itinerary:

> [A]n 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 elements (fragments) of a phenomenon filmed in diverse dimensions, from diverse points of view and sides (Eisenstein, 1980:16-17).

Film follows the geographic course of architectural exploration: it ventures to draw on the multiple viewpoints of a picturesque route. It reinvents this practice in modern ways by allowing a spectatorial body to take unexpected paths of exploration.

Filmic and Architectural Promenades

From this mobile viewpoint we have observed that an act of traversal conjoins film and the city. An architectural ensemble is read as it is traversed.

This is also the case for the cinematic spectacle, for film—the screen of light—is read as it is traversed, and is readable insofar as it is traversable. As we go through it, it goes through us. A visitor is the subject of this practice: a passage through the surface of light spaces.

This passage through textures of light is an important issue for both cinema and architecture. As Le Corbusier put it, developing the idea of the *promenade architecturale* by way of Auguste Choisy, as Eisenstein would do[11], architecture "is appreciated *while on the move*, with one's feet . . . while walking, moving from one place to another. . . . A true architectural promenade [offers] constantly changing views, unexpected, at times surprising" (Le Corbusier, 1964: 24). Le Corbusier's articulation of the architectural promenade, first developed in 1923, describes architecture as if it were a film. It is only fitting, then, that the filmmaker and film theorist Eisenstein, who was a former architect, would "picture" this notion similarly, and that it would resonate in his work.

In building the conceptual construction that connected architecture and cinema, Le Corbusier met Eisenstein in many ways on the grounds of the architectural promenade. Claiming that "architecture and film are the only two arts of our time," Le Corbusier went on to state that "in my own work I seem to think as Eisenstein does in his films"[12]. Indeed, Le Corbusier and Eisenstein not only admired each other's work but fashioned their thoughts similarly: they crossed paths in the production of space, just as their theories intersect profoundly as the practice of mobilized space. Filmmaker and architect "street-walked," side by side as they set out on a filmic-architectural promenade.

Architecture and film came to be related on the cultural map that resulted, on which viewing ended up designed as a successive, picturesque, peripatetic activity. If film derives its penchant for *flânerie* from the architectural field, it is because architecture itself houses a version of

---

11   In "Montage and Architecture," Eisenstein used Auguste Choisy's "picturesque" view of the Acropolis from the latter's *Histoire de l'architecture* (1899), following Le Corbusier's own appropriation of Choisy to picture his notion of the *promenade architecturale* in *Vers une architecture* (1923).

12   This statement, from the only interview Le Corbusier gave during his stay in Moscow in 1928, is cited in Jean-Louis Cohen (1992: 49).

cinematics. As a form of imaginary perambulation, the moving image shares the dynamics of an architectural promenade and has the ability to create its own architectural motion: a *promenade architecturale* is inscribed into, and interacts with, film's own "street-walking."

Film Panoramas

As we look back at the origin of cinema through this theoretical lens, we can now fully recognize the historical root of the architectural promenade. Genealogically speaking, the turn-of-the-century travel-film genre, which would become instrumental in the development of the fiction film, clearly exhibits the generative bond of film to architectural peripatetics. Early film envisioned "panoramic views" that turned sights into sites: it incorporated modernity's desire for "site-seeing"—its taste, that is, for viewing sites in motion. In these films, which were massively produced at the origins of cinema, the camera practices circular pans, up-and-down tilts, and forward, vertical, and lateral tracking motions, offering a variety of picturesque vistas across the city space. A film like *Panorama from Times Building, New York* (American Mutoscope and Biograph, Wallace McCutcheon, 1905), for example, portrays New York's aerial cityscape by first tilting upward and then panning across an urban bird's-eye view. In panoramas like this, the camera strives for diverse viewing possibilities from the height of buildings or from different perspectival points in the city. As seen in *Panoramic View of Monte Carlo* (Edison, 1903), the genre of city travelogues offers not only panoramic perspectives but also street-level views. In this way, film reproduces a practice of urban space that involves the city's public and its daily activities.

The travel genre is attracted to the street motion of urban strolling and represents the urban circulation of male and female urban dwellers. In films such as *At The Foot of the Flatiron* (American Mutoscope and Biograph, Robert K. Bonine, 1903), architectural tours turn into diverse gender travelogues. As the urban panoramas show, the sidewalk houses sexual mobility and freer circulation for a growing female urban public. Public circulation takes cinematic

shape, and the sidewalk becomes the site where gender dwells in various ways.

In these films, not only the subjects of urban views move; the very technique of representation aspires to motion. Film cameras are placed on railroad cars, incline rail cars, subway cars, boats, moving street vehicles, and even balloons for attempted aerials. Movement was also simulated. Beginning with Hale's Tours and Scenes of the World, in 1905, phantom rides were offered to spectators who would watch films in theaters designed like railroad cars, with the screen placed at the front of the vehicle.

When the camera is placed at the very front of a moving vehicle—in trains, most typically; in subway cars, as in *Panoramic View of Boston Subway from an Electric Car* (Edison, 1901); on streetcars, as in *Panoramic View of the Brooklyn Bridge* (Edison, 1899); or on vehicles moving through the street, as in *Panorama of 4th St., St Joseph* (American Mutoscope and Biograph, A. E. Weed, 1902)—the camera becomes the vehicle: that is, it becomes, in a literal sense, a spectatorial means of transportation. The travel-film genre inscribed motion into the language of film, transporting the spectator into space and creating a multiform travel effect that resonated with the architectonics of the railroad-like movie theater that housed it.

The Art of Cultural Travel

> Space . . . exists in a social sense only for activity
>
> for (and by virtue of) walking . . . or traveling.
>
> —Henri Lefebvre

In re-viewing the history of early film through the lens of cultural theory, the relationship between film and the architectural ensemble has unfolded an architectonics of traveled space. The panoramic views, the shifts in viewing positions, the traversal of diverse spatio-temporal dimensions, and the movements of the spatial consumer have linked the city to travel to film. Cinema, born out of the theater of urban motion, exhibits a fascination for the

27

very means that produced the modern, moving visual space.

In this respect, film reworks another aspect that contributed to the evolving image of the city. It is genealogically related to *vedutismo*: the "art of viewing" the city that emerged in early modernity, before panorama paintings[13]. By the time cinema was born, paintings of city views were well established as a form of urban representation. They had become an autonomous artistic genre in the late seventeenth century, evolving from a pandemic of urban imaging and the drive to geographical expansion. View painting, developed as an art of viewing the city, introduced a real "taste" for viewing sites. This hunger for viewing was inseparable from the history of travel and the development of urban culture. At times, the *veduta* was even produced as a souvenir of a city, becoming a literal visual memento of the experience of a town. In this way, view painting participated in the composite construction of the image of the city and materialized its memory.

As an integral part of early modernity, view painting affected the creation of cultural memory even as it projected itself forward, toward a cinematic future. The city in transition that came to be embodied in film first became representable in the art of topographical viewing that made moving portraits of the city in the history of art. The city views produced by *vedutismo* moved from painting to film, taking up steady residence in early cinema. The genre of panorama films in particular, while insisting on portraying the city, followed in the footsteps of urban view painting with modes of representation directly derived from the art-historical rendering of city views. At a representational level, for example, film rendered feasible the imaginary bird's eye-views of view painting, which had been impossible aerial perspectives in *vedutismo*. It also materialized the street-level portrait of the city present as well in the art of viewing. Early cinema recollected the city: it made its own sweeping panoramas and montage of streetscapes, fixing the fleeting moment of passing through a site on the wax-like texture of celluloid and the surface of the screen. In the visual style of view painting, film created a modern image of the city while making more space for viewing, perusing, and wandering on the surface.

---

13 For an introduction to this subject see, among others, Cesare de Seta, ed.(1996).

The architecture of view painting thus became transferred to the urban techniques of early film panoramas, dwelling there as a memory trace. Film's own art of viewing is the trajectory drawn by a visitor to or dweller in a city, who projects herself onto the wide cityscape and who also engages the close anatomy of the streets—the city's underbelly—traversing all different urban configurations in multiple perspectives. Heterotopic perspectives and a montage of "traveling" shots with diverse viewpoints and rhythms guide the cinema. Changes in the height, size, angle, and scale of the view, as well as the speed of the transport, are embedded in the very language of filmic shots, editing, and camera movements. Travel culture is written on the very techniques of filmic observation derived from city views.

Narratives of Lived Space

Geography includes inhabitants and vessels.

— Gertrude Stein

As we have seen, the genealogical architectonics of film is an aesthetic touristic practice of absorption in spatio-temporal surface. As in all forms of imaginative journey, space is here physically consumed as a vast commodity. In film, architectural space becomes framed for viewing and offers itself for consumption as traveled space—for further cultural travel. Attracted to vistas, the spectator becomes a visitor, simultaneously threading past and future in the representation of the city. This film viewer is a tourist of cultural memory.

Acting as such a cultural voyager, the itinerant spectator of the architectural-filmic ensemble reads moving views—constructions of the flow of life. In the cine city, the framing of space and the succession of sites organized as shots from different viewpoints, adjoined and disjoined by way of editing, constitutes a montage of forms of dwelling. Incorporating the subject as the inhabitant (or intruder) in this space is a narrative passage. It means not simply reproducing but reinventing her various trajectories through space and charting

the narrative and the memory these navigations create. Architectural frames, like filmic frames, are transformed by an open relation of movement to events. Not just vectors or directional arrows, these movements are practices of space, that is, veritable plots of everyday life[14]. Motions are territories mobilized internally, mappings of practiced places—landscapes of emotions. This is how urban experiences—dynamics of space, movement, and lived narrative—embody the effect of the cinema and its intimate promenades.

Haptic Routes

> How could I know that this city was made to the measure of love?
>
> How could I know that you were made to the measure of my body?
>
> —From the film *Hiroshima Mon Amour*

Hiroshima Mon Amour, written by Marguerite Duras and directed by Alain Resnais in 1959, charts an amorous map that conflates the self and the city, showing that the link between urban space and film is a haptic geography, referring to the sense of touch. 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 con*tact* between the environment and us. 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 kinesthesis, or the ability of our bodies to sense their own movement in space. As Henri Lefebvre wrote regarding this haptic architectonics:

> Space—*my* space— . . . is first of all *my body* . . . : it is the shifting intersection between that which touches, penetrates, threatens or benefits my body on the one hand, and all the other bodies on the other (Lefebvre, 1991: 184).

In this conception of "the production of space," the history of urbanity is read as a history of a socio-sexual body. Film and architecture meet on this route, for they are both productions of material representation—constructions lived by users.

---

14 See Michel De Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (1984).

Film and the city share a dimension of living that in Italian is called *vissuto*, the space of one's lived experiences. In other words, they are about lived space, and about the narrative of place. When these tangibly lived sites are narrativized by motion, they become spaces for further inhabitation. Such types of dwelling always invite, and construct, a subjectivity. Their subjectivity is a self who occupies space and leaves traces of her history on the surface of the wall and the texture of the screen.

Dressing the Surface, Addressing the Skin of the City

This experiential dimension— a haptic closeness— was recognized by Walter Benjamin when he related cinema's new mode of spectatorship to the way we respond to buildings. As Benjamin put it, "buildings are appropriated . . . by touch and sight. . . . Tactile appropriation is accomplished . . . by habit. . . . This mode of appropriation developed with reference to architecture . . . today [is] in the film" (Benjamin, 1969: 240). Thus the bond between cinema and architecture is ultimately understood in the particular sense: space can be "touching."

In writing about this haptic experience, Benjamin furthermore noted that "architecture has always represented the prototype of a work of art the reception of which is consummated" (1969: 239). An heir to this practice, film continues the architectural *habitus*: it makes a custom of building sets of dwelling and motion, and has a habit of consuming space. By being repeatedly used and appropriated, lived space is modeled or, in other words, "fashioned." In fact, just like an *abito*— a dress—a habitat "suits" us. And in the consumption of space a site is "worn," and also worn out, by a user. Thus one lives a film as one lives the space that one inhabits—in haptic intimacy.

In this psycho-physical domain of intimacy, one absorbs, and is absorbed by, moving images and their tales of inhabitation. The absorption of the subject in the narrative of space involves a series of inner transformations, played on the *surface* of the space. As in fashion, this mode of consumption involves the "skin" of things—the very touch of intimate space. The fashioning of space is a

living "architexture."

Providing space for living and lodging sites of biography, film and architecture are thus constantly reinvented by stories of the flesh. Apparatuses *à vivre*, they house the erotic materiality of tactile interactions—the very terrain of intersubjectivity. Their geometry consists in the making of a connection between public sites and private spaces: doors that create a passage between interior and exterior, windows that open this passage for exploration. As moving views, the spatial perimeter of film and architecture always stretches by way of intimate incorporation. Appropriated in this way, both forms expand through emotional lodgings and liminal traversals. Fantasies of habit, habitat, habitation, they map the transmission of affects in the circulation of material culture.

Transiti, an Urban Psychogeography

When urban culture—a haptic geography—thrives on tangible interactions and the transitory space of intersubjectivity, it filmically extends its inner perimeter. In the city, as when traveling with film, one's self does not end where the body ends nor the city where the walls end. The borders are fluid, as permeable as epidermic surfaces. As Georg Simmel filmically wrote in 1903, in the metropolis, "a person does not end with limits of his physical body . . . . In the same way, the city exists only in the totality of effects which transcend their immediate sphere" (Simmel, 1971: 335).

Thus the city, laid out as social body, is also laid bare as both surface and passage. In this way, it would eventually become "the naked city," joining up with cinema again, by way of situationist cartography, in the form of a psychogeography—a map of *dérive*, or drift[15]. Named after *The Naked City* (Jules Dassin, 1948)—a film noir bearing the title of the 1945 book of urban images by the photographer Weegee—the city is here made into a map of passages. This filmic metropolis is a palimpsest of lived experiences: the nude

---

15 For some English translations of situationist texts on space, see Ken Knabb, 1989, and Selected Situationist Texts on Visual Culture and Urbanism, published in *October*, special issue "Guy Debord and the *Internationale Situationniste* (1997).

surface of this city was modeled on an ancient map that has the texture—the very skin—of "lived space." The origin of the composite situationist map is, in fact, the celebrated *Carte du Pays de Tendre*, a map of the land of tenderness, drawn by Madeleine de Scudéry in 1654[16]. A haptic map that connects affects and space, and represents the movements between exterior and interior landscapes, this site bears the motion of emotion. Metropolis, the mother-city of film, thus becomes a peculiar means of transport—one that includes the transmission of affects.

The filmic city, finally, can be charted as a tangibly moving landscape: a map of experiential situations, an emotional cartography. Unreeling a sequence of views, the architectural-filmic ensemble has ended up revealing maps of psychogeographic mobility. In many ways, then, adopting this emobilized, inhabited perspective for both architecture and film viewing—two seemingly static and optical activities—has involved transforming our sense of these art forms. The act of joining architecture and cinema, not optically but haptically, has been aimed at corroding oppositions such as immobility-mobility, inside-outside, private-public, dwelling-travel. Remapped as permeable intersubjective spaces, in between housing and motion, architecture and cinema ultimately question the very limits of the opposition. They force us to rethink cultural expression itself as a site of interior-exterior travel and dwelling—a porous geo-psychic in-between.

We can conclude, then, that a dweller-voyager moving through intimate space drives the architectural itinerary of the city, the activity of travel, and film. All involve motion through culturally transmitted space—a form of *transito*. Embracing not only physical motion, the epistemology of *transito* is circulation that includes migrations, passages, traversals, transitions, transitory states, spatial erotics, and, last but not least, affects and that motion which is emotion.

---

16 The *Carte de Tendre* was published as illustration for the anonymous "Urbanisme unitaire à la fin des année 50," *Internationale situationniste*, no. 3 (1959). It was juxtaposed with an aerial photograph of Amsterdam, a city of situationist drift. The montage suggests a joining of aerial and navigational practices in traversing space, affirming an intimacy with the city.

Trasporto: Motion and Emotion

It is here—in the energy of e*motion*—that the moving image was ultimately implanted, with its own psychogeographic version of transport. After all, cinema was named after the ancient Greek word *kinema*. It is interesting to note that *kinema* means both motion and emotion. Film is therefore a modern means of "transport" in the full range of that word's 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, which is 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 spaces that can touch us and affect us, such as the dynamic energy of the city. The emotion of cinema pervades not only the walls of the movie house but extends beyond them. As we have shown, it was most prominently implanted, from the time of precinema, in the urban itinerary: film, intricately bound in the making of modern space, *affected* its mobilization.

Emotion Pictures

Like the city, motion pictures move, both outward and inward: they journey, that is, through the space of the imagination, the site of memory, and the topography of affects. It is this mental itinerary that, ultimately, makes film the art that is closest to architecture. Like architecture, cinema creates mental and emotional maps, acting as membrane for a multifold transport. Layers of cultural memory, densities of hybrid histories, emotional transport are all housed by film's spatial practice of cognition. As a means of psychic travel-dwelling, cinema designs cultural voyages, traversals, and transitions: its haptic

space offers tracking shots to traveling cultures and vehicles for psychospatial journeys. A frame for these cultural mappings, film is modern cartography. It is a mobile map—a map of geo-psychic differences and cross-cultural travel. A voyage of identities in *transito* and a complex tour of identifications, film is an actual means of exploration: at once a housing for and a tour of our narrative and our geography. A touching—*moving*—geography. An atlas of emotion pictures. A *kinema*, indeed.

References

Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in Arendt, Hannah (ed.). *Illuminations,,* trans. Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken Books, 1969.

_____. *Charles Baudelaire*, trans. Harry Zohn. London: Verso, 1969.

_____. *The Arcades Project*, ed. Rolf Tiedemann. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Bruno, Giuliana. *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture, and Film*. New York: Verso, 2002.

_____. *Public Intimacy: Architecture and the Visual Arts*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2007.

_____. *Streetwalking on a Ruined Map*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Charney, Leo; Schwartz, Vanessa R. (eds.). *Cinema and the Invention of Modern Life*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995.

Cohen, Jean-Louis. *Le Corbusier and the Mystique of the USSR*, trans. Kenneth Hylton. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

De Certeau,Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984.

de Seta, Cesare (ed.). *Città d'Europa: Iconografia e vedutismo dal XV al XIX secolo*. Naples: Electa, 1996.

Eisenstein, Sergei M. "El Greco y el cine," in *Cinématisme: Peinture et cinéma*, ed. François Albera, trans. Anne Zouboff. Brussels: Editions complexe, 1980.

_____. "Montage and Architecture," *Assemblage*, no. 10, 1989.

_____. *Histoire de l'architecture.* Paris: Rouveyre, 1899.

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

Hansen, Miriam. "'With Skin and Hair': Kracauer's Theory of Film, Marseille 1940," *Critical Inquiry*, no. 19, Spring 1993: 437–69.

Knabb, Ken. (ed.). *Situationist International Anthology*. Berkeley: Bureau of Public Secrets, 1989.

Koch, Gertrud. *Siegfried Kracauer: An Introduction*, trans. Jeremy Gaines. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Kracauer, Siegfried. *The Mass Ornament*, ed. and trans. Thomas Y. Levin. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995.

_____. *From Caligari to Hitler*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947.

_____. *Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Le Corbusier (Ch.-E. Jeanneret); Jeanneret, Pierre. *Oeuvre complète*, vol. 2, ed. Willi Boesiger. Zurich: Editions Girsberger, 1964.

Le Corbusier. *Vers une architecture*. Paris: Vicent Fréal et Cie, 1923.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.

McDonoughand, Thomas F. (ed.). Selected Situationist Texts on Visual Culture and Urbanism, *October*, special issue "Guy Debord and the *Internationale Situationniste*," ed., no. 79, Winter 1997.

Schlupmann, Heide. "Phenomenology of Film: On Siegfried Kracauer's Writings of the 1920s," *New German Critique*, no. 40, Winter 1987: 97–114.

Simmel, Georg. "The Metropolis and Mental Life," in Levine, Donald N. (ed.). *On Individuality and Social Forms*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Virilio, Paul. *Lost Dimension*, trans. Daniel Moshenberg. New York: Semiotext(e), 1991.