

Public intimacy: Architecture and the visual arts

Javier de Esteban Garbayo

In *Collection and Recollection: On Film Itineraries and Museum Walks*, Bruno delves into the concepts of memory and imagination from the space of the museum, film and architecture. She underlines the interest in mnemonic processes in cinema, as in the films *Memento* or *Blade Runner*, where memory is portrayed as the sum of “fragments of an archival process porously embedded in our path, part of our own shifting geography”. From the angle of this idea, the boundaries between cinema and museum are blurred, with an increasing use of moving images that turn museum rooms into projection rooms. This connection is observed in the experimentation on cinematographic language that artists such as Chris Marker, Douglas Gordon or Bill Viola have carried out. Regarding the urban passage and the transit through the museum, Bruno relates picturesque aesthetics, his legacy of “making feel through the eye”, with cinematographic optics, where “a double movement connects the external to the internal topography”. There is prominent mention of *Montage and Architecture* (1930) by Sergei Eisenstein and Le Corbusiers ‘promenade architecturale’, where cinematographic montage and architectural itinerary converge and the observer becomes a consumer of views. The museum, the gallery or the room, therefore, are conceived as “places of texture”, “fabrications of visual fabrics” or “emotional archives of the imagination”.

“Modernist Ruins, Filmic Archaeologies” runs through “A Free and Anonymous Monument”, the installation that Jane and Louise Wilson presented at the BALTIC Centre for Contemporary Art (Newcastle) in 2003. The installation reconstructs through a succession of suspended screens, like a Lev Kuleshov montage, the Apollo Pavilion design by the artist Victor Pasmore. It stimulates the sensory character of the exhibition space itself, as well as acting as suspended memories of the work. Attention is drawn to the relationship that Bruno points out between modernity and landscape culture, where the pavilion, transition between city and nature, is conceived as a privileged spectator of the perceptual, cultural and social transformations of the modern era. The installation, thus, represents the “multiple, fractured, disjointed, fluid and unstable nature” of space and the modern subject – or the ‘flâneur’, as poetically defined by Charles Baudelaire.

In “The Architecture of Science in Art. An Anatomy Lesson”, Bruno establishes a relationship between science and art through forms of observing the human body and the evolution of exhibition spaces intended for this. The origin is located in Naples, in a show of the anatomical lesson as an antecedent of cinema. Its research base and the fragmentation of the human body relate the anatomical with the cinematographic gaze, the latter from a corporeal form of visibility. In this relationship between the cinematographic and anatomical eye, the text owes to *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*, where Walter Benjamin pointed out that “the boldness of the cameraman is comparable to that of the surgeon”. Bruno analyses José de Ribera’s 1631 painting *Magdalena Ventura with Her Husband*, stressing not only high culture’s interest in an image of popular (low) culture, but also the interest in anatomical abnormalities, especially those of the female body. This “epistemological movement toward the body-object” from culture has contributed to the regarding of the body as a “privileged object of knowledge, pleasure and power”. In contrast, Bruno points out medicine’s debt to cinema in terms of observation and perception modes.

In “Mind Works: Rebecca Horn’s Interior Art”, the work of the German artist serves as a guide for Bruno to delve deeper into the idea of appropriation as an extension of our intimacy, where the human body is shown as an instrument of possession. In “Berlin Exercises”, “Dreaming Underwater” or “White Body Fan”, corporeal prostheses determine the body’s ability to explore space, while in “River of the Moon” or “Station Amoureuuses”, the hotel room is understood as a superposition of stories where space emerges as a geography of subjectivities. Regarding the relationship between body and technology, Horn explores the coordination of movements and the automation of the body to delve into how technology merges with the body to accentuate a shared intimacy.

“Fashions of Living. Intimacy in Art and Film” begins with the “Femme-Maison” series of Louise Bourgeois, which fuses the silhouette of a woman with a house. The drawing makes explicit the connection between home and female subject, eliciting an emotional gaze linked to the idea of travel, at the same time that this idea triggers a transitory relationship with the home as a wandering cartography. In this journey through the house, the first stop is in Dorothy Arzner’s film “Craig’s Wife”, where the house becomes the protagonist in a domesticity that problematizes the relationship between space and sexuality. In *The New Dwelling: Woman as Creator* by Bruno Taut, domesticity is fused with movement, the planes are interpreted as maps for living, and the female subject as a performative object. The relationship between architecture and living continues with works like the Urban maps of Guillermo Kuitca, “Crying Wall” by Ann Hamilton, “House” by Rachel Whiteread or “Untitled” by Dores Salcedo, resulting in a complete geography of intimacy.

The essay series ends with “Architects of Time: Reel Duration from Warhol to Tsai Ming-liang”, where the relationship between architecture and cinema is transferred to the temporal. In Andy Warhol’s *Empire*, the architectural landscape is presented as a “geology of modern life”, while the skin of buildings turns into celluloid. The reinvention of the visual language by Andy Warhol (*Empire*, *Haircut*, *Eat*, *Kiss*, *Sleep*) reproduces an initiatory cinema that takes an interest in everyday life, advancing a realism that tries to capture the architectural atmosphere and fuse “architectural time and the time of architectural space”. Bruno points out that this expansion, fragmentation, stratification and exploration of time marks an international cinematographic movement, as observed in authors like Chantal Akerman or Michelangelo Antonioni. Regarding the cinema of Tsai Ming-liang, Bruno underlines its incisive temporary portrait of the urban condition, where architecture becomes a minimalist atmosphere and the subjective space of a mental state. The photographic series “Theaters” by Hiroshi Sugimoto is presented as a phenomenological and atmospheric terrain, where cinema becomes an atmospheric texture and temporal substance. In this conceptual framework, the works of Warhol, Akerman, Antonioni, Tati, Tsai Ming-liang or Sugimoto remind us “from an essential politics of time” that “the radical temporal refashioning of subjectivity” can lie in “giving space to time”.

To conclude, we can add a methodological question that different essays point out. If the polyhedral story developed by Bruno, regarding constant movements that relate memory, space, architecture, body, cartography, museology and optics, does not question the overcoming of the strict disciplinary divisions between the arts established by the rationalist aesthetic, it complicates a simplistic vision of an interdisciplinary fusion. If painting and sculpture have expanded their territories since the 1960s and 1970s, film and video have done so since the 1980s, and even architecture has embraced and incorporated the formal results of the digital realm, it is equally clear that the fields of specificity, with their own micro-accounts, still offer a considerable resistance to complete fusion. Bruno invites us to treat these relationships between fields discursively, as conversations between the former and the current specificities, structured in various resistances rather than from the standpoint of ignorance and their collapse. In this sense, perhaps we could interpret our interdisciplinary experiments not as failed utopias, nor as lost disciplinary practices, but as elaborate conversations between subjects; interiors constructed as exteriors in order to capture, as Bruno points out, spaces of privacy in the public realm.